



3 1761 11649214 1

Gov. Doc.  
Can  
Com  
L

Canada. Liquor Traffic in Canada, Royal Commission.

(ROYAL COMMISSION)

ON

(THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC)

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

VOLUME II.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT

124642  
-----  
23/10/12



OTTAWA

PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST  
EXCELLENT MAJESTY

1894

[No. 21—1894.]

1009



# GENERAL INDEX.

## QUEBEC.

Name.	Residence.	Place where Evidence taken.	Page.
Andrews, Hon. F. W.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	73
Barbeau, Henri.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	691
Bates, William P.....	do.....	do.....	563
Bazin, Phillip J.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	103
Bélanger, Rev. F. H.....	St. Roch.....	do.....	120
Bell, John R.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	584
Bellemare, Raphaël.....	do.....	do.....	385
Bishop, Geo. C.....	do.....	do.....	667
Bond, E. L.....	do.....	do.....	706
Bond, Right Rev. W. B.....	do.....	do.....	758
Boisvert, Alex.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	148
Boudreau, Louis Z.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	511
Bousquet, J. S.....	do.....	do.....	717
Brosnan, Alfred.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	90
Brown, Wm.....	do.....	do.....	151
Brunet, Alfred.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	700
Bulmer, Henry.....	do.....	do.....	216
Burgess, T. J. W., M.D.....	do.....	do.....	630
Cahill, Joseph H.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	50
Campbell, F. W., M.D.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	711
Carmichael, Very Rev. James.....	do.....	do.....	762
Carsley, Samuel.....	do.....	do.....	644
Carson, Joseph.....	do.....	do.....	396-475
Chateauvert, Victor.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	78
Chevalier, Louis.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	654-665
Clouston, E. S.....	do.....	do.....	754
Costigan, James J.....	do.....	do.....	328-338
Crossley, James.....	do.....	do.....	538

Name.	Residence.	Place where Evidence taken.	Page.
Cullen, Andrew.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	488
Curran, J. J., Q.C.....	do.....	do.....	334
Courtice, Rev. And. C.....	do.....	do.....	482
Darlington, Wm.....	do.....	do.....	371
David, Laurent O.....	do.....	do.....	162
Davidson, Thos.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	106
Dawson, Sir William, C.M.G., F.R.S., LL.D.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	616
Day, Rev. Chas. H.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	158
DeMartigny, A. D.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	665
DeMontigny, Hon. B. A.....	do.....	do.....	179
Dery, E. A.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	8
Deschamp, Clement E.....	do.....	do.....	100
Desnoyers, Hon. M. C.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	262
Dick, James R.....	do.....	do.....	577
Dobell, Richard R.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	35
Dunlop, John.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	652
Doucet, Chas. R.....	do.....	do.....	782
Dougall, John Redpath.....	do.....	do.....	672
Douglas, Rev. Geo., D.D.....	do.....	do.....	431
Dow, General Neal.....	Portland, Me.....	do.....	445
Dugas, Hon. Calixte A.....	Montreal.....	do.....	167
Edwards, John Baker, Ph.D., D.C.L.....	do.....	do.....	249
Ewing, John.....	Melbourne, P.Q.....	do.....	505
Featherston, Arthur.....	Montreal.....	do.....	706
Foley, Edward.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	18
Forget, Lucien.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	777
Forsyth, Joseph B.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	27
Fortier, Joseph J.....	do.....	do.....	41
Fremont, Joseph T.....	do.....	do.....	66
French, Rev. Arthur.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	463
Girdwood, Gilbert, P.M.D.....	do.....	do.....	771
Giroux, Edmond.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	14
Greenshields, E. B.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	321

Name.	Residence.	Place where Evidence taken.	Page.
Gustaffson, Angustus.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	552
Hague, George.....	do.....	do.....	547-722
Hemming, Ed. Jno.....	Drummondville, P.Q.....	do.....	405
Heneker, Rich. Wm.....	Sherbrooke.....	do.....	438
Hooslep, Fred. W.....	Bergen, Norway.....	do.....	435
Hughes, E. A. St. G.....	Montreal.....	do.....	236, 613, 783
Ives, Hubert R.....	do.....	do.....	522
Jewell, Moses B.....	Farnham, P.Q.....	do.....	565
Johnston, Hon. F. W.....	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont....	do.....	412
Joly, Hon. H. C. de L.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	87
Jones, W. L. Evans.....	Richmond, P.Q.....	Montreal.....	496
Johnston, Peter.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	143
Joncas, L. Z., M.P.....	do.....	do.....	79
Joseph, Montefiore.....	do.....	do.....	127
Ker, Rev. John, D.D.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	736
Lacoste, Sir Alex.....	do.....	do.....	273
Lambe, Wm. B.....	do.....	do.....	277
Lavallée, Joseph T.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	150
Lawson, Rev. James.....	Compton, P.Q.....	Montreal.....	590
Leet, S. P.....	Montreal.....	do.....	602
LeMoine, James M.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	82
Meagher, John.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	388
Moore, William Walter.....	do.....	do.....	531-560
Morin, Louis E.....	Longueuil.....	do.....	293
Mulrooney, Geo.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	141
Munderloh, Wm. C.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	550
Murphy, Hon. Edward.....	do.....	do.....	702
McKay, Jno. M., M.D.....	Quebec.....	Quebec.....	52
McKeen, Chas. E.....	do.....	do.....	130
McManus, Rev. Edward.....	Montreal.....	Montreal.....	718
McMillan, David.....	do.....	do.....	609
McShane, Hon. James.....	do.....	do.....	196

Name.	Residence.	Place where Evidence taken.	Page.
Norman, Rev. Richard	Whitmore	Quebec	123
Parker, Moses	Montreal	Montreal	528
Patton, James	do	do	639
Paul, Walter	do	do	696, 774
Petit, H., M.P.P.	Chicoutimi	Quebec	49
Prendergast, M. J. A.	Montreal	Montreal	688
Rae, Wm.	Quebec	Quebec	59
Raymond, John F.	Montreal	Montreal	507
Reford, Robert	do	do	460
Robb, Wm.	do	do	346
Ryan, Michael P.	do	do	225
Sabiston, Alex.	do	do	734
Sandilands, Wm.	do	do	358
Sentenne, Rev. A. L.	do	do	485
Shaughnessy, Thos. G.	do	do	767
Thibaudeau, Hon. J. R.	do	do	313
Thomas, F. W.	do	do	681
Vallée, Charles A.	do	do	210
Vincellette, Clement	Quebec	Quebec	72
Vincent, Jos. Louis	Montreal	Montreal	394
Vohl, Leon P.	Quebec	Quebec	22
Wallbridge, Alex. S.	Montreal	Montreal	515
Wanklyn, Fred.	do	do	741
Watkins, John A.	do	do	635
Weir, Wm.	do	do	682
Williams, Rev. T. G., D.D.	do	do	418

ROYAL COMMISSION  
ON THE  
LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

QUEBEC.

QUEBEC, September 6, 1892.

The Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic met here this day at 10.30 a.m., SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman of the Commission, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
REV. DR. McLEOD.

MR. E. F. CLARKE.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

The commission was read in French and English.

ARTHUR VALLÉE, M.D., of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

18616. You are a Doctor of Medicine, I believe ?—I am a physician, a graduate of Laval University.

18617. Do you reside in Quebec ?—Yes ; I have always resided in Quebec, except during two or three years when I studied in Paris and Berne.

18618. Are you practising your profession here at present ?—I am Medical Superintendent of Beauport Asylum and Inspector of the Belmont Retreat for Inebriates.

18619. Are you in general practice as well ?—A little, but I have lost my general practice very much, because the duties connected with my position occupy the larger part of my time.

18620. Are you the chief medical officer of the Beauport Asylum ?—Yes.

18621. By whom is your appointment made ?—By the Provincial Government.

18622. How long have you held your present office ?—Nearly fifteen years, between fourteen and fifteen years.

18623. Will you please state to the Commission the number of inmates in the asylum at the present time ?—According to the last report, which was made on Saturday, the number of inmates was 975.

18624. Is there a register kept of all patients as they are admitted to the asylum ?—Yes.

18625. Is there also a record kept of the causes which have led to their mental derangement ?—Yes, that information is entered in a book.



18626. Is the record entered in detail?—It is entered as fully as we can obtain the information.

18627. Do you find difficulty in obtaining the requisite information?—No; but it will sometimes be a little while before we can obtain it.

18628. I am speaking of your experience in the hospital. You keep a register, and I understand you to say that that register shows the causes which led to the patients entering the asylum. Do you find difficulty in getting at the facts?—Sometimes.

18629. Is the register, as a general rule, an accurate record?—Yes.

18630. Can you state to the Commission the proportion of males and females in the asylum?—I could not give you the proportions exactly, but I could give you the proportions as set out in the last report. According to the last report, which was for the period from 28th to 31st August last, we had in the house 512 men and 463 women, making a total of 975. That was the number on the 31st August.

18631. Are any of those young persons, say under the age of fifteen years?—Yes, we have fifteen or twenty under that age.

18632. Will you briefly state to the Commission how the institution is managed and supported?—The institution belongs to private parties, or private proprietors, and the Government pay \$132 a year to the proprietors for each patient in the house.

18633. Please explain as to the supervision of the asylum?—The supervision is conducted by officials named by the Government and the President of the Medical Board.

18634. Then there is Medical Board?—Yes.

18635. Of how many members is it composed?—Of three. Besides, there are inspectors, who are at the same time inspectors of other public establishments.

18636. Are they appointed by the Government?—Yes.

18637. And do they conduct their inspection under instructions from the Government?—Yes.

18638. Then how is the active management of the institution carried on, what is the governing body that administers the affairs of the asylum from day to day?—I go there every day.

18639. Yes, but must there not be a Superintendent or inspector resident at the institution?—There is a deputy living there; he is placed there by the proprietors.

18640. Is he the head of the institution?—Yes, he is the attending physician. Besides, there is a manager, and he is at the head of the establishment.

18641. He is appointed by the owners, I understand you to say?—Yes.

18642. Does he confer with the proprietors from time to time?—Yes.

18643. And does he take his instructions from them?—He takes his instructions from the proprietors.

18644. Has he a number of officials under him, prepared to carry out his directions?—Yes, all the employes are under him.

18645. Then the manager and local medical officer are practically the chief officials of the asylum?—Yes.

18646. Does your register at the asylum show the number of patients whose mental derangement has been caused through the use of intoxicating liquor?—Yes; that is entered in the book as the cause when such is the case.

18647. Can you inform the Commissioners as to the proportion which such cases bear to the whole number of cases?—I could not say just now, because I would have to look up the records.

18648. Could you supply the information?—Yes.

18649. Or would that more properly come from the manager of the institution?—The doctor who attends there has the books under his control, and he makes the entries.

18650. Do you think it would be more convenient to get the information from him?—Yes, from Dr. Roy.

18651. Can you give us any idea of the proportions?—I cannot.

18652. Say the proportion out of 900 odd inmates now in the institution?—No, because we do not receive there any cases in which the disease has been caused by alcoholic liquor. There is a separate and special institution where we receive them, the

Belmont Retreat, and for a few years past we have not received any alcoholics into Beauport Asylum.

18653. Do you refer to patients who have lost their reason ; do you not admit them whatever the cause may have been, or do you send the alcoholics to the other institution ?—We admit the insane to Beauport.

18654. We understand that the other place is an institution for the reformation of inebriates ?—The other place is only for alcoholics, those who are sick.

18655. Not necessarily insane ?—Not necessarily insane.

18656. Will you please state to the Commissioners how many patients you have in the other institution ? What is the name of it ?—The Belmont Retreat. The proprietor is present, and he will be able to give the Commissioners a statement of the exact number of patients.

18657. Can you give the Commissioners any idea of how many are there ? You have stated that you are medical inspector of the institution ?—I am medical inspector of the institution for the Government. At this moment we have only one case here for the Government, all the others are private cases, and the individuals pay their own expenses.

18658. What is the name of the proprietor ?—Mr. McKay.

18659. Do you look after all the patients in the Belmont Retreat ?—No. I am called there sometimes by the families, but I do not act for private patients.

18660. Can you give the Commission any idea of the number of patients who go out of the Retreat thoroughly reformed, or shall I say cured of the vice of intemperance, compared with the number who come in ?—I think there are very few.

18661. Can you explain to the Commission the reason ?—I do not think they remain a sufficient length of time. Private patients come in for a few days, until they get over the effects of liquor. If there was a law that compelled them to remain in the institution for a certain length of time, they would have a little more chance of being cured.

18662. Will you please state to the Commission what proportion of the patients you receive are cured ?—I must say that it would be very difficult to state the number, but I suppose we might place the percentage at one-half, when they remain a sufficient length of time.

18663. Do you consider that 50 per cent are permanently cured ?—I have followed some of the cases three or four years and they have remained cured.

18664. That is so far as you know ?—Yes.

18665. Going back to the Beauport institution for a moment : of the 900 odd patients who are there at present, I suppose a certain number contribute to their own maintenance, is that the case ?—Very few do so. I should say that out of the 975 inmates, there are perhaps 10 or 12 who contribute to their maintenance, either themselves or through their friends.

18666. Is the Government allowance made in respect of them as well as of the others ?—It is as regards some of them, when they are assisted by some person, such as a friend, who is not bound to assist towards their maintenance. In these cases the Government pay for ordinary board and the friends pay a supplementary amount.

18667. Take the patients who contribute either themselves or through their relatives to the cost of their maintenance in the institution, are they included in the number for which the Government make a grant ?—Yes.

18668. Then the Government grant applies practically to all the inmates of the institution ?—Besides, there might be three or four patients for whom the Government do not pay at all.

18669. Have the proprietors a regular scale of charges for the institution, or do they simply take the Government grant and maintain the patients ?—They take the Government grant and maintain the patients admitted by the Government officers ; but they have also some private cases, for which special payment is made. They are all on the same footing.

*By Judge McDonald :*

18670. I understood you to state that the officer in charge of the institution for inebriates is present ?—Yes.

18671. I suppose he has a more intimate knowledge of the working of the institution?—Yes, he lives there. We have so few patients there that I only visit the institution once a week.

18672. In reply to a question by the Chairman, you spoke of the correctness of the record of cases in the institution?—Yes.

18673. By your statement did you mean that the record is a correct transcript of the returns you receive, or that the returns furnished are to be relied upon?—I do not understand your question.

18674. When a patient is sent to the institution you receive a report from the examining physician, stating the facts as to the patient and sometimes giving the cause of the trouble?—Yes.

18675. Do you find that those reports are always reliable?—They are not always reliable.

18676. So when you spoke about what was thoroughly reliable, you meant that the entries in your own books are thoroughly reliable so far as the information you have received regarding the patient?—Yes, from the information we have.

18677. You cannot speak yourself as regards the correctness of that information?—No, because that information is sent to us; reports are sent to us, and we have to accept the information they contain.

18678. Do you get a record in each case?—We do.

18679. But as to whether it is correct or not, you do not know?—I have had opportunities of ascertaining in some cases that the reports are not correct. In a few cases they are certainly not correct.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

18680. Is an annual return made to the Provincial Government by the Superintendent of the Beauport Asylum?—Yes, an annual report is made by me.

18681. Does that annual report contain a table showing the number of inmates and the causes which have led to the inmates being incarcerated in the Asylum?—Yes.

18682. Can the Commission obtain copies of those reports?—Some of them have been printed, but not all of them—for some reason or other they have not all been printed.

18683. Could the Commission obtain from those returns percentages of those confined in the asylum who have been sent there on account of alcoholism or kindred cause?—Yes.

18684. How many years has this Retreat been in existence?—The Retreat has been in existence 25 or 30 years.

18685. Is there any law in this Province which gives Justices or Magistrates power to commit drunkards to the Retreat?—No, that is a lack; we ought to have such a law.

18686. Then the officers of that institution have no control over such persons at present?—No control. When they wish to leave we have to let them go, and our efforts cannot have much effect owing to the absence of such a law as that to which you have referred.

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault :*

18687. You are the medical superintendent, living in the asylum?—Yes.

18688. Have you resided in Quebec constantly?—Yes, except when in England and Paris attending to my medical studies. I went to Europe in 1874-75, and returned in 1889, and I have studied cases of mental derangement during eighteen years.

18689. Can you say if drunkenness has considerably increased in Paris, and have you remarked if the use of wines had that effect?—I do not think that drunkenness is caused by the use of wines. There is no doubt that intemperance has made considerable progress, but this is due to the drinking of alcohol.

18690. Do you know it is claimed that where there is much of wine used, there is not so much drunkenness as in countries that consume less?—In France, and

ARTHUR VALLÉE.

especially in Paris, where I was, they make much use of adulterated wine, and it is that which explains the increase of alcoholism. This has been proven by a doctor (whose name I do not remember), who has published a voluminous report on the progress of alcoholism. He declares that it is an invading evil.

18691. Do you think that it is in consequence of the use of wine, or is it rather due to the fact that good wine is replaced by alcohol, or adulterated wine?—That is possible. I refer to the statement I just made.

18692. Do you think there is much adulterated liquor sold here?—I think so.

18693. Do you think that the Government ought to analyse the liquors?—Yes, I think so.

18694. In your opinion, what plan should be adopted for such analysis?—The actual law would suffice, I think.

18695. Do you know if there are any "cellars" here where they manufacture liquors?—I cannot say.

18696. Is there a great difference between the smuggled alcohol and the imported?—Yes, because the alcohol of grain is much more harmful than that of the grape.

18697. You are of the opinion that the rectified alcohol is less harmful than that which is not?—I think so, because in the unrectified alcohol there are some oils that are very harmful. I have met with people who use unrectified alcohol, and they have much more sickness than those who use the other kind.

18698. Can you tell us if there is much smuggled liquor brought in?—I have not any knowledge on that point.

18699. Do you think that if we passed a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic liquors, it would cause smuggling to be done on a larger scale?—I think so; but I do not see any necessity for passing such a law.

18700. I refer to the possibility of the Parliament of Canada judging it advisable to pass such a law. Would such a law be desirable, in your opinion?—On the contrary, I do not think it would be any protection against drunkenness.

18701. Is the moderate use of alcoholic liquors detrimental to health?—No.

18702. Are alcoholic liquors beneficial or harmful to health?—Alcohol is undoubtedly useful in certain cases. Wine taken during dinner is not hurtful, as it turns into nourishment.

18703. Would a law forbidding the sale and the manufacture of wine, in your opinion, be desirable?—Not at all.

18704. Could it be put into execution?—I think not.

18705. What do you think of the working of the license law?—I do not know anything about it.

18706. Do you not think that the number of restaurants and other licensed houses is excessive?—In Quebec the number of these houses is altogether too high. There is in that particular a great abuse.

18707. Do you think the system of high license ought to be adopted, with the object of restraining the trade and lessening the number of licensed houses?—I cannot say, as I have never studied that question.

18708. What, in your idea, would be the best measure to adopt for repressing the abuses caused by intemperance? What modification would you desire to make in the law at present in force?—I am in favour of a very severe law against drunkards.

18709. Do you think that drunkards should be punished?—Yes, I think so. The law should be modified. We should also have a law to place drunkards in a home for inebriates. This would do much good, and many of them would be cured.

18710. In England, the law imposes a fine on drunkards?—Yes; and they can be incarcerated in a private hospital for inebriates, and be kept there for a certain time.

18711. Do you think a law that would permit the incarceration of drunkards in a home where they would be under treatment, would be in a measure in the interest of the temperance cause?—Yes, I think so. It would be an improvement.

18712. It is your opinion that in Quebec there are too many licensed houses for the sale of alcoholic liquors?—Too many.

18713. Do you know if the license law is frequently violated?—I do not know anything about that.

18714. Are there any suggestions you could make to the Commission touching the question, or the working of the present system?—I do not think so. The fact is I did not have time to think about it. I only received this morning the note asking me to come and testify, and I did not know before that there existed such a Commission.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

18715. I think you have said that a certain proportion of the patients confined in the Beauport Insane Asylum are there because of drink?—Some of them are from that cause.

18716. Are they there because of excessive drinking indulged in by themselves?—Some of them are there because of their own excessive drinking.

18717. You now refer to some of the insane patients?—Yes.

18718. I think you said in answer to Commissioner Gigault, that the moderate use of wines and liquors does not lead to insanity?—That is my opinion.

18719. Have you any means of knowing and are you able to express an opinion as to whether the moderate and continuous use of alcoholic liquor may be a predisposing cause to insanity?—I do not think it is a predisposing cause, because of the inmates of Beauport Asylum I think the great majority are not drinkers. They were too poor to be drinkers; some may have been drunkards, but the great majority were not even drinkers.

18720. Do you know whether any proportion of those who were not only moderate but very regular drinkers are insane because of that continuous moderate drinking?—I do not know what you mean by “moderate drinking.” If a man takes three drinks of strong liquor daily, I consider he is a drinker; it is too much.

18721. What is moderate drinking?—A man who takes at his dinner a glass of wine or a glass of beer is a moderate drinker. I think a man who takes once a week or twice a month just a little liquor before his meals is a moderate drinker; but a man who takes, as some do, a drink before each meal, is an excessive drinker.

18722. That is immoderate?—It is immoderate in my opinion.

18723. You spoke of having some idiots at Beauport?—Yes.

18724. Do you know anything about the parentage of those idiots?—No; but I think that very often the cause of the idiocy is heavy drinking on the part of the parents. I have no doubt of it.

18725. You have reason to believe, as a physician, having given thought to the matter, that drinking on the part of parents may predispose their children to insanity?—Certainly, it is one of the most obvious causes of it.

18726. Do you as a physician believe that abstinence from the use of intoxicants would promote the general physical and moral health of the people?—Do you mean complete abstinence?

18727. Yes, complete abstinence?—I do not see the necessity of it.

18728. You think, however, that the immoderate use of intoxicants is always injurious more or less?—Certainly.

18729. And you think the use is immoderate when one drink is taken before every meal?—Yes, at every meal. Any one who takes one drink of strong liquor at every meal is an immoderate drinker.

18730. Speaking about Belmont Retreat for inebriates: is there a large number of inmates there?—It is a small establishment.

18731. In answer to Commissioner Gigault, I think you said, that it would be far preferable to have fewer licenses in Quebec than are granted now?—Yes.

18732. What do you think would be the advantage of having a less number of places licensed?—There would be less temptation to drink.

18733. Do you think that the present ample opportunities to drink in the form of restaurants and the like, cause more drinking than there should be?—Certainly.

18734. Do you think it would be an advantage to have them all closed up?—As much as possible. To get them all closed up would be rather a difficult task I think, and it would be going too far, but I think half of them should be closed.

18735. You think they could be closed with advantage to the community?—With advantage to every one.

ARTHUR VALLÉE.

18736. Do you know whether the provisions of the license law are strictly observed or not?—Really I could not say whether they are or not. I have had no experience in regard to that matter, but from what I have heard sometimes, I think there are some abuses and violations of the law.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

18737. Do you think it would be beneficial to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquor by reducing the number of licensed places?—Yes.

18738. Would the cause of temperance be promoted by the free sale of liquor, by doing away with the license law altogether and allowing those who desire to engage in the traffic?—No; I think the number should be diminished without the trade being abolished completely.

18739. I understood you to say, in reply to Commissioner McLeod, that a curtailment of a number of places would be beneficial?—Yes.

18740. What would be the effect of giving *carte blanche* to people to sell?—It would have a bad effect.

18741. Do you think it would promote temperance?—It would have a very bad effect if everybody could sell liquor without obtaining a license.

18742. How can the best possible results be obtained: by the free sale of liquor, or by a rigorous license law, vigorously enforced?—By having a rigorous license law faithfully enforced: that is my opinion.

18743. I suppose the excessive use of tobacco is very injurious to the individual?—Yes.

18744. It would be better for the people generally, and promote health if tobacco were not used?—Yes; but altogether there is less abuse of it than of liquor.

18745. Is there any abuse of it?—Certainly, there is some abuse, by those who smoke too much.

18746. Do you think they had better not smoke at all?—Not too much, at all events.

18747. Do not some people over-indulge in food?—Yes.

18748. Is not their health interfered with in consequence of over-indulgence?—Yes, but there is a difference, because tobacco is a poison.

18749. Is not a'cohol a poison too, if taken to excess?—Yes but ordinary food is not.

18750. Do you have complaints made to you of sickness which has been brought about by over-feeding?—Certainly, sometimes I have.

18751. If food is used in moderation the health of the individual is promoted, I suppose, just as the use of liquor in moderation is less injurious?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

18752. When you spoke of the use of alcoholic liquor by parents being one of the causes contributing to idiocy in their children, did you not mean the excessive use of liquor?—Certainly.

18753. When you spoke of curtailing the number of licenses here, in the city of Quebec, am I right in concluding that your opinion is that the more licensed people there are selling liquor the more inducements there are to drink, and that licensed saloon keepers do what they can to induce people to drink?—Yes.

18754. If you curtail the number, are you not at the same time curtailing the opportunities to drink?—Yes.

18755. You at the same time remove some of the temptations to drink, I suppose—Certainly.

E. A. DÉRY, Recorder of the City of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

18756. You are, of course, a member of the legal profession?—Yes.

18757. How long have you held the office of Recorder of the city?—15 years.

18758. Are you a native of the Province of Quebec?—Yes.

18759. Have you lived in this city many years?—I was born here, and I have lived here all my life.

18760. What is the nature of the cases that, as a rule, come before your court?—Violations of the city ordinances, which class covers nearly every offence and especially drunkenness; also cases connected with maintenance of the good order of the city and public morals and so forth. I have jurisdiction in criminal cases similar to that possessed by the Judge of Sessions; I do not usually take those cases, but send them before that Judge.

18761. You are familiar, of course, with the license law of the Province?—Yes, pretty much so.

18762. Is there any Inspector under the license law in the city of Quebec?—Not that I know of.

18763. Is there no official appointed by the city?—No.

18764. Nor by the Provincial Government?—I could not answer that question; the Judge of Sessions could probably tell you.

18765. Are the cases heard before you brought by the police?—I only take cases brought before me by the police.

18766. Can you tell the Commissioners whether drunkenness has increased or decreased during the time you have held the office of Recorder of this city?—It has decreased very especially in the city during the last 15 years.

18767. Do you publish any report of the cases tried by your Court?—No.

18768. Is your appointment made by the Provincial Government, or the city?—By the Government.

18769. You have said that you make no report of the business that comes before your court?—No.

18770. Is no record published of the cases that come before your court?—Not to my knowledge. If there is, it is done by the Clerk.

18771. Of course you have a record of the cases?—Yes.

18772. Do you not make a return to the head of the Provincial or Dominion Government of the cases that come before you?—Mr. Foley does for the court, but personally I do not.

18773. The Dominion Government in some way obtain a return of the cases of drunkenness, &c., that are tried before you?—Yes, but from the Clerk of the court, not from me.

18774. Is it within your knowledge that the license law is disregarded to any serious extent?—I think so, but I am not sure, because all the offences against the license law are heard at the Police Court. I occasionally hear in my court cases of keeping open on Sunday and during illegal hours at night; but cases of infringement of the license law itself, are nearly all taken before the police court.

18775. Keeping a licensed house open contrary to the law would be an infringement of the License Act, I suppose?—Yes.

18776. Would such a case come before you?—Yes. It would not, however, come under the license law, but under a special Act of the Legislature respecting the closing of taverns on Sunday and at eleven o'clock at night.

18777. Have you many such cases brought before you?—Not as many now as previously. I think the police court have more cases now than we have.

18778. Do you mean that these cases are prosecuted by the Provincial Government?—Yes.

18779. You have said that you think that there is less drunkenness now in Quebec than there was some years ago?—I do not know that there is less drinking, but there are much fewer cases of drunkenness.

E. A. DÉRY.

18780. To what do you attribute that change?—I do not know if I can explain the cause. I endeavoured to have the taverns closed on Sunday and at a proper hour at night. I fought them for several years, and I think that had good results, because the taverns are now pretty generally closed on Sunday, and that has diminished the number of cases brought before the court.

18781. You say that you have endeavoured to have the taverns closed on Sunday?—Yes.

18782. What particular action have you taken to secure that end?—I gave the police orders that they were to be very strict in regard to the closing of taverns on Sunday and at a proper hour at night, and they have carried out my orders. The liquor sellers have done all they could in opposition. They have contested the cases before all the tribunals and have even taken a case to the Supreme Court, but at length the local Act was declared to be constitutional, and then they had to close their houses. I consider that the number of cases of arrests for drunkenness has been very much less than it was before, especially on Sunday.

18783. Has there not been a large increase in the license fees charged liquor dealers in the Province of Quebec?—Yes.

18784. Have there been two or three changes made?—There have been several.

18785. Do you consider that the increase in license fees has tended to diminish drunkenness?—I do not think so, because I observe that the number of licenses issued is the same, if not greater.

18786. Do you think there are more licensed places now than previously?—Yes, I think so.

18787. Notwithstanding the high license?—That is my opinion, though I cannot exactly say.

18788. Can you inform the Commissioners how many places are licensed to sell liquor in Quebec at the present time?—I cannot tell you exactly. The Judge of Sessions or the Clerk of the Police Court will be able to tell you exactly.

18789. But you think there are quite as many now as there were formerly; in your opinion the number has not diminished?—Not at all, to my knowledge. I refer to the number of taverns. It may be that the number of licenses has diminished, but the number of taverns, licensed or unlicensed, I do not think has diminished.

18790. The Commissioners understand that you have three classes of licenses in Quebec?—Yes.

18791. Of course there are hotel licenses?—Yes, there are licenses for hotels, for restaurants and for clubs.

18792. Have you a grocer's license?—Yes. There is also a wholesale license, making five classes in all.

18793. Have you any knowledge of the working of what is commonly called the Scott Act?—Not at all.

18794. You have not had any experience of the working of that law?—No.

18795. I understand your view to be that high license has not had any effect in diminishing the number of places where liquor is sold. Am I correct?—It may have diminished the number of licenses issued, but it has not diminished the number of houses where liquor is sold.

18796. How many of the cases that come before you are cases either of drunkenness or connected with offences against the liquor law; what is the proportion of such cases to the whole?—Nearly all the cases that come before me are for what may be called penal offences, the civil jurisdiction being outside of my court. The greater proportion of the arrests made by the police are for drunkenness.

18797. Then it is your opinion that the great proportion are liquor cases?—Certainly. I am speaking of the arrests made by the police. There are, of course, summonses issued for infringement of by-laws, offences which are not due to drinking.

18798. But of the cases that come before you during a year what proportion, in your opinion, arise out of the use of intoxicating liquors?—It is not very easy to answer that question without making an examination of the registers of the court.

18799. Is it a large proportion?—Do you mean cases under the criminal jurisdiction?



18800. I mean the proportion of all the cases that come before you as Recorder of the city?—There is also civil jurisdiction, and actions are taken in my court for taxes and other matters. Taking the whole cases, I do not think those under the license law form the greater proportion; but if you include only infringements of the criminal law, I think such cases as those to which you have referred form the larger proportion.

18801. You say that, taking all the cases, the charges under the license law do not constitute the larger proportion?—Quite so, because there are civil cases.

18802. But how does the proportion stand if you only take criminal offences?—Then that class of cases constitute the larger proportion.

18803. Do you think that if all the places selling liquor in the city of Quebec were closed, there would be less drunkenness?—Certainly, much less.

18804. Have you considered the question of a prohibitory enactment, the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor?—Sometimes I have done so, but not much.

18805. Do you consider that legislation of that sort is desirable?—If it were possible to enforce it, I certainly think it would be desirable.

18806. Do you think a prohibitory enactment, one that would prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, is desirable?—Certainly. I think the greater proportion of crime against the law would not be committed if there were no liquor. That is my opinion.

18807. Do you think, in the present state of public opinion, from your knowledge of public opinion on the subject, such an enactment could be enforced?—I do not think it would be possible altogether, but it might be. I can only answer that question partially, because I think it would depend upon whether the Government took the necessary means to enforce the law. I do not think it would be possible to put the law into force absolutely.

*By Judge McDonald :*

18808. Have you a varying number of persons before you who are repeating constantly the offence of drunkenness?—I have not a great many of them, but of course I have some. I may say that I have 40 or 50 habitual drunkards who come repeatedly before the court the year round.

18809. You expect to see them now and then before the court?—Yes. They are released to-day and to-morrow they are again before me; there may be 40 or 50 of them altogether.

*By the Chairman :*

18810. Are you of the opinion that there are 40 or 50 such cases in Quebec?—I have certainly 40 individuals of that kind.

18811. Whose faces you know?—Yes. They are sent to jail, and soon after their time expires and they are released; they are again arrested by the police and are again brought before me, and I again send them to prison.

*By Judge McDonald :*

18812. Are these both males and females?—Yes; of course there are more males, in fact there are only a few females; the latter only come before the court once or sometimes twice.

18813. Have you many sailors, men of the sea-faring class, and strangers in the city brought before you?—Not a great many.

18814. Then they are mostly citizens?—For several years now, six or seven or perhaps more, there have been very few seamen brought before me.

18815. They are mostly residents of the city?—Yes, and strangers.

18816. Have any belonged to the rural districts?—Yes, a large part of those who come before me live outside of the city, in the different counties around the city, and are strangers here.

18817. As I understand your evidence, persons charged with selling liquor without a license are tried before the Judge of Sessions?—Yes.

E. A. DÉRY.

18818. Those who break the terms of the license by selling on Sunday or out of hours are tried by you?—They may be tried before the police court or before me, but when they are brought before me it is done under the provisions of a special local law.

18819. But still they come before you?—Yes. When they are taken before the police court it is under the license law, because they have violated some provision of it.

18820. You have stated in answer to the Chairman, that while you thought the number of licensed places had diminished, the number of places in which liquor was sold had not diminished?—I think so.

18821. Do you mean to say there has been an increase in the number of unlicensed places?—I think so.

18822. Has any effort been made to suppress the illicit sale of liquor?—That is the business of the Government, and I have nothing to do with it.

18823. Do you know what efforts are made in that direction?—That is done by employees of the Local Government.

18824. Are you able to say from your own knowledge that there are many places where liquor is sold without license?—No, I could only say from what I have heard; I have no personal knowledge in regard to the matter.

*By the Chairman :*

18825. Has the number of licensed places increased or decreased within your knowledge?—I could not say; I think the number has been nearly the same for many years.

18826. But you think there is a large number of unlicensed places vending liquor?—Yes, that is my opinion. I think the number of licensed places has diminished a little, but I could not say in what proportion.

*By Judge McDonald :*

18827. I understand you to say that you have directed the police to see that the provisions of the law with which you have to do are enforced?—Yes.

18828. Do you believe they have done their duty?—I think so.

18829. Is it any part of the duty of the police to look after people selling without license?—No, that is part of the duty of the Provincial Police.

18830. And you were referring to the Municipal or City Police?—Yes, it is the duty of the Municipal Police to look to the closing of the taverns on Sunday and at night at eleven o'clock, but they have nothing to do with cases of selling liquor without a license.

18831. The Provincial Police have to do with that?—Yes, and they are under the control of the Judge of Sessions.

18832. And the others are under the officers of the municipality?—Yes.

18833. Is there a Chief of the Provincial Police?—The Judge of Sessions is Chief.

18834. Then the Provincial Police are under his control?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

18835. What is the rule in regard to arresting drunken people? Are the police expected to arrest a drunken man when he is drunk simply, or only when he is drunk and disorderly?—They have the right to arrest him when he is merely drunk; according to our by-law, they may arrest a man simply for drunkenness.

18836. What is the practice? Do they arrest a man when he is heading home and they think he will get there, or do they arrest a man only when they think he will make a disturbance?—They do not generally arrest a man when he is able to go home. They give him a chance, and if he cannot go home, they arrest him. I think the general rule is to give him a chance to go home.

18837. I think you have said that the larger proportion of the criminal offences tried by you are attributable to drink?—I think so, the greater part of them.

18838. Have you noticed whether petty thefts, vagrancy, offences by children and ordinary small offences are traceable to the parents of the children or not? Have you a lot of young people brought before you?—Yes, sometimes.

18839. Do you know whether, for the most-part, those are children of parents addicted to drink?—I could not answer that question. I do not have a great many children before me; children are very seldom before me.

18840. As to boys of fourteen or fifteen years: are they, as a rule, boys who have been neglected by their parents, and have become degraded on account of the drinking habits of their parents?—I could not answer that question.

18841. Do you know whether the licensed places violate the provisions of the law regarding keeping open on Sunday and after a certain hour at night? Do you know whether there is much sale on Sunday by licensed places?—I think that during the last one or two years the sale on Sunday has been increasing.

18842. I ask this question because on Sabbath I noticed two places open?—There are too many open now. I must say that I do not know the reason, but it is a fact that our municipal police do not care as much now as formerly about closing the taverns on Sunday.

18843. Why is it?—I do not know. Two or three years ago the control of the police passed from the hands of a Commission, composed of the Mayor, the Judge of Sessions and myself, to a Committee of the Corporation. Since that time I know the police have not looked after the closing of taverns on Sunday or at night.

18844. They have not looked after them so closely as before?—No; but when under our control, they had express orders to do so.

18845. Do you suppose this is the result of the police being under the control of the City Council, each officer knowing his position depends upon his pleasing the Councillors?—I think so.

18846. And the Councillors do not wish the places to be interfered with?—Yes.

18847. Do you believe it would be better if the control of the police were again placed in the hands of a Commission?—Certainly.

18848. A Commission independent of the popular vote?—Yes, the police would then be more able to do their duty than now. They are now afraid of being dismissed and so on.

18849. You have spoken about club licenses. What are they?—The club licenses are given by the Government itself. A few persons join together, and go and tell the Government that they have formed a club. Then they obtain a license for the club. It is understood that with that license, they have the right to keep open their club on Sunday and drink.

18850. And keep open all night if they like, I suppose?—Yes.

18851. Does their license permit them to remain open on Sunday, and all night, in violation of the provisions of the License Act?—The license says they are subject to the provisions of the license law.

18852. But they violate the provisions?—Yes.

18853. Do the provincial police or the municipal police seek to prevent this Sunday sale and night sale?—They do not do so in two special cases, that of the Union Club and the Garrison Club. It is understood that those two clubs have a right to be open on Sunday. To my knowledge some other places known as clubs, places that have given themselves the name of clubs, have been seized occasionally; but there has always been very great difficulty in deciding whether the rule applied to the Union Club and the Garrison Club should be applied to those other clubs or not.

18854. Do you know whether there are many club licenses issued?—I know there are five or six, and perhaps a good many more clubs could be found that have not license. I do not know whether they are *bonâ fide* clubs or not. I know only two *bonâ fide* clubs in the city, the Garrison and Union.

18855. Do you know how the other clubs are formed? Is there a membership fee?—They pretend there is.

18856. Do they have a bar in the club room?—Yes, they all have bars, and everything belongs to the man who keeps the club.

18857. Can any one obtain liquor there except a member?—They pretend to sell only to members, but I think any body can get liquor.

E. A. DÉRY.

18858. Do you know whether the fact that a man subscribes his name as a member makes him a member?—Yes. If a man goes into one of these clubs and finds his name on the register and pays five or ten cents as a member, he can get drink when he likes.

18859. Do you consider that this club system is a very bad one?—Yes, it is worse than anything else that I know of, because this practice is carried on under cover of legality.

18860. I think you have said that there are a good many unlicensed places in Quebec. I find there were not as many places licensed in 1891 as in 1890; but I understood you to say that there were as many places as before?—I think so. In my opinion there are more unlicensed places now than there were before, during last year or two years ago.

18861. Is it not the duty of the Provincial police to look after those places?—Yes.

18862. You appear to think they do not look after them very carefully?—I did not say so; that matter does not come before me.

18863. Do you know any localities in the vicinity of Quebec in which there are no licenses issued and in which there is no sale of liquor, localities that are under local option?—Yes.

18864. What localities?—There is one, the parish where I am living.

18865. Then you do not live in Quebec city?—During the summer I live in the parish of St. Laurent, one of the parishes on the Island of Orleans.

18866. Is there any sale of liquor there?—There is no sale of liquor.

18867. What is the condition of the community?—It is certainly good; I think it is the best parish of the county.

18868. You think it would not be improved if licenses were issued there?—No, certainly not.

18869. Do you think, as a rule, it is beneficial to a parish if there is no liquor sold there?—Certainly.

18870. Do you think it would be beneficial to the State if there was no liquor sold?—I think so. If it was possible to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor altogether, it would be beneficial. Perhaps the use of wine might be permitted.

18871. I think you said that a prohibitory law could not be enforced. What would be the difficulties experienced?—I have not much confidence in all these prohibitory laws. I think it is always pretty easy to violate them.

18872. Is it not pretty easy to violate any law?—Yes.

18873. As a presiding Judge, do you know any law that is absolutely enforced?—No, I do not know of any.

18874. They are all violated somewhat?—I suppose so.

18875. Do you think it would be possible that if, a prohibitory law were enacted and officials appointed, as is the case in regard to the Internal Revenue law, by the Dominion Government, those officers could enforce a prohibitory law as well as the revenue law is now enforced?—Certainly, but there would be violations.

18876. You do not regard the fact that a law is violated as evidence that it is a failure?—No, certainly not.

18877. So perhaps you would not regard a prohibitory law as a failure if there were some violations?—No, certainly not.

18878. Do you believe that if there were a prohibitory law enacted and fairly well enforced, it would lessen drunkenness?—I think so.

18879. In that respect would its effect be good?—Certainly, that is my opinion.

*By the Chairman:*

18880. Have you not expressed the opinion that the adoption of a prohibitory law would not entirely prohibit the use of intoxicants?—Yes.

18881. Have you not stated that the number of licensed places in the city of Quebec has not increased, that drunkenness has decreased, but the number of places at which liquor is sold in the city has increased? Am I not correct?—I think there is a greater number of unlicensed places.

18882. Then you say that you think the number of licensed places has not increased?—I think it has not increased.

18883. But the places at which liquor is sold have increased?—I do not think so. I do not think I have said that.

18884. And that drunkenness has increased?—Drunkenness has certainly decreased. I judge from the number of arrests made. The number of cases tried before me has certainly decreased very much during the last nine years. As regards the number of houses where liquor is sold, I do not say the number has increased, but the number of unlicensed places has increased, and perhaps the licensed houses have diminished in the same proportion. The licensed houses may have diminished and the unlicensed houses may have increased, so that the number of places where liquor is sold may be the same. Although the number may be the same, I consider there are less arrests now than previously.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

18885. Have the license fees been increased within the last few years?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

18886. Is it your opinion that the places where liquor is sold, licensed or unlicensed, has increased in number?—No, I have no reason to think they have. The fact is that all questions connected with the license law are specially dealt with by the police court.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

18887. What increase has been made in the license fees?—I could not say, it may be found in the Statutes, but they have been very much increased.

18888. Has the increase in license fees caused people to stop procuring licenses to sell legally; and consequently to sell illegally?—I think the number of places selling illegally has increased since the license fees were increased. Some of those who took out licenses previously did not take them out on account of the fees being increased, but at the same time they continued to sell liquor.

*By the Chairman :*

18889. Has the number of places in which liquor is sold, whether licensed or unlicensed, increased or decreased within the last five years?—I think the number is nearly the same.

18890. So, if there has been a decrease in the number of licensed places, there has been an increase in the number of unlicensed places?—Yes.

18891. You do not attribute the decrease in drunkenness, which you think has taken place, to the operation of the license law?—No.

18892. Will you state distinctly from what cause it has arisen?—It may depend on many causes. Perhaps the people are poorer, and perhaps it is on account of the fines imposed in the Recorder's Court. I am pretty severe—that is my reputation.

*By Judge McDonald :*

18893. Do you think, besides the fact of the severity of the sentences passed by you, that any share of the improvement manifested may be reasonably attributed to the influences of religion and of the temperance societies diminishing the amount of drunkenness?—Yes.

18894. You have spoken of drunkenness having decreased on account of the severity of your court. Do you think that any portion of the decrease of drunkenness may properly be attributed to the effects of religion and of the temperance societies in improving the condition of the people and bringing good influences to bear on them?—I suppose that may be the case.

18895. I suppose you do not attribute the whole of the improvement to your own severity in court?—No, I give a share of it to that cause; but the temperance societies have done a good deal.

18896. And I suppose the influences of religion have assisted?—Certainly.

E. A. DÉRY.

18897. Within your own memory, have you found a great difference in the social habits of the people in regard to drinking customs? Do you think there is a great deal less liquor drank socially than was the case many years ago?—Not to my knowledge; I think the quantity is nearly the same. I have not been in the surrounding section where much liquor is taken, but I think there is nearly the same quantity now as formerly.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

18898. Respecting the Clubs you have mentioned: Do you have many cases of arrests of people who have been supplied with liquor in these clubs, that is to say, people who have been arrested in or about the clubs?—Such cases may have been before me two or three times during the last two or three years, but I am not sure that such has been the case.

18899. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the fact that the law is being evaded in the establishment of these clubs, that they are really drinking places?—I could not say as to that.

18900. Is a record of the convictions made by your court sent to the Government each year?—I do not think so. It is only in criminal cases.

18901. In speaking of these clubs, you do not refer to the Garrison or Union Clubs?—No.

18902. You have made no reference to them at all?—No.

18903. You have only referred to those drinking places that are established, which are nominally clubs, but are really simply drinking places?—Yes. They assume the name of club, but they are not *bonâ fide* clubs, because everything belongs to one party.

*By the Chairman :*

18904. Is the license in those cases taken out in the name of some individual?—Yes, and in the name of the club. We have the Club de Québec and the Club Vendôme and we now have a club in St. Rochs; but I think that in those cases the business is done by an individual.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

18905. The law is violated?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

18906. The financial benefit is the only benefit derived?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

18907. Regarding the existence of saloons: is there not a class of licenses issued to saloons where sleeping accommodation for travellers is supposed to be provided? Do the saloons do more damage than the hotels, and are purely drinking places more injurious than hotels?—Certainly.

18908. Have you any doubt about it?—No, I think there should be no saloon licenses issued.

18909. If either the hotels or saloons had to be deprived of their licenses, which in the public interest, would you like to see removed: the hotel bar or the saloon bar?—The saloon bar.

18910. Is it more harmful than the hotel bar?—Yes, in my opinion.

18911. The statement has been made that the hotel bar is the more dangerous of the two; that young men go into hotels in the evenings ostensibly to call on guests or attend to business, but really they go in to drink; and if the hotel bars were closed altogether and liquor was sold only in saloons, the result would be beneficial, because young men would not go there. Is that your belief?—My opinion is that the saloon bar is more dangerous than the hotel bar.

18912. Would you favour the passing of an enactment to suppress the saloons altogether?—Yes, I would vote for it.

18913. On the ground that they are mere drinking shops?—Yes. They do nothing but sell liquor, especially to a class who should not get any, to the poor people

and so on. On the one hand, the hotels are visited by a good class of persons generally speaking; on the other hand, the saloons are visited by the poorer classes who suffer from intemperance.

18914. So you think it would be a good thing to suppress the saloons?—It would be a good thing to suppress them altogether, at all events to close them on Sunday and say at five or six o'clock other days, at the latest.

18915. From whom could the Commissioners obtain information respecting the non-observance of the law regarding Sunday closing and closing at eleven o'clock at night on other evenings?—From Judge Chauveau, Judge of the Sessions.

18916. Do you know anything about the operation of the prohibitory law in the State of Maine?—No, not at all. I think if you could close the saloons on Saturday afternoon, say at five or six o'clock at the latest, it would be a great benefit to our people. If all the taverns were closed at that time, it would be the means of saving a large sum of money to our poor people, because when returning from their work, they go into saloons, and when they reach home at night they have spent nearly the whole of their week's wages.

*By the Chairman :*

18917. Does any reason occur to you why places should be licensed to sell liquor without having the obligation imposed on them of supplying meals and beds for the accommodation of travellers? Are such places necessary for any public purpose?—No.

18918. I refer to places licensed simply to sell liquor?—Quite so.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

18919. Is the hotel bar necessary?—Well, it may be a convenience to strangers. It is not necessary in the strict sense of the term.

18920. You think it would be better if all these purely drinking places were shut up?—I think so, if it were possible.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

18921. Is there any officer whose duty it is to inspect places applying for licenses and see whether they possess accommodation for travellers?—Yes, such an officer is appointed by the Government.

18922. Do you think that hotel bars observe the Sabbath law and the law against selling at night better than do the saloons?—I think they do, but the law gives them more liberty.

18923. Does the law give an hotel liberty to keep its bar open on Sunday?—No, not its bar; but it can furnish liquor to guests in their rooms or at the table.

18924. Do you know whether the hotels keep their bars open on Sunday or not?—I do not think they keep their bars open, but liquor is sold in some of the rooms to every one who comes in.

18925. Do they do that as much as or more than the saloons do?—They do that for a smaller number of people than do the saloons.

18926. Of course there are fewer hotels than saloons?—That is the reason why I think they do less harm than the saloons, it is because they serve fewer people.

18927. You are inclined to believe that the hotels in some way or other supply liquor to people who come in?—Yes, I think they do it as much as they can.

*By the Chairman :*

18928. Do you think this is done by such hotels as the St. Louis and the Florence?—I do not know whether there is a bar in the Florence.

18929. Do you think in the St. Louis Hotel liquor is sold to any one coming in and asking for it on Sunday or out of hours?—That is my opinion. I have been informed that such is the case, but I could not say personally in regard to it.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

18930. You have spoken of habitual drunkards and others who after they have returned from prison or have come up before for the same offence. Have you any amend-

ments to suggest to the Commission. Do you think, for example, that those individuals ought to be sent to a special place, a retreat, or a private hospital and confined for a certain time?—I think that if the Recorder had power to send them to a private hospital for a certain time, it would make a great improvement. If the drunkards were treated by a scientific man, he could cure them; while in disposing of them as we do, and are obliged to do now, they return at once to the same place where they learned the habit of drinking. They find themselves in the same atmosphere, and as a consequence they cannot be cured. I think that if we sent those drunkards to a private hospital, it would make them very much better.

18931. Does not the law impose a fine on all persons that get intoxicated?—That is a municipal law.

18932. It is not a law for all the province?—No.

18933. Do you know if the license law is frequently violated?—As Recorder, I have not occupied myself with that question, because those cases go before the police court. There is a disposition towards the closing of hotels on certain days and certain hours. Infractions of those provisions come before me as Recorder; the other violations of the license law are taken before the Police Magistrate. That is why cases under the license law go before two different courts. This has been the practice for some time.

18934. Do you know if the sale of liquor has increased since the number of hotels has diminished?—I believe so.

18935. If we had a general law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of liquor, do you think that the liquor sale would remain the same, or even larger?—A law of that kind would be good if it could be applied effectively, but I think it would increase the number of houses selling without license.

18936. Has the number of houses of ill-fame in Quebec increased or diminished?—They have diminished considerably during the past few years. About fifteen years ago in the ward of St. Jean we counted about seventy of those houses. At present there are only about seven or eight.

18937. You think there are not more than seven or eight?—In all the city there are not more than nine or ten.

18938. Do you think it is more difficult to detect houses of ill-fame than places where liquor is sold?—It is about as difficult in one case as the other.

18939. Has the number of crimes increased or diminished?—It does not seem to have lessened any in my view.

18940. Speaking of temperance: do you think there is a general improvement in the district of Quebec?—I do not think that drunkenness has increased.

18941. In the district of Quebec?—I do not think it has increased generally.

18942. Has smuggling done any harm?—I have heard it said in certain parishes, that they make more use of liquor than formerly. There is a greater volume of illicit traffic.

18943. Do you think that if we had a general prohibitory law, smuggling would increase?—I think the number of these houses would increase.

18944. Do these houses sell openly?—Yes.

18945. Do you not think that the police ought to see to this?—I have nothing to do with the city police. I do not know if orders have been given, as the police have not reported for nearly two years.

18946. Do you not approve of a more stringent inspection?—That matter is in the hands of the Police Committee of the City Council. They can give the orders to watch more closely those who break the law. If such an order were given, it would work a change, but it seems to me not to be done.

18947. Could you suggest any amendment in the law?—I do not find it perfect. We should limit the number of licenses, but at present there is hardly a case where we refuse an application for a license.

18948. In case a prohibitory law were enacted, would the illicit sales be made on a larger scale?—It is possible. I do not know positively if this would increase in the same proportion as the number of licensed houses is now increasing.



EDWARD FOLEY, of Quebec, Advocate, and Clerk of the Recorder's Court, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

18949. Do you keep the records of the Recorder's Court?—I do.

18950. Do you make up any official return?—I do.

18951. To which Government is it forwarded?—My annual return is forwarded to both Governments, Federal and Provincial.

18952. How long have you held the position of Clerk of the Recorder's Court?—About 16 years.

18953. Does the court deal with offences against the city by-laws?—Yes, and also offences against the statutes.

18954. And also in regard to the collection of taxes?—The court deals with offences under statutes and by-laws, because one half-half of our offences are covered by statute and not by the by-laws. There are two distinct offences under the head of drunkenness. There is drunkenness as a violation of the police ordinance, and violation of a by-law, the offence being termed found drunk. Those offenders are brought up under a by-law of the city. The other offence is under statute, and covers the case of a man being drunk and fighting.

18955. Of the total number that come before the court, how many are what we may for the lack of a better term call criminal cases?—Three-fourths of the penal actions are cases of drunkenness.

18956. What is the proportion of the whole?—Altogether we have about 2,500 penal actions annually and about 2,800 civil cases, the latter being confined purely to the collection of city taxes.

18957. Of the penal offences tried before the court, how many arise out of drunkenness?—Between 400 and 500 annually.

18958. Of the 2,500 cases?—Yes, perhaps 600; somewhere from 400 to 600.

18959. You are speaking of the cases that arise directly out of drunkenness?—Yes.

18960. Can you give the Commissioners any idea as to how many arise indirectly out of the use of intoxicants or from the abuse of them?—Perhaps 300 or 400.

18961. Making about 700 to 1,000 in all?—Yes, about 700 in all.

18962. Do you try in your court any offences against the license law?—No. Our court being a court created for municipal purposes, our business is confined pretty much to municipal matters, such as infringements of the by-laws of the city and, as the Recorder stated, to the carrying out of the Ross Act of 1878 for the closing of taverns on Sunday and after midnight.

18963. Do those cases come before your court?—They did so altogether at one time, but within the last few years a great many have gone to the police court.

18964. You do not try cases arising out of sale of liquor, I understand?—No, we never take any action against parties for selling liquor after hours, under the License Act. It is no matter to us whether the houses are licensed or not if they are selling after midnight or on Sunday. We never look into the question as to whether they are licensed or not; I repeat, it is of no moment to us whether they are licensed.

18965. Then cases of selling out of hours do come before your court?—Yes, but very few of them.

18966. Under a Provincial statute?—Yes, under the Ross Act. It is an Act that was passed at the time the Hon. David Ross was Attorney-General, in 1878.

18967. Have you any knowledge of the number of licenses issued in the city of Quebec?—Not the least, I have nothing to do with it.

18968. Or as to the proportion of taverns, saloons and groceries?—I have no idea at all.

18969. Has drunkenness within the city increased or decreased?—It has diminished no doubt.

18970. Within the last ten years?—It has considerably diminished.

18971. Do you think there are as many places selling liquor now as formerly?—I am not prepared to answer that question.

EDWARD FOLEY.

18972. From your knowledge, are there many places selling liquor without license?—I could not say.

18973. Are the license laws fairly well enforced in the city?—That matter is beyond my province. It is one confined to the police court.

18974. Is there much selling out of hours?—It has apparently decreased. One of the chief reasons for this I will state. After the Ross Act was passed, appeals were taken through all the different courts of the province and the Supreme Court at Ottawa, and the Act was at length declared legal. Four years were occupied in these cases going through the different courts. Judgments in all cases were suspended until the final judgment was rendered. When that was obtained, which was about four years from the commencement of the proceedings, I think it was in 1885, then all those judgments were put into execution, and from \$15,000 to \$20,000 were collected from keepers of city hotels, restaurants and taverns against whom judgments had been rendered. Some parties had as much as \$750 or \$800 in fines to pay.

18975. What was the point in regard to the Ross Act which was taken into the courts?—One of the first points taken was, that the Local Legislature had not power to pass the Act, that the liquor traffic was a question of trade, that the enactment of such legislation was within the power of the Dominion Parliament only.

18976. What is the particular character of the Ross Act?—The Ross Act declares that all places in which liquor is sold shall be closed from twelve, midnight, until five o'clock in the morning and during the whole day of Sunday. The only exception allowed is in regard to hotel keepers, they being allowed to sell during the whole of Sunday to their guests, either at the dinner table or in their private rooms, but not outside of them.

18977. Then it is an Act regulating the liquor traffic?—Exactly.

18978. Have you formed any opinion as to the efficiency of the license system to control the liquor traffic in this city?—I have not; I have never given it any consideration.

18979. Have you given any consideration to the subject of a prohibitory measure?—I have not.

*By Judge McDonald:*

18980. Did I understand you to say that in the enforcing of this Act, the provisions regarding selling out of hours, people whether licensed or unlicensed were punished?—Yes, under the Ross Act.

18981. It makes no difference whether the people are licensed or not?—We take the law as it reads, and it reads: All parties, such as restaurant keepers, shall be obliged to close their establishments from twelve o'clock midnight, till five o'clock in the morning.

18982. Does that apply to restaurant keepers, who may not sell liquor?—I speak of the sale of liquor—when liquor is sold out of hours, we do not bring in the question as to whether the party is licensed.

18983. Do you take it for granted that the parties are licensed?—That is the effect of it. We never inquire, it is not our business to inquire, that is the business of the police court.

18984. Suppose a complaint was brought against a man for selling out of hours, and he proved that he sold to guests who were in his house, and that the liquor was used on the table or in the private room?—The exception was in his favour.

18985. But the party, if not licensed, would not have the right to sell?—We do not inquire into that.

18986. You confine yourselves entirely to the question as to whether sale was made during those prohibited hours?—Exactly.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

18987. You have said that drunkenness has diminished. To what do you attribute that decrease?—The chief factor to my mind is religion.

18988. You attribute it to the teaching of the church and to religious and moral influences generally?—Yes, and to temperance societies; but I must certainly say that

so far as Quebec is concerned, I believe that it is owing to the religious societies that are organized in the city.

18989. Do you believe the religious influences in operation are in any degree thwarted by the continued existence of a large number of licensed drink places?—I am not prepared to offer an opinion on that subject.

18990. I understood you to say that of the number of cases that come before the court about 600, or one-quarter of the number of criminal cases, were the cases of drunkenness?—About 400.

18991. Did you say what proportion of the five-sixths of those 2,500 cases was traceable to drink, directly or indirectly?—About 300.

18992. I understood you before answering either of those questions, to say that three-fourths of the penal actions are caused by drunkenness?—Three-fourths of the arrests made by the police for offences in the city arise from drunkenness.

18993. Then is this the fact, that three-fourths of the cases of arrests were offences caused by drunkenness, and one-sixth of the cases were for drunkenness pure and simple, and about 300 or 400 more were more or less traceable to drink?—No, the opposite. I say that traceable cases are between 200 and 300.

18994. And three-fourths of the cases are for drunkenness purely?—Exactly. I say that altogether there were 700 cases of drunkenness before our court. Out of those 700 cases about 400 are cases of drunkenness purely, in which the parties were arrested.

18995. And 300 are traceable to drunkenness?—Yes, through quarrels and so on.

18996. That accounts for 700 out of the 2,500 cases?—Yes.

18997. And the balance of the cases had nothing to do with drink?—Yes, they were infractions of the by-laws, the snow by-law, keeping houses of prostitution, unlicensed dogs and cases of that kind.

18998. Speaking of houses of prostitution: do you know whether drink sale is ordinarily carried out in such houses?—I could not say.

18999. They are not licensed?—They are not. In regard to houses of prostitution, we have a by-law in Quebec which says that no house of prostitution shall be tolerated in any street where there is a school, church, chapel or place of worship, or within two acres of such.

19000. That covers pretty nearly the whole city?—Yes. So to-day the houses of prostitution are located within one street. Outside of that street there are perhaps three or four houses, but not more.

19001. Do you know whether licenses are issued to those houses?—They are not.

19002. Do cases of violation of the law by selling liquor on Sunday and after hours in those houses ever come before your court?—Never; but I see them every day appear before the police court.

19003. I thought I understood you to say that at the outside three-fourths of the penal actions that come before the Recorder's court are caused by drunkenness?—No.

19004. Speaking about the limitation as to hours for the sale of drink: do you believe it would be advantageous to still further limit the hours?—Certainly it would be advantageous to the working classes.

19005. For instance, the hour of closing now on Saturday is, what?—Twelve at night for the whole province.

19006. That is the same on every day in the week except the Sabbath?—Yes, except Sunday.

19007. You believe it would be to the advantage of the labouring classes if the licensed houses were closed at an earlier hour?—Yes, and on pay nights particularly, which is generally Saturday night.

19008. You think there would be less temptation for a man to spend his wages?—There is not any doubt of it.

19009. Do many cases of violation of the Sabbath law, I mean the law that prohibits the sale of liquor on the Sabbath, come before your court?—Not now.

19010. Have you any reason to believe that the law is evaded?—Of course, I have no direct knowledge of it, and no knowledge of it except from hearsay.

19011. I ask you because I have seen two places on the public street open, and I do not know whether they represent a great many places or not. I desire to know whether

the constables are aware of houses being open?—I know the municipal police receive instructions every year on being sworn in by the Recorder, to have an eye open particularly to the closing of taverns on Sunday and after midnight; but the police are no longer under the control of the Recorder, but under the control of the municipal body. The police committee is composed of members of the City Council.

19012. Probably they have given directions to the force?—I could not say about that.

*By the Chairman:*

19013. What has been the amount collected in fines by the Recorder's court annually during recent years?—It has fallen off very much within the last four or five years. It would be impossible for me to state the total amount collected, at all events from memory. Moreover, I would have to make a detailed statement, because all the fines are put together.

19014. Can you give the Commissioners the aggregate?—I would have to work it out.

19015. Will you furnish a statement to the Commission?—Yes, for a couple of years.

19016. That is a statement of the amount of fines collected and the proportion of fines for drunkenness?—Yes.

19017. You inflict fines also, I suppose, for selling out of hours?—Yes. I will include those fines.

19018. Does the Recorder's court look after the collections of claims of the city on the citizens?—Yes.

19019. Does the city get any return from the granting of licenses to sell liquor?—I could not tell you.

19020. Have you often before the court persons who are not licensed to sell, I refer to persons brought there for breaches of the by-law by selling during prohibited hours, and who are found not to hold a license?—Not a by-law, a statute.

19021. They are brought there for selling out of hours, contrary to the statute?—Yes.

19022. You deal with them in your court simply for that offence?—That is all.

19023. Is there any system under which the Provincial authorities take action against these people and bring them up for breach of the license law?—Yes.

19024. Is there any report made as to the number of cases?—The moment the Provincial Inspector ascertains that any parties have been fined in our court, he sends one of his officers to make inquiry and ascertain the names of the parties.

19025. So in that way the Provincial authorities assist in getting at those who sell liquor without license?—Yes.

19026. You have had a lengthy experience in the city. Do you see any reason for licensing places to sell liquor simply, without being called upon to provide meals or furnish beds; do you see any reason why places that are purely saloons should be licensed?—I do not know, I never formed any opinion, the subject has never come into my mind.

19027. Have you in Quebec a large number of places licensed purely to sell liquor, and which provide neither meals nor beds?—Yes, and a great many of them are first class houses.

19028. Is there really any necessity for their existence as a matter of accommodation to the public?—For business people, say in Lower Town, which is our principal business locality, such places are almost a necessity. Of course I do not know about it; I never put my foot inside a restaurant.

19029. As mercantile people will not, as a rule, go into those places to drink, do you consider it is necessary that the working classes should have such places in which to get drink?—I am not prepared to offer an opinion on that subject. It would come more within the province of gentlemen who are engaged in business to express an opinion on it, and they would be better qualified to do so than I am.

LÉON PHILLIP VOHL, Chief of Police of the City of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

19030. How long have you held the position of Chief of City Police?—For 12 years.

19031. Are you a native of the Province of Quebec?—Yes.

19032. How long have you lived here?—I have lived here all my life.

19033. How many men have you in your charge?—71 all told.

19034. Is your appointment made by the Municipal Government?—Yes.

19035. Then you are not in any way responsible to the Provincial Government?—No, not in any way.

19036. Under whose direction do you act?—Under the Mayor and Police Committee.

19037. How many members of the Council are on the Police Committee?—The Committee is composed of 10 members.

19038. I understand that you are in charge of the city police?—Yes.

19039. And the provincial police is another and separate body?—Yes.

19040. You take charge of the enforcement of the city by-laws, of course?—Yes.

19041. What is your rule in regard to arresting people in a state of intoxication?—If they are able to take care of themselves we do not arrest them, but as soon as the constable finds that a man is not able to take care of himself, or he is a nuisance to the public, he is taken in charge.

19042. Have cases of drunkenness increased in the city since you have been in charge of the force?—They have decreased.

19043. To what do you attribute that change?—It is a matter I have not taken into special consideration. A good deal of benefit has been derived from the temperance societies and religious bodies.

19044. Are the by-laws of the city more strictly enforced now than they were some years ago?—Their enforcement is about the same.

19045. Are the punishments in the Recorder's court and in the police court more severe now than formerly?—They are, especially in regard to drunkenness on Sunday. For that offence the Recorder fines the parties pretty heavily.

19046. Are there more places selling liquor in the city now than formerly, whether licensed or not?—The number is pretty much the same.

19047. Is the number of licensed places larger or smaller than when you first took charge of the force?—The number appears to me to be a little larger than it was at the beginning of my term of office, but I do not find a great deal of difference.

19048. Then the increase in the license fee has not largely diminished the number of licensed places in Quebec?—It would not appear to have done so.

19049. Has it increased their respectability at all, and do they keep more orderly houses than before?—I think so. Certainly there is a better class of houses selling liquor to-day than there formerly was.

19050. The opinion has been expressed before the Commission that the number of unlicensed places has increased. What is your opinion on that subject?—I could not say that.

19051. Is that your opinion?—I could not say that. I have heard the statement made, but on thinking the matter over and considering the number of places selling without licenses, I must say that I do not know of a great many.

19052. Would you feel it your duty or the duty of the police to take immediate steps to prevent parties selling liquor without license, if the matter was brought to your notice?—If the matter was brought to my notice, I should certainly inform the provincial authorities of the facts.

19053. You would report the facts to the provincial authorities?—Yes, as I have sometimes done. I can give the Commissioners, if they desire, an official statement of the number of arrests for drunkenness during the past eight or nine years.

LÉON PHILLIP VOHL.

19054. I suppose the information on that subject goes to Ottawa?—I have nothing to do with that matter.

19055. Do you report to the Mayor or City Clerk, or to your Committee?—There is no special report made, but we have a record of the cases on the books.

19056. Do you make annual reports?—They do not print them.

19057. The information to which you are now referring is supplied to the City Clerk, I suppose?—The information is on the books.

19058. Will you please read the statistics?—The arrests for drunkenness were as follows :

1884.....	567	arrests.
1885.....	715	do
1886.....	536	do
1887.....	580	do
1888.....	581	do
1889.....	660	do

I desire to remark here that in 1888 a municipality, which contained a population of 13,000 souls, was annexed to the city, and of course the population of Quebec was increased by that number.

1890.....	687	arrests.
1891.....	487	do

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19059. Have you a statement showing the total number of arrests during those years?—No; but the greater part of the arrests, over three-fourths of them, were for drunkenness.

*By the Chairman :*

19060. You think that three-fourths of the arrests made by the police are cases of drunkenness?—Yes, fully that proportion.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19061. You say that three-fourths of the arrests made by the police are for drunkenness, or offences arising out of drunkenness?—For drunkenness, because when a party does anything else causing him to be arrested, and he is drunk at the time, a charge of drunkenness is also preferred against him.

19062. So three-fourths of the arrests made by you or your force are for drunkenness?—Yes, for drunkenness.

19063. The Recorder's Court returns of offences include those against the snow by-law?—We do not arrest the parties for that offence. The cases are reported by the constables and the parties are summoned before the Recorder's Court.

19064. Of the other one-fourth of the arrests, are any proportion of the offences traceable to drink in any way?—Very few.

19065. Do you have to arrest many juvenile offenders, boys of 17 and under?—Not many. We have sometimes had boys as young as 14 arrested for drunkenness, but the cases have been very few.

19066. Of the cases of young offenders not guilty of drunkenness, can you tell the Commissioners whether any proportion of their offences are traceable to drunkenness on the part of their parents?—There must be a proportion, but a small proportion.

19067. Are you able to state the proportion?—No.

19068. Are there any wards or districts in the city in which there is no licensed sale of liquor?—No, licenses are granted all over the city.

19069. Are there any wards or districts in which there are not as many licenses granted as in other wards?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19070.—I suppose that in residential wards there are not so many licenses granted?—Of course not.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19071. In the wards where there are residents chiefly, you say there are not so many?—There are a few licenses there.

19072. Do the people living in those wards object to licenses being granted, or does that element enter into consideration?—It is because the parties do not find it a paying business to have houses there.

19073. It does not pay to have licensed drinking shops there?—Yes. Of course there are some in the residential wards, but not in the first class residential quarter, but rather where workingmen reside.

19074. Do you know whether there have ever been applications for licenses in residential wards that have been objected to by the residents?—I do not know.

19075. Are all the licenses issued by the provincial police?—I have nothing to do with the granting of licenses.

*By the Chairman :*

19076. Are not licenses issued in Quebec by a Commission?—There formerly was a Commission composed of the Judge of Sessions and the Recorder. I think that has been changed, however, but the Inspector of Licenses, who is here, can inform the Commissioners on that point.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19077. Of offences against women and children for which you have to make arrests, as I presume such arrests are made, is any proportion traceable to drink and drunkenness?—Yes.

19078. Is any proportion so traceable?—A good many cases. Complaints are made to the Recorder's Court by women, and arrests are then made.

19079. Do you find that any considerable proportion of such cases are traceable to drink?—No doubt.

*By the Chairman :*

19080. Are cases of that kind numerous?—Not very numerous, and I could not tell you what proportion of the whole.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19081. I suppose you give your men instructions concerning Sunday selling, and selling after hours?—Yes, special instructions, which are renewed now and then.

19082. Do you give oral instructions, or instructions in writing?—I give them orally principally. If I find that things are getting loose, I refresh their memory by renewing the instructions.

19083. Have you reason to believe that your men carry out your instructions pretty thoroughly in regard to this matter?—I believe they do. I have often spoken of the fact that in such and such places liquor is reported to be sold. I am told this, that liquor sellers have a kind of telegraph system, and if they see a policeman in the neighbourhood they will give certain signs, and the doors will be closed so that the officers will see nothing wrong going on.

19084. Have you reason to believe that the men who hold licenses violate the law when they can?—Undoubtedly there are some who violate the law.

19085. Do you think that violations of the law are very general, or that only a few are guilty of them?—There are a good many that violate the law.

19086. And you say they keep a watch on the police?—Exactly, they keep a watch on the police.

19087. The police watch them and they watch the police?—Exactly.

19088. Do you know whether saloon-keepers are more persistent violators of the Sabbath law than keepers of hotel bars, or are hotel men more persistent violators than the saloonkeepers, or are they both equally bad?—I should think that the saloons would violate the law more than the hotels.

LÉON PHILLIP VOHL.

19089. Is that because there are more saloons than hotels?—There are more, and the hotels having the law in their favour to a certain extent, can accommodate a good many of their customers, while other sellers, having no regular customers, have to sell to whomsoever they can, and are placed in a disadvantageous position as regards selling.

19090. But the hotels have no privileges under license more than saloons?—They have the right to sell at the table, or in rooms to guests.

19091. But not to sell at the bar?—No. My men have had occasion to visit the regular hotels on Sunday, the St. Louis and the Florence and one or two others, but they have not found any violation of the law being committed.

19092. You think their bars are closed on Sunday?—Always.

19093. Do you believe there are a good many unlicensed places in the city?—I do not think there are a great many unlicensed places.

19094. Of course you have not any official connection with them?—No, but I do not believe there are a great many. There may be an odd one or two, but there are not a great many.

*By the Chairman :*

19095. As Chief of Police, would you not feel it your duty to order any one found selling liquor on Sunday, or out of legal hours, to be prosecuted?—I would.

19096. Then we may fairly suppose there are no cases, except a few that escape notice, where illegal sales are taking place, or the offenders would be prosecuted?—Certainly, or there may be some cases where we cannot get proof against the parties.

19097. You endeavour to prosecute them, of course?—Yes.

19098. Then the record of the court may be taken as a fair criterion of the number of cases of violation of the Sunday law and closing hour law?—Yes, to a certain extent.

19099. I am supposing, of course, that the police force do their duty?—No doubt.

19100. Your force is acting now under a committee of the Council, we understand?—Yes.

19101. And formerly you acted under a Commission?—Yes.

19102. May I ask your opinion as to which system is the more efficient in securing the enforcement of the law?—I would rather not answer that question, as it would scarcely be fair for me to give a reply.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19103. Was there any public demand for a change in the law?—It was the city charter that amended the law and made the change.

19104. Was any representation made to the Legislature, on behalf of the citizens of Quebec, against the change proposed?—There was some objection taken before the Committee on Private Bills, but the City Council succeeded in getting the amendment passed.

19105. How many years ago was the change made?—I think three years.

19106. The Police Committee having charge of the force, have not issued any orders that the police shall not enforce the law?—No, to the contrary.

19107. They are just as anxious to have the law enforced as the members of the Commission were?—Certainly, so far as I know.

19108. At all events they have not given instructions to the contrary?—Certainly not.

19109. But, on the other hand, they have given instructions to you to see that the law is enforced?—Yes.

19110. What about these saloons that have been mentioned; how are these saloons or drinking places, pure and simple, conducted?—In what respect do you mean?

19111. Are they well conducted, and are they necessary for the convenience of the people?—I do not believe that they are. We can certainly do without the saloons.

19112. Do they turn out many more drunkards than the hotels, or are you as Chief not able to form an opinion on that matter?—I believe they do, because they are much more numerous than the hotels. That would be one reason. Another reason would be, that some people would rather go into saloons for the purpose of drinking than into regular hotels.



19113. You think they would rather do so?—I believe so.

19114. If one or other class of licenses had to be dispensed with, would you dispense with the saloon or the hotel license?—If called upon at this moment to express my opinion, without having given the subject particular attention, I should say, close the saloons and leave the hotels.

19115. The reason I ask is, because it has been stated to the Commission that saloons do less damage than hotels, that young men may go into hotels ostensibly to see friends and do business, but in reality to get liquor, and that they would rather go to the hotel bar than to the saloon bar?—I do not think that is the case.

19116. Do you know anything about a prohibitory law, or local option laws?—No.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

19117. Do you think it would be in the interest of temperance to reduce the number of licenses?—I think we could reduce the number of licensed restaurants without injuring the welfare of the people.

19118. Do you think that the license law is defective in some of its provisions?—I do not know the law very well.

19119. Since you have been Chief of Police, has the number of houses of ill-fame diminished?—Very much.

19120. What is the present number?—Correctly speaking, the number of houses of ill-fame is twelve.

19121. How many were there before?—About twice as many.

19122. Do you know anything about smuggling?—Only by hearsay, not personally; but it is within my knowledge that some smuggled liquor has been seized in the streets of Quebec.

19123. Has a large quantity been seized?—No.

19124. What sort of liquor was it?—Whisky; six barrels in all.

19125. Do you know what was the total quantity?—No.

19126. Do you know any habitual drunkards?—Yes.

19127. Many?—Comparatively, the number is small, perhaps twenty. They are the individuals who come up before the court continually.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19128. Have you any knowledge as to the quality of the liquor sold in Quebec, whether it is pure or not?—As a general rule, the quality is very fair.

*By the Chairman :*

19129. Have any tests been made at any time?—Not to my knowledge.

19130. Either by officers of the Provincial or Municipal Government?—No, I know nothing about that matter.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19131. Do you find it very difficult to enforce the closing provisions of the license law, that is as regards Sunday closing, and closing at proper hours?—It is a difficult matter. Some of the houses close regularly, and we have no difficulty with them, while others are constantly on the lookout to try and sell after hours.

19132. Do the majority observe the law, or do they try to evade it?—Undoubtedly the majority observe the law.

19133. Do you think you can successfully enforce it?—We can succeed in enforcing it to a certain extent. We are enforcing it moderately well now, because the keepers are afraid of being caught and reported, for they are fined pretty heavily.

*By the Chairman :*

19134. And those that remain open are caught sometimes?—Yes, sometimes.

LÉON PHILLIP VOHL.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19135. And they are afraid of being caught again?—Yes.

19136. Do you think it would be much more difficult to enforce a prohibitory law than it is to enforce the closing provisions of the license law?—It is a matter I never thought much about, but I have no doubt it would be very difficult.

19137. But supposing there was such a law, and you were Chief of Police exercising full authority; do you think you could successfully or fairly well enforce such a law?—If I had the men at hand I could to a certain extent, no doubt, but our means are very limited and our police force is very small.

19138. Your strength is 71, I believe?—Seventy-one men all told.

19139. And what is the population of the city?—About 70,000, but it covers a very large area of ground.

19140. Have you noticed that there has been any difference in the enforcement of the law since the control of the police was changed from a Board of Commissioners to the City Council?—If I am not mistaken, there was a law passed a few years ago which permits the police court to take hold of these cases, and they are reported by the provincial police. The provincial police now act.

19141. They act on information which they obtain from the Police Court?—From their own officers.

*By the Chairman :*

19142. But they report to the police court?—Yes, and those parties are sued for being open on Sunday and after hours.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19143. I think you have said that the police committee, which has charge of the force, gives you instructions?—Yes, in a general way, and I carry out the by-laws of the city. The committee never interfere to prevent my doing so.

19144. Do members of the Council, outside of the police committee, ever interfere with you in the discharge of your duties, or with your men touching the closing features of the license law?—No, not to my knowledge, certainly not with me.

19145. And you know they do not with your men?—Yes.

JOSEPH B. FORSYTH, Collector of Customs of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

19146. How long have you held the office of Collector of the port?—Since April, 1891.

19147. Do you look after any of the outports?—Yes.

19148. What are the outports?—There are a good many. We have outports at Tadousac, Chicoutimi, Bersimis, Sault au Cochon, Rivière du Loup and Beauce, and we have preventive officers at several smaller places.

19149. Have you permanent officers stationed at those places who act under your instructions?—Yes, who act under my instructions.

19150. I think you are a native of Quebec?—Yes, I was born in Quebec.

19151. Have you lived here all your life?—Yes.

19152. From your general observation, has drunkenness increased or decreased in the city?—From my general observation, I should think it had decreased, but I live out of the city, in one of the adjoining municipalities.

19153. Do you think as many places are selling liquor as previously, say, ten years ago?—I should say fully as many, but I have no data to go on.

19154. The license fee has been increased once or twice, and there is a high fee at the present moment. Do you think that has had any tendency to decrease the number of licensed places?—I do not think so.

19155. From your knowledge, do you consider there are many places selling liquor without licenses in the city?—I do not know in regard to the city, but I know there are a great many places in the adjoining municipalities; I think, more of them, perhaps, than in the city.

19156. Selling without a license?—Yes.

19157. Does it not come specially under your duties to look after such places?—No.

19158. That would be the duty of the provincial officers, I suppose?—Yes.

19159. You have had, I believe, a good deal of smuggling below Quebec during the past season?—Yes, a good deal.

19160. Have you had within your district many cases of illicit manufacture of liquors?—That comes more under the Inland Revenue or Excise Department, and I do not know so much about it as does the head of that department. We know, of course, a good deal about smuggling that has been going on.

19161. Can you inform the Commission whether the importations of liquors, wines, spirits and beer into Quebec have increased or decreased?—I thought that was a question that might be asked me, and so I have had a statement prepared. The importations of brandy, gin, rum, Scotch whisky, wines and champagne have increased during the past five years.

19162. Have you the figures with you?—Yes.

19163. Will you please read them to the Commission?—Yes. The statistics are as follows:—

QUANTITY OF SPIRITS AND WINE ENTERED AT THE PORT OF QUEBEC.

	Value.
1883.....	\$128,093
1884.....	100,962
1885.....	102,150
1886.....	90,352
1887.....	96,321
Total for five years.....	\$517,878
<hr/>	
1888.....	114,268
1889.....	120,224
1890.....	130,649
1891.....	117,984
1892.....	120,220
Total for five years.....	\$603,345

Showing an increase in the latter over the former term of \$85,467. The quantity of whisky received from Ontario, from 1883 to 1887 was 3,032,216 gallons, and from 1888 to 1891, 2,505,556 gallons, a decrease of 526,660 gallons.

19164. Have you any statistics regarding beer, ale and porter?—No, I have not. I could obtain for the Commission a statement of the quantity imported from England, but it is a small quantity. There is one matter to which I desire to draw attention. There is a very large quantity of smuggled liquor coming into this province from St. Pierre and Miquelon, the quantity being very much larger than people are generally aware of.

19165. Can you give the Commission any statistics as to the quantity of smuggled liquor brought into the port of Quebec?—No, nothing reliable.

19166. You say there has been a considerable quantity brought in?—Yes.

19167. And the liquor so smuggled has been sold here?—Yes.

19168. Have there been complaints from the dealers in spirits in respect to the Government pursuing that course?—There have been complaints, but of course those complaints have been made to Ottawa.

JOSEPH B. FORSYTH.

19169. You know they have been made?—Yes. I know many of the liquor dealers here object to the sale of smuggled whisky.

19170. You think that importation has had some influence on the statistics?—I am sure of it.

19171. Do you think that the quantity smuggled has displaced, if not a corresponding quantity of liquor, a considerable quantity of what would have been brought in by the usual way, and through legitimate channels?—Yes.

19172. When liquor which has been seized is sold, what are the restrictions imposed, or are there any restrictions in regard to any one purchasing it?—Any one may purchase it. It is generally sold in large quantities. Most of it leaves Quebec and goes to Montreal or the West.

19173. Is it sold to dealers and merchants?—A great deal goes back to the distillers in the country.

19174. Do the general public or dealers in liquor, as a rule, purchase such confiscated liquor?—Dealers in liquor do, not tavern-keepers or saloon-keepers, for they do not buy any.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19175. You say the larger quantity is sold to the dealers?—Generally to commission merchants, and we have the idea that this liquor goes back to the distilleries.

*By the Chairman :*

19176. I have had a matter mentioned to me by way of complaint against the Government, that the sale of this seized liquor, of which there has been a large quantity recently, has interfered with the trade of the regular wine and liquor merchants. Do you think it has done so to any considerable extent?—I am quite certain it does interfere a great deal with the sale of spirits.

19177. Would not that affect the manufacturers more than the dealers, because if it goes back into the hands of the merchant, he sells it?—Yes, but a great many men will not take this stuff that comes in, which is very strong and of poor quality.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19178. Where is it manufactured?—In the Southern States, we believe.

*By the Chairman :*

19179. Is it manufactured in Indiana?—Yes ; a great deal of it is manufactured from Indian corn. It is very strong, and the smell is almost strong enough to knock a man over.

19180. Of course, the quantity smuggled will displace about the same quantity of that manufactured in the country or imported in the regular way?—Yes.

19181. But the liquor seized here and sold again to merchants cannot have the effect of displacing the other, because the merchant, as you say, does not keep it, but sends it somewhere else?—A great many merchants will not take it.

19182. But there must be purchasers of it?—Yes.

19183. The purchaser sells it again?—Yes ; he sells it again, of course.

19184. You were in business here, I think, for many years before you became Collector of Customs. You are, of course, familiar with the city?—Yes.

19185. Do you think the license laws in the city are fairly well enforced?—I think they are.

19186. While you were in business, were you a large employer of labour?—Yes ; at one time I was a very large employer of labour.

19187. Had you much trouble on the score of drunkenness with your men?—I went to reside at Cap Rouge. We were five miles from town. It was a small village with several taverns, and of course there was an immense amount of drunkenness there.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

19188. How many taverns are there now?—None. I was Mayor of the place for a long time, and before I left we had the satisfaction of seeing all the taverns shut up.

*By the Chairman :*

19189. What was the population?—About 500. Of course, the taverns were not all licensed, but they were all taverns.

19190. How were the people employed?—Butting and preparing timber. We had also a large number of people employed all summer as raftsmen. The timber trade was carried on then very extensively, and we very often had 200 or 300 raftsmen there for weeks.

19191. Had you much trouble with your men on the score of drunkenness?—Yes; during a good deal of that time.

19192. The trade is not so large as it was: do you think the conditions have improved?—Yes; the men are of a different class.

19193. To what do you attribute the improvement?—I attribute it very much to the closing up of the taverns.

19194. You say they were not all licensed taverns?—Some were and some were not.

19195. How did the licensed places get their licenses at that time?—From the municipality—from the Mayor and Council there.

19196. And what is the system now?—At Cap Rouge there is no tavern whatever now.

19197. Is the place under a local option law, or are the houses voluntarily abandoned?—They have done away with the taverns.

19198. Has this been accomplished by the municipality refusing to grant licenses?—The municipality will not grant any licenses. The same course is followed in many of the municipalities around Quebec. In the municipality where I now live, Sillery, they do not grant licenses, but there are several unlicensed places there.

19199. Over what area would that jurisdiction extend?—Over an area of about 6 miles long by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles wide.

19200. And you have no licensed taverns in the place?—Yes, but there are several unlicensed places where they sell.

19201. Whose duty is it to prevent those places existing?—It is the duty of the Mayor and Council.

19202. And they do not do their duty in that respect?—The keepers of the houses are fined occasionally, but they sell, and they do not shut up their taverns.

19203. What action does the Provincial Government take in regard to them, if any?—I think most of the people have been fined several times, and some have been imprisoned.

19204. I suppose it is the duty of the Inspector appointed by the Provincial Government to look after them and the loss of revenue accruing?—Yes, but the trouble seems to be, from what I understand, that as the law stands just now, it seems to be rather difficult to get proof.

19205. Have you given any consideration to the question of a prohibitory law—a law which would prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of liquor throughout the Dominion?—No, I have not.

19206. With your knowledge of local sentiment here and local affairs, do you think if such a law were enacted, it could be enforced?—I do not believe it could, and I think it would certainly increase smuggling. Smuggling is bad enough now.

19207. Can you state any special reason to the Commission for entertaining that opinion?—I think people will insist on having some liquor, or some beer, if they want it; and I am afraid they will get it in spite of the law, in some way or other.

19208. You think that if they cannot get it in licensed places they will get it in unlicensed places?—I would be afraid of that result.

19209. Is it your impression that such a law would increase smuggling?—Certainly. I think it would certainly increase the smuggling business.

19210. Do you think that much drinking goes on amongst the seafaring men, and men employed on the wharfs here?—I think the sailors and men about the wharfs are a more respectable class than they were formerly. They take better care of themselves and are not so often seen drunk as they were in Quebec some years ago.

JOSEPH B. FORSYTH.

19211. What institutions to help sailors have you in the port?—Sailors are only allowed to come on shore for a short time, and the captains endeavour to keep their men on shipboard all the time.

19212. In Montreal they have a Sailors' Home, where sailors can go and read, and where religious services are held at certain times; it is an institution which is believed to have done a great deal of good to seafaring men; and a considerable amount is voluntarily given for its support each year. Have you anything of the kind in Quebec?—I do not know of anything that can properly be called a Sailors' Home. Of course, sailors come on shore on Sunday and go to church, and they are well taken care of by all the churches. There are special services for sailors held on different ships. There is also a Mariners' Chapel here, where a good many sailors attend.

19213. Is that connected with any denomination?—With the Church of England.

19214. You had a great deal of trouble at different times in Quebec, I believe, between employers, stevedores and the men?—Yes.

19215. Do you think any of that trouble has arisen through intemperance?—I do not think so; no.

19216. You do not think that men have wasted their money, and then been led to make demands for higher wages—I mean wasted their money on liquor?—No, I do not think so. The trouble arose from men who were connected with the shovellers and others handling grain trying to impose on the trade some obnoxious rules; that action led to all the trouble.

19217. The season is a very short one in Quebec, and the men have to make the year's living out of the short season in the summer, I suppose?—Yes. The employers have never objected to the wages, but they have objected to the very arbitrary rules imposed on the merchants here. That has been their objection.

*By Judge McDonald:*

19218. Have you reason to believe that a good deal of smuggling has taken place which not has been discovered?—Of course, a great deal.

19219. Did the seizures that have been made cover a large quantity of liquor?—Yes. You must remember that it is very difficult to make a guess at the quantity of liquor brought into Canada, unless you obtain knowledge from the French island of St. Pierre. The Americans, after they have manufactured a large quantity of this stuff, are obliged, after they have kept it three years, to export it. They send it to St. Pierre and Miquelon, and then a large part of it finds its way into Canada and a considerable part of it finds its way back to the States. It was calculated that last year about 5,000 barrels of whisky were landed on St. Pierre.

*By the Chairman:*

19220. You have said the Americans are obliged to export this whisky: will you please explain?—They have to pay a duty after three years, according to the law of the United States, and that is the reason they export it.

*By Judge McDonald:*

19221. Has any of the smuggled liquor seized ever been destroyed, or has it been sold?—So far I know, it has always been sold.

19222. Speaking from your recollection, have the prices realized been anything like the ordinary prices obtained for liquor?—They have not been as high as those the distillers get for their better qualities of liquor, of course. They get about \$1.80 to \$1.90 per proof gallon: that is about the average.

*By the Chairman:*

19223. For Canadian whisky?—For the seized stuff.

*By Judge McDonald:*

19224. Is it generally sold in barrels? Yes. The whisky is always in barrels. Besides this whisky, there are large quantities of brandy and other liquors that come in from France and other places outside of the United States.

19225. Is such liquor taken to the French Islands first?—Yes, St. Pierre is a free port.

19226. You have lived in Quebec and the neighbourhood for a good many years: do you think there has been a considerable change in the social customs of the people in regard to drinking?—There has been a very great change.

19227. There is much less drinking now than there was formerly?—There is much less.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

19228. Have you reason to believe that smuggling has decreased or increased during the last five years?—Smuggling was about the same for some years, but I think it has increased during the last two years.

19229. Take five years, from 1888 to 1892 inclusive, and compare that period with the period from 1883 to 1887, the years to which you referred. Have you any means of knowing whether smuggling increased during the last five years over the five preceding years?—I have no figures to judge by, but the general impression is that there has been more smuggling during the last two or three years than there was previous to that date.

*By the Chairman:*

19230. Has there been much more liquor sold?—Yes, I think much more liquor has been sold.

19231. Has the enforcement of the revenue laws been more rigorous than previously?—Certainly. This year the Government have put forth every effort, I think, to stop smuggling; at least, they have done a very great deal in that direction. They have now two cruisers below. I have been myself on two expeditions to look after smugglers, and everything is being done that can possibly be done to put a stop to smuggling.

19232. Was as much effort made during last year and previous years?—No, more has been done this year.

19233. So smuggling is now interfered with?—There are this year two cruisers looking after smugglers below. Last year there was no cruiser.

19234. Have you reason to believe that in those years when there was not as earnest an effort made to have the law observed, as large a quantity of liquor was smuggled?—No; the impression is that more liquor has been smuggled during the last two years than previously.

19235. Then an increase in smuggling has caused an increase in the efforts of the Revenue Department?—Yes.

19236. Speaking about yourself when you were an employer of labour, you mentioned the town or village in which your industry was carried on. Did you find the closing of the liquor stores a decided advantage to your employees?—I have no hesitation in saying it was a decided change for the better.

19237. Were they more regular at their work after that?—They never were irregular at their work.

19238. I did not think they were. But perhaps when the drink sale was very free, they were irregular on account of drinking to excess at times?—In those days many of the taverns were open on Sunday, and that was a great detriment to the people. Drinking was liable to commence on Saturday evening.

*By the Chairman:*

19239. With the payment of wages?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

19240. Did you find the condition of the men improved when they could no longer spend their wages in drink on Saturday night and Sunday?—In those days they had more work and received higher wages.

19241. Do you think that they would spend a proportion and still have enough?—Yes.

JOSEPH B. FORSYTH.

19242. Did you find that the men who drank regularly lost any proportion of their time on account of drinking?—Very little.

19243. Were they as valuable to you as an employer as though they had not been drinkers?—It is a very strange thing, but it is a fact that some of the best of our men were the men who drank the most. They were a little weak on Monday morning, but they were good men.

19244. What was your object in closing up the liquor stores, if the men were quite as valuable to you with drink as without it?—We were bound to close the liquor stores if we could, for the good of the place.

19245. Was that for the good of the men, or for the good of yourselves as employers?—For the good of the men and their families, as well as ourselves.

19246. So their drinking to excess was really a disadvantage to them?—It was a disadvantage to the men and their families.

19247. Did you find that the removal of the drinking shops was approved by the men themselves, and that they were glad not to have special facilities for drinking?—I think many were glad, and certainly their wives and children were glad of the change.

19248. And so their employers were, I suppose?—Yes, certainly.

19249. You have expressed your belief that a prohibitory law would be very difficult of enforcement?—Very difficult, I think.

19250. Do you believe it would be as easy of enforcement as are the revenue laws, which are very difficult of enforcement, provided the same provisions were made for the enforcement of a prohibitory law?—It would be much more difficult, I think.

19251. Why?—I do not see how you could stop the use of liquor.

19252. For instance: there are men who are bent on violating the revenue law, and they are very persistent in doing so. I have no doubt that the revenue officers have found that during this year they have given great trouble, and yet you and other officials very properly persevere in your attempts to enforce the revenue law, and with a good degree of success. Now, do you think there would be greater difficulties attending the enforcement of a prohibitory law?—I am sure there would be.

19253. For what reason?—I do not see exactly how you could prohibit a man from getting liquor if he was bent on doing so.

19254. I mean the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale, not the prohibition of a man taking a glass of liquor if he desire to do so?—I think it would be a very difficult law to enforce.

19255. Would it be more difficult than the enforcement of the revenue law, and if you think it would be more difficult, why more difficult? Is not the revenue law difficult of enforcement?—Very, and as you know, there is a great deal of smuggling going on in spite of it.

19256. Yet the revenue law is not regarded as a failure?—No, it is not.

19257. If there was a prohibitory law enacted, and there was an equally earnest effort made to enforce it, and there was still some sale, could the law be regarded as a failure on that account, any more than the revenue law is not regarded as a failure?—Well, in my opinion, you would not be able to carry out that law. Of course, I may be wrong in regard to the matter.

19258. From your observation and experience of the little prohibition you had in the town where your industry was carried on, what is your opinion in regard to the effect of prohibition? Did you not say that you were happy to have closed up the taverns?—Yes, but there were some unlicensed places where they sold liquor.

19259. Did you have all the houses shut up at last?—We had all the taverns closed, but there can be no doubt that liquors were sold at places not licensed.

19260. From your observation and experience of the good which you have stated resulted to the community and to yourselves from that degree of prohibition, do you believe that, if the same prohibition was made general, good would in a greater degree result?—If it could be general, no doubt it would, but I do not think there is a possibility of it.

19261. But you believe if prohibition of that sort could be well enforced, it would result in good?—I am sure it would.



*By the Chairman :*

19262. The Government have now a very considerable force employed in looking after smuggling and illicit sale in liquors. What inducement would they have to employ that force if there was entire prohibition and no revenue coming to the country from liquor?—There would be no revenue.

19263. What inducement would the Government have to expend as much money in preventing the smuggling and illicit manufacture as is expended now?—I do not see that there would be any inducement, except as it was considered to be for the public good.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19264. Would you apprehend greater difficulty, supposing there was no revenue collected? Is there not a great deal of smuggling of liquor into the country, and illicit manufacture?—Yes.

19265. But if there was no liquor manufactured in the country, and no liquor was imported legally, would there not be a greater quantity smuggled?—I am certain there would be a great increase in the smuggling business.

19266. That would be a practical difficulty in regard to prohibition?—Yes, it would be a very great difficulty.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19267. Would there be illicit manufacture also?—No doubt there would be.

19268. Would it be practicable and possible to enforce a general prohibitory law?—In my opinion it would not be possible.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

19269. How many officers are under your control in the district of Quebec?—I suppose there are 45 to 50.

19270. Are all the imported liquors brought in for persons residing in the city of Quebec?—No. Those are imported principally by the liquor dealers here, but it is not fair to say that all the liquor imported is for Quebec. It is of course, for their customers, wherever they may be.

19271. Are there any liquors received for persons residing outside of the Province of Quebec included in your statement?—I do not know. When a man brings in liquor and pays duty on it, we do not know what he does with it.

19272. Is not the duty paid sometimes by persons residing outside of the province of Quebec?—Very rarely. The duties are nearly all paid by Quebec merchants.

19273. So you believe all those liquors are consumed in Quebec?—I do not say that. I say the duties are paid by Quebec merchants as a rule. Now and then an outsider may pay the duty, but once he pays the duty and takes the liquor to his establishment, we do not know what he does with it, whether it is consumed here, or is sent to Montreal or other places.

*By the Chairman :*

19274. The duties being very high, would not the tendency be to pay them at the point of consumption as much as possible?—Yes.

19275. So the importer would keep his liquors in bond until he had brought them to the port of destination and pay the duty there?—Yes.

19276. And so he would save interest on his money?—Yes. The question I was asked, however, was as to whether this liquor was consumed in this province.

19277. Can you give the value of the liquors which pass in bond from your office?—Yes. My statement contains figures of the values in bond and duty-paid.

19278. Do these figures include the quantity of liquor in bond which is sent to other provinces?—It is a statement of the importations into Quebec, whether the liquor comes in in bond or whether the duty is paid. The entry is made, and whether you put it into your store and pay the duty, or merely store it and keep it in bond, the amount in value is what I have given you here.

JOSEPH B. FORSYTH.

19279. You could not distinguish in that statement liquor on which duty was paid and liquor that was shipped again in bond?—No. It is the total importation into the port for 10 years.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

19280. Could the Commissioners obtain a statement showing the quantity of liquor which came here in bond, and was shipped in bond to other provinces?—Certainly.

19281. I should like to have a statement showing the quantities and values of liquors arriving here from foreign countries, and those that were shipped in bond to other provinces?—Certainly.

RICHARD R. DOBELL, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

19282. I believe you are a merchant here?—Yes.

19283. In what line of business?—In the timber business.

19284. How many years have you been in that business?—For about 37 years.

19285. Have you resided all that time in Quebec?—Yes, generally.

19286. Is your firm large employers of labour?—Yes, we employ a good many men in the shipping season, during the summer months.

19287. Loading ships?—Loading ships and preparing timber and doing our bateau work.

19288. On what system do you employ your men? Do you pay them by the hour?—We pay them by the week. Some of our men we pay by the season; we pay a certain number by the season and a certain number by the week, and a certain number of our bateau men are paid by the year, based on their average earnings. In the cove the bateau men are paid by the season and our labourers are paid by the week.

19289. What is the work of the bateau men?—To remove in bateaux sawn lumber from the mills to the ships.

19290. You keep those men in your employment the whole year?—Yes.

19291. What do they principally do in winter?—Many of them go up into the woods, but the bateau men are chiefly around in Quebec, and are employed in various ways.

19292. How are they employed by your firm?—Repairing the bateaux and getting them ready again. Their wages are dependent upon their earnings in the summer to a very large extent, and they make enough in summer to keep them all the year. In certain months in winter they do not earn anything.

19293. But they are still attached to your firm?—Yes.

19294. How many men do you employ? Does the number vary according to the demands for timber?—It varies according to the season, but we have about 70 families altogether.

19295. Do they reside together or are they scattered?—I dare say from 40 to 50 are in our cove, under our own supervision and in our houses; the others are scattered.

19296. Where is the cove?—At Sillery, on this side, about 4 miles from here, and between here and Cap Rouge, about half way.

19297. Is the village in which they live, within a municipality?—It is in the municipality of St. Guillaume de Sillery.

19298. Is it governed by a Municipal Council?—Yes, elected by the ratepayers.

19299. Is the Council elected by the ratepayers only?—Yes.

19300. Does the governing body consist of a Mayor and a certain number of Councillors?—Yes, a Mayor and seven Councillors.

19301. Have you any liquor places in the district?—We ought not to have any. I belong to the Council, and for years we have taken advantage of the Act enabling us to withhold licenses in the district.

19302. What is the area of the district? It is perhaps 9 miles in circumference.

19303. What has been the result of your action?—I think the result of our action has been advantageous.

19304. Have you eradicated all the drinking establishments?—No, I wish we could do so.

19305. But you have eradicated the licensed places, I presume?—Yes, we have no licensed places.

19306. You have not issued any licenses?—Quite so.

19307. Have the Councillors been elected on the issue of not granting licenses?—Yes.

19308. Have you any unlicensed places there?—It is very difficult to say how many there are, but we know of several.

19309. When did you pass that by-law?—I think three or four years ago, perhaps earlier.

19310. What was the state of affairs at that time?—Not bad. Our men never drank much.

19311. Have you had any trouble with your men on the score of drunkenness?—Never.

19312. How many licensed places had you in the municipality before you adopted the policy of not issuing licenses?—I should think five or six.

19313. Was there much drunkenness in those places, say, on Sunday?—Yes, at one time I think there was.

19314. How many years ago would that be?—Ten or fifteen years ago; there was more drinking then than now.

19315. There was more drunkenness generally throughout the Province of Quebec than there is now, in your opinion?—Yes; among all classes there was more drinking fifteen years ago than there is to-day.

19316. As a Councillor, you know there are a good many selling illicitly?—Yes.

19317. Has the municipal body taken any action to put an end to that sale?—Yes, it has done so several times.

19318. What difficulty has been met with?—I will call it a political difficulty. We put a man in jail; an election comes on, the man is released.

19319. You change your Council?—No, not that. The political bias is so great that the man is brought out of jail to give his vote. That has occurred more than once or twice.

19320. Can you explain the method by which the result as regards closing the licensed houses was accomplished?—I never inquired too closely in regard to it, and I only know the result. Certain men are favoured, and that is one of the difficulties. My impression is that the reason why we stopped granting licenses was the difficulty of limiting the number of licenses. If we granted one license, we had a great many applicants for licenses to be granted to them. That was the reason we came to the conclusion not to grant any.

19321. Were the licenses granted by the Council?—Yes.

19322. Had you no petition in regard to their issue?—No, there was only the application of the person desiring to sell.

19323. Have you given up efforts to put an end to illicit selling?—No. The Mayor attempted to close one establishment, and endeavoured to have the party arrested for selling.

19324. To accomplish that, are you obliged to move the provincial authorities?—Yes.

19325. Under what law do you proceed?—Under our municipal law, and we make a charge that the man has been selling liquor without a license.

19326. In contempt of the by-law and the license law?—Yes.

19327. And is he prosecuted on that charge?—He is prosecuted.

19328. Do you find the provincial authorities willing to aid you in putting an end to illicit sale?—They have generally helped, but it is difficult for us to convict a man for doing so; although we know perfectly well he is violating the law, it is a difficult

matter to bring the charge home to him. All that is required is a more rigorous enforcement of the law. When a man is drunk he should be arrested, and so soon as he gets sober, he should be questioned as to where he obtained liquor.

19329. Would that be the duty of the provincial authorities?—I do not know.

19330. Selling without a license is a breach of the provincial law?—Yes.

19331. Would not one naturally conclude that it would be the duty of the provincial authorities to take cognizance of it?—I should think so.

19332. As regards the enforcement of the municipal by-laws, you have that matter in your own hands, I presume?—We have in our own hands the power to grant licenses or not.

19333. In regard to prosecutions for breaches of the by-law: if the municipal body does not do its duty, it can not reasonably complain of anybody else?—We complain because of the difficulty we have in obtaining a simple means of arresting and punishing the violators.

19334. I was referring to your statement that the law should be more rigorously observed, and trying to ascertain whether the provincial or the municipal body was failing to enforce the law?—Really, I could not tell whether the defect lies with the provincial or municipal authorities, but I know it exists, and we cannot enforce the law as we would like to do.

19335. Have not the license fees in Quebec been increased two or three times within late years, and are they not now considered high?—Yes.

19336. Is it your opinion that that has had any effect in checking intemperance?—No, I do not think so.

19337. You know something of public sentiment on this subject, and I suppose you have given some thought to it. Do you think a Dominion law, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, would be desirable?—No, I do not think it would.

19338. Upon what ground do you base your opinion?—Because I think it is much better to have the people sober not by law, but by their desire to live respectable lives. That has a very much stronger influence on them than a law. I believe the bulk of our men are sober simply from the number of years they have lived under our system, and they look upon it as a disgrace to go into these unlicensed houses.

19339. Is that the effect of educational and religious training?—Yes.

19340. That is your view of the subject?—Yes; that is my belief. I believe that the religious influences of the priests of Sillery have had a very beneficial effect upon the people.

19341. I suppose most of the employees there are of the Roman Catholic faith?—I think they are, almost without an exception.

*By Judge McDonald:*

19342. Have you ever been present where cases for violation of the law have been tried, and the persons prosecuted?—Several times, I have taken steps to have certain people prosecuted.

19343. Have you found that the witnesses who were summoned had great lack of memory?—Yes. They have no memory, and we have had very great difficulty in getting witnesses at all. In fact that is a most difficult matter. Last Sunday night on the St. Louis road there were no less than 8 or 9 cases of drunkenness, where the men were incapable of walking, and still we could not find where the men had got liquor. We all know pretty well where they had got it, but it would be a difficult matter to secure a conviction. It is too glaring not to know that there are certain places selling liquor irregularly. Our own people and men from certain houses in town come to me and protest because certain houses are selling liquor. We cannot secure convictions, because we are unable to find anybody who purchased drink. Only in a few cases have we been able to secure convictions in cases of drink being sold in this way.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

19344. Do those prosecutions give rise to perjury?—I think so to a very great extent.

19345. Is not that one of the results of attempting to enforce a prohibitory law?—From the evidence given in court we are led to believe that perjury is committed. I think there is a great deal of perjury. I am not personally opposed to licensing houses.

19346. I understood you to say that before you took advantage of the present law as a municipality, the duty of issuing licenses devolved on the Mayor and members of the Council?—Yes, prior to the change.

19347. Then you took advantage of the local option law?—I was not a member of the Council prior to that time.

19348. The power of issuing licenses now rests with the Mayor. How were they issued formerly?—I think they come from the Federal Government or the Provincial Government.

19349. Was it since licenses were issued by the Mayor and the Council that you took advantage of the local option clause and shut down on licenses altogether?—Yes.

19350. What led you to do that?—The desire of our own men—the actual wish of our own men.

19351. I understood you to say that it was to get rid of the annoyance of being importuned by people to grant them licenses?—That was the reason we did not grant any. There were a great many people who would have liked a few respectable houses kept open if possible, but the difficulty was to confine the licenses to those few houses.

19352. If there were three or four respectable houses licensed in the municipality, would there be a better order of things than exists at present?—I do not think there would be.

19353. Would there be any worse?—No. I do not think there would be, but I think there would be a much better order of things if you could strictly put down those houses which sell liquor without a license. I think too that certain houses might be licensed, and that it would be very desirable to do so, where really good liquor or good beer would be sold to the men.

19354. Have you heard anything respecting the character of the liquor sold at those places now?—Yes.

19355. What is its character?—It is the vilest trash and poison.

19356. Was that the character of the liquor sold when places were licensed?—I think it is much worse now. I look upon it as poison, because I see that men after they have taken small quantities show the effects of it. It is really killing those who indulge in it.

19357. How many places are selling liquor without licenses, according to general report?—Four or five in the municipality.

19358. And before you took advantage of the law, how many licensed places existed?—I do not think there were more than five or six.

19359. Were there many unlicensed places then?—A good many. Perhaps more than there are now.

19360. Then the only result has been to close out the licensed people who sold liquor before?—I think so, and that is what the licensed people complain of.

19361. Is there anything in that contention?—I would rather see a few good licensed houses, with some supervision exercised over them as to the quality of the beer and the quality of the liquor sold, and certain restrictions that would be beneficial.

19362. Would it not be well if there was a law limiting the number of licenses issued according to the population of the municipality; for example, one license for the first thousand or five hundred people, and an additional license granted for each thousand or two thousand?—That would be difficult to work because the population varies very much. At our cove we generally have a large number of ships lying there. All the men belonging to those ships come on shore. They drink far more than the people who live among us.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

19363. Is there any provision for the supervision of licensed places, and examination of the quality of liquors they sell?—I am not aware whether there is or not, but I think there should be.

RICHARD R. DOBELL.

19364. Have you reason to believe that licensed places sell a better quality of liquor than unlicensed places?—I have.

19365. That is your belief?—Yes, that is my belief.

19366. Have you found that the refusal to grant licenses in the community where your people work has had any effect in educating the people against the drink trade? Are they more strongly against it than they were before?—I think so.

19367. Do you believe that the delegalization of the trade generally might have a like educational effect? If the delegalization of the trade in that place has helped to educate the people against the drink trade, would the delegalization of the trade generally have a like effect?—I could not say that; I think it would not, because the surroundings are so different. Our own people are a small community, really cut off from the rest of the municipality, living down at the edge of the St. Lawrence. You can exercise an influence over them that you could not exercise over the more central portions and over a large city like Quebec. However, I could not form an opinion as to whether it would or would not.

19368. I understood you to say that the people themselves asked to have licenses not granted?—They did. It was in accordance with their wish that we adopted that course.

19369. It was because of the ill effects of the trade amongst them?—I think so.

19370. You have mentioned that compliance with their request and the refusal of licenses have had the effect of still further confirming them in their opposition to the trade?—I think so. I think there is one remark I should make, because you may be under the impression that there is no liquor sold in a legal way. There is still a fair amount sold by carts coming out of town.

19371. Peddling liquor?—Yes.

19372. You mean sent out by licensed people in Quebec?—Yes. They are licensed in Quebec, and I dare say they do a very good wholesale business, and our men buy liquor and take it to their houses.

19373. Do I understand that there is a class of licenses which authorize men to sell in that way?—We did not give a license, but there is nothing to prevent our men going into town and ordering six bottles of beer. That beer is afterwards sent out and delivered at the house.

19374. It is that form of delivery to which you refer?—Yes.

19375. Not peddling?—No. The dealers drive along the road and supply the houses.

19376. Do you believe that home drinking has increased since the refusal to grant licenses?—No, I do not think it has much. I only mentioned that because you might have a little wrong impression as to the facts.

19377. I think you said there were more illicit places when you had licenses than there are now?—I think there were. One reason was that the population was much larger then than now. Relatively, I think we are about on the same footing.

19378. But there were illicit places when you had licenses?—Certainly. The men who had licensed houses were our best friends in aiding us to put down the illicit ones.

19379. Did they really attempt to put down illicit sellers?—Yes, several times they prosecuted them.

19380. Did that prevent illicit sale?—No, because we never could get them punished and the law thoroughly well carried out. That has been our weak point.

19381. You said there was perjury committed in such cases?—I think a great deal of perjury has been committed.

19382. Do you think it well to refrain from prosecutions lest men should perjure themselves?—No, I think the obligation rests on the men, and that you should carry out the law if possible.

19383. As an employer of labour have you noticed that your men who drink lose any proportion of their time on account of drinking?—I think scarcely one of our employees is an habitual drunkard.

19384. Nor in former years?—No, I never remember having any drunkards in the cove. The drinking that takes place is generally among the young men, and strangers coming in with them often.

19385. I assume there must have been trouble of some kind arising out of the drink habits of the people or they would not have asked for licenses to have been withheld. Will you please state the reason that actuated them?—They are the young men, not the working men, who want liquor.

19386. They want to procure it?—That is the general rule, the young men desire it.

19387. Since licenses were refused, are the young men not drinking so generally?—I should not like to say that our young men drink.

19388. Do they drink more now or less than they did when there were licensed places?—I think there is less drinking now than there was fifteen years ago.

19389. And you believe that is attributable in a great degree to the religious influences exerted?—Yes, and the way drunkenness has been condemned, and the increase of self-respect, and the fact that people are getting a little better off.

19390. Do you think that the delegalization of the trade helps those religious influences?—I think it is an admirable rule to leave these matters to the municipality, and to let the majority rule.

19391. Do you believe in local option?—Yes. I believe it is a very good thing, indeed.

19392. That where the majority are unwilling to have drink sold it should not be sold?—Yes, I think that is a very good rule.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19393. As a business man, you are of the opinion that in the Province of Quebec local option can be carried in a small municipality such as your own?—Yes.

19394. What would you think of a case of this kind : Suppose that a town of 10,000 or 12,000 inhabitants to be in the country, and the rural district carried such an Act as this, with a majority in the town against it, would such legislation be advisable so far as the town is concerned, or would you allow the town to decide the matter for itself?—It is not desirable for a small town or city to be over-ruled by the country districts. I do not know of any case where it should be so, because the population of a town, say of 10,000 or 12,000, would scarcely be over-ridden by the votes given in the country district.

19395. But is there not such a case sometimes under the Scott Act?—Yes.

19396. Where the vote is taken by a county may not the rural population carry it over the inhabitants of a town or city? Have you had any experience of this fact?—I know of no example of it. I should think it would be rather difficult if such result happened as regards the town. I can easily imagine that if a town has a large hotel, there might be difficulty if it were not allowed to sell wine or liquors.

19397. In a limited area, such as the city of Quebec, would you approve of local option?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19398. So long as it does not interfere with the rights of the majority?—I approve of it so long as the majority favours it and endeavours to carry it out.

19399. Supposing 60 per cent of the voters favoured the passage of a local option measure and their views are reflected by the Council, and it is decided to issue no licenses, should that prohibit the procuring of liquor from Quebec or elsewhere by the minority, if they desire to do so for family use?—I would prohibit the sale in that municipality. We cannot prohibit the sale in Quebec, and those who desire liquor can get it from Quebec and bring it into the municipality.

19400. As a matter of fact there is no prohibition except that of sale?—Not except that in a public house.

19401. But a person can purchase liquor outside and bring it into the municipality for his own use?—Yes.

19402. Is that the kind of prohibition you favour?—Yes.

19403. Would you favour a general prohibitory measure?—I would not, because I think there is no better drink for a man than good wholesome beer.

RICHARD R. DOBELL.

19404. Do you draw a line between the moderate use of drink and the excessive use of drink? Are there not hundreds and thousands who drink ale in moderation and wine at dinner?—Certainly.

19405. Do you class those people as people whom it is necessary to protect by closing up the taverns?—No, I do not.

*By the Chairman :*

19406. What is the population of your cove now as compared with its population say 15 years ago?—There is not much variation in the population of the district. There has been a decline, but not so serious as some parties talk about, because it happens that our own cove and that of our neighbours has kept up the amount of work pretty well; in fact, nearly up to the old standard, but not quite. Some of the other coves have closed entirely, and no longer give employment.

19407. Has there been a reduction of 20 per cent?—During the last 15 years there has scarcely been 20 per cent decline, perhaps 10 per cent.

JOSEPH J. FORTIER, Collector of Provincial Revenue for the district of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

19408. How long have you held your present office?—I have been in this office, under different titles, since October, 1868.

19409. From whom did you receive the appointment?—I was first Collector of Inland Revenue for the Federal Government and for the Local Government. In 1878 two departments were created, and I kept my position as Collector of Provincial Revenue.

19410. So from 1878 to the present time, you have been Collector for the Provincial Government only?—Yes.

19411. From what sources do you collect revenue?—From all licenses, taverns, shops, clubs, wholesale, also licenses to keep gunpowder, also pedlars and temperance hotel licenses.

19412. What is the amount of the license fee for a temperance hotel?—Now it is \$11.

19413. Is the holder obliged to put up a sign?—Yes.

19414. Does the law require such proprietors to make a distinction with respect to their houses, as compared with ordinary hotels?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19415. The Commission have heard to-day of the existence here of what are called club licenses. Will you kindly state what the law is in that regard?—A club license is granted to a certain association, either an incorporated association or an association formed by a notarial deed, and the members have to pay so much.

19416. Is any particular number of persons required to form such association?—No.

19417. Do they file a declaration of any kind?—Yes; they file a declaration with the Government.

19418. Signed by the persons who are seeking to be incorporated?—Yes; they have to submit a copy of their by-laws and regulations.

19419. Are licenses then issued to them?—Yes.

19420. What are the terms and conditions of the license in that case?—The conditions are what I have stated.

19421. I mean the conditions imposed on them as to hours of sale, place of sale, and so on?—They are supposed to be like a family, they can sell at any time.

19422. But I presume that members of that particular club only can procure liquor?—Yes.



19423. Can they consume it on Sunday or at any time?—Yes.

19424. Can it be consumed in the club, the same as at a private house?—Yes.

19425. Is there any restriction placed on them as to the admission of new members to the club?—I do not know. There are some regulations in regard to registering members.

19426. It has been stated before the Commission to-day that persons will come in, sign their names to the register, pay five cents each, and will thus become members of the club and will obtain liquor?—They could not do that.

19427. That would be contrary to the law?—Yes.

19428. It would be an invasion of the law?—Yes.

19429. The law is not intended to cover any such case, I presume?—No.

19430. That is not what is understood as a club by the law?—No.

19431. Have you anything to do with the enforcement of the law against people who sell illicitly?—Yes; I am Collector.

19432. Before whom do you bring cases in which you prosecute people who sell illegally?—I bring the cases before the Police Court.

19433. Have you authority yourself to act and try cases and punish people?—No.

19434. Have you a staff of officers at your command to act in this matter?—Yes, I have two officers.

19435. Are they sub-inspectors?—They are revenue officers.

19436. Is it part of your duty to inspect the licensed houses, and see they carry out the requirements of the law?—Yes.

19437. In the case of hotels or taverns to see that the requirements regarding beds for travellers are complied with?—Yes, that is included in the conditions undertaken to be fulfilled by the party who desires to obtain a license. If a person wants to obtain an hotel license, he has to apply to the police court authorities, give his name and obtain a form to fill up. He has 15 days in which to comply with the law. He must get 25 names of municipal electors in the ward or place where he intends to keep his establishment; 15 days afterwards, if there is no opposition offered to his application, he gets his application confirmed by the Magistrates. Of course, they have to see whether he has complied with the conditions of the law.

19438. Is it your duty to see he has complied with those conditions?—Not at all.

19439. Is there an officer to see that he is properly qualified?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

19440. Who issues the license?—I do.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19441. Who looks after the other matter?—It is the Police Magistrate to whom the application is made.

19442. The Police Magistrate examines the application and ascertains whether the proper number of people have signed it and whether they are properly qualified, and whether the person has the necessary accommodation; and upon the Magistrate being satisfied on these points, he certifies the same to you, and you issue the license and collect the fees?—Yes.

19443. Have you any option in the matter? Could you decline to grant a license if the Magistrate had reported favorably?—When the certificate is confirmed by the Magistrate, I cannot refuse it.

19444. And a certificate having been granted and a license issued, do you exercise any supervision over the house?—Yes, afterwards. When a license is granted I have to make a visit to the house.

19445. How often are you required to visit it?—I am obliged to do so once a year.

19446. Do you see that the license holder still fulfils the requirements of the law for the accommodation of the public?—When I go round I look after it.

19447. You satisfy yourself that the party is keeping a respectable house?—I satisfy myself that he is complying with the law, and that he has such accommodation as the law requires.

JOSEPH J. FORTIER.

19448. Are you required to see that he keeps his place closed on Sunday?—The law has been changed in regard to that matter. Many years ago the city corporation took action in that respect ; but there has been a law passed by the Provincial Legislature giving authority to the Collector of Provincial Revenue to take proceedings.

19449. Is that under the Ross Act?—No, it was during Mr. Würtele's regime that the change was made.

19450. Does not the Ross Act require these places to be closed on Sunday and at twelve at night? Is it not your duty to see that the proprietors carry out the requirements of the statute?—It is to me that complaints are made.

19451. Do you look after the cases of people who are selling illicitly?—When complaints are made, yes.

19452. If you receive information that people are selling illicitly, do you cause complaints to be laid before the Magistrate?—Yes. When a party complains that there is illicit selling on Sunday, I take action, if he gives me proofs.

19453. I mean if people are selling on Sunday or on week day without license?—If parties are selling on Sunday without license, of course we cannot sue them for selling on Sunday, but we sue them for selling without license.

19454. I am inclined to agree with your position. But the Commissioners have found to-day that the municipal police punish parties for selling on Sunday whether they have licenses or not. You punish them for selling without license, I understand?—Yes, because I can only sue parties for selling on Sunday when they are licensed.

19455. Have you many such cases of people selling without license?—Not many.

19456. Do you think there are many places in Quebec now selling illicitly?—There may be some, but there are not many.

19457. When you do prosecute people for selling without license, do you ever find it difficult to get evidence to convict them?—Sometimes.

19458. Do you find that the memory of witnesses is apt to be bad in regard to sales?—Sometimes, but we generally succeed.

19459. Then you have, so far as you could reasonably be expected to do, endeavoured to carry out the law and put a stop to illicit sale?—Yes.

19460. Do you think you have fairly succeeded in doing so?—Yes.

19461. You have spoken of your district. What is your district?—My district is composed of the city of Quebec and five counties.

19462. Name the counties.—Quebec, Montmorency, Portneuf, Lévis, Lotbinière.

19463. Do you find much illicit sale in the rural districts?—There is some, not much.

19464. Does your information regarding those districts come to you from officers travelling over them, or is it hearsay of the people?—It is obtained from parties living in the country districts and also from my men. More often, the complaints come to the office either by letter or personally.

19465. Do you ever receive complaints from licensed dealers that other parties are selling illicitly?—Yes, sometimes.

19466. And do they ask that this illicit traffic be stopped?—Yes.

19467. Have you ever had reason to suppose that the licensed dealers were themselves employing others to sell illicitly?—I am not aware of it.

19468. Could you make to the Commission any suggestions as to the improvements in the law regarding the sale of intoxicating liquors?—In what way?

19469. As to the system of management and as to the system of penalties, and anything else?—I think the law is a very good one as it is.

19470. You mean the license law of Quebec?—Yes.

19471. Do you think the law is capable of enforcement?—I think it is a very good law.

19472. Do you think it is promotive of temperance among the people?—I think some places would be far better if they granted licenses than they are under prohibition.

19473. Do you mean that some of the rural districts where they exercise local option and do not grant licenses, would be far better off if they did grant them?—The Municipal Councils have not the right to grant licenses—the licenses are granted by the Government—but they have the right to say to whom they shall be granted.

19474. Have you reason to believe that in any portions of your district liquors are sold that are not of good quality?—No, I could not say positively. I have been told that some smuggled liquors were of that sort.

19475. Do you make a return which would show the amount of revenue you collect?—Yes, I make a return every three months.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19476. Are there any restrictions as to the number of licenses that can be given in a municipality?—Not in Quebec.

19477. Do you mean in Quebec Province?—I mean neither in Quebec City nor in Lévis.

*By the Chairman :*

19478. In counties?—I think one of the villages across the River St. Lawrence, Bienville, is limited to two licenses by the municipal by-law.

19479. Has the Council of the city of Quebec the right to pass a by-law limiting the number of licenses?—I do not know.

19480. But in the rural districts you think the municipality has the right?—I know that two villages, Bienville and Lauzon, limit the number—they give licenses to only one or two parties. I do not know whether it is because there are no other applications, but the municipality only grants one or two licenses.

19481. What is your opinion regarding the operation of the local option law ; what has the effect been ? Do you agree with Mr. Dobell respecting its results?—I did not hear his evidence.

19482. In those places throughout the district where advantage has been taken of the local option provision, what is the condition of the community when it has refused to grant licenses?—I think they would be better off if they confirmed the certificates. I had a great deal less trouble then than I have now in regard to that municipality.

19483. In what respect?—There are now more complaints of parties selling without license than there were then.

19484. You mean there is more illicit selling now?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19485. Then is your opinion this, that the condition of affairs was better when licenses were issued than it is at present?—I know I had less trouble then, and there were fewer complaints at all events.

19486. You had less trouble?—I had fewer complaints of illicit selling then.

19487. Was the law as rigidly enforced against unlicensed places as it is now? Almost all the parties selling liquor were licensed by the Government.

19488. But Mr. Dobell said there were unlicensed places in the municipality at the time licenses were issued?—Not so many.

19489. He not only said there were unlicensed places there, but he stated that the licensed people gave assistance in suppressing illicit places?—Yes. They took proceedings against parties who were selling liquor without license.

19490. The condition of things, then, was better under license than it is at present?—Yes.

19491. Do you know anything about the quality of the liquor sold in the unlicensed places ; is it inferior to that sold in the licensed places?—I am told that since smuggling has been going on, there are some places where the liquor sold is not as good as formerly, but I am not very well posted.

19492. From your experience, what is your opinion respecting the saloon license and its influence : is it more or less injurious to public morals than the hotel license?—I do not find much difference.

19493. Do you consider the hotel license is as bad as the saloon license in its effects?—Of course, in proportion. There are a great many more saloons and restaurant licenses than hotel licenses ; restaurants and saloons are the same.

19494. I mean by saloons licensed places whose proprietors are not compelled to provide meals or sleeping accommodation for travellers?—Saloons and restaurants are the same.

JOSEPH J. FORTIER.

19495. Is there any reason whatever why those places should be licensed ; are they necessary in this city or elsewhere ?—I cannot answer that question.

19496. Do you think the hotel license is just as injurious as the saloon license, that the hotels, in proportion to their number, do as much harm and induce drunkenness to as great an extent as do the saloons ?—I do not know.

19497. It is urged that if the sale of liquor were confined to saloons, to places where nothing else was sold but liquor, the result would be a reduction in the consumption of liquor and in drunkenness, because while people can go into hotels ostensibly to see guests or visitors but really to get drink, if liquor only were sold in saloons, and they were seen going in there, it would be known they were going in for drink, and they would not do so. Would it be better to stop the sale of liquor in the hotels, and let the saloons do all the business ?—I could not answer that question.

19498. Why is the temperance hotel charged a license fee ?—It accommodates travellers.

19499. Does it have to pay for the privilege of accommodating travellers ?—Yes, it accommodates travellers and provides board.

19500. Is there any provision of the law requiring that a notice be put up stating that the house is a temperance hotel ?—Yes, the law compels them to do so.

19501. Is the hotel where liquor is sold required to do so ?—No.

19502. Do hotels of the other class, where liquors are sold, have a notice put up to the effect that this is not a temperance hotel ?—They are obliged to put up a sign board with the words, licensed to retail spirituous liquors.

19503. Is it equally conspicuous with the sign put up by the temperance hotel ?—It is a sign board three or four inches wide.

19504. Is it generally put up over the door ?—Yes.

19505. In the same place as in the case of the temperance hotel ?—Yes, about the same ; the difference is the wording of the notice.

19506. Has drunkenness increased or decreased since you have been Collector of Provincial Revenue ?—I have not to look after that.

19507. From your observation, you being the official who has to visit those places and supervise them, have you not been able to form an opinion ?—No.

19508. Are there more licenses issued now in Quebec, than were issued formerly ?—A little less.

19509. Has there been a decrease in the number of unlicensed places too ?—Yes.

19510. Are there fewer unlicensed places and fewer licensed places than formerly ?—There is a slight decrease in the number this year.

19511. Has the increase in the license fee anything to do with the decrease in the number of places ?—It may have, but I do not think so.

19512. Do you think there has been a corresponding increase in the number of unlicensed places ?—I think not.

19513. Then there are fewer places where liquor is sold, illegally or legally ; but you have not noticed any perceptible change in regard to drunkenness ?—I am not supposed to notice that.

19514. During your experience as a citizen of the province, what conclusion has your observation forced on you respecting the drinking customs of the people during the past 15 years ?—The number of licenses is about the same ; but whether the people drink more or less than they did, I could not say. The number of licensed people is about the same.

19515. Has there been a marked decrease in drunkenness in those places where no license has been issued, where the licensed places have been closed by the action of the Municipal Council ?—Very few were refused licenses.

19516. In those places where the Council decided not to grant certificates for license, has there been a marked improvement in the drinking habits of the people ? In certain municipalities, in one at least, the Council has refused to grant certificates and consequently no licenses have been issued to sell liquor : has there been a marked improvement there, or is the condition of things worse ?—Do you mean in the municipalities where they formerly granted certificates for license, but where they now refuse them ?

19517. Is the condition of those places better or worse?—They are worse than they were.

19518. Is that owing to the fact that licenses were withdrawn and an unlicensed trade sprang up?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

19519. Do you mean there is more drunkenness there than previously?—Yes ; a great many more places are selling without licenses than there were when licenses were granted.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

19520. Are you able to state the number of licenses in Quebec?—Seeing that I have not my book with me, I cannot give the number in the past years.

19521. Could you give us the number of licenses in Quebec for the past few years?—Yes.

19522. Could you furnish us with information respecting licences in the city of Quebec?—Yes.

19523. Is it within your knowledge that the licensees help the authorities to punish those who violate the law and its provisions?—Sometimes.

19524. When you receive complaint of infraction of the license law, do you exact a certain amount as deposit before taking proceedings?—Sometimes.

19525. When you think there is danger of failing to secure conviction?—Yes.

19526. Have you often failed?—Rarely.

19527. Each time that you have a complaint, do you take proceedings?—When the complaint is well made, and I have reason to think that the defenders are unable to pay the fine, I ask a deposit as a guarantee. In a municipality where the sale of liquor is prohibited, I compel those municipal authorities to take proceedings. When I receive a complaint from a parish where there are prohibitory regulations, then I inform the municipality that such a complaint has been made against a certain person selling liquor illegally, and I warn them to take necessary proceedings ; and if the municipality neglects to take action, I have the authority to do so.

19528. Are you obliged to notify the municipality?—The law declares that if the municipality does not take proceedings, the Inspector of Customs ought to do so.

19529. Has the increase in license fees had the effect of diminishing the number of licenses in Quebec and in each of the counties that form your district?—A little this year.

19530. You have said that there was less drunkenness. Was it owing to the efforts of the clergy?—Respecting the city of Quebec, it is a little difficult for me to say, as my duties do not extend there. I desire to say that my official duties do not enable me to state directly if drunkenness has diminished or not.

19531. From what you know, is there a diminution?—I would like much to answer, but I cannot do so. In order to answer, we must compare the actual number of hotels and restaurants with the number five or ten years ago. I can get this information if the Commission has need of it ; but to say now if drunkenness has increased or diminished, I am unable to do it.

19532. You said that each time a Municipal Council prohibits the sale of liquors, the condition is made worse with respect to drunkenness?—I said that from certain municipalities I have received fewer complaints against persons selling without a license than when the sale of liquors was not prohibited.

19533. Are there always some persons who sell liquor in the municipalities where the prohibition is in force?—I do not say that it is so in all the municipalities.

19534. Is it not prudent to prohibit the sale of liquors?—It would be wise for certain places ; but elsewhere, it would cause more harm than good.

19535. Is it correct that the clergy and the temperance societies have helped to diminish intemperance?—I do not think that that influence has made itself felt, at least in my district. In the municipalities where they have passed a prohibitory law respecting the sale of liquors, nearly always the same persons sell illegally.

JOSEPH J. FORTIER.

19536. You are of opinion that this prohibitory law does not prevent the sale of liquor?—I take the municipality of Sillery. From what Mr. Dobell has said, I give that as an example.

19537. Does it not work better in the small centres?—I have no complaint. What I know about the working of the law comes to me by way of complaint.

19538. Has the City Council of Quebec the right, like other municipalities, to adopt prohibition by virtue of the provisions of the license law to this effect, that it will not issue licenses?—I do not think so. The law here does not have the same effect as elsewhere, because whenever a municipality passes a prohibitory law regarding the sale of alcoholic liquors, declaring that no license shall be issued, the Government has not the right to grant any license. Formerly the City Council had the control of granting licenses, but now it is in the hands of Commissioners in Montreal and at Quebec; elsewhere this is left to the Police Magistrates, acting as such Commissioners. It is for them to judge if a person ought to have a license.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19539. You have said that you have two officers under you: what are their duties?—Their duties are to look after the parties who are selling without license.

19540. Are they supposed to prevent illicit sale?—They are supposed to receive complaints and attend to prosecutions in court.

19541. Do they ever act as detectives to search out illicit sales?—No.

19542. Do they only act when complaints are made?—Yes.

19543. Speaking about saloons: have not saloons to give meals?—They may do so, but not in all cases.

19544. Is it not a condition of the license?—No.

19545. As a matter of fact, do most of the restaurants give meals—is it required of them?—No; it is considered to be more like a saloon, a bar-room.

19546. I have noticed that grocery stores sell liquor. Do most of the grocers have licenses to sell?—Yes, by the half pint.

19547. And has the liquor to be taken from the premises?—Yes.

19548. Have you observed in your official connection with the trade any evil growing out of the fact that liquors are sold where groceries are sold?—Yes, it sometimes occurs that they retail liquors and groceries.

19549. Would it be well if the sale of liquor were kept entirely separate from that of groceries?—It might be.

19550. Have the city of Quebec and the city of Montreal the same right to refuse to grant licenses that municipalities possess in country districts? Could Quebec refuse to grant licenses?—No. I have explained to Commissioner Gigault, the position. In Montreal and Quebec the granting or refusal of applications is in the hands of the Police Magistrate. In Montreal the License Commissioners and in Quebec the Police Magistrates act.

19551. You go into a country district, and you find that a Municipal Council can pass a vote refusing to grant a license?—Yes.

19552. Could the City Council do the same thing, if it chose?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

19553. Are you quite positive that there is prohibition in the law against that?—I think so. In former years the confirmation of the certificate was in the hands of the City Municipal Council, but it was taken from them and given to the Magistrate.

19554. In Quebec to the Police Magistrate—and who is connected with him?—There are two Police Magistrates.

19555. Is not the Recorder also authorized?—There is the Recorder also, and he makes three.

19556. In Montreal there is not the same arrangement?—There the duty is in the hands of the License Commissioners.

19557. When were they appointed? Was not this power until quite recently in the hands of the Council?—I know that they are called License Commissioners.

19558. Are they not the two Police Magistrates and the Recorder?—I cannot tell you.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19559. You have spoken about certain action being taken in cases lest the costs connected with the prosecutions might fall on the Government. Are there cases in which the Government, after a prosecution has been successful and conviction been had, have interfered with carrying out the conviction?—I would rather not answer that question.

*By the Chairman :*

19560. I will read you a quotation from the Quebec License Law. It is to this effect :—

“The confirmation of a certificate is granted at the Police Court in Quebec, for the city of Quebec by the Judge of the Sessions of the Peace, or the Recorder, and at the Police Court in Montreal, for the city of Montreal, by the two Judges of the Sessions of the Peace and by the Recorder, or any two of them.”

I think you have said that your impression is that Quebec city could not adopt a local option law?—I do not know whether the municipal law gives them the right to pass such a law.

19561. You cannot say positively that the Council have not the power?—Not according to the license law.

19562. According to the license law, they have no right to pass a local option law, in your opinion?—No. Because the privilege given them of granting certificates has been taken away and put in the hands of the Magistrates and the Recorder.

19563. Are the Magistrates and Recorders in the cities of Quebec and Montreal obliged to issue certificates to every one who applies, if he has complied with the law?—It is left to them to grant or refuse, so the law says.

19564. The two Magistrates or Recorder, or any two of them have a right to refuse those applications?—Yes.

19565. Are there not certain conditions to be complied with prior to the applications going before the Magistrates?—Yes.

19566. What are they?—In my answer I am alluding to a city. The party who desires to obtain a license has to go to the police court and give his name, which is written on a board, and he receives from an official a blank form to be filled up. Fifteen days after the date on which he gave in his name, he returns to the police court and hands in the form, which must have been signed by 25 municipal electors for an hotel license, and they must also make affidavit. If during the fifteen days no objection was offered to the granting of such certificate, the Magistrate signs and grants a license.

19567. Cannot a polling district of the city of Montreal or Quebec, by the action of the majority of the householders, or ratepayers, determine that no license shall be granted in that district?—Certainly, there can be opposition to the application. If during the fifteen days given for the preparation of the papers there is opposition offered, the Police Magistrate fixes a time to hear all the parties.

19568. If the opposition is of a certain character the Magistrates cannot grant the license, I suppose?—Certainly, if it is proved it should not be granted.

19569. Do the municipalities obtain any revenue from the issuing of those licenses?—Yes, a certain amount according to law.

19570. For granting certificates?—Yes.

19571. You have spoken of the assistance you receive from the two deputy collectors. Do you get any assistance from the police or the municipal authorities in finding out illicit sales?—Sometimes some of the policemen lodge complaints.

19572. What do you consider to be the duty of the police in regard to this matter; you have provincial police and city police?—They are not under my control.

19573. What are their duties in regard to this particular matter, because your Inspectors cannot travel a great deal over the district?—They have to see that the places are closed on Sunday; they get their orders from the Chief.

19574. I am speaking of selling without a license?—It is very seldom that the police give information to me.

19575. Would it have to come to you before anything could be done: you would be prosecutor in such a case?—Yes, but up to lately a person could take action himself.

JOSEPH J. FORTIER.

19576. Did you say that the municipalities received fees for issuing certificates?—  
Yes.
19577. But simply for the issuing of the certificate?—Yes.
19578. To what do those fees amount?—They have a right to charge up to \$50.
19579. In Montreal do they not charge \$8?—Yes. They charged \$8 in Quebec when a certificate was granted by the city municipality.
19580. What do they charge now?—Now, they do not charge anything.
19581. Does the city receive no revenue from the granting of licenses?—No.
19582. Are there any districts in which the municipal bodies obtain a revenue from the granting of licenses?—I think that in the country district or country parishes and in the town of Lévis they do.
19583. What do they receive in Lévis?—I think \$20.
19584. Is that for each license or only for an hotel license?—For each license.
19585. Whether for a grocery license or otherwise?—Yes, if I am not mistaken.
19586. You have licenses which compel the holder to supply meals and beds, and you have other licenses which are granted purely for selling liquor?—Yes.
19587. Is there any other class of license granted for groceries except the license under which liquor must not be drunk on the premises?—No, and only by the half pint.

H. PETIT, M.P.P., of Chicoutimi, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

19588. What is the population of the county?—15,000.
19589. Was the Scott Act adopted in 1885?—I believe so.
19590. Do you remember the number of votes recorded in favour of it?—No, but the vote was not very large.
19591. I observe the record shows that 1,157 persons voted for the Act and 528 voted against it, or 1,586 together, out of a total number of voters on the list of 3,256?—Yes.
19592. Has the question of the continuance of the Act ever been submitted to the people of the county since?—No.
19593. Has the population of the county largely increased since 1885?—Yes, the population has increased, but only at a moderate rate.
19594. I think you are building a railway there at present?—Yes.
19595. From the neighbourhood of Lake St. John to Chicoutimi?—Yes.
19596. Is the road actually under construction at this time?—Yes.
19597. You have a number of labourers working on it, I suppose?—Yes, a large number.
19598. Are they people of the district or strangers?—They are almost all people of the district.
19599. Of the population of Chicoutimi, how many are in the town?—About 3,000.
19600. Out of a total of 15,000?—Yes.

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault:*

19601. Where is your residence?—Chicoutimi, in the city.
19602. Your occupation?—Agriculturist. I am also deputy to the Legislative Assembly of Quebec.
19603. The Scott Act is in force in your county?—Yes.
19604. Did you notice if there were many licenses before the Scott Act came into force?—There were not any more than at present.
19605. How many places are there selling?—Two or three.



19606. What effect has the Scott Act in your place?—It had a very bad effect. Before, there were only licenses in the large centres; but after the Scott Act there were liquor depots in all the parishes; so that there was liquor sold everywhere, especially at the beginning; the liquor flowed all over, and consequently there was much disorder.

19607. Were there any parishes before where licenses were refused?—Yes, but there were some licenses granted at Chicoutimi.

19608. By virtue of the Scott Act, has the number of dealers been reduced?—They have diminished lately.

19609. How many are there now?—In the County of Chicoutimi there are three.

19610. Are you able to say if there is much drunkenness?—I do not know of any drunkards. There is hardly any liquor sold. Drunkenness, I should say, is altogether unknown.

19611. Is it due to the operation of the Scott Act, or to the action of the clergy and the Municipal Councils that have decided to put a stop to the sale of liquor?—I am far from saying that it is due to the Scott Act. Since the adoption of the Scott Act there have been many disorders; and seeing this, the clergy, as well as the Municipal Council, have decided not to grant any more licenses.

19612. Is there, to your knowledge, any illegal selling?—No, there is no liquor sold, but by those who have the right to do so.

19613. Do you think that the licensed parties only sell for medical use, or do they sell liquors also as a beverage?—No doubt this pretense is made use of. There we cheat the medical man by saying that we need the liquor for sickness, but by that I do not wish to say we make an improper use of it. The doctors give certificates to people who have no necessity for liquor.

19614. Do you think that if the County of Chicoutimi was under the operation of the ordinary law, that is to say, if the Scott Act were repealed, there would be a large number of licenses granted, or would there be any?—Would the Councils have the power to stop the licenses?

19615. Yes. What do you think of it?—There is no doubt we should not be worse than at present. The Council having the right to refuse licenses, they would not grant any.

19616. Can you tell us if strangers and tourists who go to Chicoutimi can obtain liquor?—I think at some of the hotels in the surrounding districts they are able to find liquor for their use.

*By the Chairman:*

19617. Do the people grow barley in Chicoutimi?—Very little now.

JOSEPH H. CAHILL, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

19618. Are you a native of Quebec?—No, but I have been here since I was a boy.

19619. What is your present occupation?—I am Deputy Collector of Inland Revenue for the Federal Government.

19620. What is your district?—The district of Quebec.

19621. What are its boundaries?—It extends from Three Rivers to Magdalen Islands.

19622. How many assistants have you under your control?—There are 12 members of the staff altogether.

19623. Are they stationed at different points?—They are all stationed in Quebec.

19624. Do they visit different districts?—Yes, occasionally.

19625. Have you had anything to do with the seizures of liquors that have been going on recently?—Not personally. They came within our district, but I had nothing personally to do with them.

19626. Were they more particularly connected with the Customs?—They came under the Customs Department.

H. PETIT.

19627. Can you tell the Commissioners if there is much illicit distilling or manufacture of intoxicating liquors going on in your district?—The quantity of illicit spirits manufactured is very small indeed, and we very seldom discover more than a quart or a gallon or two gallons. It is very bad stuff.

19628. Have you reason to believe that the manufacture goes on to a much greater extent than you have indicated?—We have reason to believe that there is a great deal of it made in the country, but it is very difficult to discover.

19629. By what class of people is the manufacture carried on?—By farmers, some of whom manufacture it.

19630. Is the liquor whisky principally?—The principal manufacturers we have discovered are farmers.

19631. Is it all whisky they make?—Yes; they are of the poorer class of farmers, of course.

19632. From what do they manufacture this whisky?—From molasses. That is all we discover, at any rate.

19633. Do they use any potatoes?—They may do so.

19634. Do they use any grain?—We seldom discover any, we do not know.

19635. Have you reason to suppose they use grain?—Sometimes they use oats.

19636. What is your reason for believing that a good deal of illicit manufacture goes on when you have told the Commissioners that you only seize a gallon here and there, or even a quart?—My reason is that we receive anonymous letters from persons in regard to distilling in the country districts.

19637. Advising you regarding persons who are illicitly distilling in the country?—Yes, but when we send our officers there, they do not discover evidences of distillation.

19638. Is it your experience that people are unwilling to come forward and give evidence in those cases?—We have to depend entirely on informers for that purpose.

19639. Are you assisted in any way by the police or municipal authorities, or do you depend on the exertions of your own staff entirely?—On the exertions of our own staff and on informers.

19640. What is the reward of the informer in the event of your obtaining conviction?—He receives four-fifths of the assessed value of the article seized and the full amount of the fine imposed, that is if it is paid; if it is not paid, he gets half the amount.

19641. What is the amount of the fine?—From \$100 to \$500 and six months. I suppose the Judge in some cases can impose a penalty of \$50.

19642. Do you think the country loses a great deal of revenue from this illicit manufacture?—No, I think the loss is very trifling. The quality of the spirit manufactured is very poor, and we have never detected any considerable quantity of it.

19643. Still you think a good deal is manufactured?—Yes; the difficulty is to catch the manufacturers.

19644. If your suggestion is correct, must not the Government lose revenue, because those who drink this illicitly made stuff would probably drink something else?—When I say a good deal is manufactured, I mean that the persons manufacturing it are numerous, but the quantity manufactured is very trifling.

19645. Not large?—No. They use all kinds of vessels for the manufacture, including milk cans, they use a kind of cauldron with a cover on the top. It is like a kettle, but made of cast iron. They attach a worm to it, and there is a condensing apparatus.

The Commission adjourned.

QUEBEC, September 7th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day at 10.30 a.m., Sir JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman of the Commission, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

JOHN M. MCKAY, M.D., of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

19646. Of what College are you a graduate ?—Bishop's College.

19647. Are you a native of this Province ?—Yes.

19648. How long have you resided in Quebec ?—18 years.

19649. In the city ?—Near the city, two and a half miles out.

19650. Are you practising your profession at the present time ?—At the present time I am at my establishment.

19651. Are you proprietor of the Belmont Retreat ?—I am.

19652. How long has the institution been in existence ?—30 years.

19653. Have you been there all that time ?—No, I have been there over five years.

19654. How many inmates can you accommodate in the institution ?—About 100.

19655. Are a certain number of the inmates sent there by the Government ?—Yes.

19656. Are the others there voluntarily ?—They are private boarders ; very few come voluntarily.

19657. What proportion of the inmates are sent there at the Government expense ?—Very few ; just now there is only one.

19658. Have you more than that number sometimes ?—The most we ever had was 25.

19659. You mean inmates kept there at the expense of the Government ?—Yes.

19660. For what I might call private patients, have you a regular scale of charges ?—Yes.

19661. Have you gradation of accommodation and charge ?—Yes.

19662. I think you said the whole of the patients were not there voluntarily ?—No, very few.

19663. What do you mean ?—Very few come to us voluntarily ; they are sent there by their parents.

19664. Under some order of a court ?—Some interdict themselves and others are interdicted by their family.

19665. With respect to those sent there by the Government, what rules are observed in regard to discharging them ?—Dr. Vallée is the inspector. They come in by his order, and go away by his order.

19666. And the others, who are in the institution as private patients, I suppose exercise their own option in the matter ?—The family does.

19667. You mean as regards the patients who are there by arrangement with their families ?—Yes.

19668. But have you not patients who go there voluntarily ?—I have some.

19669. Do they come and stay with you simply ?—Yes.

19670. Can you give the Commissioners any idea of the number of those in the institution who are permanently cured ?—About 50 per cent.

19671. Do you think that 50 per cent of those entering the institution go out sober, steady men ?—Yes.

JOHN M. MCKAY.

19672. And remain so?—Yes.

19673. Have you many instances of patients returning to the institution who have been in there before?—We have some.

19674. Can you give the Commissioners any idea as to the percentage of those in the institution who have been there more than once?—About 25 during the year.

19675. Out of how many; what is your average?—My average is between 300 and 400 a year.

19676. And you think 25 of those now there have been there before?—During my time I mean.

19677. Have any of those been there more than once?—Yes, a few have been there five or six times, and perhaps eight times. They did not stay long enough.

19678. Do you receive any Government grant from your institution?—I did at one time, but this year I did not get any.

19679. Your grant was cut off?—It was cut off for the sake of economy.

19680. Would you have any objection to supplying the Commissioners with a copy of your scale of charges?—No. The scale of charges is from \$5.00 to \$10.00 and \$12.00 per week.

19681. Have you no list?—Yes; I have a list showing rates from \$7.00 to \$10.00 per week.

19682. Will you supply a copy of the list to the Commissioners?—Yes, and a copy of the regulations too.

19683. Have you any records from which you could supply the Commissioners with a statement of the number of persons who have been there since the institution has been opened?—I have a record, but I should object to give information.

19684. Will you furnish the Commissioners with the numbers, not the names?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

19685. Are the patients in your institution persons who have been for a long time excessive drinkers?—Some of them are.

19686. Are some of them those who are ordinarily known as moderate drinkers?—No.

19687. And who occasionally drink to excess, or are they persons who always drank to excess?—I think they are all persons who have been drinking to excess for a long time.

19688. Are they all old persons?—They are from 35 to 45 or 50 years of age.

19688a. Have you any younger than 35 at any time?—Yes.

19689. Many?—We have had some as young as 18 years; that was the youngest.

19690. Have you any means of knowing anything about the family histories of the patients in your institution, whether their parents were drinking people or not?—I have no means of ascertaining that fact except by personal knowledge.

19691. Do you know from your own knowledge whether any considerable proportion of the inmates are children of parents who were drinking people?—As a general rule.

19692. Have you reason to believe that the drinking habits of parents predispose their children to alcoholism?—I have.

*By the Chairman:*

19693. It is your opinion that they do?—That is my opinion. Some may drink without that predisposition.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

19694. Do you know whether persons discharged from your institution, or who have voluntarily left it, and who have returned to be treated again, have fallen into the drink habit a second time because of the facilities for getting drink by the open sale of drink everywhere?—I think it was because they were not cured.

19695. About how long is one required to remain to have a permanent cure effected?—The treatment is supposed to last between three and four months.

19696. In treating the patients, do you shut off drink from them immediately they come under your care?—Yes, immediately; there is not a drop of liquor in the house.

19697. You do not taper off the liquor supply, but you shut it off suddenly?—At once.

19698. Do you think there are any who go out of your institution apparently cured who would remain cured if they could not get drink in drink shops along the street?—If they were not cured I think they would try to get liquor, and if they could not get it in the store, they would try to get it somewhere else.

19699. Do you ever find that a man whom you believe to be cured and who is cured really, comes back again?—No. I have some who have come into the institution off and on during five years; but when they are really cured, they never return.

19700. Do you think that if the drink sale were stopped, it would help the men who come out of your institution?—Yes; but it would not help me.

19701. Your occupation would be gone?—My usefulness would be gone.

19702. You would not be here if your occupation were gone, that is curing inebriates?—I should be glad if everybody could be cured.

19703. Do you think a prohibitory law, if it were well enforced, and if all the drink shops were shut up, would have a tendency to lessen the number of inebriates and so destroy the value of your institution?—If it was enforced—if it could be enforced, there is no doubt of it.

19704. If it could be enforced, it would do good?—Yes.

*By the Chairman:*

19705. Do you think that a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating drink is desirable?—I think so.

19706. With your knowledge of the state of public opinion on the subject, do you think it could be efficiently carried out?—I cannot answer that question.

19707. What is your opinion?—In my opinion it would be very hard to do so; in this country it would be very hard to carry out such a law.

19708. Then your answer is, that it would be very difficult to carry out such a law efficiently?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

19709. Do you think there are men who would quit drinking and be glad to do so if they could not get the liquor?—They often express that opinion at my place; they say they would be very glad to be cured and not meet with any liquor again.

*By the Chairman:*

19710. But would a prohibitory law necessarily prevent them getting liquor?—It would make it more difficult for them to get it.

19711. Do you think if there was a prohibitory law enacted and put in force, it would prevent those who desire to drink getting liquor?—I think so.

19712. Remember you have told us that it would be very difficult of enforcement?—Yes; I meant in that particular. If I understood you rightly, you put the question like this: If you make a law and put it in force. Now, if it is in force, certainly it will prevent them drinking.

19713. You have told us that in your opinion a prohibitory law, that is a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, is desirable. You said you thought such a law would be very difficult to enforce. Then you said, in answer to another question, that, if a prohibitory law was in existence, those who desired to drink would be unable to get it?—I think I said that it would be more difficult for them to get it.

19714. Would it prevent those who desired to get drink obtaining it? You have already said, in effect, that you are doubtful if a prohibitory law could be efficiently carried out, and you have said that a prohibitory law would prevent those who desire to get drink obtaining it. Did you mean that?—No.

JOHN M. MCKAY.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19715. Have you had reason to suppose that persons brought to your institution had been injured by the quality of liquor they drank, that is to say, that it was adulterated and impure stuff, which would have an effect on them wholly different from the effect of pure liquor?—Yes.

19716. Have you made it a study in order to ascertain what compounds were used?—No. I do not know what they have taken, but I remember that on one occasion a patient was much worse than others.

19717. We have been told that in some places the drink taken by those people is impure in quality, and instead of producing drunkenness it makes men crazy. Have you seen such cases?—Yes.

19718. Have you reason to believe that such a condition might result from impure or adulterated liquors?—Yes.

19719. Are records kept of the persons who have been through your institution during the whole period of 25 years?—Yes.

19720. Do you know whether the children of former inmates have ever come in for treatment?—I cannot say.

19721. What age was the youngest person who has been in the institution?—About 18 years.

19722. And the oldest?—Over 60.

19723. How would the inmates run proportionately as to sex?—There are a great many more men than women.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19724. Another question in regard to this desire to get drink. Do you think that men cured or helped, while they do not desire to get drink, yet seeing liquor, are tempted to drink, and they fall? Is that true?—I do not understand you.

19725. Here is a man who is an inebriate. He goes into your institution and comes out cured. He really does not desire to drink again, but drink is all about him; do you know of cases in which men, simply because the drink was about them, have been tempted and have fallen?—No. They all report to me that they are not tempted.

19726. Are they so thoroughly cured that they have no further desire for drink?—Yes. They overcome the temptation and avoid the occasion.

19727. Do you know whether it would be safe for a man cured in your institution to try and drink moderately?—It would not be safe.

19728. Do you think he would soon fall into excesses?—He would not have been cured. If he drank moderately afterwards, I should not consider him cured; if he was not a teetotaller afterwards I should not consider him cured.

19729. He would not be cured if he drank moderately?—No.

19730. Do you treat any other cases than cases of inebriety?—Yes, we have some other cases, cases of insanity of a mild form.

19731. Is it insanity produced by alcoholism?—No, not supposed to be.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19732. Do you, in dealing with those people in whom the evil effects have followed over-indulgence of alcohol, consider that they are suffering from a disease?—I do.

19733. Do you treat it accordingly?—I do.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19734. Is yours the bichloride of gold treatment?—No.

19735. Do you object to telling the Commissioners, in a general way, what your treatment is?—No. I treat my patients with paraldehyde and strychnine. There is also what we may call moral treatment. The patients are all kept together, and they avoid temptation. They are not allowed to have any money in their possession, or jewels. They cannot go in and out as they please. They can go into the grounds around the establishment, which cover 50 acres. They have entertainment in the house, and are always in my sight.

19736. Have you had occasion to visit any other institution where inebriates are treated?—Yes.

19737. Do you know of any place where the system of treatment is the administration of alcohol in every shape, mixed with food and so on?—No. I have heard of it, but I have no faith in it.

19738. Is that system ever followed?—I do not think so. A man would soon fill his house if he started such a place.

19739. I have heard of a system of treatment in which large quantities of alcohol were given, until there was perfect disgust on the part of the person taking it?—You cannot disgust a drinker with liquor. There cannot be such an institution.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19740. Have you other than inebriates in your institution?—Yes.

19741. Are the larger number inebriates?—Yes.

19742. I think you said that four months are generally required to effect cures?—Between three and four months.

19743. Do you remember any case where after a patient had remained four months, he returned after a lapse of time?—Yes, I remember two cases like that.

19744. Did you conclude that they must not have been cured when they went out, although they had remained in the institution four months?—I should say so. In some cases the patients go out because they cannot afford to remain any longer.

19745. When the Government made a grant, what was the amount given?—The grant was given for about 30 years, it was \$490 a year.

19746. Was that amount supposed to pay the expenses of patients sent there by the Government?—No. The patients sent there by the Government are paid for under a contract, so much per head. The grant was only to give us a chance to charge less to poor people.

19747. On what plan does the Government send inmates to your institution? How do they determine who shall go, and by what authority is this determined?—It is worked on the same principle as Beauport asylum. The same fireman, for example does for my place; the last one we had we got from Beauport. Dr. Vallée found he was not at the right place, and sent him to me.

19748. But here is a man who is an inebriate. Is it necessary that his family should get the certificate of a physician in order to procure his admission?—If he came to my place under Government authority, the family would have to state that he was a crazy man.

19749. Then the Government does not send any one to you because he is an inebriate?—They send them to me because they are supposed to be crazy through liquor.

19750. Then it is a case of insanity, and it is by reason of his insanity that the man is sent to you?—The fact is that contract is not worth much.

19751. Do you not get a certain amount per head under your contract with the Government, does not the Government give you so much for each patient?—\$122 a year; but the Government are not obliged to send any particular number, and they send only those who are supposed to be crazy through liquor.

*By the Chairman :*

19752. What is the system followed: are the patients sent by order of Dr. Vallée?—Yes.

19753. He finds some patients in the institution at Beauport that are suitable cases for your establishment and he orders them to be sent there?—There has been for years an understanding between the two institutions. Beauport will not receive any persons supposed to be crazy through liquor, but I must receive them. I will not, however, receive them unless Dr. Vallée gives me the necessary order.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19754. You are not supposed to receive insane patients, except such as are insane by reason of drink?—I have orders not to receive the others.

JOHN M. MCKAY.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19755. Would you think yourself obliged to pass a prohibitory law because some people drink to excess and become insane and are incarcerated in your asylum?—No ; I am not ready to answer that question.

19756. Do not the great majority of people who use liquor use it in moderation and not in excess?—Yes.

19757. Would you favour the establishment of asylums by the Dominion or by the Provinces for the treatment of people made insane through alcoholism?—Yes.

19758. Is drunkenness increasing or decreasing in this province?—I think it is increasing.

19759. To what do you attribute that fact?—To the increasing number of hotels and saloons.

19760. Is the number of places where liquor is sold in the province increasing or decreasing?—I think it is increasing.

19761. Have you any patients from the rural districts?—Yes.

19762. Is the number of patients from the rural districts increasing?—I do not know.

19763. Would it be a good thing to recommend the imposition of high duties on strong spirits, such as whisky, brandy, gin and rum, and the lowering of the duties on the lighter intoxicants, wine and beer?—I do not know. I think it would be advisable to appoint an analyst.

19764. You think it would be well to have an analyst appointed to inspect and analyse the liquors?—Yes.

19765. Would you favour the passage of a prohibitory law, a law prohibiting the manufacture, as well as the importation and sale of liquor?—Yes, if it could be maintained in force.

19766. Could it be maintained or enforced, if enacted? Would there be any difficulty in enforcing it in this province;—I think it could, I suppose it could, but I do not know.

19767. Do you know any country where prohibition is in existence?—Yes.

19768. Where?—In the State of Maine.

19769. Do you know anything about the condition of affairs there?—No.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

19770. How do you come to the conclusion that drunkenness has increased in this province?—By what I see every day.

19771. Have you been all over the province?—I think I have been all over the province.

19772. How does it occur that other witnesses have said that drunkenness has decreased?—I do not know, perhaps they have not been through the province.

19773. If the arrests or convictions for drunkenness have decreased, how can you come to the conclusion that drunkenness has increased?—I come to that conclusion from what I have seen. When I came here to Quebec I did not see as much drunkenness then as I see now. That is my opinion. I go to Montreal very often, and there is the same state of things there. I go to Ottawa, and I see the same state of things. Perhaps before I was in this branch of business I did not remark cases of drunkenness so much.

19773a. Could you suggest any amendments to the law in regard to the habitual drunkard?—The only suggestion I could make would be to pass a law that would permit people to incarcerate habitual drunkards. We have no such law now.

*By the Chairman :*

19774. Is it your opinion that any one found intoxicated and taken in charge by the police should be committed to an institution, or would you give these persons a second trial?—It is no use to give a second trial to a drunkard, because he will surely fall.

19775. Are there not many men who are not habitual drunkards who are occasionally found drunk and taken in charge by the police?—I saw yesterday, by the



evidence of the Recorder, that the police were arresting drunkards, even if they were not making any noise or disturbance. I did not know such was the case.

19776. At what point would you consider it necessary to take away a man's individual liberty. Would it be for the first offence or for the second offence? At what point would you commence the system of committing drunkards to an institution?—If he was not an habitual drunkard I would pass over the first offence.

19777. Who would you consider a habitual drunkard?—A man who gives trouble to his family.

19778. We were told by the Recorder yesterday that there are 40 or 50 people, habitual drunkards, who come before him again and again and with whose faces he is quite familiar?—I consider an habitual drunkard is one who drinks strong liquor. A person who takes three drinks of strong liquor a day I consider to be an habitual drunkard.

19779. Would you apply the rule to a man who takes three drinks of strong liquor daily, and should he be placed in an institution?—No, not the first time he took it, but he will become an alcoholic, after a certain time, and when that time arrives I would advise that he be sent to an institution to be cured.

19780. We are speaking of a public institution to take charge of drunkards, and I am anxious to know your view as to the point at which you would take away a man's liberty and place him there?—I would place a man in such an institution when his family were not able to manage him.

19781. On the application of the family?—Yes.

19782. What would you do in regard to those taken in charge by the police; a man found drunk on the streets and creating a disturbance, if it was a second offence, would you send him to the institution?—That would be a local law, a law passed by the City Council, and the carrying of it out would be left to the Recorder, I suppose.

19783. This inquiry is directed to finding out the best means of preventing intemperance. I understood you to suggest that it would be well to have an institution in which to incarcerate drunkards. I desire to get your view as to the point in the career of a drunkard when he should be sent to such an institution. So long as he committed no offence against the public peace or morals, would it not be difficult to interfere with his liberty?—Often people come to my place and beg me take a person whom the family cannot manage. I cannot take him, because there is no law. I suppose if there was a law that would permit the family to put that man in an institution, he would get relief.

19784. What is the law in the Province of Quebec in regard to that matter?—There is no other law than interdiction. The friends must prove that the man spends his money foolishly and drinks and injures his health and so on.

19785. Is it your opinion that men who come habitually before the Police Court for drunkenness should be committed to an institution and an attempt made to cure them?—It depends. Those who are going before the Police Court in that manner are not people I would like to take into my institution. They might be drunkards, but they might also be something else.

19786. We are speaking of drunkards and the treatment of drunkards. Is it your view that men who are habitually committed to jail for drunkenness by the Magistrate or Recorder should be sent to some institution with a view to reform?—I think it would be better to send them to an institution than to send them to jail, because, as the Recorder said yesterday, as soon as they come out they go back to drink.

19787. Would you have any hope of reforming such men and making them temperate?—I think so.

19788. Do you think they might be made temperate and sober men of society?—I think so.

19789. Then you think that after such persons have been committed a certain number of times, they should be sent to some institution under the Government control where they could be treated?—I think it would cure them.

19790. Have you formed any opinion as to the kind of liquor that is most injurious, spirits, wine or beer?—No.

19791. Have you taken any trouble to ascertain the patients' weakness as regards liquor?—All my patients take strong liquor.

JOHN M. MCKAY.

19792. Spirits?—Yes.

19793. Do you consider that beer and wine are as injurious as spirits?—Not wine, but other liquors are. I am a teetotaler myself and do not use alcoholic liquors.

19794. I ask the question because there are those who advise the encouragement of the use of beer and wine and the discountenancing of the use of spirits. Do you think that spirits are the most injurious?—I do not see the necessity of giving spirits.

19795. Which is the most injurious of the three classes, spirits, beer or wine?—Spirits.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19796. Have you any beer drinkers incarcerated in your establishment : men who did not drink strong spirits?—No.

19797. Do you yourself use tobacco?—I do.

19798. Is that a necessary article to use, does it promote health?—No, I do not think so.

19799. Do you think you would be better without it?—Yes.

19800. Would you favour the enactment of a law to prohibit the use of tobacco?—No.

19801. But you think it is desirable to stop the sale of liquor, and to establish an institution for the incarceration of people who use alcohol to excess?—If you could do it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19802. Do you think it would be safe for one of your cured patients to use wine moderately after he had come out of your institution?—No, I advise them not to take it.

19803. Do you think, from your experience and observation, that total abstinence would be a benefit to the health, physically and mentally, of the people generally?—I think so.

WILLIAM RAE, of Quebec, merchant and ship-owner, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

19804. I think you are the chief representative of and a member of the firm of Allans, Rae & Co.?—Yes.

19805. And you have resided in Quebec, how many years?—Thirty-one years.

19806. During all that time, have you had to do with the ocean steamers of the Allan Line?—Yes.

19807. And also with shipping?—Yes.

19808. You have had necessarily to employ a good deal of labour in Quebec?—Yes, a great deal.

19809. Have you had much trouble with your men on the score of drunkenness?—I have never had any trouble. I may say that we have never suffered any inconvenience. The great majority of our men are sober, hard-working people.

19810. Do you think there is more drinking among the men now than there was ten or twelve years ago or less?—It is very difficult to grade the matter, but so far as my observation goes, I think there is less drinking than there was when I came to Quebec first.

19811. To what do you attribute that change? Have you given the subject much thought?—It has sometimes occurred to me that men are not as well off as formerly, but I cannot say.

19812. Do you think the business of Quebec is not quite so good as formerly?—I think there really is a growing tendency among the labourers to discourage drinking; that is my conviction.

19813. When you spoke about men not being so well off as they were formerly in Quebec, did you mean that the trade of the city is not so prosperous as formerly?—Yes.

19814. But in your particular line, has not business really been larger?—We have more steamers, but we make less out of them.

19815. Have you not a larger number of men employed than in former years?—I do not think so. There has been less work done in Quebec since the deepening of Lake St. Peter than there was before, and although we have more steamers, we do not employ more labourers. We have about the same amount of business divided among a larger number of steamers.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19816. You are speaking entirely of the city of Quebec, I suppose?—Entirely so.

*By the Chairman :*

19817. On what terms are your men employed?—All the labourers we employ belong to the Ship Labourers' Society, and we pay the wages as regulated by that society, so much for day work and so much for night work.

19818. Are the men under your control when they are doing your work?—Entirely so.

19819. They are not controlled by the society directly?—They cannot break any rule of the society in doing their work. If any man or men broke a rule, the result would be that he or they would be out of work.

19820. Who is the head of the society?—I forget at the moment the name of the president. The Ship Labourers' Society has a president, secretary-treasurer and committee, and also a sub-committee.

19821. Of the men who work in and about your ships, can you tell the Commission if many are abstainers from the use of intoxicating liquors?—No; I cannot say as to that. All I can say is, that in my recollection, I have never seen any of our men under the "influence," as it is called.

19822. You mean when on duty?—Yes; or off duty, when I happen to see them, as I often do in the streets.

19823. Taking Quebec generally, has drunkenness increased or decreased in late years, in your opinion?—I am not in the way of gathering opinions about the city, generally; but in regard to the men who come under my observation, I can speak as regards them.

19824. Do you consider it desirable that an Act of the Dominion Parliament should be passed prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors?—Certainly not. I do not think it is desirable.

19825. For what reason?—Charity begins at home. I should object very strongly to being prevented from drinking in moderation, that is, what I consider moderation. It would be an interference with my liberty that I should resent.

19826. Do you think such a law, if enacted, could be efficiently carried out?—It would be absolutely impossible.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19827. Would you favour high license as a means of reducing the evils of intemperance?—I would favour anything that would tend to put the sale of liquors in every district into honest hands, and would support whatever conclusion a committee, specially appointed, might come to on the question of restriction; and whatever the recommendation might be, whether high license or otherwise, I would favour it. I am not in a position myself to give an opinion as to whether a certain system would be effectual or not.

19828. Would you favour the adoption of provisions to secure frequent inspections of liquor sold in hotels and taverns?—Certainly I would.

19829. But you would oppose the passage of a prohibitory measure?—So far as I could do so.

19830. As being an interference with your own rights?—Yes, with my personal rights.

WILLIAM RAE.

19831. Would you favour the imposition of heavier duties on spirits, such as brandy, whisky or rum?—I have often thought that would be a good thing, and at the same time diminish the burdens on light wines; but that question is also answered by my former reply—that I would leave this subject to a body specially appointed to consider the whole matter.

19832. You have had no difficulty, you say, as a very large employer of labour, on account of the prevalence of drunkenness among the men you have employed?—None whatever.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19833. Have you found during your residence in Quebec that there has been quite a change in the social customs of the people as to drinking?—I am not aware there is any serious change.

19834. Have you not noticed any diminution in the drinking customs of society during the last 31 years?—Not in the society to which I have been accustomed.

19835. You have not noticed any growth of total abstinence sentiment?—Most decidedly not. I speak only with regard to the circle to which I am accustomed.

19836. You have not noticed this change in any other circle of society?—Certainly not; I do not know any other circle of society.

19837. But possibly as a business man and as an observer you may have had an opportunity of noticing other people, and the customs of society?—No, I cannot say that I have.

19838. Is it a rule in your employ to serve out liquor to your men, or sailors on board of your ship?—At no time did we ever do such a thing.

19839. The old rule was to serve out a certain quantity of rum or grog, as it was called, to every sailor as part of rations?—I cannot speak about that. It must have been in older days than those with which I am acquainted. It never was practised in my time.

19840. Is there any reason why it is not done?—There are a great many reasons.

19841. Will you be kind enough to state them?—The expense, and the belief that exists, that it is not of advantage to an employer to give his employees intoxicating drink.

19842. You have stated you would resent any interference by law with your own right to use liquors. You have also stated that in the circle in which you moved, there has been no decrease in the consumption of intoxicating drinks for 31 years, and further that as regards the persons in your employ you think it is better they should not have any intoxicating drinks?—I do not see any comparison at all between the cases. I do not see how your question is pertinent. On the one hand, a man is obtaining what belongs to him, or what is presented to him at a table by a friend. In the other case, it is serving out grog to men who are employed, in that way enticing them to drink; for such a man often thinks that if he does not drink the grog, he is throwing away so much. There is no comparison whatever between the position of a man sitting at a friend's table and taking a glass of wine, and serving out grog to men who are working for you.

19843. I want to know whether you think a distinction should be made between a person moving in one circle of society and using liquor, and persons moving in a different circle of society and obtaining liquor?—I do not believe in compelling people. There are differences, however, in all classes of society. We all move in certain circles, in certain classes; we all have certain habits and certain means. At the same time I would leave the poor man as free to drink or abstain as I would demand that liberty for myself.

19844. Then you would have no objection to the sailor taking with him a certain quantity of ale or other liquor when he started on a voyage, if he purchased it himself and you did not give it to him?—It is difficult to imagine a man taking drink for a voyage.

19845. If you give him as good a right as you possess to gratify his taste, why should he not take a certain quantity of spirits or liquor with him?—I do not know whether a sailor takes it with him or not. I have not had an opportunity of

making up my mind as to whether it would be objectionable for a man taking drink in his bag or not.

19846. Do you on your steamers supply intoxicating liquors to passengers?—If they pay for them, they can have them.

19847. You are not prepared to say what your opinion is in regard to allowing an employee on one of your ships to carry liquor with him if he chose?—I think a man who would carry liquor for the purpose of drinking would not be a desirable man to employ.

19848. Why not? Is it from fear that the liquor would unfit him for his duty?—As a rule a man who would do so would be a man who would be likely to exceed, and a man likely to exceed is not desirable in our employ.

19849. Are the men who sail your vessels permitted to have the same privileges as passengers in regard to purchasing liquor on board?—That has never come up within my knowledge. I do not know what would happen if one of the sailors asked to buy drink.

*By the Chairman :*

19850. There is no rule prohibiting captains of your steamers from taking a glass of liquor or wine on board, I suppose?—There is no rule to that effect.

19851. Do they not move in the same circle as saloon passengers, who are privileged to purchase liquor?—Exactly so.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19852. Is there one rule for a man moving in a higher circle of society and another rule for a man moving in a lower circle, one rule for an employer and another for an employee?—There is not. There is no different rule as between the rich and the poor.

*By the Chairman :*

19853. I suppose the men on your steamers do occasionally get liquor?—I do not know.

19854. You do not take any means to ascertain whether they have liquor or not?—No.

19855. Is it the rule to sell liquor on the steamers?—I could not say that.

19856. Do you know whether one of your engineers or quartermasters could go to the bar and purchase liquor the same as any one else or not?—I do not know that there is any real prohibition.

19857. You think the captain can get what he likes?—Certainly.

19858. Of course he cannot exceed, or he would be removed from his position?—Decidedly.

19859. You do not know that the sailors do not also purchase?—No. I do not know whether they are free to do so or not.

19860. If they took liquor on board you would not know, for you do not search their bags?—But if they showed the effects of liquor, we would know.

19861. Then they might take liquor in their bags?—They might. There is no search made.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19862. Do you know any mercantile line of steamers which serves grog to the sailors?—I do not.

19863. You demand the performance of certain duties from your employees at sea and on shore, I suppose?—Yes.

19864. And if they do not perform that service, you discharge them?—Yes.

19865. If they drank liquor to excess, you would not permit it, and you would relieve them of their positions?—Yes.

19866. Have you suggested that you desire one rule to be applied to one class and another rule to another class of the community respecting the use of liquor?—No. It is not my desire to do so. I think all should be put on the same footing, the use simply being limited by the means of the different people.

WILLIAM RAE.

*By the Chairman :*

19867. Did not that practice of serving grog on board ship prevail some years ago?—I do not know. I think it was the practice in the<sup>l</sup>Royal Navy.

19868. Is it not the practice to-day?—I do not know.

19869. But is it your impression that it is the practice?—My impression is that it is not.

19870. Am I right in concluding that grog was part of the rations of the sailors that they received certain wages and certain rations?—No doubt.

*By Judge McDonald :*

19871. Was it not a rule in the navy under certain circumstances to stop a man's grog?—I have heard the term used.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19872. I understand you to say that if you knew of a sailor taking liquor on board in his bag, you would discharge him?—No. I would consider him an undesirable man to have in our employ.

19873. Then sooner or later you would get rid of him?—No doubt.

19874. You do get rid of undesirable people?—So far as we can.

19875. If you knew one of your other men, other than the captain, drinking?—You can include the captain.

19876. Would you think a captain who took liquor on board would be an undesirable man?—Any man who exceeded in the use of drink I would consider to be undesirable.

19877. When a man goes beyond what point?—So as to interfere with his mental capacity and his powers.

19878. Is that the same point in every case?—Undoubtedly not. We are wonderfully made.

19879. Then you would have to determine it by the effects on men as you observed them?—Exactly.

19880. Would you think a captain undesirable if you knew he took on his ship certain choice liquors according to his own taste?—I have said I do not think a man would be a desirable man, whether captain or sailor, who exceeded in drinking or eating, or exceeded in any way.

19881. You said you thought a sailor who took liquor in his bag would be undesirable, and I desire to ask you how it would be in regard to a captain who took liquor with him?—It would be evidence that he exceeded or was inclined to exceed.

19882. Then you would not think a captain desirable who purchased liquor at the bar of one of your steamers?—The matter is entirely regulated by the captain's conduct. A captain could purchase liquor at the bar and take a drink and at the same time be a temperate man. I consider it is not impossible.

19883. Would you think a sailor undesirable who purchased liquor at the bar of one of your steamers?—I do not think it is desirable for anybody filling a position on a steamer to buy on board: I mean where a man is strictly on duty.

19884. Does the use of liquor interfere with the man's efficiency when he is on duty?—Certainly, if he takes it in excess.

19885. But suppose he takes it moderately. Is it not a fact that the managers of steamship companies regard men who drink at all as being untrustworthy?—No, I cannot go so far as that.

19886. Are they considered undesirable?—Any man who exceeds is of course undesirable, and as a rule I think captains and officers do not drink during a voyage, that is, while they are on duty. I think that is a pretty well understood thing.

19887. If you knew there were men on board one of your ships, other than the captain, who were frequently purchasing liquor, would you regard them as undesirable, that is, while the ship was on her voyage?—Yes, I should consider them undesirable.

19888. Would they be less fit for their duty because they drank?—It would be an evidence of their being too much attached to it. But if the drink was taken in moderation, it would not affect the man's ability to discharge his duties.

19889. Do you think drink hurts one class and not another class?—It must affect people differently. It is just as I have said, that one man is different from another; one man can take much more than another without any visible effects.

19890. Does it affect one grade of society differently from another grade of society?—I do not know how the different qualities of liquor affect people. One grade of society would find it impossible to drink the stuff that another grade might take.

19891. Then it is a question of the quality of the article consumed?—The quality of the article has a great deal to do with it.

19892. I think you have said with regard to this grog allowance, that you do not think it would be advantageous to give intoxicating drink to sailors as part of their allowance. Why not?—Because, in effect, you induce a man to drink who would naturally be both mentally and physically better without it.

19893. Is the same thing true of the inducement to a man to drink in the home of his friend. The wine is put before him, and he is thereby induced to drink. Is that a disadvantage?—I do not think anybody induces you to drink. No person that I know of would induce a man to drink who said he was an abstainer.

19894. But drink is placed before the guests. Suppose drink is offered as a matter of hospitality in any shape, is that a disadvantage?—Yes.

19895. You have said something about imposing heavier duties on liquors. Would such tariff change be class legislation, and have the effect of increasing the price of liquors, or would only the rich people be able to purchase them, and the poor be unable to procure them?—No, I do not mean it in that way.

19896. What do you mean by your reference to restriction? You propose to have the trade restricted. Why do you propose to have it restricted?—I do not think I said that. I think I said I would leave that to be decided by a body specially constituted for the purpose. I would approve, as far as possible, any action towards diminishing the number of unlicensed grogeries and shebeens where the sale is illegal.

19897. Would you limit the number of licensed places?—I am not prepared to answer that question. I would join in any plan to promote temperance, and I would leave that question to be settled by a body specially selected, who would decide as to the means to be employed to that end, whether by restricting the number of licenses, or imposing heavier fees, or other measures. I would leave that subject to a body specially appointed to consider the matter. I am not prepared to give an opinion on it.

19898. But you would favour whatever restriction such a body might suggest, I understand?—Yes.

19899. Why would you favour restrictions?—Upon the principle of doing something that would be practical and possible.

19900. Why is it necessary to restrict the trade?—Do you mean the trade in drink?

19901. Yes.—Because there are certain classes of men who exceed, and do not know how to control themselves.

19902. Then you think the restriction of the trade would be a protection to those men?—Yes, to the comparatively small percentage of the population who are inclined to exceed.

19903. Do you believe any percentage of that large proportion who are not now disposed to exceed are likely to become excessive users of strong drink?—I do not suppose so.

19904. You do not think so?—No. I judge others by myself.

19905. You said that there was a strong tendency to discourage drinking?—I did, but I referred to excessive drinking; I mean drinking to excess.

19906. Is there a tendency to discourage the drinking of liquor, either in moderation or otherwise?—I did not say that I saw any occasion to interfere with drinking in moderation.

19907. Do you believe, from your observation, that moderate drinking tends to excessive drinking?—I do not believe it tends to excess.

19908. Do you believe the numerous drink shops tempt men to drink who otherwise would abstain?—I cannot give any opinion on that question; I do not know.

WILLIAM RAE.

19909. Do you give any preference to men who do not drink as regards entering your employment?—I never ask the question as to whether a man is a teetotaler, or what his religion is. If he does his work, that is all I want.

19910. You have said that you think prohibition would be altogether impossible to enforce. Why do you think so?—I say so simply from the knowledge I possess of human nature. I know it is impossible to stop the use of liquor.

19911. Do you think human nature is indisposed to obey law?—Human nature is certainly indisposed to obey certain laws that would interfere with individual liberty.

19912. Do not all laws, more or less, interfere with individual liberty? Does the individual not have to submit himself to law for the common good?—I do not believe in short metre. You cannot make a man honest and virtuous or sober by law. I think that will perhaps answer several questions you have asked.

19913. Do you believe a law might make it more difficult for a man to be drunken, dishonest and vicious?—No, I think it would encourage some men.

19914. You believe that because an evil thing is prohibited, therefore a man will do that thing?—There are certain men who are affected in that way no doubt.

19915. Would that be the effect with the generality of men?—I do not think the generality of men are law-breakers.

19916. You are a law-observer, of course?—Yes.

19917. You may not be quite in favour of every provision of the law, but as a good citizen with the common good in view, would you not submit yourself to that law, although it does not meet with your approval on certain points?—I would not submit to a prohibitory law.

19918. You would rebel against that?—Decidedly.

19919. Do you think there is a large number of men of that way of thinking?—Yes, the majority take the view I express.

19920. Do you think that is the opinion of the country at large?—That is my belief. I believe the majority of the people are against prohibition, simply because it would lead to greater evils.

19921. Upon what do you base your opinion that the majority of the people are opposed to prohibition?—Just in the same way that I form an opinion on any other subject submitted to me. My belief is that the majority of the people are opposed to intoxication. If you ask me why I hold that opinion, and on what basis my conviction rests, I reply that my conviction is based on what I feel and believe. In the same way my conviction on the prohibition question is based on the same sort of feeling—something for which you cannot give chapter and verse, but which you know in your bones is true.

19922. Have you read the papers of the country at large for any length of time touching the matter of prohibition, so as to be able to judge what public opinion is?—I do not know that I have devoted a large portion of my time to reading up the subject of prohibition: I have not.

19923. Have you read the newspapers generally?—I read a good many newspapers.

19924. Have you noticed this, touching the record covering a period of 30 years, that in reading the newspapers of the Dominion you find there is more said about prohibition, and the papers are more favourably considering it than 25 or 30 years ago?—I would rather you did not put any more questions to me, because it seems to me that I have answered everying that could reasonably be expected.

19925. You have expressed an opinion, and you have a right to express an opinion, and we have a right to ask on what you base that opinion. When you say that you simply feel it in your bones, I have a right to ask you how it gets into your bones?—It was a figurative expression of mine, meaning the effect it produces on my system.

19926. I should like to know how you get that feeling?—I have not got time I think to go on and give you all the reasons for my belief.

*By the Chairman:*

19927. I understood you to say that you felt that prohibition was impracticable from your knowledge and observation?—Yes.



*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

19928. I ask you on what you base your statement, what is the extent of your observation, and have you any close and intimate knowledge of the subject?—I decline to answer, because the subject is too large.

19929. If there were a prohibitory law passed, you yourself would oppose it after it were passed?—I have said that my feeling would be to oppose it.

19930. Even if it were passed?—Yes, my feeling would be to oppose it. I do not say I would break the law,

*By Judge McDonald :*

19931. In regard to the imposition of higher duties: would you confine the use of the heavier spirits to particular classes?—I indicated in my general observations that I would favour restriction as proposed by some body especially appointed to consider the whole matter and decide what would be best. As a matter of personal opinion, I think a reduction of the duties on light wines would be favourable to temperance.

19932. And you would make the heavier liquors and spirits pay heavier duties?—I do not say I would do that; I do not suppose there is any doubt that light wines are less injurious.

19933. Then you would encourage the consumption of light wines?—Yes.

19934. You have said that abominable stuff is sold at some places. Do you refer to adulterated compounds that are sold?—Yes.

19935. Have you ever noticed yourself the effects of these compounds on parties?—I could not say as to the results of each deleterious, poisonous stuff.

19936. When it is sold, do not parties become crazy rather than drunk?—I have heard it stated, but I have not observed anything of the kind myself.

*By the Chairman :*

19937. But you are under the impression that adulterated stuff is sold?—Yes.

19938. Do you think it is sold to any considerable extent?—I have been told so; it is poisonous stuff.

JOSEPH T. FRÉMONT, Mayor of the City of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald :*

19939. What is your profession?—I am an advocate.

19940. How long have you been Mayor of the city?—This is the third year I have been Mayor.

19941. Were you elected by a direct vote of the people?—No, by the members of the City Council.

19942. Are members of the Council elected directly by the votes of the people?—Yes.

19943. Aldermen, as they are called?—Some are Aldermen, and some are Councillors. Those elected by the proprietors are Aldermen, and the Councillors are elected both by the proprietors and occupants and tenants.

19944. Then the Aldermen and Councillors elect the Mayor?—Yes, both of them.

19945. From among their number?—One among themselves is elected by them as Mayor for two years.

19946. Were you an Alderman before you were elected?—Yes.

19947. How long had you been an Alderman?—I acted as Alderman only a few months before I was elected Mayor for my first term.

19948. Have you as Mayor anything to do with the Police Committee of the city?—Yes, as Mayor of the city, I am a member of all committees, among which is the Police Committee.

WILLIAM RAE.

19949. Then you are chief executive officer of the city, too?—Yes.

19950. And as such, I suppose, part of your duty is to see that the ordinances of the city are carried out and to exercise a general supervision?—Yes, a general supervision.

19951. And when the Council is not in session you keep an eye on the transaction of the city business?—Yes, but the Council sits every week.

19952. Do you take any special part in the work of the Police Committee?—Yes, I have done so in a general way. If I saw the Chief of Police was lax in the discharge of his duties, I might suspend him. If I saw that the by-laws of the city were not properly observed, I might notify the Chief of Police to see that his men had them observed.

19953. We were informed yesterday that the present Chief of Municipal Police and the officers of the force are appointed by the Police Committee?—Yes. That committee is composed of ten members of the City Council.

19954. What is the total number of members of the City Council?—Thirty, and the Police Committee is composed of one-third of the whole Council.

19955. What was the system of appointment at first?—At first it was by a board, composed of the Mayor, Recorder and Chief of Police. These three persons had full control over the force.

19956. Were you a member of the City Council, or Mayor when the law was changed?—No, it was changed a few months before I became Mayor.

19957. How does the new system work?—Very badly.

19958. Would you prefer a Commission, under the old arrangement?—Yes, that is very much better, because I think the men appointed by a committee of ten are not always properly chosen. Sometimes the Council might appoint a man because he had a certain amount of influence, and when appointed by the Police Committee, he became independent, to a certain extent, of the Chief of Police.

19959. Are you brought into contact with the working of the License Law?—No. Formerly, in order to obtain a license to sell liquor, it was necessary to have the certificate of the municipal authorities, but as the provincial law stands now we have nothing to do with it.

19960. Have you anything to do with limiting the number of licenses?—No.

19961. Is there any limit practically to the number of licenses issued?—In the city of Quebec I do not see how, by the law, the number can be limited.

19962. Can the Commissioners use their own discretion in granting licenses, that is as to the number of licenses they shall issue?—I think so. A party who applies for a license has to obtain a certain certificate from the municipal electors.

19963. And I suppose he has to possess certain accommodation in his house?—Yes, certain accommodation; but supposing all this to be done, the responsibility of granting the license rests with the persons appointed to perform that function.

19964. Does the city derive any income from these officials?—Not now; they derive an income, but not a special income. There is no special license, but formerly there was. Formerly the hotelkeepers had to obtain certificates, for which we had the right to charge them a fee.

19965. Can you express an opinion as to whether there has been a decrease of drunkenness among the people during the last few years?—I cannot speak from any special experience.

19966. I mean as the result of your observation as a citizen?—The result of my observation as a citizen is, that I think the people are generally more temperate than they were a few years ago.

19967. Do you find a change has taken place in the social habits of the people in regard to drunkenness during the last few years?—I speak in a general way without reference to any class of citizens.

19968. To what do you attribute that change?—I attribute it to a certain extent to the action of the authorities, both religious and civil.

19969. Has there been a growth of temperance sentiment?—Yes.

19970. And has that been beneficial as regards the habits of the community?—That is my opinion.

19971. Have you yourself formed any opinion as to whether a prohibitory law could be successfully carried out, if passed?—Yes, my opinion is that it could not be successfully carried out, and my opinion moreover is that it would be quite unjust.

19972. Have you any views you desire to present to the Commission as to changes that are desirable in the present system?—I should not like to enter into any details. I may say, however, that a general temperance law would be productive of very good results, but a prohibitory law, I think, would not be productive of very good results, for several reasons. In the first place, it is a well known fact that wherever in this country the Scott has been put into force, it has not been properly observed. According to my personal experience, and I have been in several parts of the country at different times where the Scott Act has been put into force, it was not really observed. In those cases generally the persons who make a moderate use of liquor, such as wines and ales particularly, are deprived of it, and those who are disposed to make an improper use of it or to use it in an excessive degree find the means to obtain it, and they get it in some way or another; so that the law, to my mind, produces a very bad effect. Those who are intemperate obtain the liquor, and generally obtain a very inferior kind of liquor that is greatly adulterated, while those who would use it in a moderate way cannot obtain it without doing an illegal act, and are thereby unjustly treated.

19973. Would you favour under the present system such an inspection of liquor as would result in pure liquors being sold?—I think that would be a very good move.

19974. What do you think in regard to high license?—I think it would be perhaps better if legislation could be passed such as would insure the granting of licenses only to parties of respectable character. That would be preferable to high license, because with a high license system there are always parties who sell without a license, and these are the most objectionable persons to my mind.

19975. Would you favour legislation, either by the imposition of duties or otherwise, that would lead to a diminution in the quantity of spirits consumed, and an increased consumption of light wines?—I think so; that has always been my idea. I think it would be of great benefit to the country at large if we could accustom our people to abstain from strong liquor and become accustomed to light wines, such as clarets, or ales.

19976. With respect to the question of obtaining a better class of persons to whom licenses should be given, would you think it advisable to limit the number of licenses granted in a community?—Yes.

19977. Would you have licenses granted only to men of good character and the number of licenses limited?—Yes. Of course it is very difficult to say how many licenses should be given, but I think the number should be limited.

*By the Chairman :*

19978. On what system would you regulate them?—I do not know exactly on what system.

19979. Would it be according to the number of the inhabitants of the district?—I suppose so, but it is difficult to fix a rule that would apply to all cases. In cities I suppose it would depend on the number of inhabitants, but in very small communities, perhaps it would be well to adopt another rule and fix the number according to distance. For instance, in a part of the country that has a very small population, it might be a great inconvenience to those who really required liquors to travel very great distances to obtain them, while I think they have a perfect right to have them, if they use them in moderation.

19980. Then in cities you think the number might be regulated by population, and in the rural districts by distance?—I mention this in a general way, although I have not studied this matter particularly, but it strikes me at first sight as a feasible measure.

19981. Suppose you have certain districts in Quebec that do not desire to issue any licenses, would you force licenses upon them?—No. I would not be any more in favour of forcing licenses than of forcing prohibition.

JOSEPH T. FRÉMONT.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

19982. Have you had any experience of the operation of the Scott Act throughout this province?—Only in travelling. For example, I spent about 15 days in a county this summer where the Scott Act was supposed to be in force, and that was in the county of Chicoutimi. I was travelling there with a friend, and it was only in the latter part of my trip that I ascertained the Scott Act was in force in the county. I know that liquor was being sold openly in different places.

19983. Will you name any of the villages or towns in the county where liquor was sold openly?—At Roberval and at Chicoutimi, which are the most important points in the county.

19984. Although liquor is openly sold there, you had been some time in the county before you knew the Scott Act was the law?—The fact is I went into the county, going to Roberval by rail, and I left the county by boat from Chicoutimi; and it was only at Chicoutimi, at the end of my journey, that I learned the Scott Act was in force in the county. I had already been several times in that county previously, a few years ago, and it was then within my knowledge that liquor was sold. At that time I was not aware the Scott Act was in force; but the fact is it was.

19985. Then there was no restriction?—There was no restriction whatever, and a great deal more than that, if the Scott Act were in force, the authorities should see that the law was observed. I do not mean to say that those who sell liquor to my knowledge in Chicoutimi do not keep orderly places; far from it.

19986. Have you been in any other district or county where the Canada Temperance Act was in force?—Yes; I was through Prince Edward Island some years ago.

19987. What was your experience down there?—My experience down there was, that I did not see men who did not take a glass of liquor, while I was there. I thought it most extraordinary for a place where the Scott Act was in force.

19988. Were you in Charlottetown?—Yes.

19989. How many years ago?—I forget how many years ago.

19990. Five or six years ago?—Six or perhaps seven years ago.

19991. It was while the Scott Act was in force, I suppose?—Yes; it was six or seven years ago.

19992. Did you have any difficulty in determining whether there was a prohibitory law in force or not?—The fact is I went to three or four hotels in Charlottetown. The party consisted of quite a number of friends; there were so many of us that we could not all lodge at the same hotel. I remember at each hotel they had a room—a kind of coffee room—but it was not known under that name, where there were decanters on the table and glasses and all kinds of liquors and cigars, and the people were going in and out and taking all the liquor they pleased. That was the way the Scott Act was observed there.

19993. Then they were compelled to violate a law in order to procure liquor?—Yes.

19994. Do you think that was a great injustice?—There was another injustice. When I was speaking of injustice just now, I meant to say that it is a great injustice to a private citizen who acts properly and drinks liquor moderately, when he cannot purchase what is his legitimate right to have. For instance, I have the habit of taking claret at my dinner, or some other wine, but generally claret. If I cannot procure my claret, I think it is a great injustice, and I do not see why because my neighbour may be intemperate, I should be deprived of the liquor which I take in a moderate way.

19995. Did you make any stay at Summerside?—No; I stopped for, I think, an hour or two.

19996. You do not know anything about the condition of affairs that existed there?—Not from my personal knowledge.

19997. Do you know anything about Souris or Georgetown?—No, I know more particularly about Charlottetown and Summerside. I do not know personally about Summerside, but I was told that there it was about the same thing there as at Charlottetown.

19998. Then your experience has been that the Scott Act has not worked satisfactorily either in Quebec, where it has been in force in counties you have visited, or in the Province of Prince Edward Island?—It has not.

19999. Has your experience, as a professional gentleman, led you to the conclusion that those attempts to convict persons of violating the Scott Act have given rise to perjury in regard to the evidence given?—I have no personal knowledge of it. The actions to which you refer have not been in this district.

20000. Would you consider the Scott Act as a measure, a piece of class legislation, as it permits people to bring liquor in from places where the Scott Act is not in force for domestic consumption, while at the same time it is impracticable for poor people to do so. Is it a piece of class legislation in that respect?—Yes, to a certain extent. It gives a certain privilege to those who can afford to buy and import liquor from other countries. No doubt it gives a certain advantage to those who possess more means than the poorer classes.

20001. Do you know whether, as a result of the passage of the Scott Act, drinking in the home has increased, liquor being brought in legally from outside and kept in the house?—I have no knowledge whatever in regard to that point.

20002. It is complained by the advocates of the Scott Act and of prohibition that there are difficulties in the way of the enforcement of the Scott Act, which would not exist if a general prohibitory law were passed; that under the Scott Act people are permitted to bring in liquor for family use, whereas if a general prohibitory law were passed, that could not be done. Do you think it would be practicable or possible, if a general prohibitory law were passed, to enforce it and prevent people purchasing liquor for domestic use?—My opinion is that it is altogether impossible to have a prohibitory law observed.

20003. Would it be much easier if the importation and manufacture were prohibited, to secure prohibition in districts?—My opinion is that such a law would be unjust, because it would affect in a greater degree a class that did not abuse liquor, and affect in a less degree a class which used liquor immoderately.

20004. Would you favour the enactment of a law that would enable the local authorities, say, at Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and elsewhere, being centres of population, to commit to inebriate asylums persons who have become chronic drunkards?—There is already a law respecting that matter.

20005. What is the law?—I could not cite the statute. It interdicts habitual drunkards, but only in particular cases. They must be drunkards of such habits as to endanger their lives, or be altogether incapable of taking care of their persons, or their property. Such can be interdicted. When these proceedings are taken, a curator is appointed to take care of their persons and their property, and in certain cases this curator can get them interned in an inebriate asylum. But this law is not satisfactory. It is a very delicate matter to apply the law, because it comes in conflict with the personal liberty of the subject. But if in such cases the relatives and friends had a proper authority granted to do legally what in many cases they do illegally at present—secure the commitment of the person to an asylum for a certain period, a reasonable period of time, it would be productive of good results.

20006. Would you favour the passage of a measure giving discretionary power to Magistrates to commit to such asylums persons who come before them a number of times, and who appeared to be habitual drunkards?—It is difficult for me to commit myself on this question, because the measure is one of such a dangerous character.

20007. Do you think legislation in that direction is necessary?—I think such legislation, if it did not go too far, would be productive of good effects.

(*Translation.*)

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20008. Do you approve of that provision of the license law which gives to the Council the right to pass regulations preventing the sale of liquors within the limits of their municipalities and to decree that there shall not be any license granted?—In general terms, I am opposed to a law which prevents a citizen buying liquor, providing he makes good use of it; but I understand that the law you allude to offers less objection than a general prohibitory law, or the Scott Act, because the prohibition to do this trade is not applicable to a smaller jurisdiction, but applies purely and simply to

JOSEPH T. FRÉMONT.

a municipality. This is what occurs : By virtue of this provision, the sale of liquor in one municipality is forbidden, while frequently in the neighbouring municipality it is allowed, and the population go there to procure it.

20009. Could you mention many municipalities where that happens ?—I would not say there were a large number, but I know some.

20010. Is it your opinion, that the working of the license law is not favourable to the temperance cause ?—Not always. I can quote, for instance, what has occurred in the Parish of Cap St. Ignace, County of Montmagny, where I do considerable business. One day I was conversing with the priest of that place on these municipal laws. The priest declared himself in favour of the law that gave the right to make these regulations. The reason I then gave why I was against it was, that liquors are sold by a large number of persons, more or less, and the trade causes considerable disorder.

20011. In localities sparsely populated and in small villages, the people could see to the enforcement of prohibition ?—That would not stop the sale.

20012. Is Cap St. Ignace a considerable village ?—There is hardly any village as we ordinarily understand such, but the parish is thickly populated, the population being distributed in various sections. Formerly a license was granted to a man living near the church. Since we have passed a law prohibiting the granting of any license, there has been much sale of liquor. A year ago at a wedding, the people drank some adulterated liquor, which had the effect of producing considerable disorder. Amongst others, a farmer of the place, who attended the wedding, disappeared the same night, and his body was not found until the following spring. The opinion of the majority who had knowledge of the affair, was that he was murdered. There were even proceedings taken, but we could not secure a conviction. Another cause of disorder is smuggling. This produces very bad results, and where it is practised the population contract the habit of using liquor. The sailors of the schooners, and in fact all the men who are in contact with those engaged in this trade, receive part of their profits in the form of a certain quantity of liquor, and since that time there has been more liquor consumed in the parishes, among others Cap St. Ignace, St. Thomas, and also in the various parishes on the Isle of Orleans.

20013. You think that is due to the smuggling ?—I think so.

20014. Is it your opinion that if we had a Prohibitory Act, it would produce as a consequence illicit trade ?—I believe it would.

20015. Are there any parishes where no licenses are granted ?—Yes, I think so ; but I do not know if there is a municipal law existing in the County of Quebec. I think there are parishes where there are no licenses granted.

20016. Do you think there would be any licenses given where there are none at present, except for the municipal law prohibiting the granting of licenses ?—I am less familiar with the conditions existing in the localities than in the parishes of which I have spoken ; consequently, I do not feel disposed to answer that question.

20017. Have you travelled in any state where a prohibitory law is in force ?—I do not know.

20018. Have you been in the State of Maine ?—Yes. I know it well personally ; but in Portland I have heard at different times several tales about liquor being sold there, notwithstanding the prohibitory law.

CLÉMENT VINCELETTE, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :

(*Translation.*)

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20019. Will you tell us, Mr. Vincelette, what is your occupation?—Overseer of the Lunatic Asylum at Beauport.

20020. Your age?—Sixty-two, in the fall.

20021. How many years have you been Overseer of the asylum of Beauport?—Twenty-eight or twenty-nine years in the present month.

20022. Will you tell us how many patients there are at present in the asylum of Beauport?— 975.

20023. Can you tell us if there has been an increase in the number of patients since you have been there?—When I entered the asylum of Beauport there were about 500 patients.

20024. Have the lunatics increased?—I think they have increased.

20025. Do you attribute that increase to drunkenness?—There is not the least doubt of it. I could not give you the percentage, but there is no doubt that liquor is responsible for a good proportion.

20026. Can you tell us about what proportion?—I could not tell you exactly, because in Beauport we receive insane patients only, and for the treatment of their derangements we are not obliged to know whether their malady is due to the use of intoxicants.

20027. You have not studied, I presume the particulars of that subject?—There are particulars concerning the patients, but for the past five or six years, those patients, I mean the inebriates, or drunkards, have been sent to Dr. Mackay at Belmont Retreat.

20028. Do you know anything of the working of the license law?—No. My knowledge of the working of the license law is limited to the reports my friends have made to me. As President of the Order of Catholics, I have had opportunities to speak on those questions to the members. My friends as well as myself, are opposed to the large number of licenses. There are too many licenses granted in our province. I think the authorities should limit the number.

20029. Are there any licensed houses in Beauport?—I do not think so ; there is not any necessity for them. I do not believe there is any public house.

20030. Is there any illegal selling?—I have not heard of any ; but it would not surprise me if told that there was ; they sell some liquor everywhere.

20031. Do you approve of that provision of the law which permits a Municipal Council to pass a regulation that there shall not be any licenses granted, and otherwise practically prohibiting the sale of liquors?—I think that it is a little extreme. It might answer in one parish, where there was no necessity that there should be a license granted, but why give occasion to cause scandal when there is now no necessity? I make an exception in favour of the places where strangers visit. But if you have only the people of the parish to furnish trade to the licensed house, I repeat it is not necessary to grant a license.

20032. Do you think there is an increase or a decrease of drunkenness?—The records show less perhaps, but in my opinion there is more drunkenness than there used to be.

20033. Would you be in favour of a prohibitory law?—No ; and the reason is that a prohibitory law would not be executed. In the country the people do not inform on one another ; and still less in my opinion, would they inform on one another for a violation of such a law. You could not stop the sale of liquor. A friend, who had been to a place in the United States where the sale of liquor is prohibited, told me that he met there persons who carried liquor in the streets, and sold to any one who required it.

20034. Have you some printed reports of Beauport asylum, with which you could furnish the Commission?—No.

20035. Is there any report made?—Yes ; I can give you a copy of some of those reports.

CLÉMENT VINCELETTE.

20036. For how many years?—Our report for last year has not been printed, but I think the reports we have in hand go as far back as 1883 or 1887. I will send them to the Commission on my return home.

20037. The President, Sir Joseph Hickson, desires to know to whom those reports are made?—They are sent to the Government of the Province.

20038. Is that report printed by the Government as a public document?—No.

20039. The President desires to know if there is a classification made of the patients, for the last years, to ascertain the cause of mental derangement, so that we could know in what proportion of cases there was excess in the use of alcoholic liquor?—No. As I said before, we do not take those patients; they are put with Dr. Mackay.

20040. Do you make a report on that point?—Yes, in past years. But since Dr. Mackay has opened his refuge, there is no need of making any report, for we do not receive those patients.

20041. You must have crazy people whose condition has been brought on by an excessive use of liquor?—Yes, without doubt, but the fact is not mentioned in the registers.

20042. Does not the doctor speak of it in the report of his examination?—Yes, when we can obtain information from either parents or friends of the patients; but it is not always the case.

20043. Is it mentioned in the report?—Yes; it is mentioned in the report.

HON. FREDERICK W. ANDREWS, Judge of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

20044. How long have you been a Judge of the Superior Court?—Since March, 1885.

20045. Are you a native of Quebec?—Yes, of the city of Quebec.

20046. Have you lived here all your life?—Yes, with the exception of a few years when I lived in the Townships.

*By Judge McDonald:*

20047. During what time did you live in the Townships?—When I was a child.

20048. Not in your judicial capacity?—No.

20049. Since you have been a Judge, you have always resided in Quebec?—Always.

20050. Do you take circuit duty outside of the city?—When a country Judge is incapacitated from attending to his duties from any cause, a city Judge replaces him, and I have done that duty.

20051. In that way you have been brought into contact with the administration of the criminal law?—Not to any extent.

20052. The Superior Court Judges in Quebec and Montreal confine their attention to civil business?—Entirely.

20053. In these two cities, the Court of Queen's Bench is the criminal side?—That is so.

20054. Have you any knowledge of the working of a prohibitory law?—From about 1860 to about 1880 I prosecuted for the Government in cases of infringement of the license law and violations of the local prohibitory enactments of the Municipal Councils.

20055. Have you ever prosecuted cases in counties in which the Scott Act was in force?—No.

20056. Then the cases you speak of were in municipalities in which the Councils had declined to grant licenses?—In which Councils had passed by-laws prohibiting the issue of licenses within their respective municipalities.

20057. That would be a limited district?—A township or parish.



20058. From your acquaintance with the working of such laws, did you find they were successful to any extent in prohibiting the sale of liquor?—Not at all.

20059. Was there much illegal sale?—I think as much as if the law had not existed.

20060. Taking such municipality or parish, and comparing it with one near it in which there was a license law in force, in which do you think there was more illicit sale?—I am inclined to think in that in which the prohibitory enactment existed.

20061. Did you in the prosecution of those cases find difficulty in obtaining evidence, I mean in getting witnesses who would give the necessary testimony to secure a conviction?—Usually there was great difficulty.

20062. Did you find that witnesses appeared to be afflicted with very bad memories in cases of that kind?—Largely so.

20063. Did you believe that prevailed to such an extent as to lead you to conclude that they were guilty of perjury, or was the trouble more in the direction of shuffling and prevarication?—I have no doubt perjury was committed, but I could not say to a very large extent. Much depended on the class of men who happened to be brought into the box.

20064. But there were many cases in which the memories of witnesses were bad?—Yes, and in which witnesses refused to appear and left the parish temporarily, and other matters of that sort.

20065. Did any facts that came to your knowledge lead you to suppose that the liquors sold illicitly were of an impure character?—I have no special means of judging as to that point.

20066. Have you considered the question of a general prohibitory law?—Naturally so, having been so long engaged in prosecuting offences against the law. Without making the matter a special study, my thoughts have tended in that direction.

20067. Please state to the Commissioners what your view is as to a prohibitory law, as to the propriety of its enactment and the practicability of its enforcement, if enacted?—I think it would be neither a just nor a politic law.

20068. Do you think it would be a law that could be successfully enforced?—I do not.

20069. What, in your opinion, is the effect on the moral sense of the public of having upon the statute-book a law which is flagrantly violated?—I think it has a demoralizing effect upon the people, and that it naturally weakens respect for the law.

20070. In civil cases that come before you, are you led to believe or suppose that the use of intoxicating liquors leads to litigation?—To a limited extent it does, because civil suits arise from assaults and from slanders and from various acts which frequently may be traced to the immoderate use of intoxicating liquors.

20071. Those are indirect results?—Indirect results.

*By the Chairman :*

20072. Is it your experience that prohibitory by-laws have led to an increase in the cases of perjury? You have had to conduct prosecutions under them, you have said?—I cannot say that. My experience is that unless you have a witness who is an informer and expects to profit by the result of the prosecution, you have a very unwilling witness in the box, and if his conscience is an elastic one, he will approach or quite reach perjury.

20073. You are, of course, familiar with the license laws of the Province?—I have had no special knowledge of the license laws since probably 1880, when I ceased to prosecute. As a Judge, I have general knowledge of them; but of course if a case came before me, I should refer to the law, as a Judge cannot keep all the law in his head.

20074. Do you think the license laws are fairly efficient for the purposes for which they were enacted?—I do not.

20075. For what reason?—Chiefly for want of officers whose special duty it should be to see to their enforcement.

20076. Then the fault is not so much in the law itself as in the absence of proper enforcement of the law?—Precisely.

20077. Is it your opinion that at the present moment the license laws of the province are not efficiently enforced?—I am of the opinion that in 1880 they were not enforced, and I have no reason to think they are better enforced now.

HON. FREDERICK W. ANDREWS.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20078. You have said that a percentage, perhaps not a very large percentage, of the civil cases result from the immoderate use of drink?—Yes, slanders and assaults.

20079. As prosecuting officer for a number of years, did you observe that any proportion of the criminal cases that came before the court were traceable to the use of drink or to the drink trade in any way?—I did not prosecute in the criminal courts; I merely prosecuted on behalf of the revenue, those who infringed the revenue laws.

*By the Chairman :*

20080. For the Treasurer's Department?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20081. As a lawyer familiar with the courts and with what was going on, you would probably observe whether any proportion of the criminal cases were traceable to the use of drink?—My practice never lay in the criminal court, so that I cannot give what may be called expert evidence on that point.

20082. As Judge, you have not to do with criminal cases?—No, except very rarely, when I am called to replace a country Judge.

20083. You have said that you think a prohibitory law could not be enforced. Will you kindly state why you think a prohibitory law could not be enforced?—Because if it has been found up to the present time impossible to enforce a law regulating the traffic, I think the enforcement of a prohibitory law would be much more difficult, particularly in view of the fact, of which I have no doubt, that a very large proportion of our population, probably the majority, are opposed on principle to such a law.

20084. And what about public sentiment?—Public sentiment would not support such a law.

20085. And you therefore think it would be impossible of enforcement?—I think so.

20086. You said that the license laws do not effect the objects for which they were enacted?—I think they do not, because they are not properly enforced.

20087. Their purpose is to restrict the sale and keep it within certain limits?—I presume their object is to restrict the trade and at the same time to regulate it, so that liquors may not be sold to persons whom they ought not to reach.

20088. Do you believe that the trade should be regulated?—I do decidedly, and strictly regulated.

20089. For what reason?—Because I think there are large numbers of people to whom liquors are a great danger, especially the young and working men after they have received their wages, for they are liable to drink on Saturday night and Sunday; and also Indians, and without going further I may say a large number of people.

20090. Why do you think liquor is more dangerous to working men than to professional men?—I have said working men, on Saturday evening, after they have received their wages and on Sunday, because I think there is a special temptation to a working man who has not got a comfortable home, while it is probable that a man in a superior rank spends his money in an hotel, if its doors are open to receive him.

20091. You think it would be well, then, to put such restrictions about the trade as to make it impossible for the working man to spend his money on Saturday evening or Sunday in drink?—Certainly I do.

20092. Does the license law prohibit sale to minors?—We have had during all the time I can remember, a law prohibiting sale to minors.

20093. You have an impression that the law is not very well enforced, and therefore does not accomplish its purpose?—I have said that I have no doubt from 1860 to 1880 in the city and surrounding districts of Quebec, it was not properly enforced.

20094. I think you said that a law which is flagrantly violated has the effect of demoralizing the community and causing the people to have contempt for all law. Do you think violations of the license law demoralize the people?—I do think it. If a man who has a license sees his neighbour selling without going to the expense of procuring a license and observes that he is not stopped, that man's respect for the law is weakened.

20095. I presume it would have the same effect on all persons who noticed violations of the law?—I should think it would.

20096. So that if the same thing be true of all violations, the public are demoralized by observing such violations?—I think it has that tendency in all cases.

20097. Take the city regulations and take the laws against theft, assault, and other offences: does the fact that those laws are violated demoralize the people?—The laws may be violated, but they are not violated with impunity.

*By the Chairman:*

20098. Punishment follows the violation?—Precisely.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

20099. Do you think that in the case of violation of the liquor laws, if punishment followed violation, the effect would be good and not bad?—That depends on what liquor law you mean.

20100. I mean your license law?—Yes.

20101. Violations of that license law?—Yes.

20102. Do you think that violation of the prohibitory provisions of the license law are more demoralizing than are the effects of the trade itself?—I am unable to draw a comparison.

20103. Do you think that the legalization of the liquor trade in any degree demoralizes a community?—I think in that trade as in all other trades there are abuses, probably more in that trade than in others, and to that extent they have an evil effect.

20104. Your view, I take it, is, that you would very rigidly restrict the liquor trade, that you would put strong restrictions about it. Would you limit the number of licenses?—I would largely.

20105. Do you think that more licenses are issued in Quebec than should be issued?—A very great many more.

20106. What do you think would be the effect of limiting the number of licenses in Quebec?—If in connection with that, the unlicensed selling were rigidly suppressed, I think drunkenness would decrease.

20107. Do you think it would be no use to limit the number of licenses unless there were earnest efforts made to suppress illicit sale?—I think not.

20108. Do you think that limiting the number of licenses, and increasing the license fees would have the effect of lessening the number of illicit places?—Not unless extra efforts were taken to suppress illicit selling.

20109. Then the fact of increasing the license fees and limiting the number of licenses issued would not of itself lessen the number of illicit places?—It would have the opposite effect, naturally, unless restrictive measures were used.

20110. Do you think in such case the licensees themselves would watch illicit sellers and enter complaints against them?—I do not think so to any extent, because they would feel themselves to be occupying the position of common informers.

20111. They object to that?—Strenuously.

20112. But you believe that while the trade might sell, and with good effect be restricted and greatly restricted, it would not be well, until public sentiment demanded it, to prohibit the trade. Is that your opinion?—That is my view.

20113. If public sentiment in the province of Quebec should show itself at any time, say 10, 20 or 30 years hence, to be in favour of a prohibitory law, do you believe the country would be warranted in enacting such law?—Personally, I am opposed to such a law, as being in itself unjust. If the circumstances of the country were greatly changed, and if public sentiment greatly changed in regard to the matter, I do not know what opinion I might then express.

20114. Do you believe that if public sentiment were strongly in favour of a prohibitory enactment, and such law were enacted and well enforced, it would do any good to any class of the people?—If public sentiment went very strongly that way, and if extraordinary efforts were used to enforce it, it is very possible that drunkenness might diminish, but upon that subject I cannot express a very decided opinion, not having had an opportunity of being in such a community or witnessing such efforts.

HON. FREDERICK W. ANDREWS.

20115. It is problematical entirely in your mind?—In my mind it is.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20116. Do you believe it is wise to give the Municipal Council the right to prohibit the sale of liquors?—I am inclined to think it is. I may add that it is because in certain cases I think the Councils may take effective measures to put in force the law, particularly, as is sometimes the case, when aided by the church authorities.

20117. Do you think it would encourage temperance in places which have not large populations?—I think there may be such cases. In the case of an isolated parish it might be advisable under particular circumstances.

20118. Do you think the restrictive provisions of the License Act are preferable to the Scott Act, because the Scott Act generally includes an extensive territory in which there may be some places with a large population?—I have had no experience whatever of the working of the Scott Act.

*By the Chairman :*

20119. In view of your great experience, and having been in the active practice of your profession for many years, have you any suggestions you could offer to the Commission for the improvement of the license law whereby it could be made more effective? The Commissioners would be glad to receive any suggestions from you?—I have no suggestion to offer, except one, namely the appointment of officers who should see to the enforcement of the license law. My observation has led me to this conclusion, that if the enforcement of the law is left to persons who are to profit by it, and they become and are mere informers, they are odious to the community, and they cannot long remain in a locality. Such men, who are never to be found of good character, soon fail in their efforts to enforce the law; and their efforts are also badly directed, because they are only directed against parties who will pay on conviction, while those who sell in the worst localities the strongest and most vile liquors, and sell them to the poorest people, are not prosecuted, because it is unprofitable to do so.

20120. In the municipal districts I suppose it is the duty of the municipality to look after any infringement of the municipal by-law?—In one sense it is their duty, but there is no legal obligation cast on them to do it, and there is no particular mode of compelling them to do so.

20121. Is it your experience that municipalities, as a rule, have neglected that duty?—My experience is that it is spasmodically undertaken and not efficiently done, and I might add, that it cannot be efficiently done, for the reason I have given, that they have to resort to informers.

20122. Does not the duty of looking after the illicit sale of liquor rest with the Provincial Government?—It does under the law; that is to say, they have the making of the law. There is no obligation that I am aware of resting on the Government to prosecute offenders except through their officers and Inspector of Revenue, who when complaints are laid before them, are bound to bring them before the court.

20123. But would not the obligation lie on the Provincial Government to prosecute on account of loss of revenue?—Yes.

20124. Is that work efficiently done by the Province through the appointment of the officers?—My experience was that the officers used their best endeavours to perform their duty, but they were not sufficiently numerous.

20125. They are very limited in number?—During my time there was no officer whose duty it was to ferret out and prosecute offenders against the revenue laws. The Inspector of Inland Revenue, as he was then called, was Mr. LeMoine and afterwards Mr. Fortier. Their duty was not to go into houses that were selling illicitly, but to receive information brought before them and then prosecute the cases before the court. Those informations were almost always laid by informers, who were enticed into doing it by the portion of the fines to which they were entitled by law. In some instances, very rarely, they were acting through the efforts and instructions of some one who desired to promote the public good, but of course those efforts were isolated and inefficient.

20126. In your opinion, if the whole regulation of the traffic rested with the Dominion Government, would the law be more efficiently enforced?—I cannot say.

20127. Have you formed any opinion in regard to that matter?—No.

*By Judge McDonald:*

20128. Do you ever find people who, from interested motives, would commence proceedings and would tempt people to break the law?—Most certainly, no doubt of it; and that is precisely one of the evils incident to the present system, according to my judgment.

VICTOR CHATEAUVERT, President of the Quebec Board of Trade, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

20129. Are you a native of Quebec?—Yes.

20130. Have you lived here many years?—I have lived here all my life.

20131. In what business are you engaged?—I am a Flour, Grain and Provision Merchant.

20132. I understand that at present you are the President of the Board of Trade?—Yes.

20133. Have you a large membership on the Board?—No; we have, I believe, 180 or 190 members.

20134. Have you given any attention to the enforcement of the law in the city?—I have not; I never had any occasion to study the matter.

20135. Are you prepared to express an opinion as to whether the liquor laws are efficiently enforced or not in the city?—I do not know enough to give an opinion on the subject.

20136. Can you tell the Commission, from your observation, whether drunkenness has increased or decreased in the city within the last few years?—I believe it has decreased during the last few years. The city is very peaceable now, it is kept in good order with so few policemen that we can fairly say the amount of drunkenness must be smaller than in the olden times. That is my judgment of the matter.

20137. Have you considered at all the question of a prohibitory law, a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of liquors?—I have never studied the matter as to which would be the best plan to adopt. I believe freedom is the best plan. We should fight drunkenness by impressing on our young boys the dangers of drunkenness.

20138. Do you think that a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating drink is desirable?—I am not ready to answer that question, not having any idea formed in regard to it, so I cannot give my real opinion on it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

20139. Have you, as a business man, noticed whether the drinking habits of the people interfere with business success?—I believe they do. In my store I do not keep a drinking man; all the men must be sober to do their work. I hold that my employees are all sober. The first question I put to men on employing them is, whether they are sober men or not.

20140. Sober men are better men?—Of course.

*By the Chairman:*

20141. Do you insist on your men being total abstainers?—No, during the pressure of work they must abstain, not afterwards.

HON. FREDERICK W. ANDREWS.

20142. When you engage a man, do you insist on his being a total abstainer from the use of intoxicating liquors ; do you only engage men who are total abstainers ?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20143. But you insist on abstinence during the hours of work ?—Yes.

20144. And that is because they are better men to you if they do not drink ?—Yes, because they are more sure to make their deliveries properly.

20145. Do you think it would be better if all labouring men would stop drinking ?—Of course, it would be better for every one if we could put a stop to it—it would be a great advantage to every one.

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20146. Do you think that smuggling is practised on a large scale ?—There must be much smuggling done, according to the reports that I have seen.

20147. Are you well acquainted with the surroundings of Quebec ?—I know them well.

20148. Do you know some municipalities where there is no license granted ?—No.

20149. You do not know if there is any ?—I am not a judge ; I have not occasion to visit those places.

L. Z. JONCAS, M.P., of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

20150. Are you a native of Quebec Province ?—Yes ; I have only resided here a few weeks.

20151. Where did you reside previously ?—I lived in Gaspé.

20152. Are you a member of the Dominion Parliament ?—I am member for Gaspé in the House of Commons.

20153. Is the license law in force in Gaspé, or have you a prohibitory law ?—We have the license law of the Province of Quebec, and we have besides a prohibitory law by the municipal corporations.

20154. In many districts ?—Yes, in almost all the districts below.

20155. In your particular county, have the people passed the necessary by-law in many parishes ?—They have in all the municipalities except one.

20156. Then you have prohibition under the license law in that part of the province ?—We have the prohibitory laws of the municipal corporations.

20157. Have you much drunkenness in your county ?—No.

20158. Have you more now than you had a few years ago, say five years ago ?—We have less now.

20159. Do you attribute the decrease in drunkenness to the operation of the prohibitory law ?—No, I do not. I think it is due more to the education of the people.

20160. Are the efforts of the clergy in your district directed to the suppression of intemperance ?—They are directed to the suppression of the licenses.

20161. Do you mean by that statement that they favour the adoption of prohibition by-laws under the license law ?—Yes.

20162. And therefore you say they seek to prevent intemperance ?—Yes.

20163. Is there much illicit sale of liquor in the county ?—Yes, there is a good deal of that. In almost every municipality you find liquor sold at 10 or 12 or 20 different places, although there are no licenses issued.

20164. Do you mean 10 or 20 different places in each municipality ?—In almost every municipality you will find liquor sold in 10, 15 or perhaps 20 places.

20165. What is the population of your county?—The population of my county is now about 20,000.

20166. Can you tell the Commissioners how many municipal districts or parishes are included?—We have, if I remember rightly, 17 or 18 municipalities.

20167. The Magdalen Islands are not included in your district, I suppose?—Yes, they are included. Besides those 17 municipalities on the mainland, there are five municipalities on the Magdalen Islands.

20168. Did you take into consideration the population of the Magdalen Islands when you spoke of the population of the county?—Yes, it is included.

20169. Are prohibitory municipal by-laws in force in the Magdalen Islands?—Yes, in some of them.

20170. Is there much illicit sale there?—I do not think there is as much liquor sold without license on the islands as on the mainland, although there is some sold.

20171. I suppose there are no licenses issued under the prohibitory system?—Not on the Magdalen Islands.

20172. In your county?—There is in one municipality.

20173. Whose duty is it to look after the suppression of those illicit places?—The moral duty, of course, rests on the municipal authorities. So far as the revenue is concerned, it is the duty of the officers of the Provincial Government.

20174. Do the municipalities, as a rule, take any steps to close up those places where liquor is being sold illicitly?—They do not generally.

20175. What is the reason?—I think the reason is this, that the majority of the Municipal Councils, so far as I could ascertain, would favour the granting of licenses. But they do not do so as a rule in my county, because the clergy are strongly opposed to such action, and from respect to the clergy they do not do so, although they believe, not in every municipality but in many municipalities, that it would be better to issue one license, being under the impression that the issuing of one license would prevent illicit sale being carried on by as many persons.

20176. Does the question of the expense which has to be incurred in prosecuting the proprietors of those places enter into the consideration of the question by the Municipal Councils?—I think not.

20177. Naturally, it must cost the Municipal Council something to commence a prosecution?—The way it is generally done is this: a man selling without a license is reported to the revenue officer, and then it is for the revenue officer to take proceedings, if he thinks he should do so. Of course, the revenue officers—if I understand the law rightly—can force the municipality to institute one or two prosecutions, and in many cases prosecutions are not taken because the people are afraid of the expense.

20178. Do you mean that the Municipal Council is afraid of the expense?—Yes, afraid of the expense.

20179. Can you say if public sentiment in your county and in the Magdalen Islands is in favour of a prohibitory law?—No; it is not.

20180. Do you yourself think a prohibitory law is desirable, by which I mean a law of the Dominion which would prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors?—A prohibitory law might be advisable, but I doubt very much if it could be well enforced.

20181. If it was not well enforced, would it be a desirable measure to enact?—My personal opinion is that a law prohibiting strong alcoholic liquors would be advisable if it could be enforced. But I rather think we could get better results if heavy duties were placed on strong alcoholic liquors, and if light wines and beers were permitted to come in free. My opinion is that the people want light wines to drink. I repeat that, in my opinion, if it could be enforced, a prohibitory law would be advisable; but I doubt very much whether it could be enforced, because public sentiment is now against it.

20182. You think the prohibition of spirits would be desirable if it could be enforced, but you think it could not be enforced, and in your opinion it would be more advisable to increase the duties on spirits and decrease the duties or remove them altogether on beers and wines?—Yes; that is my opinion.

L. Z. JONCAS.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20183. Is there much smuggling going on in your county ?—No ; there is none to speak of in my county ; it is carried on further up.

20184. Where is the liquor obtained that is consumed in your county and on the Magdalen Islands ?—Those who live in my county obtain it from Quebec and Montreal.

20185. Do they purchase it from the manufacturers or dealers and have it sent down ?—Yes.

20186. Do the vessels that come from the two French islands pass further up than your county ?—They do not call on the coast of Gaspé at all.

20187. Is your population composed partly of fishermen ?—The population of Gaspé is composed mainly of fishermen. Two-thirds are fishermen, and one-third carry on both farming and fishing, but spend more of their time farming.

20188. And how is the population on the Islands ?—They are almost all fishermen there.

20189. Are they a sober class of people ?—They are. In the County of Gaspé, on the mainland, we consider the people are a sober class, and it must be taken into consideration that they are carrying on an industry which obliges them to be on the water almost five months of the year. For instance, they go on the banks and are often caught in storms and exposed in small open boats for considerable periods ; they are also beaten by the waves as they come ashore, and they certainly then need some alcohol as a remedy.

20190. You say they are a sober class of people ?—Yes.

20191. What liquor they take is owing to the hardships they are obliged to undergo ?—Yes, more than anything else.

20192. Do you also find there has been a change in the social habits of the people during recent years ?—There has been, as education has advanced.

20193. Do you think that drinking has decreased ?—Yes.

20194. Do you attribute that decrease to religious influences ?—Yes, and to better education.

20195. I understand you to say that such prohibition as there is has generally been brought about at the instance of the clergy ?—Yes.

20196. With a view to helping the temperance cause ?—Always.

20197. Do you know anything in regard to the quality of liquor sold in those illicit places, whether it is pure liquor or not ?—It is generally good liquor.

20198. As good in quality as is generally sold in licensed places ?—Yes, about the same article.

20199. You think it is very much of the same character ?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

20200. Then does none of the smuggled liquor reach your county ?—Very little reaches my county.

20201. Do you include the Magdalen Islands in your answer ?—Yes, there is none to speak of in Gaspé.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20202. Supposing a prohibitory law were enforced, would it be easy in Gaspé and the Islands to carry it into effect and prevent liquor being brought in ?—I think it would be rather difficult to prevent liquor coming in.

20203. Do you think it would be smuggled in ?—I think it would be rather difficult to prevent it.

20204. Do you think that the enactment of a prohibitory law would lead to smuggling in those sections ?—It would, in my opinion.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20205. Would it be more difficult to prevent that kind of smuggling than the smuggling of other goods that goes on now ?—It would not be more difficult, the same difficulty would occur. I must say that smuggling is very easily carried on along our coast.



20206. I think you said that the clergy are opposed to granting licenses?—They are.

20207. They are opposed to granting licenses, I suppose, because they notice ill effects on the people from the drink trade. Is that the reason?—It must be the object..

20208. And the Municipal Councils, on account of their respect for the judgment of the clergy, decline to grant licenses?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20209. How long has a prohibitory law been in force in your county?—Always, to my knowledge.

20210. Did you ever have the Scott Act there?—No.

20211. Did you never have the Scott Act?—No, we have had prohibitory by-laws adopted by the Municipal Council under the Liquor License Act.

20212. Notwithstanding the fact that you have had this local prohibition for many years, do I understand you to say that liquor is sold in ten or twelve places in almost every parish?—Yes, in almost every municipality.

20213. Do you attribute that to dereliction of duty on the part of the municipal authorities?—Yes, in a great measure. Of course, I do not pretend to say that the municipal authorities would be altogether able to stop the illicit traffic in liquor, but there is relaxation of effort on the part of the municipal authorities. They could do the work better; they could at least decrease the number of houses where liquor is sold.

20214. Is the present condition, in your judgment, better than a condition of things that would exist under a rigid license law?—I think so.

20215. You think that the condition is better as it is?—Yes.

20216. Do you think that the passage of prohibitory by-laws has resulted in good?—No, I do not say they have been of much avail, they have not stopped the selling of liquor illicitly.

20217. Are there any beneficial effects observable from the operations of those prohibitory laws?—Not from the passing of prohibitory by-laws, as I said a while ago. The population is more temperate than it was, in my opinion, but it is not due to the passage of the by-laws.

20218. But you think it is due to religious and moral influences?—Yes, and the better education of the people.

20219. Do you know anything about the operation of the Scott Act in provinces where it is in force?—No, only by hearsay; I have no personal knowledge.

20220. Have you ever visited Maine?—No.

20221. Then you know nothing about the operation of the Maine law.

JAMES M. LÉMOINE, Inspector of Inland Revenue for the District of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

20222. How long have you held your present office?—I have held the office of Inspector for 24 years. Previously, I was for 20 years Collector of Inland Revenue and had control of the district of Quebec.

20223. What does that district include?—It is a pretty large one. It extends on one side from Quebec to Blanc Sablon, 900 miles on the north shore, and a similar distance on the south shore.

20224. Will you state to the Commissioners briefly the nature of your duties?—As the Commissioners may be aware, the license business has been divided since Confederation. The provinces receive the revenue arising from licenses, and the Dominion obtains the revenue from the duties imposed on spirits, tobacco and other commodities. As Inspector of Inland Revenue I have charge of the warehouses containing spirituous liquors.

L. Z. JONCAS.

I also exercise a general supervision in regard to breaches of Inland Revenue laws. I have charge of the outside service, that is, to survey the whole district, and I have charge of the warehouses containing spirituous liquors. I also exercise a general supervision in regard to breaches of the Inland Revenue laws, such as secret distillation, and I occasionally do supplementary duty with the Customs Department in the direction of preventing smuggling, and endeavouring to carry out the law.

20225. What staff have you under your charge?—The staff in Quebec numbers about 14 officers.

20226. Have you outlying places under your charge?—Yes. We have an excise warehouse at the Magdalen Islands, from which I have just returned. We have two other warehouses, one at Gaspé and one at Paspébiac, but those warehouses at the present moment, although they are adapted for the storage of spirits, contain nothing but tobacco, because the people of Paspébiac instead of getting their spirits from Canada, bring them direct from Jersey. They do not get their whisky from Ontario, but following old traditions they get rum from Jersey, that being the spirit used on that portion of the coast.

20227. Is there any distillery within your district?—No, except secret distilleries, which however amount to very little. The stills manufacture very few gallons, and the product is very bad. It only passes through one process of distillation and no rectification. There is not much evil arising from the manufacture; the great trouble arises from the French Islands, St. Pierre and Miquelon.

20228. The matter is more particularly under the charge of the Customs, I believe?—Yes.

20229. Have you had many seizures of illicit stills within the last two or three years?—Yes; I suppose we have seized ten or fifteen during the last three years, but they were very small.

20230. They did not work on a large scale?—No. In order not to mislead the Commissioners, it may be well to observe that many Canadian farmers seem to be under the impression that they have the same right to produce whisky for home consumption as they have to make beer without license.

20231. And to grow tobacco?—Yes.

20232. Are they not allowed to grow a certain amount of tobacco for their own use?—Yes.

20233. What are the articles they principally use in making whisky?—They almost always use molasses; they make perhaps four or five gallons of whisky a week with molasses.

20234. Do they use any oats?—They sometimes use oats or coarse grains.

20235. Do they use potatoes?—No.

20236. So the illicit manufacture of spirits in your district is trifling?—Yes. The great evil is the smuggling up the St. Lawrence, which, fortunately, this year has been very effectually checked.

20237. With regard to the spirits which are consumed in the district, I suppose, setting aside what is imported and goes through the Custom-house, the principal part of what is consumed comes from Ontario?—Yes, altogether.

20238. Does it come here in bond?—Almost all.

20239. I suppose they do not pay any excise duty until it goes out for consumption?—No, the duty is paid and entry made as the liquors are required.

20240. Can you tell the Commissioners if there is much whisky manufactured in other districts and brought into your district, the excise duty on which has been paid before it comes in?—No; those figures can no doubt be found in the blue-book.

20241. Take an establishment in Ontario: do you suppose it would pay the duty in Ontario on what was sent to this district?—No, because merchants wish to have the benefit of the use of their money.

20242. In view of that state of things, is it to be supposed that much whisky comes from other districts and is consumed here, the excise duty on which has been paid elsewhere?—No, very little. I have here some figures showing the amount of duty paid and the number of gallons of whisky for the years 1883, 1886, 1890 and 1892.

20243. Please read them?—The duty paid in 1883 was \$322,000 (the duty was lower then), representing 322,000 gallons. In 1886 there was a falling off. The duty paid in our office was \$238,000, representing 136,000 gallons. In 1890 there was paid in duty \$324,000, representing 242,000 gallons. In 1892, up to July, there was paid in duty \$246,000, representing 164,000 gallons. The duty instead of being \$1 as formerly, is now \$1.50.

20244. Do you attribute the falling off to the increase of duty or to other causes?—I attribute it solely to the smuggling which has been carried on from the French islands on the most extensive scale, and which is now being very efficiently checked.

20245. In your opinion, has the consumption of spirits in your district increased or decreased within the last ten years?—I do not think it has increased. In the country parishes, even within my recollection, there has been a material improvement. There is much less now used, and I do not believe it is at all owing to the prohibitive laws, but rather to the action of the temperance societies, assisted by the clergy, which organizations have been established in almost every parish of the district and have done a great deal of good, and checked a great deal the intemperance that previously existed.

20246. I understand your answer to be that there is not more spirits used now, but perhaps less?—Yes.

20247. What is the state of matters with respect to beers and wines? Has the consumption increased or decreased during the same period, in your opinion?—The quantity of beer must have decreased, because formerly we had four licensed breweries in Quebec and at the present moment we have only two, one of which has been established only a few months. These breweries do a very large business. It must also be remembered that there are a large number of bottling establishments, representing the large breweries in Montreal, Prescott and other places, so that our figures in that respect can scarcely be taken as a guide. I desire distinctly to say that our returns of the number of gallons brewed here would afford no guide, because we do not take into calculation the large bottling establishments to which I have referred, and which represent very large breweries out of the district.

20248. By this you mean that beer may be sent from Montreal here and no account of it appear?—Yes.

20249. So that the position in regard to beer is different from what it is in respect to spirits?—Yes.

20250. You really have no accurate account of the consumption of beer?—No.

20251. And wines of course come in through the custom-house?—Yes.

20252. Have you any native wines belonging to the district?—Some very curious wines are sent here from the French islands, manufactured from black currants. There are no native wines.

20253. Is any native wine made in your district?—There is some very light wine for family use made out of white or black currants, but it does not amount to much.

20254. Do any of the Upper Canada wines come here?—Not in any appreciable quantity, I should say.

20255. Would you get any account of them, or might they come in without your knowledge?—We have no duty to collect on them and would not know whether they were brought in.

20256. Can you inform the Commission whether the license laws in the district are well enforced?—For the last 24 years I have had no control over the provincial revenue, as I have stated. Previous to that time I enforced the laws, and Judge Andrews, who acted as attorney and who is a very active and intelligent man, showed very little quarter to offenders. But we had not the machinery which has been provided by statute or regulations since, that is a kind of revenue police which they have in Montreal and Quebec, and which force proves of great use in enforcing the law. We had no such force in the days to which I am referring and we had altogether to depend on private informers; and as the very name of informer was offensive to the community, we very often found their evidence was set aside as not credible. It was a very bad system, because there was no machinery to enforce the law properly,

20257. Do you think the license laws efficiently enforced in the city?—They are pretty efficiently enforced, that is to say always leaving aside the share that politics might have in them.

JAMES M. LEMOINE.

20258. Is that an indefinite quantity?—It is a very large quantity I should say.

20259. Is there very much illicit sale in the city of Quebec?—I do think there is a very great deal now. When I first took office the fee payable on a tavern license was \$29, it has been increased to \$300; a shop license was formerly \$17, and I believe it has now been brought up to \$150.

20260. In your opinion has that increase checked the number of licensed places?—Yes, it has reduced them very materially.

20261. Has the reduction of licensed places had the effect of increasing the number of places in which drink is sold illicitly?—The state of the parishes is quite different from that of the city. From here to Cape Chat there may be two licensed houses. I suppose each county comprises 16 or 17 parishes, and in all those parishes licenses are prohibited. But that prohibition does not prohibit, and I know, from having travelled for 30 or 40 years through all those parishes, it is a fact that in all those parishes spirits are constantly sold. In the towns there is a different state of things altogether.

20262. Do you mean illicitly sold?—Illicitly sold. The license law is defective in one respect. The Provincial Government appoints a collector for each district, whose duty it is to collect the provincial revenue, but the municipality has concurrent jurisdiction with him as regards the enforcement of the law. The result of this double responsibility is in very many cases that the law is not enforced at all. The priests in many parishes have put their foot down on the issuing of licenses, and, as was stated by Mr. Joncas, respect for the clergy is great and licenses are refused, although the greater part of the Council would prefer one licensed house in each parish to accommodate travellers. As it is now, there are great complaints, because while formerly a man having a license would prepare accommodation for travellers, now this business is left to what are called temperance hotels, and these temperance hotels very often are places where a person can get very strong spirits, in fact it is the case in all of them.

20263. Have you given any consideration to the question of general prohibition?—I cannot say that I have given it anything more than general consideration. I have not seen it tried here. I saw it in force in Maine many years ago, and it did not work there, and from all the knowledge I am able to procure in regard to it, I am inclined to believe that it has not worked anywhere in this section of the Province.

20264. In your opinion would it be desirable for the Dominion Parliament to pass a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor?—I think it would be very useful if the Legislature could buy the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, but it could not do much good so long as those islands supply the St. Lawrence district.

20265. I was speaking generally. Do you think such a law is desirable in the public interest?—If it could be carried out, it would be bound to do good.

20266. Have you doubts as to such a law being efficiently carried out?—I do not think it could be carried out.

20267. Will you state to the Commission your reasons for entertaining that view?—My experience of the working of such a law elsewhere is one of my reasons; and public opinion, which is not all favourable to total prohibition, is another. Public sentiment, which is adverse to the adoption of such a principle, is another reason why I think such a law could not be successful; and a third reason is our geographical position with regard to the outlying islands.

20268. By which you mean there would be smuggling on a large scale?—Since the 1st of May, there has been \$100,000 worth of smuggled stuff brought up the St. Lawrence, and the greater part sold. That is only a small portion of the whole.

20269. Are the Commissioners to understand from your answer that if a prohibitory law were passed, smuggling would be increased?—I think it would in many places. The liquor from St. Pierre was, of course, not regularly imported, but was brought in illicitly and seized.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

20270. Speaking of the parishes in which the municipalities refuse licenses, do you mean that when licenses were issued there was illicit sale in those parishes?—The prohibition or partial prohibition, as I might call it, has been going on to my knowledge

since 1850, and I could not well remember cases. I have not a distinct recollection of what took place over 40 years ago.

20271. Are we to understand that in all these parishes there has been this partial prohibition since 1850?—In almost all.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20272. After partial prohibition for over 40 years, what is the condition of affairs now?—There is room for improvement. I do not think it is very bad, there is great improvement on what it was in former days. I have been credibly informed that farmers formerly would procure large quantities of old Jamaica rum, and a puncheon was thought a fair allowance for one farmer for the winter. You do not see spirits purchased in the same quantity at present. I think there is a great improvement. I ascribe this improvement principally to the efforts of the clergy and the establishment of a temperance society in every parish.

20273. Has a prohibitory law had anything to do with the improvement?—I do not think so.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20274. In the days you speak of, when you were connected with the collection of Inland Revenue for this province, were there parishes where licenses were in force and yet illicit sale was carried on?—Yes.

20275. Had you to prosecute cases of illicit sale?—Yes.

20276. Had you reason to suppose that those illicit places were merely sub-agencies of the licensed places?—No, they were rival establishments.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20277. When you were Collector of Revenue did the licensed dealers help to punish the illicit sellers?—Scarcely ever, unless there was a quarrel between the parties. Then the licensed men would give in the names of some witnesses against the unlicensed dealers, and we would prosecute them. We often prosecuted them, but we did not receive much help from the licensed dealers.

20278. Do you make a return to the Government of the number of gallons of beer brewed here?—Yes, it will be found in the blue-book.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20279. For the further improvement of the present condition of affairs, what remedy would you suggest, what changes would you favour?—I think there are a great many persons in favour of a very high rate of license. Certainly that plan limits the number. But the license law has always seemed to me to be defective in this, that when a man wants to procure a license he has to present a requisition signed by 20 or 30 electors. I think that is where one of the errors lies. There should be more safeguards established in regard to procuring licenses, in order to ensure the maintenance of good order and that sales will not be made to minors or confirmed inebriates. Then there should be a revenue police, for this force, which has been instituted since my time, is most useful in securing the punishment of offenders.

20280. Would those measures be more effective than a general prohibitory law, in the present state of public opinion?—I could not exactly form an opinion as to the effect of a general prohibitory law, but my opinion is unfavourable to it, because I think it could not be carried out. In my view the principle is a splendid one, if it could be carried out, but in practice it would not work.

20281. Have you had any experience in the State of Maine?—Yes. In Bangor, which I visited, I had ocular demonstration that although it is in a prohibition State, there was very good brandy and whisky sold there, for it was done in my presence.

20282. Was there any secrecy about the sale of it?—It was quite a secret affair. There was no regular bar, but people were told to walk in a certain direction, through a covered way or passage, about half an acre long. At the other end there was the entrance, and on passing through the door you entered a place that was fitted up like a small bar, and liquor was dispensed there to any one who was willing to pay for it.

JAMES M. LEMOINE.

HON. H. G. JOLY DE LOTBINIÈRE, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

20283. How long have you resided in this district?—A great many years, ever since I came from college in France, where I was born. I came here when I was 20 years of age; my father brought me here, and I have been here ever since.

20284. I believe you were at one time a member of the Dominion House of Commons?—Yes.

20285. You were Premier of the Province of Quebec for some time, I believe?—For 18 months.

20286. What is your profession?—I am a lawyer.

20287. You understand, I suppose, in a general way the subjects to be inquired into by this Commission. The Commissioners will be very glad if you will make a statement to them of your views on this question. There are counties in which the Scott Act is in force and there are districts where there is prohibition under the License Act of the Local Legislature, and one of the principal questions into which this Commission is to inquire is whether a prohibitory law is desirable and whether it should be enforced. There is a very important phase of the question which engages the attention of the Commission, and that is the influence of the liquor traffic on the social and moral well-being of the people. This is, of course, a very wide question, but if you will be so good as to make a statement to the Commission as to your views in regard to the license system, as to local prohibitory legislation and as to the passage of a Dominion Act to enforce total prohibition of the liquor traffic, they will be very glad to hear you?—I need not say that I am very much puzzled to suggest a remedy, while at the same time I sympathize completely with those who seek to put down that dreadful calamity, drunkenness. I was brought up in a country where the use of wine is general, in France, where wine is looked upon as part of the daily food in every house, in every family, even the servants receiving a certain quantity of wine every day; and when I was a little boy at school, six or seven years old, the servant at table handed me a little measure and filled it with claret, which as I grew older I came to look upon as part of my daily food. So I can scarcely bring myself to look upon drinking wine as a sin—I cannot bring myself to do that. On the other hand, I have seen such dreadful abuse of liquor that I feel much sympathy with all those who try to find a remedy for the trouble. I happened to be in the North-west Territory when total prohibition prevailed, and certainly at that time, with the class of people who were there then, I think it was very beneficial. There were scarcely any settlers there and the country was over-run with working men from every part of the world who were employed in constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. I travelled on a construction train with hundreds of men, as the railway was not finished beyond Moose Jaw. Some American gentlemen were with me, and they called my attention to the fact, observing all the discomfort to be endured by these men, large numbers being packed in the cars and even standing on the platform, that if such a state of things had prevailed on the Northern Pacific there would have been regular pandemonium, while here, though the men were very much crowded and though some that could not find seats and had to lie on the floor, there was no liquor drunk and there was no disorder. In our country parishes in the county of Lotbinière, which I have represented for a good many years, we have not got the Scott Act, but our Municipal Councils do not allow licenses to be granted.

20288. Is that carried out throughout the county?—Yes, in nearly every parish.

20289. Are there exceptions?—I do not know any. I think it is pretty well enforced in Lotbinière; all the parishes surrounding the place where I live do not allow any licenses. It is a kind of local option, if you like—it is tantamount to that. I think it produces beneficial effects. It certainly does not prevent the people going to town twice a week on the market steamboat and bringing some drink back with them, and no doubt there is a certain quantity of drink sold illegally. But in the country, especially among the respectable farmers, there are very few who buy any of that drink which is illegally imported, and very seldom do you see a case of drunkenness in that part of the country. In fact, I remember a case where a man was selling liquor without a license, and the most respectable people in the parish—I know it was a most illegal act to do, but they

wanted to protect the young men who were tempted to go there—destroyed his house at night and drove him out of the parish. It was a most illegal act, committed by some of the most respectable men in the district, but they did it in self defence and for the sake of their children. I think in small communities, in farming communities, where every man lives comfortably, where he is master of his own house and where he has fuel and food, I do not think there is the same difficulty in obtaining a majority of the people to prohibit the sale of liquor, or at all events to refuse to grant licenses for the sale of liquor. What puzzles me is how to apply a remedy to large centres and large cities, where the condition of the bulk of the people is so different from that of the pretty happy lot of a farmer, who has got practically everything he wants, food and fuel, and has not the same craving for drink, because a craving it is to a certain degree. Perhaps I should not enter into these details. I see great difficulty in preventing in the cities the sale of liquor and in enacting a general prohibitory measure to apply to the whole country. I do not see very well how it can be accomplished.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20290. Then you would not favour such a measure in the present state of public opinion?—I have often considered how to arrive at a solution of the problem, as everybody who takes an interest in his neighbour is bound to do, and in my opinion if we could educate our people and show them that there are other pleasures apart from that of taking a glass of wine or a glass of liquor, that there are higher pleasures in reading, study, and in friendly intercourse, and that in those they would find pleasures of a different order—if we could secure to our people a little more comfort in their homes, I think perhaps we might educate them in temperance. When I see a poor man at night, lightly clad, walking home in the snow, sometimes carrying a bundle of chips under his arm, which he has picked up at the place where he has been working—when I see him shivering as he goes along and think of the poor home to which he is going, with very little fire, the proof of which is the bundle of chips under his arm, I cannot help wondering, as I watch him passing a tavern, that he does not enter. And so if we desire to aid him, the only way to do so is to help him to have a comfortable and warm home. But as to suggesting the true remedy, no one will wonder, when I state that I was brought up in a country where light wines are used like water, that in my opinion the customs tariff on liquors should be framed in such a way as to lighten as much as possible the duties on light wines and place as restrictive a duty as you like on whisky and gin and all those strong liquors which are really doing all the mischief. That is the only remedy I can see, apart from efforts to promote the moral and physical well-being of our people.

20291. Have you given any consideration to the laws that prevail in some States in Europe under which the Government regulates the traffic?—I have been very much struck with a case, with which you must all be acquainted, that is the city of Gothenburg in Sweden, where drunkenness was very prevalent and where an attempt was made to regulate the tariff in the way you have indicated. It was ascertained, and I think the inference was logical enough, that liquor dealers contributed in a great degree to increase the consumption of liquor by giving credit to customers and by encouraging them to drink, and further it was established that they adulterated the liquors. The people thought that if the Government could substitute themselves for the liquor dealers and control the manufacture and sale, and distribute liquor by means of agents, who should be paid, not a commission on what they sold, but a yearly salary, so that there would be no incentive for them to exceed their duty, means might be found of reducing intemperance. I have not followed very closely the result, but I was very much struck at the time with the practical view taken by those who originated the plan. If there were no liquor dealers interested in the traffic, if you could abolish them in a country like this, you would have to deal with the enormous vested interests which would be destroyed. It must be remembered that if total prohibition were adopted, the Government would have to compensate the liquor interests, which have been sanctioned and legalized as it were, and which have contributed such a large part of the revenue of the country. I do not see very well how it would be possible to close all those establishments without giving the parties some compensation.

HON. H. G. JOLY DE LOTBINIÈRE.

20292. Have you given any consideration to the question how the revenue that would be lost by enacting a prohibitory law would be replaced to the Dominion, provinces and municipalities?—Not only that, but you would have to compensate the distillers.

20293. You have spoken of the question of compensation for what we, in English, call vested interests?—Vested rights.

20294. There is the other large question of revenue to be considered?—Yes.

20295. Possibly about \$3,000,000 would be lost to the revenue. Have you thought how that could be replaced, or such portion as would necessarily be required?—I have scarcely thought of that, because, unfortunately, it seems to me to be impracticable to suppress the traffic directly.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20296. Do you think it is better to regulate and restrict it, and admit light wines on as easy terms as possible, and place heavy duties on all spirituous liquors?—I have noticed that some of our municipalities do not allow any licenses to be granted. By adopting that measure they surrender a little revenue, but no one complains of that; nevertheless, there is a certain quantity of drink consumed. It is nearly always the case that people bring back some liquor from town. Fortunately those addicted to drink have not the forethought, and prudence, and control over themselves to enable them to keep on hand any drink they bring with them, so they go to town and drink a good deal and return perfectly inebriated, and in two or three days all the liquor has disappeared, and those individuals remain sober for months.

20297. What do they do with the liquor?—Friends partake of it, and it disappears very rapidly. In our parish there is a Frenchman who learned in France the art of manufacturing a sort of claret from currants and dried raisins. He came to our place last fall, and manufactured a large quantity merely with currants and dried raisins, sugar and water. My agent, who is there all the time, told me that during the New Year's holidays, when the people generally go to town, they drank this largely and were perfectly satisfied to drink the mixture, which was perfectly innocuous, not even as strong as claret. This shows, I think, that if we would only place ourselves under the same circumstances as the people of France and southern Europe, and have light wines for general consumption, we would not have so much trouble with the question of intemperance as now, when we have to deal with such fiery drink as spirits.

20298. Do you think the prohibitory clause of the License Act, reasonably well enforced, would produce better results than granting permission to sell in municipalities?—Certainly. I wish it were possible in every municipality to induce the Municipal Council to refuse licenses. It would then be difficult to sell without license.

20299. There is a very interesting experiment being worked out in the Dominion. In a city in one of the Maritime Provinces, no licenses are issued, but parties who desire to sell and comply with certain regulations respecting the mode and hours of selling, do so without license. There is practically free sale of liquor with police restrictions, such as, no obstructions at the windows, one entrance, and a certain height of counter and so on. What is your opinion respecting such a plan?—My opinion is dead against that.

20300. Do you think it better to have a license system than that plan?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20301. Have you studied the Swiss system at all?—No, but I am under the impression that it is something like the Gothenburg system.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20302. Is it a fact that no effort has been put forth in Europe to prohibit entirely the use of alcoholic liquors by the enactment of a general law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale?—I can only give you what my impression is—I do not speak with any authority on the subject, but I do not think so.

20303. Have the efforts so far been to regulate the traffic?—Yes.



20304. No attempt has been made to control it by municipal or legislative action?—In the countries where wine is produced and is cheap, and where it forms a part of the daily food of the people, there is very little need of restriction, and very little drunkenness prevails.

20305. In those countries in the south of Europe and in France where wine is used as a food, do the people who have used wine from infancy to old age become drunkards?—No.

20306. Do they remain temperate all through their lives?—It strikes me that they remain temperate. I saw very few cases of intemperance.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20307. Have you noticed recent reports to the effect that the use of alcohol is increasing in France, that strong liquors are being used?—I remember when I was a young man, I drank as a great treat sugar and water. When I returned to France, I also occasionally took it. I mention this fact not from egotism, but in order to show what the prevailing idea was. We had so much wine we did not look upon it as a luxury. Even now I take a glass of sugar and water occasionally, not from any temperance idea but because I like it. People accustomed to drink wine feel that way, they do not crave for wine or liquor. To come back to the question the Commissioner asked: I am afraid the conditions have changed in France a good deal of recent years, and that the custom of taking absinthe has gained a terrible foothold in the country.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20308. Has the failure of the vintage, due to phylloxera, diminished the yield of wine to some extent?—Yes.

20309. So that the people cannot obtain it as freely as formerly?—So that they are beginning to make wine with currants and dried raisins. I have not been in France lately, so I do not know how the people in the country live.

*By the Chairman :*

20310. Statistics show a very large decrease in the production of wine and an increase in the production of alcohol. I remember that in the Pyrenees, where wine is plentiful, if you gave a man two dozen empty bottles he returned you one dozen bottles filled with *vin ordinaire*. The reason was that wine was plentiful and formed part of the food of the people.

20311. That is not the case now, I believe?—No, the phylloxera has destroyed the vineyards, but I am certain if we could import light wines here, we would see a great diminution in drunkenness.

ALFRED BROSNAN, Comptroller of Provincial Revenue, Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

20312. How long have you held your present position?—Since September, 1888, but I have been in the Department since 1882.

20313. Please inform the Commissioners of the nature of your duties?—In 1888, the Treasury Department was divided. A new branch under a Comptroller was established, corresponding in some respects to the Revenue Department in Ottawa. There they have two Ministers with separate Departments; here there is but one Minister with these two Departments or rather Departmental branches under his charge, that Minister being the Treasurer. There is the financial branch like the Department of Finance at Ottawa, and there is the Revenue branch of which I am in charge, which has under its management the collection of revenue in general, and in particular that derived from licenses, and also the administration of the laws connected with the several branches of the revenue, so far as its collection is concerned.

HON. H. G. JOLY DE LOTBINIÈRE.

20314. Does that include the collection of revenue from the issue of liquor licenses?—It does.

20315. Can you inform the Commission briefly whether the number of liquor licenses issued by the Province has increased during the last ten years or decreased?—Speaking from memory, I think in 1871 the number of liquor licenses issued was 2,222. The population of the province being at that time 1,100,000 odd, the ratio was one license to every 536 persons. In 1892 the number of liquor licenses issued so far has been 2,457, the population being as you know 1,488,543. The ratio is therefore one license to every 606 of the population. I make this statement as the question of high license has been discussed. The maximum cost of licenses has been increased from \$80 until it has now reached \$800 in the large cities, which is of course an immense increase. It is therefore clear that high license has not reduced the number of licenses issued.

20316. What was the revenue of the province in 1871?—I should have to consult the public accounts for the exact figures, but I remember that in 1871 it was not over \$200,000 from licenses, if as much.

20317. And what is the amount now?—It is nearly \$600,000; I can procure you the exact figures if you choose. I find the revenue in 1871 was \$87,879, including fines, but the fines amounted to \$3,000 only. The revenue for this year ending 30th June, 1892, was \$595,927, including fines. The revenue from liquor licenses was \$580,232.

20318. Then proportionately the number of licenses decreased while the amount of income increased many times over?—Yes, there was six or seven times more revenue.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20319. Did you say that the number of licenses has decreased?—The absolute number of licenses has increased, but the relative number, that is, the proportion of licenses to population, has slightly decreased.

20320. But notwithstanding the high license, the number of licenses has increased?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

20321. But the population has increased in greater ratio?—Yes, it has; but not so much as to affect the results to the degree one would imagine. I was surprised when I turned up the figures.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20322. There were 235 more licenses issued in 1892 than in 1871, I believe?—Yes. The population has increased since that time from about 1,200,000 to 1,500,000 in round numbers, or 25 per cent.

*By the Chairman :*

20323. Have you statistics of the consumption of liquor in the province?—No, except with regard to Scott Act counties and those parishes in which prohibitory by-laws exist. But I am not able to give you the figures now: those figures remain with the collectors.

20324. Are they records of the quantity of liquor consumed?—Yes, because every vendor is obliged under the Quebec license law and also under the Scott Act to furnish to the Collector of Revenue, a yearly statement of sales.

20325. You are speaking of licensed vendors?—Yes.

20326. Are the returns laid before Parliament?—They have never been called for, to my knowledge.

20327. Are they kept in the Department?—They remain with the collectors and are only called for on special occasions. I have a statement here showing five or six typical cases.

20328. Are there specially appointed vendors in those municipalities where the Councils refuse to grant licenses?—Yes.

20329. How are they appointed in those parishes and municipalities?—Their appointment comes under clauses 860–865 of the Quebec License Act, which is an

adaptation of the Dunkin Act to our provincial law, and under articles 561 to 565 of the Municipal Code.

20330. Then those licensed vendors are authorized by the Provincial Government?—Yes, under recommendation from the Municipal Council.

20331. They vend for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes?—Yes, and they are obliged to make a special return of their sales to the Collector of the District. There is a difference between one provision of our law and the similar provision in the Scott Act, and I consider it an important one. The Scott Act establishes a minimum. It states that the vendor may not sell less than one imperial pint, but he may sell as much as he chooses, and I believe it has been given in evidence before this Commission in other places, if not here, that as much as one gallon has been supplied on a prescription for a single individual. Our law fixes no minimum, an ounce may be sold, but not more than one imperial pint may be sold at one time under a certificate.

20332. You mean on the prescription of a medical man?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20333. Are members of the medical profession prohibited from giving certificates for a larger quantity than one imperial pint?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

20334. Is there any limit to the number of times they may give those certificates?—If a person wants a dozen bottles of beer—in cases where the law is observed theoretically and not practically—of course he has only to go to a doctor and get 12 certificates for 12 bottles.

20335. May he present them all at one time?—He could not; that is to say he could not do so according to a proper interpretation of the law. If I were Collector of Provincial Revenue—and these are the instructions I have always given—and such an abuse as that was committed, I should consider that the doctor came under the law as being liable to a fine for giving a certificate for liquor under false pretenses.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20336. Are those certificates retained?—Yes. I received a return this morning from our Collector at Kamouraska and he sent me all the certificates as well as the return.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20337. Is that document confidential?—I consider it official. It is a blank form furnished by us to the collectors; it simply contains the name of the party to whom liquor is sold, the quantity sold, the name of the doctor on whose authority the sale was made and, as a rule, the kind of liquor.

20338. You say you have samples of certificates?—Yes, I am not very much in favour of medical certificates on account of the way in which we see the law work.

*By the Chairman :*

20339. You say the collectors only make returns on application?—Yes, but I always send for the certificates when calling for the return.

20340. A return is only made when applied for?—So far, I may say that it is the intention of the department to have the collectors send in returns regularly, as securing a better means of control.

JUDGE McDONALD.—Kindly read some of those statements you have with you.

WITNESS.—I have here a report addressed to the Treasurer of the Province. It is a report made by myself on the working of the local option law. It says among other things :—

“I have the honour to report that the working of Articles 861 to 865 of the Revised Statutes respecting the sale of liquor under certificate in municipalities where a prohibitory by-law is in force, is very unsatisfactory. A much larger quantity of liquor is sold than can be needed for medicinal purposes; these certificates which are granted in profusion, are for the most part disgraceful scraps of paper indicative of the carelessness and indifference of those who deliver them, and I am assured that forgeries are not unfrequent.”

ALFRED BROSNAN.

These forgeries are very common. Another point that I may mention is this: Some doctors have little blanks bound together in book form, and they sign a number of these blanks when they go away, and they are often filled up even although the doctor is absent.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Do you often find the word “repeat” at the bottom of the prescription?

WITNESS.—No. We had one such case before us of a prescription being given by a medical man and the word “repeat” added. My report goes on to say:—

“But the point to which I desire more particularly to call attention for a moment is that of the number of certificates granted, irrespective of all other considerations, and I shall lay before you a few typical instances which will serve to show what is generally done throughout the province.”

To explain this report I must say that it was written with the object of having the rate of licenses raised, because quite a number of people who could not have taken out ordinary licenses, as they cost too much, took those medicinal licenses with the intention of using them as they would use an ordinary hotel or shop license.

THE CHAIRMAN.—What is the fee?

WITNESS.—It is now the same as for an ordinary shop license, \$200 in cities, \$160 in incorporated towns, \$125 in other organized territory and \$70 in unorganized territory.

MR. CLARKE.—Is more than one such license issued in each parish?

WITNESS.—Not more than one can be issued in each parish under the law.

My report continues:—

“During the month of January, 1889, the following liquor was sold in the parish of ———: 279 bottles of whisky, 217 bottles of gin, 28 bottles of brandy, 11 bottles of wine, 6 pints of whisky, 1 pint of beer, half a pint of brandy.”

I have entered in my report the names of the alleged parties who signed the certificates. The certificates given in another parish in February 1892, were 748 in number.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I observe that the certificates are signed by more than one medical man?—In one parish they are signed by five doctors, but they may not be signed by doctors, for clergymen have also the right to give certificates. Physicians are entitled to issue them to persons under their immediate care only, and clergymen only to persons whose spiritual advisers they are.

JUDGE McDONALD.—Do magistrates sign certificates for mechanical purposes?

WITNESS.—Yes, under the Scott Act; but there is no special provision under our Act.

*By the Chairman:*

20341. Are many of the certificates signed by clergymen?—Quite a number.

20342. How many out of the first number you mentioned were signed by clergymen?—Out of 548 issued, the parish priest signed 288, one physician 204, another physician 40, and the vicar 16. There are two physicians in that parish.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

20343. What is the population of that parish?—I remember that in the first letter I wrote about that parish, I mentioned there were 600 adults there. I think the whole population, counting men, women and children, would be about 900. There are a large number of men in the parish, who work in the saw-mills and so on. In another parish, 748 certificates were given during one month; in another parish, 281 certificates were given, and in another, 250. These are small parishes. In one municipality, the Collector indicates the certificates which he considers to have been forged. In this case the authentic certificates for one month number 213; the forged certificates during the same month number 150. The authentic certificates for another month number 179; the forged certificates for the same month, 92. My report closes with the following recommendation:—

“In presence of the above facts, I confess, as I have already stated to you verbally, that I have no confidence in the certificate system, nor in that of prohibitory by-laws in general, and I would gladly see it done away with and regular licenses issued in every municipality. This change, however, cannot be hoped for at present; but, as the low price of these medicinal licenses is one of the

inducements to their being applied for, as such large quantities of liquor are sold under them, and as it seems next to impossible to reach the signers of the certificates, I would suggest that the rate of duties payable on such licenses (and what I now say applies equally to licenses issued under the Canada Temperance Act) be raised to the same figure as that fixed by the law for retail liquor shop licenses, namely : in cities, \$200 ; in incorporated towns, \$160 ; in other organized territory, \$125 ; in unorganized territory, \$70."

20344. Have you reason to believe that a similar condition of things exist generally where local option is in force?—So everybody tells me. There are some parishes where the condition of things is better, but it depends a good deal on local opinion, and a great deal, of course, on the ecclesiastical authorities of the parish and the physicians.

*By the Chairman :*

20345. I think you said the Government were about to have returns made to them regularly regarding the certificates granted, and also have the certificates sent to them?—Yes.

20346. Have they called for returns from any considerable number of districts at the present time?—At Mr. Gigault's request, I called, a day or two before the Commission met, for returns from all districts under the Scott Act.

20347. And any others?—I have not called for the others yet.

20348. You said you had called for some?—That was in June.

20349. It was an exceptional measure?—It was done because I wished to show the Treasurer that it would be a good measure to raise the rate of those licenses.

20350. How many districts are there in which local prohibitory laws are in force?—I can give you the number of licenses issued under this law. I find that in all the province there are only 27 of those licenses issued.

20351. So there are only 27 districts where local prohibitory laws are in force?—There are 2 of those licenses issued in the district of Quebec. The rest are more or less scattered throughout 11 or 12 of the districts mainly below Montreal, in the region of the Lower St. Lawrence.

20352. Then it must be largely the district of Gaspé?—On consulting the list I find that the 27 licenses are in the districts of Arthabaska, Beauce, Kamouraska, Matane, Montmagny, Quebec, Richelieu, Rimouski, Saguenay, St. Francis, Temiscouata and Three Rivers.

20353-4. Mr. Joncas has told us that local option prevails in nearly every parish in that district, Gaspé?—In 27 parishes in the whole province ; we have only issued 27 licenses this year. On consulting the list I find that the 27 licenses are distributed as follows : 2 in the district of Arthabaska, 6 in that of Beauce, 1 in Kamouraska, 4 in Matane, 1 in Montmagny, 2 in Quebec district, 1 in Richelieu, 4 in Rimouski, 2 in Saguenay, 2 in St. Francis, 1 in Temiscouata and 1 in Three Rivers.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20355. Are there only 27 parishes in which a municipal prohibitive by-law is in operation?—It must be so.

20356. Do you issue only one license in each parish in which the by-law is in operation?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

20357. Your answer was that you issued 27 licenses?—Yes, but a license may do for more than one parish.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20358. I understood you to say that there are 27 licenses issued?—Yes.

20359. Then those 27 licenses are not in 27 parishes?—Yes, one in each parish.

20360. Are there any other parishes that have come under the provisions of the municipal by-law, and in which there is no license of any kind issued?—Yes. Those parishes have issued no licenses. I can give you the districts. We have from 900 to 1,000 municipalities in the Province, say 900. Of that number there are 210 in which a prohibitory by-law is in force.

ALFRED BROSNAN.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20361. But you say only 27 licenses have been issued?—Yes, this year.

20362. And those would cover 27 parishes?—Yes.

20363. And there are 210 parishes in which a prohibitory by-law has been passed?—Yes. The others grant no license certificates.

20364. How are they provided with liquor for medicinal purposes?—If the people need it, they go to the next village and get it; that very often happens. There is sometimes an understanding between villages. For example, a parish priest at one village says they do not need a license there, and the same statement is made by the priest in the next parish, but at the third parish it is decided to have a licensed place; and if people in any of these three parishes are sick they can run there and get their liquor, and on this account it is considered useless to have a depot in every parish. This is what I referred to when I said a moment ago that one license may serve for more than one parish.

*By the Chairman :*

20365. There is another consideration in connection with this system, and it is this: may not the permits which have been handed in to the Collector from one particular parish have really come from a lot of parishes? There is no Collector I believe, for a parish; the Collector is for a certain district?—There is one Collector for each district. A district may, and as a rule does, contain several counties. The certificates must come to the Collector from the parish in which the vendor resides, as far as the latter is concerned; but they may have been signed and issued by clergymen or physicians residing in different parishes.

20366. So may there not be five municipalities in which no license is granted and in only one of which there is a licensed vendor? May not the people who get those certificates or prescriptions come from the other parishes in which there is prohibition, but no vendor?—Certainly, they assuredly do that.

20367. And, therefore, they may represent a larger population that is being served than merely the people of the parish?—That is very true. Those 548 certificates, which appear as issued in only one parish, might represent several parishes. At the same time what made me use that basis for argument was the fact that I happen to know that the doctors who signed those certificates resided in that parish, and that under the law a physician can only issue certificates to patients under his immediate care.

20368. Here is a case where there were not five doctors in the Parish, yet the certificates were granted by five physicians?—It is very likely that four or five parishes were included in that return.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20369. In cases in which you think that does not occur, in which the prescriptions are limited to the particular parish doctors and large quantities are sold, have you reason to believe that the people in the neighbouring parishes, where there is a prohibitory law in force, but where there is no vendor, have any less trouble in getting drink. If so, how do they get it?—Here is one way in which it may be done: Suppose I live in Parish A. and I have a friend living in Parish B. My physician does not wish to give me a certificate, and my friend is a friend of the doctor in Parish B., where there is a licensed vendor. I ask him to get me some liquor, and he will get it on his own certificate in his own name, and pass it over to me.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20370. How many counties are under the Scott Act in this province?—Chicoutimi, Brome, and until 18th August, the County of Drummond, but now the Act has been repealed there.

*By the Chairman :*

20371. Is not the Dunkin Act in force in Richmond?—That, I believe, is the only county in this province where that Act is in force ; but there is one municipality in the County of Beauharnois, Hinchinbrooke, where the Dunkin Act is in force.

20372. Is there a large English-speaking population there?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20373. Has Arthabaska ever been under the Scott Act or the Dunkin Act?—It may have been formerly, but not to my knowledge.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20374. Were there formerly many counties under the operation of the Scott Act in this province?—I have never looked into the history of the Scott Act.

20375. Say within the last five years?—I know of none except those I have mentioned.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20376. Are ordinary liquor licenses issued in all parishes in which a municipal prohibitory by-law is not in operation?—Not in all parishes. There are at present 121 parishes in which there is no prohibitory by-law in force, but the Municipal Councils of which refuse to issue any license certificates.

20377. That is in addition to the 210?—Yes ; and these figures are not complete. I asked for a return recently, and three districts have not sent in returns, Iberville, St. Hyacinthe and Gaspé.

20378. I suppose there are no licenses issued in those 121 parishes, because they are not asked for?—In a large number of parishes they are not issued because they are not asked for, but the Collectors have informed me that there are parishes in which people have applied for licenses and which the Councils, after taking the applications into consideration, have refused them. That is why I made a report entirely separate as regards them.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20379. Had not Stanstead such a law, and was it not repealed?—Yes, Stanstead was under the Scott Act formerly.

20380. Is there any other information you desire to submit to the Commission?—I am at the disposal of the Commission and am ready to give any further information in my power.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20381. Have you a return from Chicoutimi?—Yes, I have a return for two months, stating that in the month of May 232 pints and in the month of July 252 pints were sold for the parish in which the vendor who made that return is located. That quantity represents the sales of one vendor.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20382. Are you satisfied with the operation of this local option law?—That is hard to say. In an ideal society, where the public opinion of the majority would be such as it ought to be, I think a local option law would work very well to repress intemperance among the minority ; but I do not know any such. The way I look at the question is in this light, and I think my view pretty well agrees with that of the Hon. Mr. Joly : Licenses for light wines and beer might be granted in each municipality and in each city, or one license granted for every 2,000 or 3,000 people in a city would work better, because the licensee is the best detective you can obtain to repress the illicit sale of liquor. Where there is no license everybody is tempted to sell, and no one helps the cause of law and order.

ALFRED BROSNAN.

## *ERRATA.*

Page 97, evidence of Mr. A. Brosnan :—

Questions 20387 and 20393, and answers thereto, should read as follows :—

20387. Can you tell us how many municipalities have prohibited the granting of licenses?—I cannot give the number now. I have asked for a statement from the Collector of Provincial Revenue. The explanation of this is that the unit of administration with us is the district and not the municipality, and each district is administered separately through the collector of such district. When I have obtained that information, it will be necessary to make up the total for the province.

20393. Has not the increase of license fees had the effect of diminishing the number of licenses?—The numbers are for 1890, 25; 1891, 32; for 1892, 27, due to the increase in the price of licenses. For 1893, there has been still an increase in the price and the number of licenses is but 9





20383. Would you prefer, as a means of minimizing the evil effects of the excessive use of liquor, the enactment of a law reducing the customs impost on light wines and beers and increasing the duties on spirits?—Decidedly.

20384. Would you think that an effective means of producing the best possible effect rather than the enactment of a prohibitory law, *i. e.*, a law which would prohibit the manufacture as well as the importation and sale of intoxicating liquor?—When you speak of prohibiting the manufacture of liquor, you must remember that I am speaking of the question from a provincial and not a federal standpoint. If it were possible to prohibit the manufacture and prohibit smuggling also, the condition might be different; but I have not thought enough on the question to wish to give an opinion on it, for it goes beyond the limits of the administration of our provincial laws.

20385. Would more satisfactory results in your opinion follow the introduction and adoption of light wines and beers as beverages in this province?—I think so, because I am convinced that certain people will drink, and if you get them to drink light wines and accustom them to light wines and beers, they will not drink strong liquors; but if all liquors are kept from them by the law, they will in spite of the law get drink somewhere, and it will, for obvious reasons, be pretty sure to be strong drink.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

20386. You have spoken of three districts from which no returns have yet been received; will you include those in the general return, so that we may know how many parishes are without licenses?—Yes.

(*Translation*).

*By Mr. Gigault:*

20387. Can you tell us how many municipalities have prohibited the granting of licenses?—I cannot give the number now. I have asked for a statement from the Receiver of taxes. The explanation is here: unity for us, that is for the district and not the parish; each district sufficient for itself. When I have obtained that information, it will be necessary to make up the total for the province.

20388. Have you the total number of violations of the provisions of the license law for the province?—Yes, I have it here, but I have not the number for the year 1892. For 1891, in the province there were 425 cases, which came before the courts and in which convictions were obtained.

20389. Can you state if there was an increase or decrease in the number of cases?—There was an increase.

20390. In the interest of the temperance cause, do you think it would be proper to take away from the municipalities the right to grant licenses?—Yes. They have a singular idea as to the exercise of that right. I received the following answer to the question as to whether a license should be granted: “Yes, on condition that the gentleman gives a small present to the Council.”

20391. Do you think the license law is what it should be in a moral point of view? I think the license law contains very good provisions. For example, we have a law which permits parents or guardians to give orders to an hotel-keeper not to sell liquor to a person under age, and if the licensee violates that order the parent or guardian may take an action for damages, besides the penalty inflicted in such cases. We have also permission from the authorities to search the licensed houses. We have laws that permit us not only to punish those who sell illegally, but also those in whose houses we find a certain quantity of liquor, such as a merchant not licensed. We have laws relating to the sale of liquor to persons under age, that are more severe than those of Ontario. The sale of liquor on Sunday is strictly forbidden, except in hotels at the public table.

20392. What do you think of the results of the application of the Scott Act?—I have heard for the first time the following words, spoken by a deputy: We hear complaints everywhere, not because the law is bad, but because public opinion is not on a level with the law.

20393. Has not the increase of license fees had the effect of diminishing the number of licenses?—The numbers are for 1890, 17; 1891, 17; for 1892, 11, due to the increase

in the price of licenses. For 1893, there has been still an increase in the price, and the number of licenses is but 9.

20394. From your experience, can you tell us if these licensees help the authorities to punish those persons who violate the law?—Yes. They help us. The liquor merchants' association of Montreal and of Quebec help us much. It is to their interest to do so, and they know it. As a general rule the licensees help us.

20395. Can you leave the list that you have in hand?—Yes. These are copies that are not complete; but I will complete them for the Commission.

*By the Chairman :*

20396. What has been done by the Treasurer's Department to prevent the illicit sale of intoxicating liquor?—Our Collectors are enforcing the provisions of the law so far as they can be pressed. The methods they adopt are two-fold. In the first place, they receive informations and act on them; but where they do not receive informations, they must depend on their own exertions and those of informers. I may explain how the machinery works as regards ferreting out offenders. To-day, however, we require certain machinery we do not possess. Some of our Collectors are obliged to follow another occupation in addition to that of Collector, and in certain districts, I may instance that of Charlevoix, no man could give his whole time, for the present pay, to the collector's work. This man works at his trade, another Collector practices as a notary, another is an agent and so on, because the fees, which amount to perhaps \$100 or \$200 annually, in some cases, are not sufficient for the man's living. These remarks, however, apply only to certain outlying rural districts. Naturally the efforts of the department are crippled by the fact that the greater part of the time of these men is employed in their own private business, while theoretically they are supposed to go through the district constantly, to have their eyes open to violations of the law and to ferret them out. One means we have is the cupidity of the informer. A feature of our system is the giving of a portion of the fine, \$15 if the fine is over \$60, and one-fourth if the fine is under \$60, to the informer. That helps us. There are always informers ready; but I hold there is other and different machinery that would certainly work better, only it would be too costly.

20397. Then you consider the machinery of the department for detecting sales of liquor without license is not efficient?—It is efficient so far as it goes, and our men do their best.

20398. But the system is not satisfactory?—Not entirely as regards the machinery of the law. The law might be amended I think.

20399. Does not the law give the Government full power to employ as many persons as are necessary to collect the revenue?—There is one Collector under the law for each revenue district.

20400. Is that the law?—Yes, but he may have an assistant. Of course the Government can employ a certain number of detectives, there is no law to prevent the Government doing so. We have in Montreal a Revenue Police, composed of six men, attached to the Collector's office.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20401. Do not the Provincial Police look more after the criminal part than the penal part, but at the same time, to a certain extent, carry out the law generally?—I do not refer to the Provincial Police, the Revenue Police of Montreal is a different force. The Provincial Police could not do the work, they are too much taken up with other matters.

20402. Is it within the knowledge of the department that illicit sales of liquor take place?—Naturally, it is within the knowledge of the department; but we cannot put our hands on the sellers always, although we do so when we can.

20403. Would it be the duty of the Collector, if unlicensed dens where whisky was sold were brought to his knowledge, to take action?—Yes.

20404. By whom are the costs of prosecuting such offenders borne?—That is one of the matters in regard to which we are very much hampered in carrying out the law. If judgment is rendered in favour of the Government, well and good, the defendant is

ALFRED BROSNAN.

called upon to pay or he goes to jail, which is the case in three out of four prosecutions. Then the Government has to pay the costs. If the case is lost, the costs of the defence are not strictly chargeable to the Government, but the costs of the prosecution have to be paid by the Government. At the same time, the Magistrate often recommends the payment of the defendant's costs by the Government, and it is very seldom the Government refuses to do so in such cases.

20405. Does a Collector enter upon a prosecution at his own risk?—No, at the risk of the Government

20406. In the event of the prosecution failing to establish their case, and the Government refusing to pay the costs, I suppose no one can come against the Collector, who is an officer of the Government?—He has acted in his capacity as Collector.

20407. Then I suppose the defendant cannot recover?—The defendant may recover from the Government, as above explained, not from the Collector.

20408. Then is the Collector reimbursed under any circumstances?—The preliminary expenses are at his risk. Suppose a Collector finds that at a certain place there are infractions of the law. A person perhaps complains, but he cannot furnish proof, so the officer must try to work the case himself. The Collector at his risk spends perhaps five or ten dollars in order to secure evidence, but it is the only risk he takes, and he is reimbursed by the share of the fine which the law allows him, if the case is won.

20409. Having commenced a prosecution and failing to get a conviction, who pays costs?—Not the Collector, except those preliminary expenses of which I have spoken.

20410. Who pays the expenses of the trial?—They are paid by the Crown, if the Crown fails to obtain a conviction.

20411. Then the Collector is held harmless in the way of costs?—Yes, but not harmless in the way of preliminary expenses.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20412. Do you suppose it would make any difference in those cases where vendors' certificates are given if the men were not dependent on the receipts from profits from sales : if, for instance, the vendors were appointed agents of the Government and paid salaries to supply liquor?—Certainly, so long as human nature is what it is.

20413. Would you favour the removal of inducements to those men to make extra profits?—Yes, I think the removal of inducements to oversell would be a good thing, and the appointment of vendors with a fixed remuneration, without such vendors being required to pay the Municipality for their license certificates, would modify the action of certain Municipal Councils, which are led to grant certificates by reason of the tax they are allowed to charge therefor. But, on the other hand, the appointing of vendors in every parish, if this were done generally, as some have suggested, would only increase the difficulty as regards medical men, inasmuch as the latter, or at least many of them, charge for medical certificates.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20414. What is the fee charged for a prescription?—In some parishes the fee for a medical certificate is ten cents, but I have known \$2 to be charged.

20415. What size is one of those licensed districts over which there is a Collector with two assistants?—All Collectors have not assistants. I could not give you the mileage of the districts from memory. There are seven counties in the revenue district of Montreal.

20416. How many officers?—In the district of Montreal, there is only one Collector, with a deputy, and six revenue policemen.

20417. Are those men employed in the country as well as in the city?—They are supposed to go to the country as well, but they are mainly for the city.

20418. Can efficient enforcement be expected if there is only one officer to enforce the law in districts so extensive as those of the Province of Quebec?—It is not efficiently done, if efficiently be intended to mean the absolute arrest and punishment of every offender. I can prepare for the Commissioners a return showing the size of the districts and the number of officials employed.

CLÉMENT E. DESCHAMPS, of Quebec, Clerk in the Provincial Civil Service, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

20419. Where are you employed?—I am a clerk in the Provincial Secretary's Department.

20420. How long have you held your present position?—Sixteen years.

20421. Are you a native of this district?—No, I am from Lachine.

20422. How long have you resided here?—Sixteen years.

20423. I understand you have some information to submit to the Commission?—I have the judicial statistics and a compilation respecting the asylums of the Province from 1880 to 1891.

20424. Have you prepared those statements at the instance of the Provincial Secretary?—Yes.

20425. Will you briefly tell the Commissioners what they are, and file them? Have you personally compiled those statistics?—They have been compiled for the Commission.

20426. They are signed by the Assistant Secretary, I observe?—Yes. These returns include a statement of the number of inmates in each of the insane asylums, the asylum near Montreal, the asylum in Quebec, the asylum at Dorchester, Belmont Retreat, Verdun Asylum and Baie St. Paul Asylum. I beg to file the documents.

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20427. Do you know if there is any increase in the number of crimes?—Yes.

20428. What is the increase that you have knowledge of?—I could not tell you. This is how I found that there was an increase: Sometimes during the last five or six years I have prepared a case for the Department, and then I have observed there was an increase.

The Commission adjourned.

QUEBEC, September 8th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day at 10.30 a.m., Sir JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman of the Commission, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

EDMOND GIROUX, Chairman of the Quebec Harbour Commission, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

20429. You are a resident of Quebec, I believe ?—Yes.

20430. Have you resided here long ?—40 years.

20431. What is your business ?—I am a druggist.

20432. You are Chairman of the Harbour Commission, I believe ?—Yes.

20433. Of how many members is that body composed ?—There are nine members.

20434. By whom are they appointed or elected ?—Five are elected by the Dominion Government and four are elected by the Board of Trade and shipping interest, that is by the two Boards of Trade, that of Quebec and that of Point Lévis.

20435. Has the Board many employees under it ?—We may have 50, including labourers and clerks.

20436. At different times, of course, there have been a very large number of men working for the contractor, no doubt ?—Yes.

20437. How long have you been a Commissioner ?—I have been a Commissioner for ten years.

20438. Has much difficulty been experienced at any time with employees of the contractor on the score of drunkenness ?—Not to my knowledge. We have nothing to do with men working for the contractor.

20439. Of course they are not under your control, but I assume that the Harbour Commissioners have knowledge of what is going on in connection with the work ?—Not to my knowledge.

20440. From your observation, is the present license system fairly effectual in the city of Quebec ?—I could not answer that question.

20441. Can you tell the Commission if there is any illicit sale of liquor in the city ?—I could not answer that question.

20442. The Harbour Commission have charge of the works of the harbour and the regulations in regard to them, I suppose ?—Yes.

20443. Do they make regulations for the shipping ?—No, only for the pilots.

20444. Are all the pilots under them ?—Yes.

20445. Is there much trouble on the score of intemperance among the pilots ?—Not to my knowledge. In ten years we have had very few cases brought before us for drunkenness on the part of pilots, very few indeed.

20446. Is there any regulation of the Board making it a condition of the employment of a man that he be a total abstainer ?—No.

20447. As a matter of course the Commissioners would not permit intemperate men to be employed ?—No.

20448. As a resident of Quebec, what is your opinion as to the matter of drunkenness : has it increased or decreased of late years in this city ?—I could not answer that question.

20449. You have not formed any conclusion in regard to the matter?—No.

20450. Have there not been a great many cases of smuggling discovered during the last year? Is smuggling conducted on a very large scale?—I have read so in the papers, that is all I know about it.

20451. Would that imply there must be a great deal of liquor brought into this port illicitly that is not detected?—I think there has been.

20452. Can you give the Commission any idea as to how that is disposed of, whether it is sold to people who are in the trade, or whether it is sold to illicit vendors?—I know nothing about it.

20453. Have you given any consideration to the question of prohibition, that is the enactment of a law by the Dominion which would prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor?—I have never given that subject a thought.

20454. Do you think such a law would be desirable?—I think it would be hard to put it in practice, from all I know and from all I have read.

20455. But if it could be put in practice, do you think it would be desirable?—Please repeat that question.

20456. My question was, whether you thought a law passed by the Dominion Parliament, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of liquor would be desirable?—I do not think so.

20457. And your reasons are, what?—I think it would be hard to put such a law into practice.

20458. You think it is not desirable, because it could not be efficiently enforced: is that your conclusion?—That is my conclusion.

20459. But provided it was efficiently enforced, what would you say to the matter then?—It is hard to answer that question. I have never given a thought to this liquor question, and it is very hard for me to give an opinion. I am not a teetotaler, but I am a temperance man. I allow wines to be used at my house at my own table, and I do not think I would like to see a law passed which would prevent other people from doing what I do. I think that is as fair an answer as I can give.

20460. Do you think adulteration of spirituous or malt liquors is largely practised in this community?—I could not answer that question.

20461. You have not had occasion as a chemist to analyse at any time samples of drink?—I have never been asked to do so.

*By Judge McDonald:*

20462. It has generally been stated that liquor sold by druggists is of a pure character and superior to that found in drinking places. Have you any knowledge as to that?—I do not think that druggists in this city sell liquor.

20463. Do you say they do not sell liquor?—They do not. We have never sold it, and I have been in the trade forty years, and to my knowledge other druggists do not sell it, with the exception of one or two.

20464. In the rural districts, or country towns, I suppose there is a certain quantity sold by druggists?—We have no druggists in the country parts of this district.

20465. Is your business that of a wholesale and retail chemist?—Yes.

20466. And do you carry on a certain amount of manufacturing?—Very little. We are more drug merchants than manufacturers.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

20467. Do you know anything regarding public feeling in this city and province on the question of prohibition?—I do not.

20468. Has drunkenness decreased or increased in the province during the past ten years?—I am not in a position to form an opinion.

20469. Do you know anything about the operation of the local option law, or the Scott Act in any part of the province?—No.

20470. Have you answered the question as to whether you favour a prohibitory law or not?—I would not, I think.

20471. Would you favour the enactment of a law that would impose heavier duties on whisky, brandy, gin and rum, and that would remove some of the imposts on beer

EDMOND GIROUX.

and light wines?—I would favour higher licenses for all those who are selling liquors, and I would also favour the granting of licenses to only good men. I would favour placing the licenses as high as possible.

20472. You think that would be the best plan for checking the evils of intemperance?—Yes, and then have fine and imprisonment for drunkenness.

(*Translation.*)

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20473. What difference is there between rectified and unrectified alcohol? What are the substances so injurious to the health that you find in the liquors in use? Are there such substances?—There is no doubt about it.

20474. What are the substances in the unrectified alcohol?—I have never studied that question, but there is no doubt that the alcohol contains substances injurious to health.

20475. Do you think that wine is beneficial as affording nourishment?—Yes, I think so.

20476. Do you think that a moderate use of wine is injurious to health?—No.

20477. Can you tell us if there is much illegal selling of liquor in the neighbourhood of Quebec?—I do not know of any.

20478. Have you ever analysed or obtained a knowledge of the deleterious substances in smuggled liquor?—I have never ascertained.

20479. However, it is your opinion that alcohol not rectified is much more injurious to health than the other?—Yes.

20480. What is the character of the smuggled alcohol?—As I have never seen any, I am unable to reply to the question.

20481. Mr. Clarke asks if you think that the smuggled liquor would be more general if Parliament passed a prohibitory Act?—There is no doubt that such would be the case.

PHILLIP J. BAZIN, of Quebec, merchant, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

20482. Are you a native of Quebec?—Yes.

20483. I understand your occupation is that of merchant?—Yes.

20484. Are you a member of the firm of Turcotte & Co.?—Yes.

20485. How long have you been in business here?—I have been in partnership about six months, but I have been employed with Turcotte & Co. for 17 years.

20486. What class of business is conducted by the firm?—They are wholesale grocers and liquor dealers.

20487. You have no objection, I suppose, to state whether your customers are principally located within the province?—Yes, they are.

20488. Do the liquors sold by your firm include spirits, wine, beer and ale?—Yes.

20489. Of the spirits, are your supplies principally Canadian or imported?—I suppose the largest quantity is Canadian.

20490. When you give that answer do you take into consideration gin, rum and brandy?—Yes.

20491. But still you think, notwithstanding the fact that all these are imported, that whisky made in Canada bears the largest proportion to the whole of your sales?—Yes.

20492. Do you get any whisky from the other provinces, the duty on which has been paid before it reaches Quebec?—Not very often.

20493. The duty is paid here?—Yes, we pay the duty here. It has happened two or three times that we have had one or two carloads duty paid when it came here. When we expect a change in the tariff, we obtain it duty-paid.



20494. That was lest you should have a larger duty to pay when it reached its destination?—Yes, that is the only instance.

20495. Have there not been many serious cases of smuggling detected on the St. Lawrence during the last 12 months?—Yes, I have seen that in the newspapers, and I have also seen some sales at the custom-house of what I supposed was smuggled whisky.

20496. You are aware that smuggled liquor has been sold by the Government?—There are many sales made by the Government.

20497. Is it publicly sold by auction?—Yes.

20498. Who are the principal purchasers?—I remember one or two sales at which the purchases were made, it was understood, on behalf of distillers.

20499. Did distillers purchase that liquor with a view to rectifying it afterwards?—That is what was understood.

20500. They would put it through a process of rectification and afterwards vend it again?—Yes.

20501. Is it fair to assume, seeing how many cases of smuggling have been detected, that there must be a good deal of smuggling going on which has not been detected?—It is hard to say, but I suppose so.

20502. If there has been so much detected within the last 12 months, is it a fair assumption to conclude that there is a good deal of smuggling practised?—Yes.

20503. Can you give the Commissioners any idea as to the parties to whom the smugglers would dispose of their liquor when they reach a port like Quebec? Would it be sold to licensed vendors or illicit vendors?—That is more than I can say.

20504. Have you formed any opinion on the subject?—It may be sold to licensed merchants, but of course I have no knowledge at all of it.

20505. Would not the licensed vendors run the risk of having it discovered on their premises by the officers of Excise? Suppose a man having a licensed house bought a quantity of smuggled liquor, would not his house, being subject to certain supervision, be liable to be searched by the officers and the liquor thus detected?—Certainly there would be some risk.

20506. That being so, is it not more probable that this liquor is sold to illicit vendors, men who sell without license?—Of course, we have found a diminution in our sales during the past few years, and we have thought it was due to the smuggling going on. We paid much less duty than we formerly did, and so we concluded that smuggling was proceeding.

20507. You are not able to say whether that was the result of your customers getting liquor through other regular channels, or from a large quantity of smuggled liquor being sold through people who have no licenses whatever? You only know you had a reduced demand?—Just so. It may be that the Government by selling this illicit whisky at auction reduces our sales in proportion.

20508. If the bulk of smuggled material is sold to distillers, how would that affect your sales?—I am aware that only one or two sales were made to distillers. The other quantities sold were thrown into the market and sold by lots of two, three or five barrels.

20509. Can you tell us by whom they were purchased?—I could not say.

20510. Were they purchased by any one?—Yes.

20511. The effect, of course, would be if the stuff was sold openly and purchased by vendors, whether illicit or licensed vendors, to decrease the demand through the regular licensed dealers?—Yes.

20512. Such would not be the effect, I assume, if the stuff was sold to rectifiers or distillers?—It would not be.

20513. It would come out of their establishment again as part of their regular distillation?—I have petitioned the Government not to dispose of the smuggled whisky in that way.

20514. Am I correct in coming to the conclusion that the wish of the wholesale vendors of whisky is that this smuggled stuff should be put into the river?—It should be destroyed one way or another, but not put on the market and consumed.

20515. What is the object of that? The liquor dealers have urged the Government to discontinue the open sale of this smuggled liquor, I understand?—I would rather,

PHILLIP J. BAZIN.

Mr. Chairman, that my examination be continued in French, as I cannot fully understand some of the phrases used.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20516. I understand you to say that your sales have diminished and that you attribute the falling off to smuggling. Do you think that the drinking habits of the people have become less, and therefore your sales have been affected?—I do not think it.

20517. Do you think the people drink as much as they did 15 years ago?—I have no reason to believe to the contrary.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20518. Did you say that drinking has not decreased during the past 10 years?—I do not know.

20519. Has drinking among the people increased during the past 10 years?—It seems to me to be about the same.

20520. If there had been a decrease in the drinking habits of the people and of your customers, your business would have been affected by it?—Yes. If there had been a certain decrease, I should know it.

20521. Do you know anything about the operation of the Scott Act in this province?—I have seen in the papers that some counties wanted to give it up because they did not find it work satisfactorily.

20522. Does the Scott Act interfere with the liquor business?—I suppose it affects the business.

20523. Would the sales of liquor diminish where the Act was in force?—It would diminish the liquor sales no doubt.

20524. Are liquors sold to people in Scott Act counties by the trade here?—Yes.

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20525. Have the wholesale merchants asked the Government to stop the sale of confiscated liquors at auction?—We have asked that, because these sales are hurtful to our business. The Government does not gain anything by it, inasmuch as they would receive more duty paid on the liquor we would sell if the smuggled liquor was not placed on the market.

20526. Do you know if smuggled liquor was brought in on a larger scale at the time that there was an increase in the duty?—I have not any knowledge of the operations of smuggling, but I think that very naturally it would be so; the tendency would be in that direction.

20527. Have you noticed by the volume of your business, the effect of bringing in smuggled liquor, or the adoption by the municipalities of the Scott Act, or the prohibitory by-laws?—We do not have very much trade in Quebec, and to my knowledge there are very few counties where the Scott Act is in force. We do but very little business at Chicoutimi.

20528. What do you think of the right given to the Municipal Councils to stop the sale of liquor within their limits?—The intention is a very good and wise one, but I do not think that the results are good everywhere. I mean to say that there is no such success as we desire to attain, for we have heard that there is as much liquor drunk where that prohibition exists as anywhere.

20529. Does your house sell as much liquor there as at other places?—We do not know it.

20530. Do you know of any municipalities where liquor is sold in an illicit manner?—Not to my knowledge.

20531. Mr. Clarke asks if, in your opinion, it is preferable in case of persons who have held licenses for a long time to continue that license even if the proprietor of the hotel should change?—I do not see why it should not be allowed.

20532. In the city of Quebec, is there much illicit selling?—None that I am aware of?

20533. Do you think the retailers help the authorities to have the law respected?—Naturally, it would be to their interest to do so.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20534. We have had it in evidence from witnesses that in some places at certain times the licensed vendors helped the unlicensed ones by selling them liquor to sell again, and that the two classes of dealers never entered into competition? Has that been your experience?—No.

20535. Did you ever hear any report of that kind in this province?—Not to my knowledge.

20536. I understand that you have expressed the opinion that there is not much unlicensed sale in Quebec, that is in the city?—There is none to my knowledge. We see the statements sometimes made in the newspapers to the effect that people have been found selling improperly.

20537. Is the law fairly well administered?—I think so. When arrests are made, the parties are fined, I believe.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20538. Do you know whether there are many unlicensed places in Quebec?—No, I am not aware of any.

20539. It has been stated that there is a considerable number. If there are many, do you know where they get their liquor? Do unlicensed places smuggle their liquor, or do they buy it from merchants in the city?—I could not say, I do not know.

20540. Do wholesale liquor merchants when they sell liquor make inquiries as to whether the persons buying it are licensed, or are going to sell it illicitly?—No, as a rule we do not ask such questions.

20541. Do you have reason to believe that unlicensed sellers smuggle most of their liquor?—I could not say.

20542. Speaking about smuggling, are the smugglers located here in Quebec or elsewhere?—I do not know them at all.

20543. You have no reason to believe that the liquor dealers in Quebec smuggle themselves, and sell smuggled liquor here?—I have no knowledge of it.

THOMAS DAVIDSON, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

20544. How long have you been a resident of Quebec?—Forty years.

20545. What is your occupation?—Merchant's clerk.

20546. By what firm are you employed?—By John Ross & Co.

20547. What is their business?—Wholesale grocers.

20548. Also dealers in liquor?—No.

20549. Simply grocers?—They are general grocers and importers.

20550. Have they a large number of employees?—Not a very large number, but just enough for their regular business in Quebec.

20551. Have they any regulation in regard to not employing men who are not total abstainers?—They have no such regulation.

20552. Have you given any attention to the question of the liquor traffic in the city of Quebec?—Yes, I have been observing its effects during my whole residence in the city and neighbourhood.

20553. On your own account, or as a member of some society?—On my own individual account.

20554. Do you think there is more, or less, drunkenness in the city than there was ten years ago?—I think there is less.

PHILLIP J. BAZIN.

20555. Is it the result of your observation that the laws regulating the liquor traffic are fairly well enforced, or otherwise?—I really do not know much about the enforcement of the laws regulating the traffic.

20556. Can you tell the Commissioners if there is much illegal selling in the city?—Personally I do not know. It is reported that there is, but I do not know personally that such is the case.

20557. Have you any idea where the smuggled stuff brought into the city comes from, and how it is sold—through whom? I am speaking now of that which has not been sold by the Government, for of course we know that the liquor seized has been sold. Of course the smugglers must find a market for the stuff they bring in here?—No doubt they do.

20558. Have you any information on the subject?—I really do not know.

20559. You cannot speak as to whether licensed vendors buy it or those who sell without license?—I think it is quite probable that licensed people buy it.

20560. Would they not run the risk of being detected, if they had it on their premises, by the officers of the Excise?—Not nearly as readily as if they had no license. Having a license and being legitimate traders they would not run the same risk as persons having no right to have liquor on their premises at all.

20561. But the people who have no right to sell are not generally found out and visited by the officers of the municipality or Provincial Government. Are there not special detectives to look after such cases?—There are detectives for the purpose of preventing illicit sale and they also look after the smuggled liquor.

20562. Is not that the business of the Inland Revenue Department of the Dominion Government?—I myself know one detective, who informed me that he was appointed for that very purpose.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20563. For what purpose?—For the purpose of discovering where the smuggled liquor went and seizing it wherever he could find it.

*By the Chairman :*

20564. By whom was he employed?—I think by the Dominion Government.

20565. That is for the purpose of detecting the illicit importation of stuff which does not pay duty?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20566. I do not understand. Do you mean after it is landed?—Before and after it is landed.

*By the Chairman :*

20567. Your impression is that the smugglers who manage to get in their smuggled stuff find purchasers among licensed vendors?—It is my opinion that the principal portion of it goes through the hands of licensed vendors.

20568. Have you been an active temperance worker?—Personally I have been. I have not been connected with any temperance association for a number of years, but I have been doing my individual duty in the matter as I thought best.

20569. Is there much drunkenness among the sailors coming to this port?—No, I do not think there is.

20570. Or among the employees on the wharfs?—Not nearly as much as formerly.

20571. Then there is improvement among those classes?—A decided improvement.

20572. Have you had any experience of the working of the prohibitory clauses of the license law?—I have had no practical experience more than noticing the operation in counties where the Scott Act was adopted.

20573. Have you ever lived in any municipal district or county where either of these Acts was in force?—I lived for a time in a municipality where there was partial prohibition, not the Scott Act, but the municipal authorities refused to issue licenses.

20574. Is not that prohibition under the present license law?—The municipality simply refused to grant licenses, and prosecuted any illicit sellers.

20575. How did that system work?—It worked admirably.

20576. Where was it in operation?—In the county of Portneuf, one of the counties adjacent to the city on the north side of the river.

20577. What is the area of the parish?—The particular parish I refer to is the parish of St. Rémi, containing about 10,000 people.

20578. Are they scattered throughout the whole place?—The village of St. Rémi is the centre of the parish, but the whole parish was under it.

20579. What is the population of St. Rémi?—About 2,000.

20580. Was prohibition enforced within the boundaries of the municipality?—Entire prohibition.

20581. No licenses were issued?—No.

20582. Was there within the parish a licensed vendor, authorized to sell liquors for medicinal purposes?—I am not certain, I think there was. The doctor of the village I think had a permit to issue orders to get liquors for medicinal purposes.

20583. We know that doctors have the power to issue prescriptions, but was there a place in which his prescriptions could be filled?—Not to my knowledge.

20584. Within the parish?—Not to my knowledge.

20585. Where would the people of the parish get the doctor's prescriptions filled?—In Quebec.

20586. Is it your impression that there was no licensed sale of liquor of any kind within the parish?—I think not.

20587. Can you of your own knowledge say whether there was any illicit sale or illegal sale?—There must have been some illicit sale, because I know of prosecutions being commenced for illegally selling.

20588. Were there many such?—No, only one came to my personal knowledge.

20589. Do you think there was more illegal selling after the prohibitory law was put into effect than there was before?—No. I think illegal selling increased when the railway was constructed through the village six or seven years ago. We had railway workshops established and strangers came in, and a larger quantity of liquor was used then than formerly.

20590. Was it brought in from outside the parish?—It had to be brought from outside illegally. If it was brought from outside it had to be brought in by parties illegally because there were no licenses granted to any of the hotels.

20591. Are you speaking of a period when the prohibitory license law was not in effect?—No, it was in effect there, I suppose, for twenty years.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20592. Is it in effect now?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

20593. Is there anything to prevent a resident within the municipality coming to Quebec and obtaining a supply of liquor?—There is nothing at present.

20594. And taking it home?—Yes.

20595. Having observed the effect of that limited prohibition, do you think it would be advisable that the Dominion Government should pass a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors of all kinds?—I think it would be most desirable.

20596. Do you think that such a law could be efficiently carried out?—I think if the Dominion Government were in earnest, they could carry it out efficiently.

20597. You know something as to the state of public feeling?—In the present state of public feeling do you think such a law could be carried out?—I think it could.

20598. Has your experience led you to the conclusion that public sentiment is such that a law of that kind could be efficiently worked?—Judging from the public sentiment of those municipalities where it is carried out, I think so.

20599. I am speaking of the whole of the Dominion. Do you think public opinion is such that a prohibitory law could be enforced efficiently if enacted now?—I do. I will give my reason for thinking so. The only portion of the public who have had an

opportunity to pronounce on the subject have decided in favour of a prohibitory law, I refer to the people of the North-west.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20600. You mean the people of Manitoba ?—Exactly.

*By the Chairman :*

20601. That is the ground you take ?—That is one of my reasons.

20602. You have no doubt observed that there are many counties in Ontario which adopted the Scott Act and subsequently repealed it ?—Yes, that is true.

20603. What do you think is the state of public sentiment in those counties ?—I believe the Scott Act was repealed because it was not efficiently enforced.

20604. But you have told us you base your opinion that a prohibitory law could be carried out on the fact of what has taken place in Manitoba ?—That is one of the reasons.

20605. Is not Manitoba in its relation to the whole Dominion much the same as a county is in relation to a province ? Yes.

20606. You have told us that you think a prohibitory law is desirable ?—I do.

20607. It would destroy of course a large amount of capital invested in brewing establishments and distilleries; &c. ?—Yes, but it would divert that capital to what I think would be better employment.

20608. Would it not render it useless for a time ?—Not altogether useless. It would simply render it useless in that business.

20609. If you had the framing of the law, would you propose to compensate the holders of such properties ?—No, but I would give them some years' notice to prepare for the coming change.

20610. How long notice do you think would be reasonable ?—Five years, I think, would be a reasonable time.

20611. Have you formed any opinion as to the amount of capital that is invested in distilleries and breweries and manufactories of liquor ?—I know that the amount must be very large.

20612. What is your idea as to the amount ?—I really do not know, but it must be a good many millions.

20613. You have not formed an idea ?—Not any definite idea.

20614. Then that would mean, I suppose, if your theory were carried out, that prohibition would only come into effect five years from the time of the notice being given ?—Exactly.

20615. After the expiration of five years' notice being given to all concerned ?—Yes, and in the meantime public opinion would be preparing for the advent of the new law, and in this way it would be more likely to be fully enforced.

20616. That is your view ?—Certainly.

20617. Have you any knowledge of the revenue which is derived by the Dominion and the provinces and municipalities from the liquor traffic ?—A large amount, probably seven or eight millions.

20618. Would it not be necessary for the governments of the Dominion and of the provinces and municipalities to raise that revenue, or a large portion of it, in some way ?—Certainly.

20619. Have you arrived at any conclusion as to the best method of doing that ? On what classes of the population would you lay the additional burdens ?—I would leave that with the Finance Minister to determine.

20620. You have come to some conclusion as to how that burden would be distributed upon the population, I suppose ?—Sir A. T. Galt was one of our Finance Ministers for many years, and he was one of the most able men in the Dominion. He declared in a public speech delivered in Sherbrooke some years ago, that if the liquor trade was prohibited, he, as Finance Minister, would undertake to replace the lost revenue without any additional burdens being placed on the people.

20621. That was many years ago ?—Yes.

20622. Do you see how that could be done ? That was a platform speech, I assume ?—Yes.

20623. I desire to ascertain from you how you think such additional income as would have to be raised to replace not necessarily the whole revenue that would be sacrificed by a prohibitory law, but a considerable portion of it, should be levied?—I think if the Government would take away about one half of the protection now afforded to manufacturers, it would make up more than the loss on the liquor traffic and benefit the country largely.

20624. You would replace the lost revenue on the liquor by further reducing the revenue from customs duties?—I do not think it would further reduce it, but would rather increase the revenue.

20625. You mean to reduce the tariff?—Yes, by all means and increase the revenue.

20626. You think the effect of your proposal would be to increase the revenue of the Dominion?—I do.

20627. By having larger importations?—Yes.

20628. Would not that necessarily result in a reduction of all manufactures?—Certainly.

20629. Then that being the case, your scheme would result really in throwing the burdens upon those who have their capital invested in manufactures?—Not altogether.

20630. But largely?—To some extent. I would have protection very much modified.

20631. You are speaking of the tariff generally on all imported goods, I suppose?—Manufactures should exist in the country for the general advantage of the whole people, and not for the special advantage of the manufacturers themselves.

20632. You spoke of a large reduction of the tariff on imported goods, did you not?—Yes.

20633. Would you make such a reduction as would make manufacturing in Canada unprofitable?—No, I do not think it would render it unprofitable if there was a 20 per cent tariff. I think any legitimate manufacture should exist under that, and if it could not exist on 20 per cent tariff with the added cost of importation then I think it should not exist at all, but the capital should be diverted to some other purpose.

20634. You have spoken of Sir Alexander Galt, a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect, and who is personally known to me. I ask whether you know what the tariff was at the time he made the statement to which you have referred?—The tariff at that time was something like 25 per cent, I think.

20635. It was 20 or 25 per cent if I remember correctly. Was it not before the introduction of what is called the “National Policy,” and has not the tariff been largely increased since then?—It has been very much increased since.

20636. Have the importations during the period decreased?—I really do not know. I do not think they have much increased. The country has been progressing and more importations were required; probably that kept them from decreasing to any great extent.

20637. Is it your impression that the higher tariff has seriously checked importations?—I have no doubt that our importations have been very seriously checked. A great many of the goods we formerly imported we cannot import now.

20638. Your theory is that the loss of revenue to the Dominion which would ensue from the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law could be replaced by a reduction in the tariff of customs duties upon imported goods, which would have the effect of decreasing, if not preventing manufacturing in Canada, but would result in increasing importations that would augment the revenue from customs duties?—My opinion is that a 20 per cent tariff would pay all legitimate expenses of government with a prohibitory liquor law in existence.

20639. Have I summarized your opinions correctly?—That is correct.

20640. Could Canadian manufacturers continue to carry on business profitably with a 20 per cent tariff?—That would be for them to consider, I really do not know.

20641. What effect would a twenty per cent tariff have upon home manufacturers?—A twenty per cent tariff would give legitimate protection to the manufacturer, I believe.

20642. But suppose in that opinion you were mistaken, would you sacrifice the home manufacturer?—If the home manufacturer could not exist without enormous burdens being placed on the people, I would certainly sacrifice him.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

20643. If he could not live under a twenty per cent tariff, you would allow him to be abolished?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20644. Continuing another branch of the inquiry, I desire to ask you how you propose to prevent liquor being brought into the country?—The Government of the country would have to organize a detective force to seize any contraband liquor found in the country and destroy it.

20645. Have you given this matter some consideration?—I have.

20646. You know we have a coast line with bays and indentations of all kinds, both on the Atlantic and Pacific?—Yes.

20647. Do you think any force, small in number comparatively, could police these shores and prevent liquor being brought in?—I would not depend so much on a force to prevent the introduction of liquor as on a force to seize smuggled liquor in the country and destroy it. When the police were satisfied that the liquor was contraband, it would be immediately destroyed.

20648. How would you have a staff of officers to do that work?—Let each municipality look after the contraband goods found within that municipality.

20649. And who would pay the officers?—The municipalities would do it willingly.

20650. Would you leave it to the municipalities to pay them?—Certainly.

20651. Then you would make each municipality keep a certain staff of officers permanently to do that work?—It would not be necessary to do that. The officers already in office could do it, and probably they would not find their duties too onerous even by attending to those matters.

20652. Do you know whether any of the rural districts of this province have officers permanently on duty as constables, for my opinion is that generally they are men in other avocations of life, and who merely attend to those duties when needed?—Take this municipality of St. Rémi, to which I have referred. The present officer could attend to those duties as readily as he now attends to the illicit sale of liquor.

20653. I understood you to say that people came from there to Quebec and got what liquor they needed?—Yes.

20654. With the Quebec market taken away, would those purchases be illegal?—Yes.

20655. Does not the fact that the people are able to buy liquor in Quebec act as a safety valve in the way of preventing illegal sale in the municipality to which you have referred? But if you take away that opportunity of obtaining liquor in this city, would not the illegal sale be increased?—But all sale in that municipality is illegal.

20656. Would not that illegal sale be increased?—Not if there were general prohibition, which would prevent the importation and manufacture of liquor, for there would be no liquor in the country except what was brought in from outside.

20657. So you think the present officers could much more easily prevent smuggling than now?—Much more easily than now.

20658. And would you throw the cost of that supervision on the respective municipalities?—Yes.

20659. And that supervision would take place mostly in places contiguous to the coast?—Not necessarily.

20660. I mean so that the liquor would not get further into the country?—Could not a vessel bring in liquor from St. Pierre to this port and carry it up to Montreal as readily as it does now?

20661. You would have provision made to search such vessels I suppose?—I would have the Government adopt every provision necessary to prevent its introduction.

20662. I thought you said you would throw the expense on the municipalities?—I say the municipalities would do the work.

20663. In reply to the objection of the Government being called upon to provide a force sufficiently large to extend over the vast boundary, you suggested that the work could be done by the municipalities?—I would have some officers appointed by the Dominion Government, but, in addition, each municipality might take measures to prevent illicit sale, or the introduction of liquor within its own boundaries.

20664. Would you have search made on vessels?—Certainly.



20665. Then if the search was made and illicit liquor found, that liquor, of course, would never reach Montreal?—Yes.

20666. Would not the Dominion Government be called upon to pay the expense of making the search, and thus enter upon the work entrusted to the municipalities?—No. The municipalities would have nothing to do with the searching of vessels, for that would be the duty of the Dominion Government.

20667. Would you have another staff of officers employed also?—No. The staff employed by the Dominion Government would watch the Atlantic coast, and their work would be supplemented, in the event of liquor escaping them, by the officers employed in the rural districts by the different municipalities, which would look after liquor brought into their own districts.

20668. How would the cost of all this work be provided?—The cost would be a mere trivial one compared with the cost of regulating the license system now.

20669. We will take the city of Quebec. We are told that at present there are seventy-one officers, and that those officers have to take charge of all matters including infringements of the city by-laws and the collection of taxes. Would that force be employed in the way you have indicated?—No.

20670. There is still the question of expense to consider?—Of course it would be necessary to maintain the force, at least for some time.

20671. Have you any doubt in your own mind that there would be a necessity for imposing additional taxes on the people in order to enforce a prohibitory law?—I do not think a single additional cent would be necessary.

20672. Do you look upon the liquor traffic as an unmixed evil?—I do.

20673. Do you look upon the licensing of it as a sin?—I do.

20674. Do you think, therefore, for one moment that with an unmixed evil and with a thing that is a sin, it should be allowed to be continued five years after notice is given?—It would be better to get rid of it in five years rather than not at all.

20675. Would you be content with getting rid of it in five years?—I think so.

20676. You would put in a plea for five years rather than pay compensation to distillers and brewers?—It would take that time anyway.

20677. How?—Because we are not going to abolish it in five years.

20678. You say that the law should provide for five years' notice to distillers?—Yes.

20679. Then, you would pass a law that would, for a period of five years, keep a sin and an unmixed evil on the people, rather than pay distillers compensation and cut off the traffic at once?—Yes, because we could not get rid of it earlier.

20680. Would you favour the reimbursement of distillers?—No.

20681. You have said that you would not reimburse them, because you would give five years' notice, and during that period they would have an opportunity to wind up their business?—Yes.

20682. Would you rather not, with an unmixed evil and a sin, pay a certain sum of money to get rid of it at once?—I would, if I could.

20683. Then that would rest with the people?—Those five years would give the distillers ample time.

20684. During all that time you would allow this evil to prevail among the people, if what you have said be true?—It is true.

20685. Then, instead of remunerating the distillers, you would like them to run on just five years?—Certainly.

20686. If the traffic is an unmixed evil and a sin, would it not be right to give remuneration at once and terminate the evil?—I would rather remunerate them than keep them five years in existence. I would, however, prefer to give them five years' notice, because at the end of that time we would be more certain to carry out a prohibitory law. If compensation were granted and a prohibitory law enacted, the country would not be likely to see its satisfactory enforcement.

20687. You have told us that the Scott Act was a failure in Ontario for lack of enforcement?—Yes, that was one reason.

20688. Why was it not enforced?—The Government had no heart in enforcing it.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

20689. How much heart would the Federal Government have in enforcing a general prohibitory law?—It would be much more easily enforced than local laws of that kind. If no liquor was allowed to be in the country at all, it would be much more easy to regulate any small quantity that might come in illicitly.

20690. You have stated that the reason of the non-enforcement of the Scott Act was the want of heart on the part of the Government?—That was one of the reasons.

20691. Could that cause be got rid of?—I suppose so, if public opinion were sufficiently strong to endanger the existence of the Government.

20692. Public opinion was so strong as to sweep Ontario in favour of the Scott Act and the great majority of the people voted for it, but three years afterwards repealed it. Do you not look upon the Government very much as the creature of public opinion?—Yes.

20693. Yet you say the Government were half-hearted in enforcing the law?—I believe they were.

20694. You know the City of Quebec, of course?—Yes.

20695. Would you consider a prohibitory law could be enforced in the present state of public opinion here?—I could enforce it much more readily than the present license law.

20696. Would you consider you could enforce thoroughly in the city of Quebec a prohibitory liquor law?—I believe it could be enforced very well.

20697. Do you believe it could be enforced thoroughly?—There is no law thoroughly enforced.

20698. But must not this law to be a success be thoroughly enforced?—The law against stealing is not thoroughly enforced.

20699. Do you put the drinking of liquor, or sale of liquor, and stealing on the same footing?—The cases are perfectly analogous.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

20700. What do you say is the name of the firm with which you are connected?—John Ross & Co., wholesale grocers.

20701. Do they sell liquor?—They have not sold liquor for 35 years.

20702. They discontinued its sale at that time?—Yes.

20703. Did they go out of the liquor business?—Yes.

20704. Does your firm do a large business?—Yes.

20705. You are chief clerk, I understand?—Yes.

20706. You have said you have had experience in municipal prohibition. Do you believe that municipal prohibition helps to lessen the drinking?—Greatly.

20707. Of course religious and moral influences have entered into the decrease of drinking?—Undoubtedly.

20708. Has prohibition helped religious teachers and moral agitators?—Greatly.

20709. Speaking of the license law as you have observed it in Quebec: is it quite generally violated?—I think it is.

20710. Do you believe that as vigorous efforts as can be made to enforce the provisions of the license law have been put forth?—I do not think so.

20711. Do you find that men who hold licenses are concerned about having illicit sellers interfered with?—I think so. It would be to their interest to have them interfered with.

20712. Yet there is considerable illicit sale?—I believe so.

20713. You have said something about the cost of regulating the trade. Is the cost of regulating the trade by licensing very heavy?—I think so.

20714. In what way?—Look at the large force of police, and the Recorder's Court, and the Police Magistrate we have in the city. They must all be supported, and a large portion of their duty is in regard to cases connected with the liquor traffic.

20715. You think if the liquor traffic did not exist, there would be no necessity for a considerable portion of those expenses?—Three-fourths of the expenses could be done away with after, say, ten years of the non-existence of the liquor traffic.

20716. You have already said that you favour prohibition, and you have given reasons why you believe the prohibition of the manufacture, importation, as well as the

sale of intoxicating liquors would be more easily enforced than the regulation of the trade now is done, and more easily enforced than is local prohibition. Have you observed, as a business man connected with an important and large business firm, the effect of the liquor traffic on general business interests outside of the liquor business? If so, please state what is your observation.—My observation is that it has been injurious to any legitimate business.

20717. In what way?—A large proportion of the failures I have known have been caused through the liquor traffic.

20718. In what way?—Country traders become addicted to the use of liquor and neglect their business, and that fact accounts for a large proportion of the country failures.

20719. You think that a good proportion of the insolvencies of country traders are due to the drink habit?—That is my observation.

*By the Chairman :*

20720. Do you mean due to intemperance?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20721. What do you regard as intemperance?—Intemperance I would regard as an excessive use of alcoholic liquors.

20722. Do you mean by excessive use the taking of drink frequently?—Yes.

20723. Do you consider that intemperance is habitual drinking?—There is a worse case than that of a man who goes on a spree once a month or once in two or three weeks. He is better off than the man who is half drunk every day.

20724. You think the periodical spree is not quite as bad as the habitual use?—It is not.

20725. Speaking about a prohibitory law and the cost of enforcement by an army of officials, do you think that the liquor traffic question and liquor legislation should be considered wholly in the light of dollars and cents?—No, I do not.

20726. We had it in evidence in the maritime provinces from the largest employer of labour there, if not the largest individual employer in the Dominion, that he believed it would pay the Dominion Government to spend every dollar of revenue to enforce a prohibitory law. Would you take such strong ground?—I would hardly go that length.

20727. I suppose you think it is not a mere matter of dollars and cents when the moral, physical and mental welfare of the community are concerned?—No, that should be taken into account, the general moral and spiritual welfare of the people.

20728. You believe that even in Quebec a prohibitory law could be enforced if the proper machinery were provided?—I have no doubt of it at all.

20929. Do you believe that a prohibitory law would be as well enforced as the prohibitory provisions of the license law now are?—Much better, because there would be very much less to regulate. All the liquor in the city now is legal, at least no one can interfere with all the licensed vendors. Under a prohibitory law, liquor, wherever found, would be contraband, and would therefore be much more easily looked after.

20730. Speaking of the liquor trade being an unmixed evil and the licensing of the trade, do you believe the granting of compensation to those engaged in the trade would be a wrong use of the public money?—I do.

20731. In regard to giving five years' notice: do you mean that the trade now exists and is likely to exist for some time?—That is my reason simply.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20732. You said you would compensate them by giving them five years?—I did not suggest that that was the reason why I would give them five years' notice.

20733. Are you in favour of compensation or not?—I am not in favour of compensation. I think it would be wrong to compensate.

20734. Then you would not give five years if you could avoid it?—No.

20735. You would shut up the traffic at once?—Yes.

20736. Has your experience in connection with prohibition been confined to St. Rémi?—No, not at all.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

20737. Where else have you seen it in operation?—I have travelled all through this province.

20738. Has your experience been confined to this province?—I have been in Ontario also.

The CHAIRMAN called the attention of witness to the previous part of his testimony, in which he suggested that five years' notice should be given to manufacturers and distillers, and that he had now said that he would wipe the business out without compensation,

WITNESS—My reason for saying that I would give five years' notice was because I knew that a prohibitory law could not possibly be enacted and put into force under five years; but if I were enabled to enact a prohibitory law to-day, I would do so and wipe out the trade at once.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20739. You think it would take five years after the enactment of such a law before it could really be operated?—Yes.

20740. You have had experience in this parish, I believe, and throughout other parts of Quebec?—Yes.

20741. And in some in Ontario?—Yes.

20742. What places in Ontario?—Very little there. I lived one year in Ontario.

20743. Where did you live?—I think in the County of Renfrew. That was a long time ago.

20744. Was a prohibitory law in force?—No. Liquor was being distributed like water while I lived there.

20745. What was the cause? Was a railway being constructed there?—It was the custom of the country, and men drank liquor like water.

20746. You say there was no prohibitory law there then?—No.

20747. Is there one there now?—No.

20748. Was your experience of Ontario confined to Renfrew?—It was.

20749. When you resided there, was the use of liquor very much greater than at present?—Very likely; I have not been there for a long time, but I think it has improved very much.

20750. What kind of prohibition have you in the rural districts of the province: have you complete prohibition?—We have complete prohibition so far as the municipal government can give it.

20751. Is it illegal for a person to vend liquor in the municipality?—Yes.

20752. Is there a probability of residents in the municipality purchasing liquor outside and bringing it in for domestic use?—Yes.

20753. Then the kind of prohibition is merely a prohibition of the sale by tavern keepers?—Yes, that is the only prohibition.

20754. That is the only prohibition that prevails there?—Yes.

20755. The Scott Act was carried by many of the counties in Ontario, and even by large majorities in some counties?—Yes.

20756. You have given the Commissioners your opinion that the reason that the Act was repealed was its non-enforcement?—That is my opinion.

20757. The Act having been carried by large majorities and put into operation by the people of the county or locality by an overwhelming vote, to what do you attribute the apathy that has prevailed in enforcing it?—I attribute it to the fact that the Government did not appoint officials.

20758. But the Government did appoint officials.—Where were they?

20759. They appointed Stipendiaries and Inspectors. Why, then, was the Act not enforced? You have given an opinion. Is it not a fact that any person could lay information under the Scott Act; and if the people desired to have the law enforced, there was really no difficulty standing in the way?—I understood that the Government never appointed proper officials to enforce the Act.

20760. Why was the Act not enforced, when the people had the question practically in their own hands?—You assume that the Government did appoint officials, and then you ask me why the people did not enforce the Act.

20761. Although without experience of the law in Ontario; you have expressed the opinion that the Act was repealed because it was not enforced?—Yes.

20762. And in answer to a question you have said that this was because the Government was half-hearted in the matter, and did not see to the enforcement of the Act?—Yes.

20763. But the Government appointed officials?—Was that the case?

*By the Chairman :*

20764. To what Government do you refer?—I refer to both, but mainly to the Dominion Government.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20765. Has the Dominion Government anything to do with the appointment of officers to enforce the Scott Act?—Yes.

20766. You have found fault with the Government?—Yes, because they passed an Act and did not enforce it.

*By the Chairman :*

20767. Was it not the duty of the municipalities adopting the Act to see that it was carried out?—There was some conflict of authority.

20768. Would you consider that to be the duty of the municipalities?—I would.

20769. And you are of the opinion that the municipalities did not efficiently perform their duty?—I am.

20770. Yet you would thrust upon the municipal authorities to a very great extent the enforcement of a Dominion prohibitory law?—I would require their assistance.

20771. I think your answer was that you would leave the enforcement, the watching for smugglers and all those features of a prohibitory law, very largely to the municipal authorities?—No.

20772. My impression is that you said that the district should be looked after by the municipal authorities?—The law being a Dominion one, I should wish to see the Dominion Government first strive to enact it, and then require the municipalities to give them all aid possible.

20773. You would, in the rural districts, largely look to the municipalities to carry out the law?—Yes.

20774. You are convinced from what you have seen in the past where the Scott Act was in operation that the people did not carry out the law?—I think not.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20775. You never resided in a Scott Act county?—No.

20776. Your opinion is based on what you have heard?—Yes.

20777. You have no personal knowledge at all?—No.

20778. Do you know of any country where a prohibitory law is in force?—In the State of Maine there is a prohibitory law.

20779. Do you know anything as to how the law is enforced there?—Nothing further than that I have the testimony of Neal Dow, the father of that law, who says it is as well enforced as any other law in the State.

20780. I understood you to say that you would replace the revenue that was lost by the abolition of the liquor trade by lowering the duties now imposed on imports?—Yes.

20781. You would not have a higher tariff on imported goods than 20 per cent, I believe?—Sir Alexander Galt declared that would do, and I consider him a much better authority than I am.

20782. You take his word for it?—I do.

20783. You have no knowledge, I suppose, as to how it could be done?—No, I have not thought of it sufficiently.

20784. You have expressed your opinion that there are a great many failures owing to intemperance on the part of merchants?—A good proportion, I said.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

20785. Do you know what proportion?—Probably 20 per cent.

20786. Do you include in the 20 those who drank liquor in the morning, those who took wine for dinner every day, or those who drank to excess?—They had got largely to excess before they failed, as a rule. They were no doubt very moderate for years, but they ultimately became very immoderate.

20787. Had they been immoderate for a certain number of years before they failed?—Yes.

20788. Were there no local conditions connected with trade that caused their failure?—There might have been.

20789. Those you have not taken into consideration?—Yes.

20790. Might not one be keen competition in business?—Yes.

20791. Also the opening of new avenues of trade?—No doubt that would influence the matter, but men half drunk are in no condition to compete with clearheaded men.

20792. Does your trade give credit to merchants who are half drunk all the time?—No. So soon as a trader becomes in that condition, we stop his credit.

20793. Then you would trade with such men until they get into a condition of drinking immoderately?—We do not close their credit so long as they pay fairly well.

20794. You attribute those failures to the fact that the merchants were immoderate drinkers and were half drunk all the time?—No, to the fact that they drank immoderately, not were half drunk all the time.

20795. How do you classify them?—Men who drink intoxicating liquors to excess I call drunkards.

20796. Are those the men you refer to—those who drink intoxicating liquors to excess?—Yes.

*By the Chairman:*

20797. I think you have said that in your opinion if a prohibitory law were enacted, about three-fourths of the expense of maintaining Magistrates and police would be unnecessary?—Yes, in the course of time, not immediately.

20798. How long after the enactment or passing of a prohibitory law would that statement be true?—The process would be a gradual one, and would apply to insane asylums, and jails and all those institutions, but it would be a gradual process.

20799. Take Quebec. There is the Recorder's office, for instance, and the police force. The police force does not appear to be a very large one. The men have to deal with breaches of the statute and by-laws respecting clearing snow, also the collection of indebtedness to the city, and it has been given in evidence before us that the cases apart from those connected with drunkenness numbered about 2,800—these being largely cases in connection with collection of debts and breaches of the by-law, and of this number 2,500 were criminal cases. With that state of things, how could you abolish the Recorder's Court and police force?—I would not abolish them.

20800-1. Then how would you economize and save three-fourths of the amount?—We could not economize to the extent of three-fourths in Quebec, but taking the municipalities all over the country, there would be a smaller proportion of those officers needed in the city.

20802. What expenses do you think a municipality could save if we had a prohibitory law?—All expenses flowing from the liquor traffic, and its consequences on the people.

20803. Give the Commissioners some idea what they are, in your opinion?—Insanity is very much increased by the liquor traffic, and in course of time that would decrease, and the same would be the case in regard to crime.

20804. Would it decrease to the extent that the people would be able to do away with the institutions altogether?—No.

20805. Then prohibition would not do away with crime to an extent that would enable the people to dispense with the Magistrates?—No, but the expenditure could be reduced.

20806. Or do away with the police force?—No; you could reduce it, but not do away with it. In course of time it would be reduced by as large a proportion as three-fourths.

20807. Would not the expense of the Police Court and the Magistrate's office be much greater in cities than in the rural districts?—Yes, no doubt.

20808. You do not think that either the police force, or the Recorder or Police Magistrate could be abolished in a city like Quebec?—No, not entirely.

20809. Have you considered the amount of revenue which the province derives from the liquor traffic?—No.

20810. Do you know what that revenue is in the Province of Quebec?—I do not.

20811. The Commissioners have had returns submitted to them showing that it is in the neighbourhood of \$600,000 from the granting of licenses for the sale of liquor alone. In what way would you replace that revenue to the treasury of the province?—If there was no other way of raising that revenue, I would raise it by direct taxation.

20812. By direct taxation on the people you would raise \$600,000 taken out of the treasury of the province?—Yes.

20813. Do you think that would be a popular movement in the province?—I think it would replace the revenue, whether the movement was a popular one or not.

20814. Do you think it would be popular?—Possibly not. I think few people are enlightened enough to support it.

20815. Then it would not be a popular movement?—No.

20816. You spoke of a general prohibitory law being more easily enforced than a prohibitory law in the municipal districts?—Yes.

20817. You further said it could be more easily enforced?—Yes.

20818. Is the law not enforced in those municipal districts simply because public sentiment is not in favour of it by a considerable preponderance?—No doubt.

20819. Are you quite certain that public sentiment throughout the Dominion is preponderatingly in favour of a general prohibitory law at this time?—I think the public sentiment of the Dominion is in favour of a prohibitory law, but I do not think there is a preponderating influence in that direction yet; but the educative effect of one or two years' existence of the law would bring public sentiment up, as it has done in the municipality to which I have referred.

20820. Am I correct in concluding that you think the practical way of bringing about prohibition would be to give the interested parties engaged in the manufacture of spirits and intoxicating liquors 5 years' notice, and at the end of that period the law might be inadaquately enforced, but in your opinion it would be such an educator that in time it would be efficiently enforced?—I think there would be such an educative force at work during those five years that a prohibitory law could be enforced afterwards.

20821. Then at the end of five years public sentiment would be such that the law could be efficiently enforced. I understood you to say that it would require some experience of a prohibitory law before it could be effectively enforced?—I think it could be effectually enforced.

20822. Without any experience of the working of it?—Yes. I would regard those five years as being practically a prohibition period, because it was certain that at the end of five years prohibition would take place, and the people would prepare for the change.

20823. It would not be prohibition if the manufacture of liquor were permitted to go on, and there would, under that state of things, be no experience of prohibition by the people?—No.

20824. Do you think a longer period than that would be required to educate the people up to an efficient enforcement of the law?—I think it would be necessary to have a longer period than that. I believe the longer it is in existence the stronger public sentiment will be in its favour.

20825. Then there would be five years of notice; and how many years would you put down as necessary for educational purposes?—I believe it could be immediately fairly well enforced. It would be better year by year as it continued in force, and every year beneficial effects would become manifest. Of course it could not be passed until a majority of the electors of the Dominion wished it. That is the first step. If the majority decided to have prohibition and it was enacted, then when it had been in existence two or three years, it would gradually acquire more strength and be supported thoroughly by public sentiment.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

20826. I am led to ask you these questions in consequence of the statement you made that a general prohibitory law would be more easily enforced than a prohibitory law in a municipality?—Perhaps you misunderstood my answer to that question. My reason for giving that answer was this: any quantity of liquor exists in the country now under the license system legally, and can be sold. Under a prohibitory law there would be no liquor imported or manufactured, and there would be no liquor in existence except a small quantity of the contraband article, and wherever that was found the very fact of its being liquor would prove it contraband, and consequently it would be much more easily detected and proved than is illegal liquor now among legal liquor. That is my reason for entertaining the belief that a general prohibitory law would be much more effectual than the efforts now made to regulate the traffic.

20827. But would it not be necessary that public sentiment should be such as would encourage an effectual enforcement of the law?—Certainly.

20828. Because you have obtained prohibitory measures in those municipalities simply on account of a preponderating sentiment in favour of them?—Yes.

20829. Would you permit the sale of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes?—Certainly.

20830. How would you regulate that sale?—Just as the sale of all other poisons is regulated now; I would register the druggist and doctor.

20831. Are you aware that a system of that kind is in existence at present? That in some of the municipal districts in Quebec where they have prohibition there are licensed vendors, and also that in counties where the Scott Act is in operation there are also licensed vendors? Have you made yourself at all acquainted with the way in which the law has been observed by those licensed vendors?—I think it has been greatly abused.

20832. From the information placed before the Commissioners the law has certainly not been observed in its spirit at least, if in its letter. Would there be danger of the same thing occurring under a general prohibitory law?—Not so much danger, although the danger would exist. The taste for liquor would gradually die out to a far greater extent than could possibly be the case where it can be had at almost every door.

20833. Some reference has been made to the State of Maine, where they have a prohibitory law in force, and I think that law has been in existence for perhaps 40 years?—It has been in existence a long time.

20834. Can you tell the Commissioners if that law is enforced?—Personally I do not know.

20835. Would you be surprised to hear that in Portland the commitments for drunkenness are larger than in the city of Montreal?—I would really be surprised to hear that. The municipal government of Portland may have fallen into the hands of the liquor men, for all I know. If they have to do with the enforcement of the law I should not be astonished at that state of things.

20836. I have had a statement supplied to me for the information of the Commission, prepared by an ardent advocate of temperance and prohibition, and for one year, the figures for which we are given, the commitments, so far as I can remember—that is commitments for drunkenness and offences against the liquor law—were 50 per thousand of the population, and I think in Montreal the commitments of all kinds do not exceed 45 per thousand.—Indeed.

*By Judge McDonald:*

20837. Would you favour a vote being taken over the whole Dominion on this question?—Yes, I would favour that strongly.

20838. Supposing that vote to be taken, and you found the Maritime Provinces voting strongly in favour of prohibition, Quebec strongly against prohibition, Ontario about evenly balanced, Manitoba strongly in favour, and British Columbia strongly against, would you consider it just to enforce a prohibitory law in British Columbia with a population ten to one against it?—You could get out of all the difficulty by allowing each Local Government the privilege of passing a prohibitory law.



*By the Chairman :*

20839. But that would not be a Dominion law ?—No ; I would rather have a Dominion law, but I think the Local Government should have the right to pass a prohibitory law. I would rather have the Dominion Parliament pass a prohibitory law, but if that is impracticable or impossible, I would like a local measure in the meantime.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20840. What proportion of the inmates of asylums are incarcerated there on account of excessive use of drink, either on their own part or on the part of their parents ?—I have no knowledge other than newspaper reports.

20841. Have you any knowledge at all on the subject ?—No.

20842. Where could the Commissioners obtain a copy of the speech delivered by Sir Alexander Galt, to which you have referred ?—I do not know.

20843. How many years have elapsed since it was delivered ?—Twelve or fifteen.

20844. Would you prohibit the importation of liquor in the different provinces for sacramental purposes ?—I think intoxicating liquor should not be used for sacramental purposes.

20845. Would you prohibit those who think differently from you from using it ?—Certainly not.

REV. FRANÇOIS HENRI BÉLANGER, Curé de St. Roch de Québec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20846. About how many years have you been in orders ?—I have been in the priesthood sixteen years.

20847. And as curate ?—About seven years.

20848. How do you find the license law to work ?—It is altogether defective.

20849. The law itself ?—No, I believe the law is good ; but it is not enforced.

20850. To what do you attribute the violation of the law ?—This is what I ascertain. The number of licenses is excessive ; and besides, the punishment for the fourth or fifth offence is the same as for the first. If I understand correctly, the law makes a gradation between the first, second and third offences, whilst in the majority of cases, if not in all, there is no difference made in the punishment of offenders. I know of several persons at St. Roch, who were prosecuted for third and fourth offence, and punished as though it was the first offence only. I know of a mistress keeping a house of ill-fame, who has been prosecuted repeatedly for selling liquor without a license, but she has always been condemned to pay the same fine, and the punishment is never increased.

20851. Do you know of any cases where the fines imposed were not paid ?—I have been informed, and in a certain manner I know, that one individual on whom a fine was imposed continued selling liquor until he was able to pay the fine. Then again I can say that two weeks ago the hotel keepers in my parish had not paid their licenses renewable May 1st. I am in favour of the present law, as much as I understand of it, but I am also in favour of its complete execution.

20852. Do you desire to stop the abuses ?—I desire that the law be enforced.

20853. Do you know if there are any illegal sales of liquor in your parish ?—There have been, but I do not know if there are any now. Proceedings have been taken in several cases ; but I do not know of any one in my parish who has been imprisoned for selling liquor illegally.

20854. Are there many hotels in your parish ?—There are forty in all the parish, and sixty liquor dealers.

20855. Do you think that is a considerable number ?—Considerably too many.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

20856. What remedy would you suggest?—We ought to be much more strict in granting licenses. In the majority of cases, the people to whom the licenses are granted have signed, even the inn-keepers themselves. It is only necessary to examine the documents on which the licenses have been granted to prove this. I would recommend that we should be more strict in granting licenses. However, I should prefer that they were not so numerous.

20857. Is there much selling of liquor on Sunday?—Plenty.

20858. Less by the licensed grocers than the hotel-keepers?—Certainly. I draw the attention of the Commission to the fact that the parish of St. Roch, Que., is about a mile square. I speak of what is to be found south of the River St. Charles, inhabited by a population of twenty thousand souls. There are at least one hundred licensed liquor dealers there, and proclaimed as such. So I think I have reason to say, that we have granted too many licenses altogether.

20859. In your opinion, has drunkenness increased or diminished during the last few years?—In my opinion it has increased considerably. I have noticed what has been stated before the Commission, but in spite of that evidence, I retain my opinion. I naturally speak particularly of the parish of St. Roch. Drunkenness is the great plague of the country, as well as the city.

20860. Do you think it would be to the interest of the temperance cause if the duties on strong drink were increased and the duties on light wines reduced?—The law that has been passed in France is perfectly just. The duties on the strong drinks are high while the light wines are allowed to go duty free, or nearly so.

20861. Is a general prohibitory law desirable, in your opinion?—I do not place on the same footing the abuse and the moderate use of liquor. A prohibitory law would not secure any practical, it would not secure any good results. According to experience there is more liquor sold where the traffic is forbidden than where, with necessary precautions, it is allowed. A law passed with the object of restraining something evil in us, has the effect of forming public opinion in an opposite direction; that is very evident.

*By the Chairman :*

20862. Are there many places selling liquor in your parish?—In my parish there are more than 100 persons selling liquor, including barkeepers and grocers. The population in my parish is about 2,000.

20863. Are there many places selling liquor without a license?—I am perfectly sure there are, but I do not include them when I say that 100 persons are selling liquor there.

20864. You are speaking only of recognized licensed places?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20865. Have you any experience in regard to the working of that Act?—My information in regard to the working of the Scott Act is only learned from others.

20866. Have you had any experience in regard to local option under the present license law, where municipalities have refused to grant certificates for the issue of license?—If that system were enforced, I consider it would be beneficial.

20867. Do you think it would be preferable to the Scott Act?—I am not at all in favour of the Scott Act.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20868. In regard to liquor allowed to be sold in licensed places, have you considered the question of permitting the use of light wines and doing away with the heavier liquors: do you think such would be an advantage?—I have already said that I would be in favour of light wines, but not in favour of heavier liquors.

20869. In regard to wine used for sacramental purposes, must it be fermented wine?—Of course.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod.*

20870. Have you observed whether any proportion of poverty, crime, family disorder, and neglect of religion are traceable to drink?—I am obliged to admit that, to a large extent, they are due to liquor.

20871. Do you think that the legalization of the drink trade encourages the drink habit?—I am perfectly sure that if the law were executed, it would prove a good one; but, of course, if the law is not enforced, excess comes.

20872. Would you have strong restrictions placed upon licensees?—Certainly; I desire the law to be executed.

20873. Have you had an opportunity to compare the condition of a community in which there are licensed places for the sale of liquor with the condition of a community where municipal prohibition is enforced?—Not at all. I know that where the Scott Act was in force, I am not speaking of all places but a certain place. According to the statement of Bishop Beauchamp, Bishop of Chicoutimi, liquor was sold, and liquor was sold to even a greater extent than when that Act was not in force.

20874. Do you believe that a law against an evil thing has any effect in forming and strengthening public sentiment against that evil thing?—I do not consider liquor is an evil and a bad thing in itself. It is a good thing, and it is only the excess of it that is bad.

20875. Do you think that a law which would prevent the excess would strengthen public opinion against the excess?—Certainly.

20876. But you do not think that liquor in itself is bad?—Liquor in itself is certainly not bad.

*By Judge McDonald:*

20877. Can you conceive that public sentiment would be opposed to a law to prevent excess?—No. Public opinion will always be in favour of a good thing.

20878. If a law that is flagrantly and continuously violated remains on the statute-book?—Certainly, if it is continuously violated.

20879. Will it not be apt to conduce to a feeling of contempt for law?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

20880. Is the use of liquor in moderation a sin or an evil thing?—No, it is a good thing.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

20881. Have you noticed that the moderate use tends to the excessive use of liquor?—You may say the same of all good things. Of course the use of a good thing in excess does harm, and it becomes bad.

20882. Do you think there is a stronger tendency to excess in the use of liquor than there is in the use of other things?—I am obliged to say that there is.

REV. RICHARD WHITMORE NORMAN, Dean of the Cathedral of Holy Trinity, Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

20883. How long have you resided in Quebec?—About four and a half years.

20884. I believe you resided in Montreal previous to that time?—Yes, for over twenty years.

*By Judge McDonald :*

20885. What is the position of the Church of England in regard to the wine to be used in the holy communion ; is it to be fermented or unfermented wine?—Do you mean in this country ?

20886. I mean in the ecclesiastical province of Canada?—The Provincial Synod of the ecclesiastical province of Canada a few years ago, I think in 1886, passed a resolution, a canon in fact, that the wine to be used in the holy communion shall be always fermented wine. It was passed by the Provincial Synod, which is the highest assembly of the Anglican community in Canada.

20887. Does your own opinion accord with the canon?—Entirely.

20888. Have you considered the question of the advisability of encouraging the use of what are called light wines and beers, and seeking to restrict the use of the heavier and spirituous liquors?—I have considered it, but not perhaps very closely. I think it would be highly desirable if the people could be induced to take light wines or beers rather than the strong spirituous liquors which they now consume. I think there are one or two very important points to be considered in regard to this question, which, whether we be total abstainers or not, are of vital consequence to the community. In my opinion, one of the objects to aim at is a proper supervision of the quality of the liquor that is sold in places of public entertainment. I know from my experience in Montreal that the number of places where liquor is sold is out of all proportion to the population and is far too large. And though I have not the personal knowledge myself, yet I have reason to believe that the quality of the liquor sold is most injurious to health, as well as highly intoxicating. The number of places where liquor is sold should be very much curtailed, and there should be, if possible, some authority, such as an Inspector, who would test the quality of the liquor offered for sale. I am not in favour of prohibition, because I do not think it could possibly be observed, and it could not prove effectual. If the people wish to drink, they will drink, and the only result is that a certain amount of the spirit of deception is fostered. It is a very demoralizing thing for anybody or any community to get into the habit of breaking a law. If you break one law you will probably break another, and this injures the moral sense of the individual very much. If you have a high license in force, the quality of the liquor is always bad, and it is therefore more injurious to the health of those who partake of it. I am inclined to think that where prohibition has been the law, it has not succeeded. At the hotels in the city of Portland, which I frequently visit, you may order what you like. It is exceedingly bad liquor, still you can get it ; and I think that very fact is injurious to the moral sense of the community, namely, that although a prohibitive law is on the statute-book, the people openly violate it. It is true the hotel-keepers can be fined, but they compensate themselves from their sales. I think the true remedy for drunkenness is the education of the people. I am of the opinion that indulgence in spirituous liquors is in proportion to the education of the people, and certainly it does not prevail to the same extent it did some years ago, and I hope that education, moral suasion and good example will produce fruit in a larger degree among the community at large. It is useless to pass laws which do not carry with them the weight of public opinion ; they become dead letters, and prove injurious to the community. I do not desire to speak on questions of finance and revenue, because those are not my business. I look upon this subject, and this is principally due to my calling, from the moral standpoint ; and what we should try to do is, to diminish intoxication by the adoption of those remedies of which I have spoken, by diminishing the number of places where liquor is sold and by instituting a proper inspection of the quality of the liquors sold. Much can be done by educating the young in the

matter ; and having had during my life a great deal to do with young people, and I hope having had some influence for good over them, I have endeavoured to make them total abstainers. While I do not consider alcoholic liquors to be wrong or injurious if taken in moderation, I consider that if young people grow up without knowing the taste of liquor, they are spared many temptations of mankind, their pockets are not likely to be depleted, and moreover they do not need in a country like this, where the air is so bracing and exhilarating, stimulants to the extent perhaps as people who live in a damp climate may need them. I recommend all young people whom I train in any way, religiously or morally, not to know liquor, never to taste it and never to have anything to do with it ; but I do not recommend them to take the pledge, for I believe that voluntary abstinence is a higher act of self control than taking a formal pledge. I respect those who think otherwise than I do, and I am only expressing my own individual opinion. The prospects of Canada are highly favourable in that way. I think there is growing up among us a body of young people of both sexes who do not know what the taste of liquor is, and have no temptation to take it, who enjoy good health ; and although it is perfectly possible to be sinful and at the same time be total abstainers, yet at the same they are spared many temptations which otherwise might befall them. Among my young acquaintances of both sexes, I scarcely know one who has ever tasted liquor, except when he or she has come to the Lord's table. I have yet to learn that any person coming in a proper frame of mind to that ordinance, will ever be likely to fall into intemperate habits by partaking of the cup at that sacred rite.

20889. Do you consider that a law on the Statute-book which is flagrantly and persistently violated has an evil effect on the community ?—I certainly think so.

20890. Is it apt to induce contempt for all law ?—It is apt to induce contempt for all law, and it tends to produce a confusion between what is absolutely and distinctly wrong, and what is simply wrong because it is illegal, and also it tends to bring about a habit of deception decidedly demoralizing.

20891. Have you in your experience of Canada found that there has been a great change in the social customs of the people in regard to the use of intoxicating liquors ?—Certainly ; I have noticed a change.

20892. Do you attribute that change to the influence of religion and education, or is it due wholly or in part to prohibitive legislation ?—I attribute part of it most distinctly to the way in which public opinion has been acted on by those good and respectable people with whom I do not agree exactly on this subject, those who are in favour of total abstinence. I was very pleased to see when I visited England and dined out among my relatives and at other houses, the proportion of people who took nothing in the way of stimulants and whose abstinence was not noticed, whereas when I was a boy, if a person did not take wine and beer at dinner, he was laughed at and ridiculed. Now ladies and gentlemen who move in the best society take nothing, and no one makes a remark. While, no doubt, the influences of religion and morals have had a good deal to do with this change, we ought to pay a debt of gratitude to those who have so earnestly performed, what was a duty in their minds, the work of pressing the desirability of adopting total abstinence on every one. No doubt their efforts have had an effect on the public.

20893. Have you any knowledge of the working of the Church of England Temperance Society ?—Not very much.

20894. Taking that society as it is, do you think the double pledge is valuable, the first being a pledge for total abstinence, and the second a pledge not to treat ?—Certainly I think it is good, because it spreads widely the interest on such an important question and prevents the subject being dealt with in a too narrow spirit.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20895. Have you, as a pastor, observed whether any proportion of the poverty, crime, family disorder and neglect of religion is traceable to the drink habit or the drink trade ?—Certainly, I must admit that a proportion is attributable to the drink habit, that is to excessive drinking.

20896. Do you think the legalization of the drink trade encourages the drink habit ?—It is very difficult to answer that question exactly. I am perfectly certain that

REV. RICHARD WHITMORE NORMAN.

people would drink whether the sale of stimulants was legal or not. I think it would only encourage drinking in this way, that persons who are determined to exceed, would, of course, avail themselves of the facilities to obtain stimulants.

20897. Do you think more people drink because the trade is legalized than would drink if the trade was not legalized?—I do not think it would make very much difference. During my experience in England as a young man at the University of Oxford, where there were 3,000 under-graduates, I only knew of two who ever exceeded; they were low down and lost caste in society in consequence.

20898. You have said that violation of law has a demoralizing effect on the people of a community. From your observation in Quebec and Montreal, have you noticed whether violation of the prohibitive provisions of the license law has had a demoralizing effect?—I do not think I have had much opportunity of judging.

20899. Have you reason to believe that the license law is violated?—I can hardly say that. I should say it was violated, but I have not had an opportunity of judging.

20900. You have said that you counsel young people to abstain from the use of drink. Do you think that legalizing the trade and providing facilities for drinking and inducements to drink, help young men to carry out your advice as to abstinence, or do they make it more difficult for young men to follow the good advice that you give as to abstinence?—I should think not. There is a law in human nature to this effect, that if there is difficulty experienced in obtaining a thing, that fact causes the individual to be more desirous to get it. If young men could obtain liquor without difficulty, and they had been taught to abstain from it, I do not think the fact that the sale was legalized would have any effect on their action.

20901. Is it because a thing is prohibited that human nature, in its depravity, desires to do it?—I think that is human nature all over.

20902. May that account for the violation of the decalogue?—I think it has probably something to do with it.

20903. You have said that there are many temptations attending drinking from which young people who abstain are free?—To which they are not so subject certainly.

20904. And yet you are not sure that the establishment of the trade, with all the facilities for drinking, makes it more likely that young people will drink who might otherwise abstain?—I think not.

20905. Speaking about the violation of law and the demoralizing effect of such violation—and I suppose you had in mind violation of the liquor law especially—do you think that the violation of the liquor law is more demoralizing than the legalized liquor trade itself?—I think that question is an exceedingly difficult one to answer, because it involves a knowledge of statistics, which I certainly do not possess, and an inquiry into the subject that I cannot give. It appears to me that we must first arrive at an understanding as to whether the use of liquor under any circumstances is wrong. I do not think it is wrong. I do not see, therefore, there can be anything wrong in its being legalized, provided the liquor be wholesome; but I think that if people get into the habit of violating what they know to be a law, it injures their moral sense in more ways than one. If liquor be wrong, there is an end to the matter, and trade in it should not be legalized, but I do not admit that liquor is wrong.

20906. I think you said that there should be very careful supervision as to the quality of the liquor, and also that the number of places should be restricted. Why should the number of places be restricted?—Because I do not think we should make it particularly easy to obtain liquor, and the more you multiply those places, the more difficult is it to keep them under control and to see that the law is observed.

20907. You evidently believe, then, that there is a great deal of evil resulting from the drink trade and drink habit?—From the intemperate use of drink.

20908. And you think that the restriction of the number of places would reduce the evils that grow out of the drink trade. Do you think there would be less sale if there were fewer places selling?—I should think so, probably.

20909. And good would result from reduced sale?—Yes.

20910. If good would result from the restriction in that degree, do you think greater good would result if there were still greater restrictions?—I think very likely. The number should be diminished to something like a reasonable one. The people should

be able to purchase what is necessary, but I do not think we should have a saloon or anything of that kind close to everybody's door, so that liquor will be too easily within the reach of the individual.

20911. At what point would you stop the restriction?—I have never calculated that. I remember some years ago the matter came before the people in Montreal, and I willingly signed a petition to reduce the number of places selling, because it was out of all proportion to the population, compared with other cities, and necessarily, therefore, the places could not be kept under that control which it is desirable should be exercised.

20912. Taking your statement altogether, it is in effect this, that evil results from the drink trade and the drink habit. Do you think that a law against such evils as result from the drink trade would have any effect in creating and strengthening public feeling against those evils?—I doubt it very much.

20913. Do you think public opinion against the evils that admittedly result from the drink trade, would be strengthened by the removal of restrictions from the trade, so as to permit the trade to go unchecked and unhindered?—I do not think that legal prohibition would have any effect on those who are disposed to take liquor, not any material effect on those who are disposed to drink. I do not think that is the way to remedy the evil. I think that the evil from drink arises from the excessive use of it, not from the thing itself.

20914. Do you think the restriction of the number of places would lessen the amount of drinking?—I think it would.

20915. Where would the perversity of human nature come in as to that point? If the opportunity to get drink were restricted, would that not strengthen the desire to get drink, instead of lessening it?—I do not think so. It would simply amount to this: If a person knew that the nearest place where he could obtain liquor was some distance from his house, he would think twice before he went to purchase it; whereas if it was close at hand, he would probably go out at once. But if you shut up all those places, and tell the people that they cannot have any liquor, then a certain class at all events would simply make up their minds to obtain by deception what they wanted.

*By Judge McDonald:*

20916. Have you given any consideration to what is known as the Gothenburg system, under which the Government take control of the sale of liquor?—I have not.

20917. Do you think it would be well, if the trade is to be carried on at all, that the Government should take the sale into their own hands and appoint salaried officers, the Government taking all the profits, the salary paid to the officer not furnishing an inducement to make large profits out of the business?—It sounds feasible, but I have never given it any consideration, so as to be able to give a decided opinion on it. That would encourage the idea of inspection, which is a matter of very great importance.

20918. It would cover inspection of liquors, and limitation of the number of places selling; the appointment of officials by the Government on salaries, the net profits being received not by the sellers but by the Government?—There would be no inducement to sell an inferior article and charge highly for it. I came before the Commission unexpectedly, and therefore had not an opportunity to look into the question. I have spoken generally from my own experience.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

20919. As to the existence of saloons, that is, places where accommodation is not provided for travellers in the shape of meals and beds: do you think saloons are necessary in connection with the sale of liquor, drinking shops as distinguished from hotels where beds and meals are furnished?—I think the saloon is in many respects an evil.

20920. Do you think it is a greater evil than the hotel bar?—I think so.

20921. The view has been presented to this Commission that the hotel bar is a greater evil than the saloon bar, because young men go into hotels ostensibly for the purpose of seeing friends or guests, but really to obtain liquor at the bar, while if they go into saloons every one knows that they go there for the purpose of getting liquor?—

REV. RICHARD WHITMORE NORMAN.

It is a distinction without a difference ; they are both evils, and it is hard to say which is the greater. I think one of the great evils which all of us in our particular lines should fight against is the system of treating at bars. I always say to my young men that as regards anything they may do at home, with the sanction of their parents, in the way of partaking of stimulants, I have nothing to do with that ; but I ask them to promise me never to treat or be treated, because, as I know and everybody knows, it is not so much the stimulant you may take with a meal that breeds habits of intoxication, as it is stimulant taken without food in the early morning and in a concentrated form of drink, which is highly intoxicating and injurious. I think therefore that any place which offers drink without food must be injurious to the community.

MONTEFIORE JOSEPH, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

20922. How long have you resided here ?—I have lived here all my life.

20923. What is your business or occupation ?—Wholesale grocer, including liquors.

20924. Do you at the present time hold any office in the Board of Trade ?—No, I hold no office, but I am a member of the Board.

20925. Have you ever been President of the Board ?—Yes.

20926. Do you carry on business alone ?—I carry on business with my brother, as a firm.

20927. Have you been in the wholesale grocery and liquor business all your life ?—Yes.

20928. Are the spirituous liquors you sell Canadian products or imported products ?—Both ; I imagine we deal more in Canadian than in imported goods.

20929. Are your customers principally residents in the Province of Quebec ?—Yes, I might say altogether they are, with few exceptions.

20930. In regard to the home-made whisky you sell : does it come to you duty paid ?—No, we pay the duties here.

20931. Has the sale of spirituous liquors increased or decreased within the last few years ?—It has very much decreased.

20932. Has the sale of wine, beer and ale increased or decreased ?—I could not say, our sales are moderate.

20933. To what do you attribute the falling off in the sale of spirituous liquors ?—I attribute it to the enormous quantity of smuggled liquor that comes into the Province.

20934. Do you think the consumption of spirituous liquors is as great as it was ten years ago ?—I have no means of judging. So much legitimate trade has been taken away by smuggling that it is impossible to make a comparison.

20935. In your opinion the decrease has been caused largely, if not principally, by the illicit importations ?—Yes.

20936. Within the last twelve months, has a very large quantity of smuggled liquor been seized by the Government ?—Yes.

20937. How has that liquor been disposed of ?—It has been sold at public auction.

20938. Who have been the purchasers ?—Dealers, except I think in one case liquor was bought by distillers, but usually local dealers have bought at the sales.

20939. You mean licensed dealers ?—Yes, licensed dealers as a rule.

20940. Has the liquor been bought in many instances by intermediate men to vend again ?—Yes, both by intermediate men and by retailers. It is put up at auction.

20941. That you think has interfered very much with the trade of the legitimate dealers ?—Very much so.

20942. Is it natural to conclude that if so much liquor has been discovered and seized, there has been a good deal which has not been discovered and seized ?—I should say that the seized liquor has formed a very small fraction of the total quantity.



20942a. Was it especially so before the last twelve months?—Yes, and probably even this year. I do not consider the seized portion is more than a fraction of the whole. I base these remarks on hearsay evidence to a certain extent and from what I have heard, being in contact with dealers at the time and officers of the Department.

20943. Then your opinion is based on experience?—Yes.

20944. Have you any knowledge of the class of persons to whom these smugglers sell this contraband stuff?—Yes, I have heard hearsay evidence as to that.

20945. What is your impression about it?—That it is sold to men of such standing that the general public would never suppose they were engaged in an illicit traffic. If I could mention the names, they would surprise any Quebecker, the names of the persons whom I have heard were in it.

20946. Have you any evidence to put forward to bear out the accuracy of that conclusion?—There was a case that occurred at one of the Government sales. One man had brass enough to say that he had made \$9,000 out of that business last year, but he would not touch the stuff now, and he had given the trade up. That was said by a man who should be ashamed to be in such a business.

20947. Is it your impression that the smuggled liquor finds its way to consumers through licensed vendors of liquors or illicit vendors?—Largely through licensed dealers. The unlicensed dealers from my experience do not extensively handle it. They act more on the quiet, and the largest quantity consumed passes into consumption through the licensed dealers.

20948. Of course the liquor that passes into the hands of the regular distillers would be rectified and refined again?—Yes; but I remember only one case of that.

20949. Can you inform the Commission as to the character of the contraband article?—Yes, I have been told by officers of the Department who have tested the liquor frequently that it almost always contains a large proportion of fusel-oil, which chemists tell us is rank poison, and is an ingredient against which the Government have provided by compelling Canadian distillers to keep spirits for two years before they are passed into consumption. Certainly the spirit brought in and re-sold is not two years old. I have heard one case of eight per cent of fusel-oil being found in smuggled spirits.

20950. Where does the contraband article principally come from?—I understand from St. Pierre and Miquelon.

20951. It is not made there, I suppose?—No, it is presumed to be United States spirit.

20952. Is it made in Indiana?—I do not know in what State it is manufactured, but it is always spoken of as American.

20953. Are there not numerous districts in the Province of Quebec where, in connection with the existing license law, there is local prohibition?—Yes.

20954. Have you any experience of these districts in your business?—Yes.

20955. Do you still sell and vend liquors to customers in those districts in which the prohibitive law is enforced?—Yes, perhaps to a less extent than formerly and perhaps to a different class of customers. The licensed dealers who have been taking liquor from us for years still come to us, and say that on account of the license being refused them they are unable to take any more goods; but some strangers will come and buy right along.

20956. When they come to purchase from you, is it known where the goods are going?—This trade is mostly done by correspondence, and we usually know where the liquor is going.

20957. You mean that some one writes to you and purchases a certain quantity?—Yes, and of course in those cases we are more particular about giving credit than we are with established dealers.

20958. Do you think the sales in those districts are very much reduced?—The sales made to illicit dealers are in small quantities. The illicit dealer is not going to risk keeping a large stock of liquor on hand, as a licensed man will do.

20959. Are you under the impression that although your sales have been less in those districts, the consumption has not been necessarily less?—It has not been necessarily less; but really I have no information on which to form an opinion on the subject.

MONTEFIORE JOSEPH.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

20960. I think you said that you believe only a small percentage of the smuggled liquor was detected?—Yes.

20961. And you base that statement on your experience?—Yes.

20962. Have you personal knowledge on the subject, and do you mean when you say experience that you are satisfied liquor came into Quebec?—If I were allowed to produce my books I could show it by my cash sales. The ice between Quebec and the Island of Orleans, which is a good depot for smuggled liquors, took six weeks later than usual, and consequently a larger quantity of spirits was bought in town. Under normal conditions smuggled spirits can be brought in in enormous quantities. Farmers who had not visited our store for two or three years came and made purchases. In this way I consider our books for December would furnish very important testimony, especially if I were allowed to mention names.

20963. You attribute your increased sales during that month to the fact that the people could not get smuggled goods as early as usual?—Yes, and I only speak as one of six or eight wholesale dealers. That is my experience; of course others can cite their experience. In one parish down the river where there are 14 or 15 licensed dealers, I have ascertained by personal conversation that only two ever bought any legal liquor.

*By the Chairman :*

20964. What are the duties of the Inland Revenue officers in regard to the inspection of places selling?—I am not aware.

20965. Are they not expected to go round and look at the stocks of the vendors and see what they have got?—I do not know that such is the case. I presume they can do so.

20966. Would it be very difficult to ascertain if those dealers were vending smuggled liquors?—Yes.

20967. Why?—Take Rimouski, where they sold quantities of smuggled liquors. There have been sales there, and any man may have bought a barrel or two of spirits, which were properly branded showing that duty was paid, and he may have stored them away. Suppose an officer came along, he would simply see a barrel of whisky that had been bought in Rimouski probably six months ago, and would not see any smuggled liquors.

20968. Do you sell imported liquors to persons living in other provinces?—Only in the Province of Quebec. We might occasionally sell a little elsewhere, but very rarely.

20969. Do you believe any portion of the liquor imported here is sold to persons residing in other provinces?—Yes, a portion must be.

20970. Is that a large or small portion?—I presume it would be a small portion. Montreal, of course, does a large trade with Ontario.

20971. Did the increase in the smuggling commence at the time the increased duties were placed on spirits?—Do you refer to the last increase in duties?

20972. Yes.—I think it commenced before the last increase. Of course that increase encouraged the smuggling, but it had been previously very large.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20973. Has one of the effects of the operation of the local option law been to drive respectable men out of the business and place it in the hands of less responsible people?—Yes, that is my opinion, especially in regard to persons who are licensed to sell on certificate, so that the certificate system is very much abused.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

20974. Do you sell a good deal of liquor in the County of Chicoutimi?—We have only one customer, and he takes as much as he formerly did.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

20975. Is he the licensed vendor?—I think we have two customers, and he is one of the two.

20976. Does he sell as much now as formerly?—Yes.

20977. Do these men keep depots for the sale of liquors for medical purposes?—Yes.

20978. And notwithstanding the fact that the sale is confined to medical purposes, the business done is just as large as formerly?—Yes, or very nearly so.

CHARLES E. McKEEN, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

20979. How long have you resided here?—About a year and a half.

20980. Where were you before you came here?—In Truro, Nova Scotia.

20981. What is your business or occupation?—I am a manufacturer of shoes.

20982. Have you been carrying in that business all the time you have been in this neighbourhood?—I have been engaged in the business of shoe manufacturing within the last year only.

20983. Prior to that, what was your business?—Selling shoes wholesale.

20984. In Truro?—Yes.

20985. Are you a large employer of labour?—We employ from 50 to 200 hands.

20986. Where is your factory situated?—At St. Roch, Quebec.

20987. Where is the principal market for your manufactured goods?—The Dominion.

20988. Do you mean all over the Dominion?—Yes.

20989. Have you much trouble with your men on the score of intemperance?—Yes, considerable trouble.

20990. Will you tell the Commissioners in what the trouble consists?—From our men being incapable of doing their work through the influence of intoxicating drink, going out on Saturday night and not putting in an appearance probably till Tuesday.

20991. Are you a total abstainer?—Yes, I am.

20992. Have you been so for a number of years?—I do not suppose I ever drank a quart of intoxicating drink in all my life.

20993. You say your men come on duty intoxicated?—Sometimes they do.

20994. What is your course of procedure with them under those circumstances?—We work along with them the best way we can. Very often the best men are addicted to drink, and we have to put up with a great deal of inconvenience rather than discharge them, but sometimes we are obliged to discharge them.

20995. Do you pay them by the day or week or month?—They are paid weekly, but most of them draw their pay according to the amount of work they do. They do piecework.

20996. How many hours do you consider a day's work?—The majority of the men are paid so much per case for the different parts of the work they do.

20997. Then if a man is away on Monday or Tuesday, it is his own loss?—Yes, but it is also our loss.

20998. In what way is it your loss?—In the first place, it lessens our output, while our running expenses are the same; and in the second place, we very often have orders cancelled from not having them filled in time.

20999. Does not the absence of men in that way lead to the employment of a larger number?—No, because we have just so many machines and so many men to work them, and the room will be all filled.

21000. Have you any temperance organizations among your men?—Not that I know of. Some of our men may belong to temperance organizations, but we have no organizations established in connection with the factory.

21001. From what you have said, I gather that you do not insist on your men being total abstainers before you take them into your service?—No, we should like it, but it is no use insisting on that.

MONTEFIORE JOSEPH.

21002. Have you given any consideration to the manner in which the laws regarding licensed places for the sale of liquor in Quebec are enforced?—Not very much, except what little I have learned by observation during the time I have been here.

21003. At what conclusion have you arrived?—Perhaps it is as well enforced as in other places, but I do not think it is thoroughly enforced.

21004. Do you think there are too many licensed places in the city?—Yes.

21005. Do you think it would be an advantage if the number was curtailed?—Certainly.

21006. Is it your opinion that there are many unlicensed places in the city where intoxicating liquors are sold?—I do not know. I understand there are quite a few.

21007. I judge from what you have said that you look upon all these places for the sale of liquor as unnecessary?—I certainly do.

21008. As between the saloon and the hotel, which is the more harmful?—I do not know that I have given thought to that question. Both sell intoxicating drink pretty freely, and both are in my opinion evil.

21009. Do you consider the unlicensed places worse than the licensed?—In one way yes, but in another way no. Inasmuch as the unlicensed places are prevented from doing any great amount of injury, I think places are worse for being legalized to sell; the mischief they can do has no limit. In the case of the illegal places, they are watched all the time.

21010. But in the one case are not the places selling legally and in the other committing breaches of the law?—They are.

21011. Must breaches of the law not have a demoralizing effect on the community?—Any law-breaking has, I suppose.

21012. Have you considered the question of the adoption of a prohibitory system for Canada?—I have to some extent.

21013. Do you think it desirable that the Dominion Parliament should pass a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicants?—Yes. I think the sooner we can get such a law the better.

21014. With your knowledge of public sentiment and with your experience, do you think that if such a law were enacted, it could be effectually enforced?—I think it could. It would depend somewhat on the definition of the word “effectually.” I do not think the use of liquor would be entirely done away with, but the authorities could cope with the sale very well, as well as they can cope with other evils.

21015. Would it not be a condition precedent to the successful enforcement of the law that public sentiment should be strongly in favour of prohibition?—It would be necessary I think to the enforcement of the law that a majority of the people should be in favour of prohibition.

21016. Would a majority be sufficient to enforce it?—I think so, because I believe prohibition sentiment is growing, and growing very rapidly.

21017. The passage of a law for the whole Dominion would, of course, cover cities and rural districts. Do you think it could be efficiently enforced in the cities?—I think so.

21018. There would be sections of the country where public sentiment might be strongly in favour of prohibition, and again there might and would be sections in which the public sentiment was not in favour of prohibition?—Yes.

21019. Do you think it could be effectually carried out in the latter districts?—I think any law passed by our Federal Parliament bears harder on some places than on others. For instance, take the laws of trade. Non-producing sections do not stand in the same relation to such laws as producing sections; and I hold it is the same in regard to the liquor traffic.

21020. Do you not think it is a little different?—The present protective tariff will apply to and protect a community in which there are large manufacturing industries, while at the same time the country districts are obliged to pay an advance for goods on the prices for which they might otherwise obtain them. I think it is pretty nearly on a similar basis.

21021. Under those conditions, do you think such a law leads to smuggling?—No.

21022. What is the analogy between such a law as you speak of and a law prohibiting the sale of liquor? I was speaking of the public sentiment, and asking if you thought in districts where public sentiment was not strongly in favour of a prohibitory law, such a law could be effectually enforced?—We are obliged to obey the laws enacted by the Dominion Parliament, even though in certain sections they are disadvantageous to the people, but that does not make any difference in regard to their application to the whole. So it is in regard to prohibition.

21023. Then you believe a prohibitory law could be enforced?—I think so.

21024. Are you aware there is a great deal of smuggling going on *via* the St. Lawrence?—I am.

21025. Is not that in violation of the law: what is the inducement?—Gain, I suppose.

21026. Would not the enactment of a prohibitory law necessarily destroy the capital invested in breweries and distilleries and establishments where they deal in liquor?—Yes.

21027. In your view, should the owners of those establishments be compensated?—Not at all.

21028. How would you deal with them?—Simply in this way. If it was the wish and desire of the majority of the ratepayers of the Dominion to enact a prohibitory law, I would let it go into effect as soon as possible.

21029. And you would let the owners of those establishments take the consequences?—Certainly.

21030. Would that in your opinion be just?—I think so. They know very well that a large percentage of the people are opposed to their business. They knew that when they put their capital into it, and they were also aware that the business was liable at any time to be cut off, and they took the risk.

21031. Have you any idea of the amount of capital so invested?—I have not any definite idea; I know a large sum is invested, and that the business is lucrative.

21032. Have you any idea in your own mind?—Not as to the figures.

21033. You are no doubt aware that the Dominion and Provincial Governments and the municipalities, speaking generally, derive a large amount of their revenue from the liquor business?—Yes.

21034. Have you made yourself acquainted with the amount of that revenue?—No, I have not; I never studied that part of the question, because I did not see the necessity of doing so. I felt that all this money was derived from the consumer, and the consumer gets no advantage; consequently it would be better to make up the revenue in any way whatever, even by direct taxation, rather than in the way it is obtained at present.

21035. Are you aware that, in round figures, the amount is about \$8,000,000. How would you propose to replace that revenue in the treasury or treasuries of the Dominion, provinces and municipalities?—I do not know that I could outline any way of making up that amount. I merely satisfy myself that I believe the country would be better off were it to derive that revenue from some other source. I leave the matter to be carried out by those who are at the head of our financial affairs.

21036. Those who propose radical changes ought to be prepared to carry them out, I suppose. I am speaking to you as a representative man in favour of prohibition, and I want you to tell the Commissioners, if you will, how you would raise the revenue that would necessarily be lost or taken away from the Dominion, provincial and municipal treasuries?—I have not, without thinking the matter out, jumped at the conclusion that it would be wise to pass a prohibitory measure. I feel that it would be better to raise the revenue in some other way than by the present means. That is my decision. I have thought very little about the different ways in which the revenue might be raised, except the fact that the money having come from the pockets of the consumer in connection with a traffic that does him no good, I believe it would be better to raise the revenue by some other way, even by direct taxation. At the same time, I do not say that direct taxation would be necessary.

21037. Of course all such taxes necessarily fall upon the consumers and are paid by them in the end?—We hope they get some benefit sometimes.

CHARLES E. MCKEEN.

21038. Is that a fact?—Certainly.

21039. Please state the ground of your belief that the revenue could be raised in other ways than by direct taxation?—It is that there would be no less money in the country from which to raise it. I believe that less machinery would be necessary to enforce laws against criminals and all matters of that kind, and there would be a large saving, in my opinion, in such directions.

21040. Would you vote for a direct tax to replace the loss of revenue?—If necessary, yes. I do not believe such would be necessary; but if necessary, I say yes.

21041. What is the reason you make the statement that it would not be necessary?—Because I believe the revenue can be raised without raising it in that way.

21042. In what other way?—The revenue derived from the importation and manufacture of intoxicating drink is not the only source of revenue, it is not the only way in which revenue is raised.

21043. Is it not a large amount of the revenue?—Probably it is a large amount. I believe in many ways the expenditure of the country would be reduced. There would be less crime, there is no doubt about that.

21044. Then you are in favour of having prohibition, even if the necessity is forced on the country of raising the revenue by direct taxation?—Yes, if necessary.

21045. Is there not a great deal of smuggling going on *via* the St. Lawrence?—Yes, there is reported to be.

21046. How do you suppose the smugglers dispose of what liquor they manage to get in?—Through the legalized channels of trade I fancy, that is as nearly as I can find out.

21047. Do you mean through legalized vendors?—Yes.

21048. Do you think any proportion is sold to illicit dealers?—There may be to some extent, but I think it is principally sold to legalized vendors.

21049. Has not the Government of the Dominion at present a double incentive to put an end to smuggling, one being the protection of the revenue and the other the promotion of the good of the community? What would be the incentive for the Government to put an end to smuggling if prohibition were enacted?—In order that the laws they have enacted might be enforced.

21050. Would that be all?—That would, I think, be sufficient reason.

21051. It would necessarily involve a large expenditure. Do you think the country would be prepared to sanction that large expenditure without deriving any revenue?—I think a less force would be necessary to enforce prohibition than would be required to prevent smuggling.

21052. But would it not require very considerable expenditure to prevent smuggling and illicit manufacture?—Yes, it would no doubt.

21053. Do you think that after a time the public would begin to grumble about that expenditure, because there would be no corresponding compensation in the shape of revenue?—Some would grumble in any case.

21054. But you think the community would be so improved that they would not grumble at this large expenditure being incurred on the part of the Government to enforce the law?—I think the law would prove to be so desirable that there would be no grumbling to any extent.

21055. Have you had any experience with regard to prohibition in counties or parishes?—Yes. I lived in and had something to do with the Council of a county where the Scott Act was in force, and the means taken to enforce it.

21056. What county?—Northumberland, New Brunswick.

*By Judge McDonald:*

21057. Was there not a vote taken to repeal the Act there a few days ago?—understand so.

21058. How did you find the Act to be enforced when you were there?—We had many obstacles to deal with. It is now four years, I think, since I left there. While there I represented the town in the Council, and we had the question to deal with. By the Local Act we were authorized to appoint an Inspector.

21059. Did you do so?—We did so. The first appointment we made was not a good one, and we had a good deal of trouble; but we finally succeeded in making an appointment of an officer who did his duty as far as he could, and he did a great deal of good.

21060. Under the New Brunswick Act there is provided a maximum salary of \$500 to be paid the Inspector?—I do not know the amount.

21061. Is that provided by taxation of the ratepayers, or from the Scott Act funds?—We could not use Scott Act funds, for we are obliged to leave the fines in the hands of the Treasurer. The county had the disposition of them, but the amount had to be placed to a special credit so as to be used for further prosecutions under the Scott Act.

21062. In order to enable the Scott Act to be enforced, which would include the appointment of officers, I suppose?—We had such officers one year, but were unable to pay them in that way. We could not get the vote of the County Council to do it.

21063. After efficient officers are appointed, do you find the Scott Act is then thoroughly carried out?—Not thoroughly carried out. We have had a lot of trouble from appeals due to one cause or another.

21064. Do you find any difference between the rural districts and the towns and villages?—No; I do not think we do.

21065. Is the Act more easily carried out in the rural districts?—There is not much difference.

21066. Kent County lies next to Northumberland, I believe, and licensed places are found in Kent?—Yes.

21067. Did the fact that there was this county adjoining, where liquor was sold, make much difference?—I do not think it did. Some liquor may have come over from Kent.

21068. Where did the liquor come from that was brought into Northumberland?—It came in in various ways.

21069. Take the case you spoke of respecting a national prohibitory law. Do you believe that if a bare majority carried the Act, it should go into effect? Let me put a case to you: Supposing there was national prohibition submitted to the people. The Maritime Provinces voted by a large majority, ten to one, in its favour, Quebec and Ontario were about evenly divided, Manitoba was largely in its favour, and British Columbia ten to one against it, do you think you could enforce a prohibitory law under those circumstances?—I think I would ask the Government that sanctioned the National Policy to do so in this case also, because it applies in the same way.

21070. The National Policy was carried by the whole Dominion, I believe?—Yes.

21071. Take a case of this kind in which the sale is not illegal, unless it is made so by law, and take a province in the Dominion in which there is a majority of ten to one of the people against it, how long do you think it would require to have such a law efficiently carried out?—I suppose it would take a much longer time than where public opinion was in favour of such a measure, I have no doubt it would.

21072. Put it the other way. Suppose the Maritime Provinces voted very strongly in favour of this Act, and Quebec, by a large majority, against it, would it not be a very difficult matter to enforce it, even although a majority voted in its favour?—As I have said, it would be more difficult to carry it out in any section where public opinion was opposed to it, rather than in any section where public opinion was in its favour.

21073. It has been suggested that where that difficulty was likely to occur, there might be provincial prohibition instead of Dominion prohibition, that instead of prohibition being extended all over the Dominion, the different provinces might be allowed to legislate on the subject. Have you considered that question?—Probably in that case there would be a conflict as to the right of the provinces to enact such a law.

21074. Granting the right of the Provinces?—No; I think there should be a Dominion Statute applicable to the whole Dominion.

21075. You have spoken of the enactment of a general law and expressed your opinion that the Dominion should provide for the expense of carrying it out. Do you not remember that laws requiring enforcement in this way, such as criminal laws, are not enforced by the Dominion, but by the Provinces? Would you have a special body

of officers appointed by the Dominion Government to enforce this particular law, if it were passed, or would you leave the ordinary officers who enforce other laws to carry it out?—That would depend on what was found to be necessary.

21076. What do you think would be necessary?—That might be necessary in some localities, while in others it might not be.

21077. What would make the difference?—What makes the difference now in regard to protecting the coast line from smugglers?

21078. Is not smuggling carried on all over the Dominion?—It may be.

21079. I am speaking as to whether there should be Dominion or Provincial officers appointed to enforce a prohibitory law?—I think there should be Dominion officers.

21080. So you would have a body of Dominion officers appointed whose duty it would be to see that this prohibitory law was thoroughly enforced?—Yes.

21081. Do you think, if that were done, the law could be thoroughly enforced?—I do not know how large a body would be required, but certainly such officers should be appointed.

21082. Then, you would have as large a body as would be necessary?—I would have whatever was necessary to control the traffic.

21083. So your view I take to be this: that you consider this traffic to be so great an evil and the results of it so injurious that, at any cost, it should be got rid of?—Yes, I think it should be got rid of at any cost.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

21084. You are an employer of labour, I believe?—Yes.

21085. What proportion of time is lost in one month, on an average, by a drinking man on account of drinking?—The average drinking man is incapable of doing his work one day in the week. He may report for duty some day, but he is unfit for his work. We have men who will come in on Monday and work all day, but they do not do half a day's work.

21086. That is the estimate you make after you have had experience and observation of men who are addicted to drink?—Yes.

21087. Does the man who drinks to excess only lose time on account of drinking, or do other men who are associated with him lose time?—If he does not drink enough to incapacitate him, he is all right.

21088. May he be incapacitated, even though he does not get drunk?—Yes. The man may report for work, but he is unfit for work.

21089. Your knowledge of these men is, that when they drink, they lose time. I desire to ask you whether men who never get drunk, but who drink regularly, are sometimes incapacitated for work?—Yes.

21090. And they lose time?—Yes.

21091. And is it not a fact that not only they lose time, and are therefore themselves the losers, but that your work is interfered with?—Yes.

21092. You say that the drinking habits of one man will sometimes interfere with the working of a gang?—Yes.

21093. In some establishments work is done by a gang of men, and one being away stops the others, I presume. Does that ever occur in your establishment?—Yes.

21094. Are those cases due to the drinking habits of one man sometimes?—We had a case about two weeks ago. Four men stopped the output of an entire factory for three or four days.

21095. All on account of drink?—Yes.

21096. I suppose you have different grades of workmen, some workmen being more skilled than others?—We have.

21097. Do you find that men in certain branches of work require to be more skilled and educated than in others, and do you find that some of the superior men are more or less addicted to drinking?—Some of our best men are addicted to drink.

21098. Do you suppose that in regard to some of those men, drink affects them more seriously?—It does in some cases, and this is not imaginary.

21099. Of course the drinking of skilled hands affects you more seriously than in the case of unskilled labour, for you can secure substitutes for unskilled labour?—Yes.



21100. Have you noticed that legalized drink shops in the vicinity of your factory are an inducement to your employees to drink?—I have only noticed it in this way, that they will slip out sometimes by the back way and go over to them and get a drink. I know they do it.

21101. Are you able to say whether the legalized drink shops in the vicinity of your factory gather your men in during the evening to a very considerable number?—I know they go there in the evening on pay day, but I do not know that this is done much more in the immediate vicinity of the factory than in other places.

21102. Are drinking places quite general in Quebec?—Yes, there are a good many of them.

21103. Do you believe if the legalized shops were closed, it would be a benefit financially and morally to the employees and working people generally?—I do.

21104. When you expressed your opinion in favour of prohibition I believe you said that the sooner it came the better, and you said also you believed it could be efficiently enforced. Do you mean that it could be absolutely enforced?—No. I do not believe that liquor could be kept out of the country entirely.

21105. Therefore, you do not believe that a prohibitory law could be absolutely enforced?—No.

21106. Do you mean when you say efficiently enforced that the law could be so well enforced as to do a great deal of good?—I do.

21107. Speaking of the capital employed in manufactures otherwise than in the liquor trade at present: As a business man, do you think that the capital at present invested in establishments for the manufacture of liquor in this country would go unemployed if the liquor trade were prohibited? Is it your experience that capital goes unemployed in this country?—It is not.

21108. Do you believe the employees in the different breweries and bar-rooms, and in all branches of work connected with the liquor trade, would go unemployed if the trade were delegalized?—I do not.

21109. Certain capital is invested in buildings and machinery connected with distilleries and breweries. Now do you believe that if the business stopped, the machinery and plant could not be turned into money?—I do not know anything about that question. There is some machinery used that is particularly adapted for distilling, and that might be of very little use if prohibition were enacted.

21110. If your factory were shut up, would you not be able to utilize a large proportion of your machinery?—It would be merchantable because the industry could be continued in the country.

*By the Chairman:*

21111. But suppose the industry was discontinued by law?—I do not think the machinery would be of very much value.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

21112. Could the machinery be utilized in some other country?—Yes, but it would not bring the original cost.

*By the Chairman:*

21113. Where could it be utilized?—So long as the neighbouring countries had no prohibitory law, a market might be found for that machinery.

21114. Where could your machinery be utilized in such a contingency?—Our machinery changes very frequently. If a manufacturer fails, the machinery is bought up by some one else who goes into the business.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

21115. So if you are able dispose of the old machinery, you do not consider it a dead loss?—No.

21116. You are no doubt aware that eight million dollars of revenue are derived from the drink trade. Do you, as a business man, believe, looking the question all over, that if

CHARLES E. MCKEEN.

the drink trade were prohibited and the consumption lessened or abolished, there would be more money at the disposal of the people to be used for the purchase of more useful articles, and that the general revenue would be increased in that way?—That certainly would be the case.

21117. Do you believe that would make up any considerable proportion of the deficit caused by the loss of eight million of dollars?—Yes. This money would be expended, and a percentage would go into the revenue, I presume.

21118. Do you believe there would be, gradually perhaps, but not immediately, a decrease in the expenditure now made by Federal, Provincial and Municipal authorities on account of crime and the like, and that there would be a considerable saving in that way?—I do.

21119. Do you believe that after all this whole question is one of dollars and cents?—Yes, it is question of dollars and cents, undoubtedly.

21120. Do you believe this question is of vital importance, aside from dollars and cents?—Yes. I regard the necessity of dealing with the question of prohibition, if it is possible to enforce it, as far more important than all the money invested in the liquor traffic, or the revenue derived from it.

21121. Do you believe if the moral welfare of the people depends on the solution of this question, that the Government ought to hesitate to deal with it because there may be involved the loss of a few millions more or less; or do you believe that the country is warranted in dealing with the question because the moral welfare of the community is at stake, aside from the question of dollars and cents? Suppose it is seen that the prohibition of the trade would necessitate the loss of certain money to the country, do you believe that that fact should deter the Government of the Dominion dealing with the question?—No, I do not. I do not think money should prevent them from taking any step to repress a wrong.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21122. Do you believe this, that because the abuse of liquor, or the excessive use of it, is the cause of great injury to some persons, thousands and tens of thousands of those who use it in moderation should be prevented from procuring it, and that the Government should pass a law prohibiting those who use liquor in moderation from enjoying that privilege?—I do. It may not be any great harm, but I do not believe it does any good, and therefore there is the danger that it may do harm.

21123. Do you consider that on that ground you have the right to interfere with thousands of people who use liquor in moderation?—Yes.

21124. Do you think it would be right and proper for the Government to take such action?—Yes.

21125. People who are in the habit of using wine and beer at meals only would be prohibited from exercising that privilege simply on account of the undoubted evils that follow the abuse of liquor. Do you believe that such action should be taken? I do; if it is necessary I would do it for the sake of others.

21126. What experience have you had in the operation of a provincial prohibitory law?—Not a very great deal.

21127. You have lived in Northumberland County, N.B., I believe?—Yes.

21128. In what town?—In Newcastle.

21129. Is the Scott Act in force there now?—Yes.

21130. Were you ever in Moncton?—Yes.

21131. How did you find the prohibitory law enforced there?—I do not know much about it. I never lived there.

21132. Do you know anything about the operation of a prohibitive law anywhere else?—Speaking of Moncton I know that the law had the effect of making the people very careful how they sold; I have been in the hotels when all sorts of methods have been adopted in order to get drink.

21133. Do you know anything about the state of affairs there now?—I have not been there very lately.

21134. You cannot speak as to the operation of the law within the last year and a half?—I have not been in Moncton for any length of time, except on business.

21135. How long did you live in Truro?—I was in Truro 3 or 3½ years.

21136. Have you been there since a year and a half ago?—I was there 3½ years previous to that.

21137. Did you have the Scott Act in force there then?—The Act was adopted by the county, but through some irregularity, it was a question as to whether it was in force or not, and the temperance people have since petitioned for its repeal, and carried it. They have repealed it in order to be able to work under the License Act.

21138. The temperance people having had an experience of the Scott Act in the county in which Truro is placed, desired to have it repealed?—Not that. There was some informality as to the adoption of the Act in the county.

21139. It has been represented to the Commission that there were difficulties in the way of its enforcement?—There were special difficulties.

21140. And the temperance people joined with the opponents of the Scott Act to have the Act repealed?—No. The liquor interest was unanimous in trying to maintain the Act.

21141. You know that as a fact?—Yes. I know that the temperance people and parties favourable to temperance and temperance legislation were one in favour of the repeal of the Scott Act in that county, and that the others were opposed to it, because when convictions were sought under one law, the defendants to the actions claimed that the law was not in force, that the other law was in force, and *vice versa*, and between the two, no law was carried out.

21142. What law is in force now?—The prohibitory clauses of the present license law.

21143. Do you know anything about the operation of the law?—Not the recent Act.

21144. Your knowledge of the Scott Act is confined to Newcastle in Northumberland County?—Yes.

21145. You have said that the average drinker loses one day a week?—Yes.

21146. What do you mean by the term average drinker? Of course he is a person who is not a total abstainer, but what is an average drinker?—A person who drinks sufficiently to interfere with his ability to do his work, it does not matter whether he gets drunk or not.

*By the Chairman :*

21147. Is he a man who is in the habit of drinking?—That is my idea of an average drinker.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21148. What percentage of your men are average drinkers, according to that definition?—I suppose possibly thirty per cent.

21149. You think that thirty per cent of your men lose one day a week on account of excessive use of liquor?—They do. They may not be absent from work one day in the week, but their capability for work is lessened by a percentage of one-sixth by the use of drink.

21150. What percentage of your men are total abstainers?—I am afraid very few; there cannot be many.

21151. Did you ever try the experiment of paying the men on Monday or Tuesday, instead of Saturday?—No. We pay on Saturday.

*By the Chairman :*

21152. I think you said you considered an average drinker to be a man who took sufficient liquor to weaken his ability to perform his duties, or to impair his efficiency?—Yes.

21153. But applying the word average, do you mean that an average drinker is an average specimen of all who take drink?—I gave my answer based on that definition of the word average.

CHARLES E. MCKEEN.

21154. If the definition is wrong, your answer would necessarily be wrong, I suppose. What is the average drinker? You have said the average drinker is a man who drinks sufficiently to incapacitate him, but surely that is not an average of all the people who drink?—I do not know how many people do drink. The answer was applicable to the question put to me, and I do not see that it would make any difference, so long as I have given the definition of the word “average” as I understand it.

21155. Is that an average of your employees?—Yes, and I think I have good average employees.

21156. Of the men who take liquor in any shape, is the average man who drinks only incapacitated?—Not at all times, but at times, yes.

21157. Did you say you had 150 men in your employ?—We have from 100 to 200 employees, but they are not all men.

21158. What do you mean by the word “average”; do you mean a fair specimen?—What was the question asked me in the first place?

21159. The “average drinker” was the term used. You must define what you mean by an “average drinker?”—I have given you my idea in my answer.

21160. Then your definition of an “average drinker” is a man who shows his incapacity to do work. Is that your definition?—That is the definition I have given.

21161. But do you think that is an average specimen of men who take drink?—I was answering a question with respect to the men we employ.

21162. Out of 150 men you employ, how many take drink and how many do not?—I must say that probably 90 per cent take drink, 85 per cent at any rate.

21163. The average of the 90 who take drink, according to your definition, would be men who render themselves less efficient for the discharge of their work?—At certain times, yes.

21164. Is that what you mean?—At certain times, yes.

21165. I think you said, in answer to a question by Commissioner McDonald, that supposing the people of the Lower Provinces voted by a considerable majority in favour of a prohibitory law and the people of Ontario voted in favour of a prohibitory law, and in short that a majority of the people of the Dominion voted in favour of a prohibitory law, but the people of Quebec strongly opposed it, you would nevertheless put the law in force?—I believe in having such an Act in force, and I believe in having it a Dominion law.

21166. Would you coerce the people of Quebec into the adoption and observation of such a law?—I do not believe any coercion would be necessary; but if such were the case as applied to any one of the provinces, I would certainly say, yes.

21167. Then the answer to the question is, that you think the people of Quebec, although opposed to such a law, should be coerced if the majority of the people of the Dominion were in favour of it?—Yes; I say I would do so in the case of any of the provinces.

21168. Then you would coerce the people of Quebec into the observance of such a law?—I have said I would do so in regard to any one of the provinces.

21169. Would not that require a large force to be employed? You have seen what has taken place in regard to smuggling, and how difficult it has been to suppress it. Would it not take a larger force to coerce the people of Quebec, supposing they were opposed to a prohibitory law, to observe prohibition?—I do not think it would.

21170. The revenue derived by the Government of the Province of Quebec from the liquor traffic at the present moment is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$600,000. Of course prohibition would stop that source of revenue. Now, how would you propose to replace that revenue to the provincial exchequer?—The capital employed in the liquor traffic now would then be employed otherwise and would pay taxes.

21171. The province derives a revenue of \$600,000 annually from the issue of licenses for the sale of liquor. It is clear that a prohibitory law would remove that source of revenue. Now, how would you propose to replace that revenue in the treasury?—I think the capital thus employed and the labour thus employed would be taken into other channels and would produce an income. Manufacturers under the recent Act are obliged to pay taxes into the provincial treasury. This capital might be employed in manufacturing, and thus pay a tax all the same.

21172. But how would you arrive at that result? Supposing you take the case of brewers and distillers, and their business is prohibited, how is an income to be derived from their property?—The prohibition of the business would only destroy their plant, and the buildings could be used for some purpose at least.

21173. It is true they might be used, but would they be of the same value for any other purpose as they are now?—They might not be. I presume it would lessen the value of the buildings, certain plant and machinery employed.

21174. Do you mean it would lessen the value of the property generally?—I presume it would lessen the value.

21175. Suppose a proportion of the amount now invested were reinvested, into what industry do you think the capital could be turned in order to yield a return to the Province of Quebec?—It would probably be divided up.

21176. Name any new business in which it could be employed?—New industries are continually coming up, and there are different manufacturing establishments and new factories being built up all the time, and I do not see why this money could not be turned into those channels.

21177. Suppose it were turned into those channels, how would the Province of Quebec derive any revenue from it?—The province, as I have said, derives a revenue from manufacturing industries now. Manufacturers are taxed.

21178. To what extent?—That depends on the amount of capital employed.

21179. Then you would propose to tax those industries to an extent that would replace the revenue lost on account of the liquor traffic?—I do not say I would do that. I say that if the capital were invested in manufacturing industries, it would pay a tax, and that would help to make up the deficiency.

21180. But how would you propose to get this sum of \$600,000 out of the people of Quebec, into the treasury of the Government?—I have already stated the way in which it could be in part obtained.

21181. You say that this system could be generally adopted?—I presume it might be adopted. No doubt the capital would find its way into other channels which would be beneficial to the province. There is no question about the fact that the manufacture of liquor does not actually do good. It is of no monetary value.

21182. Then you do not claim that the capital so employed, if invested otherwise, would return to the treasury of the Province of Quebec \$600,000 annually?—I claim that the people of the province, who are perhaps earning \$8 or \$10 per week each, would have \$8 or \$10 a week to spend in ways which would result in a portion of the amount finding its way into the provincial treasury.

21183. Under what circumstances? The Government would have to adopt some other mode of taxation in order to raise the revenue I presume? We all know that as regards the Province of Quebec it has no spare revenue at the present time. \$600,000 is a large amount for this province to lose, and how do you propose, supposing the liquor traffic to be prohibited, to replace that sum in the treasury of the province?—The capital now employed, if invested otherwise, would certainly return a part of the present income. I am not connected with the management of public affairs; but, if necessary, I should certainly say that it would be better to increase the taxes.

21184. Increase the taxes, on what?—On whatever the people are taxed now, whatever sources of revenue there are to the Government, not any one in particular.

21185. Do you mean increased taxation on manufacturing and business establishments?—Any of the sources from which the Provincial Government derives revenue.

21186. Would you favour direct taxation to replace the deficiency?—I would, if necessary.

21187. Then you are prepared to resort to direct taxation to replace the loss of revenue to the provincial treasury?—I would, if necessary. I believe in direct taxation.

21188. The question was asked, whether the expenditure which would be made, in an increased ratio, by working men and other classes expending what they now spend in drink in purchasing other articles, would add materially to the revenue, and I think you answered that it would replace a large amount of the revenue lost to the Dominion treasury by the adoption of prohibition?—Yes.

CHARLES E. MCKEEN.

21189. What articles would occur to you as being those that would be purchased in an increased ratio?—They would probably be useful articles that pay duty.

21190. Please enumerate them?—They would be very numerous.

21191. Please state a few of them?—Articles of clothing apparel and luxuries.

21192. Of what kind?—There are hundreds of kinds. They might include a watch and chain or ring. All these articles pay duty. The people would have more money to spend, and if they did not need to spend it on the necessaries of life, they would spend it probably for luxuries, or perhaps increasing the value of the property of the community, and consequently increasing the quantity of taxable property.

21193. How would that replace the revenue lost by the Dominion? It would replace the revenue to the Dominion in this way, that a portion of the goods thus purchased would be dutiable.

21194. How would you propose to replace the revenue taken from the Dominion treasury? I want your view as to the articles which would be purchased or consumed in large quantities that would go to replace six millions or seven millions of dollars which would be lost to the Dominion treasury?—It would be hard to enumerate them. I have already mentioned articles of jewellery and watches, and other imported articles which pay a large duties.

21195. Do you think they would form any considerable portion?—Not likely all. Probably the people would eat a little more beef. I do not say all of this money would go into channels which would return revenue. A portion of this money that would do to purchase drink would certainly go to purchase dutiable articles.

21196. You have mentioned two articles, wearing apparel and watches?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21197. Luxuries generally?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

21198. What are they?—It is hard to enumerate them. I say luxuries outside of the bare necessaries of life.

21199. In order to replace this revenue to the Dominion treasury, it would be necessary to impose taxes on articles that would pay duty into the Dominion treasury. You have answered that the money saved, which is now expended in drink, would be largely expended in the purchase of other articles in the way of luxuries which would contribute to the revenue of the Dominion?—Such as are dutiable.

21200. And thus the deficiency would be replaced?—I did not say it would be wholly replaced.

GEORGE MULROONY, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

21201. How long have you lived here?—Since I was born.

21202. I understand you are at present President of the Ship Labourers Society?—Yes.

21203. Is that a large body?—It has about 2,000 members.

21204. Do you charge an entrance fee?—Yes, \$10.

21205. Have you any regulation of the society enforcing temperance or total abstinence on your members?—No.

21206. In that respect your members are allowed to follow their own inclination?—Yes, so long as they do not come to the meetings intoxicated. They are fined if they come to the meetings intoxicated.

21207. Is a heavy fine imposed?—Five dollars.

21208. If a member were reported as having appeared to do duty on one of the Allan ships in a state of intoxication, would your society take cognisance of it?—Yes.

21209. Have you any temperance organization in connection with the society?—  
No.

21210. Does the society, as a society, take any steps to inculcate temperance on the members?—No.

21211. Can you inform the Commissioners if many of your members are members of temperance societies?—Yes; a number belong to temperance societies, and some are total abstainers.

21212. How long have you been President of the society?—Going on two years.

21213. And how long have you been connected with the society?—Sixteen years.

21214. Are the members as a rule more temperate now than they were when you first joined the society?—I think so.

21214a. Are you yourself a total abstainer?—No.

21215. In your opinion would a reduction in the number of licensed places in the city have a beneficial effect on members of your society in the direction of temperance?—I really cannot give much information on that point. I know there are lots of licensed places and other places selling that are not licensed; but if there were fewer licensed places in the wards, it would not make much difference if the non-licensed places kept selling.

21216. In your opinion, are there too many licensed places?—I really could not say, I am not up on this question. I have no opinion on it. Of course, if these places did not exist the people would have to do without liquor.

21217. Are the places selling liquor without license in the city numerous?—I think so.

21218. Do you think it would be advisable for the Dominion Parliament to pass a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating drink?—It might be well to stop it altogether.

21219. Do you think a law would do so?—It might be well to do it, if it were for the good of the country.

21220. Do you think it would be effective?—If liquor was not distilled, it could not be used, and I think that would be a good thing.

21221. Then you think it would be a good thing to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of it?—I believe it would make some persons in the world do better than they are doing.

21222. Do you believe such a law would be efficiently carried out and observed?—I am not in a position to answer that question, it is rather far up for me.

21223. Do you not feel competent to give an opinion on the subject?—To be honest with you, I do not feel competent to give an opinion.

21224. Do you think if the sale of liquor was prohibited and men wanted to drink, they would not take means to get it?—If they were only prohibited, they would take means to get it.

21225. But you think if it were not manufactured or imported, they would not be able to get it?—If that was the case, I do not see how they would manage.

21226. Would there not be smuggling?—There would be smuggling so long as liquor was distilled.

21227. Would it not continue to be distilled in other countries, and would not the smuggled stuff coming in be probably foreign?—Yes, I think so.

21228. Would a prohibitory law prevent smuggling?—I do not think so. Smugglers come here almost every day; some are caught and some get clear.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21229. Have you any rule in your society respecting the granting of sick benefits?—Yes.

21230. Is there any provision, that if a man's sickness is caused by over-indulgence in liquor, he forfeits his sick pay?—He does not get any pay at all.

21231. There is that provision in regard to men who make themselves ill from the excessive use of liquor?—They must receive injuries while at work to get sick benefit.

21232. Then there is no sick pay in the ordinary sense?—No.

GEORGE MULROONY.

21233. I understand that you do not care to express an opinion as to the practicality of a prohibitory law, whether it could be enforced or not; you do not know whether this could be done?—No, I do not.

21234. To what do you attribute the improved condition of things as regards drinking habits that prevails among the members of your society?—To the churches.

21235. To religion and moral influences?—Yes.

21236. Have you had any experience in local option or Scott Act enforcement?—No, I have not had any experience, I have never been away from Quebec. I have heard some of our men speak of the Scott Act. It seems that some men could not get liquor where they were working, but it was brought to them from another place; and as the men had it in their homes, they used more of it than if they had been able to go to a saloon and get it.

21237. Would it be to the interest of members of your union to have heavier duties imposed on whisky, brandy, rum and gin and lighter duties on beers and light wines?—I believe it would.

21238. Do you think it would tend to promote temperance?—I think it would.

21239. Do you think it would be advantageous to your men if the saloons were shut up and licenses granted only to taverns and hotels, places where food is served to travellers and accommodation in the shape of beds provided?—I could not very well speak as to that. I came here only to speak for the ship labourers.

21240. The Commissioners want to ascertain what special advantages there are in saloons, whose proprietors do not supply meals but merely sell liquor, and which in fact are nothing more than drinking shops. Would it be well to do away with them?—Many of them could be done without.

PETER JOHNSTON, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

21241. How long have you resided in Quebec?—I have lived here since I was eight years of age.

21242. What is your occupation or profession?—I have been out of business some years.

21243. What was your business?—I was a bread and biscuit baker.

*By Mr. Gigault:*

21244. What do you know of the enforcement of the license law here?—I think it is very poorly enforced in the city.

21245. Is there a good deal of illicit selling?—Of course I can only give an opinion without possessing any special knowledge; I hear there is a great deal of illicit selling, but I do not know it myself.

21246. Is there any selling on Sunday?—There is a great deal of selling on Sunday. I see places open as I pass along the street. I have drawn the attention of the Chief of Police to it several times, but no action seems to be taken.

21247. What did the Chief answer?—He shrugged his shoulders. I had noticed particularly that hotel doors were open and there was, apparently, drinking going on. When I spoke to the Chief about it, he said, shrugging his shoulders, "There are influences." He did not indicate what they were, but I suppose from the way he spoke that some of the Councillors had been speaking to him. That is simply my idea; he did not say so.

21248. Do you know anything about the enforcement of the license law in the rural districts?—I have been down at Metis for two months, and prohibition is in force in that township; yet I know, at least I have been told, and I may say I know for I have seen it through the windows, that sale of liquor went on at the station. There are three or four places at the station, and at the same time there is no license issued in the township.



21249. What is the population of the village?—I cannot tell you.

21250. Do many visitors go there?—A great many.

21251. Do you know anything about the smuggling of liquor?—I do not know anything about that, except what I see in the newspapers.

21252. Do you believe drunkenness is increasing or decreasing?—I think it is decreasing.

21253. To what do you attribute the decrease?—I attribute the decrease largely to the influence of the temperance societies and to the influence of the curés of the various parishes in this Province.

21254. Do you think it is wise to give the Municipal Councils the right to prohibit the sale of liquor in municipalities?—I think it is wise to give such power as you speak of.

21255. What is your opinion of a general prohibitory law?—I am entirely in favour of a general prohibitory law.

21256. Do you believe such a law, if enacted, could be enforced?—It could be enforced as well as most of the other laws.

21257. If the license law is not enforced, and you say it is not, how do you come to the conclusion that a general prohibitory law could be enforced?—I believe that a prohibitory law would have an educational influence, and that it would be much more easy to enforce a prohibitory law for the whole Dominion than a prohibitory law for a single parish.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21258. How long has Metis been under prohibition?—I cannot tell you. I understand no licenses have been issued for perhaps ten years.

21259. How many illicit places are there?—I do not know how many, but I was told this year that there were three at the station. I heard of two or three others within a very short distance of where I was living.

21260. Is there a large population in Metis?—During the summer there are probably 400 visitors at one particular time. The township is very well settled.

21261. Has it been your experience that, where municipalities refuse to issue certificates for licenses, they take vigorous means to enforce prohibition, or is the effort put forth spasmodically?—I have had very little experience as to that. I made inquiries with respect to the Inspector, and I was told he lived a short distance away and that his salary was so small it was not worth his while to interfere. That was the excuse given.

21262. Was any attempt made to close the unlicensed places at Metis or vicinity?—No, I did not hear of any attempt being made.

21263. What is the effect of having liquor sold illegally day after day and no attempt made to enforce the law?—I think the moral effect of such a state of things is bad. Any law-breaking has a bad moral effect.

21264. And the remedy you would suggest is prohibition?—I maintain that if there were a Dominion prohibitory law, it would be more likely to be enforced than where a township here and there endeavours to enforce prohibition.

21265. Do you approve of giving control of the city or town administration into the hands of a committee of the town or the Mayor?—No. I was not in the county at that particular period, but I was in the county before. I objected very much to allowing Councillors to have any control over the police in Quebec; I considered that a Commission was the proper body to deal with the force.

21266. Has your experience since the police were removed from the control of the Commission and placed under the control of a committee of the Council been that the change has not been advantageous?—So I understand. The fact is I have been told as much by the Chief of Police himself.

21267. Is the enforcement of the law against illicit liquor selling here not as vigorous as formerly?—Not nearly so complete. The Recorder, who was one of the Commissioners, had to a large extent the control of the police, and the law against illicit selling, against selling on Sunday and after hours, was much better carried out under the old regime. I would favour a return to it.

PETER JOHNSTON.

21268. Can you account for the apathy of the municipalities which refuse to issue certificates for licenses and yet permit liquor to be sold illegally? Can you explain why this apathy exists?—I presume there is very little interest in the matter. Each person leaves it to another. That is the reason of the apathy, I suppose.

21269. Are there no officers employed to enforce the law?—No.

21270. And it is a dead letter?—Yes, in the parish in which I live.

21271. Have you had experience in regard to any other parish?—No.

21272. Has your experience been as you have stated it, year after year?—Year after year.

21273. Do you know anything about the smuggling that is alleged to have been going on?—I know that during the time I was at the seaside, smugglers in that parish supplied liquor at about half the regular price.

21274. Would they supply it to all people who would purchase it?—Yes, but that is only hearsay.

*By the Chairman :*

21275. I think you have expressed the opinion that a Dominion prohibitory law would be more easy of enforcement than the prohibitory by-laws of the municipalities?—Yes.

21276. What is your reason for holding that opinion?—Wherever a parish or county is surrounded by other counties where liquor is sold, it is easy to bring liquor into the county where prohibition prevails.

21277. You have expressed your opinion in favour of a Dominion prohibitory law : Do you think it could be carried out?—I do not think I said so, but I am quite satisfied that if the Dominion authorities pass a law, they will see it is carried out.

21278. If the Dominion Parliament should pass such a law, is it your opinion it could be efficiently carried out?—It would depend upon what you mean by "efficiently."

21279. Would it prevent the sale of liquor?—To a large extent.

21280. Your view is that it would only prevent it to a degree?—To a large degree, I hope.

21281. Supposing Nova Scotia and the Lower Provinces were largely in favour of a general prohibitory law, and the Province of Quebec was largely against it, yet the majority in the whole country was in favour of it, would you force such a law upon the Province of Quebec?—That is a large question and a rather difficult question. I think it is the essence of all democratic government that the minority must submit to the majority. In this case I should say that if the Dominion Parliament passed a general prohibitory law, it would be the duty of every part of Canada to submit to it.

21282. Of course it is the duty of the whole community to observe a law when passed, but some laws are broken. We have a great deal of smuggling going on *via* the St. Lawrence at the present moment. If a prohibitory law were passed in opposition to the wishes of a large section of the people, would there not be smuggling on a very large scale?—I think smuggling would be less likely to be successful with a general prohibitory law in force than under present circumstances.

21283. Give your reasons?—My reasons are that there are immense facilities for selling smuggled liquors at present, while the facilities then would be very limited.

21284. In order to have a general prohibitory law efficiently carried out, would it not be necessary to have it backed up by public opinion?—It would be most advisable.

21285. Would it be necessary in order to have it thoroughly and efficiently carried out, that public opinion should be in favour of the law?—When a measure is passed by a majority in Parliament, public sentiment is always supposed to be in its favour.

21286. If the representatives of the people by a majority vote are in favour of it. But we have sectional interests, such as those to which I have called your attention, and you have to deal with them as they exist. I understood you to answer that you would coerce the people of Quebec to observe a general prohibitory law, if passed, whether they liked or not?—We pass a law and then expect the people to obey it. Of course, law is to some extent coercion.

21287. Are you of the opinion that in the parishes which have adopted prohibitory by-laws, public sentiment is really in favour of prohibition?—I presume so.

21288. That renders it practicable to carry out the law, I presume?—To some extent it does.

21289. Have you given any consideration to the financial aspect of the question?—It has been a matter of thought with me for many years.

21290. The enactment of a prohibitory law would destroy, to a large extent, the capital invested in breweries, distilleries, and so on. Have you any idea what the amount of that capital is?—I have heard you remark what the value is; it is a very large amount I know.

21291. The capital invested in manufacturing establishments alone is reported to be about \$15,000,000. Do you think it would be just, if a prohibitory law were passed, not to compensate the owners for the loss they would sustain?—Of course that is a very serious matter, and I cannot help thinking that where the machinery was put in under auspices of the Government and to a large extent in good faith, it would not be honest to destroy the value of those men's property without giving some compensation.

21292. There is a large revenue derived from the liquor traffic at present, which accrues to the Dominion, the Provinces and the Municipalities. A prohibitory law enacted would necessarily put an end to that source of revenue. How do you think the loss could be made up? What taxes would you resort to in order to replace it?—Of course, that is a very difficult question, but in my opinion it is not the primary question that should be considered. I believe the comfort and welfare of the people should first be considered, and after that had been secured, the people would be in a position to pay much larger taxes, and each individual would be in a position to buy more comforts and luxuries than at present.

21293. But you admit it is a question that will have to be dealt with?—Most certainly. You cannot conduct the affairs of the country without revenue. I cannot say, however, that I consider the expenses of the country would be nearly so great under prohibition as now.

21294. You believe there could be some saving in expense?—I believe so.

21295. Your theory is that some saving will be effected in the matter of expense, and that the purchasing power of the community will be increased for other articles than intoxicating drink?—Yes.

21296. But do you think the savings and increased purchasing power would be sufficient to replace the \$6,000,000 which the Dominion Government obtains and the \$1,500,000 which the provinces and municipalities receive?—I have no doubt of it. The importations would be very much larger and the people would be in a better position to buy.

21297. Have you thought of any particular articles imported on which no duties are charged now, or on which those charged could be increased?—Either that or direct taxation. I am in favour of direct taxation, for I think it is the most equitable. It is a tax that would be more likely to make our people look after their representatives than any other.

21298. Then you would resort to direct taxation, so far as the Dominion is concerned, to replace the deficiency in the revenue?—Yes, if necessary.

21299. I come now to the provinces. I will take the Province of Quebec, where probably about \$600,000 of revenue would be lost. How would you replace that sum?—A large portion of it would not need to be replaced, in my opinion. I believe the jails, the judiciary and the police might then be largely curtailed. Our police, instead of arresting one hundred prisoners, would not, under different circumstances, arrest probably more than twenty-five or thirty.

21300. You do not claim that those items would make up \$600,000, I presume?—I do not claim it.

21301. Then how would you make it up?—I am not in a position to state.

21302. But you must see that it is an important element in the consideration of the question, because if we have prohibition, it will be by a vote of the people, and the people will be largely influenced by considerations of this kind. Would not classes that are going to be additionally taxed carefully consider whether they would vote for prohibition under those conditions?—They are paying the taxes now. On every gallon of brandy

or whisky, for every cent paid to the producer two or three cents are paid to the Dominion as a tax.

21303. Take the provincial revenue. If license fees were done away with, the Provincial Government would have to collect a large amount of money from other sources. On what section of the population would you place that burden?—Upon the whole population. I would personally rather have the taxes increased if it would obviate the necessity of issuing licenses.

21304. Do you think a direct tax would be a satisfactory method of replacing the deficiency in the Provincial revenue?—I would rather have it. I do not say that the habitants would like it, because they are paying taxes now without knowing how they are doing it.

21305-06. Do you know any class of the community with which such a plan would be popular?—No. I presume there is no tax you could indicate that would be popular either with that class or any other.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21307. If the Government in power in this Province found it necessary to impose additional taxation, you think they would find means of doing so?—Yes.

21308. Your view is that if the revenue now derived from liquor licenses was wiped out, other sources of revenue would be found?—That is my view.

21309. Is it not a very difficult matter to decide on what industries additional burdens should be levied? Do you think the fear of taxation on the part of the people in the municipality you spoke of, Metis, had anything to do with the non-enforcement of the law?—I really do not think so.

21310. It is difficult to ascertain what the trouble is when a community votes in favour of a prohibitory measure and casts a large majority in favour of it, and subsequently makes little effort to enforce it. Is this due to fear of imposing taxes to pay officials and others to enforce the law?—I think it is largely from fear of being considered as informers. I stood outside the door of one of those drinking places, and I saw the natives enter and get liquor. They made no secret of it either last year or this. I spoke to a man I knew, who was a sensible fellow, about this, and he said it is not our business.

21311. Is that state of things, in your opinion, better than the condition of things that exists under license?—I really do not know. Of course under license a number of places may be licensed, but the illicit shops may continue. Some of those places are really licensed temperance hotels.

21312. Is liquor sold in them?—Yes, but they are said to be temperance hotels, and they have the sign temperance hotel over the door.

21313. Is it not extraordinary that there should be such a large illicit business in municipalities where the Councils have refused to issue licenses, or where the people have voted in favour of the adoption of the Scott Act, and that no attempt should be made to enforce those prohibitory measures? If the law is steadily, persistently and flagrantly violated, must not the moral effect on the community be very bad; and if no effort is made to enforce those prohibitory laws, would it not be better in the interests, morally and financially, of the people, to grant licenses?—If the granting of licenses would lessen the quantity of liquor used, then it would be better, but I doubt if it would do so.

21314. Do you think the people would go to unlicensed places in preference to licensed places, if they had the choice?—They do not care, they go into the first place at hand.

21315. Would they drink more under license than they do now?—It is hard to say. All the places are perfectly open now.

21316. If instead of a temperance hotel there was a licensed hotel, would there be more liquor consumed in the house?—The licensed dealer uses every means to draw customers. The unlicensed man has to do it in a quiet, unassuming way. There is no indication outside that inside he has liquor for sale.

21317. Would you prefer that state of things to a license system?—They are both evils, and it is hard to say which is worse. I would sooner than have free grog have restriction of some sort. A licensed tavern is in some degree under control of the law.

21318. Are there no officers to carry out the law?—I think the Provincial Government has an inspector, and I do not know why he does not do his duty. There seems to be no machinery.

21319. There seems to be machinery, but no one to set it in motion?—No.

21320. Is it not the privilege of the Municipal Council in a district to refuse to grant certificates so that persons may obtain licenses? If they decline to give the necessary certificate, the sale of liquor in that municipality is illegal, and if they honestly desire to prohibit the sale, would not the Council appoint an officer to enforce the prohibitory law?—They might bring it to the attention of the Inspector.

21321. It is a difficult matter to see why a community strongly in favour of temperance, passes a prohibitory law, but does not take steps to enforce it. Do you know the reason why attempts were not made to enforce the law in Metis?—It is an evil, whether licensed or unlicensed.

21322. Under license is there not some restriction and regulation?—Yes; the police can go into the house on Sunday and after hours. In case of unlicensed places, the police are not supposed to know anything about them.

*By the Chairman:*

21323. Does not illicit selling involve two evils, a breach of the law and the sale of liquor?—Yes.

LOUIS ALEXANDRE BOISVERT, of Quebec, restaurant keeper, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault:*

21324. What is your occupation?—I keep a restaurant.

21325. How many years have you been keeping a restaurant?—During 33 years.

21326. Do you think that the restaurants or the refreshment rooms do more to increase intemperance than the hotels?—Not in my opinion, providing the proprietor keeps the house orderly.

21327. Do you give meals?—I do; but I do not lodge any one.

21328. Do you think that the regulations of the license law are observed?—No.

21329. Are they violated by the liquor dealers?—They are by certain persons who have licenses.

21330. Do you think the authorities should make more efforts than at the present to repress violations of the law?—The authorities are not able to succeed, if the party having a license is not himself disposed to observe the law. He would always seek means to evade the law.

21331. Do you think that the number of licenses is excessive?—It is in my opinion.

21332. Should we, in your opinion, reduce the actual number of licenses, say by a third or a fourth?—I am unable to state the number, but I think that if certain persons were excluded, I mean from this business, it would be much better.

21333. Is it your opinion that a large number of licensed liquor dealers persuade the people to drink?—No; if there are any, the number is small.

21334. If the sales of liquor were handled by Government employees would it be preferable? What do you think of that?—It is quite contrary to my opinion. It is not in the interest of the proprietors of the hotels to persuade the people to drink. They have only disturbance with people who drink too much.

21335. Do you think that the licensed dealers would refuse to give drink in those cases?—I am positive that a large majority do so. I am in a position to know it.

21336. Seeing that certain licensed liquor dealers do not respect the law, what remedy of protection would an honest dealer possess, who fulfils all the requirements of

PETER JOHNSTON.

the law?—He can have protection in several ways. The statistics given respecting licensed dealers afford the necessary information. If these licensed dealers were dangerous, they could be served with a writ, and they would not be entitled to licenses in the future.

21337. Do you mean to say that if they are found guilty they ought to be deprived of their licenses?—For a certain number of years, yes; as it will teach them to respect the law.

21338. Have the police a right to enter your place, to ascertain that all which transpires is in accordance with the law?—No.

21339. Does not the law give that power?—No.

21340. Do you know the quality of the smuggled liquor brought in?—No.

21341. Do you think it is more injurious to health than the liquor manufactured here?—I do not think it is equal to what we have here; the smuggled liquor brought in is an inferior article.

21342. Very inferior?—Oh, yes. We are not permitted to sell any such liquor.

21343. If we had a general prohibitory Act, would smuggling, in your opinion, be practised on a larger scale?—That is my opinion.

21344. And would the liquor be of a still worse quality?—Yes.

21345. Do the liquor dealers aid the authorities to bring to punishment those who sell without a license?—No, not in my opinion; otherwise, than by the action of the licensed Liquor Dealers Association, which had the law enforced at Quebec for a certain number of years. The reason why they did not continue was because we were treated as though we had no license. The association has stopped the means of having the law respected. I ought to know something about it, as I am President of that Association.

21346. Is it not to the interest of the honest liquor dealers to have those who violate the law punished?—That is what we have done, and we could have attained results that others could not have secured. We had a sub-committee in each district. We submitted our inquiries to the Government, and they classed us all as those without licenses, placing licensed dealers on the same footing as unlicensed. Seeing this, we decided not to interfere, but to mind our own affairs.

21347. You know very well the complaints made against the liquor traffic, and also the abuses with which dealers are reproached. Do you not think that the licensed liquor dealers ought to see into this?—I think it is the duty of every citizen to look into this.

21348. Do you not think that by taking that action you were making your business popular?—Perhaps not to a considerable degree. Up to the present we have stopped quite a number selling.

21349. Do you think that drunkenness has increased?—I think it has diminished considerably.

21350. In what way?—The people understand much better the action of the religious authorities. The Recorder's Court proves this also.

21351. Is this not due to the License Law?—It is not owing to that. There are hardly any cases of illicit liquor selling.

21352. Is the law better respected?—No.

21353. Do you know if there are many illicit sales?—Of that I cannot speak. Besides, those who sell in this way reside for three months during the summer in the Isle of Orleans.

21354. Are there any of those sellers in the city?—No, not to my knowledge.

21355. Are there any persons selling liquors illegally in the place you have just mentioned?—Very few, and the visitors do not go there.

*By the Chairman :*

21356. Do you think there has been a large quantity of smuggled liquor brought in beyond the quantity seized?—I cannot say positively, but I am under that impression.

21357. Who purchases it from the smugglers?—I may have an idea, but I am not sure that it is correct. All that I can say is that I have never handled those goods.

21358. Do you think that liquor is purchased by licensed dealers or by illicit dealers?—I have no doubt some of it is purchased by licensed dealers. The licenses issued in Quebec include licenses for hotels, restaurants, wholesale grocers, retail grocers, brewers and manufacturers of bitters.

JOSEPH T. LAVALLE, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

(*Translation.*)

*By Mr. Gigault :*

21359. What is your occupation?—Hotel-keeper.

21360. How many years have you resided in Quebec?—I was born in Quebec. It is now forty-eight years ago.

21361. How long have you kept hotel?—Thirty years.

21362. Is the number of hotels too great?—There are not too many restaurants, but of eating houses, yes.

21363. And the licensed groceries?—No.

21364. Do you agree with the opinion of Mr. Boisvert, regarding the action of the Association of Liquor Dealers to secure the punishment of violators of the license law?—Yes. When we did everything possible to aid the authorities, and they did not keep record of our reports, there was not much encouragement.

21365. Do you think that drunkenness is increasing or diminishing?—I think it is diminishing.

21366. To what do you attribute this diminution?—To the better education of the people in general, to the better observance of the law by those who are in the traffic, and to the religious authorities, who have done much in that direction.

21367. Do the licensed dealers encourage the people to drink?—It may be so in some localities; but we have not the time.

21368. Do you think the eating house proprietors do so?—I cannot say. I suppose they are anxious to make as much money as possible, but I am not certain about it.

21369. Is it desirable to have the eating houses abolished, I mean those houses where they sell liquor, but are not in a position to offer lodging to travellers as do the hotels?—No. I carry on my business as I understand it. There are some who are a disgrace, and we ought to be more particular in granting licenses.

21370. What means can you suggest to the authorities to suppress drunkenness as much as possible?—The best method would be for the authorities to put a watch on those people, and not to grant them licenses after they had violated the law.

21371. What do you think is the quality of smuggled liquor?—Inferior.

21372. Do you know anything of the operation of the license law in the country?—I reside in the country, at Canardière on the way to Beauport, and I hold a license.

21373. How many dealers are there licensed down your way?—Four, and the number is too many for the locality.

21374. Could you tell us if there are any illegal sales?—I am unable to say.

21375. Are there any made in Quebec?—Several have said so.

21376. As many as by licensed dealers?—Oh, no.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21377. Have you had an opportunity of watching the operation of a local option law?—I have seen parishes where the state of things was even worse than if there were licenses granted.

21378. Were there as many places selling?—The people would carry around whisky with them, and give it to whomsoever they pleased.

21379. Has there been a decrease in drunkenness during five or ten years?—Yes.

21380. To what do you attribute that decrease?—To the influence of the clergy and to better education.

21381. Has there been a change in the drinking customs of the people?—Yes.

LOUIS ALEXANDRE BOISVERT.

WILLIAM BROWN, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

21382. How long have you resided here ?—I was born here, and have lived here all my life.

21383. What is your employment ?—I am Chief Accountant of the Quebec Bank.

21384. How long have you held that position ?—Twenty-five years.

21385. Have you taken any active part in temperance work in the city ?—Yes.

21386. Are you a member of any temperance organization ?—Not just now.

21387. Are you a total abstainer ?—I am.

21388. Have you been so all your life ?—Yes.

21389. Have you paid any attention to the manner in which the license law is enforced in the city ?—I cannot say that I have particularly. I have seen a good deal of drunkenness in the city.

21390. Do you think there is more drunkenness in the city now than there was ten years ago ?—I do not think it.

21391. You think there is less ?—I think so.

21392. To what do you attribute that decrease ?—To enlightened public opinion, to the work of temperance organizations and to the influence of the clergy of all denominations.

21393. Do you think it would be advantageous to curtail the number of licensed establishments ?—I think it would be advantageous to dispense with them altogether ; I do not think they are at all necessary.

21394. Have you any knowledge in regard to the number of places where liquor is sold in the city without license ?—No.

21395. From your previous answers I conclude that you are in favour of the entire prohibition of the traffic. Is that so ?—I am.

21396. Have you had any experience of prohibition on a limited scale under the Scott Act, or under the provincial license law ?—I have had a little experience this summer at the village of Lorette.

21397. At the Indian village ?—Yes, I stayed there for two months, and my experience there was very satisfactory and very pleasing. Only on one occasion did I see drunken men, and they were from the town. The fact is when men wanted to get drink, they had to go to the city for it.

21398. Then prohibition is in force there ?—Yes, local option under the License Act.

21399. That is, the municipality refuses to grant licenses to sell liquor ?—Exactly.

21400. Is there any licensed vendor selling for medicinal purposes in the district ?—There is an apothecary's store, and I suppose liquor is kept there, but it is very difficult to get it.

21401. Do you know as a fact that the apothecary keeps it ?—Not personally. A brother-in-law of mine, I believe, purchased some liquor there for medicinal purposes, on a prescription.

21402. Have you any idea how the law governing such sales is observed in that district ?—It seems to be well observed.

21403. You do not know if people get an excessive number of prescriptions for liquor filled ?—No, it is very difficult to get it, and I am very glad of it too.

21404. The by-law prohibiting the granting of licenses is the act of the Council ?—Yes, it is done by the people's representatives.

21405. Do you think prohibition over the whole country could be as easily enforced as prohibition in a parish ?—I think so.

21406. What are your reasons for thinking so ?—I think it would be more easy to prevent liquor coming in if there was general prohibition. If the United States was a prohibition country it would be very difficult to get liquor brought into this province, in fact, it would be almost impossible, I think ; while if there is a locality where licenses are issued and liquor can be bought, adjoining a district under prohibition, it is of course much easier for the people of that district to obtain liquor.



21407. But to carry out any prohibitive law, I suppose you consider that public sentiment generally should be in favour of it?—Yes. I do not think such a law would be carried out unless that sentiment prevailed.

21408. Do you think public sentiment throughout the Dominion at the present moment is in favour of general prohibition?—I believe it is.

21409. Do you believe the majority of the people of the Dominion are in favour of the enactment of a prohibitory law?—I think if the question were submitted to a plebiscite, the majority of the people would vote in favour of prohibition.

21410. Therefore, you think it could be efficiently carried out?—If the proper men were appointed, and supposing politics did not enter into the business.

21411. I am asking your opinion as to what would probably result?—I should like to put liquor under the ban of the law and array all good men on that side.

21412. I want your opinion as to the probability of a prohibitory law, if enacted, being efficiently carried out?—I think it could be enforced.

21413. You referred in one of your answers to the United States. Is it not a fact that smuggled liquor now comes in from the United States?—I do not know that; I thought it came from the Island of St. Pierre.

21414. You do not suppose they made it in the Island of St. Pierre?—I really do not know.

21415. If it be the fact that liquor is smuggled here at the present time, and of that we have evidence, would there be any more difficulty in bringing in smuggled liquor with a prohibitory law in force than there is now?—I should think so.

21416. Why?—Because there is a sort of leave or license to have liquor in the places down below, and if liquor is brought in it is not noticed.

21417. As St. Pierre is not under British jurisdiction, of course they can keep liquor there if they choose?—Yes.

21418. I understood you to express the opinion that it would not be brought in under a prohibitory law. Under the present law, with the whole force of the Government directed to keeping it out, in the interest of the people, in the first place, and for the protection of the revenue in the second place, smuggled liquor comes in. The evidence is clear on that point. Why would it not come in under a prohibitory law?—I think the attempts made at present in the direction of seizures and the prevention of smuggling have not been made as they should have been. When an officer is appointed who is in sympathy with the Government's views and endeavours to carry out the Government's wishes, there is a change at once. I allude to Captain May. Before that time they never made any important seizures, but competent men have stepped forward.

21419. What would be the incentive to the Dominion Government to put a stop to smuggling if they were deriving no revenue from liquor?—I think the morality of the people and the welfare of the people.

21420. They have the morality of the people as an incentive at present, and they have revenue as a further incentive. Under which system is the supervision of the Government likely to be the more effective, it being remembered that under prohibition there would only be the former incentive?—The present system is one for revenue. If liquor were prohibited from entering the Dominion, there would, of course, be no revenue received from liquor. Then the Government would only have the welfare and moral well-being of the people to consider.

21421. Under which system do you think the action of the Government would be likely to prove more effective?—I think under the prohibition system.

21422. Then you think under a prohibition system the Government having only the welfare and morals of the people to look after and no financial interest, would be more energetic than they are at present, having the same welfare and the same moral interests of the people, and also a revenue to collect, as incentives to action?—I think so.

21423. Have you given any consideration to the question of granting compensation to the owners of breweries and distilleries?—I think it would only be just to compensate them, not fancy compensation but just compensation for the capital they have expended on their establishments. I put it on a parallel with the slave system of the United States. It would have paid the United States fifty times over to have compensated the slave holders rather than enter upon war to suppress the traffic.

WILLIAM BROWN.

21424. You have no doubt given consideration also to the financial side of the question as it affects the Governments of the Dominion, Provinces and municipalities. They derive a very large revenue from the liquor traffic, and under prohibition that revenue would be taken away to a very large extent, if not wholly. Have you considered at all how that revenue would be made up to the exchequers of the Dominion, provinces and municipalities?—I am quite in favour of the view expressed by Mr. Johnston with respect to direct taxation. I think it is the only correct and legitimate mode of deriving a revenue.

21425. Are you in favour of imposing direct taxation to replace the loss of revenue?—I am in favour of direct taxation for everything and the abolition of all duties on imports and so on.

21426. Take the Province of Québec. How would you replace about \$600,000, which would be swept away if prohibition should be enacted? I think the Province would have a legitimate claim on the Dominion Government for an increased subsidy.

21427. Will you tell the Commissioners your grounds for thinking so?—The Provincial Government derives a certain revenue from the sale of a certain article. The Dominion Government sweeps that revenue away. If the Dominion takes away a source of revenue from a Province, it is bound to replace that revenue.

21427*a*. It would not be done by the Dominion Government, but by the action of the people, and the people of Quebec are an integral part of the whole population?—If a prohibitory law is passed, it must be enacted by the Dominion Parliament. If a majority of the representatives of the people enacted a prohibitory law, it would take away one of the sources of revenue from the Provincial Government, and the Dominion would be bound to replace that revenue. That is my opinion.

21428. The Provincial Government at present is exercising its right to issue those licenses and regulate the traffic, and if the people in the Province voted for prohibition and thereby sacrificed the revenue collected, would it not be rather unjust to saddle the other portions of the Dominion with the payment of money to replace that revenue?—I think the principle of government by majority is the one that should prevail. I am afraid there is too much sectionalism.

21429. If the people are in favour of prohibition, would it not be natural that they should assume responsibility for their own actions, and not ask some one else to assist them?—They might, but still they might have a claim on the Dominion Government.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21430. On what ground?—On the ground that the Dominion Government had taken away a source of revenue.

21431. But the Dominion Government would not have taken away a source of revenue. The representatives of the whole Dominion would simply have declared that the liquor traffic was an evil, and the best way to deal with it was to abolish it altogether. Would not the people of the Province of Quebec, equally with the people in other Provinces, be called upon to bear additional burdens on account of the loss of revenue consequent upon the withdrawal of licenses and non-payment of fees on that account? Do you think that if the people of Ontario, or Manitoba, or Prince Edward Island were told that, in the event of a prohibitory law being passed for the whole Dominion, Quebec would expect the other provinces or the Dominion Government to increase her provincial subsidy, they would be likely to vote for prohibition?—Would not the law, if passed, affect equally the other Provinces?

21432. If so, how would the treasury be recouped \$600,000 unless additional burdens were imposed on your people?—Suppose the revenue of the other provinces were swept away, as well as the revenue of Quebec, then all would have a claim on the Dominion Government.

*By the Chairman :*

21432*a*. Are you aware that some of the provinces receive no revenue from licenses?—No.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21433. Would not the Dominion Government have a right *per contra*, if by the votes of the people's representatives, a source of revenue yielding \$6,000,000 was taken away from the Dominion, to impose special taxes to make up the loss sustained?—I would not object to paying special taxes.

21434. You would not urge that the Dominion Government should recoup Quebec?—Not Quebec alone, but it might recoup all the Provincial Governments that would suffer from the enactment of prohibition.

21435. Would you suggest to the Commissioners where the Dominion Government could procure money to compensate all the provinces for the loss they might sustain by the abolition of the liquor traffic?—No, I have not given that question consideration. I heard the Finance Minister make his great speech on that question at Ottawa, and it was with much pleasure I heard him state that the question of revenue was neither here nor there. Evidently he was prepared with a scheme to meet any deficiency that might arise in the revenue. That honourable gentleman has evidently given the subject special consideration, for Mr. Foster stated, and I must say I was greatly pleased with his speech, that the question of revenue need not enter into the consideration of the question at all. I understood him to say that he was prepared with a remedy for any deficiency.

*By the Chairman :*

21436. I did not read Mr. Foster's speech; he may have, hidden in the depths of his own mind, some scheme for replacing the loss of revenue. This Commission, however, is instructed to inquire into the whole subject, and I have therefore sought to obtain your views, as well as the views of gentlemen occupying similar positions, as to the method by which the revenues could be replaced. I understand you suggest that as regards the Province of Quebec, it ought to receive an additional subsidy?—I would not confine the additional subsidy to Quebec, but I would give it to all the provinces deprived of revenue by the abolition of the liquor traffic.

21437. Suppose a province were not deprived of any revenue, do you propose that the people of that province should be more heavily assessed in order to recoup Quebec?—It would not be fair.

21438. If the Dominion should pass a prohibitory law, and Quebec should thereby lose \$600,000 a year, if the Dominion Government should be called upon to recoup that amount to the Province, would not the people of the whole country have to pay it?—Certainly.

21439. Nova Scotia, and I think New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, derive no revenue from the issue of liquor licenses. Would it be just to saddle them with additional burdens in order to recoup Quebec?—You might increase the subsidies of the provinces proportionately.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21440. Would you not be burning the candle at both ends?—I do not know.

*By the Chairman :*

21441. Unless you gave additional subsidies to provinces which do not collect revenue from licenses also, you would not equalize the burden?—It would in so far as justice is concerned, but I do not know that it would be to the general advantage. One of the witnesses has stated that the loss arising to the revenue from the non-issue of licenses or the prohibition of the traffic would be largely recouped by the diminished crime, the fact that fewer prisoners would be in our jails, that there would be a reduced number of criminal cases and fewer members of the judiciary, which is a very expensive body, and a consequent reduction in expenditure.

21442. Have you examined the official returns of the expenditure on jails, asylums and that class of institutions?—Not lately.

21443. Then you cannot tell the Commissioners whether the expenditure in those directions is at all equal to the amount of revenue which is received by the Dominion, provinces and municipalities from the liquor traffic, which is about \$8,000,000?—I cannot tell you.

WILLIAM BROWN.

21444. Have you formed any opinion as to the percentage of reduction in expenditure on such institutions which would follow the enactment of a prohibitory law?—No. In my opinion, the expenditure would not diminish all at once, but the diminution would be gradual from year to year, as the principle of prohibition was more and more enforced.

21445. Do you think the Police Magistrates, the police, and Justices of the Peace would still exist?—You might have jails, but no prisoners in them.

21446. You think that such establishments would still have to be maintained?—I do not know.

21447. Have you considered what proportion of the total crime arises from drunkenness?—I think I have seen it stated that about three-fourths of the total crime is caused by strong drink.

21448. Your impression is that it amounts to three-fourths?—That three-fourths at least of the crime committed is either directly or indirectly caused by intoxicating liquor.

21449. Is it your impression that this crime would entirely cease?—I think to the extent of fully three-fourths.

21450. Do you believe it would cease to that extent?—I do believe it.

21451. How soon after the enactment of prohibition?—That would depend on how the law was carried out. If proper officials were appointed to enforce the law and carry it into effect, I think crime would decrease to that extent in ten years.

21452. Do you think if a prohibitory law were enacted at once, it could be efficiently carried out?—I do not know. As I said before, it would depend on the machinery, and it would depend on the appointment of proper officers.

21453. You could only get the machinery if the people desired its enforcement. If its enforcement were left to the municipalities, would not the Councils do what the people electing the members desired; if it were left to the Provincial Governments, would not the result be much the same; and if it were left to the Dominion Government, would not the action of its agents be the reflection of the views of those surrounding them? In the present state of public sentiment would it prohibit?—Not at first.

21454. How soon?—In ten years a vast difference would have taken place.

21455. Do you know any country where prohibition has been adopted and successfully carried out?—No, I am not personally acquainted with any. A great difference of opinion prevails in regard to the State of Maine law. Some say it does prohibit. I do not know anything personally, but on the testimony of honourable men and men who I believe would not state an untruth, the law has been carried out, not thoroughly, for it is utterly impossible thoroughly to carry out any law, but it has diminished drunkenness and vice of every kind 75 per cent.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21456. Where?—In the State of Maine.

21457. Have you any statistics to show that?—Not at the moment.

21458. Could you procure any? The Commissioners would be obliged to you if you would produce statistics.—I will endeavour to do so. I think this is compared with 25 years ago.

*By the Chairman :*

21459. You do not claim that prohibition would immediately prohibit?—Not at once.

21460. Do you know any country that has adopted the principle of absolute prohibition?—No, I do not.

21461. Do you think looking at the result of prohibition in other countries, such a law would prove actually prohibitive in Canada?—I do.

21462. What reason have you for making that statement, in view of the experience of Maine during 40 years of prohibition?—Maine is only one of a parcel of States, and the adjoining States are not prohibition States. But if our whole country was one prohibitive State, I think it would be much easier to enforce a prohibitory law here than it would be if we had little States alongside from which liquor could be procured.

21463. Would not that condition exist in view of the long boundary between the United States and Canada?—Yes, that is a very extensive boundary.

21464. Would you not have exactly that state of things existing?—The world is growing a little better and wiser.

21465. Is it punishable to carry liquor into Maine?—Yes.

21466. Then would not the cases be parallel? The people of Maine say they are embarrassed in carrying out prohibition by our country sending liquor into that State.—I think that the world is growing a little better and wiser, and public opinion is being better carried out.

21467. Would not Canada under an absolutely prohibitive law stand in precisely the same relation to the United States that Maine occupies to New Brunswick now?—Yes, there is no doubt of it; but I think if we could get a prohibitory law, we would exercise an influence on our neighbours.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

21468. What do you mean by indirect taxation: do you mean taxation direct from customs?—Yes.

21469. And what do you mean by direct taxation?—Where a man is taxed so much on his income.

21470. You would replace the deficiency in the revenue caused by the passage of a prohibitory law by the imposition of direct taxation. That would be taxation on what?—On income.

21471. On anything else? Would you impose taxation on the land and upon a thousand and one other things, or would you confine it to income?—I would confine it strictly to income. I think the less taxation there is on business the better.

21472. You have given a very gratifying picture of the state of things in the parish where you spent the summer season. Were there any officers appointed by that municipality to enforce the law?—I am not aware. All I know is that the law was enforced. I did not see a drop of liquor or a drunken man, and when my brother-in-law's child was sick, we had great difficulty in obtaining from the druggist liquor as prescribed by the doctor.

21473. Did you hear Mr. Johnston's testimony?—Yes.

21474. His evidence about Metis?—I did.

21475. Were there officers appointed in your parish?—I am not aware.

21476. Can you account for the fact that with no officers appointed in one parish, the law is well observed, and with officers appointed in another parish, it is utterly disregarded there?—I suppose local sentiment in favour of the Act is more pronounced there. There is another point. Metis is a great watering place, and some of the folk who go from the town are not much in favour of temperance.

21477. Visitors would hardly patronize unlicensed places, I suppose?—I think they would not care where they got liquor, if they wanted it.

21478. It is very difficult to ascertain what the causes are of the non-enforcement of the law in some places, the partial enforcement in others, and reasonably fair enforcement in others where similar conditions exist. Can you offer an explanation?—There are many local influences in different districts which check the officers in the discharge of their duty. I think everybody has had that experience. A Councillor goes to the Chief of Police and asks him not to touch such and such a man, or to let him off, and some officials are, of course, weak-kneed.

21479. That would not apply where there were no licenses?—Yes.

21480. Mr. Johnston has said that at Metis there are flagrant and sad violations of the law?—No doubt of it.

21481. Yet the Council will not allow liquor to be sold legally, but permit it to be sold illegally. Can you account for that action?—No. I want the law, because a good man will not violate it. A man who has right motives and principles, as is the case with the majority of the people of Canada, will not violate the law. If the law is prohibitive, and the sale of liquor is made illegal, and this has been decided by the majority of the people, he will not violate the law.

WILLIAM BROWN.

21482. Would you consider such a law an interference with personal and natural rights, and would not some men continue to violate such a law when they would not violate any other law, men who use liquor in moderation, taking occasionally a glass of wine or ale?—The law regarding the sale of opium and the law regulating the sale of poisons interfere with a man's liberty; still I think those laws are perfectly legitimate.

21483. Is there not a great difference between the use of opium and the use of ale or wine?—I do not know. Some people are greater slaves to the opium curse than to anything else. I have also read accounts of persons having the chloral habit.

21484. In what country?—I think in Canada, but I am not sure.

21485. Do you know in what part of Canada?—I think in Montreal.

*By the Chairman :*

21486. We have had witnesses before the Commission who have stated that they do not consider liquor in itself an evil, and there are, no doubt, a large number of people in the community who do not consider it a sin to drink alcoholic liquor. On what principle do you think those individuals should be coerced into total abstinence?—I think for the general good.

21487. We are speaking about observance of the law. Might not a man treated in this way and put under coercion be apt to think that this was a law not binding on his conscience?—I do not think he has any right to have that opinion. The law is there, and it is made to be obeyed.

21488. Supposing a law were passed compelling you to attend a certain church, would you feel that law was binding?—It would be an interference with conscience.

21489. What is the other?—It is a matter of appetite.

21490. There are people who believe that alcoholic liquors, properly used, absolutely do them good. I was speaking of observance of the law, and merely mentioned going to a certain church as an illustration. If a law were passed which the majority of a community did not consider binding on them, and to which they had objection, would they not be apt to disregard it, as not binding on their consciences?—People give their consciences a little stretch, and they are pretty elastic sometimes.

21491. I want your view about this matter.—If the law says that liquor is not to be sold, then it is not to be bought.

21492. The man might say it was an unjust law?—I cannot see what conscience has to do with drinking liquor.

21493. He says it is an interference with his individual liberty, and he does not consider it a law binding on him?—If a man indulges in any habit that is injurious to the greater part of the community, that man should be prohibited from continuing it. A good man once said that if meat made his brother to offend, he would not take it. I know he gave the advice to Timothy to take a little wine; but Timothy was sick.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21494. Do you take the ground that the drinking of a glass of wine is wrong in itself?—It is wrong to me.

21495. Then, of course, you should not drink it?—Yes.

21496. Do you believe in prohibiting the drinking of wine because some men may and do drink to excess? Is such a proposition just or right? I agree that the example of individuals has tremendous value, but that is a different thing from coercing individuals?—I think any one should be coerced if he is doing what is injurious.

21497. If he is committing a crime?—Would it not be a crime on my part? I have a family of three boys at home. They have never seen liquor on my table. Would it not be a crime for me to place a decanter on the table and give liquor to them? It strikes me that that would be a gross crime on my part.

21498. Suppose any other man thinks otherwise?—It is a matter of opinion, it is not conscience.

21499. You are quite consistent if you argue from the basis that the taking of a glass of wine or beer is a sin?—Yes.

21500. But there is a vast divergence of opinion as to the soundness of that view, even among the clergy, jurists and others?—I would not say that the act was a sin, that

the man was doing wrong ; but I think so. I hold that every man has a duty to perform to his fellow man, and that is to make him better, and no one can be made better by the selling or drinking of intoxicating liquors.

REV. CHARLES H. DAY, of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

21501. How long have you resided in Quebec ?—I have resided here since last November.

21502. Where did you reside before that time ?—My home was in Yarmouth, N.S.

21503. Were you born in Yarmouth ?—I was born in St. John, N.B.

21504. Then you have lived in New Brunswick ?—Yes, I have lived there.

21505. With what religious body are you connected ?—I am pastor of the Baptist Church in Quebec.

21506. What is the name of your church ?—The Baptist Church. It is the only one in the city.

21507. What is the extent of your congregation ?—About 200.

21508. Have you paid any particular attention to the carrying out of the license law in this city ?—No, I have not paid any special attention to that matter.

21509. Then you are not prepared to tell the Commissioners whether the law is efficiently carried out or not ?—No, I am not. I have noticed, however, that certain establishments have been open on Sunday, which I presume is against the law. I noticed last Sunday that one of the sailors of the “Blake” was intoxicated, and I heard that he obtained liquor from one of the places on the main street, John Street. That is the only instance I know.

21510. Do you mean that he obtained liquor from one of the licensed places ?—I do not know whether it is licensed or not. It is on John Street, and was open on Sunday.

21511. Of your own knowledge, do you know that many unlicensed places are selling liquor ?—No, I do not.

21512. Have you had any experience in districts where the Scott Act or local option was in force ?—In the town where I previously lived, Yarmouth, I believe the Act was in force, and carried out to a very great extent.

21513. Which Act ?—The Scott Act.

21514. And was it efficient in the direction of preventing drunkenness ?—Yes, I think so. That is to say it was as efficiently carried out as any law against crime within my knowledge.

21515. Is it your experience that a prohibitory law really prohibits effectually ?—That would depend on the opinion of the community, that is to say, whether it was supported or not.

21516. I am speaking of your past experience. Do you know of any case where a prohibitory law has really prohibited the sale and use of intoxicating liquors ?—I think it has prohibited the sale and use in the town where I was reared.

21517. What town was that ?—Yarmouth.

21518. Then it has been effective to a certain degree ?—It has not been absolutely prohibitive, just the same as no law can be absolutely carried out, and just as the law against stealing cannot prevent it absolutely.

21519. Has the law been fairly efficient in preventing intemperance ?—In my opinion it has.

21520. Do you know anything of the operation of the law in the State of Maine ?—I lived for one summer on the border between the State of Maine and New Brunswick, at Andover. On one occasion I went to Fairfield in Maine to purchase some alcohol for medicinal purposes, and I went to two or three drug stores in the town and was unable to get it. So I judge that the law was pretty strictly enforced. That is my experi-

WILLIAM BROWN.

ence. I heard the remark made by men who lived in that State that if prohibition was in force in New Brunswick, there would be very much less liquor in the State of Maine.

21521. Having lived on the frontier between New Brunswick and Maine, have you been led to suppose that liquor was taken from New Brunswick into the State of Maine?—Yes, I believe the law is such that liquors are smuggled across the frontier from New Brunswick into the State of Maine.

21522. That would indicate that there is a demand for liquors in the State of Maine, I suppose?—Yes, it would indicate that there are a certain class of people there who want liquor.

21523. Do you know anything in regard to the operation of the prohibitory law in the towns and cities of the State of Maine, as to the effect there?—I heard gentlemen on the train who came up with me from Maine say that the law must be prohibitive, because they could not get a drink in Portland.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21524. Did you ask his name?—They were two gentlemen from New York. I met them on the Intercolonial Railway the other day.

*By the Chairman :*

21525. I suppose you have not lived in any of the towns or cities in the State of Maine?—No.

21526. You have merely passed through them, but have not remained any length of time in them?—I lived for one summer on the frontier line, but I have not lived in the State of Maine.

21527. Judging by your past experience and your observation, are you disposed to think it would be beneficial if the Dominion Parliament were to pass a general law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicants?—Yes, I think so.

21528. Do you think if such a law was passed, it could be efficiently enforced?—I think in certain localities where it was supported very strongly by public opinion, it could be enforced, and that the passage of such a law would tend gradually to educate public opinion up to it, so that in time it would be as generally enforced as is any law.

21529. Do not the provisions of the license law allow communities to adopt the prohibition clauses of the law and thereby secure local option?—Yes.

21530. Why should not the adoption of those prohibitory clauses of the License Act be as effectual as a general prohibitory law?—My opinion is that any local option law has not in it the dignity and force of a general law, consequently the people have not generally as much respect for a law passed merely by a small section of the country as they would have for a general law.

21531. But if a large number of parishes or districts adopted a prohibitory law, the process which you have described would assuredly be going on, that is to say, that the people would be gradually educated up to the point of asking for general prohibition?—I do not exactly understand your question.

21532. You spoke about educating the people. There are certain districts in favour of prohibition, and there are other districts that are not in favour of prohibition. Local option and the Scott Act were framed to meet such cases. If those laws were put in force, would not the process of educating the people go on?—I think the aim of this law is to reach those who are under the control of drink. There are a great many who take liquor who would like such a law to be enacted and enforced, men who are really under the control of liquor and cannot refuse it when it is in their way.

21533. But the adoption of a general prohibitory law would have the effect of forcing it upon districts that do not want it, I presume?—Yes, to some extent, possibly so; without doubt it would do so.

21534. So the districts favouring prohibition would force their views on districts which were not in favour of it?—Yes.

21535. Under that state of things, do you think the law would be efficiently carried out?—I think it would be carried out in those places where it was supported by public opinion, and the law, of course, being a general prohibitory law, would gradually gain over to its side more and more adherents. I think there are certain places now which



would not be in favour of prohibition. There are quite a number of people who are in the habit of taking liquor, and think they require it, who would feel the loss of it if deprived of it, but they would be able to do without it in time, and they would vote for prohibition. I think a great many men who take liquor would admit that they are really better without it, and would be glad if we helped them to get rid of the liquor trade, although they might clamour for the liquor at first, and support the liquor interest.

21536. Is there not a good deal of smuggling under the present law, and do you not think there would be more smuggling under a prohibitory law?—No, I do not think there would be. I think (as has been said to-day by some of the witnesses) as the trade is at present licensed, there is a red hole for liquor whenever it gets beyond the bar. In case of prohibition, illicit places could not be kept open, and it would be more difficult to get rid of any liquor if it had been smuggled into the country. So I think the difficulty that would be experienced in selling when it came into the country would balance the other consideration, that there would be a greater demand for it.

21537. Have you ever been in Germany?—Yes, I was there for some time.

21538. In what part of Germany did you reside?—Berlin.

21539. Can you tell the Commissioners anything in regard to the drinking habits of the people of that city?—I noticed that drinking was almost universal, that it was the common custom of the people to take beer, which is there drunk as water is here. By beer, I mean lager beer. I believe that the drinking of liquor in Berlin is on the increase. I judge from statements I heard by the public men in that city. I heard a lecture by Dr. Stucklenberg, a prominent professor in the city, who said that the quantity of liquor which was being consumed was gradually on the increase. I have no doubt of it from what I saw myself. Almost every store is supplied with it, that is, every store that sells eatables of any kind. I went into one shop for the sake of satisfying my curiosity, and I gave an order for different articles, and in that shop they had no less than eighteen different brands of liquor. That is a very common thing, however.

21540. Do the authorities require those places to take out licenses before they vend liquor?—I am not positive, but from the number selling I should judge that sale was allowed by all.

21541. Is there any other feature of the liquor traffic in Germany to which you would like to call the attention of the Commissioners?—I only desire to make this statement. The socialistic influence is on the increase among the lower classes of the people generally, and it has been the aim of some of the leaders of that movement to inculcate in their teachings the desirability of cultivating more temperate habits. They think temperance would be a great help to the people, and this movement is led in Germany by some of the most celebrated men, including the leading physicians whose names I could mention, who are prominent in advising the people to give up the use of intoxicating liquors. Such a movement is akin to some of our temperance movements. These men have pledged themselves, as our total abstainers have done, by placing their names on the list. The names include those of celebrated professors of physiology and anatomy in the Berlin University. As you know, in Munich there is a very large consumption of liquor. According to some statistics I have read, there is more liquor sold there than in any other city in Germany.

21542. What would the consumption amount to per head per annum?—I could not tell you.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21543. Are these statements you have made the result of your own knowledge, or are you simply repeating statements you have gleaned from newspapers?—What I have gleaned from newspapers I have mentioned, and all the other statements I have made are from my own experience in regards to the drinking habits of the people and the evil effects thereof. I may say that I have seen considerable drunkenness in Berlin. They have a great many clubs there for labouring men. After the work of the day is finished, these men very frequently assemble in parts of the city in their clubs, and I must say they spend most of their money in drinking.

21544. Is drunkenness increasing in Berlin?—That is the statement I have made.

REV. CHARLES H. DAY.

21545. Did you reside in Munich when you were over there?—No.

21546. Were your statistics taken from a newspaper?—Yes.

21547. You are a native of Yarmouth, I believe?—Yes.

21548. Do you know anything about the enforcement of the law there?—I think it has been enforced : liquor has been seized again and again and burnt on the streets. I have seen that myself.

21549. Do you know whether liquor is being sold in the hotels in Yarmouth now, or not?—I have not been in Yarmouth for about a year, but I think the hotel keepers have been selling, at least I believe they have been fined for selling liquor.

21550. The evidence shows that the hotel keepers in all the Scott counties have been fined ; but do you know whether they have continued to sell right along after they have been fined : in fact, have they not continued to sell right along?—I believe they have done so, some have done so.

21551. Do you know anything about the Yarmouth hotel keepers?—I know I have heard many people state that liquor was sold by hotel men, some of them at least in Yarmouth.

21552. Do you know if the leading hotel confined its dispensing of liquor to one bar, or dispensed liquor from more than one bar?—I could not answer that question.

21553. They have had an experience of seventy years of prohibition in Yarmouth, if I am not mistaken?—I believe for a long time.

21554. Is the condition of things which exists in Yarmouth at the present time attributable to the educational influences of prohibition upon the people there during a term of seventy years? Are we to attribute that condition to the result of temperance effort and temperance sentiment?—I do not think we can attribute the condition of the people absolutely to any one cause : many causes must enter into it.

21555. I am referring to drunkenness. After seventy years experience of prohibition there is drunkenness prevailing in Yarmouth, and the question is, to what do you attribute it? The people have been educated in prohibition there for seventy years.—I do not think drunkenness is the outcome of the prohibitory law.

21556. Notwithstanding the fact that during seventy years prohibition has been in force, you are unable to explain the condition of things regarding the illicit sale of liquors, because it is admittedly going on to a very great extent now?—No.

21557. I understand you to speak of the educational influence of the prohibitory law?—I think that generally the people of Yarmouth are temperate people, and certainly there is a strong temperance sentiment prevailing there? Notwithstanding this fact there are a certain proportion of the citizens who have not been brought under the influence of the temperance sentiment there.

The Commission adjourned, to meet in Montreal.

MONTREAL, September 9th, 1892.

The Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic met here this day, SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman of the Commission, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
Mr. E. F. CLARKE.

Rev. Dr. McLEOD:  
Mr. G. A. GIGAULT.

The commission was read.

LAURENT OLIVIER DAVID, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

21558. Are you a native of this district?—Yes, I was born at Sault au Recollet, six miles from here.

21559. You have lived here all your life?—Yes.

21560. You are a member of the legal profession?—Yes.

21561. And you are at present City Clerk of Montreal?—Yes.

21562. How long have you held the office?—About three months.

21563. Prior to that time you were practising your profession in the city of Montreal?—Yes.

21564. You have been at different times a member of the Provincial Legislature?—I was for years a member of the Legislature, and I have been a newspaper proprietor and editor for ten years.

21565. Having been only a short time City Clerk, of course you are not very familiar with the statistics of crime and information of that kind?—No; I cannot give statistics.

21566. But having taken part in public affairs, you have no doubt given some attention to the general question of the liquor trade. Do you consider the present system of granting licenses for the sale of liquor the best method of regulating the traffic?—No.

21567. Would you tell the Commissioners what you think would be a better system?—That is a great question. I think it requires a great deal of study and reflection, and I have tried during many years to form an opinion, and I have heard everything possible and have read a good many articles in papers and books on the subject, because I think the abuse of liquor is the greatest scourge of the country. I know personally it has destroyed half the men of talent whom I have known in my life. I think that those who try to find a remedy do a great service to their country; but when the question as to what is the right remedy comes up, there comes also difficulty, because there are evils in this world which you cannot destroy. You can diminish the evil, but I think it is impossible to destroy it as long as human nature is what it is. So that I think the only thing which can be done is to find a remedy which will diminish the evil. After having, as I remarked, heard everything that has been said on this question and seen the statistics and ascertained what has been done in other countries and the effect of legislation elsewhere, and having reflected on the matter, I came to this conclusion, that the best way perhaps would be not to attempt to destroy the evil, because I think it is impossible. If I thought prohibition would secure that result, I would be in favour of it, but I do not think prohibition would produce that result, though I admit that those who are in favour of it have good reasons and strong arguments. They act in good faith, and must be heard with consideration when they propose their method or system as being the best. But I

LAURENT OLIVIER DAVID.

think it is not the best method. The best method would be to have very high customs duties on the importation of strong liquors and very high excise duties on the manufacture of alcohol, so as to be prohibitive, and I would—and there comes my remedy, or not only mine, but a remedy proposed by many—encourage the importation of light wines as much as possible and the manufacture in this country of light wines. I would encourage the culture of grapes, believing, as I do, that in cold countries especially you must give a certain beverage to the people, and that if you do not give them an in-offensive beverage, they will try to get something worse. Take as an example, France, and especially the part of France where grapes are cultivated or where wine is produced : for the French people this is the best remedy that can be proposed. I have some statistics showing that in France, in the country where wine is produced, there is almost no drunkenness, and in all the other parts of France where grapes are not cultivated, alcohol is prevalent. I think that is about the best I can say in the circumstances. Naturally there should be very high licenses on the sale as well as high duties on the importation and manufacture, so that there would be, if possible, none of those shops where strong liquors are sold, except perhaps in very few establishments for strangers. I think that would be the best thing that could be done, and there should be very heavy fines and even imprisonment for those who adulterated liquors or wines. If there were places where wines were sold, there should be very stringent inspection, and very heavy fines and even imprisonment where people are found selling liquors without license or selling adulterated liquors.

21568. Did I understand you to say that you had statistics or had seen statistics as to the effects of cultivating the taste for wine in France?—They are published in statements in France, and show the difference between the wine growing districts and the others. I have not those statistics, but I think Judge Dugas has them.

21569. Judging from your own experience and observation, do you think that intemperance has increased or decreased in this district of late years, say a period of ten years?—I do not know ; I would not like to give an opinion. I think, considering the population, it is about the same. It has increased because there are more people.

21570. There has not been much change on the average?—I do not think it. I read a book which interested me, written by one of the principal writers in England. He wrote the history of civilization in Europe, as Guizot did in France. I think Buckle was his name. I remember one of his ideas, which struck me at the time. He makes a comparison between the different countries of the world, and he shows that in all the cold countries people feel more the need of strong liquors and of eating meat. It is true, he says, that in certain countries where they cannot get alcohol or strong liquors, they use oil and prepare a different kind of stimulant, showing, he says, that in those countries there is the need of something to warm and stimulate the people.

21571. You say that idea struck your mind with great interest?—Yes, because I think it is wise when we live in a country like this to take that into consideration. When such an idea is expressed by a man who is considered one of the principal philosophical writers in England, it is worth being considered.

*By Judge McDonald :*

21572. Have you considered at all the question of the authority that should have the power of granting licenses, whether they should be granted by the municipal authorities or by a Commission appointed by the Government?—No. I never attached great importance to that, though I think the more independent you make the authority the better it would be.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

21573. You were at one time a member of the Local Legislature?—Yes.

21574. Did you at one time seek to reform the license law?—Yes.

21575. What did you propose?—I expressed at one time those ideas, but it is very difficult to induce a Government to do certain things. I proposed a high license system, and they did something in that direction. They raised the price of the license, and that is a part of the system.

21576. You proposed to increase the price and limit the number?—Yes, considerably, so that there would be only few establishments where strong liquors would be sold. If it were possible to put that into practice, I consider it would be the best remedy. If there were only three or four places such as the Windsor or the St. Lawrence Hall, where you could get good liquors and good brandy, it would be better. If it were possible to have none at all, it would be best, but I do not think that is possible.

21577. You think that the large number of licensed places encourages drinking?—No doubt. When a man has to pass ten or twenty places on his way home, he is tempted to drink ten or twenty times.

21578. Have you thought whether such places as the Windsor, and hotels generally, which have bars, are not really a greater temptation than mere saloons or restaurants?—It makes a difference to the people. I think the abuse of liquors is specially dangerous among the workingmen, and they would not go to the Windsor or to the St. Lawrence Hall. If the workingman had not four saloons at the four corners of his street, he would not go to the Windsor to drink, but the temptation is so near that he goes to the saloon and spends his money, and the result is that his family has no money and no bread.

21579. You regard his spending his money for drink as an interference with the necessities of his family?—No doubt.

21580. Do you think the hotels furnish an inducement to certain people, young men and others, to drink?—Certainly.

21581. And so they are a greater danger to them than saloons?—No. People belonging to good society would go to the Windsor, and would not go to saloons. Perhaps there is something in that.

21582. Some people hold that the hotel bar is more dangerous, for this reason: That if a man goes to a saloon, he is known to go there in order to drink, but if he goes into a hotel, he may go there to see a friend, and he gets his drink under that pretense: and therefore the hotel bar is a greater temptation to a certain class of people than the saloon bar?—I do not say no. There is a great deal of truth in what is said by those who are in favour of prohibition.

21583. Was there a vote on your proposition in the Legislature?—There was no vote on the question of prohibition.

21584. But on the question of high license?—Yes; but as it was proposed by the Government, which was very strong, there was no vote. The proposal was considered to be of importance, so I think everybody voted for it.

21585. Why do you think that prohibition could not succeed?—I told you before that, especially in a country like ours, and in all cold countries (I relied upon the information of Mr. Buckle on this subject) people must drink something to warm and stimulate them. You cannot prevent that. Starting from that point as a basis of my argument, I said that prohibition might not be the best remedy, because statistics show, and it has been proved that where tried it has not succeeded, and that you have had very bad liquors, and that the sale of liquors and the drinking are more secret, but perhaps more dangerous, because the liquor is worse.

21586. Have you observed in your reading that several parties of Arctic explorers have refrained from the use of alcoholic liquors?—I have.

21587. How do you reconcile that with Buckle's statement?—He does not say it is good, but he mentions the fact as being a fact. It is a different thing to say a thing must be done, and to say that it is done.

21588. The people make the demand whether they need it or not?—Certainly, though I think the use of light wines, far from being bad, is perhaps good, though there may be abuse.

21589. Have you observed in late years official statements to the effect that drunkenness is increasing steadily and very largely in France?—Yes.

21590. How do you account for that?—If it was shown that the increase was in the districts where wine is produced, that would be an answer to the contention of those who say the use of wine prevents or diminishes the use of strong liquors.

LAURENT OLIVIER DAVID.

21591. It is conceded that the use of wine encourages the use of strong liquors, and if it is true that alcoholism is increasing in France, would not that encourage that belief?—It is difficult to say that the one thing results from the other.

*By Judge McDonald :*

21592. Would it not be better to say that the phylloxera having destroyed the vines to a great extent, the production of wines has been reduced?—That would express my views better.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

21593. Do you know that that is the fact?—I know it is true.

21594. Do you know if that has covered the period of the increase in drunkenness?—I do not know, but I do not think the use of light wines inevitably leads to the use of strong liquors. I think a man accustomed to drink good wine does not like these horrible drugs which are drunk, because I think the wine has a good effect. It is a delicate beverage, which does not spoil the taste.

21595. As a public man, and as a business man, have you observed whether the drink trade affects in any degree, beneficially or injuriously, other branches of trade?—That is a question which I have not considered.

21596. You have said it affects injuriously social conditions?—Certainly, terribly, morally, physically and intellectually. I think it is the great destroyer of human strength.

21597. What about the effect financially?—That is another point of view.

21598. Have you not given attention to that question particularly?—No.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21599. Is there any city revenue derived from licenses?—No.

*By the Chairman :*

21600. When was it abolished?—I think formerly there was \$8 charged?—That was only for the certificate, but the revenue from the licenses strictly speaking goes to the Provincial Treasurer.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21601. Have you considered what would be the effect of the imposition of higher payments in the way of increased customs duties upon the importation of strong liquors, such as brandy, gin, rum, etc.?—I do not know exactly. For the last three or four years I have not thought of that matter much.

*By the Chairman :*

21602. Has the fact that there has been a great decrease in the production of wine in France during the last half century come to your knowledge?—No, I do not remember it.

21603. Granted it is a fact, that there has been a very large reduction in the production of wines and an increase in the consumption of alcohol, to what would you attribute that change?—I would like to know if that increase in the use of alcohol has taken place in districts where wine is produced, because it would be perhaps an answer in part, if not in whole, to the argument of those who say that the use of wine is an obstacle to the use of strong liquors. But I do not know that that is a fact. Supposing the production of wine has decreased, I think it is true that phylloxera has caused it. That would be an argument in favour of the opinion of those who say that the use of wine prevents the excessive drinking of strong liquors.

*By Judge McDonald :*

21604. The use of wine in France has been prevalent for centuries?—Yes.

21605. The increase of drunkenness is a matter of comparatively few years last past?—Yes.

21606. Would you not, therefore, in looking for the cause of the increase of drunkenness, look beyond the mere fact of the consumption of wine, the consumption of wine not having produced drunkenness in the centuries past when it only was used?—Yes.

21607. The increase of drunkenness is, therefore, modern?—Modern.

21608. Therefore, would you not look to some other cause than the use of wine for the increase of drunkenness?—I would probably say it is because they drink less wine.

21609. Inasmuch as the consumption of wine was almost universal in France for centuries without producing drunkenness, would you not, the drunkenness having increased within a modern period, look for some immediate cause why the people have taken to the consumption of strong liquors?—There might be several reasons.

21610. And then the phylloxera having destroyed the vines might have something to do with it?—It is difficult to ascertain the cause of the diminution of morality in a country.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

21611. Is it a fact that the increase of drunkenness is a matter of recent years, or has it been going on for generations?—No, it is only recent, I think.

21612. If the phylloxera theory is correct, does it show that the use of wine causes the appetite for liquor, so that when there is an absence of wine people are bound to have the strong liquor, or is it a taste independent of wine?—I think it is independent.

21613. If wine production were encouraged here, and there should come a time when wine was not very plentiful, would it cause an increase in alcoholism?—Your idea is that they would try to find compensation; that may be so.

*By the Chairman:*

21614. It is a fact that the production and consumption of wine in France have decreased. It is also a fact that the consumption of alcohol has greatly increased. Is not the latter result caused by the fact that wine has become dearer and there is less of it to be got, and therefore the people resort to a more stimulating beverage?—That would justify what I said at the commencement, that we must give something to the people, and if you do not give them a light and inoffensive beverage, they will drink something worse, more dangerous.

21615. Is not that a very probable explanation of the conditions in France in reference to the consumption of liquors?—That would be a reason.

*By Judge McDonald:*

21616. Has the phylloxera caused the reduction in the production of wine to a large extent?—Yes.

21617. And has it doubtless increased the cost also?—Yes.

21618. Has the fact of the wine not being so plentiful and being more costly, had any effect in leading the people to use the more stimulating intoxicant?—Yes, according to the principle I have put before you, I think so. I think it must be the only result.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

21619. Do you think the greatest possible good can be accomplished by inducing people to drink light wines and light beer, instead of stronger drinks?—It would be better to induce them not to drink at all, if possible.

21620. But you say that is not possible?—Yes.

21621. As to what is possible: do you think it would be better to induce them to abandon the strong liquors and drink light wines and light beer?—Yes.

21622. By placing higher duties on the strong liquors?—Yes, as high duties and high licenses as possible, to restrain as far as possible the drinking of those liquors.

21623. Do you know of any country where prohibition has been tried as a remedy for the undoubted evils of intemperance?—Not personally. I have known people coming from Maine and other parts of the United States, where strong liquor is prohibited, and from what I have heard I do not think prohibition is the best remedy possible.

21624. Has prohibition been tried in Europe, in France or Switzerland, by the reformers who are desirous of suppressing drinking?—I do not know enough to speak as to that.

LAURENT OLIVIER DAVID.

HON. CALIXTE A. DUGAS, of Montreal, on being sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

21625. You have lived in this district almost all your life ?—Since 1865.

21626. And you are a member of the legal profession ?—Yes, since 1868.

21627. What is your present position ?—Judge of Sessions and Police Magistrate since 1878, and one of the License Commissioners for 11 or 12 years.

21628. Will you describe to the Commission the manner in which licenses are issued in this city ?—An application is made by the party who wishes to have a license, signed by 25 municipal electors—though the law has been changed under different circumstances—residing and having their place of business within the district for which the license is asked.

21629. The polling district ?—Yes, the polling district. As Commissioners we have to look into the veracity of the certificate, and confirm it to the Government.

21630. And the license is issued by the Provincial Government ?—Yes.

21631. Has the City Council nothing whatever to do with issuing licenses ?—Nothing, except to issue a certificate, for which I think \$8 is paid.

21632. Is it the City Clerk or the City Treasurer to whom the money is paid ?—I could not state. We have only to confirm the certificate, and do not go further.

21633. Prior to the period you have spoken of, were the licenses granted by a committee of the City Council ?—The law declares that the Recorder and the two Judges of Sessions in the City of Montreal shall confirm those certificates. We are not called Commissioners under the law, but it is a duty imposed upon us.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21634. Have you the privilege of rejecting those applications ?—Yes ; we have perfect discretion, and we complain of that. We do not want to have that discretion.

*By Rev Dr. McLeod.*

21635. It is difficult to exercise it, is it not ?—It is impossible to exercise it in a proper way.

*By the Chairman :*

21636. Then there is no discretion left in the hands of the Commissioners if the conditions are complied with ?—On the contrary, we are completely at liberty to refuse to grant a license without giving any reasons, though we have to exercise that discretion within the spirit of the law.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21637. Do you think that power should be taken away from you ?—I believe we should have no discretion, that the law should state reasons why a license should or should not be granted, and should leave us to decide only whether the conditions are carried out or not.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

21638. Do you think the number of licenses should be limited according to population ?—On that point I have certain views. I contend that every citizen should be equal before the law, and that the law should be framed in such a way that if A comes under certain circumstances and has a right to obtain his license, B coming under the same circumstances, should have the same right. As to limiting the number, if that were the intention of the Legislature, the law should be so constructed as to force a limitation by itself.

*By the Chairman :*

21639. Do you consider the present system of controlling the liquor trade a satisfactory one ?—No.



21640. Have you formed any opinion as to what would be a better system?—One of the systems would be, first, to take away that discretion from the Commissioners; and, secondly, to secure a better class of restaurant or hotel keepers.

21641. How would you accomplish that?—First, by high license, although I do not believe, according to what I have heard of the experience of others, that that has been very successful. I was at first very much in favour of high license, and I am only repeating hearsay as to other places, as to its not having had the good effect expected by those who wanted to limit the number of licenses. We have increased the amount of the license a great deal, considering the wealth of the people and the taxes upon them, and we have always about the same class of licensees and the same number of licenses. Too often we have shoemakers, carters and people of like kind entering the business, people who have no experience whatsoever. I do not think it is doing justice to the public when such men open restaurants, for they cannot give good meals, and they should not be encouraged to go into the business. If any means could be adopted to exclude them entirely from the business, unless they possess previous knowledge, I think it would be a good thing.

21642. Have you thought of a method by which the number of licenses could be reduced?—Yes. I believe that if the law to which I have referred went into details and gave the size of the houses required, and stated that there should be no hotels with less than 15, 20 or 25 rooms, taking into consideration the locality, it would be better. There are poor localities where smaller hotels are needed, and where it is impossible to have large accommodation, and that must be taken into consideration, but generally there should be a number of rooms required.

21643. And the obligation of supplying meals and beds should be imposed on the restaurant keepers?—Yes. They should have large and good buildings for hotels. A restaurant here is a place that does not lodge people, but gives drink and meals. As to that class, I would go further than our law does now, because the law, as it is construed, is very wide, and permits a great many of those so-called restaurant keepers to omit, to a certain extent, to fulfil the requirements of the law, and the Commissioners are thus placed in the position of giving a license to what is not a real restaurant, but only a place where they give a sandwich or something of that kind, and so pretend to meet the requirements of the law. If the size and accommodation of the hotels and restaurants were specified, it would be of great advantage. Another amendment which would improve the standing of restaurants and hotels would be to give permanent licenses, as long as the holders behave themselves well.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21644. Do you mean licensing the house?—Of course, the license must also be personal, because the person must be responsible. Sometimes disorders occur in a house, and that against the will of the license holder, and that must be taken into consideration. But if permanency were established, giving no option to the court to annul a license, except under certain circumstances, I believe the licensees would be the best guardians of their houses, because they would be interested in seeing that everything was kept in good order.

*By the Chairman :*

21645. These are points which you think would improve the present system?—I believe these would be improvements. I am one who in the position I occupy deplores every day the injurious effects of alcoholism. I have often mentioned that 80 or 90 per cent of the crime is due to alcoholism, not speaking, of course, of professional thieves, whom I do not consider in making this statement; but in my mind a great deal of the lower class of crimes is due to bad liquor sold in those institutions.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21646. What institutions?—Some of these restaurants and hotels of the lower class.

21647. Is the restaurant what is called the saloon in Ontario?—Yes.

HON. CALIXTE A. DUGAS.

*By the Chairman :*

21648. Are there places in Montreal where only liquor is sold and nothing else?—We suppose there are, but when we come to try and find them out, there is always proof to the contrary.

21649. It would be a violation of the law?—It would be, and our duty would be to refuse licenses to the applicants for such licenses.

21650. Do you think it would be an improvement to substitute some prohibitive measure?—I do not believe in prohibition. I do not admit that strong drinks, such as whisky, gin and such things are a beverage. I belong to the class of persons who believe that mild liquor would be a great benefit to this country or any other country, that is mild beer and wine.

21651. You think a prohibitive measure would not be an improvement upon the present system?—No; I believe it would bring people to accustom themselves to break the law, which is a very bad thing generally. The inclination of the majority would not be in favour of following such a law, and they would use all sorts of means not to submit to it, either by manufacturing the liquor or buying it, or getting it under false pretenses. And as long as there is any means of making or getting that liquor somewhere, prohibition cannot have any good effect.

21652. A law prohibiting both the importation and manufacture of liquor would render it certainly very difficult for those who desire to get it to do so. How do you suppose under such a law, they would manage to get a supply in Canada?—They would get it from the most honest man who would have it to sell. Druggists and others would have it, and anybody who would go there would get it.

21653. They would have to import it or make it?—In the North-west the Government had to keep an army to prevent liquor coming in from the States.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21654. They have repealed that law?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

21655. You think a supply would be smuggled in from the States, and there would also be illicit manufacture?—I have no doubt about that.

21656. Have you any knowledge of the character of the liquor sold in many of the saloons here?—Generally it is very bad, and this is, according to my view, one of the greatest causes of alcoholism, and of the brutalization of those who use it. They make brutes of themselves after three or four glasses, but with good liquor there would be less danger to those who use it.

21657. Do you think the present system of inspection is efficient?—To say exactly what I believe about it, I think there is no inspection at all.

21658. Then one of the improvements of the present system, you think, would be a rigid inspection?—Of course, and a very severe punishment for all falsification.

21659. In what was known as the McCarthy Act, there was a very stringent clause against adulteration?—It did not come under my notice.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21660. Would the re-enactment of these clauses in the provincial law have a good effect?—I have tried many times myself to have such provisions introduced, but nothing was done. There is a sort of indifference about it. In preparing these clauses, the penalty was so strong that they were afraid to pass them. In France the law is very severe on this subject. The shop will be closed for 25 days or a month or stopped entirely where adulteration is found and the judgment is placarded over the door.

*By the Chairman :*

21661. Will you tell us the class of cases dealt with in your court?—As Judge of Sessions, I hear the criminal cases, that is all cases which come before the Queen's Bench and a jury, with a few exceptions; and as Police Magistrate, I hear all the petty cases such as, assault and battery, infringing the liquor laws and the excise laws and customs laws, cases of vagrancy sometimes, and the infringement of some of the local laws.

21662. Do you mean municipal laws?—No; provincial laws. I have nothing to do with municipal laws.

21663. What cases are dealt with in the Recorder's Court?—Principally the execution of the by-laws of the city, but the Recorder has jurisdiction also in the petty cases I have named, and people can go to either court as a matter of choice.

21664. About how many cases, on an average, have you before you in the Police Court?—We receive more complaints than appear before the public, because many of those petty cases are settled. We generally have before us every day from fifty to sixty or seventy persons complaining. Many are sent back, after they have explained their cases. Sometimes we find that they have no case, or we advise them to stay quiet. We try to avoid difficulties between people, because there might be a fight between two people, and the one who struck first would be brought before the court, though the other might have been the aggressor. We discourage cases of that kind. Of course, this takes place in chambers. Besides, we have to make a preliminary examination in cases of felony and high class misdemeanours, and send them before the Queen's Bench, where the prisoners take the option of having the trial before us as Judges of Sessions or before the Queen's Bench.

21665. It is your court which takes cognizance of all these cases in the city and district of Montreal?—Yes.

21666. The district includes—what?—The County of Jacques Cartier, the County of Hochelaga, the County of Laprairie. It is a very large district; the largest in the Dominion, I think.

21667. Do you know of any other police court in the country that has as many cases as you have?—We have more to deal with than all the others in the province.

21668. What percentage of the cases in the police court do you attribute to intemperance?—To intemperance, leaving aside the professional criminals, I attribute eighty or ninety per cent. By professionals, I mean those who make a specialty of larcenies and burglaries, and live upon the fruit of robbery and crime.

21669. You make a deduction from the total for that class?—Yes. It comes to this, that generally the people here are good; but when they get drunk they are apt to commit many offences, more or less serious, which they would not do if they were not drunk. The general excuse, when a prisoner is brought before us, a man who is known to be a good man up to that time, is, "I was drunk"; and it is upon this that I base my statement that eighty or ninety per cent of crime is due to drunkenness.

21670. Eighty or ninety per cent of the total cases?—I base that upon the statements of those brought before us. The general answer is that they were drunk. Of course, the professional never says that.

21671. Occasionally that is put forward as an excuse and in mitigation of punishment?—It may be, and it must be in many cases.

21672. I suppose the statistics are supplied to the Dominion Government?—No; not to the Dominion, but to the Local Government. The statistics are very succinct. Our report is in two lines.

21673. Does it appear in the official documents presented to the Legislature in Quebec?—Nothing, but the number of cases.

*By Judge McDonald:*

21674. There are criminal statistics published by the Dominion Government, showing the number of crimes, divided according to the different offences?—That must come from the Clerk of the Peace.

21675. Do the cases which come before you in connection with breaches of the license law include cases of people who sell without license?—Yes.

21676. And those who sell at times when they are not allowed to sell?—They are not allowed to sell after 12 o'clock during the week and not at all on Sunday.

21677. What is your experience as to the memory of witnesses in cases of that kind, is it poor?—Yes, and there is a great deal of perjury. I had the law amended, reducing the time of proscription. Sometimes we would have to hear cases which happened two or three months before, and we thought it was not right to the witnesses,

HON. CALIXTE A. DUGAS.

and it put us in a difficult position, because then they could not remember. We thought that by reducing the time, the revenue office would have to bring its cases before us sooner; and the change has had a good effect. Still, there is a great deal of perjury on the part of the defendants, either those who hold licenses or those who sell without license.

21678. Do you think the system in France of putting a notice on the door of a person who sold out of hours would be beneficial?—I have no doubt it would, provided there was no discretion. It is perfectly understood between the three authorities, the Recorder, my colleague Judge Desnoyers and myself that we will annul the license of any one who breaks the Sunday law. We have threatened that often, and had it published, but when we came to keep our word, we found it would be too severe, because we are men having a little heart, and when it appeared that by annulling the license, we would put five or six children on the street, and perhaps the man himself might be dying from consumption, it was very difficult to enforce our decision. We suffer, and the public suffer, and every one suffers from our having a discretionary power.

*By the Chairman :*

21679. You think the law should not give you that discretion?—The law should say what we should do after the first and second offences. It is the same with the granting of a license. We are blamed right and left. We are ashamed to see some of the places to which we have granted certificates. There are reports made by good men no doubt, and they tell us: this is a good man, and he has every facility for giving meals; and if there is nothing against the man, we grant the license, but if we pass the place and see the character of the place, we say it should not have been licensed. If we refuse a license, those people if they could, would bring the Pope from Rome to induce us to grant it. They try to induce Ministers to come to us, though I must say, they never interfere. We are perfectly at liberty to do what we like, but I know numbers of cases where innumerable letters were sent to Ministers of the Crown asking them to use their influence with us. We have the clergymen and aldermen and the doctors, the notaries, the advocates, every one, and when we are surrounded in that way by men of good standing who tell us that we have not the proper information, and give us some information to benefit those whom they desire to protect, it is difficult to know how to act. I have resisted for two months sometimes, and afterwards have had to yield. As long as I am human, I cannot exercise that law properly. I have always said so, and I say so still.

*By Judge McDonald :*

21680. Then, in your opinion, would it be wiser to have the granting of licenses placed in the hands of Commissioners or in the hands of the municipal authorities?—I do not believe in the aldermen giving licenses.

21681. They would be subject to the influences of which you speak?—Certainly. We are independent, and if we submit it is not from any desire to please this one or that one. It is from no undue influence, but it is from the pressure of the different good citizens who come to us, and say we have discretionary power, and tell us the terrible effect our refusal would have upon those people by putting them on the street. We are told: here is a man who has a daughter at the convent and his boy at the college, and if you refuse his license, his children will have to leave school. That is one of the reasons sometimes given to us.

21682. As to the use of impure liquors, are they more used by illicit dealers than by the licensed dealers?—No, they are used by both. I do not think you can go into the country and find anything but adulterated liquor.

21683. Have you any idea how they procure those liquors?—I had a small bottle of essential oil which had placed on it: "Twelve-year-old Whisky." It was to be added to some other stuff to make twelve-year-old rye. That bottle was brought before me, and it contained poison.

21684. Is the effect of that sort of stuff to produce craziness?—Certainly.

21685. Can you suggest any other amendments or remedies than those of which you have spoken?—Tax alcohol as much as possible. Make it 50 cents a glass, so that the lower class cannot have it, and give them the opportunity of drinking mild beer and

wine. I do not take alcohol to be a beverage, but I do the other kinds of liquor. It strikes me sometimes that it is a great mistake to believe that the mob can be made a good class of citizens. The mob exists everywhere, and it is not a part of the population that should be much considered, but the better class of the population should be protected, and if you can prevent the better class from joining the mob, you will have done a great deal of good.

21686. Do you not find, from your knowledge of the Province of Quebec, that, in the last fifteen or twenty years, there has been a great change in the social customs of the people, tending towards temperance?—No, I cannot say that. I was very young at the time that Mr. Chiniquy preached temperance, but I remember him well, and I know my Province pretty well. I have been everywhere amongst the habitants, and I am satisfied that persuasion is one of the greatest means to promote temperance.

21687. Have not religious and moral influences for many years past been bearing in that direction?—There is no doubt whatever that people are impressed by the way in which they are spoken to, and the question is whether they have been properly spoken to. Father Chiniquy was a man who had the greatest influence with our people.

*By the Chairman :*

21688. You think he did a great deal of good?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

21689. Are those influences still going on?—They are tried, but not with the same effect.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21690. He was the Father Mathew of Canada?—Yes. You will see his portrait, as taken at that time, in many Catholic houses now, though he has turned to be a Protestant. They had a sort of veneration for him.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

21691. An application for a license requires the signatures of twenty-five electors?—Yes.

21692. Do you think it would be better if the applicant had to obtain a majority of the electors of the ward or district where his place is located?—That is a question we have discussed. We had a law framed to that effect, but we had to repeal it.

21693. What were the difficulties attending it?—It is nearly impossible to get a majority, and it would close nearly all those hotels already established. I do not agree with some people on the point, I know, but I want everybody to be equal before the law; and, when you require a majority, you know perfectly well that people will refuse to sign for some applicants without knowing particulars of the application. So that those hotels already in existence, that have respected the law, would in that way have their license cut off or refused because they could not get a majority, for what reason I do not know, but I suppose because more influence or activity would have been employed in other quarters.

21694. You think that some persons could get a majority, while others could not?—In some quarters they could not get it at all.

21695. And we understand from you that licenses are granted in localities where the majority of the people are opposed to having licensed places?—No doubt.

21696. Should the majority rule in such cases?—They have a right to do so. They can come before the Commissioners and oppose the application.

21697. If the majority come and oppose it, the Commissioners refuse the license?—Yes.

21698. The application must have 25 signatures, and if the majority oppose the granting of the license, it is refused?—Yes; if they show they have a majority against, but we have discretion. I am much opposed to requiring the majority of the people to sign the certificate. It would be equivalent to making it impossible for the hotel-keepers to get licenses.

HON. CALIXTE A. DUGAS.

21699. The law as it now stands requires the applicant to get only 25 signatures, and puts the burden of labour on those who are opposed to his application?—Of course.

21700. Would it be unfair if the burden of labour were put on the man seeking a license?—Quite so. If you are a prohibitionist, you will say that that would be just. If you are not, you will say that it would be most unjust. This is a trade which every one can exercise. The law requires certain preliminaries in order to prevent abuses or disorder in the houses, and it is for that purpose that the certificate is required. For my part, I would not require any certificate at all; I think it is only a farce. Once the man has his license and observes the law, why should he have to get a certificate every year?

21701. You would not have it renewed?—No, he should keep his license.

21702. In perpetuity?—Yes.

21703. Is the number of licenses to be granted within your discretion?—As judges administering that law, we contend that we cannot go into the question of the number. We are not there to say there shall be 200 or 300. We are there to look into each case, and to say whether the man is entitled to a license or not. Of course, the discretion must be exercised within the spirit of the law, and I say it is not our business to limit the number and that it would be even against our duty to do it.

21704. The law does not limit the number?—No; and it does not permit us to do it. We have to look into each case separately.

21705. The character of the licensee does enter into the question?—Yes.

21706. You determine whether he is a proper person or not?—Yes, but there is not a scoundrel who cannot get 1,500 signatures from the best people in the city.

21707. Do you find irregularity in the signatures, or is there any way to guard against that?—I had the law altered in this respect, and now they are obliged to swear to the signatures. There is now a case pending against one who forged the name of another. We have 500 applications in a year, and the parties come and swear to the signatures and generally they are all right, but sometimes they are forged. It has come to my knowledge that sometimes the party going around for signatures would be authorized to sign for another, who had given the authorization *en passant*.

21708. That would be more an irregularity of form than a forgery?—Yes.

21709. You do not find much perjury in that matter?—No.

21710. Is the license law generally observed as to sale after hours and on Sabbath?—I think it is better observed this year in Montreal than before, judging by the reports from our officers, and I think that is due to our having threatened to annul all licenses on the first offence. Every hotel-keeper, with very few exceptions, has no inclination to follow the law, however stringent we make it. Many people in the community, from the Ministers of the Crown and the Judges to the lower class of people, have no inclination to follow the law.

21711. They are parties to violation of the law?—You have seen legislators voting for a law, and going after 12 o'clock and taking a drink behind the bar, and Judges also.

21712. Which class are more inclined to violate the law, hotels or saloons?—Hotels.

21713. Then the law is not observed altogether, though better than before?—Yes.

21714. Do you think a reduction in the number of drinking places would help the religious influences which exist?—The reduction of the lower class would.

21715. You would not apply that to the higher grade of places?—No.

21716. But a reduction of the lower grade of places would help the religious influences?—Yes. It is very hard sometimes to draw a conclusion. We have found in many instances where they had given the order in the suburbs to close on Sundays and to see that the law was strictly observed, that people would gather together on Saturday night and buy three or four bottles of bad whisky, and then get in a room on Sunday and get as drunk as beasts.

21717. These are cases which are hard to get at!—What can you do? You ask if the number were less, would that be an improvement? I give you that example, and that is admitted by others. If you had prohibition in Montreal and could get whisky ten or fifteen acres away, the people would go there, and of course, they would stay there and get drunk. This will happen in some instances, and in other instances it will not.

21718. You do not believe in prohibition, and yet you would interfere with the sale of the stronger liquors?—Yes.

21719. Would you prohibit the sale of the stronger liquor?—How would you prohibit it when it is required for so many purposes?

21720. Do you think that by the imposition of what you call prohibitive duties on the stronger liquors, it might in a large degree prevent the trade in those stronger and dangerous liquors?—No doubt of it. If a man has to pay 50 cents for a glass of whisky, generally he will not take it.

21721. Do you think that would be an interference with the rights of those who prefer that kind of drink?—I do not consider alcohol a beverage, while I do so consider beer and wine. I do not think alcohol was ever considered a beverage until about 150 years ago.

21722. There seems to be a larger class who prefer the strong alcoholic drinks as a beverage. Do you think prohibitive duties on that liquor would be an interference with the rights of that large class of people?—All laws are an interference. When you want to draw an exact conclusion, it is very difficult to do so on these points. I know the argument is: Do not interfere with me, even if I want to take poison. At the same time, there is a feeling, and it is a fact, that alcohol is not doing a great deal of good, and every one is in search of some means of restricting its use, because of the evil it does.

21723. Would that justify a prohibitive duty?—It would not be a prohibitive duty, but it would fall in the same category as other articles on which there are heavy duties. For instance, you are interfering with the purchasing of a silk dress if you impose a high duty upon it. It would be the same if people had to pay 50 cents for a glass of whisky. This is not interfering with their liberty more than in other cases, but it would place the use of heavier liquors in the light of a luxury.

21724. A dangerous luxury?—Yes, a very dangerous luxury.

21725. You think the attempt by high duties to interfere with the sale would be justified because of the great injury that class of liquors does?—That is my view.

21726. Can you say what proportion of the professionals are drinkers, that is, thieves, burglars and the like?—I think they all drink, but they take great care not to drink before committing their depredations.

21727. They do not drink in business hours?—They drink after. They are more cute than many others.

21728. That would show that the man is better prepared for his business when he is not using strong alcohol?—Yes.

21729. In your years of contact with those professional criminals, have you formed any opinion as to whether any proportion of them are so by inheritance, whether the matter of heredity has entered into it, and whether it can be traced back a generation or two, and you can find that their progenitors, men or women, have been addicted to the alcoholic habit?—My view has always been to try and protect a child from 14 or 15 till 23 or 24 years. If you can save him from bad habits during that period, generally he will continue good. The great danger is between those ages. If a young boy reaches 16 or 17 years and his salary is about \$2 a month, his wants become more numerous; there is great danger for him then, and if he wants a dollar or two he will go to the till of his employer and take it.

21730. Have you observed whether any proportion of the juvenile criminals, boys and girls, brought before you, for petty larcenies and little disorders of that kind, are the children of parents who are given to drink and neglect their children, so that they fall into those evil ways?—There is a good deal of it. I may say that education is a great restraint. People have no idea generally in large towns of the amount of degradation that exists in the lower classes of people, what I call the mob. You cannot bring those people back to be good. They are there to remain.

21731. Do you think there is any use in attempting to improve the mob?—No; I think the greatest work that the philanthropists could do would be to protect from falling those who are good.

21732. But you think the mob will remain the mob?—Yes.

21733. Will it perpetuate itself?—It will remain.

21734. You will always have that class?—Yes, you will always have the mob in large towns.

HON. CALIXTE A. DUGAS.

21735. You think it is better to prevent the better class from joining the mob and to prevent the mob from doing injury to others?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

21736. The result of the efforts of those philanthropists would be that the mob would decrease in time?—Yes.

21737. Have you observed whether the system of suspended sentences is beneficial in the case of young people?—Yes; but in the case of old people that discretionary power comes in again. I have so much experience in that system that I do not want it at all. We have tried it for old people, and we have found that we never could pass sentence afterwards, surrounded as we are. I am much in favour of protecting children against jail; I am strongly against reformatory schools generally within the city. The amount of dirty things we hear from boys who seem to tell the truth, puts me on my guard against reformatory schools. People seem to think a reformatory school is a sort of college, and try to induce us to put their boys there. The reformatory school here could not be better administered, and the Superior has great experience and those in charge are good people, but there are 400 young men there, between 200 and 300 are of bad dispositions, and the other 150 have the bad association, and as it is impossible to follow them every hour of the day, very bad things take place.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

*(Translation.)*

21738. What do you think of the licenses granted to clubs; do you not think that it would be much better if such were not granted?—I am a member of some clubs. There are abuses, no doubt; yet if you only note the abuses without taking into consideration the advantages derived, you will necessarily be against the clubs, as against all other institutions of this nature, because of the strong likelihood that there are abuses committed there. I belong to several clubs, and have seen there on certain occasions, men intoxicated. Such things mortify the other members of the club; but these are things we cannot prevent.

21739. It has been intimated in Quebec, that the licenses granted to clubs induced the sale of liquor on Sundays?—Yes, that is certain.

21740. Is there much illegal sale of drink in Montreal?—Very much.

21741. Are there as many unlicensed as licensed retailers?—No; I do not believe so. There are 500 licensed; I mean saloons, chop-houses and inn-keepers. I have no exact statistics about the numbers, but I speak of it from the opinion I have been able to gather by the reports that have been made to me. I calculate that there must be from 100 to 150 unlicensed liquor shops, I even believe, when I come to think well about it, that there must be many more than that number. Thus, it has been stated to me that there were 135 houses for rendezvous, or for disorderly purposes in Montreal. Well, there is no doubt that liquor is sold in each one of these houses. Their number must come well nigh to 200.

21742. Do not the authorities try to stop the illicit sale of liquor?—The authorities, which are made up of the city police and the Provincial Government police, endeavour, I believe, to prevent the sale, but they meet such difficulties that it is impossible to cause the law to be respected in a proper manner on that score.

21743. Do you think it impossible to adopt amendments to this law that would allow of more frequent punishment of its violators?—The difficulty is to prove the offence.

21744. Do licensed retailers generally help in securing the conviction of parties who sell without licenses?—On this point, the Government Police will be able to answer you better than I can. It is the police that institute the actions and make proceedings, and we are only obliged to try them. I know it to be their desire to do so.

21745. In the McCarthy Act, there was a clause which provided that the number of licenses should be limited according to population?—I believe that it was one license for 400 inhabitants.

21746. You complained a little while ago of the discretionary power left to the Commissioners to grant licenses. Do you not think that such power ought to be



inserted in the license law of the Province of Quebec?—I am against this power being given, because of the principle that I have enunciated, that each must be equal before the law, and that when you have to decide between four or five applicants entering for each license to be granted, you commit an injustice to those applicants you refuse.

21747. If the interest of morality demands it, is it not better to sacrifice the innkeepers?—I would not have it that way. Give a license to each of the applicants, but be severe as regards the enforcement of the law.

21748. If I understand correctly your argument, you would grant a license to each individual worthy of receiving it?—Yes, provided he observes the requirements of the law. It is for our legislators to frame the law in its details, to make the conditions as severe as possible. I have no objection to that, provided each citizen has the benefit of this arrangement. I would not like to limit the number of retailers by committing an injustice.

21749. What do you think of the power given to Municipal Councils to prohibit the sale of liquors?—It is still another question somewhat difficult to answer. I have been this summer in Carleton, and the Council has refused all licenses. I have received information from the authorities that they were satisfied. On the other hand, they added, that it happened often that people left and went to get drink in the neighbouring municipalities, as in Dalhousie to take but one example.

21750. Do you not think that a prohibitive by-law that operates successfully is to the interest of temperance in thinly settled countries?—I have not on that point the necessary experience. I will give you as an illustration what they told me in Carleton the other day, and afterwards in St. Barthélemi, where I have been lately. The municipality had refused to grant a license, and I inquired how the prohibition worked. They told me that it did not prevent drinking, and even that they thought drinking was on the increase, because people who were "dry" did not now go and take a glass without coming back drunk, more so perhaps than if they had liquor in their house. This is perhaps exaggerated.

21751. You have declared in favour of high duties on strong drinks and fermented liquors. Would you like an arrangement that, at the same time, would give to licensed parties the right to sell only wine, beer and cider?—Certainly; we have this in our law.

21752. It has been shown in Quebec, in the course of this inquiry, that the holders of divers licenses for the sale of what are called temperance drinks, break the law in almost every case, and sell strong drinks. Do you not think that retailers authorized to sell only wine and cider would break the law in the same way?—That is quite likely, unless there were some very strong measures to restrain them. In Switzerland there is what is called the monopoly of alcohol by the State. It is in existence also in Russia. The manufacture and the sale of alcohol can be conducted only by the officers of the Government.

21753. What do you think of the imposition of a heavy tax on alcohol, or of a system that would invest the Government with the control of the sale of alcohol in such a way that they would be able to follow it into whatever hands it might pass, and to leave to licensed persons the right to sell beer, wine and cider. Do you not think this would be the system the least liable to abuse?—I would be favourably disposed towards such a system.

21754-5. In Sweden and in Norway there are associations authorized by the State to sell alcoholic drinks, and these societies have a right to retain nothing but the interest on the capital invested, the surplus of the profits being paid to the State, to be employed by it in whatever way it thinks best, or to be employed for charitable purposes. The advocates of this system maintain that it is better than ours, seeing that the retailers are not incited to sell alcohol to realize profits. What would you think of the application of that system here?—I do not like to give an opinion thoughtlessly. I have, however, ventured an answer to the other question, and in that case I have answered unhesitatingly, although without cognizance of its results through experience.

21756. Do you think that drunkards should be punished more severely than at present? I do not know the purport of the law here, in Montreal. Do you inflict punishment on the inebriate here, for the act of mere drunkenness, or must this person break the public peace to deserve punishment?—He must break the public peace.

HON. CALIXTE A. DUGAS.

21757. Several persons have expressed the opinion that drunkards should be punished for their very drunkenness. What do you think about that?—I am against all legislation which tends to punish the sin itself; it is only when the public peace and society suffer from the behaviour of its members that punishment should be meted out, according to my opinion.

21758. Is there an increase or decrease of crime in Montreal?—It has been about the same for six years. I do not think it has increased except in ratio of the increase of the population. I must say that I even deem there is a decrease.

21759. Have the licensed shops decreased or increased in the city of Montreal in the ratio of increase of population?—The licenses have not increased in ratio of the population.

21760. You have spoken of the North-west. Have you had some experience of the operation of the prohibitory law in the North-west?—Yes.

21761. What has been your experience?—That it did not prevent drinking. I used to see even those who were not addicted to drinking trying to get liquor.

21762. Have you noted that there were many habitual drunkards in the North-west?—I have noted that people became intoxicated by means of lavender water, pain-killer and other such drugs. I have seen in Edmonton very respectable people who have confessed that at times they have even mixed tobacco juice with their tea.

21763. Have you examined the operation of the prohibitory law in the State of Maine?—No, but I have obtained information from many people who came from there, such as Judges and Sheriffs. One day, I asked a Judge what was the effect of prohibition at home, in Maine. He said to me: "This very morning as I was leaving home, I received a newspaper which said that of 52 arrests in the city, 48 were for drunkenness." That was a city in Maine.

21764. Have you ever visited France?—Yes.

21765. What have you noted there?—I went to France in 1875. I visited a little everywhere in the provinces. I found that the people were very sober as a rule. They certainly take wherewith to make merry, but the thing stops there. Since you speak of France, I do not know if you have had any information of the work published when M. Tirard was Premier of the Cabinet. This publicist draws the conclusion that a certain quantity of stimulants is necessary for mankind, and that a sufficiency is found in ale and wine.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21766. Is the Scott Act in force in any part of your district?—No.

21767. Or a local option law?—No, not that I know of.

21768. Have you examined into the Scott Act itself as a prohibitory measure?—No.

21769. You cannot make any suggestions as to changes in the Scott Act that would render it more efficient?—No.

21770. You said something respecting the ten or fifteen professionals or habitués who appear before you out of 100?—No. I spoke of 100 cases in order to make a comparison, but I did not include the professionals in that number.

21771. What do you say respecting the professionals? Would it be right to draw the conclusion that their crimes are committed when they are sober?—They are sober when they commit the crimes, but they get drunk afterwards.

21772. Do they commit the crime to get money to get drunk?—They have no other object than to rob, and, if necessary, to murder.

*By the Chairman :*

21773. Do they as a class show great astuteness?—The greatest astuteness; they are very intelligent.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21774. Are these professionals generally guilty of petty crimes?—No, that is below their dignity.

21775. Have you known the licensed vendors to aid the unlicensed vendors to ply their trade?—No, they are against them.

21776. It has been stated in some places that the licensed vendors seem to help the unlicensed ones?—No, on the contrary they are jealous of them.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

21777. Do you think that the licensed sellers sometimes sell to the unlicensed sellers?—I suppose if one has a chance, he will sell; but I have no experience in regard to that.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

21778. But would an ordinary hotel-keeper, if he knows the unlicensed man is going to sell again, sell to him, or would he give information to the police?—They do not like to give information, but generally they will ask the police to see to it. Of course, there are always exceptions, but I am speaking generally.

21779. Would you consider their action in selling to a person who came in and was an unlicensed vendor, an evidence that they desired to aid the unlicensed trade?—No, not at all. I believe the licensed man will sell for ready cash to any one, without having any consideration for the other man.

21780. He does not take the unlicensed man as a partner?—Nor under his protection.

21781. As between the restaurant and the hotel, the view has been presented to us that the hotel bar is more dangerous than the saloon bar, and it has been urged that if either the hotel or the saloon bar were to be abolished, it would be better in the interest of temperance to abolish the hotel bar?—Personally, I am against bars. I am against having the bottles exposed. I think it would be better and more in the interest of temperance if, as is generally done in France, two gentlemen could go and sit at a table and drink quietly, which is more dignified than going to a bar and standing there and taking two or three drinks.

21782. Is that the custom more in hotels than in saloon bars?—It is about the same thing.

21783. Would you recognize any difference between the two?—I suppose that people who make their residence for a time in a hotel gather there more frequently, but I do not think there is any difference.

21784. This view has been presented to us: that young men will go into hotels ostensibly to see visitors at the hotel, but really to get drink, but if they enter a saloon, the public must conclude that they have gone there for drink, and consequently there would be less likelihood of their visiting saloons than hotels. Do you agree with that view?—I cannot see on what that is based. Speaking in a general way, I do not believe so.

21785. Supposing you had to abolish either the restaurant or the hotel bar, which of the two would you abolish?—It is difficult to give an opinion, because I am against bars altogether.

21786. Is the hotel bar as prominent a feature in the hotel as the saloon bar is in the saloon?—They are just the same.

*By the Chairman:*

21787. The hotel supplies more or less accommodation to travellers?—Yes.

21788. In that respect, do you consider it better than the restaurant?—I do not know. I think both should exist.

21789. Would you impose upon the restaurant the obligation of giving meals and providing sleeping accommodation?—Not providing sleeping accommodation. I am in favour of saloons, as we have them, giving meals.

21790. No doubt you have before your Court a number of offenders who appear continually for drunkenness?—They do not come before us for drunkenness, they go before the Recorder. Of course, the same person will come very often before us for other crimes, which they always say were committed under the influence of liquor.

21791. Is not the Recorder's jurisdiction confined to the city?—Yes.

HON. CALIXTE A. DUGAS.

21792. Your jurisdiction is for the whole district?—For the whole Province.

21793. Have you not the same persons before you frequently for the same offence?—No, very seldom.

21794. But it is a fact that there is a class of offenders in this respect who appear again and again?—It is known that as soon as they get drunk, they will commit petty crimes. We have some who have been convicted 70 times.

21795. Do you think it would be an advantage if, after a second or third offence, the Magistrate should have the power of committing those persons to some reformatory, where they could be kept or cured?—I may say that we deplore every day not having some institution of that kind.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21796. You think drunkenness should be treated as a disease?—I think there should be some place where drunkards should be put for six months or even two years. I think there is something in the law in reference to that, but the proclamation has never been made. They must first be interdicted, and the parents often object to do that.

*By the Chairman :*

21797. You think it would be a positive advantage to have such institutions and to allow the Magistrates to send the habitual drunkards there?—Yes. It would affect people who come and apply to us, and we should have the power to send these persons there; I mean even on the application of people themselves who desire to be cured. It is a great drawback not to have a place where the authorities can send those people. The amount of distress which is caused to wives and families in this way is very great. Some of them belong to the better class, though they are not so numerous.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21798. Should those institutions be maintained by the Provincial authorities?—That would be the only way.

21799. Are there only annual licenses granted to persons to sell liquors?—There are wine and beer licenses, but only since last year.

21800. That is the only class?—Yes.

HON. BENJAMIN A. D. DEMONTIGNY, Recorder of the City of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

21801. How long have you been Recorder of Montreal?—Twelve years.

21802. Have you lived here all your life: are you a native of the district?—No, I am a native of the district of Terrebonne, St. Jérôme, the parish of Curé Labelle.

21803. You are a member of the legal profession?—I was for some 20 years; I was District Magistrate for the district of Terrebonne before being Recorder.

21804. Your district extends throughout the City of Montreal?—The Recorder is a justice of the peace, and as justice of the peace I have jurisdiction over all the district; but as President of the Recorder's Court, I have jurisdiction only in the City of Montreal. I may say that my jurisdiction is the jurisdiction of two justices of the peace, that is the same jurisdiction as the Police Magistrate, and moreover I have to sit in cases of contravention of the by-laws of the city.

21805. The cases which come before your court are principally, what?—Principally contraventions of the city by-laws, such as not clearing snow, etc. I take cognizance of little misdemeanours, cases of drunkenness, assault and all petty misdemeanours, but generally I send all important ones to the Police Court, which is particularly their place, though I can take cognizance of them.

21806. Do cases of drunkenness come before your court?—The greater part of them naturally come before me, because the police of the city make the arrests and they bring the prisoners before me.

21807. Have you any control over the police of the city?—The control is that they are obliged to obey my orders. They are named by the Police Committee or by the Chief of Police, but they have to come before me to be sworn, and they are obliged to obey my orders.

21808. Do you give them any instructions in regard to the performance of their duties?—Not directly. Sometimes when any matter comes before me, or when I see something wrong and think I should interfere, through delicacy I refer it to the Chief of Police, because it is he who gives the needed orders to the police. I do not take it in hand myself, although I have a right to do so, and I do so sometimes, though seldom. I sometimes draw the attention of the police to matters, and ask them to go here and there.

21809. You are speaking, Mr. Recorder, of the city police?—Yes.

21810. You have no control over the Provincial Police?—Well, as any other Justice of the Peace, I may order them to keep order or maintain the peace. I was never called on that I remember to give such instructions, but I have a right to do so, as any Justice of the Peace has.

21811. Can you give the Commissioners an idea of the number of cases which come before your court in the course of a year? Well, just before coming here I thought about the Annual Report of the Recorder's Court, and I could only find one for the year 1890. I will, however, send you the reports for several years, which contain a comparative statement of the criminality of the district, and particularly the cases which come before my court. The cases are classified in that report according to the character of the offences. I will send you the record for ten years.

21812. Has crime been increasing or decreasing in the city, I mean in proportion to the increase of population?—Of course there has been an increase of population and necessarily an increase in crime, but no increase in the percentage of crime. It is true that I have more cases than when I took the office, but population has increased and the city has increased, so I do not say that there are relatively more cases. There are more cases naturally, but not proportionally more than the extension of the city would warrant.

21813. Some outlying municipalities have been attached to the city and the area has been extended?—Three wards have been added to the city.

21814. Do you think there is a less percentage of crime now than there was ten years ago?—I do not say it is less, but it is not more.

21815. In the Recorder's Court I think you deal with the claims of the city against citizens?—Yes, I am obliged to look into all cases of contravention of the by-laws of any kind. There is a small civil jurisdiction as to ejection cases and in reference to the wages of servants and journeymen; they are not obliged to come before me as they may go to the Magistrate's Court or the Circuit Court, but they sometimes come before me, because it is a more expeditious proceeding and not so expensive. They are not obliged to have lawyers, although lawyers may plead before me.

21816. Can you, from your memory, give the Commissioners an idea of the number of cases which come before you per annum?—In the year 1890, there were of penal cases, that is infractions of the by-laws, 10,928, and a total of civil proceedings of 17,033.

21817. That would be over 27,000 cases?—Yes, 27,961, or nearly 28,000 cases.

21818. Of which between 17,000 and 18,000 were civil cases?—Yes, all the claims of the Corporation for taxes come before me, and that is the reason the number of cases is so large. In cases of water and other taxes they generally send the warrant and take the proceedings in the Recorder's name in the Recorder's Court, but I have nothing to do with the case unless it is contested.

21819. Those 17,000 cases include all cases in which proceedings are taken by the city, do they?—Yes, in a civil way. And the 10,000 penal cases are for little misdemeanours and contraventions of the by-laws.

HON. BENJAMIN A. D. DEMONTIGNY.

21820. Of these 10,000 cases, can you give the Commissioners an idea of how many would be cases of drunkenness and cases arising out of drunkenness?—They are mentioned in the annual report of the Recorder's Court, but you must remark that when the offence is set down as drunkenness it does not include all cases of drunkenness, because the greatest part of the crimes and misdemeanours come directly or indirectly from the abuse of liquor. I do not say that the contraventions of the by-laws, such as neglecting to clean sidewalks, are caused by drunkenness, but all petty misdemeanours, such as assaults and disorders, are on account of drink.

21821. Are cases of neglect to clean sidewalks and such cases included in the 10,000 cases or the 17,000 cases?—They are in the 10,000.

21822. Can you tell the Commission what proportion of the 10,000 and odd cases are cases which originate from intemperance?—It is mentioned in the annual report: but if I am to judge from the daily list, more than three-fourths of those cases are on account of drunkenness. As I told you, the number set down as drunkenness does not represent it all, because assaults, disorders and furious driving and such are generally indirectly due to liquor. The cases of keeping disorderly houses and being inmates and frequenters of disorderly houses are mostly due to abuse of liquor. I merely take this as an average year, and there may be more or less some years.

21823. You think that three-fourths of the 10,000 cases are either cases of drunkenness or are cases which originate in drunkenness?—At least that, and I trust you will allow me to say that if we had not the abuse of liquor in this country, we would have the best people in the world, and I think it would not be necessary to have a Recorder in the city of Montreal; at all events, he would have a good time if there were no liquor.

21824. How would you deal with the 17,000 civil cases without a Recorder?—It would be necessary to have a Recorder for those cases, because only the Recorder has jurisdiction. In fact, when I am sick or absent, I have to name a substitute or assistant, who has jurisdiction only when I am not here; the moment I am here, he ceases to have jurisdiction.

21825. Did you quite understand my question, Mr. Recorder? You made the observation that if we could do away with drink, there would be no necessity for a Recorder. My question was: how would you deal with the 17,000 civil cases if you had no Recorder?—As I tell you, the Recorder would have a good time, or more leisure than he has, because the most of the time he is employed with criminal cases, such as assault, disorderly houses, breaking the peace and drunkenness particularly; if these cases were taken out of his court, the Recorder would not have much to do.

21826. Did you mean literally, that if there were no cases of drunkenness, the office of the Recorder of the city might be abolished?—I do not say so, because there must be a functionary there to try the contraventions of the by-laws.

21827. Have you anything to do with the enforcement of the license laws and the regulations governing the sale of liquor?—Yes, as a License Commissioner.

21828. Not as Recorder?—Certainly, when the police reports some offence against the license law the offender is brought before me; that is one part of my jurisdiction. Not only so, but even when the police do not report it is my habit when a case comes before me for drunkenness, especially if I see he is a minor, or that he was drunk on Sunday, to ask where the liquor was obtained; and then I ask the Clerk to make a case of it when the party consents to give his deposition. The parties frequently, however, refuse to make the depositions, or they refuse to state where they got the liquor.

21829. Do many of those persons who are brought before you plead that they were drunk as a sort of extenuation of their offence, with a view to a mitigation of sentence?—Well, they generally give several reasons why the sentence should not be severe. They say it is their first time, or their second time, or it is an accident, or he is a father of a small family, or so and so. Sometimes, and indeed often, those who consent to come before me to give their depositions against the inn-keepers do so because they hope they will be treated less severely. I ask them where they obtained the liquor, and they say they got it in such a place; and I say I will suspend sentence, if you will give your deposition.

21830. Does it occur frequently, or does it occur at any time that a prisoner who is brought up for some offence pleads that he committed the offence while in a state of

intoxication ; and if so, what is his object in so pleading ?—Though the law says that it is not an excuse, yet there are some offences in which we have to take it into account. When a man has no reason, we cannot see in him such gross malice as if he committed an offence when he was sober. There are some gross indecencies and exposures which are more excusable when people are drunk, and for which, if they were not drunk, they would be treated more severely, because the offence would have been intentional ; so also in cases of blasphemy. I have no jurisdiction over blasphemy in my court, as it is treated by common law and cases go before the Queen's Bench. But when I see on the list that a person has blasphemed or has taken the name of God in vain, I condemn him more severely than for the offence of which he is accused.

21831. From your observation do you consider that the license law and the regulations in regard to the liquor trade are carried out strictly within the city ?—No.

21832. In what respect do you think they are not enforced ?—If the law were thoroughly carried out in the city, I think it would be sufficient, because it provides for nearly all cases, and its penalties are very severe ; but unfortunately, and I do not know what is the reason, there are certainly many clauses of the law which are not observed for want of inspectors or proper officers. I have already spoken to the Chief of Police, who has, I think, done his best to send men to catch those who break the law, but he says that it is very difficult, for several reasons. In the first place, when he puts his men there, they sometimes become drunkards themselves, because they go from one inn to the other taking drinks ; besides when they are one or two days on that duty, they are known by all people in the city, and it is impossible to secure any cases. The Chief tells me, in the third place, that it depreciates the force, because the officers are put down as informers or something like that, and he finds it is an inconvenience. There is no doubt that many cases which come before me are due to the activity of the police. The Chief tells me that his force is not large enough to put special men on that duty. We have about 400 policemen in the city of Montreal, and they are not able to discharge the duties of that particular service. Each Sergeant has received an order from me to go to any place where he suspects liquor is sold, and the officers often bring cases ; but the law is not sufficiently put into execution, for I believe in many cases the law is not obeyed.

21833. In what respect do you think it is not enforced ; is there illicit sale of liquor, or do the licensed vendors break the law, or both ?—There are many who sell without any license, and there are some who, being licensed, sell during Sunday or after hours. There are even licensed persons who give liquor to those who are already drunk, and that is forbidden by the law.

21834. You have expressed the opinion, I think, that the law is sufficient, if properly executed ?—I think so ; it is possible to make it more strict, but I find it strict at present.

21835. In your opinion, would a prohibitory law be more effective, by which I mean a law passed by the Dominion Parliament which would prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of liquor altogether ?—Well, there is no doubt, if it would be possible to prohibit liquor totally, it would be the best means to adopt, because if we had not the abuse of liquor in our country, we would have the best population in the world, for the reason that there are all nationalities and all religions. We look at what our neighbours are doing, and we try and do better ; that tends to create a good population, not only as regards industry and commerce, but also as to morality. If it were possible to prohibit completely the liquor traffic, I am certainly of opinion that it would be a good thing, because if there are ten or one hundred saloons the drunkards will find a way of obtaining liquor. It is only when there is no liquor at all they will cease to drink, and it is with this as with our other passions, we must cease to give them nourishment in order to allay them. It is particularly so with drunkenness. I know that many drunkards if they take a drop of liquor, must break their good resolutions. Generally all the drunkards come before me, and they are from all classes of society, from the workman up to perhaps the Judges, though I have not had any Judges before me ; drunkenness is in all classes of society, and if we do not see more in the higher classes, it is because they have the means of concealing themselves or drinking at their own

HON. BENJAMIN A. D. DEMONTIGNY.

places, or for some other reason. Some drunkards do their best to reform, but when they get into the habit of drinking it becomes a passion, and I think they are not responsible. It is so strong that it becomes a real rage.

21836. You look upon it as a disease?—Certainly, when it once becomes a habit. I have already written to the Government to try to get a place to which to send habitual drunkards as crazy persons.

21837. To send them to some reformatory institution?—Yes, where they will be completely free from the opportunity of drinking, because I have seen many who try their best to keep sober and fail to do so. Generally drunkards deplore their sad habit, they make good resolutions, but immediately an occasion offers they fall. If there were no liquor at all, naturally they would not have that occasion.

21838. I notice that you express your views with a certain reservation: you think prohibition would be an excellent thing, if it could be enforced?—Yes.

21839. Is it your view that it could be enforced?—I do not think so. We could pass the law, but I do not see the possibility of having it observed. The law is not completely executed now for want of vigilance or for want of sufficient officers, and we cannot check even those who sell without any license; there are always some holes where they sell without license. I do not see the possibility of having a prohibition law enforced.

21840. Do you think it could be enforced to an extent which would be a great benefit to the community, and that there would be less intemperance under a prohibitory law than there is under the law existing to-day?—Well, if I were to judge by all crimes or offences or sins, the less occasion there is the better; but the question is, can we judge all the passions by this one? I find from my experience as a License Commissioner that when we do not grant a sufficient number of licenses, there are a greater number of those who sell without any license, and they are less controllable by the law than those who have licenses. The officers have permission to visit the places of those who have licenses and they can control them more easily; but when they are not licensed, it is very hard, and I must say that sometimes we were obliged by necessity to give licenses to those who were selling as openly as it was possible without being arrested by the police.

21841. That is, selling without a license?—Yes, they sold so much without a license, and there was so much disorder that the Sergeant of Police asked the License Commissioners to grant the house a license so as to enable the police to check misdemeanours, and have some control over the house.

21842. You have not, I think, quite answered my question yet, Mr. Recorder?—The answer is this. It is true that prohibition will have the effect of diminishing the occasion of drunkenness; but, on the other hand, it will have the effect of creating many places where drink will be sold, and which will be uncontrollable by the law, from the fact that they will not be known by the police.

21843. Then, if I understand you correctly—and please correct me if I do not understand your opinion accurately—you think that while prohibition would possibly decrease the amount of intemperance, it would lead to other crimes?—I do not know that it would decrease intemperance. That is a question I am not ready to answer, but I do say prohibition would have the effect of decreasing the open occasion for drink, although it would certainly have the effect of increasing the number of holes where they would sell liquor without a license and be beyond the control of the police.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

21844. Would that be a desirable state of things?—Well, no. During the twelve years that I have been a License Commissioner, I have changed my opinion several times about that. In the first years I was of opinion that we should decrease the number of licensed places as much as possible. I was of opinion that the fewer licensed places we had the better; but that does not always succeed. Though we choose the best among the applicants as licensees, yet some of the inn-keepers sell out of the hours permitted by the law, and when they become prosperous by that trade, they are not all good citizens. I do not say the most part of them, nor the whole of them. We take care to see that the character of the person who asks for a license is good, and we are very particular as



to the opening up of new places. Every year there are some new licenses granted, due to the fact that a restaurant is needed near a market or a railway station or commercial centre. We sometimes are obliged to open new places, and when we do so it is on the recommendation generally of those who know the necessities of the places, among them generally an alderman. It is very seldom we open new places, but sometimes we consider they are almost necessary. In fact, I do not to-day know whether a larger number of saloons is any worse than a smaller number.

*By the Chairman :*

21845. Can you tell the Commission if the number of licensed places within the city has increased or decreased?—Well, they have certainly increased for some years past.

21846. Have they increased within the last ten years in as large a ratio as the population has increased?—I think so.

21847. Have you any suggestion to make for the improvement of the present law? I understand that you act with the Police Magistrate for the granting of licenses; and that leads me to ask you about the system?—The only suggestion I would make is to have more effective inspectors, or call them police if you wish, to enforce the present law. In each case the punishment is very severe, but we have discretion to impose fines from a certain amount up to another amount. Then I would make the law state distinctly that for a third offence the person should lose his license. I do not say the first offence, because an inn-keeper might break the law innocently, one of his employes might break the law and it would be hard to take away his license for the first offence, but on conviction for the third offence the law should state that such a man was unworthy to have a license. I would make the law state that distinctly, and take away discretionary power from the Magistrate, and I am sure it would make the inn-keeper observe the law better.

21848. You would leave no discretion with the Magistrate?—No discretion. When we have to condemn a man our feelings of pity are worked on by those who speak in favour of the guilty party. The man may have a family of five or ten children, and may have never committed any offence except that of selling liquor illegally; it would involve the ruin of all the family to take away his license and leave them without the means of living. Naturally, when these circumstances come before the Judge, he pays attention to them, and it is always very severe to ruin a family in that manner. More than that, when we have to condemn the licensee he brings influence to bear so that he may not lose his license. In any case where we strike very hard, there are friends to speak in his favour. So it is in all the courts of the world, and even in the Queen's Bench, when a party is found guilty by the jury, there are petitions in his favour before sentence. When a man is to be ruined totally, and deprived of his license and put on the street, naturally his friends and persons of some influence represent that it is very hard on his family or something like that. If there were no discretion left with the Magistrate, and if it were known by all that under the law he would forfeit his license for the third offence, it would make licensees very careful. At all events, there should be a limit as to the number of offences for which a man should lose his license. You see yourself, Mr. Chairman, that the moment the Windsor or the St. Lawrence Hall or the Richelieu Hotel or some of these first-class hotels were convicted for the third time and their license taken away by the Magistrate, what the consequence of such an amendment of the law would be. We would be obliged to shut up the Windsor Hotel, the first hotel of the city, or the St. Lawrence Hall, or some other hotels which receive many strangers, and there would be great difficulty in doing that.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

21849. But, Mr. Recorder, would the effect not be the same whether the law was put in force by the Magistrate or simply by enactment. The Magistrate would be relieved of the responsibility, but the result would be the same?—The result would be the same.

21850. Do you think that would be an improvement?—I think so.

21851. Is it within your knowledge that liquors sold within the city are seriously adulterated?—No doubt there are very bad liquors sold.

HON. BENJAMIN A. D. DEMONTIGNY.

21852. And the effect of vending such to the population or those who partake of them is very injurious?—So injurious that the most part of those who drink that liquor become furious. We do not see such results in countries where they partake only of beer or wine or good liquor. They become furious with bad liquor, and, as I remarked many times in the court to those who act as they do, insulting God, treating their wives as beasts, striking their fathers: You are worse than any animal, because you do not see any animal treating his family as you do. Such men do not know anything, and they strike everybody.

*By the Chairman:*

21853. Is it your opinion that those adulterated liquors are sold more extensively in unlicensed than in licensed places?—License is very high, and those who pay licenses of course pay more than unlicensed persons.

21854. Is there an efficient inspection of liquors in this city?—I do not think it is sufficient.

21855. Is it done at all, to your knowledge?—Well, I think there are some officers appointed for that object, but I do not see the effects of inspection.

21856. You made an answer to a question of mine which led me to suppose that it was your opinion that there was as much drinking among what are called the better classes of society as amongst the lower classes. The distinction is not mine, but I use it as it will convey to your mind a sufficiently clear idea of the question I wish to ask you. You put it in this way: that the richer classes drink in their homes and the poorer classes drink at the saloons and public houses. Is that your opinion?—I am not ready to say that it is worse than any other class, but there are many abuses which do not appear, for two reasons. First, the better classes generally drink good liquor, which does not make them so furious; but I have occasion to see every week some young men, some men of good families who are habitual drunkards, and their wives or others come to have these drunkards incarcerated, or use some means to stop them drinking. The means we adopt consist in sending them a letter and giving them a lesson. When that is not sufficient, it is necessary to bring them under warrant, not to punish them at first but to suspend sentence, to see if it is any use; if that does not succeed, we afterwards must send them to jail. There is another proceeding. According to our law, they must be interdicted and a curator named, and they may then be placed in a certified house for habitual drunkards. Unfortunately these certified houses are not maintained by the Government, and those committed have to pay their board there. When they are not rich and have no means, they cannot be incarcerated. It is for this reason that I have asked the Government to maintain an institution such as an asylum, to which to send habitual drunkards. When it is stated that they are drunkards and have got beyond control, they should be sent there for two or three months, or for as long as it is necessary to cure them, and there should be a medical man or a specialist there to treat them.

21857. Would the cases you have referred to be cases in which the parties have bought liquor in licensed places, or got it in their own homes? Would they be cases where the liquor was procured at some restaurant, or hotel, or saloon, or in their own home?—It depends very much on the persons; but the drunkards generally want to go to the saloon; they have more pleasure from meeting friends there. I know very many of them who drink in their rooms alone, and they drink as long as they can. The worst place is, perhaps, the saloon or restaurant, but I think there are great abuses in groceries, in cases where they are licensed to sell liquors. They have no right to sell by the glass, but in many places they do sell by the glass. That is a great abuse, because, generally, the mechanic has a little account with the grocery store, and when it comes to Saturday, they drink there by the glass. They buy a bottle or two and, during Sunday, they drink. Generally, on Monday morning, when I ask them where did you take the liquor, they say, I bought a bottle on Saturday.

21858. Is it your opinion that the licensing of grocery establishments to sell liquor is an evil and is undesirable? You were speaking of the bad results which follow the vending of liquors by grocers: would you have that portion of the license law changed? Would you take away from the grocers the right to have a license?—Yes; that was

suggested and embodied in a law, which was unfortunately declared unconstitutional. It was provided that the sale of liquor should be separated from groceries, and we considered it a very good proposal.

21859. And you think it desirable?—Certainly.

*By Judge McDonald:*

21860. Mr. Recorder, the evidence that you have given us is only another of the many proofs we have of the evil results that flow from drunkenness, and an examination of this report from your court confirms what you have stated as to the cases which come before you. I see that the cases here of drunkenness, disorderly conduct, refusing to work for a living, indecent exposure, living on the profit of prostitution, begging without permission, and other such charges, amount to 5,436 for the year 1890, and in your opinion, most of these offences may be traced to drunkenness?—The greater part of them.

21861. Then there are a number of other cases, such as resisting the police, assaults upon women, interference with religious and social assemblies, keeping houses of ill-fame, and so on. Are many of these cases also connected with drinking?—Well, more or less. You take the houses of prostitution, and it is generally liquor that has brought those girls there.

21862. Do you not find that liquor is given away or sold in those places?—Yes.

21863. I find that 165 cases which came before you are for lunacy: are all these cases in which lunacy has arisen from the use of these vile compounds to which you have referred?—I may say half of them.

21864. Have you any knowledge at all, Mr. Recorder, of what is used in making up these vile liquors which you speak of, and which are largely not the fruit of the grape or the grain either; they are made of some drugs, are they not?—Well, as to lunacy, I am pretty sure that it comes from the abuse of bad liquor.

21865. I was asking if you could tell the Commission what is used in making this bad liquor?—I do not know. I have heard that they put in all kinds of mixtures and in some cases even vitriol.

21866. Poisons at any rate?—Certainly.

21867. I see you have had some 17,000 cases before you, what might be called civil suits?—Yes.

21868. In reply to His Honor the Chairman, you have stated that the sale of adulterated liquors was not confined to unlicensed people, but that licensed people also deal in these vile compounds, and you gave as a reason that the license was so high it induced them to sell cheap and deleterious liquors to make a profit?—I did not pay particular attention to that, but the reason why liquor is so much adulterated by licensed people is because they they have to pay more than others, and naturally they want to make large profits.

21869. In your opinion a high license would not be necessarily beneficial as regards the quality of liquor sold?—High license has been tried. The fee was increased last year, but I do not think that drunkenness was decreased at all.

21870. Do you think it would be a benefit to diminish the number of persons who sell liquors?—We have been decreasing their number for the last couple of years.

21871. If a less number of licenses were granted, do you think it would be any benefit?—As I have said, I have changed my opinion about that. I was of opinion that the smallest number we could have the better, but now I really do not know.

21872. A witness has put forward the view to-day that where you lessen the number of liquor places, you lessen the occasions of temptation. For instance, if a man is going from his work to his house, the temptation would be less if he only had to pass one house than if he had to pass ten?—It would evidently have a good effect on that part of the population who are not in the habit of drinking; but as to those who are in the habit of drinking, when the rage comes on them, they will find means to get it. For the working population the less occasion they have of getting drink the better it would be.

21873. Your idea is that a man who is driven to the habit of drink will get it, and that the fewer places there are, the less will be the temptation?—Certainly, because

HON. BENJAMIN A. D. DEMONTIGNY.

there are some good people who never drink when there are no licensed places in their locality. There is a licensed grocery at the corner of every street almost, but where there is no licensed restaurant, they often go to the grocery, and it is worse than a licensed restaurant.

21874. I understand from your evidence that you think prohibition is not possible, and that it could not be carried out?—It is not possible, in my opinion.

21875. Then holding that opinion, have you formed any opinion as to what would be the best remedy?—Well, education has certainly much to do with it, because when a person in a certain position in society gives his word of honour, he generally sticks to it. It is the opinion of all, I think, that religious means are the best. We certainly see everywhere that moral suasion and teaching have done a great deal to prevent drinking. Religious people may fall sometimes, but the best way to make the people moral is by religious suasion.

21876. There is no question of the very great importance of the means you speak of; but do you think that in case you have not total prohibition, it would be well for the State to do what it might to promote the introduction of light liquors?—I think so.

21877. And to do away, if possible, with what might be called the stronger liquors?—I think so. When people have the habit of drinking beer or wine the effect is not so disastrous, as they enter to a certain extent into the food of the population. Where they use wine or beer, there are not so many drunkards as in countries where they use strong spirituous liquors.

21878. It is stated that in France when the phylloxera destroyed nearly all the vines, disorder greatly increased in that country, and there were more drunkards than ever before because the people could not get the light wines and took to drinking stronger liquors?—I am certainly of the opinion that the introduction of French or California wine would be a great improvement. Upper Canada wine is also very good now, and the drinking of that should be encouraged. I am certainly of opinion that it would be better if the greater number of restaurants were licensed only for the sale of wine and beer, or what we call a half license.

21879. It would appear, Mr. Recorder, from what you tell the Commission, that the greed of men to make money leads them to break the provisions of their licenses, such as a grocer selling by the glass, or a man selling on Sunday or to minors. Is it your opinion that this traffic must be maintained in some shape, and that it would be well to have light wines and ales sold instead of stronger liquors. How do you think it would answer if the State were itself to sell the liquor, simply paying a salary to those who sold, and the State taking the profits?—I do not understand your question.

21880. Suppose, instead of allowing individuals to take out licenses to sell for their own profit, the State appointed the vendors of liquors and merely paid them salaries, as they do other employees, the State getting the profit: do you think that would be an improvement on the present system, or have you ever considered the matter?—That is an example of the Gothenburg system, and I think it would be an improvement. It is like that in France in regard to tobacco, as the vendors of tobacco are only agents for the Government. I believe the effect would be good. The Government would not be tempted to sell for the purpose of gaining money, but the difficulty would be to find officers who would do their work conscientiously. Probably the Government might get some good employees, but I am afraid that the majority would abuse their positions.

22881. Do you think such a system would be better than the present one?—Well, I think not, because of the difficulty of operating it properly.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

21882. I notice, Mr. Recorder, that while the grand total of penal cases before you in 1890 was 10,928, the number in 1891 was 9,860; so that there has been a decrease, and there were fewer convictions in 1891 than 1890. How do you account for that decrease, in view of the fact that the population of the city has increased?—It is hard to account for it. I certainly see that there is a difference between the two years, and it is due to a great many causes. During the last few years the Magistrates and the police have been a little more vigilant, and we have been pretty exact in the choice of those to whom we give licenses. As I have already told you, a great number of them

are unworthy to have that trade in hand, and if there was any possibility to make a better choice, I would like it. When a man has his trade established, it is a serious thing to put not only him on the street but his family as well. The police have been more vigilant these last years than ever. The License Commissioners have been more exact with regard to those to whom they issue licenses, and we have tried to frighten licensees selling illegally by taking away their licenses. We tell them that the next time they will be condemned and their licenses cut off.

21883. There are, then, more precautions on the part of the innkeepers, and, by consequence, less crimes and less abuses?—I see that there is a great difference between the two years, and I think it is largely accounted for by the fact that there are more societies working very hard in the temperance cause, and I have already had occasion to congratulate them. They have sometimes taken the law in hand and have done police duty themselves, and I find that they have done very good work. They do not confine themselves to lodging information, but they take the law in hand and denounce those who go against the law. When the demands for licenses come up, they make requisitions against them as much as possible. It is very hard for them to get signatures to their requisitions, because the friends of the innkeepers are engaged before them. It is hard for them to get an opposition majority, and when they have not a majority, it is difficult to maintain the opposition. They succeed in some cases in preventing some new places being opened. For my part I have recognized their services, and I can express myself openly to the Commission; they have done a very good and a very difficult work.

21884. It has a good effect?—Certainly, a very good effect.

21885. You think there is a very great improvement in the city?—Evidently. And it comes back to the first opinion I expressed, that the law may be sufficient, although not sufficiently put in operation. If we had sufficient officers and inspectors to put the law in force, it would have a good effect. The decrease in intemperance is in part due to the vigilance of the societies.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21886. Which societies?—I have remarked particularly that the Alliance is doing a very good work, and its members are making sacrifices in order to carry it out. There are also temperance societies connected with the churches, which are carrying on a good work.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

21887. I believe your law requires the signatures of 25 persons in order to obtain a license?—Yes, for licenses for restaurants, but only three for groceries.

21888. What is the number for hotels?—25 signatures are required for saloons, restaurants and hotels; they all require the same.

21889. Do you think it would be better if an applicant for license were required to have the signatures of a majority of the people in the district where he has his establishment?—Evidently so, if we are of opinion that the fewer the number of licensed places the better. It would perhaps be a good thing to require the signatures of a majority of the electors residing in the district, because the residents experience most inconvenience from having drinking places near them.

21890. Does the law forbid the sale of liquor to minors?—Yes, certainly, in groceries, restaurants and hotels.

21891. Do you find that feature of the law generally violated?—I have had many cases of that kind before me; but now the dealers generally take another course, they sell to the parents who send boys or girls to get the liquor. When they are accused of selling to minors, they say they did not sell to minors but that they sold to so and so, who sent their children for the liquor. Cases often come before us in which vendors are accused and convicted of selling liquor to minors.

21892. You think it would be well to separate the sale of liquor entirely from the sale of groceries?—Evidently, because there is not only that inconvenience that I pointed out, but the working people who go to the groceries have got an account, and in taking

HON. BENJAMIN A. D. DEMONTIGNY.

a loaf or a pound of butter they will take a bottle of liquor. If they have no money to pay for it, they get credit till the end of the week or month. When they go to the grocery, the grocer may say, "Why don't you take a bottle of whisky," and if it is taken, it is put down in the account.

21893. I take it that you believe that the prohibitory provisions of the license law, such as selling after hours, selling on Sundays, and selling to minors and drunken people, are quite generally violated?—They are not so much lately as some years ago.

21894. You think there is an improvement?—Oh yes, evidently.

21895. But yet there are numerous violations that probably never come under your attention?—I think so. I often hear it said in court that they sell openly at such and such a place, and when I draw the attention of the police to it, they say no doubt it is true, but they cannot catch them in the act. They know the police, and when they see them coming they take care that proof cannot be obtained against them. It is true that in the cases of restaurants, there is a law which compels them to keep their places closed; but in the case of hotels it is very hard to get evidence against them, because they are allowed to be open on Sunday, and they have a right to give liquor to their guests at table or in their rooms. It is very hard for the police to distinguish between voyageurs and boarders who have a right to get liquor, and those who have no right.

21896. Speaking about the hotels, I think you said a little while ago, that if the law were enforced very strongly against the licensees, and their licenses taken away, the hotel would have to be closed? Do you think that if the bar were shut, the hotel would have to be closed? Do you think it is not possible to run an hotel without a bar?—It might be possible to run an hotel without a bar, but it would be very difficult to run one without liquor. It would certainly be an impossibility to keep an hotel without liquor. I believe the profit on the hotel is not sufficient without liquor, and I think that it is sometimes necessary for strangers who come to an hotel to have a glass of wine or even a glass of good brandy. I do not see the possibility of keeping an hotel where strangers visit, without selling liquor.

21897. We had it given in evidence in one of the Eastern Provinces by a proprietor, that it was impossible to run a hotel without a bar; and when he was asked if the people who did not patronize the bar did not pay for what they got, he said that the people who did not drink had exceptionally good appetites. I do not know whether that applies to Montreal or this western part of the country or not?—I do not know by experience, but I think that when a man has taken a *coup d'appetit* he eats twice as much, and the taking of bitters or a drink before dinner is a leading cause of dyspepsia, because it increases the appetite and the stomach receives more than it can digest.

21898. Your theory and the theory of the hotel proprietor are opposed, but I am inclined to agree with you?—Yes, and I think I will be seconded by medical men on that point.

21899. While we are talking about hotels: you said something about young men of good families who come to be habitual drunkards, and that their friends had consulted you concerning them. Have you any reason to know whether those young men did and do the most of their drinking at hotel bars, or in the lower grade of places, or at home?—We cannot call these a lower grade of places. The difference is, that the hotel is obliged to receive strangers and provide rooms, and remain open every day, including Sunday: but the restaurant is a place which is supposed to give meals, although most of them do not. Under the law a restaurant is obliged to be able to give meals to at least ten people at a time, but the most of them do not give any meals at all.

21900. It is simply a place for the sale of drink?—Yes, for drinking. To answer your question, I may say that the young men generally begin to be drunkards in the hotels or restaurants, and not at home. They meet their friends there, and take one glass or two or three glasses until they get drunk.

21901. I think you said that adulterated liquors are sold quite generally by licensed dealers because they have to pay a high license fee. Have you observed whether what is called good whisky crazes men, or crazes them as quickly or to the same degree as bad whisky?—I think not. I think that pure liquor has not that effect. It makes them rejoice and be exuberant, but bad liquor makes them furious.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21902. They become hilarious on good liquor?—Certainly, they try to laugh and have a good time, but those who drink bad liquor become furious, and they are worse than any animal because they beat their wives and families, and it is the tendency of drunken men to insult the Deity.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

21903. While we are on this branch of the subject, I may ask this question : Have you noticed in your many years of public and official life, and observation of people and things generally, whether the class of drunkards is being rapidly or slowly recruited from the moderate drinkers ; or do the drunkards bloom into drunkenness with any lengthened process, and the moderate drinkers always remain so?—They become drunkards by degrees, and at a certain time they find it impossible to control themselves.

21904. You said that drunkenness, that is the strong habit of drink, is a sort of passion and a terrible passion. Do you think it is well to provide places where such people can get drink ? There is a large class of people who are habitual drunkards ; do you think it is well to provide facilities for such people to get drink?—On the contrary I think it would be the best plan to remove all occasion ; but the only effective way in my opinion is to incarcerate them in places where they will receive proper medical treatment.

21905. You have said that people who did not drink habitually would be less tempted if there were fewer drinking places?—Yes.

21906. If you would incarcerate those who have a passion for drink, would you not also remove the drinking places, so as to prevent the opportunities of drinking?—It is for that reason I say that if prohibition could be enforced, it would be the best thing possible.

21907. You think prohibition could be enforced?—I think it is not possible. If prohibition is a good thing, and if we cannot have prohibition, then the next thing would be to have the most part of it we can.

21908. Do you think that if prohibition could be well enforced, it would do a great deal of good?—Certainly.

21909. Would you consider prohibition a success although it was not absolutely enforced ? Suppose it was enforced in the same degree that the license law or the law against furious driving is enforced, would it be a success?—Well, I think it is possible to have prohibition in part and in great part, but as to destroying the liquor trade totally, I doubt very much the possibility of it. I do not say that it would not have a good effect on the country. If you could have liquor used only as a medicinal remedy, it would be a good thing.

21910. Do you know of any ward or district in the city or in the vicinity of the city in which no licenses are issued?—No.

21911. There is Côte St. Antoine.—Perhaps there are no licenses there. It is outside of the city. If they do not drink there, they come and drink here.

21912. Do you know whether it is not an advantage to that town that the sale of drink is not carried on there, and that those who want it have to come here or go somewhere else to get it?—I think it is better.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

21913. The Côte St. Antoine people go to other places?—I do not say that, but I know a few who come. I am sure that when they come to the city and lunch at the restaurants, some of them take liquor.

21914. If these people from outside drink in the city, it increases the sale of drink here?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

21915. Have you any personal knowledge of Côte St. Antoine?—I have no personal knowledge of it. I know that the people there are of a high class and very respectable. As I have told you, in all classes of society there are some in the habit of

HON. BENJAMIN A. D. DEMONTIGNY.

drinking, I do not say generally, but we find them in all classes. Drunkenness is not so evident amongst this class of people, because they have the means to take a cab to go home, or they get friends to protect them. Even an hotel-keeper, when he sees a friend drunk, sends him home in a cab or keeps him in a room; but the poor man sometimes does not take his meals regularly, and if he takes a glass of bad whisky, he gets drunk, and is found on the street and is brought to the police station.

21916. Do you think that the increase of penalties for drunkenness would have the effect of lessening the number of offences?—For those who are not in the habit of drinking, there is always a means to restrain them; but for those who are drunkards, we may put them for years in jail, and when the passion comes they will fall again.

21917. Do you think that the increase of penalties would have no effect, except it might be upon beginners?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

21918. Have you observed the effect the drink trade has on business interests generally, outside the interests of the trade itself?—It has the effect that when a man begins to drink and gets into the habit of drinking, he does not care if he loses his honour, his reputation and his fortune. It has the effect of ruining a man in his soul and in his body, and of putting him in an asylum.

21919. Have you observed what effect the liquor trade has upon the people engaged in it?—Awful, because they generally become drunkards themselves, and their children grow up with bad habits, from the fact that they have occasion to see bad example or hear bad words from the people who frequent their houses.

21920. You think that the drink trade affects injuriously the people engaged in it?—Certainly.

21921. Does it have an injurious effect on people who neither engage in the trade nor drink themselves?—Well, I do not think so. It does not affect those people who keep sober.

21922. Do you think that the spending of so much money in liquor injuriously affects the working classes, inasmuch as they do not have so many comforts and necessities even, as they would have if the money were not expended in liquor?—If you see a family in a poor condition and asking for charity, or to be helped during the winter, you are sure to discover it is due to the drinking habit of the head of the family. That, no doubt, forms part of the evil which comes from liquor.

21923. You spoke of the large number of offences which come before you. Do you keep any kind of record, or have you any means of knowing what percentage of the offenders are excessive drinkers, what percentage moderate drinkers, and what percentage abstainers?—I have not a record of it, but the habitual drunkards are, I must say, comparatively few.

21924. What about the moderate drinkers?—They are many.

21925. Are there many total abstainers?—Not many. I may state that the only way of correcting a drunkard is that he shall drop drinking entirely, and stop even smelling it. When a man who is in the habit of drinking is sober and takes one drop, he will continue taking it; the only way to keep rid of the habit is not even to smell it.

21926. That is why you think it would be well that liquor were not within his reach?—It is for this reason that I say it is well to incarcerate them in an asylum, so as to prevent them taking it at all.

21927. A witness in the Maritime Provinces was asked if he would favour the establishment of inebriate asylums which should be supported by the liquor sellers, and the answer was: I would be in favour of inebriate asylums if you were to put all the liquor sellers in them?—As I have already said, I have myself asked the Government to have inebriate asylums maintained by the Government.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

21928. What for?—For drunkards that are really crazy. They are insane and are not responsible for their actions, and though there are some places we call certificated houses, in which a man may be put by his curator if he is interdicted, yet they must pay their board there, and can only go if they have means. I want to have an asylum—



call it another name if you wish—a refuge where those who are recognized by the Superior Court as habitual drunkards, can be put for some time, and be specially treated at the expense of the Government. Let it be paid for by the inn-keepers if it is possible to have a special tax levied on them to support that asylum, because they are really the cause. The first cause of it, however, is the wholesale merchant. We strike very hard upon the retailer, but if there is a tax on selling liquor, it must comprise the wholesale trade because it is the first cause.

21929. Would not the manufacturer come before either?—Yes, certainly.

21930. Have you any experience of the Scott Act?—I have no experience in this country. I know it was put in force in some places, and that they were obliged to repeal it.

21931. For what reason?—Because it was not possible to be executed, and I believe it would be the same with prohibition.

21932. Have you any suggestions to make as to amendments to that Act, which would enable people to enforce it more efficiently? No, the only suggestion is that the authorities should find officers to put it in force, and that is difficult. If liquor is prohibited totally, it will be sold without any license, and it will be more difficult to enforce the law then, because it will be harder to find out where they sell illegally.

*By the Chairman :*

21933. To what class of the community do the inhabitants of Côte St. Antoine principally belong?—Generally the high class commercial people.

21934. Are there many mechanics or labouring men in that place?—There may be, but generally it is inhabited by the richer classes.

21935. Do you think it would be desirable to have an asylum in which to put all the liquor sellers?—Not at all. That is only a joke evidently. As long as the selling of liquor is permitted by law, it is only the abuse of it that constitutes an offence.

21936. And for those who make an improper use of the liquor itself, and break the law?—They are too well off in an asylum, they ought to be in jail.

21937. You expressed the opinion that an asylum for the treatment of habitual drunkards would be a good thing, but I do not think you intended to convey the impression that you think it would be desirable to place all the liquor-sellers in an asylum?—Not at all. I must say that there are many respectable persons who sell liquor, but those who abuse the privilege and break the law should not only be in an asylum but in prison.

21938. May I ask, Mr. Recorder, are you a total abstainer yourself?—No, I take some wine and beer, but I do not take any strong liquor, except when I go out hunting, or something like that, or when I feel cold, I then take a good glass of brandy, but generally I do not drink any.

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault :*

21939. Have you been in Italy, Mr. DeMontigny?—Yes, I lived there two years.

21940. What have you noted in Italy concerning drunkenness?—I have noted that people do not get drunk there. They certainly get a little gay, but not tipsy.

21941. How do you account for that?—By the fact that generally they drink nothing but wines. They do not use strong drinks generally, they drink wines. Wine is plentiful, and a bottle of it costs from two to three cents, and so almost every body drinks wine. People get gay, but do not get tipsy so as to become wicked as here.

21942. Does the use of wines produce as evil results in Italy as here?—Certainly not, and in France it is the same thing.

21943. Are the retailers of liquors licensed there?—I suppose that everybody can retail liquors, probably by paying a tax, but this trade appeared to me as if unrestrained.

21944. Are there retailers of strong drink?—Yes, the *aqua vitæ*, the ordinary whisky.

HON. BENJAMIN A. D. DEMONTIGNY.

21945. But the greatest consumption is of wine?—Yes, wine is very plentiful and quite mild. There is some wine, however, that will enliven a person.

21946. If I have understood rightly, for I have not been here continuously since the beginning of your testimony, you would be in favour of a law that would permit a freer use of beer and wine in our country?—Yes. I would like if there were what we call a half license for the sale of beer and wine.

21947. But such is not the position to-day. Do you not believe that the retailers, who would be granted such licenses, would break the law and would sell also alcohol?—Yes; so much so that while formerly our law was like that, it has been abrogated.

21948. I can inform you that in the County of Rouville the County Council has enacted a by-law such as mentioned, and it has been violated?—Yes. I know that the Legislature has abolished it, because it was a source of abuse.

21949. At all events, how would you grant this license, and by what means would you make it effective?—Well, at the outset, to encourage the sale of wine does not mean only to grant licenses for the sale of wines and beer; but the importation of wine into the country can be encouraged, and then the manufacture of wine can be favoured and encouraged in our own country. Thus, to make the wines manufactured here saleable without a license, would be a means of favouring the production of wine, and consequently cheap wine. It would also favour its use. It is true that the Government have cancelled the licenses for the sale of wine and beer only because abuses were committed. But yet, notwithstanding the abuses, I believe it would have been better to have left the law in force and allowed us to grant licenses for the sale of wine and beer only, because there are found at all times fifty per cent of retailers who are conscientious, or at least stand sufficiently in awe of the law so as not to violate it. Moreover, if the police force was composed of good material, the law might even go such a length as to forbid wine and beer retailers keeping spirituous liquors in their shops. The law at the present time forbids any unlicensed trader keeping fermented liquors in his shop, because to-day the police make search, and if a single bottle is found there, he suffers arrest, and pays a fine. Well, if this was forbidden to unlicensed dealers, the fear of the police would cause a great number of the holders of licenses for the sale of wine and beer only to abstain from keeping any alcohol at their place of business, if they were not permitted to retail it.

21950. When the Commission sat in Quebec, some days ago, it was proved that inn-keepers licensed to keep only a temperance hotel, sold fermented liquors?—This corroborates what I said in the first place, that if the law is properly enforced, it is effective; but I believe it is not properly enforced for lack of a sufficient number of officers to enforce it and exercise a vigilant supervision.

21951. But this seems to be the fault everywhere. In New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island, in Nova Scotia, in fact the complaint made everywhere is the same: that the law is not enforced, that the number of officers is not sufficient to carry out this supervision?—Yes, I believe it.

21952. In France there has been a Commission of inquiry on the sale of liquors, and the conclusion it came to was that it was necessary to free from taxation all mild beverages, as wines, and to place a high tax on alcohol. Do you think that would be the best system?—Let the preventive measures come through that channel or another, the more there are adopted the better. In France I observe that since the vines have become diseased, the statistics show increased crime, and in all countries where wine is no longer used, the use of alcohol increases.

21953. This morning, Judge Dugas expressed the opinion that he would like to see such heavy taxes imposed that alcohol would not be sold for less than fifty cents a glass; and if possible, exempt wine and beer from all duties. Are you of the same opinion?—Well, that would operate as a check on drinking, but I know not whether this would have the desired effect as regards drunkards. When a drunkard is unable to obtain liquor he will drink anything he can lay his hands upon. I have seen some take pain-killer and also shellac, which is a preparation used by painters. Another man who is now dead, said: "If I knew there was arsenic in the liquor, I would take it just the same." In fact drunkards kill themselves by a slow process. Well, let there be the

greatest number of obstacles to the sale of alcohol, I am not opposed to that, but the consequence will be that innkeepers will prepare deleterious beverages.

21954. You have declared in favour of prohibition. Would you go so far as to say that you would wish to prohibit the sale of wine and cider?—Well, if it were possible, I believe it would be desirable, but that not being practicable, let us endeavour to use the one to exclude the other. In my opinion, the best alcoholic liquor is of no merit, except as a medicine, and it could be adequately replaced by something else. Should you stand in need of a copious preparation, or of being warmed up, a good glass of cognac or gin in some cases or even of whisky, might prove beneficial as a medicine, but generally, the best liquor is of no value even to excite the appetite, because although it quickens it, alcohol makes people dyspeptic.

21955. Do you believe the number of licenses for the city of Montreal is excessive?—I believe so.

21956. Do you believe it would be wise to limit the number of licenses by taking as a basis the population?—That would set us License Commissioners at ease, because to-day when we refuse a man a license, he reiterates his demand, supported by several others stronger than himself, the member of Parliament, the member of the Legislature, the alderman, the merchant of his ward, and all these influences are set at work. They bewail the applicant's misfortune; he is going to be left in utter poverty, he has a wife and children. Now if the Legislature limited the number of licenses, then we could say: 'There are sufficient: do not press us any longer.'

21957. Do you think it would be better to increase the license fees?—This could not be determined, it is an obstacle, and the greater number of obstacles we can set to the sale of liquors the better.

21958. Have you ever visited the North-west?—No.

21959. Have you been to the State of Maine?—No.

21960. Have you been to the United States?—Yes; I have visited the United States.

21961. Have you visited any State where prohibitory laws were in force?—I do not think so, because every where we had as much liquor as we wanted

His Honour the Recorder handed in the following letter:—

BUREAU DU RECORDER, MONTREAL, 11th September, 1892.

To His Honour

SIR JOSEPH HICKSON,

Chairman of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic.

SIR:—In answer to your question regarding the decrease in the number of cases before the Recorder's Court, I attributed this decrease in my testimony partly to the efforts of societies, which accomplish an earnest and effective work, and I then mentioned the Dominion Alliance, as one of those societies. In justice to others I must say that there exists in town another society who do good work, called Citizen's League. In several parishes of the city exist temperance societies whose members promise not to take any liquor at all.

The League of the Sacred Heart, a society having a membership of several thousand, obliges its members not to take liquor in a saloon, restaurant or hotel.

Besides in all Catholic and Protestant churches energetic means are taken to put a check to the advance of this scourge, and the great zeal shown, in the interest of the cause of temperance by the clergy of all denominations, must have a considerable effect on the decrease of criminality due in a great measure to the abuse of intoxicants.

Humbly submitted,

B. A. T. DEMONTIGNY,

*Recorder of the City of Montreal.*

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 12th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met here this day, Sir JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

HON. JAMES McSHANE, Mayor of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

21962. How long have you been Mayor of the City of Montreal?—Going on two years.

21963. And before that you were a member of the City Council?—For 20 years, and 14 years a member of the Legislature, and for nearly 2 years a member of Mr. Mercier's Cabinet.

21964. You were Minister of Public Works and Railways?—Yes, Minister of Public Works and Railways.

21965. As Mayor of the City, you are not required to take active part in the administration of justice, I think?—No, but I sometimes have to ask for clemency for the people.

21966. You do not sit as a Magistrate?—No.

21967. But you are a Magistrate for the District?—Yes, I have been a Magistrate for the District of Montreal for 28 years.

21968. From your observation and experience, has intemperance increased or decreased in the city within the last 10 years?—Well, I must say that it has increased; but taking our population in the city of Montreal with the surrounding municipalities, comprising about a quarter of a million of people, I do not believe that there is any city with its population, mixed as it is, in which people are so sober and so good as are the people of the city of Montreal, that is with reference to liquor allowed to be sold as it is.

21969. Do you think the percentage of intemperance has increased, taking into account the increased population?—I would say that it has in a measure.

21970. You think there is a greater percentage of intemperance now than there was 10 years ago?—I do.

21971. In the city?—Yes.

21972. With regard to crime, has it increased or decreased to your knowledge?—I must say that recently, within the last year, whether it is owing to the enormous crowds who go to Sohmer Park or not, I consider that fewer people appeared before the Recorder. I think it is owing in a large degree to working people going on Sunday evenings and in the afternoon to Sohmer Park, where they enjoy themselves.

21973. Are we to understand that, in your opinion, crime has decreased?—I believe so. If you will allow me, I will say this. If there was a law passed by the Legislature to prevent the adulteration of liquor, which is carried on to an alarming extent in our city, I think less drunkenness would be seen in Montreal. The adulterated liquor that people drink is poison.

21974. Do you think the present system of issuing licenses is an efficient way of regulating the liquor traffic?—Well, it is almost impossible to grant fewer licenses, and for this reason, every Government that is in power wants all the money it can get, and the influences that are brought to bear in cases of men or women who

do not get their license make it hard for the Commissioners to refuse applications. These are facts I have been cognizant of for many and many a day.

21975. It has been given in evidence by the Hon. Judge Dugas, and I think also by the Recorder of the city, that it would be an improvement if the Legislature took away from them altogether any option, and simply provided that their duty should be so and so with regard to refusing licenses. Do you consider that would be an improvement?—I do.

21976. But as a system, do you consider the present licensing law efficient?—I believe that the three men who award the licenses, Judge Desnoyers, Judge Dugas and Recorder DeMontigny, are three gentlemen who give their time and attention to it, and do what they think to be right. However, as I stated before, there are influences that human nature cannot well stand, brought to bear in order to have licenses awarded. When the licenses are refused, even members of the Government bring influences to bear upon them, and say to the Commissioners: "I want this gentleman, or this man or this woman to get a license."

21977. What is the existing regulation with regard to the granting of licenses? Must the applicant for a license present a petition?—Yes; signed by twenty-five resident electors in his district.

21978. Is that the polling district?—Yes.

21979. And that goes before the Commissioners, who determine upon his application?—Yes.

21980. What is the duty of the Commissioners in case a majority of the inhabitants of the district present a petition against granting the license?—Their duty is simply to refuse the license, that is, if there is a resident majority of the people in that district who sign against granting such a license, their duty is not to grant the license.

21981. Is it a petition of the majority of the householders, or what is the designation?—I believe that it includes both tenants and proprietors who are residents of the district and who have the power to sign.

21982. From your observation, Mr. Mayor, are the license laws efficiently enforced in the city?—Recently they have been pretty well enforced, fairly well, because I have seen that the Commissioners have taken away the licenses of some persons who came up before them two or three times for breaking the law.

21983. They took away the licenses of those who broke the law?—Yes; they lost their money and their license also.

21984. But with regard to selling out of hours, and offences of that kind?—I think those who sell liquor are more particular not to sell on Sunday than they used to be.

21985. Has it come within your observation that there is any illicit sale of liquor in the city as well in places where they have licenses as in places without licenses?—Yes.

21986. Are there many places without licenses which sell liquor?—I cannot say; but I know that there are some.

21987. There are some such places in the city?—There are some and there will always be too. They not only sell liquor, but they violate the other laws of the city; for instance, grocers sell meat, when they have no right to do so. It would take an immense body of policemen to watch and find out everything that goes on. It is not alone in the city of Montreal, but I believe in other cities also.

21988. All vendors have to take out licenses under the city by-laws?—Certainly.

21989. All shopkeepers?—The man who keeps a meat market has to take out a license. We have reduced that license fee from \$200.00 to \$100.00, because a great many sold and did not say anything, and it is impossible to enforce the law unless you have an immense body of men to watch them.

21990. Your view is that the law in regard to persons taking out licenses to sell whether storekeepers or liquor sellers is not strictly observed?—It is impossible for the present staff to enforce the law.

21991. I understood that to be your opinion?—Those are the facts.

21992. You referred in a previous answer to the adulteration of liquors which are sold. Do you think that takes place extensively in the city of Montreal?—I do.

HON. JAMES McSHANE.

21993. And by those who are licensed to sell as well as by the illicit dealers in liquors?—There are a number of people who are not licensed, who adulterate liquor.

21994. There are none of them licensed to adulterate liquor, but a man may be licensed to sell and still adulterate liquor?—If there is a law to stop the adulteration of liquor, it is never enforced in the city of Montreal.

21995. Is there any inspection, to your knowledge?—There is a supposed inspection. You go into the saloons and you ask for a glass of brandy, and they give it to you out of a bottle labelled “brandy,” which is only whisky and bad whisky at that, and a drink of that will sicken a man and almost poison him.

21996. Are you speaking of licensed places?—Yes.

21997. You think there is just as much adulterated liquor vended out of licensed establishments as out of those which have no licenses?—There are a very large number of respectable people who do not sell anything but the very best of liquor, but others do not sell good liquor, whether they adulterate it themselves or buy it from those who do so is not to my knowledge.

21998. Under the present license system, I understand that the citizens of Montreal have not the same power as the citizens of country districts to put in force the prohibitory clauses of the license law?—What would be the use of that?

21999. Am I right in the conclusion that that power does not exist in the citizens?—Yes. I said in the beginning that I did not believe there is any city anywhere with as large a population as Montreal has, where the people are so sober, quiet, decent and respectable. Talking about liquor laws; last summer when I was in Portland, where they pretend to carry out the Maine liquor law, I saw more drunkenness than ever I saw in Montreal.

22000. I think you hardly comprehend my question. There are a number of parishes or districts in the Province of Quebec where the people themselves vote that no licenses shall be issued within the boundaries of their municipality. I understand that the citizens of Montreal have not that right?—In the country places, like any place else, politicians bring influence to bear on the voters. If they take the side of prohibition or liquor, politics are at the bottom.

• 22001. You are speaking of the number, but I wanted to get at the fact. Do you understand that the citizens of Montreal have no power under the law to vote prohibition?—No; such a measure has never been introduced here, and I do not believe that prohibition would carry in the city of Montreal.

22002. The citizens have no right to enforce it in the polling or other districts?—No.

22003. The only method the citizens have of influencing the issue of licenses is by a majority objecting to the applicant having a license?—Yes.

22004. From what you have said I conclude that you do not think it would be an improvement if they had that power; still, I may ask you the question. Do you think it would be better if, in the polling districts of Montreal, the citizens had the right, by a certain majority, to prevent the issue of licenses?—Well, it might work, perhaps, in certain districts where the people are entirely opposed to drinking liquor or the sale of liquor; but taking the whole city of Montreal, it would not carry at all, because the influences are against it.

22005. But I am asking the question with regard to the possible advantage of it; whether the people would avail themselves of it is another thing?—Even if they did, if they carried prohibition, the people would drink all the same. You cannot stop them; if you sell it, they will drink it.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

22006. Where would they get it?—As long as you allow brewers to distill and make beer and whisky, they will find it. I have seen in Portland large coal oil cans supposed to contain coal oil when it was whisky, and bad whisky at that. I saw it with my own eyes. That is a place where they pretend to be working to enforce the Maine liquor law.

*By the Chairman:*

22007. Is there any special reason which occurs to you why the districts of the city should not have the same privileges as districts in the country, to vote against the issue

of licenses?—I do not think that any politician who stood on the platform of introducing that system in the city, would find it a popular measure. The most part of the people who are inclined to be respectable and decent, like their liberties, and if they want to drink, like to get it.

22008. At one time, I think, the issue of licenses in the city was controlled by a committee of the Council?—Yes, and we were very glad to get it out of our hands and give it to the Judges. I think ex-Mayor Clarke, of Toronto, has more experience on that matter.

22009. How long is it since that system was in force in the city?—It is more than twenty years ago.

22010. You have a recollection of the state of things prior to that?—Oh, yes; a very warm recollection.

22011. Do you think that the present system is a preferable one to that?—I do.

22012. Now, with regard to the general question. You have told us your opinion about the license laws. Do you think it would be in the interest of the suppression of intemperance, and that it would be an advantage, if we had entire prohibition of the traffic by Dominion legislation, by which I mean a law that would prohibit the importation, the manufacture and sale of liquor altogether?—Well, I do not think that will ever be done; and as to the result, I do not know. I think that our priests and our ministers here in the city of Montreal are endeavouring, from the pulpit and at the altar, to do everything in their power to suppress intemperance. I know that the Catholic priests are strongly working for that, and a great number of them are ardent, and are working night and day with the object in view of curtailing drinking.

22013. Do you think such a law desirable?—I do not think so, because it would never be worked.

22014. Have you any special reasons to express to the Commissioners why you entertain that opinion?—I have none, only that it has never worked in any country that I know of.

*By Judge McDonald:*

22015. Mr. Mayor, you have stated that in the rural districts influential politicians act so that if the people are for prohibition they are for prohibition, and if for liquor they are for liquor?—That is my opinion.

22016. We were told in Quebec that in many of these rural sections the influence of the clergy has a very strong effect with the Council of the municipality in inducing them to pass prohibitory laws?—I do not think it. There are perhaps reasons for men being prohibitionists; sometimes they are men who used to drink very hard themselves, and if they drank any more they would get drunk and degrade themselves. These men sometimes act a little too stringently in the matter when they appear upon the platform, and caution other people who like a little liberty, and of course the excitement on the question becomes intense in that way.

22017. It is not really party politics. It is temperance politics?—It is a good deal that way. There is a good deal of party politics in that way.

22018. But is it not often the case, Mr. Mayor, that in the rural districts the temperance men make a strong effort to elect Councillors who will make a strong effort against issuing licenses?—They succeed only where the masses of the people are in favour of prohibition. I know a great many people who preach temperance, and yet drink more than anybody else. I know a great many who preach temperance, and I have seen them drunk nearly every day.

22019. You have spoken, and I have not the slightest doubt you have spoken correctly as to the considerable amount of adulteration of liquor that goes on. Do you find that the drinking of this stuff has the effect of producing, not only drunkenness, but a species of insanity?—Yes, a species of insanity. Men become wild after taking such liquor. It is poison.

22020. I had the privilege of reading since I came to the city two sermons or addresses. These were delivered on the occasion of the Father Mathew anniversary a year ago, by Father McCallen, one of the clergy of your church, and admirable addresses they are. Have you read them?—Yes.

HON. JAMES MCSHANE.

22021. Perhaps you heard them?—Yes.

22022. This clergyman deals with several of the difficulties that arise in question. The adulteration of liquor is one of them. I am going to ask you about total abstinence. Would you agree as to the benefit of it if a man chooses to be a total abstainer?—Yes, it depends on the individual.

22023. He says: "Though total abstinence is an infallible remedy against intemperance, it does not follow that total abstainers are the only temperate men in the world. Well-meaning temperance advocates have maintained that the use and sale of intoxicating liquors are in themselves sinful. Neither proposition can be defended by scripture nor by reason." Do you agree in his opinion as to that?—I do.

22024. Then he says: "It is the abuse, not the use of any of God's gifts which constitutes sin." Do you agree in that?—Yes.

22025. He says: "The efforts of temperance men are, therefore, to be directed to the elimination of the abuse of liquor selling and liquor buying as practised in the city of Montreal." One of the things he refers to, and I wish to ask you about this, as you occupy a representative position, and having had long experience in dealing with the people you ought to be an authority, is this: He says: "Our legislators, if they are true to the best interests of their constituents, not only have the right, but are in duty bound to protect us from the adulterated beverages which are manufactured and sold under the name of liquor in the various groceries and saloons of the city. Much evil arising from the use of intoxicating drink can be traced to the ingredients which enter so largely into the adulterated liquors sold to our people." Do you agree in that?—That is a solid fact.

22026. Now, see if this clergyman's conclusions are correct: "How rapidly is not the brain affected, the body diseased, the health shattered, and an irresistible craving created in those who indulge frequently in drink." Do you believe in that?—True.

22027. Another thing he speaks of is separating the sale of liquors from the sale of groceries. What is your opinion as to that?—Well, we have had that question before us from time to time. We have had it in the Legislature, and we have had deputation after deputation before us. Some of the people who come as a deputation have places of their own rented where liquor is sold, and people who know that say: "What hypocrisy." There are a great number of gentlemen that I have seen coming to Quebec, who I know had houses rented for saloons, had houses rented and were receiving large rents from hotel-keepers and tavern-keepers, and saloon and restaurant keepers. If these men were honest, why should they rent their places at all to any person for that purpose?

22028. That is hardly an answer to my question, and I quite agree with you these are difficulties of that kind. Here is the point the clergyman takes, and I use it in questioning you. He says: "Experience having taught that the liquor trade, combined with the grocery, offers such facilities to wives, mothers, sisters and daughters to procure intoxicating drink, which so often drags them from the high plane on which man's love and veneration have placed them." He also says that a great many women get liquor in groceries who would never go to saloons?—They do.

22029. The abuse is presented as a reason why this separation should be made?—Yes.

22030. Are you aware this separation is made in the Province of Ontario?—I am aware, but do not think it is carried out.

22031. I hope it is.—Well, I know it is not strictly carried out in Ontario.

22032. At all events it is intended to be. Do you think if such a law could be passed and carried out, it would be a good one?—Most undoubtedly it would.

22033. You would be in favour of such a law?—I would be inclined to favour it, but I would not ask for it, nor would I interfere in any way with the rights of the people.

22034. Another thing which this clergyman refers to as one of the great difficulties is the breach of the Sunday law. Do you think it is broken much in the city?—Not so much as formerly.

22035. You spoke of some licenses having been taken away?—Yes. At one time liquor was sold in nearly every place on Sunday by getting into the premises by back doors and lanes.



22036. This clergyman suggests that as fines fail to check the evil, there should be imprisonment and cancellation of the license after the third offence?—That is being done now.

22037. Do you approve of that?—I do.

22038. Another thing which this clergyman refers to is the selling of liquor to minors?—Well, I do not think there is any man in the city of Montreal who has a licensed place, and who would intentionally or willingly sell liquor to any boy or girl. I do not believe it.

22039. Do you believe that such a law, however, could be thoroughly enforced?—Yes, that law was enforced, and boys were dressed up as men and sent in to catch people, but I do not believe that any one in the city in the business wants to sell liquor to minors.

22040. Who would do such a thing as to send persons to mislead the liquor sellers?—It was proven in court.

22041. Was it done with the object of getting people convicted?—Yes. It was proven in court.

22042. That deceit was practised on the dealers?—Yes.

22043. This clergyman seems to think, however, that there was a great deal of liquor sold to drunkards. He says: "Are there ten liquor dealers in this city who never sold liquor to well-known drunkards. If there are, let us have their names," and so on. —From what I know of the people of Montreal I think that their respect for youth is such that they would not sell to minors. The children learn evil ways soon enough, and I do not think the people are vile enough to give them drink.

22044. I judge from your answer that such sales should be condemned?—Most undoubtedly.

22045. This clergyman also deals with the diminution of the number of saloons, and advocates that?—The Mercier Government raised the tax double on saloon keepers, intending that the number should be reduced.

22046. What was the result?—The number has increased, and it has increased again this year.

22047. Do you think yourself that a law should be passed diminishing the number of places where liquor is sold?—Yes, I do.

22048. Do you favour what is called a high license system?—Yes, I do, in order to bring the most respectable class of people into the business. When the law recognizes them, they should be protected.

22049. It seems to me there was a witness before us on Friday who intimated that high license leads to a poorer class of liquors being sold?—There is a great deal of truth in that. If the license is high, a man, in order to make money, will sell as cheap liquor as he can. A man pays \$300 or \$400 for a place in any decent locality in the city of Montreal in which to carry on business. His license is \$400, his business and other taxes come to over \$1,000, and it is almost impossible for that man to keep good liquor, there is such competition in the business. You cannot get a good small glass of brandy anywhere less than fifteen cents; but still they will sell you brandy, some of them, for ten cents. It is neither brandy, nor whisky, nor gin. I believe that the more expense you put on the saloons, the greater the encouragement to sell bad liquor. There are certain persons who go into the business who should not be allowed into it at all.

22050. I understand you favour a rigid system of inspection of liquor?—I certainly do.

22051. And a rigid inspection into the character of those to whom licenses are given to see that they are respectable men?—That is done by our three Magistrates.

22052. Now, you favour it as a system?—Yes. Our three License Commissioners have experience on the Bench: they know nearly everybody in the city of Montreal, and they seldom give a license to anybody who, to their knowledge, is not respectable. If they do, they are deceived.

22053. You favour a rigid inspection of the character of the applicants to whom a license is given and diminution of the number of licenses granted, and a rigid enforcement of the law preventing sale to minors. With some doubt as to the ability to enforce

it, you favour the suppression of the sale of liquors in grocery stores?—In a measure I do, but I do not think it would do a great deal of good in our city; I may be wrong, however. There are a great many respectable grocers who keep the law.

22054. And I suppose you would prevent the sale in groceries in any but unbroken packages?—That could be done; that law is in force now, but it is impossible to watch them. No grocer is allowed to sell any liquor now, except by the pint. For instance, you take places that are breaking the law. In order to show what feeling some people have against becoming informers, I may say that when Mr. Mercier was in power, we tried to get ten men to become Provincial policemen and spies and informers, and I could not get one old countryman to accept the position. As representing the Irish people of the city of Montreal, I had the right to appoint two of the men, and I could not get one; they would not take it on any account, and even the Canadians that took the position were not much in favour of it. There is a feeling here against informers and spies which it is impossible to get over, and so it is impossible to have a law of that kind carried out in our city. They are manly and liberty-loving people here.

22055. Mr. Mayor, you have spoken to His Honour the Chairman in regard to the effects of general prohibition, and you think that although such a measure might be passed, it would be impossible to carry it out. I wish to ask you a question or two in regard to it. In the first place, the principle of prohibition might be carried by the people of the whole country and every section of the country?—That could not be carried in Montreal.

22056. Even if carried, you do not think such a law could be enforced?—It could not be enforced.

22057. Take a case of this kind. Suppose that either by a plebiscite or otherwise, the opinion of the people of the Dominion as a whole on this question was obtained, and you found that in the Maritime Provinces they were ten to one in favour of general prohibition, Quebec against it, Ontario a balance of opinion or almost so for and against, in Manitoba a large majority in its favour, and in British Columbia ten to one against it, do you think that in those sections of the country in which there was a heavy vote against prohibition there would be even greater difficulty in enforcing it than if the whole of the country were pretty evenly divided?—You would require a great staff of policemen to enforce it. Do you suppose the country would be able to pay for that?

22058. Do you think that there would be greater difficulty in the sections of the country where the trend of public opinion was against prohibition, than in other portions where public opinion was in favour of it?—I think it would be almost equally difficult to carry it out in all portions of the country.

22059. You think that in the provinces, even where there was a majority in its favour, it would require an immense force to enforce it?—I do. It would be very difficult to prevent the people getting liquor.

22060. What would be the means of getting liquor if it was absolutely prohibited?—I may tell you that I saw men last summer, and the summer before at Old Orchard Beach doing many things down there: they could teach a philosopher as to the means of getting liquor to drink. In every place down there you found it; they presume that they enforce the law there, but they do not. They think it the purest country in the world, and the people as a rule are down on the liquor traffic; but all the same, the liquor is got and drunk there, and wherever they get it, I do not know.

22061. You think the same would result in this country as in Maine?—Yes. I say that you could get drink anywhere you wanted it in Maine.

22062. As you are not in favour of a prohibitory law, because it could not be enforced, you say, perhaps I may ask you if you are not opposed to it on principle?—I believe that a man who wants a drink should have a right to get it. We have lots of temperance societies in our church, and our priests are doing everything to restrict it, either in its entirety or to promote temperance. There are men in these societies who formerly used to drink very hard, but since they joined the societies they drink no more.

22063. You are opposed on principle to prohibition, and also you think that, if passed, it could not be effectually enforced without a tremendous staff of officers. I ask you this question as a public man of experience: suppose a prohibitory law were

passed and a staff of officers were appointed, do you think that they should be appointed by the municipal or provincial authority?—I have seen officers appointed even lately in our own city, and the men who were appointed were found drunk immediately.

22064. The officers themselves?—Yes, the very men who were appointed to spy, and to see that the people kept the law, were drunk themselves; and you will find that everywhere.

*By the Chairman :*

22065. Whose officers were they?—The Government officers and civic officers.

*By Judge McDonald :*

22066. I asked you, if such officers were appointed, by what authority you think they should be appointed?—That would be a question for the different parts of the Dominion to decide. In some places the civic administration is carried out very well, and in other places it does not take. For instance, in the city of Montreal it would be far better for the Provincial Government to assume that responsibility.

22067. You would have each province look after the enforcement of the law by its own officers, as it does in regard to other laws?—Most undoubtedly.

22068. Now, the passing of such a law as His Honour the Chairman spoke of, that is the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, would have the effect of taking away from the Federal Government, I think, an income of seven million dollars a year, besides the amount that would be taken away from the Provincial and municipal treasuries; and the payment of this body of officers, of whom you speak, would make an additional charge upon the revenue of the country. How would you propose that should be met?—They would have to leave the beer and light wines upon which to levy duties.

22069. But such a measure as the Chairman spoke of refers to all classes of liquors?—Under Confederation the different duties of the provinces and the Dominion were stipulated, and I do not know how this would affect the terms of Confederation. You would, I think, have to make new laws to meet it.

22070. Under the plan you speak of, if the provinces appointed the officers, the province would have to pay for them, and the revenue from licenses, which I think is some \$600,000 in this province, would be wiped out. Would it lead to direct taxation, or how would you provide for the payment of these men: the province cannot put a duty on teas or sugars?—I think the only right way then would be to put direct taxation on the people; but we are taxed heavily enough now.

22071. If the benefits that would be hoped for from this legislation by those who put it forward could be obtained, do you suppose such benefits would be worth paying for?—They would be; that is, if there was a way devised by which nobody would ever get drunk, it would be the greatest benefit to humanity that could be obtained:

22072. But you do not think that happy result would follow?—I do not.

22073. But if that result could follow, it would be worth direct taxation?—It would be worth it, but the result does not follow in any country, and it will not follow here.

22074. Then this proposed change would lead to the breweries and distilleries being abolished. Do you think that if that were done, the owners of those properties should be compensated?—Most undoubtedly; but the Government will never buy out the breweries, the people would not be in favour of that.

22075. Suppose prohibition were carried, do you think that one of the clauses that should accompany it would be a provision for the compensation of these men?—Most undoubtedly.

*By the Chairman :*

22076. You think that would be just?—Certainly, for you intend fair prohibition; it will never be carried in this country.

22076a. What we are specially anxious to obtain are the facts in regard to the traffic, and the opinions of experienced persons who can judge things as they are in their own

HON. JAMES McSHANE.

localities, and from their own experience. This is one of the objects in asking men in your position the questions we do. Have you any suggestion to make for improvement of the license laws?—None whatever. You will meet a great many people, I suppose, here in the city of Montreal, who will give you different opinions. I have not followed what you have done in the city up to the present, but I speak for the city of Montreal. I think, as I have said before, that Montreal is a city that is quite sober and respectable.

22077. Do you think it would be any more so under a prohibitory law?—It could not.

22078. Do you think it would be less so?—It would be less so, because if people were deprived of their liberty, they would drink more.

22079. In your own opinion, the effect of a prohibitory law, so far as Montreal is concerned, so far from being beneficial, would be hurtful?—I do not think it would do any good.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

22080. You said, I think, that the license law has been better observed in the city recently?—I believe so.

22081. To what do you attribute that better observance?—Well, the caution given by the Commissioners, who give out the licenses, to the restaurant keepers, and tavern keepers, and saloon keepers. When they come and get their licenses, they are told that they had better be careful, that the second time they commit an offence they will be more heavily fined, and the third offence will be followed by cancellation of license. I believe the Commissioners have taken away twenty licenses this year.

22082. That is carrying out the law?—Yes, strict and straight.

22083. That is the officers are carrying out the law better than they did?—They always tried to carry out the law, but there are influences brought to bear. Men have their friends in court, and they can sell every Sunday and every night. I may say that recently I have warned hundreds of people who come to me that if they cannot earn their living by doing an honest business and keeping the law, they should give it up. People come and claim the same rights in business as the Windsor Hotel and St. Lawrence Hall.

22084. Is there any distinction between these places?—I do not think any of these places sell except to their guests.

22085. You spoke of certain causes that interfere between the violators and the enforcement of the law. What do you mean by that?—The strictness of the Commissioners lately has made the law breakers afraid, and they are conforming to the law pretty well in Montreal.

22086. I presume it is fair to assume that the better enforcement of the law is attributable largely to the warnings that are given by the Commissioners?—Yes, and besides those of all of the Aldermen and representative men here who have to get these people out of trouble. They tell them that they must not come to them in court, and that their license will be broken if they do not keep the law.

22087. That is a very gratifying state of things. Can you tell us what has caused the Aldermen to take this different position from what they did before?—It is very hard for an Alderman of the city of Montreal, when the circumstances and facts of the case are brought to bear upon him, to refuse. Twenty men come to you, and ask you to do something for these poor people; it will be the last time they will commit an offence. Human nature cannot stand the appeal made; nor can any man in public life, who wants to be elected. Owing to the recent action of the Commissioners in laying down strict rules, there is very little liquor being sold on Sunday, except in places like the Hall and the Windsor, which sell to their guests.

22088. The Aldermen at one time were solicited and entreated to interfere on behalf of the violators of the law?—They did not interfere. They asked the Judges to let off the offenders, that is, not to give them power to sell liquor on Sunday, but to let them off on that special occasion for violating the law.

22089. That was the condition of things?—It is the condition everywhere, and not alone in the city of Montreal.

22090. You say that now the Aldermen do not do that so much, and that they warn these men : why do they do that now ? It is said it is because there is a stronger feeling among the people generally in favour of the enforcement of the law ?—Yes, in favour of people closing their places on Sunday. There was always a strong feeling among the people here in favour of that, and it is growing stronger every day.

22091. To what do you attribute that growing strength ?—To a desire among the people to do what is right.

22092. Is it because of the influence of the priests and ministers ?—Yes, that is having a great effect.

THE MAYOR.—Were you not in our city yesterday, Sunday ?

REV. DR. MCLEOD.—Yes.

THE MAYOR.—Have you ever been in a quieter city on Sunday ?

REV. DR. MCLEOD.—It is very quiet.

22093. Do you know whether there have been any cases in which the majority of the people in a district petitioned against the granting of a certain license ?—I know of one man who was prosecuted a great deal, a man by the name of Kearney. That man is one of the most respectable citizens of Montreal, and he has observed the law. That man has been eight or ten years in his place of business, and he had as much right to be there as the Windsor Hotel. I have heard of the matter you refer to, and I think the Judges have always acted pretty fairly to both parties ; but there was a terrible attempt made against that man, and I do not believe in that.

22094. The law provides, I understand, that if the majority of the electors in the district petition against the granting of a license, the Commissioners must refuse that license ?—They must, and they have done it.

22095. I want to know whether people take advantage in any case of that right which the law gives them ?—I know of some people who because some of their relatives drink liquor, petition against places and almost go wild. It is not the fault of a man who keeps a respectable place that these people drink ; these men go there themselves. As far as I know, the carrying out of the law in Montreal by the Commissioners has been an effort to do what is right and correct. If the majority of the people in a polling district signed against the granting of licenses, to my mind the Commissioners always conformed to the law.

*By the Chairman :*

22096. Do you know of any case, or if more than one, how many, in which the majority of the people resident in a district have petitioned against the granting of a license ?—I know of none.

22097. You mentioned one ?—That is what I heard through the press. I saw it in the *Montreal Witness* and *Star*, but I never knew whether it was a fact.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22098. Was that a case in which the people exercised the right which the law gives them, to secure a majority of voters to protest against a license being granted ?—That case to which I have referred was one, and the people on both sides worked very hard.

22099. Did they succeed in preventing the license being issued ?—No, they never succeeded.

22100. They did not get a majority ?—Not to my knowledge.

22101. There has evidently been no case in which they have succeeded ?—Not that I know of. I do not think that the Commissioners would do anything wrong.

22102. I want to know whether the people have taken advantage of this right which they have, or not ?—Some of the people have gone a little too far. In petitioning against this license, they were too earnest. When a man pays his taxes and conforms to the law of the land and keeps a respectable place, and never has been brought up for selling liquor after hours on Sunday, I do not think that man should be annoyed continuously. I do not think it is fair.

22103. The law requires that 25 people sign a petition or an application for a license. Do you believe that it would be an advantage if the law required that the appli-

HON. JAMES McSHANE.

cant should get a majority of the signatures in his district?—No, I do not think it would. For instance, you take Beaver Hall. I know to my knowledge that people have tried to get licenses there, but the people would not sign, I would not sign myself.

22104. Why not?—Because we do not want them there; I do not want them there myself.

22105. Why?—Because we do not want them.

22106. Is it a purely residential locality?—It is a business and residential locality. The inhabitants in that locality do not want a license house; a great many of the people who would not sign for a license there take as much drink as anybody down town.

22107. Is Beaver Hall near the restaurant kept by the man you spoke of?—Yes, it is near it: Mr. Kearney has been there for years.

22108. In the country places the Municipal Councils can refuse licenses if the people require them to do so?—Yes.

22109. How is it you do not think it would be well to have the same provision extended to the cities?—The Aldermen here were glad to get rid of that. They were plagued to death by people wanting to get licenses.

22110. You said people like liberty. Do not you think they like it in the country the same as in the city?—It depends. In Montreal, Aldermen do not care to have the great honour of awarding licenses.

22111. The people of the country by a majority, may, through the municipalities, refuse to grant licenses. Would it not be fair if the people of a ward or district in Montreal were permitted to ask that no licenses be granted?—That would be giving both sides a great deal of trouble.

22112. Would it not be right for the majority to rule?—You would have to change the law. I think that twenty-five respectable citizens are enough to ask for the granting of a license.

22113. Do not you think that law should apply to cities as well as to rural districts?—I would not be in favour of changing the law, because it is well considered. Formerly there were only three names required on the petition.

22114. I understand you said that boys were disguised to entrap liquor sellers?—Yes.

22115. Was that frequently done. Was it evidence, or was it conjecture?—There were one or two cases came under my notice.

22116. Were the facts brought out in the investigation?—I do not remember; I never followed it up.

22117. It was not conjecture?—No. It was not conjecture, it was a fact.

22118. You said that priests and ministers are doing a great deal to promote temperance, and I think that is correct. Do you believe that the closing of the liquor stores would help the priests in that good work, that is the closing of all liquor stores?—No, I do not think it.

22119. Well, the closing of any number of them?—Some of them might be closed, and it might do a great deal of good, more especially near churches.

22120. Do you think liquor stands are a disadvantage near churches?—Well, I think they should not be there.

22121. Does it make disorder in the vicinity of the churches, or are they an inducement for people to buy liquor when going to church?—Well, we have complaints from priests and ministers about it.

22122. Do you think it is a disadvantage to have them in the vicinity of schools?—There are a great number who do keep places near churches, who are very respectable and never violate the law. I have myself been the means of taking away the licenses of some people who did not deserve to have them. I do not know with regard to liquor places being near schools.

22123. Do you know what the licenses paid in Montreal amount to?—About \$250,000.

22124. Does the city receive any of it, or does it go into the Provincial treasury?—The province receives most of it.

22125. Have you any idea what would be the average sales per day in these places?—Since the license was raised some of them have had to close, but there are

other people making a fortune. One man told me that his profits were \$25 a day on the average the year round, of course there are those who do not sell nearly that quantity.

22126. Would they average \$20 a day, gross receipts?—Yes, I think they would, including the food sold.

22127. That would be over two millions a year?—Yes.

22128. What does the city get?—They get the business tax and assessments.

22129. How much does the business tax realize?—Seven and one-half per cent on the rental; then of course there is the property and water tax.

22130. How much is charged for granting certificates?—\$8.

22131. Those other taxes apply to others as well as to the liquor dealers?—Yes, they are placed on the premises.

22132. Has the prohibition question any reference to politics?—Yes, the man who would stand up here and preach prohibition to the masses would not be a safe politician.

22133. You think it is not wise for a politician to advocate prohibition?—It might be in a ward where people are inclined to prohibition, but it is political influence all over in the country, and I suppose you know it well too.

22134. I have been a reader of Montreal papers more or less for a number of years, and I notice that you have disposed of a good deal of charity, some of it out of your own pocket. Is the poverty that you have been good enough to relieve, caused in any degree by drink?—In a good many cases it is; I am not able to give everything that I am asked for in money, but I endeavour to lighten their hearts somewhere or be kind to them when they come to me. I do all I can for the people, and I intend to carry out that policy.

22135. It is your belief that a large proportion of poverty you have been called upon to relieve was caused either by the drinking of the people themselves, or of those on whom they were dependant?—Yes, a large proportion of it. It is caused by drunken fathers leaving their children in want.

22136. Can you tell the Commission what the State does to support these poor people?—We have a number of charitable institutions.

22137. Does the State make a large grant for that purpose?—No, with the exception of relieving them of taxes.

22138. Does it make no grants to support homes for the poor?—The Province does. It gives grants to a great many institutions.

22139. I have noticed from reading the papers for a number of years, and seeing frequent references to yourself, that you are particularly the workingman's friend. Have you studied his condition with some degree of closeness?—Yes, a good deal.

22140. Have you noticed whether the liquor trade and the liquor habit affect working men?—Well, since their labour organizations have come into growth, I must say they have done an immense deal of good, and that the workingmen do not drink as much as they did formerly. Last year, when they had their picnic on the Exhibition grounds, they were allowed the liberty of selling ale. This year they themselves and their leaders came and asked me not on any account to grant leave to gamble or sell liquor on the grounds. Of course some people were very anxious that I should give that liberty, and a great deal of influence was brought to bear on me to do so; but I refused straight. The Knights of Labour themselves supported me in what I had done, and in fact they even asked me not to grant any licenses.

22141. You think there is a great change for the better in the habits of labouring men?—I do.

22142. Is there anything in the rules of their society in favour of temperance?—I do not belong to them, but I think there is. They make straight appeals for temperance.

22143. Why do you think that the societies and those who control them so strenuously object to drinking by the members?—I suppose they have the experience that it is injurious to the men.

22144. Speaking of the sale of liquors the year before last on the picnic grounds: what was the effect of selling liquors on that day?—Well, there was a large body of people that came there from all parts, and some of them did not act very wisely.

22145. What was the condition when liquor was not sold?—Very orderly and very respectable.

HON. JAMES McSHANE.

22146. There was a marked difference?—Yes.

22147. Have you noticed whether the labouring people waste much money in drink?—Some do, and will continue to do so.

22148. You think they are doing less of that now?—A great deal less.

22149. You attribute that to the influence of the church?—In a great measure to the example and preaching of the church.

22150. Do you believe the best interests of the workmen and their families would be promoted by total abstinence?—In a sense it would be far better if no man ever took a drink, except cold water.

22151. Do you think that abstinence would be helped by closing the drinking shops?—I do not.

22152. Do you not think that the drinking can be prohibited?—No. People would drink still.

22153. You are opposed to total prohibition?—I am.

22154. Take opium: would it be well to license the sale of opium?—No.

22155. Or gambling, for instance?—I think gambling should be prohibited.

22156. The sale of obscene literature is prohibited.—That should be wiped out. Since I have been Mayor, I have stopped all scurrilous papers coming in here. I think most undoubtedly they should be prohibited,

22157. That is done in the interests of morality?—Undoubtedly.

22158. You know men pretty well and have a large experience of them, and no doubt you know a great many men who drink. Do you know any drinking men who would be glad if they could not get drink?—If a man has an appetite for drink, he will get it.

22159. Do you know whether the abundant facilities for getting drink is an inducement to men with appetites for drink to procure it?—I was advising a man the other day, and he told me if hell was open to him, he would jump into hell and get a drink.

22160. Is his an extraordinary case?—This man told me that he could not resist the temptation.

22161. Do you think that that poor fellow would be glad if there were no place to get drink?—I do not know. That man goes around preaching temperance; he made a great speech here on temperance.

22162. Have you observed whether mechanics and labourers lose a large portion of their time by drinking?—Indeed they do: some poor unfortunates lose a good deal of time.

22163. Could you say how many days in the month?—It is well known that some of our workmen miss Mondays; whether it is from drink or not, I cannot say. The employers complain that sometimes the men keep from work through drink; I have not enough knowledge on that point to give any very definite answer.

22164. Employers do complain?—Yes, but whether it is because of drink or licenses, I am not aware.

22165. You have expressed yourself against prohibition, but said that if prohibition could be enforced the effects would be great, although you do not think it could be enforced. I suppose some people do believe in prohibition?—Certainly. There are a great many who, if they take a drink would go crazy, and they believe in prohibition.

22166. Do you know where there is any considerable body of people in Montreal who are really favourable to prohibition, and who are working along the line?—I believe there may be, and many of them act with good intentions; but the great body of them are men who formerly drank liquor and could not restrain themselves, and they are now very strong on that point.

22167. There are some men who do not drink at all and never did?—Yes.

22168. And they think that prohibition may be a good thing, whether they are mistaken or not?—My uncle took the pledge from Father Mathew, and he never took a glass of liquor since he was a boy. I never took a drink until I was twenty-eight, but I take a nip now when I like it, and will always take it when I want it.

22169. Do you think among those in favour of prohibition in Montreal there are some quite prominent citizens, and that they have a following?—They have been working very hard and very earnestly and they have some following.



22170. Do you think that that following is increasing in Montreal?—I do not know. There are some men at the head of these institutions who try to crush out others. Their conduct in life and their business transactions, apart from drink, do not warrant them in some of the actions they take. They find fault with their neighbours, but their own acts in the past have not been such as to have a good effect upon others.

22171. Do you suppose that the active efforts of the priests and ministers and other persons prominent in the church, are creating a sentiment against the drink habit and the drink trade?—I believe so.

*By the Chairman :*

22172. Do you believe that this is the most efficacious way of promoting temperance?—Yes, it is the best.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22173. I think I understood you to say that there were fewer cases before the police courts during the past twelve months than formerly?—Yes.

22174. And you attribute that to the fact that a great many people go to Sohmer Park?—Yes, and other quiet places of amusement.

22175. I ask you if liquors were sold during the past twelve months in Sohmer Park?—I do not know; I have gone myself two or three times, and I think I had some ale there.

22176. I want to know if these advantages obtained by the people going into parks were secured because there was no liquor sold in the parks?—I think so.

22177. Was there not liquor sold in Sohmer Park?—I had a glass of beer the day I was there; I think it is a quiet, orderly place.

22178. You think that the establishment of parks for the people has the effect of reducing drunkenness?—Yes; we have our parks, where liquor is prohibited, and it is a great boon to the people to be able to go there.

22179. Would you favour a law which would fix the number of licenses according to the population?—Certainly.

22180. Do you think it a proper thing to give licenses to grocery stores?—I do; the law has always existed in the city and I do not object to it.

22181. Do you favour the granting of licenses to places where meals are not supplied?—I do not.

22182. You do not think there should be licenses given to such places?—No.

22183. What is the average number of qualified voters in each polling subdivision? I suppose there are from sixty to eighty residents. I understand that it requires the signatures of twenty-five resident voters to obtain a license?—Yes.

22184. What proportion of the average number is 25?—Perhaps about 60 per cent.

22185. That is a large proportion?—It is a fair proportion.

22186. From your experience, Mr. Mayor, as a public servant, serving the people in many capacities, what conclusion have you come to respecting the influence of the saloon as compared with the influence of the hotel bar?—Do you mean the restaurant?

22187. I want to know if the influence of the saloon is more injurious to young men than the influence of the hotel bar; which does the most harm?—I do not see that there is any difference; if a man drinks in a saloon, he will drink in a hotel.

22188. Is it not a fact that a person does not go to a saloon if he will be seen entering there, but that it is different when he enters a hotel for drink?—The people who take drink do not care where they go; the man who dodges in by the back door is a hypocrite. The people take what they want, and they are not ashamed to go to Freeman's or the St. Lawrence bar or anywhere else. I do not see any difference between the restaurant bar and the hotel.

22189. It has been urged that the hotel bar does more harm than the saloon?—I do not think it: the saloon is a restaurant.

22190. Would you favour the issue of licenses for the sale of beer and light wines?—Certainly; but the difficulty is that people who take such licenses sell all kinds of drink, and it would be impossible to detect them.

HON. JAMES MCSHANE.

22191. What is your experience respecting the operation of the Maine liquor law?—I do not think it works at all. From what I have seen, you can get wine and liquor in every drug store in Maine.

22192. Do you get it in the hotels?—All you want of it. I saw some men come from a picnic in Portland in one day, and there were about 14 of them drunk. I believe that they drank bad liquor, and that if they had had good liquor they would not be so incapable. I went across to the place where I saw them going in; it was a place on the wharf in Portland, where they were getting liquor. The liquor they sell in some of these places is perfect poison.

22193. Do you think that that system of things does more harm than licenses?—Certainly it does. It would be far better if they had licenses.

22194. Have hotel-keepers in Montreal the right to sell liquor to guests in their rooms on Sunday?—They have, and it would be impossible to prevent it.

22195. Then you are not in favour of a prohibitory law?—No.

22196. Because you believe it could not be enforced?—I do not think it could.

22197. What do you favour as the best means of promoting temperance?—I would be in favour of promoting all the temperance societies possible, of being very careful to whom licenses are given, strict vigilance of our police force day and night, and sometimes an inspection to see that liquor is not adulterated or poisoned.

*By the Chairman :*

21198. Are you in favour of the inspection of liquors?—Yes. I think a man who adulterates liquor and puts poison in it ought to be in the penitentiary.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22199. Suppose these temperance societies and churches by and by get the people to believe that the drink trade is wrong, do you believe that a prohibitory law would be right, and that it could be enforced. I mean, of course, the great majority of the people?—I cannot answer that question.

22200. Is it not true that the church and temperance societies influence the people, they no longer patronize the trade and are opposed to it?—I cannot speak as to that. We have a great many different classes of people in Montreal, we have very good people in our city.

22201. Is not this Sohmer Park a public resort?—It is a most respectable place.

22202. People go there very largely on the Sabbath and other days?—The Church does not find any fault with the people going there after they go to mass. We do not consider it any crime or harm whatever.

22203. Is it a licensed place?—Yes.

22204. Then it is not allowed to sell on Sunday?—No.

22205. Do you know whether the proprietor of the park does sell on Sunday or not?—He does not.

22206. Has he been convicted for selling on Sunday?—I think the Local Government have taken an action against him for selling on Sunday, but there is some question as to whether the beer sold is intoxicating or not. There is a legal question involved in it.

CHARLES A. VALLÉE, Governor of the Montreal Jail, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

22207. How long have you occupied the position of Governor of the Montreal jail?  
—For two years.

22208. How were you occupied prior to that date?—I was three years on the Montreal Stock Exchange, and seventeen years connected with the Banque Nationale.

22209. Can you tell us how many prisoners you have in jail at the present time?  
—When I left this morning there were 211 in the men's jail.

22210. How many in the female jail?—There were about 140 females in both jails.

22211. Were the present inmates all sent to jail for committing offences?—For committing offences and drunkenness.

22212. Any for vagrancy?—Yes, some for vagrancy. They are sent down to the jail because there is no other place to which to send them. Suppose a destitute person is found on the streets, unless one of the National Societies takes him, he is sent to the jail and is disposed of later on.

22213. Is it a fact that there is no provision made for taking care of the poor except in the jail and through the national societies and the charitable societies of the Roman Catholic Church?—That is all that I am aware of.

22214. Your appointment is made by the Provincial Government?—Yes, by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

22215. And you report to the Provincial Government?—I report every year to the Provincial Government.

22216. The expenditure of the jail is met by the Province of Quebec?—Yes.

22217. Does the city contribute anything towards the maintenance of the Jail?  
—Yes, there is a law by which the municipalities are bound to pay us fifteen cents a day for each person sent by them.

22218. That applies to the city?—Yes.

22219. And to the different municipalities of the district of Montreal?—Yes.

22220. All those who are sent by the municipalities, including felons, have to be paid for at the rate of fifteen cents a day?—Yes.

22221. Is the number of inmates given a fair average?—No, the average for 1891 was 274, and the average this year would be about 250.

22222. Are you speaking of male and female?—I am speaking of males.

22223. A fair average for a number of years would be about how many?—Our jail is so small we are glad to send some to different districts very often. If we were to take the average, I would say that 250 or 260 would be about it; this year, however, the number is much lower than it has been in previous years.

22224. Is a register kept of all the prisoners, their names, etc.?—Yes.

22225. Is each prisoner's record kept separately?—Yes.

22226. Can you tell us from that register how many of the offences for which persons are imprisoned arise out of drunkenness?—Well, I have got the statement of last year here, and from it you would have an idea, but it does not give you a very precise idea, because, according to my calculation, at least eighty per cent of all the prisoners received are there through drunkenness, that is either directly or indirectly. We generally put in for our special reports to the Inspectors of government those who come directly under the head of drunkenness, but as a matter of fact the most part of those who come in under the head of vagrancy and assault are drunkards.

22227. Please give us the official figures first?—This is my special report for 1891; total number of imprisonment warrants during 1892, males 2,602, females 631; Protestant females 131; total 3,364 male and female. That is the number of warrants issued; a party may have come down two or three times or ten times to the jail, each time under an accusation, and a warrant would be issued each time. Now I will give you the number of prisoners. The total number of prisoners were: males 2,217, Roman Catholic females 517, Protestant females 109; total 2,843. There is a deficiency here

CHARLES A. VALLÉE.

compared with the previous number of 520; but that is accounted for by the fact that the same prisoners may have been sent down several times.

22228. You make a distinction between the number of commitments and the number of prisoners?—Yes.

22229. The commitments are more than the number of prisoners?—Yes.

22230. I notice that you seem to classify the females under the head of religions. Have you done the same with the males?—The Protestant societies demanded that they should be separated from the Roman Catholics, because Roman Catholic female prisoners are under the supervision of nuns, and they wanted to have their prisoners under the supervision of matrons.

22231. Have you a classification as to the kind of offences for which the prisoners were committed?—Yes. We subdivided them as follows: Assault, 141 men and 8 Roman Catholic and Protestant females; assault and battery, 31; assault on a constable, 40 men; assault on females, 14 men; aggravated assault, 4 men, and 1 Roman Catholic and 1 Protestant female.

22232. Can you tell us the number on the list committed for drunkenness and offences against the liquor law?—You will have to do that yourself, because I think they are all directly or indirectly due to drunkenness.

22233. How many have you under the classification of drunk?—863 males, 165 Roman Catholic females and 46 Protestant females.

22234. That is for the year 1891?—Yes.

22235. That is a total of 1,064 out of 3,364 committals?—Yes.

22236. These are classified in your returns as commitments for drunkenness?—Yes, because the commitment specially says that the party is sent down for drunkenness.

22237. The return which you have read from is a return made to the Provincial Government?—It is one prepared out of our register especially for the Inspectors of prisons.

22238. And the Inspectors of prisons make a report to the Provincial Government?—Yes.

22239. Does that report find its way into any official document laid before Parliament?—Yes. I have put it in a better form, which is more intelligible than the one the Inspector asks for.

22240. Have you a classification of offences that may be traced to drink?—Most of them may be traced to drink.

22241. Have you any statement of the total expenses of the jail?—No. You will have to get that from the Sheriff. The official report of the Inspector of prisons and asylums has been published. In that book you will find all the information you require as to the expenses and everything like that. It was prepared by the Inspectors and submitted to the Government.

22242. Have you given any attention to the present system of regulating the liquor traffic by the issue of licenses?—That is a little outside my business. The only thing is that I have studied the question by reading authorities in England and France and all parts, and I have seen many articles written about drunkenness.

22243. My question had reference to your own observation and experience in Canada. Have you observed as to the efficiency of the present license system, and as to its enforcement? Do you consider the license system is an efficient way of regulating the liquor traffic?—Yes, if it is well enforced.

22244. Do you think it is efficient?—I could answer more directly if you put me some question about drunkenness, because outside of my own business I do not look much into questions of political economy.

22245. I am asking you to speak from your official experience. Can you tell us, from your observation, if the license laws are efficient in regulating the traffic?—I do not doubt that they are now. Those sent to jail for illegal liquor selling should be sentenced to hard labour, in my opinion.

22246. How do you feed them now?—I feed them the very same as hard labour prisoners, and give them no more privileges than any other prisoner.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22247. Is it permissible for the friends of prisoners to provide them with food?—Not those sentenced to gaol; only the accused and untried prisoners have a right to have food sent by their friends. Those who are in the paupers' ward have got privileges as well as Crown witnesses, or those sent for contempt of court; those prisoners have a right to receive food and tobacco from their friends outside.

*By the Chairman :*

22248. Are their friends allowed to send them liquor?—Never. There is a fine of \$40 for that offence.

22249. What is the rule with regard to simple vagrants sent to gaol. Are they generally sentenced to hard labour?—Yes.

22250. All sentenced prisoners are treated alike?—Yes, with regard to food and clothing, except the debtors and those sent for contempt of court, and Crown witnesses. Those who are sent in sometimes for the selling of liquor without a license are kept in the ward and are not sent out to work. If they do not wish to work they do not work; and if they are clean, sometimes we do not put them in the prison garb.

*By Judge McDonald :*

22251. You have spoken of the drunkards who are sent down to gaol. In your character as Governor of the jail, do you find that some of the people who are brought to you for drunkenness have been affected by taking impure liquor so as to render them crazy almost?—Yes, most cases of that kind are due to the fact that they have taken bad, adulterated liquor.

22252. You have mentioned that some persons are committed several times: I suppose that would be for drunkenness. When they leave the jail, do they get drunk and come back in a short time?—Yes, that is the case; they should be sentenced for a longer term at first. If an habitual drunkard is sent down for eight days, he has not time to sober up, and when he gets out of jail he is drunk still.

22253. Would you think it desirable to place habitual drunkards in some other place than the jail, where they would be under medical charge?—I have no doubt that could be done, and it would be better. You see that matter referred to in all these reports, and the plan is highly spoken of by all those who treat offences of this kind.

22254. How would you deal with those people?—I think it is nonsense to send them down to jail for eight or ten days; the least you could do would be to send such an habitual drunkard down for three months, to give him time to sober up. It will take nearly a year to influence some men not to drink.

*By the Chairman :*

22255. Suppose a man is sent down a second time to prison, and when let out he commits a third offence, do you think it is any good to send him down to prison again? Should he not be sent to some other establishment?—He certainly should. An habitual drunkard should be confined in some institution where he would get medical treatment. Sometimes he is sent down for a month, the next time for perhaps eight days, and the next time he only gets five days. If he was sentenced for each offence for a little longer time than for the previous offence, we might get a little good out of him.

22256. You simply treat him as a prisoner: you do not attempt in the jail to treat him from a medical standpoint?—We try to sober him up. We have got a certain treatment for those who are in delirium tremens. It takes about eight days to put him right, and then we put him to work, and get him to work as much as possible, and by the influence of the minister or the priest, try to make him do better.

22257. Do you administer anything in the shape of medicine?—Nothing special.

22258. Do you think the system is as good, or better, than a system which would provide some institution to which offenders of that class could be sent and treated scientifically?—The present institution is perhaps better for the first offence, but it is pretty hard to bring habitual drunkards back. Perhaps the best place for them is in the jail.

CHARLES A. VALLÉE.

Keep them there for a number of months. You might have an institution, I suppose, where they could be treated, and if they show signs of permanent reform they might, perhaps, be set at liberty ; but if not, they should be continued in jail and kept as lunatics are kept.

22259. What is your own conclusion in regard to these habitual drunkards?—I think the system of keeping them in some kind of an asylum, until they show signs of permanent reform, is a good one,

22260. You told us, in reply to questions which I put to you some time ago, that a larger number of the crimes can be traced to intemperance than those which are classified under that head. Your classification shows that out of 3,364 committed, 1,064 are there for drunkenness. Is it your opinion that there is a very much larger number who go the prison owing to intemperance?—As I have told you, I think about eighty per cent are in jail because of drunkenness, either directly or indirectly. There is no doubt that drunkenness is the chief cause of about eighty per cent of the offences that are committed.

22261. You think that eighty per cent of the male and female prisoners find their way into jail because of intemperance?—Yes. They come there either directly or indirectly through intemperance.

22262. Can you tell us from your return the number of committals simply for vagrancy : I suppose the poor have sometimes to be charged with vagrancy in order that they may be legally committed to jail?—Yes, there must be a charge against him, and he must be sentenced for some offence. Last year there were sent down for vagrancy 408 men, 211 Roman Catholic females and 45 Protestant females.

22263. Are there any considerable number of these vagrants drunkards?—For the most part, perhaps 99 out of 100 are drunkards. It is even classified on the commitments: "For being drunk on the street." I suppose they are not making any noise, and they bring them on a charge of vagrancy. There is no heading "disorderly," which generally results from people being drunk.

22264. Do you know how it is determined in the case of a person found on the street, whether he is to be a vagrant or a drunkard?—I do not think they make any distinction.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22265. Have you any juvenile offenders under 13 years of age?—We do not take them in our place. They are sent to the reformatory.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22266. What steps would you recommend for the minimizing of the evil effects of the liquor traffic?—I would recommend strongly the encouragement of the sale of Weiss beer and soda water and other temperance drinks ; I would recommend especially that these drinks should be sold, for instance, in Sohmer Park and Mountain Park. I generally go to Sohmer Park myself, with my wife and children, as it is near our own door. The children are glad to go there and amuse themselves and hear what is going on. Very seldom we see a drunken man or a drunken woman in the place ; I know my prisoners very well. They have not got much energy of character, they are always under the domination of the women, either inside or outside the jail. If a labourer has money and his wife can induce him to take her and the family to Sohmer Park, they can spend a fine evening and amuse themselves for 20 or 30 cents, and the man goes home sober. I have seen some of my old customers in the park, and they say that whilst they are there they never get drunk, and do not get back to jail again. Instead of going to the barroom and spending a week's wages and getting drunk, they go to the park and take a glass of lager beer for a few cents. If a man wants to drink strong liquor, his wife is with him, and she tells him not to do so ; and he keeps away from jail. Whilst I have been in the jail, perhaps 9,000 people have passed through my hands, and I have seen hundreds of them in the park and doing well since. Yesterday I was looking at my books up to the 10th of September. In 1891 we received 1,830 ; this year up to 10th September we received 1,538, that is a decrease of 300 odd. Of women we received 43 less in the same period this year than we did last, making a grand total of 344 persons less. Some

of the witnesses here have told the Commissioners that they believe crime was on the decrease in the city, and I think these figures prove it. I believe the Sohmer Park has something to do with it. I have also read many authorities, amongst others Mr. William Tallack, President of the Humane Association, who encourages the use of light wines.

22267. Would you favour the passage of a prohibitory law, prohibiting altogether the manufacture, sale and importation of wines and liquors?—No, that is impossible.

22268. Would better results be obtained, in your opinion, by the adoption of measures that would enable the mass of the people to get recreation in parks and drink light wines and refreshments?—Yes, my idea is that that would be far better; prohibition will never take in this country. If you prohibit liquor, they will get it around the corner.

22269. I understood you to say, in reply to Judge McDonald, that many of those incarcerated in the jail were sent to jail on account of the vile character of the liquor they drank?—There is no doubt of that.

22270. You would favour a rigid inspection of all liquors sold?—Yes.

22271. Is there any necessity for the existence in the city of these saloons, which are drink shops, and where meals are not supplied?—Well, in a large city like Montreal it would be hard to close them up; but if they were divided into districts, according to a certain ratio of the population, it would be better.

22272. Is it necessary to have liquor sold in grocery stores?—I think it is a fruitful cause of evil, it gives facilities for purchasing liquor.

22273. Do you favour a continuance of the grocery licenses? Would it not be better to remove the sale of liquor into shops where only liquor would be sold, and have no liquor in groceries?—I do not know if you would benefit much by that.

22274. I think that facilities are given in the grocery stores to people buying small quantities of liquor, and secret drinking is encouraged in families. When families go to procure groceries at the stores, they frequently are supplied with liquor. Would it not be well to remove that temptation from the stores?—If they want to get liquor, they will get it elsewhere just the same.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

22275. Would you favour reducing the number of licensed places?—Yes, according to the population.

22276. Do you know whether the licensee in Sohmer Park has violated the law by selling on Sundays?—There are different points of view with regard to that case. I have never seen the least drop of liquor sold in Sohmer Park on Sunday, except Weiss beer. I am quite sure the proprietor does not allow it to be sold; I suppose if it were sold, I could get it as well as any one in the city of Montreal.

22277. Does that Weiss beer intoxicate?—I do not think so. I could drink a keg of it.

22278. Here is a clipping from the *Gazette*: “A woman went with a number of friends to St. Helen’s Island; while there she took Weiss beer. This made her excited, and she started to fight, which caused her arrest.” Do you think that correct?—She might have taken something stronger than Weiss beer, before she reached the restaurant on St. Helen’s Island.

22279. You think it could not be Weiss beer that excited her?—I do not believe it was.

22280. I was anxious to find out whether it was Weiss beer made her intoxicated?—You may be sure it was not, she had had something else before.

*By the Chairman:*

22281. The Mayor was unable to say definitely whether or not the proprietor of Sohmer Park was licensed to sell spirituous liquors?—They must be licensed, because they have an open bar there. You can have whatever you please, gin, brandy, or anything of that kind. I have had it myself on week days, but you can get nothing else than lager beer on Sundays.

CHARLES A. VALLÉE.

22282. Does his license authorize him to sell beer on Sunday?—That I do not know. They have been discussing that for three months before the courts, and it is not settled yet.

22283. Do you know anything about the working of the prohibitory law in the State of Maine?—Not of my own personal knowledge.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22284. Do you know anything about the local option law, or the Scott Act in this province?—No, only what I have seen in the papers. I do not believe in the Scott Act or in prohibition.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22285. Have you educated persons amongst your prisoners?—Yes. I would astonish you by showing you the work some of them have done. I have several very nice young fellows there.

22286. Are they there on account of drink?—Yes, some of them are down there for forgery, but they were drunk when they committed the forgery. If it had not been for drink, they would have been well-behaved.

22287. The prisoners in your records are not all labouring men?—I have had lawyers, I have had priests, I have ministers ; I have had every class down there.

*By the Chairman :*

22288. Will you please procure for the Commission a statement, giving officially the figures with regard to prisoners and their offences, which you have quoted?—I will procure such a statement.

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault :*

22289. What do you think of the operation of the license law?—I have no doubt that the law as it exists at the present time, might have a salutary effect if it were enforced continuously, as has been done for some time past ; but there is one thing on which I would lay special emphasis, viz., that those who are sentenced for selling liquor without license, instead of being sentenced to fine and imprisonment, should be sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour and fined. As the law is to-day, the penalty for its violation is nothing but a rest in prison, and they make light of it.

22290. What measures would you adopt to lessen drunkenness?—By encouraging the use of temperance beverages, as wine, beer, cider and the like ; by encouraging also divers places of amusement where the working classes, the bulk of the people, could betake themselves, such as Sohmer Park, Mountain Park, Mount Royal Park or St. Helen's Island, some public and popular resort where they would spend very little of their money. The artizans now go there with their wives and children ; there they find cheap amusement, and return home sober. I have had personal experience in these matters, especially in regard to Sohmer Park. By the report of 1891, under date of September 10th, there appear the names of 1,839 persons in our jail book. In 1893, at the same date, we had only 1,538, or a decrease of 301. We have the same ratio as regards women ; that is 43 less at the same date. This gives a grand total of men and women of 344 less incarcerations this year than last. If the causes of this decrease are sought, it cannot be said that there was less money this year than last, because although trade is not so brisk, great works are carried on by the city corporation on the streets, and money is plentiful. But one of the principal reasons, according to my judgment, is to be found in the cheap and well regulated amusements. The artizan goes there on Sunday or week-day evenings, in the society of his wife and children, and for a few cents he can procure agreeable diversion. The artizan is generally weak in character and he does not escape temptation ; but if his wife accompanies him and keeps him in her hands, as is the common saying, he would meet her wishes. We see every day that as soon as he is willing to spend twenty-five cents to take all his family with him to some public resort, he will no longer swerve from the right path ; if he wishes to



incur more expense his wife is beside him, and she watches over him and leads him away. Sohmer Park is about the only resort with which I am thoroughly familiar ; I go there almost every night. I meet there some of my former "boarders," who no longer come back to prison. They will take a glass of soda or lager beer, but if they want to take something stronger, their wives are there to watch over them and warn them. Generally they lead them away.

22291. These places of popular amusement at cheap rates are one of the modes suggested in the book of William Tallack to oppose drunkenness?—Yes.

22292. Can you procure us a comparative statement for the last 5 years of convictions for drunkenness?—I will cause it to be prepared.

22293. Only mention the number of arrests for drunkenness.—Yes.

22294. According to the statistics which you have published and of which you have cognizance, is there an increase or a decrease of drunkenness?—I believe there is a decrease. There is a decrease in this sense : The return for twelve months ending 10th September inst., shows there is a decrease of 343. Now, as I said a little while ago, 80 per cent of my prisoners have suffered arrest indirectly through drunkenness ; this is proof of a decrease.

22295. Is there an increase in crime?—There is a decrease in crime, all these things are closely regulated.

22296. Have you resided in Italy?—Yes, lived there 3 years. The Italians are a remarkably sober people in everyway, both in drinking and eating. They usually drink wine, and drunkenness is rare ; cases are to be found, but drunkards never reach the degradation they reach here.

22297. The use of wine is much less to be deplored than the use of alcohol, is it not?—Yes.

22298. If we could have the same custom of drinking wine, would you prefer it?—Yes, assuredly.

22299. What do you think of a system by means of which the retailers would be licensed to sell only wine, beer and cider, there being a similar system to that prevailing under the Scott Act, by which persons would be specially licensed to sell strong drink, and only upon a doctor's certificate?—I do not believe that it would be a success. In my opinion it is as well to grant an open license to a reliable person, capable of observing the law ; and also limit the number of licenses pro rata to the population. Moreover, a careful watch should be kept on all drink retailers, and we should encourage as much as possible these places of recreation I have mentioned, provided these places of popular resort be well kept and good liquors sold. And we should promote as much as possible the use of sound wines by charging the minimum of duties on such wines imported into the country, in order that good wines be sold.

22300. Have you lived some time in France?—I have merely passed through it.

HENRY BULMER, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

22301. You are Chairman of the Board of Harbour Commissioners of Montreal?—Yes.

22302. How long have you occupied that office?—For the last three years.

22303. Were you a member of the board prior to becoming the Chairman?—Yes.

22304. For how long?—Since 1879.

22305. And you have lived in this district, how long?—Since 1841.

22306. Are the Harbour Commissioners large employers of labour?—Yes, very large, just now especially.

22307. How many employees have you under your control?—At present I think between 300 and 400 ; it varies a little from week to week, but 300 or 400 on the average.

CHARLES A. VALLÉE.

22308. Have you much trouble with them on the score of intemperance?—Comparatively little. Once in a short time there may be a solitary case, but from my observation there has been very little trouble indeed.

22309. Do you think in this respect there is an improvement in recent years, that the men are more temperate than they were?—I could not say that. I have been a large employer of labour during all my life, and the same little difficulties have occurred from time to time, but I cannot say that things are any better or any worse than they were in former times, as far as my observation goes.

22310. Have you in existence any regulations connected with the Harbour Commission looking to improving the habits of the employees in respect to temperance?—No, I could not say that; but it is a perfectly understood thing that if a man is persistently given to drinking habits and cannot attend to his work, he is discharged.

22311. Do the men lose much time through indulging too much in intoxicating liquors?—I do not think I could say that. There are instances which occur every now and again, but I do not think they are on a very large scale.

22312. Do you think those cases are more frequent of recent years than formerly?—I do not think it; I do not think there is any change in the habits of the people.

22313. Having been a large employer of labour, and having been here so long taking an active interest in civic affairs, you have had an opportunity of observing the operation of the license laws?—I had some years ago, when I was a member of the City Council.

22314. Do you think they are efficient for the regulation of the liquor traffic?—Giving my individual opinion, and of late years I have not paid so much attention to it as I used to do, I think at the present time the license laws are better than they were when I was a member of the City Council, but that is a long time ago.

22315. In what respect do you think they have been improved?—In this way, that the license law is more stringent. There is a higher license, and I think if the present license law was enforced, it would be as good a license law probably as you can have, if you will have a license law. I know when I was a member of the City Council and took an active part in those matters, the license laws were very lax. Without being *au courant* with what is proceeding now, and without any special reason for paying attention to it, except as a good citizen, I think the present license laws, if properly enforced, are very good laws.

22316. From your observation, do you consider they are well enforced at present?—That I would not like to give an opinion upon. I am not in a position to say whether they are properly enforced or not; but reading the law on the face of it, if there must be a license law, it is a very good law.

22317. Do you think a license law is the best law you could have for the regulation of the traffic?—That is a very broad question.

22318. Opinions of gentlemen like yourself, the Commissioners are anxious to obtain. Would you prefer some other law than the license law?—I do not know that I would, for this simple reason—you are now getting to the pith of the whole thing. Is prohibition possible? I believe if you could introduce a prohibition law and enforce it thoroughly, it would be a very great advantage to a very considerable portion of the community who abuse indulgence in liquor; but unless you can enforce it, I do not see any use in having it on the statute-book.

22319. Then you think a law prohibiting the importation and sale, except for medicinal and mechanical purposes, of all intoxicants would be an improvement over the present system?—I believe it would be for the benefit of a very large portion of the community, if you could enforce it.

22320. In the present state of public opinion, do you think it could be efficiently enforced?—I should doubt it very much. The present state of public opinion is not sufficiently educated up to it. It may come to it, but at the present time, I must state it would be very difficult to enforce it in this country, and in this city especially. If it could be done, I believe for a very considerable portion of the community it would be of very great advantage, and I do not know that the other portion would suffer anything.

22321. Have you paid any attention to the efforts of the various temperance organizations in this city?—Nothing, except to read the reports of their proceedings. I have taken no part in their proceedings.

22322. They have been very active for a number of years?—Yes.

22323. Do you think their efforts have had any effect upon the public sentiment in regard to the use of intoxicants?—I am scarcely in a position to answer that question. As far as my observation goes amongst the people I come in contact with anywhere, I do not see that there is much difference. I have not been in the habit of going where these things are liable to be abused; but taking the mass of workingmen, apart from my own social circle, I must say that I do not see much difference in the position now from what it was in previous years. I have never been in the habit of being in places where it was likely to be abused in any way, and I cannot say anything further than that.

22323a. Have you given any consideration to the financial side of the question?—In what respect?

22324. Naturally, if we had prohibition, there would be a large loss of revenue to the Dominion and also to the provinces, or some of them, and to the municipalities?—I have looked on that from a general standpoint, without giving any particular study to it, but I do not think that is a question which ought to come in at all. If it is for the benefit of the community, I do not think a matter of dollars and cents for revenue should come in at all.

22325. If it could be enforced, you think the financial question should not be considered?—Not at all.

22326. But you make the condition that it must be enforced?—Certainly, or it would be worse than useless.

22327. And it would be sacrificing a large amount of revenue?—For no good.

22328. Do you think any benefit would arise in a city such as this by a reduction in the number of licenses issued?—That has been my conviction for many years.

22329. That the number should be curtailed?—Yes. I know that that was one of the efforts I made when I was a member of the City Council—to have the number reduced.

22330. Under the Quebec License Law, parishes have the power to secure prohibition in their own districts in this way, that the Municipal Councils can refuse to grant any licenses. Do you think it would be an advantage if a similar power were given to the city polling districts?—It would be an advantage if they could enforce it.

22331. You know somewhat of public sentiment here. What is your view: would it be really an advantage to give them that power, or not?—I think it would be an advantage to give them the power, but my opinion is that they could not enforce it in the present state of public opinion.

22332. Do any other suggestions occur to you in reference to the License Law beyond that you have mentioned, the curtailment of the number of licenses, which would be an advantage?—I do not know anything further, except to say in addition, that my own opinion is, that the number of licenses granted is too large, and from all reports, though I am not in a position to substantiate them, there are many places where liquor is sold without a license, and they are the least controllable. If the number of licenses were restricted, if the license fee were put at any figure you like, but make it an object to restrict the number—if that were enforced and liquor prevented from being sold in any other than licensed places, probably that would meet the requirements of this city, and you would be able to carry it out. There ought to be no difficulty in enforcing a license law such as we have now, and our present license law, as far as I understand it, is a very good law, but I think some further power should be given to restrict the number of licenses. You cannot walk along the streets of this city without seeing that there are too many places licensed to sell spirituous liquors.

22333. You would curtail the number and have very strict supervision?—Decidedly so.

22334. And you would have the law carried out?—Yes, and would keep these places under proper control, and I believe the respectable places would never offer any objection to this supervision.

HENRY BULMER.

22335. Do you think there is any necessity for having saloons to simply sell liquor, or should the duty be imposed upon them of supplying meals and sleeping accommodation?—I do not see why the two should not be combined. In a city like this there should be something to eat in all restaurants.

22336. I believe that is the law in Montreal, but it is not observed?—The license law reads all right, but it is necessary to have it enforced. It is necessary to have places where people can get something to eat, and those places would be sufficient to supply those who absolutely need some stimulants. My own opinion is, that the present law, if it were enforced and restriction were placed upon the number of places licensed, would be a very good law.

22337. The Commissioners have had placed before them the view that the respectable hotel with a bar is a greater danger to public morals than a saloon where liquor alone is sold off the counter. Which do you prefer?—I must say that in respectable first-class hotels that keep a bar they ought to observe more supervision in regard to those to whom they sell liquor than they do now.

22338. In what direction, may I ask?—Selling to boys or to people who have already had too much. That is one of the difficulties in connection with the traffic.

22339. Do you consider that the system of licensing groceries to sell liquors is a good one?—My own opinion is, that it would be better to separate the two, decidedly.

22340. Have you any special ground for saying that?—Nothing further than that the grocer with whom I deal for my groceries does not sell liquor at all. The danger is not so much in respectable places as in the lower class of groceries, where they are liable to lead the people to suppose that the privilege of selling liquor in a grocery is abused by a very large class of the community. I should say the two businesses should be separated.

22341. In what way do you think the present system leads to abuse? Is it the liquor being drunk on the premises, contrary to law?—No, I do not think that at all, but it is the facility with which the poorer classes can get the liquor. From my own observation, I could not say. I do not know of any single case where liquor has been sold on the premises by retail. Without being able to give a sufficiently satisfactory reason to other people, I think it would be better if that class of business were separate from the grocery business, but that is my own individual impression from observation and what I have heard.

22342. There is a large amount of capital invested at present by distillers and others in making intoxicating drinks. If a prohibitory law passed, that capital, if not entirely destroyed, would be greatly reduced in value?—No doubt of it.

22343. It is your view that those who are engaged in the business should in that event receive compensation?—I think it would naturally follow.

22344. You think it would be just?—I think so. I think it follows that if what is to-day a legitimate business were destroyed by a legislative enactment, it would be a very hard case that the individual should suffer. I think compensation would follow naturally. I remember the abolition of the slave trade in the West India Islands by the British Government, and the British Government compensated the slave owners; and in this case it follows almost naturally, according to all sense of justice, that if the business were destroyed, those engaged in it would have a legitimate claim for compensation.

22345. Have you had any experience of the working of what is known as the Scott Act?—None, whatever.

22346. Or the prohibitory clauses of the Quebec Act?—No; I have never lived in districts where it was in force.

22347. Do you think there is much smuggling taking place?—We know nothing, except what appears in the newspapers. I could not say anything about it.

22348. What class of those engaged in the liquor business do you think would receive compensation in the event of prohibition being enacted?—I presume the only parties who would be entitled to compensation would be the manufacturers of the article, the manufacture of which would be destroyed.

22349. What about importation?—That importation business does not involve anything like the amount of capital.

22350. And as to hotel proprietors?—People must have accommodation, and if you have prohibition and no liquor is allowed to be sold, people will come here and have accommodation, and hotel proprietors would have to make their charges accordingly.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22351. What do you mean by that?—Instead of charging \$4 or \$5 a day for a room at the hotel and making something out of the sale of liquor, they would have to charge so much more, because if they did not make a profit in one way they would have to make it in another.

*By the Chairman :*

22352. Do you not think there would be a great depreciation in the hotel business?—I do not think there would be any difference. In this city, I do not think it would make any difference to the hotel-keepers.

22353. Have you given any consideration to the question of encouraging light wines and beer and repressing the use of spirits?—No.

22354. Do you think it would be an advantage if people took more wine and beer and less spirits?—I think it might be for the mass of the people. I know in foreign countries where I have travelled a very great deal, we see very much more light wine and beer.

22355. In England they have a system of licensing premises for the sale of beer alone?—Yes.

22356. Do you think the licensing of places for the sale of wine and beer only would be an advantage?—Decidedly.

22357. No doubt there would be some danger of those places still selling spirits, though they were not licensed to do so?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

22358. Did you say that in reference to the drinking habits of the people, you had seen no change in some years past?—I think so.

22359. You have travelled a good deal?—Yes.

22360. Have you observed that on a steamboat or on the cars the man who takes a glass of liquor or wine now is the exception?—Yes.

22361. And formerly, the man who did not take it was the exception?—Yes, that is so. The man who wants to take his glass of wine with his dinner will take it before or after, but you do not see so much on the table.

22362. Do you not see people at the table who do not take liquor, but confine themselves to water and aerated drinks?—I cannot say that I have noticed that very much.

22363. Do you not think the position of the temperance question in the community is very different from what it was in the old days?—Certainly.

22364. Do you not think that the advocacy of the temperance question has passed to a certain extent into different hands and into many more hands than it used to be in the old time?—Yes, it looks that way; but the hard fact remains that the returns of liquors imported and manufactured in the country do not show a decrease. There may not be so much around the table. But how can you account for the amount imported and manufactured?

22365. Do you think the increase has kept pace with the increase in population?—As far as I can see, human nature is just the same as it was, notwithstanding all the efforts that are being made, and I think a very great deal of credit is due to the parties who have made those efforts; and that so far whatever may be the result in the future, the result has not materially altered, if we are to believe the official statistics that have been published.

22366. You have heard of men in the past who could take their three bottles of wine at table without it affecting them?—Yes.

22367. Do you think the number of those men has decreased or that the liquor has deteriorated?—I do not know; I never came in contact with them.

HENRY BULMER.

22368. Do you not think there is a great deal of difference in the quality of the liquor supplied now and in the days gone by?—That is a matter for actual observation, and I use so little of it that I am not able to judge.

22369. Do you not find that the temperance question is dealt with more prominently by religious bodies than it was formerly?—There is no doubt about that.

22370. But judging from statistics, you think things are about the same as they were?—That is a matter of general observation, and taking the number of people, the quantity consumed per head is about the same, which leads me to believe that the majority of the people are moderate living, temperate people, but a certain proportion will continue to use liquor or it would not be manufactured. If you could reduce the use of liquor, it would be better for the whole community.

22371. If a man was in the habit of spending a certain amount in liquor, do you think the Government should supply the loss which would result to the revenue by taking that out of the pockets of the people?—Each individual might consider it a hardship to be deprived of what he might think a necessity, or a luxury, and yet to have to contribute an equal amount to make up in some other way the loss to the revenue. That is one of the difficulties in connection with society at large.

22372. That is one of the difficulties which would have to be faced?—Yes.

22373. You consider it would be difficult to enforce such a law?—Yes.

22374. And to enforce it would probably require a large staff of officials to prevent smuggling and other violations of the law?—Yes.

22375. The question would be by whom should those officials be appointed and by whom paid?—Yes; I have never looked at it from that standpoint.

22376. Do you think the difficulty of enforcement might be affected by a difference in locality. Suppose that in the Maritime Provinces the number in favour of the law was ten to one, and that was about balanced in Ontario and Quebec, and that further west the majority was wholly against it, would you not expect that the enforcement would be less efficient where public sentiment was against it than where public sentiment was in favour of it?—That question is difficult to answer; but in a Dominion situated as we are, if the public sentiment were in favour of it in one section and against it in another, it would be very difficult to enforce the law anywhere.

22377. The way Sir Leonard Tilley put it was that the strength of a chain was the strength of the weakest link, and, therefore, there being some weak links, such a law could not be enforced?—That is very much my own opinion.

22378. Are there any other suggestions you think of in reference to this matter?—No. I never considered the matter sufficiently to make suggestions in regard to it, but I should be very much pleased to see the difficulties that exist, and the evils and the misery that are caused by the liquor traffic reduced to a minimum. What is the best way to get at that, it is not for me to say.

22379. There is a local revenue in the province of Quebec of \$600,000 derived from the license fees?—Yes.

22380. But the enactment of a total prohibitory law would do away with that?—Yes.

22381. Have you considered how that revenue would be made up?—No further than this: that I always considered that if the revenue were destroyed, the people would have to make it good in some other form; but in what form I cannot say. It is reasonable to suppose that the Government of the country cannot be carried on without a revenue, and if the liquor interest is to be destroyed entirely, they would have to make up the revenue in some other way.

22382. And the people should be prepared for that?—Yes.

22383. You spoke of seeing in foreign countries the larger use of light wines and ales and less spirits?—Yes.

22384. Was the effect beneficial?—I must say it was.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22385. In the countries of Europe in which you have travelled, where light wines and beer were consumed, did you see much drunkenness?—Less than in England.

*By Judge McDonald :*

22386. Have you been in any of the United States where there has been a prohibitory law in force?—The only State I have been in of that kind has been the State of Maine.

22387. Did you notice how the law was enforced there?—I have not been there for seven years, and am not able to speak with any degree of positiveness in regard to it. I have heard many contradictory reports. When I was there I saw no drunkenness. I have been in countries where liquor was not allowed to be used at all, for conscientious reasons. If you go into eastern countries where the people are not allowed to use liquor, such as Egypt and Palestine and Turkey, where the natives are not allowed even to drink wine, you find they have other narcotics, which have just as bad an effect.

22388. Did they seem to observe that rule there?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22389. It is a religious obligation?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

22390. It is not a matter of statute?—No ; but they use a peculiar kind of tobacco and black coffee.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22391. It is a question of morals?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

22392. Is liquor sold in those countries?—Yes, at the hotels ; but it is always used in moderation, and only by people who travel.

22393. You say the accommodation in hotels is now furnished at a price for guests' in rooms and meals that would have to be increased if the sale of liquor were abolished?—Yes.

22394. Is not that a false business system?—That may be.

22395. Suppose, for instance, that the sale of liquor were attached to dry goods shops instead of hotels, would it be supposed that dry goods should be sold cheaper?—I do not know how you can justify it, but there is the fact.

22396. It has become a sale attached to hotels?—Yes.

22397. Not as a matter of business, but as a matter of practice?—That is it.

*By the Chairman :*

22398. One witness has expressed the opinion that the loss to the revenue of the province should be recouped by a payment by the Dominion. The province now gets \$600,000 for the issue of licenses, and other things connected with the liquor business?—I do not see much reason for that, for if the license system was taken away from all the provinces, they would all be in the same boat, and if the Dominion had to pay it, we would all have to pay our share.

22399. Some of the provinces get no revenue from the sale of liquor. In Nova Scotia and I believe in New Brunswick and in Prince Edward Island they derive no revenue from licenses. Do you think it would be fair to make them pay their share for Ontario and Quebec?—No ; I think those provinces that now get the revenue from liquor should be the only ones called upon to pay.

22400. Do you think there is any other plan as regards the Province of Quebec, except direct taxation, to make up the loss?—That question might be answered by the Provincial Treasurer.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22401. As an employer of labour, can you state whether men are very frequently discharged from their employment in consequence of the use of liquor?—Not very often.

22402. Sometimes?—Sometimes.

HENRY BULMER.

22403. And when they are discharged, I suppose it is for inefficiency?—Inefficiency, because they are not able to attend to their duties, and men are liable to be obstreperous and so on.

22404. Do you find that many of those whom you have to discharge for inefficiency are inefficient because of drinking habits?—I have no doubt that a large proportion of them are, but my experience for a long time as an employer of labour is, that the proportion of men discharged for that reason has never been very large. In connection, for instance, with the harbour works, we have had from 300 to 400 men steadily at work this summer, and from my knowledge regarding those men, this summer there have not been more than three discharged for that reason.

22405. Do you use carefulness in the engagement of men, declining to engage those who are known to be drinkers?—If they are known to be men of drinking habits, they are not taken on. That is my experience, in my own case as well as in the Harbour Commission.

22406. Do you find that the drink habit, not necessarily to excess, interferes to any extent with the wage earning power of the men?—No doubt it is injurious.

22407. And it interferes with their value to the employer. I do not speak of the man who is on a spree frequently, but a man who drinks regularly day after day and does not seem to be affected by it at the time. Does his wage earning power decrease as the years go on?—No doubt about it at all.

22408. Have you observed whether any proportion of the accidents in the works with which you have been connected, have been occasioned by the drinking men?—Sometimes, but I could not say to any very large extent, for the simple reason that, as a rule, the men I have had to deal with have not been given to drinking habits.

22409. You have no knowledge of the Scott Act or of its workings?—No.

22410. Have you any knowledge of Côte St. Antoine, where no licenses are issued?—I know there is no license there at all.

22411. Is the condition of that district good?—Yes, very good.

22412. Do you know anything about St. Lambert?—Not of late years.

22413. I have understood that there are no licenses issued there?—I am not aware.

22414. You have observed that there is less drunkenness in European countries than in England. Is there less than there is in this country?—It is pretty hard to run down your own country, but it is a hard fact.

22415. There is less drunkenness than there is here?—Yes.

22416. And you attribute that to the fact that the public consume more light wines and beer and less strong alcoholic liquors?—Yes.

22417. Did you observe whether the tendency, in the countries where there is the consumption of light wines and beer, is toward the consumption of alcoholic liquors?—No, my experience would not justify the opinion that it leads to the other at all.

22418. You thought good might come from the encouragement of light wine and beer, to the exclusion of the stronger liquors. Do you suppose it would be as easy or easier to enforce a law providing for the selling of wine and beer as to enforce the present law?—That I am not prepared to say. The efficacy of the whole thing is dependent on the way it is carried out. As to whether it can be carried out or not, I cannot say.

22419. You say the license law is carried out here better than it was some years ago.—Yes.

22420. And it is a better law?—A better law in that respect.

22421. Do you think the existence of a better license law to-day is due to the growing feeling of the people in favour of a restriction of the trade?—Yes.

22422. Do you think the secrecy of drinking is due to a sort of deference to public opinion?—I think so.

22423. You believe, then, that temperance sentiment is growing and making itself felt?—I believe, that, and if it is continued for a certain length of time, I am perfectly satisfied in my own judgment whatever it is worth, that the day for prohibition will come.

22424. And you think that is desirable if it can be enforced?—Yes, but unless it can be enforced, I do not see any use in it.



22425. You referred to compensation to the slave owners. Were the slave traders compensated?—Not that I was aware of, I never heard of that.

22426. As a business man, have you observed the effect of the liquor trade on other branches of trade, whether it is beneficial or injurious?—I never studied the question from that point of view.

22427. You have stated that the effect on the social conditions of the community is bad?—Yes.

22428. But you have not observed whether the liquor trade is a menace to other branches of trade or a benefit?—No, I never studied that part of the question.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22429. Will you define what you mean by the expression given to the drink habit?—If a man has been accustomed to drinking until his whole system is affected and that is continued from year to year, he certainly will not be as good a man as he was before he began to drink.

22430. That is the definition you give?—That is what I mean.

22431. How far is Côte St. Antoine from the city of Montreal?—It adjoins it. It is divided by just an imaginary line. It is the west end of the city.

22432. There are no taverns or restaurants there?—There is not one in the Côte that I am aware of.

22433. Is it a residential part of the city?—It is residential entirely and not business.

22434. Is there any prohibition against getting liquor in Montreal or having it sent from Montreal there?—You can get all you like sent there, but I do not think there is a place there where you can buy any liquor at all. I think their Act of incorporation provides that no licenses shall be granted for the sale of spirituous liquors, and that provision has been well carried out to my knowledge, and I know a good deal about that part of the city.

*By the Chairman :*

22435. There is a clause in the license law which gives power to refuse to issue any licenses?—I think it is in their Act of incorporation.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22436. Are there any residential portions of the City of Montreal in which there are no licenses and no liquor sold, such districts as Sherbrooke street?—I think there is a large section of Côte St. Antoine Ward where there is no saloon or restaurant.

22437. That is in the City of Montreal?—Yes, I think to the west of the Windsor Hotel there is not such a thing as a saloon or a restaurant; of course there are groceries having grocery licenses.

22438. I think you stated that during the present season only three men had been discharged by the trust for the excessive use of liquor?—To my knowledge.

22439. Are all your men total abstainers?—No.

22440. Would you consider that those who are not total abstainers are addicted to the drink habit; do you consider that taking a glass of beer a day is being addicted to the drink habit?—Not at all.

22441. Such people are only those who drink to excess, I suppose?—I should be very sorry to say that a man who drinks a glass of beer or takes a glass of spirituous liquor once or twice a day is incompetent to do his work.

22442. Would you say that he was addicted to the drink habit?—Not at all.

22443. In your testimony you refer to those who drink to excess and abuse liquor?—Yes.

22444. I understood you to say that prohibition would afford an absolute remedy, if it could be applied, and it would suppress all evils that flow from the traffic?—Yes.

22445. Do you think it is practicable to apply it?—Not at the present time. I think public opinion is not educated up to the point of enforcing it; but in the course of time, if the efforts now being made are continued for a few years, it is quite possible that it will be feasible to enforce it.

HENRY BULMER.

22446. Speaking of the present, what do you think would be the best course to pursue in order to reduce to a minimum the evils that flow from the traffic?—My opinion is that if you impose a high license, and give some competent authority the power to enforce the law, to restrict the number of places in which liquor is sold and to regulate the trade, it would be preparing the way for total prohibition.

22447. Would you favour a rigid inspection of the liquor sold in those licensed places?—I think so; but I am not aware from my personal knowledge that there is any adulteration practised.

22448. But the evidence given before this Commission shows that such is not the case?—If there is adulteration, there should be a rigid inspection.

22449. We have had it in evidence that the vilest kinds of compounds are sold as alcoholic beverages?—That may be so, but I cannot speak from personal experience. At all events, if there is adulteration, there should be rigid inspection.

22450. You believe that the evils connected with the traffic can be remedied by adopting high license, by having the law rigidly enforced, by regulating the hours and reducing the number of places where liquor is sold?—Yes, with the view in the future of having the people educated up to entire prohibition, if those means do not succeed.

MICHAEL P. RYAN, Collector of Customs, Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

22451. You are at present the Collector of Customs at the port of Montreal, I believe?—Yes.

22452. How long have you held that office?—During the last 10 years.

22453. Prior to that time, were you in business in Montreal?—I was in business in Montreal for a number of years.

22454. I believe you represented an important district of the city for a number of years in Parliament?—During 14 or 15 years.

22455. How long have you resided in this district?—52 years.

22456. Have you been at any time a large employer of labour?—I have been an employer of labour for many years, but not to the same extent as during the last few years in my capacity as Collector of Customs. During this time I have employed on an average about 200 persons.

22457. Have you had much trouble with them on the score of intemperance?—Very little indeed.

22458. Do you think the people are more temperate now than they were ten years ago?—I do. I think temperance principles prevail more extensively in Montreal now among all classes. I remember 30 or 40 years ago men in high positions drank wine to excess, and nothing was thought of it. If they did that now, they would be ostracised.

22459. You think few comparatively now overstep the bounds of moderation?—Very few. We have very little trouble with the men we employ on the ground of intemperance. We would not retain them if they were addicted to drink to the least extent to unfit them for the performance of their duty. During the number of years I have held office I have been called upon to discharge not more than three or four individuals annually for drunkenness, and we had to get rid of fully as many for dishonesty.

22460. Have you any regulation on the subject of temperance in your branch of the public service?—No, none whatever.

22461. You do not exact any conditions on the subject?—No.

22462. But you do not keep intemperate men in the service?—No, if we know they are intemperate.

22463. You naturally are in a position, being brought into contact a great deal with labouring men on the wharfs and sailors and others employed in shipping, to give an opinion on this subject? Do you think that the class to which I now refer are more

temperate now than they were ten years ago?—I think they are fully as temperate, if not more so. This result arises in my opinion from the great moral agitation that has been going on during recent years. Formerly it was quite common on New Year's day for every one to offer wine and other refreshments. The result was a great deal of intemperance, especially among young men. The clergy and women of every denomination set their faces against this practice, and the result was that it was eventually abolished. Now we have nothing of this kind on New Year's day, and the result is that we seldom see a man under the influence of liquor on that day. That is the most effectual way, according to my judgment, to bring about temperance, and ultimately prohibition. I should be glad, as a temperance man, to see prohibition, if the people were educated up to it; but I do not think public opinion, and I have stated this opinion on the platform and when I have been running at elections, is ripe for prohibition, and I have declined to support the enactment of a prohibitory law on the ground that public opinion was not prepared to enforce it.

22464. I believe you have taken a very active interest in temperance work for many years?—Yes, I have been a temperance man for at least 25 years. I do not know that I ever took a very active part, beyond endeavouring to increase moral effect by my example. I do not go into the street and proclaim temperance, but I do all I can to practise it, and we should all endeavour to get every man to practise temperance. If this were followed, there would be no need of the enactment of a prohibitory law, for all would be temperate.

22465. As to the quantities of spirituous liquors and wines brought into the port of Montreal: has the quantity largely increased of late?—No; on the contrary, it has decreased. I have had a statement prepared of the quantities of wines and spirits imported at the port of Montreal during the years 1887-8 and 1889, 90, 91 and 92. I find in every instance (with the exception of champagne) there has been a decrease, less ale, beer, porter, spirits and wine imported than formerly. It is a remarkable fact that while the quantity of champagne imported during 1887 was 11,543 dozen, it had increased in 1892 to 13,660 dozen; so the people at any rate must be in a better condition financially as they are able to afford to drink an increased quantity of champagne.

*By Judge McDonald:*

22466. What was the value of the champagne?—In 1887-8, the value was \$99,556, while this year the value is \$109,588.

*By the Chairman:*

22467. Had not the duty been increased between the two periods?—Yes.

22468. Can you tell the Commissioners the increase? What was the duty in 1887-88?—I cannot tell you.

22468*a*. Take spirituous liquors. Have the duties been increased on them?—Of brandy, gin, rum and other spirituous liquors the quantity imported was 415,093 gallons, in 1887-88, while this year the quantity is 349,441 gallons.

22469. Then the quantity has decreased?—Yes, very materially.

22470. What was the value?—The value was \$354,364 last year.

22471. What was the value in 1887-8?—\$317,214.

22472. Have you the figures in regard to the importation of beer?—Yes, the importations have fallen off very materially. That is, however, very easily accounted for. The duty on beer and ale was increased very materially last year. Moreover, the result has been that a larger quantity has been manufactured and sold here. The figures are as follows:—Ale, beer and porter in 1887-88, 61,934 gallons, value \$46,367; duty \$8,242. In 1891-2, 49,014 gallons, value \$37,841; duty \$9,288. The full statement is as follows:—Ale, beer and porter in 1887-8, 61,934 gallons, value \$46,367; duty 48,242, and in 1891-2, 49,014 gallons, value \$37,841; duty \$9,288. Spirits in 1887-8, 415,093 gallons; value \$317,214, duty, \$557,496; and in 1891-2, 347,411 gallons; value, \$345,364; duty, \$554,228. Wines, other than sparkling, in 1887-8, 309,443 gallons; value \$246,208, duty \$143,652; and in 1891-2, 232,319 gallons; value \$204,606, duty \$131,678. Champagne 1887-8, 11,543 dozens, value \$99,556, duty, \$49,578; and in 1891-2, 13,660 dozens, value \$109,588, duty \$72,951.

MICHAEL P. RYAN.

22473. Can you tell the Commissioners if there is a large quantity of wine or liquor imported into Montreal which goes to other provinces?—There is a large quantity which pays duty here and which is sold to other provinces, particularly to the Province of Ontario. It is just the same in regard to other classes of goods such as dry-goods. I cannot tell the exact quantity sold to other provinces, but it must be very considerable. I know that Ontario in Parliament sought to make out, through its representatives, that that province paid one-half of the duties collected at the port of Montreal. That I am not prepared to admit; but if it be so, one-half of the spirits imported went to Ontario.

22474. Will you please explain to the Commissioners the system on which the business is carried on. A large importation comes to Montreal by vessel; it is consigned to a house in Toronto; does it pass through in bond?—Yes, the customs duties would be collected in Toronto.

22475. Is that the practice in regard to goods consigned to all places where there is a port of entry?—Yes, but some people in Ontario find it more convenient to come to Montreal, and they can absolutely buy goods at a cheaper rate here than if they import them themselves.

22476. Goods which have paid duty here?—Yes, on which the duty has been paid by the importers.

22477. But I suppose liquors coming to Montreal and forwarded to Ontario are sent in bond to places which are ports of entry?—Yes, I believe they are.

22478. And I suppose those shipped duty paid are principally sent to a place along the frontier line between Quebec and Ontario?—As a fact I can recall isolated cases when Toronto men, who did a very large business and no doubt brought large quantities of goods into Toronto, at the same time bought goods in Montreal, wines and spirits, and found it advantageous to do so.

22479. I suppose they were influenced to some extent in that action by the fact that the agents of European houses are located here?—Yes. I desire to say that in my opinion there is very much less drunkenness now than there was ten years ago. Then it was a common thing for an individual to buy a gallon or two of rum, and if he does so now, it is an exception to the rule.

22480. Is there any channel through which the Commissioners could ascertain the quantity of liquor transferred to Ontario and other points?—Not that I know of.

22481. Having been in business in Montreal so long, and having been so intimately brought into contact with all classes of the community, can you tell the Commissioners if the present license laws are efficient for the purpose for which they were designed?—I believe the present license law is very good; but it can be still further improved by reducing the number of licenses, for there are certainly more licenses granted than are necessary. A large number of licensed houses has a tendency to encourage treating. Take the case of a man who asks John Smith to come and have a drink. Smith asks where they will have to go to get it. The answer is that they will have to go a mile or half a mile. They may not have time to go, and therefore do not get a drink; but if there is a saloon within a block or two, they will go there. That is one reason why, in my opinion, the number of licenses, which is at present entirely excessive, should be reduced.

22482. Then you would advocate a reduction in the number of licenses?—Yes.

22483. Do you think the license fee too high, or would you increase the license fee?—I would increase the fee if it would have the effect of reducing the number.

22484. Do you think any improvement would result from licensing the sale of wines and beers, apart from spirits?—Yes, if it could be successfully carried out, but I am afraid you would be simply opening the door to other trouble. If the number of licenses were reduced, drinking should be reduced to a minimum, but unfortunately there are many men who sell without licenses. That is one of the great troubles connected with this question.

22485. Do you think there are a large number of unlicensed sellers?—Yes, but I think they are diminishing, owing to the energetic action of the temperance organizations, and by the exercise of greater vigilance on the part of the local authorities and of the Provincial Government.

22486. Do you think the authorities are vigilant in enforcing the law?—I think they are at the present time, but this action is an improvement on the past.

22487. Do you consider the present system, under which the Police Magistrates and Recorder grant licenses, an improvement over the old system by which the Council granted licenses?—Decidedly. I think that was the very worst system possible. Even now when a licensed seller is fined, he goes to the Councillor for his ward and seeks to obtain his influence to get him relieved from the payment of the fine.

22488. The Judge of Sessions and also the Recorder have stated that they desire to see the law altered so as not to leave them any option in dealing with liquor cases?—That would be better.

22489. They desire the law to provide that on breaches taking place their duty shall be definitely defined?—Yes.

22490. Have you had any experience in regard to counties where the Scott Act has been in force, or districts where local option has been in force?—No.

22491. Do you know anything about Côte St. Antoine?—Yes, and the system to which Mr. Bulmer has referred. It is a notorious fact that there is no saloon within the limits of Côte St. Antoine, and it is more orderly and better organized than any portion of the city. Where I am now living, in St. Henri, when I first went there no saloon was established within a mile of my house, but now there are three or four on the same street, and one of the most disorderly houses formerly is now fortunately turned into a school.

22492. Are not the residents of Côte St. Antoine principally people who are engaged in business in the city?—Yes.

22493. Is there any number of large manufactories in the district?—I am not aware there are any, not to any extent at all events.

22494. And the householders are men, I suppose, who are in official positions and are engaged in private business?—Yes.

22495. Does it differ largely with respect to the position it occupies towards the liquor traffic from the west end of Montreal?—Yes, because there are no licenses granted at Côte St. Antoine.

22496. In regard to the western section of Montreal, along Sherbrooke Street, although there is no prohibition, is not that district practically in the same position?—It is practically in the same position, owing to the fact that, from the temperance sentiment prevailing, when a license petition is circulated, the people at once oppose the granting of the desired license.

22497. You are no doubt aware that under the law in the Province of Quebec a parish can adopt prohibition?—I am aware of it.

22498. And that in the Province of Quebec, there are over 200 parishes which have voted that they will not permit a license to be issued?—Yes.

22499. Would it be an advantage to permit the same law to be applied in such cities as Montreal and Quebec?—I doubt it very much at the present moment, because public opinion is not yet sufficiently educated. No doubt public opinion has increased very materially in favour of temperance, but I doubt the applicability of this system to the cities you have mentioned.

22500. On the general question as between a license system and prohibition, to which would you give preference? By prohibition I mean the total exclusion of liquor from the country and the suppression of its manufacture in the country?—At the present moment I am not in favour of prohibition. The fact is I do not believe that the public opinion of the country is prepared to carry it out, although I think it is prepared to accept a more rigid license law than prevails at present, and also to effectually carry it out. Even the saloon keepers themselves—and I have spoken to several of them on the subject—are in favour of a more stringent license law. There is another question, and it is in regard to the effect of liquor on some people. In former days if a man got drunk, he was supposed to get over it quickly, and it did not do him much harm; now if a man gets under the influence of liquor, it seems to drive him crazy.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22501. To what do you attribute that condition?—To the deterioration of liquor, to the fact that the liquor is not what it should be; I cannot attribute it to anything else.

MICHAEL P. RYAN.

*By the Chairman :*

22502. Is there, to your knowledge, any inspection of liquor carried on?—Not that I am aware of. The Government have an inspection of articles of food, but I am not aware that they inspect liquors.

22503. Do you think an inspection of liquors would be beneficial?—Yes; it would no doubt have a beneficial effect.

*By Judge McDonald :*

22504. Is there not a provision in the law for inspection?—It is possible, but I am not aware of it.

22505. You are aware that it is not carried out?—Yes. I know that Mr. Curran in Parliament has referred to the fact, and has taken a strong position with respect to the desirability of the inspection of liquor.

22506. I think Mr. Curran spoke in Parliament of the fact that there is inspection in Montreal?—He is not in favour of total prohibition.

22507. But he spoke of the different officials employed?—Quite so.

22508. Do you think adulteration is practised in regard to the manufacture of liquor?—Yes.

22509. Should there be a limitation of the number of licenses issued?—Yes.

22510. Should there be a separation of the sale of groceries from the sale of liquor?—I agree with that suggestion.

22511. Reference has been made to the temptation afforded to women to buy liquor at groceries?—I consider that to be one of the evils that arises from the present system. Women are known to go into groceries where liquor is sold and obtain it, while, of course, they could not enter a saloon. At the grocery they can buy half a pint of liquor and take it home.

22512. Do you favour, then, the total separation of the sale of liquor and groceries?—Yes, the total separation.

22513. You have referred to the manner in which the saloons have been increasing in number in the street on which you reside yourself?—Yes.

22514. Is there not objection raised on the part of the people in the residential portions of the city to the establishment of saloons there?—Yes, especially among the better class. Although it is necessary to obtain twenty-five or thirty signatures to a license petition within a certain area, they can always be obtained, and as the law now stands, there is scarcely anything to be done by the Commissioners except grant the license asked for, unless a counter-petition is put in by opponents to the application.

22515. So when you find that in certain residential parts of the city there are many saloons, it is not apparent that the people have not a strong objection to them, or an equally strong objection to that manifested in other sections?—Of course.

22516. In regard to the question of the use of liquor, taking things as they are, do you think prohibition can be successfully carried out?—No.

22517. What do you think of the proposal to endeavour to change the drinking habits of the people by inducing them to drink light wines and ale instead of spirits?—I think it would be advisable, if we could succeed in inducing the people to do so.

22518. Do you think it would be a good thing?—Yes. There has apparently very little evil arisen from drinking in France, but I have been informed recently that the people are becoming addicted to the use of absinthe.

22519. You have, no doubt, also heard that, owing to the destruction of the vineyards by phylloxera, the supply of wine has become diminished and is dearer, and is, therefore, now out of the reach of a great many people?—No doubt.

22520. Have you been in the State of Maine?—I have, but I cannot speak in regard to that State. I believe liquor is to be obtained there, and I have known parties to obtain it. I have recently been in New Jersey, in a portion of which there is prohibition and no licenses are granted; but I found liquor sold openly. Raids were made on one or two places while I was there, and the violators of the law were fined.

22521. Having considered this question, have you any suggestions to submit to the Commission?—The only suggestion I have to make is that the number of licenses should

be reduced and better enforcement of the law secured, and the total suppression, if possible, of places selling liquor without licenses; and, still further, the total separation of the sale of liquor from the sale of groceries.

22522. I presume you desire a strict enforcement of the law in regard to sale to minors?—Yes.

22523. You have referred to Mr. Curran having spoken of this matter in the House of Commons?—Yes.

22524. I remember reading in his speech that he complained that in making inspections in Montreal of samples submitted to the Dominion Analyst, it appeared that samples had only been taken at houses of the highest respectability and not at low places?—Quite so.

22525. Do you remember the names of any of the places at which samples were taken?—No. In order to secure efficient inspection, samples should be taken indiscriminately from saloons and other drinking places, on the same plan as is followed in regard to articles of food. If you go into a leading house, such as Mr. Chapman's, you would not expect to find adulterated liquor there.

22526. Do you know anything of the working of Sohmer Park here?—No, I am not aware there is any liquor sold there; I think I saw ale or lager beer sold there on one occasion.

*By the Chairman :*

22527. Given the respectable hotel, given the saloon, say that they are both bad if you like, which do you consider the more pernicious?—The respectable hotel is, to a certain extent, a necessity, whereas there is no necessity for the saloon.

22528. And how is it in regard to its influence?—Its influence is very much worse; I mean the influence of the saloon.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22529. You think the influence of the saloon is more injurious?—Yes.

22530. Is there any reason for continuing the existence of the saloon?—No. I believe the proprietors are endeavouring to make it appear to the Commissioners that under the law they have to supply people with meals; but in one-half of the places you could not get a meal for love or money.

22531. With regard to the corner grocery, of which we have heard a good deal: would it be advisable, in your opinion, to stop the sale of liquor in groceries?—A desperate effort was made to do this, and the impression prevailed that there was a separation of the sale of liquor and groceries to the extent that liquor was not allowed to be sold in the same place, and under a recent law of the Quebec Legislature these dealers are only allowed to sell by the bottle. If there is not such a separation, there ought to be.

22532. I believe they are not allowed to sell less than three half pints?—Yes, but they do so.

22533. If the saloons were shut up, these places not being *bona fide* restaurants and no provision being made for the travelling public, if the right to sell liquor were taken away from groceries and shop licenses were substituted therefor, would that create a better state of things?—I think so decidedly, there is no question about it.

22534. Would you favour a change in the law to bring about that condition of things?—Yes.

22535. Are there any suggestions with respect to increase in license fees or other matters you wish to submit to the Commission?—Nothing further.

22536. Do you think those amendments in the law would produce better results than an attempt to enforce prohibition?—Yes, if the law were so amended, it would have such satisfactory results as would satisfy even extreme temperance men. I have always differed from them on this ground: They say liquor in itself is an evil. I say liquor is not an evil, and that it is only when it is abused that it becomes an evil. Still we must admit that two-thirds of the crime and poverty arise from the use of drink.

MICHAEL P. RYAN.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

22537. Do you believe smuggled liquor finds its way to Montreal?—I believe some of it has done so, but it is a notorious fact that since the duty on liquors was increased, there has been a larger quantity of liquor smuggled in the lower St. Lawrence.

22538. Do you believe that a large portion of that smuggled liquor finds its way to Montreal?—Some is brought to Quebec and resold. With a frontier extending thousands of miles there is sure to be smuggling in whisky as well as in coal oil; and if we had prohibition here, and prohibition did not prevail in the United States, there would be smuggling going on over the whole of that frontier to a very large extent. Canada would need an army as large as that of Russia to prevent it.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22539. With respect to the duties: when were the increased duties imposed?—There was some slight increase last year, and the duty on spirits was increased  $12\frac{1}{2}$  cents per gallon, which was as much as the Government thought it could stand. That was in 1888 I think.

22540. It is difficult to understand these statistics. The imports steadily increased in 1887, 1888 and 1889. Then they dropped, so far as regards spirits, brandy, gin and rum?—Yes, and all last year too.

22541. After this duty was changed, half as much again of champagne was brought in, 23,294 dozens in 1890-91, as against 17,000 in 1889, and 10,816 in 1888?—Yes.

22542. Have you any theory on which to account for these changes?—No. The country seems to be more prosperous and the people better able to consume champagne.

22543. Do you think we imported more tea and sugar at the same time?—Yes.

22544. The importation of champagne appears to have increased in 1891 to 31,000 dozen, as compared with 23,294 in 1890-91?—Yes, there was considerable increase in nearly all the imports.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22545. I think you have said that the officers of the city are more vigorous in their efforts to enforce the license law now than previously?—I think so. I judge this by the fact that occasionally I see an offender has been brought up for violating the law. Further, now the fines are exacted. Formerly offenders would be brought up and punished, but the fines would not be exacted.

22546. Do you think that this greater vigilance in exacting fines is due to any change in public feeling towards the liquor trade?—I think partially so.

22547. Was that change in public feeling brought about largely by religious and moral teaching?—Altogether.

22548. Do you think in its train there comes increased vigilance?—The increased vigilance arises in a measure from that teaching.

22549. Do you think that this helps to create public sentiment to a still greater degree?—No doubt. When an officer finds he is successful in performing his duty and that the public sustain him, he will be more vigilant in the future.

22550. That is all in confirmation of your statement that there is a steady increase in public sentiment on this question?—Yes, any one must admit that.

22551. Reference has been made to the absence of saloons in certain residential portions of the city. Do you think a saloon in a residential part of the city is a greater evil than a saloon in the midst of a factory district where there are a large number of employees?—I do not think so. I think it is injurious in both places, but the people in the factory districts do not bring public opinion to bear as strongly as do the people in the residential sections. The applicants for licenses get up counter-petitions, and so the fight is attended with great expense, which is not exactly fair to impose on the temperance people.

22552. You have spoken of a case in which a very strong attempt was made to establish a saloon in the vicinity of your own residence, which was prevented?—Yes.

22553. Was that prevented owing to the action of a majority of the voters in the district?—Yes.



*By the Chairman :*

22554. Would a saloon-keeper desire to obtain a license in a residential portion of the city?—They have made several attempts to obtain licenses on St. Catharine Street.

22455. Do they really desire to have saloons there?—Yes, I am inclined to think so. They have been fighting for one on Academy Street, near University.

22556. There are a lot of shops and business houses there, I believe; but do you think these people desire to obtain licenses for the part of the city west of Mountain Street?—Yes, and if saloons were established there I am inclined to believe they would get some patronage. People would drop in at night. It is better not to have them.

22557. Whether they made application or not, and whether it was necessary for people to oppose the applications or not, do you think that the business would be such or would be so profitable as to make it an object to any one to establish saloons there?—Not perhaps in the extreme west, but several applications have already been made, as I have said, for licenses on St. Catharine Street.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22558. I think when you began to live where you are, you said there was no saloon there then?—No, nor within one mile. They have crept up, and are now certainly within half a mile.

22559. And each one does business?—They seem to live.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22560. Has there been an increase in population?—There has not been much increase.

22561. Has there been any increase?—Nothing remarkable.

22562. Do the people in the neighbourhood drink more now that saloons have been established in the neighbourhood?—The license is pretty high, and it is a wonder to me how they exist.

22563. We can hardly reconcile that statement with your remark that the population there was not rapidly increasing. If the population were rapidly increasing we could understand it?—In that neighbourhood the number of employees has increased very rapidly.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22564. Do you think it would be better, if instead of requiring an applicant to obtain the signatures of the twenty-five persons, he were required to obtain the signatures of a majority of the voters in the district?—I think so.

22565. Do you think it would be fairer than placing the burden on those who want to prevent the issue of the license?—Of course I think it would be an additional safeguard and another obstacle in the way.

22566. Reference has been made to the hotel bar *versus* the saloon bar. I think you have said it would be well to close the saloon bar?—Yes.

22567. Do you think the closing of the saloon bar, while the hotel bar was allowed to remain open, would be a kind of class legislation?—I do not think it would.

22568. Does not one class of people go to the hotel and another to the saloon?—Yes, but the class who go to the saloon, if they want liquor of any kind, will get it. The men who go to the hotels never think of going to the saloons.

22569. Would that be class legislation, inasmuch as it would prevent men who prefer to go to the saloon bar and get the glass of liquor that is sold there, obtaining it, while at the same time it would not prevent men going to the hotel bar? As a matter of fact, do the hotel bars sell to whoever comes, and not confine their sale to guests?—They do unquestionably, they sell to every man except to a man under the influence of liquor, and they are not likely to sell to minors.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22570. Then there would be no class legislation if all were permitted to go to hotel bars?—No.

MICHAEL P. RYAN.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22571. Would that not be giving a monopoly to hotel bars? Is there not a class of people who prefer to go to the hotels, and another who prefer to go to the saloons?—I do not know.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22572. It has not been established that people prefer to go to the saloon bar instead of to the hotel bar?—I am of the opinion that the restaurants where we take lunch down town every day are increasing year by year. So, obviously, a great majority of the people, of the mercantile people, at all events, take lunch down town. These people go there, and they do not go to the saloons. If they go to a restaurant, they can order something to eat and something to drink as well. I would have these restaurant keepers permitted to continue to sell liquor.

22573. Are there plenty of respectable restaurants where gentlemen can go and get meals, and where liquor is not sold?—Not many.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22574. I understand you to say there are saloons that are not desirable?—Yes. I do not think there is any necessity for them.

22575. Given the respectable hotel and given the saloon, which do you think is preferable?—I think of the two evils choose the least; I choose the hotel.

22576. What I want to ascertain is whether this is not after all a sort of class legislation, in that it makes it difficult to get drink by the man who is in the habit of going to a saloon, and who prefers the kind of liquor that is sold there?—It would be wider legislation.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22577. Now, could it be class legislation to close up the saloons?—All would be treated alike.

22578. How would it be class legislation? If so, would they not start a hotel or restaurant?—The primary object is to reduce the number. If possible you might add to the responsibility by increasing the license fee. I do not know about that. Some now claim it is too high, but it never should be reduced.

22579. About increasing the license fee, is this a fact, that increased smuggling places an increase of taxes on the people who prefer to go to the hotel bars?—It is possible. The same argument would apply to duties on spirits.

22580. I suppose all the taxes come out of the consumers?—Yes, but people think they could stand that. People think it would stop intemperance if the price of all liquor was increased to \$3 a gallon.

22581. You have expressed yourself strongly for prohibition when the sentiment of the people demands it?—Yes.

22582. And you think that sentiment is turning in that direction rapidly and strongly?—Yes.

22583. As a Customs official, do you find it difficult to enforce the revenue laws?—No.

22584. But I suppose there are constant violations?—Yes.

22585. Some that are discovered and some that you never know?—That is human nature. The only harm some people think about evading the law is the harm of being found out.

22586. Do you think general prohibition would be more difficult to enforce if there were officials provided to enforce it, as there are to enforce the revenue laws?—I think it would be very much more difficult.

22587. Why?—I have nothing to do with the revenue laws. But in one case you are dealing with the human nature of people, whereas in regard to prohibition you are dealing with the whole public, and therefore the staff of officials you would have to employ would have to be very largely increased.

22588. Of course there would be violations?—Yes.

22589. As there are violations of the Customs laws at present?—The only violations we have are by people who pass goods at less than cost. Goods come in separately and have to be accounted for. They sometimes cheat us by producing fraudulent invoices and getting them passed, but sometimes they are caught.

22590. You expect more or less of that kind of fraud, do you not, and yet at the same time you adopt measures to catch the parties?—Yes.

22591. You detect them in the fraud sometimes?—Yes.

22592. I understood you to say that, in your opinion, the condition of the people would be better if there was a prohibitory law; but you think that unless public opinion was very strongly in its favour, it could not be enforced?—It would be next to impossible to enforce it.

22593. What would be the result on the temperance cause of the passage of a prohibitory law if it were found impossible to enforce it?—It would have a very immoral and bad effect on the people.

22594. The moral effect of having a law on the statute-book that is not obeyed is bad, I suppose?—Yes.

22595. You have stated that of the two bars, the saloon bar and the hotel bar, the saloon bar is, in your opinion, the more injurious?—Yes.

22596. Can you conceive, as a temperance man, why it should be urged that the hotel bar should be closed and the saloon bar allowed to remain open?—I cannot conceive why this should be argued, judging the question from my standpoint.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22597. Here is a case. On St. James Street there is the St. Lawrence Hall on one side and Freeman's on the other, both of which are well patronized: in your opinion which is the more patronized?—I have not the slightest idea.

22598. Is not Freeman's a popular resort?—Yes, it is an eating house.

22599. And is not the St. Lawrence Hall popular?—Yes.

22600. As between the two, which would it be better to close—neither of them coming under the category of the saloon?—Neither should be closed.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22601. One is a restaurant and the other is a hotel, I believe?—Yes. But there are half a dozen places probably on the same street that are simple saloons, and which do not furnish meals, and they might be closed. On St. Francis Xavier Street there are four, five or six.

*By the Chairman :*

22602-3. Would you make it a condition of granting a license that the proprietors of houses should provide meals?—Yes, and it would still be better if they supplied beds to travellers.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22604. Then you would not grant licenses to places except they provided food and lodging?—I think so. The law at present contains this provision, but it is not carried out.

22605. Why do you think it preferable that a place where lodging and meals are provided is better than a place where beer is sold and nothing else?—Of course it is preferable.

22606. Some people contend this: that a young man goes to a hotel on the pretense of seeing a guest or reading the newspapers, and under cover of this pretense he goes there to drink, whereas if a man goes to a saloon pure and simple, every one knows he goes there to drink and nothing else?—My impression is that that is only an exception to the general rule. I think the general rule is the other way.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

22607. Do you think the people would still get drink even if they did not go to the hotel bar? It is contended that at our most respectable hotels, such as the Windsor, young men go there at night, and that this tendency may be demoralizing?—I am not aware of it.

MICHAEL P. RYAN.

22608. That is said of hotels in general?—The St. Lawrence Hall is the very opposite, because after six o'clock the people are up town. I would apply early closing to all the hotels down town.

22609. Speaking of the law being flagrantly violated and the demoralizing effects that follow, I desire to ask you this question: Does the persistent and continuous violation of the customs and other laws demoralize the people and bring into contempt those laws?—It has that effect.

22610. Is the customs law persistently and flagrantly violated?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

22611. We have heard of smuggling on the St. Lawrence?—That is an exception. We have only heard of that to any great extent within the last year, and the Government have incurred a large expenditure on two vessels for the service and they have now stopped it.

22612. Then those laws were being violated, and in order to enforce them the Government set themselves earnestly to work to enforce the law, and adopted extraordinary measures to do so?—Yes.

22613. Would not the same thing be true in regard to enforcing a prohibition law?—It might.

*By the Chairman:*

22614. In that one case an effort was made to stop smuggling and to punish the smuggler?—Yes.

22615. Do you apprehend that smuggling would still go on if a prohibitory law were enacted?—Yes.

22616. Might not such a law, if placed on the statute-book, be found to be unsupported by the bulk of the people?—Yes.

22617. Would not the effect of having a law on the statute-book, which the people openly disregarded, be demoralizing?—That is my position exactly.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

22618. But in your opinion if prohibition could be enforced, it would be a great blessing?—Yes, no doubt about it, and I should be very glad to see it.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 13th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day, Sir JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
REV. DR. MCLEOD.

MR. E. F. CLARKE.  
MR. G. A. GIGAUULT.

EDWARD ARTHUR ST. GEORGE HUGHES, Chief of Police, Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

22619. How long have you held the office of Chief of Police?—Four years and six months.

22620. Are you a native of Montreal?—No ; I was born at Three Rivers.

22621. How long have you lived in the neighbourhood of Montreal?—Twenty-two years.

22622. How many men have you under your charge?—Three hundred and seventy-four all told, officers and men.

22623. Do you take your instructions from a committee of the City Council?—Yes ; from a committee called the Police Committee.

22624. That committee is composed of how many members?—Seven members.

22625. Is it a part of the duty of the police to look after the closing of places for selling liquor on Sunday, or after hours?—Yes ; it is a part of their duty.

22626. Do you find many cases where the by-laws of the city are infringed in that respect?—Not a great many, but still I think two years ago there were seventy-two fined in the Recorder's Court for selling liquor on Sunday and after hours. Last year that number was reduced ; I think there were about forty cases dealt with last year.

22627. To what do you attribute the reduction?—I attribute it to the fact that the Magistrates have been saying for a long time they would initial the certificate in case of a second offence.

22628. You mean, initial the license?—Yes ; and this year shows a considerable improvement. There are fewer cases than there were.

22629. From your observation, is there less drunkenness in the city than there was a few years ago?—Decidedly so.

22630. You think there is a falling off?—Yes. The other day I was consulting the police books, and I found that in 1866, 1867 and 1868 there were more arrests for drunkenness than there are now.

22631. Can you give us the figures?—Yes.

22632. Can you give the arrests for 1866?—Yes ; I will furnish the figures. There was a large number of arrests at that time, which was due to the troops being here.

22633. Can you give us the statistics for ten years?—Yes, I will furnish them.

22634. Is the license law better observed now than it was five or six years ago?—I think so.

22635. Are there many places where liquor is being sold without a license?—Undoubtedly there are some, but not a very large number.

22636. Do you think they have increased or decreased?—I think they are on the decrease.

22637. Whose duty is it to look after such places?—There is a police called the Revenue Police specially appointed for that purpose by the Provincial Government. They are appointed and paid by the Provincial Government. Of course, it is the duty

E. A. ST. GEORGE HUGHES.

also of the municipal police to look after those places all the same. The fact is, we have about ten men employed all the time, under the surveillance clause, going around trying to find out cases of that kind—the illicit sale of liquor.

22638. In the interest of the city?—Yes, they belong to the municipal police.

22639. How many men are there in the provincial force?—I think about ten men.

22640. Under whose supervision?—Under the supervision of the Chief.

22641. Who is the Chief?—Louis Chevallier.

22642. Are they in plain clothes or in uniform?—I have not seen them in uniform this year; last year I met them sometimes in uniform.

22643. Do you arrest persons whom you find on the streets in a state of intoxication, if they are not disorderly?—If they can say where they live, they are sent home.

22644. If they are disorderly, what becomes of them?—They are taken to police quarters.

22645. And a certain number of persons are found, I suppose, in the streets in a destitute condition: are they sent down to jail?—Yes, for it is the only place we have.

22646. Is there a large number of such cases?—There is quite a number, especially old people, old men and old women.

22647. From your observation and knowledge, are they generally people who have given way to intemperance?—In a large number, in the majority of cases.

22648. There are other causes than those, I suppose?—Other causes are old age, general infirmity and the fact that they are unable to work. They are arrested as vagrants and brought before the Recorder, and they are fined one dollar or three months in jail. They go to jail, and when they come out the same thing is repeated.

22649. If there was a poor house in the city they would be sent there, I suppose?—Exactly.

22650. Can you tell the Commission if Sohmer Park has a spirit license?—I have been informed by the City Attorney that it has obtained a special license from the city.

22651. Do you know the character of it?—No.

22652. Have the police often apprehended persons there for causing a disturbance of the peace?—No.

22653. Are there irregularities of any kind there?—There may have been, but there have been very few cases of the kind. If I remember well, during three years there has only been one case before the Recorder in which the man declared he had got liquor at Sohmer Park. There may have been other cases, but to my knowledge there has been only one in three years.

22654. Was it brought before the Recorder by the city police?—By the city police. The man was arrested for being drunk and disorderly, and the Recorder asked him where he got the liquor, and he said at Sohmer Park. That occurred two years ago.

22655. Would it, in your opinion, be an improvement in the direction of curtailing intemperance if the number of licensed places was reduced in the city?—Very surely.

22656. What class of licensed establishments do you think might, with advantage, be reduced?—The lowest class. For instance, within one hundred yards of the City Hall, on a certain street, I counted nine saloons within a distance of three hundred yards. I do not believe out of the nine a man could get a meal in any one of them.

22657. You think it would be an advantage to curtail the number of those restaurants, so-called, but which are really saloons?—My opinion is that no one should have a license without giving proper accommodation to the public, meals and everything of that kind.

22658. What do you call proper accommodation?—If a man goes into a restaurant he should be able to get a meal.

22659. Would you compel the keepers of restaurants to provide sleeping accommodation?—I do not know about that. The best restaurants in the city do not provide any lodging.

22660. Is it obligatory that they should supply meals?—Exactly so, but they do not.

22661. Have you ever had any experience in a district where prohibition was in force, either a parish or a county?—Yes.

22662. Will you tell the Commission where that was?—In Drummond County.

22663-64. Did you live in Drummond County?—Yes, but at that time there was no prohibitory law, the Scott Act was not in force at that time. I have been there since, four or five years ago. Some years ago I also had experience in the County of Missisquoi during election times.

22665. Were you living in Drummond?—No; I went there during election times.

22666. You say you were in the County of Drummond during an election?—Yes.

22667. How long ago was it?—I cannot say exactly; I think it was in 1886.

22668. And the Scott Act was then in force?—Yes. I know that no liquor was supposed to be sold at that time in the county.

22669. From your observation was liquor sold?—Yes, I think there was; I know there was.

22670. Did any case come under your notice?—I know that we were a party of eight or ten from the city, and I never saw a man refused liquor who asked for it.

22671. Was that in the hotels?—Yes, that was in the hotels.

22672. I was asking you with regard to Drummond County?—Yes.

22673. Was any effort made to prevent the sale?—I was there only a very short time. I went there on Saturday and came back on Monday.

22674. Did it seem to be understood that the parties could sell with impunity?—That is more than I could say; the only thing I remarked was that liquor was sold, that it could be had.

22675. Do you mean sold quite openly?—Not at a bar, but in the rooms.

22676. With respect to the County of Missisquoi, what have you to say?—I was there in 1878 or 1879, and I had the same experience there.

22677. Was that during election time?—Yes.

22678. Do you think it would be an advantage if the citizens of Montreal were given the same privilege as people in the counties, to determine whether or not licenses should be issued in certain districts?—I think so.

22679. And be able to determine this by a majority?—I think so.

22680. I am speaking with respect to the local option law, which gives parishes the right to determine whether they will issue licenses or not?—Yes; I think it would be a very good measure.

22681. Would you allow the people of Montreal and Quebec this privilege?—The same privilege as the others.

22682. At present, we understand, licenses are issued in Montreal by a Commission composed of the Police Magistrate and the Recorder?—Two Police Magistrates and the Recorder.

22683. And the applicant presents a petition signed by twenty-five residents?—Twenty-five voters.

22684. And we understand a license is granted unless there is opposition?—Unless there is opposition from the majority of the taxpayers and voters of the polling district in which the house is situated.

22685. If a majority of the residents in a polling district petition against the application, we understand it cannot be granted?—That is the case.

22686. The Commissioners have no power then to grant it?—No.

22687. Do you think it would be an advantage if the districts of the city had the same right as the parishes, to vote prohibition if they thought proper?—That would be a very difficult matter, because there are 500 or 600 polling districts.

22688. Would you divide the city, or would you give that right to the people of the city as a whole?—If you gave a polling district the option of refusing licenses there, the applicant would be likely to go to the next district and get a license, and that polling district might not be more in size than a quarter of a mile.

22689. Then would you consider it an improvement if the citizens of Montreal were allowed to determine by a certain majority whether they would have licenses issued in the city or not?—I believe it would be a good thing, but I hardly think it could be done.

22690. I am speaking in regard to some system that would be an improvement on the present license-system. I understood you thought that the citizens of Montreal

E. A. ST. GEORGE HUGHES.

should have the same power as the citizens of a municipality or parish in regard to granting licenses, and that this would be an improvement?—Yes.

22691. I was speaking with respect to local prohibition, which has been adopted in many districts in the province?—Yes, I understand.

22692. Do I understand that you think it would be an improvement to give the people of Montreal that right in regard to polling districts, or otherwise?—No, my own idea would be to have a vote taken by electoral districts the same as in counties.

22693. The vote taken in each electoral district?—Yes.

22694. You would give each electoral district the power?—Yes.

22695. From your observation and experience, do you think a general prohibitory law is desirable, a law enacted by the Dominion Parliament, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicants, except for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes?—I do not think so.

22696. You think it is not desirable?—It is not desirable.

22697. Will you please state the ground on which you base that opinion?—It is that it would be almost impossible to enforce the law. It would take an army of revenue officers to look after its proper observance, and even then it could not really be done. I have had a very late experience. I was in the State of Maine two weeks ago. There is a prohibitory law in that State, and all the liquor that people want they can get in the hotels, although they have a very strict law, and the punishment is imprisonment for three months for a man who sells liquor. A man, however, who wants liquor in any place where I went, could get it, and it was rank poison at that.

22698. It was bad liquor?—Yes.

22699. Was that in the city of Portland, or where?—It was at Old Orchard Beach.

22700. Then you are opposed to a general prohibitory law on the ground that it could not be carried out?—Yes.

22701. Do you object to it on the principle that one man should not be allowed to dictate to another by vote what he should drink?—No.

22702. Do you think the majority in such a case should govern?—Yes, the majority should govern.

22703. Will you tell the Commission if there is any general inspection of liquors that are vended in the city?—I have been told so, but I question it very much. I think there is an awful lot of bad stuff sold here.

22704. Is it sold by the licensed vendors?—Yes, by the licensed vendors.

22705. Is any portion sold by the unlicensed vendors, or those who are selling illicitly?—Very likely.

*By Judge McDonald :*

22706. We understand that the provincial or revenue police are appointed by the Provincial Government?—Yes.

22707. We suppose that the municipal police are appointed by the Municipal Council of Montreal?—I have the appointment of the constables.

22708. The appointment is vested in you?—Yes.

22709. You select the men whom you think most fitted for the position?—Yes, to the best of my knowledge.

22710. Do the police who are under your charge make arrests of persons charged with criminal offences?—Yes.

22711. Such as larcenies, burglaries, etc.?—Yes.

22712. And do they look after the peace of the city generally?—Yes.

22713. And you have told the Commission that there are ten men who are specially detailed from your police to look after the enforcement of the license law?—Yes.

22714. And the municipal by-laws relating to licenses?—Yes.

22715. Then there is a force of ten men of the provincial police whose duty it is also to look after such matters?—That is their only duty.

22716. They do not deal with criminal matters, I suppose?—No. Besides, we have detectives appointed by the Local Government to look after criminals in the district of Montreal.

22717. Do they meddle with the liquor laws?—No.



22718. You have stated that you think, judging by statistics, there has been quite a diminution in what may be called offences against the liquor laws within the last year or two?—Yes.

22719. You have attributed that to the fact that the Magistrates have intimated that there would be a stern enforcement of the law, and they have endeavoured to carry that into effect?—Yes.

22720. Will you state, judging from your own experience, whether, if the law were properly carried out or looked after by the officers, both judicial and executive, the liquor trade might be fairly well regulated?—I think so.

22721. And the requirements of the law might be carried out?—Yes.

22722. You have stated to the Commission that you think, in regard to a prohibitory law, it would be practically impossible to enforce it?—That is my opinion.

22723. Without an army of officers, and even then there would be breaches of it?—That is what I believe.

22724. If the license law is capable of enforcement with twenty officers, that is, ten provincial and ten municipal, backed up by the firm efforts of the Magistrates charged with the enforcement of it in the city, why do you think that a prohibitory law would require an army of officials?—Because when places are licensed, any provincial or municipal policeman has a right to go there at any hour of the day or night and assure himself that everything is carried on according to law. If the man who sells liquor has no license, he must be pointed out, and the officer cannot enter his house without being armed with a warrant.

22725. Your reason is that in the one case there are a certain number of well known places which the police have the right to visit and supervise?—They have the right to visit every licensed place in Montreal.

22726. And in the other case there would be a host of places where liquor would be sold, but which the officers could not visit?—Yes.

22727. And to watch those places there would require a host of officers, according to your theory?—That is my theory.

22728. You have told us that there is a certain district in the city in which there are nine saloons where alcoholic liquors are sold?—Yes.

22729. And that, notwithstanding the requirements of the law, a man would not be able to obtain a meal at any one of them?—Yes.

22730. Do the officers look after those places?—This is a duty devolving purely on the provincial police.

22731. On those ten men who have this special duty assigned to them?—They are looked after by the municipal police in regard to observance of the law, such as selling on Sunday, or after hours, selling to minors, &c., but the moment the Commissioners are satisfied that a license should be granted, it is granted, and the municipal police have nothing to do with it.

22732. Your ten men look more after matters connected with the peace of the city?—Yes.

22733. And cases which might lead to disorder?—Exactly, such as selling on Sunday, after hours, to minors and to intoxicated people.

22734. But such a matter as whether meals are provided comes, we understand, especially within the purview of the provincial police?—Yes, who are appointed expressly for that purpose.

22735. With your knowledge, as a citizen, of those places, I suppose it must be pretty apparent that a great deal of this kind of thing is going on in regard to restaurants where meals are not sold?—Any one with two eyes can see it.

22736. Surely the provincial police could settle the question by compelling meals to be provided?—Exactly.

22737. You would soon test that matter?—Yes.

22738. Do you think, then, that these restaurants are merely drinking places?—Yes.

22739. Do you think such places an injury to the community?—Yes.

22740. And they should be suppressed entirely?—I think so.

22741. I have had the privilege of reading two lectures delivered by Rev. Father McCallen as a tribute to Father Mathews's memory and work, and the reverend gentle-

E. A. ST. GEORGE HUGHES.

man deals with many of the points which render the working of the license law difficult in Montreal. The first point made is in regard to adulterated liquors. You have said that foul stuff is sold in Maine, and you have also reason to believe that such is sold in this city?—I do not think it is quite so bad here.

22742. But that bad liquor is sold here?—Yes.

22743. Have you noticed that the affect in some cases of taking liquor is to make the person actually crazy?—In a great many cases when men drink bad liquor, it makes them crazy and they become stupid after a few hours.

22744. They are afflicted by a kind of lunacy?—Yes, as if they had taken poison.

22745. You mean as if drugs had been taken?—Yes.

22746. Another difficulty spoken of is the question of the separation of the sale of liquors from the sale of groceries, and it is urged that liquor sale should be stopped in groceries. What do you think of that point?—I believe it should not be allowed.

22747. It is stated that women get liquor from groceries who would never procure it otherwise?—I believe more liquor is sold on Sunday in groceries than in the saloons. A saloon-keeper must close his bar. If his bar is found open, even if he does not sell one glass on Sunday, he is liable to be fined.

22748. Are groceries allowed to keep open?—They often live over their shops or behind them. There is a door communicating with the shop; 8 or 10 friends come in, and they drink in the apartments of the grocer.

22749. So there are evils in regard to sale of liquor at improper times, and also in regard to selling liquors to people who would not buy if they had to go to a general saloon to get liquors?—Exactly so.

22750. And this applies to the case of women who go to buy groceries?—Both women and men.

22751. The law does not allow grocers to sell liquor to be drunk on the premises?—No.

22752. Nor to sell liquor by the glass?—No.

22753. But they do sell liquor by the glass, and it is drunk on the premises, I understand?—Amongst the suits brought last year a majority of them were taken against grocers for selling liquor to be drunk on the premises.

22754. And they violated their licenses in that way?—Yes.

22755. Were the licenses taken away from any such places, or were they refused to be renewed?—I do not think so. These cases are brought by the municipal police before the Recorder, but the Recorder, so far as my knowledge goes, has not yet cancelled any license.

22756. Another of the difficulties raised by the clergyman to whom I have referred is in regard to the Sunday law. You have told us that efforts are made to enforce that law strictly?—Yes.

22757. Do you think the efforts are successful?—The law is fairly carried out.

22758. Another point raised is with respect to the sale of liquor to minors?—Do you think there is much trouble in this community in that way?—No, not very much.

22759. Another point is in regard to reducing the number of saloons: I understand that you are in favour of decreasing the number?—Yes.

22760. You think that would be an advantage?—Decidedly so.

22761. Taking the law as it is, that a hotel license is granted to a man who provides boarding and lodging for travellers, and that a restaurant license is granted to a man who is not required to provide lodging, but must provide meals, which, in your opinion, is it desirable to retain in the interests of the community?—Please repeat the question.

22762. Suppose it was decided by the Legislature to do away either with the hotel or the restaurant license, which should be swept away?—I do not think the restaurant license should be done away with. I do not think either should be wiped out.

22763. Supposing a law were passed to do away with either one or the other, which, in your opinion, should be retained?—The hotel, of course, for it affords accommodation to the public.

22764. You think if the law were carried out properly, the restaurants would not be required?—I would cancel the license of every man who has not proper quarters for providing meals at all hours of the day.

22765. Do you look upon saloons for the sale of liquors on the premises as an unmixed evil?—Yes.

22766. And you think they should be done away with?—Yes.

22767. You have given to the Commission your experience in the Counties of Drummond and Missisquoi?—Yes.

22768. Have you been in the North-west Territory?—Yes; I was there during the rebellion for a period of four months.

22769. I believe you were in the North-west when the prohibitory law was in force?—Yes.

22770. Was any liquor to be obtained there?—No.

22771. Then the law was well enforced?—I saw very little of the North-west. We reached Calgary on the 12th April and left on the 20th. We had brought what we needed with us. When we left Calgary we went to Edmonton and remained three days there, and then we went to Fort Pitt, and then on into the wilderness. We travelled hundreds of miles and did not see many houses.

22772. You carried your own supplies with you?—They were exhausted at Calgary.

22773. How did you manage after that?—We did without.

22774. You did well too?—We did well enough under the circumstances.

22775. You did not suffer in health?—No, we lost only one man, who died from exhaustion.

22776. So the fact that you had exhausted your supplies and were not able to renew them, did your troops do harm?—Not at all.

22777. After you left Calgary you could not help yourselves in regard to prohibition?—That was the case.

22778. If you could have helped yourselves, would you have done so?—I do not think so.

22779. If you could have obtained liquor, I suppose the men would have wanted it?—Very likely.

22780. Do you suppose that if troops were placed under the same circumstances again, prohibition could be enforced?—I suppose so, when no liquor could be obtained.

22781. Did you observe that when the men were not able to procure liquor, they attempted to make it themselves?—I do not know about that.

22782. Have you had any experience of illicit stills?—I have not had much experience in that line. I think about half a dozen cases have been brought up and fined during the last six months.

22783. In this district?—Yes.

22784. Were they in a very small way?—Yes. There was, however, one man making 40 gallons a day.

22785. What was it made from?—Barley, I think.

22786. And made in a regular still?—Yes.

22787. We had evidence before us in Quebec to the effect that farmers make spirits in a small way occasionally, using molasses, but that the quantity is trifling?—Yes, but in Quebec they get all the spirits they want by smuggling.

22788. Have you had any experience of smuggling here?—No.

22789. Have you ever seen any smuggling?—No, I do not believe there is any smuggling in Montreal. There may be, but if there is, it is to a very small extent.

22790. In case of the enactment of such a law as you have suggested, which would enable an electoral district in Montreal to be placed in the same position as an electoral district in the country parishes, do you believe the Scott Act would be carried in any electoral district in this city?—Probably in the West.

22791. That is a residential part?—Yes.

22792. I believe such a law is actually in force in Côte St. Antoine?—Yes.

22793. And you think in that section of the city, the law, amended as you suggest, might possibly be carried?—I do not know, but I suppose so.

E. A. ST. GEORGE HUGHES.

22794. Would you expect that it would be carried in other districts?—No.

22795. Why not? Would it be due to lack of sentiment?—In the central part of the city it is the interest of the citizens that hotels should go on and do business. All the hotels are in the central portion, and I think it would hurt their business considerably if they had no licenses.

22796. Have you ever been in any prohibition State except Maine?—No, I do not think so.

22797. Do you remember when in Drummond or Missisquoi Counties the character of the liquor you obtained, whether it was the same as you obtained elsewhere?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

22798. Your official position brings you necessarily into contact with the criminal classes?—Yes.

22799. Have you observed whether any proportion of the cases with which the police have to deal arise from the drink habit and the drink trade?—Decidedly so.

22800. A large proportion?—Yes, a very large proportion.

22801. Then, if it were possible to do away with the drink trade, do you think the police would have less to do?—Certainly.

22802. Have you noticed this, whether any proportion of the juvenile crime, the crime carried on by boys, say under 16 or 17, petty offences, larcenies and the like, is attributable to the drinking of parents and neglect of children?—I do not know; I could not say. On the contrary, last year we arrested 2 or 3 very young criminals on the charge of breaking into houses.

22803. How old would they be?—The leading one was 9 years of age.

22804. Had they a regular organization?—Yes, and the father of the boy captain is one of the most respectable mechanics here, and his mother is a very respectable woman. The majority of the children belonged to very respectable families.

22805. Is it an unusual condition of things, that the children of sober and thrifty people should fall into such evil ways, or do you find that the street waifs are the children of respectable parents?—The condition of children picked up on the streets is often due to drunkenness on the part of their parents.

22806. Have you noticed that cases of offences against women and children, cruelty to wives and neglect of children, are in any degree due to drunkenness?—A great majority of the cases, I believe, are due to drunkenness.

22807. Have you noticed whether the saloon is generally a centre of possible disorder and disturbance in the community? Here is a ward in the west part of the city where there are no licenses, or at any rate not many, and there is Côte St. Antoine, and there are other parts of the city where there are a good many licenses: how do these wards compare?—No doubt there will be more drunkenness and more disorder, around those places where there is liquor sold.

22808. And the police have to watch these places a little carefully?—Yes.

22809. More than places where there are no licensed shops?—Of course.

22810. Do you think there would be much illicit sale if the police did not vigilantly watch the licencees: would they sell more after hours and on Sunday?—No doubt of it.

22811. Is it really a fact that they observe the law because you watch them, or because they have the law in dread?—Not all of them, but some.

22812. Do you think a large percentage of them come within that category?—I could not say exactly; I believe quite a number.

22813. They observe the law simply because they know the officers are on their tracks?—Yes.

22814. So that part of the license law which prohibits sale after hours and on Sunday is in force simply because the officers look after the houses?—There are a great many hotel-keepers who are very respectable men and who would not sell after hours or on Sunday, but there are a large number who would be willing to sell at any time.

22815. Which would form the larger number, those who would not under any circumstances violate the law, or those who would violate the law when they had a chance?—They are pretty evenly divided.

22816. It is a fact, therefore, that the prohibitory provisions of the law are enforced because the officers are diligent in the performance of their duties, and the Recorder and the Police Magistrates impose penalties when there are violations. These have an effect?—Of course they have.

22817. And if the police and the other authorities dealt with the trade with less severity, the parties would go on violating the law?—If they were let alone, no doubt a large number would avail themselves of the opportunity of selling liquor on Sunday. I do not say all would do so.

22818. There are in Montreal, as in other large cities, local regulations of a prohibitory character, such, for instance, as prohibition against building wooden houses within certain limits?—You cannot build a wooden house in the city.

22819. That is a prohibition?—Yes.

22820. Does the city find it difficult to enforce that prohibition?—I do not think so.

22821. It is to protect the city against fire?—Yes.

22822. And a butcher could not establish a slaughter house in this ward, for instance?—No, he could not.

22823. That is a prohibition, and how it is enforced?—It is enforced very well.

22824. Do you suppose, if the officials were slack about that matter, there would be danger of the establishment of a slaughter house in this locality?—Yes, but very little.

22825. There are also regulations forbidding people keeping pigs in the city, I suppose?—Yes, it is against the law.

22826. Is that prohibition enforced?—Yes.

22827. Are there violations?—Yes.

22828. And sometimes the officers have to get rid of a pig-pen?—Yes.

22829. I remember reading some two or three years ago, when the smallpox prevailed here, that vaccination was enforced?—Yes.

22830. Was there not opposition to it?—Yes.

22831. Was there very strong opposition to it?—At the beginning there was, because the vaccine was not pure and children were being killed by hundreds. When the people found out what the matter was, they opposed vaccination for a time, but as soon as they become convinced that no possible harm could follow, they submitted to it.

22832. Do you think the people were within their right in exercising their individual judgment and in objecting to vaccination?—I think they were.

22833. Were the authorities within their right in insisting on vaccination?—I think so; it was the law.

22834. For what reason?—Are you a doctor?

22835. Was it because they thought it a protection to the public?—Yes.

22836. Am I wrong in the information I gathered from the newspapers that the militia were called out to enforce vaccination?—They were called out.

22837. That was a case in which the force of the city and all the power at the command of the Mayor was brought into requisition, to enforce a city regulation?—Yes.

22838. In the interests of the public health?—Yes.

22839. I should like to ask you, then, do you think it would be more difficult if there were a prohibitory law on the statute-book, and proper officers appointed to enforce prohibition?—I do.

22840. Why?—Because it would take an army to do it. I do not suppose you could look after Montreal with less than 200 officers, appointed expressly for that purpose, and even then liquor would be sold.

22841. Is there not illicit sale now?—Yes, but not so much as people think.

22842. Or so much as formerly?—Yes, where most liquor is illicitly sold is in houses of prostitution.

22843. Those houses, I suppose are not licensed to sell?—No. They have no license.

22844. They are of low character, I suppose?—As to places where liquor is sold illicitly, I think there are very few. We got rid of twenty in the eastern district this year, and the reports of my officers are to the effect that there are very few left.

E. A. ST. GEORGE HUGHES.

22845. Speaking about houses of prostitution: they have no legal standing in this community, I suppose?—No.

22846. Do you have difficulty in prohibiting them? I suppose the police raid them at times?—Yes, when complaints are made.

22847. Only when complaints are made?—Yes.

22848. You do raid unlicensed liquor places without complaints being made?—Yes, I have officers go round and find out where there are such places. There are places called “Beaneries,” where people get beer, the supply being kept under the counter, or under the bed.

22849. You only raid houses of prostitution, you say, when complaints are made?—Yes.

22850. Are there many complaints made?—Not very often.

22851. Do you find it difficult to suppress that class of institution in this city?—The fact is we do not suppress them.

22852. Would it not be well, since they are not suppressed, to license them?—I think so.

22853. Do you think if they were licensed, there would be no places of that sort, or that they would continue their bad business unlicensed?—If licenses were issued to those places, of course it would then become the duty of the police to prevent those who did not pay license from selling.

22854. But since none are licensed, there are no attempts expressly made to prevent any of them?—No.

22855. Do you believe there would be fewer or more places if they were licensed?—I am not ready to say.

22856. If a certain number were licensed, you cannot tell whether there would be a larger number of unlicensed places or not, as in the liquor trade?—No.

22857. You have spoken about your experience in Maine. I suppose you are aware that Old Orchard Beach is the resort of tourists and visitors generally?—Yes.

22858. And perhaps in your opinion Maine should not be judged by Old Orchard Beach?—Nor by any other part of Maine.

22859. You think the liquors are very deleterious and injurious there?—Yes.

22860. You have spoken also of Drummond County as under the Scott Act, and you lived in it prior to the Scott Act?—Yes, but I was merely a boy.

22861. What was the condition of Drummond County when you were a boy?—Was there a great deal of drink sale?—Yes, there was a hotel in the village where I lived.

22862. It was a village, not a town?—Yes.

22863. Was there a great deal of drunkenness?—At that time there was a good deal.

22864. You observed Drummond County subsequently under the Scott Act, but not as a resident I believe?—No.

22865. You visited there?—Yes.

22866. And it was at election time?—Yes.

22867. Were you there on election day?—No.

22868. I suppose you are aware that during election time there is a good deal of laxity in the enforcement of all law?—Very likely.

22869. Do you believe there was likely to be more liquor sold during an election campaign than during an ordinary period?—Certainly.

22870. So your observation in Drummond during an election campaign would not be a fair judgment of the place all the year round?—No. The Scott Act or the Dunkin Act was in force there, and we had liquor just the same as if there was license.

22871. And that was during the election campaign?—Yes.

22872. You do not think it was the Scott Act that made them sell the liquor?—No, but it did not prevent them.

22873. You made a brief stay, I believe, there, from Saturday to Monday; but even under a license they would have no right to sell on Sunday?—Yes, the liquor was not sold at a bar, it was sold in the rooms.

22874. Do you think the fact that an election campaign was in progress had any influence in increasing the sale of drink at that time?—Yes.

22875. The people, I suppose, were excited and were lax in regard to almost everything, except the political conflict between the parties?—Yes.

22876. You have spoken of the county of Missisquoi; was the Scott Act ever in operation there?—It was either the Scott or Dunkin Act.

22877. My recollection is that the Scott Act was never in force in Missisquoi, and that it must have been the Dunkin Act?—I think so. I speak of 1878 or 1879, during the election contest between Mr. Baker and Mr. Racicot.

22878. You spoke about limiting the number of licenses, and I think you said you would close the lower class of restaurants?—Yes.

22879. In what way are they different from other places?—You take the east end of this city, and you will find a saloon at almost every street corner. When people go to their work and return at night, they are induced to go into these places. If there are five or six together they go into one place and have a drink, and at the next street corner another of the company says it is his turn to treat, and they go in. At the next corner the third man wants to treat, and so on until they have had four or five drinks and they have treated all round. If there were not so many saloons at the different corners, there would not, of course, be so much temptation. If a man had to go half a mile he would frequently not do so.

22880. Then you think the frequency of the saloons is a temptation to a man?—Yes, and especially in that part of the city where they are not needed.

22881. Why are they not needed there as well as here or elsewhere?—Because, as I have said, in the centre of the city if we had good restaurants where a man could get a meal and a glass of beer or wine, they would be very good, for we need restaurants in the city; but these drinking places at the street corners are not wanted, for they tempt men to drink and are not needed.

22882. Take the good restaurants: suppose they were only eating places, do you think that would be an advantage to any man? Are the restaurants in this vicinity the same temptation to a certain class of men to drink that restaurants in another part of the city offer to another class?—Not so much.

22883. But somewhat you think?—If a man does not drink, he is not tempted to go in; if he drinks occasionally and is invited by a friend, they go in and each takes a drink.

22884. He wants lunch and goes in?—I take my lunch very often in these places, and I notice that the majority of the people drink milk, soda and ginger ale—I mean those who take their meals there.

22885. Do you think if no liquors were sold there, a good many people who drink would refrain?—I do not think so.

22886. There is temptation?—The liquor is bad, first of all, next there are too many places, and the fact that there are so many affords the temptation to people to drink—that is the poorer classes.

22887. I think you said also that you objected to all restauraunts having licenses?—To those who are not properly equipped as regards providing lodging and meals.

22888. Why do you give the hotels a preference, why do you think they are more desirable than ordinary saloons in which liquors only are sold?—Because the hotels are the resorts of people from all parts of the world, and travellers are accustomed to have their glass of liquor, and as a rule, they are people who have the money to pay for it. It is not fair to compare an hotel with 300 rooms with a small shebeen.

22889. Leaving the fact out that hotels may supply guests with liquor, either at the table or in their rooms, do you think it is well to have bars in the hotel?—I do not see any objection.

22890. Of course the bars are supplying other people than guests?—Yes, guests and other people as well.

22891. You spoke about the North-west campaign, which was short and decisive. Do you think it would have been better for the men of your force if they had had opportunity to get liquors freely along the line of march?—I do not think so.

22892. They were not any worse for not having that opportunity?—Not at all.

22893. No worse in health?—No.

E. A. ST. GEORGE HUGHES.

22894. Or in courage or endurance?—No. I think it is a good thing for troops not to be allowed liquor—although there is a difference of opinion on that point.

22895. If it was a good thing for troops, would it not be a good thing for other men if they had not so many opportunities for getting liquor?—I suppose a man could live very easily without it.

22896. Very comfortably?—Yes.

22897. From your observation, in your official position, and as a soldier, also during a somewhat troublesome time, and as a citizen, do you believe that if public sentiment were up to the point of asking for a prohibitory law, and if a prohibitory law were enacted, touching the importation, manufacture as well as the sale of liquor, and if proper officials were appointed to enforce it, as the revenue laws are enforced, or as you enforce the prohibitory provisions of the license law, do you believe a law so enacted would be beneficial to the country?—Do you mean the prohibition of all liquors, light wines and everything?

22898. I mean all intoxicating liquors and beverages?—Including wine?

22899. Yes. I have put it that way?—I would not go for such a law.

22900. Do you believe that such a law, prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of strong alcoholic liquors, if it were well enforced, would be beneficial?—I think so.

22901. Do you think it could be enforced?—I do not think it is very practicable.

22902. Do you think it would be practicable if the people were educated up to believe in it, if public sentiment were strongly that way?—If there was a long enough time.

22903. Take a community in the province of Quebec, in which the people say, "We do not want the liquor trade here:" do you believe it is possible to enforce prohibition fairly well in such a place, as well as other laws are enforced?—I suppose so.

22904. If that same condition of things were true of the people of the whole country, do you think it would be possible to enforce a law against strong alcoholic liquors?—I have told you my opinion about it; I thought it would be a most difficult thing.

22905. In the present condition of affairs?—Even if a law were passed, it would be a most difficult thing to enforce the law.

22906. Do you believe the condition of public sentiment has anything to do with the enforcement of the law?—Suppose four-fifths of the people of Montreal were against the liquor trade and favoured prohibition, do you think it would be fairly easy to enforce it here?—I cannot say; it would be very difficult, I think.

22907. Would you favour a law that would prohibit strong alcoholic liquors, and encourage the free use of light wine and beer?—Yes, that would be a very good thing.

22908. Do you think the encouragement of the use of light wine and beer would discourage the use of alcoholic liquors?—I think so.

22909. And promote temperance?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

22910. The objections to building wooden houses and slaughter-houses are apparent, I believe?—Yes.

22911. Have you a law that prohibits butchers selling bad meat?—Yes.

22912. And I suppose the law is enforced because the people want it enforced?—Yes.

22913. Supposing the people were determined to get bad meat to eat, would it be easy to enforce that law?—I do not think that question is a fair one, because the people do not want bad meat.

22914. Questions have been put to you with respect to slaughter-houses in connection with this subject of the liquor trade. If the people did not want liquor, would it not be easy to enforce a prohibitory law?—Yes. It would be the easiest thing in the world if nobody wanted it.

22915. If the people wanted bad meat to eat, would it not be very difficult to enforce the law to prevent them getting it? Do you think you could enforce it?—Yes, if there were enough officers to look after it.

22916. Then if the people wished to get bad meat, it would be a difficult law to enforce it?—Yes.



22917. You have had the question of the suppression of the small-pox put on the same footing as the suppression of the drinking of liquor. Supposing that the people were as anxious to catch small-pox as people are to get liquor to drink, would it not be very difficult to prevent the spread of small-pox? Would you not require the same army of officials to prevent it as you said would be necessary to prevent the liquor traffic?—Of course. If people want something it is very difficult to prevent them getting it.

22918. Is not this question of the drinking of liquor on a different footing from almost anything else in regard to legislation?—Yes.

22919. It is difficult to put a parallel case to it?—Very much so.

22920. And to draw a comparison with other cases?—Yes.

22921. Why do you think the liquor trade stands on a different footing from any other?—If you compare the prohibiting of the sale of whisky with the prohibiting of the erection of wooden houses, I do not see where the comparison comes in. If people want to sell whisky they can always find a hiding place for it, in the cellar, under the roof and everywhere. It is found sometimes in the cellar and it may be carried under the clothing. It is therefore a difficult matter to prevent its sale. You can easily sell a glass of liquor, but you cannot easily complete the building of a wooden house. It is practically impossible to prevent the sale, as in Maine they sell it openly and you can get all the liquor you want.

22922. You have to know the signs, I suppose?—Yes. A dealer would sell liquor to a local man and not sell it to a stranger; but his friends would form themselves into a club and obtain liquor for their own use,

22923. Which do you think would do the most most harm, small-pox or the drink trade year after year?—That would require a special study: I will study the question for a few days and then answer you.

(*Translation.*)

*By Mr. Gigault:*

22924. Have you lived in Italy?—Yes.

22925. Do you know anything of the operation of the law in Italy as regards the sale of liquors?—I have not studied the operation of that law; but I know that in Italy, as well as everywhere else where I have been, liquor is sold, wine especially. There are very few establishments where alcohol is kept for sale.

22926. Is there less drunkenness there than here?—Yes.

22927. Do you think that the use of wine would tend to lessen drunkenness?—Yes, assuredly.

22928. Do you think the Government should encourage the sale of wine, and its manufacture here?—Yes, if there were means of securing better kinds of grapes, and thus being able to manufacture a better product, a national industry could be built up; but there is no doubt that with the grapes we now have, a superior wine cannot be manufactured.

22929. What measures would you suggest with the object of encouraging the use of Canadian or foreign wine?—The abolition of duties on the imported article.

22930. And would you be in favour of imposing a heavier tax on alcohol?—Yes.

22931. Do you think that if higher duties were placed on alcohol, there would no longer be any smuggling?—That concerns the Government. If they enact laws, they ought to be able to enforce them. They forbid the sale of liquors except under license; but a club of fifty friends is created, for instance, and they have the liquors which they need. If we had a prohibitory law, we would need an army of revenue officers to prevent the entry of liquors into the country.

22932. In Switzerland is to be found what is called the monopoly of alcohol by the State. What would you say regarding a system by means of which a similar state of things would be brought into existence here, and which would allow the sale of wine, beer and cider by licensed retailers, with a prohibitory law for alcohol?—I have not studied the matter; I cannot say what difference that would involve.

22933. Would you be in favour of granting licenses to retailers for the sale of wine, beer and cider only, and for other drinks?—I think it would be a good thing.

E. A. ST. GEORGE HUGHES.

22934. Do you think such a law would not be violated very frequently, and that the retailers authorized to sell wine would not also sell alcohol?—Well, if they sold alcohol, they would be absolutely in same position as those who have now no license. They would be liable to a fine.

22935. Do you think it would be easy to put such a law in force?—Yes, quite so.

22936. Would you be in favour of establishing a prison or an asylum specially for drunkards, or where they could be sent for treatment?—Yes. It seems to me that would be a good thing.

22937. Has crime increased or decreased here of late years? I mean all crimes, felonies and misdemeanors?—Felonies have been on the decrease.

22938. Are there fewer houses of ill-fame than there were formerly?—No; there are more, but the population increases every day.

22939. It is often asked why could not prohibition be enforced? The opinion is expressed that it could not be easily enforced, because a great number of persons do not look upon taking a glass of beer or wine as an immoral act. Many laws have been enacted against prostitution, but they have not succeeded in eradicating it, seeing that a great number of persons believe it to be a necessary evil, and this notwithstanding the fact that their immorality is not a subject of doubt. Would not the fact that a great number of persons do not believe they are doing a reprehensible action by taking a glass of wine or beer, prove one of the greatest shackles of prohibition? What do you think of that theory?—It would mean that since prostitution exists, that it is immoral, and difficult to suppress, it is more difficult still to suppress the sale of liquors, because a greater number of persons believe it is not immoral to take a glass of cider or beer. In my opinion it is well nigh impossible to prohibit the sale of liquors. There are no countries in the world I know of where the sale of liquor is wholly prohibited.

22940. There is the State of Maine?—That is not a country. - It is a State of the American Union, and more liquor is sold there than elsewhere.

*By the Chairman :*

22941. Questions have been put to you with respect to the keeping of pigs within the city limits and the prohibition of slaughter-houses: were not the by-laws on the subject enacted with a view to the preservation of the public health?—Yes.

22942. Does a person who takes a glass of wine or ale endanger the public health, in your opinion?—No.

22943. So long as the person uses it in moderation, does he endanger public order?—I do not think so.

JOHN BAKER EDWARDS, Ph.D., D.C.L., of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

22944. Are you a member of the medical profession?—I am not. I am a scientist, a doctor of science, and practical chemist, but I am not a medical practitioner.

22945. At what university did you graduate as a doctor of science?—I am a doctor of philosophy of the University of Giessen and a doctor of civil laws of Lennoxville.

22946. Have you had considerable experience in making analyses of foods and liquors, in fact of nearly all kinds of substances?—I have, both in the old country and since my residence in Canada, which has extended during a period of about twenty-five years.

22947. Do you hold any official position at this moment?—I do. I am Public Analyst to the Inland Revenue Department in the Montreal district.

22948. Were you appointed by the Dominion Government?—Yes; I have held that position for a period of 17 years.

22949. Have you resided in the district for many years?—Yes, for twenty-five years.

22950. Will you kindly state to the Commissioners the nature of your duties as public analyst?—I receive periodically from the Department of Inland Revenue certain samples of food, or drink, or drugs, or fertilizers, according to the several Acts of Parliament, with certain instructions in regard to analysing them. They are supplied to me by the Inspector of food, who is another officer belonging to the department and who is appointed to collect them. I then report the result of my analyses to the Inland Revenue Department. The Inspector furnishes me the samples, and I receive them without any reference as to the source from which they are obtained.

22951. Who collects them?—He does.

22952. Are you continuously employed in conducting analyses of samples sent in this way?—I always have some on hand and I am pretty constantly employed.

22953. Will you tell the Commissioners what articles come to you principally for analyses?—Such substances as bread and flour, baking powder, milk, cheese, coffee, spices, liquors, including malt liquors and other beverages, such as ginger ale, soda water. I also receive fertilizers in connection with the Agricultural Department. Occasionally other general samples are received by me, including lard.

22954. Do you get any considerable number of samples of liquor to be examined?—Not a very large number. I have had something like 50 or 60 samples during the last twelve months.

22955. I think you said you do not know where the samples came from; you are not informed where they come from?—I am not informed further than they come from a certain district, such as Ottawa or Sherbrooke and the like. I am given the names of the places from which they come, but I am not informed as to the vendors.

22956. Are you informed as to the ostensible manufacturers?—No.

22957. As a rule when you get samples of liquor for analysis, do you know where they have been taken or who is reputed to have made them?—I only receive the name of the locality, without the name of the vendor or the maker, but that information is communicated to the department. The samples are taken in triplicate by the officer. He sends one of those samples to me, he transmits a similar sample to the department at Ottawa, to the chief analyst, and the third he seals up for the benefit and protection of the vendor in case he wishes to have a separate analysis made.

22958. Do the samples come to you sealed and labelled?—Yes, and numbered consecutively.

22959. Have you any knowledge as to the manner in which the Inspector obtains those samples? Are you aware whether he collects them and afterwards seals them up?—I can speak as to the instructions he receives. His instructions are that he shall call for a certain quantity of liquor. Three half pints is a suitable quantity, and having purchased that, he then tells the vendor that it is obtained for the purpose of analysis. He produces sample bottles and divides the liquor into three portions, in the presence of the vendor. He has three separate labels upon which he writes the name under which the substance is sold. One is for the analyst, the second for the department, and the third for the vendor. He leaves one of the samples in the custody of the vendor interested in the sale; he transmits the other to the department at Ottawa, and the third he sends direct to me.

22960. Is the vendor in whose premises the article is found called upon to put a seal on the bottle or vessel in which the liquor is placed?—No. The Inspector seals the samples in his presence, each with the same seal.

22961. Will you tell the Commissioners the extent of your district or the boundaries of it?—It is in the Province of Quebec, and includes Hull, St. Jérôme, Ste. Thérèse, and extends as far as Three Rivers, including Sorel. It runs along the boundary line of the United States, and extends up to Ottawa. It also includes the townships.

22962. Can you inform the Commission whether, in your experience, liquor sold is largely adulterated in your district?—I have not found that liquors have been largely adulterated.

22963. From the samples sent to you, can you state the percentage of liquors that have been found to be adulterated? You had better take a number of years?—In the

first place, the strong liquors have not been found to be adulterated with deleterious drugs in any instance, either in my own district or in those reported from other districts by other analysts. There is in the Act of Parliament a schedule of drugs named which are prohibited from being mixed with liquors, but in no case have we been able to detect those particular drugs in the adulteration of liquors. Then, of course, there has been wine found more or less adulterated, not to any great extent, however, especially the heavy classes of wine. The beers have not been found to be adulterated. The principal adulteration in respect to liquor has been a dilution by water. They have not been up to what is considered the standard: but inasmuch as there is no definite standard to go by in regard to gin, brandy or whisky, we find it difficult to call these adulterations, even when they have been detected. The adulterations, as I have said, have been in the direction of the dilution of liquors, and not the addition of toxic matters, which would render them more intoxicating than the alcohol they contain.

22964. Do you say that in regard to wines also?—In wines there has been more adulteration and they contain more doubtful ingredients. Wines are very much more difficult to analyse, inasmuch as the very best of wines are liable to change in certain conditions from fermentation, and there are also difficulties in regard to their manufacture. Therefore, wines have not been examined to anything like such an extent as to enable me to give an answer as to whether any large percentage of them has been adulterated or not. In fact, the number of liquors that have been examined altogether has been exceedingly small, considering the enormous extent of our district; and this is seen in the fact that about 6 samples of spirits have been analyzed in Ottawa, about 4 in Sherbrooke and say 12 in Montreal at one time, and therefore, in justice to the vendors, it must be said that I am not able to give an opinion as to the extent of the adulteration. In my judgment the proper course to adopt would be that when an officer detected that adulterated liquor was being sold in certain premises, the whole of the stock-in-trade should be examined, because it is easy for a vendor to have a good bottle of whisky at hand from which to give his sample to the officer and at the same time not have any such whiskey in stock. And this is important also in regard to the use of mixed drinks. So long, however, as it is the practice of those who drink to occasionally take mixed liquors, it is almost impossible that we should be able to prevent impure liquors, or to ascertain exactly whether adulterations have taken place or not.

22965. You have said that the adulterations have taken place, is more in the direction of dilution than anything else?—Yes.

22966. With respect to wine: is it within your experience that there has been much adulteration?—There has been a considerable amount of adulteration, perhaps thirty or forty per cent.

22967. Will you tell us the character of the adulteration?—The character of it has been largely from the addition of cane sugar and glycerine, both of which are not injurious to health taken individually; and also fortification by alcohol, either brandy or whisky. In every case where there have been found to be such dilutions, they have been pronounced to be adulterations, but there have been very few cases in which there have been additions injurious to health. There is, however, very great difficulty in detecting these cases, which occur generally in the wine sold under the name of Canadian wine, the home manufactured wine, which is supposed to be a very superior article, whereas in fact injury is caused through vinous fermentation.

22968. Am I correct in concluding that the law requires that the Governor in Council shall fix the standard for liquor?—It has not been done.

22969. Does the law require it to be done?—Is there a condition of the law providing that the Governor in Council shall fix the standard?—I think there is no such provision in the law.

22970. What standard have you by which to judge whether liquors are pure or adulterated?—Only the standard of general sense and information on this subject and the standard of the pharmacopœia, where there are certain standards laid down in regard to liquors used for medical purposes, but we could scarcely expect liquors to be sold for general use such as are sold for medical purposes.

22971. Have you noticed the reports made by the officers in Ottawa, by the public analyst, Mr. Macfarlane, and which have been published as official documents?—No.

22972. Is it not a fact that he complains that his work cannot be efficiently carried on on account of there not being a fixed standard?—Yes. I understand he has no power, and it would require a change in the Act to enable him to fix a standard.

22973. My understanding is that the Privy Council has not fixed a standard. I think it is so stated in the reports, and therefore the officers are without a standard, without which they are unable to say whether liquor sold is illegal or not?—Yes.

22974. Is that not your understanding of the situation?—My impression is that the Act of Parliament does not give authority to the Governor in Council; but you may be right. It may be there is some clause in the Act giving the Governor General power from time to time to fix the standard on that subject, but not particularly with respect to liquor.

22975. But you cannot give us any positive information on that subject?—No.

22976. From what you have said the Commissioners would conclude that there is not a sufficient inspection of liquor sold at the present time?—That is my impression.

22977. Is it your impression that the liquors sold in your district are largely adulterated?

22978. So far as my experience has gone, I should say certainly not. The error would be that some are as much too strong as others are too weak. There is considerable variability.

22979. The adulteration to which you referred I think you characterized as harmless adulterations?—Yes, not injurious to health.

22980. The law was changed a short time ago, and manufacturers have to store their productions for a certain period before they can be sold. Have you knowledge of that fact?—Yes, I believe such is the case.

22981. For how long a period must they be stored?—I cannot say; I do not remember.

22982. Can you tell us the object of that storage?—The object, of course, is to cause the separation of one of the most injurious substances which is formed at the same time as alcohol, amyl alcohol or fusel-oil, which is one of the intoxicating principles and always occurs in the fermentation of raw grain, and sometimes also in malted grain, but which is considered very much more deleterious and intoxicating than alcohol itself. This has been to a very large extent removed, and in the samples of liquor which I have examined it has only occasionally been detected, and that in exceedingly small quantities. So that it has been practically, to a large extent, removed by the manufacturers. Still, it must be remembered that spirits are not kept in this country so long as in the old country for the purpose of removing this objectionable ingredient, and some portion of the deleterious effects of liquors may be attributed to the practice of consuming liquors too soon after they had been manufactured.

22982a. Then you consider that the keeping of liquor for some time before it is placed on the market is advantageous and tends to improve it?—Yes, invariably. And that applies more particularly to wine than to spirits.

22983. Do you not think that whisky is greatly improved by leaving it in bond two years, and that it is then less objectionable?—Yes, it is a very much less objectionable beverage. The Government have gone further than that, for they allow a drawback on all fusel oil manufactured in the distilleries, thus giving the distillers every inducement to separate it from the spirits that will, after the regulated time, enter into consumption.

22984. How does the separation of the fusel-oil occur?—It separates by difference in the gravity, by which one liquid can be drawn away from the other. The two will separate by age, and they will separate into two layers, one of which can be drawn from the other.

22985. I suppose in practice one layer is drawn off?—Yes.

22986. Have you any knowledge of how it is done?—The whisky is put into large inclosed tanks, and there are taps at different heights from which the gravity is ascertained. When the whole of the fusel-oil is removed, there is a difference in the equilibrium of the liquids. They separate into layers, and when that process is complete, the alcohol is drawn from the upper layer. Towards the end of the operation there is a little of the fusel-oil remaining, and this is transferred to small tanks and is there separated.

JOHN BAKER EDWARDS.

22987. It is done in bulk before it is put into casks?—Yes, I believe so ; I have not seen it in operation.

22988. Have you any knowledge of the character of the tank or vessel in which it is kept?—No, I have not.

22989. You do not know whether it is copper or wood?—I believe it is a large iron tank.

22990. Would it make any difference whether the vessel was of wood, copper, iron or glass?—I think iron would be the most objectionable of the metals. A large bulk facilitates the separation ; in small casks the separation would not be as complete.

22991. Do you think it is better after the separation of the fusel-oil has been carried out, that the whisky should be put into bottles or into casks? In which do you think it would be better preserved, or would it make any difference?—I think casks would be better than bottles. There should be an intermediary stage, because under the circumstances there would be a slight quantity of fusel-oil remaining in solution in the alcohol, and the fusel-oil would have a greater tendency to sink in the wooden casks than the alcohol itself.

22992. Do you mean that it would sink and be absorbed?—Yes, and be separated.

22993. Is there a certain standard adopted with respect to the quantity of alcohol which should be in liquor when it comes from the manufacturer?—I believe there is such a regulation by the Inland Revenue Department, but it has not come under my notice.

22994. Is there not a regulation in Canada that whisky shall contain a certain quantity of alcohol? What is the meaning of “proof,” or so much “over proof”?—The proof relates to a particular quantity of alcohol and of water, a mixture, and the word “proof” stands for a specific gravity of .920. That is taken to be the standard of proof spirits. Then there is a scale of degrees, which is quite arbitrary, describing spirits as being so much over proof or so many degrees under proof, according as it contains more or less water than proof. Absolute alcohol is 63 degrees over proof, that is what is called in commerce absolute alcohol.

22995. What is the meaning of that term? Does it indicate a certain percentage of alcohol in the liquid?—63 per cent is equal to 95 per cent of alcohol, which is the strongest commercial alcohol sold. It is not possible to get it higher except by special chemical means.

22996. Can you tell the Commissioners what is the strength of the whisky sold in Canada? Take a large distillery, does the spirits sent out require to be up to a certain standard? Can you tell the Commission what that standard really means in ordinary terms?—I shall have to reply to that question in a little memorandum which I will send in. At the same time I will give particulars with respect to whisky and other commercial spirits.

22997. If the standard were reduced the intoxicating power of the article would be lessened, would it not?—It would.

22998. Would any harm result from reducing this standard, allowing a larger proportion of water?—It would be of benefit to the consumer so far as his health is concerned, but it would be more out of his pocket. Of course it is a question of taste.

22999. It would mean that he would be paying for water rather than for alcohol?—Yes.

23000. But suppose he was compensated by a lower price being charged for the article?—Then no injury could accrue to him.

23001. Do you know any special reason why such a high standard of alcohol has been fixed upon?—No, I am not aware.

23002. Have you observed in your reading on the subject that the quantity of alcohol varies in the spirits sold in different countries?—Yes, and also in the different spirits. Rum contains more alcohol than whisky, and gin is very variable. I believe there is a standard for whisky and brandy in the Paris Codex, and in the United States Dispensatory, but I am not aware that it has been adopted by the British Pharmacopœia, which is our only authority in this country.

23003. Admitting that alcohol is injurious, would not the reduction of strength be an improvement?—Yes, it would be an improvement, and be for the benefit of both parties.

23004. With regard to ales and beers sold: have you had many samples sent to you for analysis?—I have only received a few of the lower qualities, such as lager beer, Weiss and Root beer, and others which are considered by some so light as to be scarcely intoxicating beverages. In this I have found the percentage of alcohol varies. The Niagara beer contains one and a half per cent of alcohol.

23005. Is that the ordinary malt liquor?—It is a concoction of different kinds of roots, probably also containing a little extract. Weiss beer, made of malt and hops, contains from three to six per cent of alcohol. Cider contains about five per cent.

23006. About what percentage of alcohol does the ordinary beer made by such establishments as the Montreal, and the London breweries contain?—From six to seven per cent; it very rarely amounts to ten per cent. Occasionally it may go over ten per cent, but very rarely.

23007. You were proposing, Dr. Edwards, to add some figures to your evidence: Have you got them now?—Yes. The question relating to proof spirit, spirit of wine, is indicated both in the United States and in the British Pharmacopœia. It consists of rectified spirits, five parts, and distilled water three parts. That is thus explained, and you ask for the explanation. A hundred measures of rectified spirit of specific gravity of 838 mixed with six measures of water, yield 156 measures of proof spirit; therefore, spirit of wine is called 56 measures per cent over proof because there is a diminution involved by the mixing of the alcohol with the water, and therefore this diminution of volume, amounting to 56, is called 56 measures over proof, and the standard is an arbitrary one. These degrees go above and below proof spirit; this is the explanation, in the first place, of proof spirit, and, in the second place, of the degrees above and below proof.

23008. I think you have stated in your evidence that Canadian whisky, for instance, would contain 95 per cent of alcohol?—No, it was a mistake if I conveyed that impression. What I stated was that spirit of wine of sixty-five over proof would contain 95 per cent of alcohol; it had no reference to whisky; proof comes down to the rigid measurement, that is of rectified spirits five parts and distilled water three parts, so that it is a dilution of that, and they take the standard of that for proof spirit. The proof spirit is not a rectified spirit, nor is it an absolute alcohol. With regard to brandy; brandy is a medicinal preparation both in the United States Codex and the British Pharmacopœia, and therefore we have a medicinal standard for that, and the standard is from 45 to 56 per cent of absolute alcohol, that would amount to 56 or 60 over proof.

23009. Can you tell us the actual percentage of alcohol in Canadian whisky. Am I correct in understanding that there is a standard up to which the Canadian whisky manufactured has to come before it is permitted to be sold?—Well, I am not aware of any such standard. According to the United States Pharmacopœia, it must have a specific gravity of not less than 917, nor over 930, but I believe that no standard for sales has been fixed so far as I am informed.

23010. Are the figures which you have given us those which guide the inspectors?—There is, for instance, an Inspector of the Inland Revenue Department who goes to Toronto to inspect the production there; he has to have some standard by which to determine whether the spirit is up to the legal requirement or not?—He speaks as to over or under proof which the spirit contains, he does not speak of specific gravity, nor those percentages of alcohol. He says simply how much the spirit is under or over proof.

23011. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that he has any standard, and that if the spirit failed to come up to the requirement, he would reject it?—I am not aware of that regulation.

23012. It is natural to suppose that he must have some standard; he does not exercise simply his discretion?—I believe that the distiller pays duty upon the degrees under or over proof; the manufacturer has to pay upon the degrees under or over proof, but he can sell it of any quality that he chooses, I believe; there is no standard of sale so far as my experience goes.

23013. He may produce liquor at various degrees over proof, and the Inspector would pass that, charging duty simply upon the degrees of proof; is that what you understand?—That is what I understand.

JOHN BAKER EDWARDS.

23014. Then you cannot tell us, Dr. Edwards, I gather from your answers, how much alcohol there would be in Canadian whisky of the ordinary kind?—No, I believe that a standard has not been fixed, and that is the effect of Mr. Macfarlane's report. I refer you to Mr. Macfarlane's report for that matter.

23015. We had a gentleman of the medical profession before the Commission in Halifax. He gave evidence on the subject of rectified and unrectified spirits, and I think he expressed the opinion that there was not much difference between the two. What is your opinion of unrectified spirits; do you think they are more injurious than rectified spirits?—Certainly: I should consider unrectified spirits as perfectly noxious and injurious to health. Not only so, but rectified spirits require considerable time to get rid of their noxious qualities before they are fit for consumption. I am fortified in that by the British Pharmacopœia, which prescribes that in the case of brandy, it must be kept at least four years in store before it is fit for human use. That is the only prohibition as to quality and the quantity of alcohol it contains, but it must be stored for a time to get rid of its obnoxious ingredients, which would be injurious to health.

23016. Do you hold the same views with regard to the storing of brandy, that you hold with regard to the storing of whisky, namely, that it should be put into wood?—Yes, before it is bottled. It gives it the opportunity of getting rid of these substances, which are absorbed by the wooden cask as a filter.

23017. Have you paid any attention to the working of the liquor laws of this city?—I have been consulted specially with regard to the liquor sold in public parks, both by the Inland Revenue Department and by the City Council.

23018. With what object?—With the object of ascertaining the percentage of alcohol in those liquors, and whether they were prejudicial to health.

23019. And are you prepared to state the conclusions you have come to on that question?—I think that it would be favourable to the public health to supply weak liquor, not exceeding, say, five per cent of alcohol on these public places. There is a great deal of exercise taken in these places, and they would be less injurious in these places than in saloons, or if the people drank in the city.

23020. Do you think that the present liquor laws are well enforced in the city?—I have no experience of that.

23021. Do you consider the present laws in relation to the sale of liquor sufficient to satisfactorily regulate the traffic?—As regards the provincial law, the Provincial Government insists that no liquor containing any intoxicating principle shall be sold without a special license, so that whether such liquors contain one and a half per cent, or two per cent of alcohol it does matter. If even one per cent of alcohol is present, they cannot be sold on Sundays, or without a license.

23022. The present law, of course, provides for the selling of intoxicating drinks, for the prohibition of the sale at certain hours and on Sundays. Do you think these laws are fairly well enforced in the city of Montreal?—As a citizen, I consider that they are.

23023. Are they sufficient for satisfactorily regulating the liquor traffic?—No, I think they are insufficient.

23024. In what respect?—That prosecutions have been issued against certain parties, and they have never lost their licenses when found guilty. I think that where parties have transgressed the law in this particular, a fine is not a sufficient penalty, but they should be deprived of the license after a second offence. Of course that is only my private view as a citizen.

23025. Do you consider it an advantage to reduce the number of licenses issued in the city?—I do.

23026. What class of licensed places do you think it would be best to reduce in number?—Those places which are called saloons, and in which only liquor is sold.

23027. There ought to be no such places in the city if the law was strictly observed. I believe the present law states that in every place where liquor is sold the licensee must supply meals. You do not think that is strictly observed in the city?—I believe not, but I cannot answer from my own experience.

23028. You think the saloons should be reduced in number?—Yes, and also that the licenses should be taken away from groceries.



23029. Would you take the licenses away altogether from grocery establishments?—Well, either so, or else I would put such a high license upon them that only those which did a large business could afford to pay such a license.

23030. Have you any reason to suppose from your observations that these places, which are only licensed to sell liquor to be taken away, sell and allow it to be drunk on the premises?—I have no personal knowledge of that.

23031. Have you had any experience of a district where a prohibitory law was in force; either what is known as local option, or the Scott Act or Dunkin Act?—Yes, I visited Portland in Maine several years ago.

23032. There is a prohibitory law there?—Yes.

23033. Will you tell us something about what you observed there?—I think there was a better state of conduct in the streets than there is in most places of its size. I would particularly mention that I was in Pembroke, in Ontario, during a trial. I was there for about a week, during which there was a large accession of population on account of the exciting nature of the case. There were a great many witnesses, and there was a great deal of disorder through consumption of liquor. I had occasion to go again to the same place when the Scott Act was in force, several months afterwards, and I then found a very different condition, both in the streets and in the hotels; I found that there was much more order, and much less noise at night. It was much quieter in the hotel, and in that respect I think the adoption of the Scott Act was to the advantage of the place.

23034. You think there was greater order?—Yes, better order in the streets, and those idle people, the witnesses who were not engaged, had not an opportunity of indulging in drinking just as a pastime.

23035. There was less drunkenness?—Yes, and less noise.

23036. You speak of Pembroke, Ontario?—Yes, when it was under the Scott Act.

23037. What year was that?—I am not quite sure, 1886 or 1887.

23038. Did you notice any evidence of liquor being sold there during the time you were in the town?—No. I made some inquiries of the druggists, and I found they were exceedingly strict, and that there was no possibility of their selling without a medical certificate. I only inquired from these stores as a matter of curiosity, but the change in the comfort of the hotel was very marked indeed.

23039. Have you at all considered the desirability of the total prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of alcohol, except for medicinal and mechanical purposes?—I have given general attention to the subject.

23040. May I ask you if you think that such an enactment by the Dominion Parliament is desirable?—It would be desirable, if practicable.

23041. Is it your opinion that it is not practicable?—It is.

23042. Have you any special reasons for coming to that conclusion, or is it a mere opinion?—From my observation of public opinion, public opinion is not ripe for such a change. The first step, I think, in that direction would be woman suffrage; then the ladies would have a voice in Parliament, and then I believe we should have public opinion on the question, but at present we are not ripe for it.

23043. You think that public opinion is not sufficiently educated up to that point of prohibiting the manufacture and importation of all liquors?—I believe it is not, and at present our constitution is that we must be governed by the majority.

23044. And do you think if sixty per cent of the population of the Dominion should vote for a prohibitory law, it would be perfectly right to enforce it on the forty per cent who object?—You might have a consenting minority.

23045. When they are willing to submit to a vote on the subject?—Yes.

23046. The result of not having a consenting minority would be what, in your opinion?—Anarchy, I am afraid. General rebellion against it. Vested interests are so large that there would be enough to cause an outbreak, I am afraid, if such a majority were to attempt to rule.

23047. What, in your opinion, would be the effect upon the public morals of having a law upon the statute-book which was not observed?—Educationally it would be of advantage, and I think that the first step towards the instruction of the people in the

JOHN BAKER EDWARDS.

principles of temperance must begin in schools. It is the most important step we can take, and it should be made a matter of education, so that another generation would be able to do what we would not be able to do in this generation.

23048. I think, perhaps, you have not quite apprehended the question. Suppose we had a prohibitory law enacted immediately, you think public opinion is not sufficiently advanced to enforce it. If by force of circumstances such a law should be passed by the Dominion Parliament, it would follow that it would not be observed. What effect would it have upon the morals of the community, if such a law were upon the statute-book and not observed?—I do not think it would have an injurious effect; it would be a protest in favour of morality. I could see no objection to passing such a law, even were it a dead letter, provided the majority consented.

23049. But if the police proceeded to ignore the law, would that be an advantage?—I think it would still be an advantage to have the expression of opinion of the majority: I am still assuming a majority of 60 per cent.

23050. You look upon the illicit sale of liquors, and smuggling, and offences of that kind as immoral?—Yes.

23051. And hurtful to the public morals?—Yes, but not more so than the immorality caused by drink, which might, to a certain extent, be debarred by these statutory regulations.

23052. But illicit selling and smuggling encourage the sale of drink. If you had a prohibitory law, which was not observed, and parties went on to sell and distribute liquor, you would have them breaking the law and distributing a dangerous commodity. Would that not be the case, following up your argument?—It would, but they would be more liable to conviction, and they would know they were doing wrong: at present they do not know they are doing wrong, they are not aware of the moral evil which they are doing.

23053. Of what class are you speaking?—Of those who sell legally.

23054. The illicit vendor is breaking the law, and distributing also what you look upon, judging from the nature of the replies you have made, as a hurtful article. The smuggler is aiding in the same work; they are both breaking the law, and they are both distributing the intoxicating beverages. Now, if we had a prohibitory law, and parties proceeded to manufacture, and import, and sell contrary to the law, they would still be distributing the offensive and dangerous article, and at the same time breaking the law?—Yes, but limited to the extent which the State might take special pains to prohibit.

23055. Are you quite convinced of that; have you thought it out whether really it would be to a smaller extent. The illicit sale now is very considerable, the smuggling is very considerable, the illicit selling and smuggling under a prohibitory law would still be very considerable, probably more so than now. Would there not also be a large acquisition to those who desired to get drink in some shape or other, and who would encourage illicit selling? People who want drink now can get it at licensed places, afterwards they would have to get it at unlicensed places. Do you think that the unlicensed places and the illicit sale would be likely thereby to be decreased?—I think that the amount of the sale would be decreased, but the amount of the criminality would be increased. The amount of the sale would be very much diminished, and people would be afraid to incur the criminality.

23056. You think the criminality would be increased?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

23057. Do you consider that it is wrong for a man to take intoxicating liquor to any extent whatever?—No, I do not.

23058. You think that the moderate use of intoxicating liquor is not wrong: do you think, therefore, the taking of liquor in itself is not a sin *per se*?—No.

23059. You have stated that, in your opinion, the passage at the present time of a prohibitory enactment would produce anarchy in the community?—Yes.

23060. Do you think that the production of anarchy in the community, or a law which could produce it, could be a good educator to the community?—Not at all, I am speaking of the fear which I would entertain that in that case there would be a rebellious feeling on the part of the lower class.

23061. It struck me that there was a conflict, perhaps unintentional, in your answers to the Chairman's questions, in this way: You said that you think such a law, if passed at the present time, would probably produce anarchy, and that evil results would flow from such a state of things. Do you think that would be injurious to the morality of the community?—It is beyond my ability to say. Of course a rebellion against certain things would be a blessing—a rebellion against alcohol would result well.

23062. Do you consider that any law which is openly and flagrantly violated is a good educator?—I am afraid we shall get into a theological argument.

23063. If you say yes or no, I will take your answer, whichever it is?—The decalogue is not always obeyed, but it is right nevertheless.

23064. Well, Dr. Edwards, to come back to the special matter in regard to which you were called, the question of the inspection of liquors: I understand you to say that liquors which have been given to you to test have, as a general rule, been comparatively pure, and the adulterations of a harmless character?—Yes, that is my experience.

23065. Do I understand you to say that the number of samples submitted to you form only a small portion of the total quantity sold?—A very small proportion.

23066. How many samples would you say in Montreaal?—There were twelve in this city sent to me, and proportionately about twice that number during twelve months: I am speaking of samples alone.

23067. Were these liquors in the original bottles?—Some of them were and some of them were not: some of them were filled evidently in old bottles bearing other labels and were relabelled for the purpose.

23068. Are the manufacturers' labels carefully washed away from the bottles or removed before brought to you, I mean the labels which show from what distillery they come?—Not in all cases: they are partially covered in some cases, in others they betray the manufacturer's name, but not the name of the vendor.

23069. In any of these cases in which they betray the manufacturer's name, was that the name of a manufacturer in what you would call good repute?—Yes, and several samples belonged to the same manufacturer in different districts.

23070. Do I understand that in obtaining liquors from places, there would be a risk that the officers would get a sample which is pure, while there might be other liquors which were not pure?—Yes.

23071. Does the same officer supply you all the time?—Yes.

23072. Do you know whether that officer visits these places to purchase?—He does.

23073. Might there not be a certain risk of the dealer being acquainted with him personally and knowing him when he came in to purchase?—Yes.

23074. While we are on that point, and having had much experience, could you suggest any improvement in the mode of getting these liquors to be tested? I would suggest that where the place of a man is visited in that way, samples of nearly all the liquors he has on the premises should be taken. I do not mean two or three samples of gin or whisky, but that samples should be taken of all that he has, and that there should be a general analysis of what he is selling to the public. I think it is not sufficient to ask for brandy or whisky or any particular liquor and to take only one or two samples. The custom of the country is to use mixed drinks such as gin cocktails and mixtures, and it is in these mixtures that adulterated substances are contained; and these are the substances which disagree with the stomach and probably produce worse results than intoxication, as they upset the condition of the man and increase the effects of the intoxicants. These mixtures are not given for analysis, because they are not intoxicating in themselves; therefore, we do not get a thorough overhauling of every article offered for sale. I think it would be an improvement to have a general examination.

23075. Do you think there might be a more general inspection as to places in different parts of the district?—I think the amount of analysis ought to be at least ten times more than it is at present, and probably it ought to be in the hands of an analyst who would give his whole time to the business, because it would occupy the whole time of a person to investigate thoroughly the quality of liquors sold in Montreal alone.

23076. Therefore, as a specialist and as a citizen, you think that a rigid inspection as to the quality of the liquor should be obtained?—I think it would be very desirable.

JOHN BAKER EDWARDS.

23077. We have a very large volume of testimony taken in different places, as well as in this city, as to the effects upon the people who drink the compounds that are bought in some places. The effects are such as are not generally produced from the mere taking of alcohol, and instead of drunkenness it is craziness that comes on the people who use these compounds. That testimony was given here and in other places, and it seems to be very widespread. What do you think would cause that difference: while alcohol produces drunkenness, these other mixtures produce craziness, and sometimes stupidity?—I cannot explain that by the nature of the liquor sold; I believe that alcohol is a cumulative poison, and that entering the system, it gradually acts upon the different nerves of the body. If the habitual drunkard takes even pure liquor, he time and time again will get into a condition in which his nerves and brain become affected and sodden, for alcohol after all is a true poison.

23078. How do you explain the different effects on different persons: if some take a small quantity of liquor it maddens them, and the effect is more like lunacy than anything else?—Many things have to be taken into account to explain that effect, perhaps want of food or condition of the atmosphere. Some people will indulge in these liquors on an extremely sultry or hot day, under conditions in which they are liable to get sunstruck.

23079. May adulterated liquor with poisonous compounds produce such an effect?—Undoubtedly; that is to say, we know some substances that will produce that kind of effect, but we have not found those substances in the liquor supposed to be adulterated.

23080. You have said that most of the tampering with spirits is by adding water. Suppose that a man having adulterated liquor with water, and wishing at the same time for something that will be fiery enough to please his customer's taste, put tobacco into the cask from which he draws his whisky, what would be the effect on the consumer?—Well, the man who drank it would not require a second glass of it; he would probably go into a state of delirium and he would not be a very good customer. There would be no object in a man destroying the custom which he has invited, by doing a thing like that.

23081. Suppose a dealer added what is called "bluestone"—I think it is the same as blue vitriol, bluestone being the common name of the country—what would be the effect?—It would most probably produce vomiting very shortly and gastric pains.

23082. Would it cause a burning sensation in the throat?—Yes.

23083. And a fiery feeling in the stomach?—Yes, and most probably the stomach would eject it.

23084. Suppose a person added logwood chips to what is called "port wine," what would be the effect?—It would be an astringent, causing stoppage of the bowels; but I do not think it would have any physical effect.

23085. It would be astringent on the throat?—It would likely be.

23086. I think you made the remark, and it struck me in passing, that you have found, so far as wine is concerned, that the heavier kinds are mostly tampered with by syrups being added?—Yes, imitations of port and sherry.

23087. Have you analysed much port wine?—Very little.

23088. Have you any reason to suppose that any port or sherry which you have analysed has been thoroughly genuine?—There would be a difficulty in establishing the genuineness of any wine; all these were manufactured and manipulated very much.

23089. Taking the general question, and passing again from your position as a specialist to that of a citizen, or in both relations, what would you think, supposing that prohibition could not be carried or enforced at the present time, of trying to stop the sale of the heavier liquors and seeking to confine the people to the use of light wines and ales?—Well, I think that could only be done by raising the duties or licenses upon these heavier liquors.

23090. Do you think it would be an advantage to the people?—I think it would be very desirable. I think that liquors in this country are too cheap; they are cheaper than they are in the old country or in the States. The habit in these saloons and bars of giving a man a decanter to help himself is conducive to immoderate drinking. In England a drink is limited to a certain quantity. Here some people are well known to

help themselves very liberally out of bottles. I repeat that liquor is too cheap here, and that the raising of the licenses would have the effect of causing the publican to look after his liquor, it would be an advantage in the way of sobriety.

23091. It has been stated that under high license the result would be that men would sell poorer classes of liquor to make up for the increased expenditure?—So far as my experience goes, they would make up for it by diluting with water, and that is no harm to the consumer.

23092. Speaking of other drinks that you have analysed, Weiss beer and beers of that kind, what do you think generally is their effect upon the people, healthful or the contrary?—I think there is no objection to Weiss beer, or to any malt or hop beer which does not exceed five per cent of alcohol; but when it comes to six or seven per cent, it is to be dealt with as an intoxicating drink.

23093. Have you ever tested peppermint and those drinks sold as temperance drinks?—Yes; no doubt they contain a small percentage of alcohol. Even in ordinary ginger ale there must be a small percentage of alcohol to keep it, less than one per cent though, but that is in order to make transparent the amount of essential oil and flavouring which it contains. It amounts, however, to so small a proportion in the whole quantity consumed, that it is hardly worth speaking about; for instance, people do not take more than one bottle of ginger ale at a time, and there is a limit to the quantity they drink.

23094. Speaking of lager, is there anything hurtful in it? It has been stated that there is resin in it?—That would only act as a refining agency.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

23095. Do I understand that the adulterations are largely a cheapening process?—That is so.

23096. You have not yet discovered serious and deleterious substances in these liquors?—In some cases I find such substances as capsicum and cayenne pepper, but such a small quantity that it would only occasion a desire for liquor; I have also found salt in beer, but to so small an extent that it is difficult to say if it is injurious to health.

23097. We had it in evidence in Halifax from the Medical Superintendent of the insane asylum that nothing used in adulteration was, in his belief, worse than spirit itself. Do you agree, in the main, with that opinion; I think you have said that all alcohol is a real poison?—Yes, alcohol with its accompaniments. At the same time I must say, with regard to the liquors which I have ordinarily examined, that alcohol is the main poisonous substance which is present, but still it is often charged that liquors have been drugged, and they have been drugged with such substances as opium, cannabis indica and others which would produce rapid coma. These have been given for the purpose of robbery; that is within my police experience and not within my experience as public analyst.

23098. Your police experience in Montreal?—No, in Liverpool. I had twelve years' experience there in connection with the courts of law, before I came to this country; and there I examined liquors which contained these adulterants, about which so much has been said in the press and other publications. That is not my experience in this country. These substances were found in liquors in houses of prostitution or in low liquor shops.

23099. Are these more injurious than alcohol?—These are poisonous, independent of the alcohol altogether, and they are still more injurious.

23099a. They were introduced into the liquor for that purpose?—Yes, to produce rapid insensibility.

*By the Chairman:*

23100. Not death necessarily?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

23101. They were supposed to reduce the users to such a condition that they could be robbed?—Yes.

JOHN BAKER EDWARDS.

23102. That was purely a police experience. Were you acting for the police force in an attempt to bring to book those dangerous characters?—Yes.

23103. Have you found any such adulterations in your experience in Montreal?—I have not.

23104. What is the effect of the continuous use as beverages of alcoholic liquors: I mean not the excessive use, but the continuous use in moderation?—It produces different effects, in different individuals. It may cause degeneration of the heart, and sometimes of the liver, and all the organs are involved in a state of debility and deficiency as regards the assimilation of food. Eventually upon the accumulation of alcohol in the system, it acts specially on the brain.

23105. You have spoken of what are called five per cent drinks as less injurious. Do we understand that they are both injurious, but that these are so in a less degree?—I do not think the injurious effect of alcoholic liquor is ever measured in degree by the percentage of alcohol. There are effects due to the ingredients in the drink, whether malt or substances connected with malt; and in the case of wines, there are also different effects upon the system. No general rule can be laid down as to what effect a particular intoxicating liquor will have in relation to its quantity of alcohol; some will be more poisonous, though less alcoholic than others. The question is the ability of the system to throw off the whole of this alcohol by the eliminating organs, by the kidneys, or by the glands of the skin. If there is a deficiency in the eliminating organs or if these get paralyzed or choked in any way from any cause, then the effects of alcohol become more marked, and the alcohol is in proportion a greater poison.

23106. Do you regard these liquors in any case as a food?—No, I do not. I formerly did so, but I have given that up: I think they may be just as well done without altogether.

23107. I presume there are cases of old persons in feeble condition and persons seriously sick with certain troubles in which wines may be used with advantage?—They are excellent medicinally, but are to be used as medicines and not as beverages.

23108. You have abandoned the theory that they are in any case food?—They are not necessary food.

23109. Have you observed that the use of wines or five per cent beer encourages or tends to the use of stronger liquors?—I think malt liquors of a low grade do not give a taste for strong liquors.

23110. I understood you to say that the standard beers contain from six to seven per cent of alcohol?—Yes.

23111. Do you think that is a percentage which might create a tendency to the use of stronger liquors? I think that the other ingredients of the malt beer tend to increase the eliminating powers, and that there is not any such accumulation of alcohol as there would be in the case of wine or spirits.

23112. In answer to a question concerning prohibition, I understood you to say that there would be an increase of illicit sales, and that the amount of criminality would be increased. Did you mean to say the increase in criminality would be in the increase of illicit sales?—The amount of criminality in the individual who seeks it, in the persons who sell and the persons who indulge. Each knows he is transgressing the law. Now he knows he is acting legally, and therefore there would be an increase in criminality.

23113. Do you think there would be an increase of crimes from the drink trade if the drink trade were made illicit?—No, I do not.

23114. Which do you think would be more demoralizing, the illicit sale under prohibition or the legalization of the trade?—I am not prepared to say.

23115. Do you believe that law generally is an educator?—I do not know enough about it, fortunately, to be able to say. Everybody is supposed to know the law, but I must say that I do not.

23116. You said a prohibitory law, although it were a dead letter, would have a good effect, and I understood you to say that the law would have an educating effect?—That was a suggestion.

23117. Do you think that a law against an evil creates and strengthens public opinion against that evil?—Yes.

23118. Do you believe that a prohibitory law, if it were practicable, if public sentiment demanded it and it were thoroughly enforced, or fairly well enforced, as other laws are, would have a beneficial effect?—Have we not that now—option to adopt prohibition.

23119. Do you believe the effects are beneficial where prohibition under local option or any other form is fairly well enforced?—As far as I have observed, they are so.

23120. How long elapsed between your two visits to Pembroke?—I think six months. I visited Pembroke four times, twice during the prohibition period, and it was my experience on both occasions that there was a manifest improvement.

23121. Do you think a general prohibitory law, if it could be enforced, is desirable in the interests of the country?—I think I said it would be desirable, but impracticable.

23122. Did you state the people needed to be educated up to it?—Yes.

23123. And if education touching the effects of alcohol were given in the schools, the next generation would be able to do what this generation is unable to do?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

23124. Your first visit to Pembroke which, I think, is in the County of Renfrew, was made when?—I think in 1885.

23125. And the Scott Act was not then in force in the county?—On my first visit it was not in force, and I then observed the evil effects of alcohol being distributed among the jurors and the witnesses.

23126. Your second visit was made when?—It would be in the spring of 1885, and the third was in September of the same year.

23127. Do you know if the Scott Act is now in force in that county?—I do not know.

23128. The Act was voted on in Renfrew in 1884, and carried by 730, and in 1888 it was defeated by 910. Would you take that as evidence that the people of Renfrew, after some experience of the Act, were not in favour of it?—Yes, I imagine so. That is the feeling of the whole county. I cannot say what opinion the people of Pembroke town might hold.

HON. MATHIAS CHARLES DESNOYERS, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

23129. What is your official title?—I have been Police Magistrate since 1876, and Judge of Sessions and License Commissioner since 1878.

23130. Taking your position as Police Magistrate, in the first place : do you try cases summarily?—Yes.

23131. Of what nature?—Light offences generally, assaults, also thefts to the extent of \$10, with the consent of the accused party.

23132. And offences against the License Act?—Yes, specifically, because the law mentions the Police Magistrate and Judge of Sessions as well.

23133. Besides the summary jurisdiction, you also act as the examining Magistrate in cases sent for trial to the Assizes?—Exactly.

23134. That is, the cases of persons who elect to be tried by a jury?—As Police Magistrates we make the preliminary inquiries, and then the accused are examined and sent to the Queen's Bench for trial ; but on the way they are brought before the Judge of Sessions, sometimes before the same officer, by the Sheriff, and then the option is given them. That is the rule in the majority of criminal cases.

*By the Chairman :*

23135. You said the accused are examined?—Yes ; I mean the defendant. It is called the examination of the accused. The statement is read to him, and he is put on his guard.

JOHN BAKER EDWARDS.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23136. In the Court of General Sessions of the Peace those criminals who come within the jurisdiction and elect to be tried by a Judge, are tried by him without a jury?—That is at the Special Sessions. General Sessions have been abolished in Quebec for some years.

23137. Is it found that by far the larger portion of people elect to be tried by the Judge without a jury?—Yes, the majority.

23138. Is there any division of work between you and Judge Dugas other than as you arrange?—No. The jurisdiction is the same, and we take a month in turn. One will take Chambers, the initiation of cases, and inquiries, and the other will take the summary trials.

23139. Are the provincial police under your charge?—Only as License Commissioners.

23140. Are their duties confined to license cases?—The License Police here are confined to a very small number.

23141. Do the municipal police also take cognizance of these cases?—Yes; they take cases and bring them before the Recorder's Court.

23142. We were told by Chief Hughes that there are 12 men detailed in plain clothes for this purpose?—I do not know the number.

23143. What are your duties as License Commissioners?—To receive applications, inquire into the conduct of the applicants, see that they are provided with the necessary appliances as to their houses, and that they have a sufficient number of qualified voters on their lists and so forth.

23144. And if those requisites of the law are complied with?—Then, as a general rule, they get their licenses unless they are well known to be bad sheep.

23145. Have you complete jurisdiction to refuse?—Yes; the law gives us full power.

23146. Are there cases in which you have no discretion?—Yes. There is a recent provision in the statute that when the majority of the electors within a certain area declare their opposition to the granting of a license to the applicant, we have no discretion.

23147. What is the proportion?—It is a half—that is, a majority,

23148. Of the residents, or of those who are on the voters' list?—They must be residents or must have their places of business there. That is the amendment of a few years ago. The Legislature has been changing the law so often that we cannot keep track of it by memory.

23149. In the first place 25 persons have to sign the requisition?—Yes.

23150. Has that requisition to be made from year to year for the same person?—It has to be repeated every year.

23151. And the opposition must be repeated also?—Every time. Every application is considered as entirely distinct.

23152. Speaking in all your capacities, do you think there are too many licenses issued in the city of Montreal?—A great deal too many; more than twice too many.

23153. Do you think it would be well if there were a legislative enactment limiting the number?—That is my belief. I know I differ with some gentlemen on that, but I think there should be a limit fixed. The Federal Act of 1883, which was superseded by the Privy Council, had some very good provisions in regard to licenses, and under it there was a limit fixed according to population.

*By the Chairman :*

23154. That is what is known as the McCarthy Act?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23155. You believe that should be the line taken?—I believe it, for this reason: Of course, some people believe every one should have the same right to sell liquor by the glass; but I cannot admit that, because I think it would be better if there was some limit, so that we could weed out those we know are not good ones. Now it is almost impossible to do that. People have given reasons and have had good supporters, and in fact everything has been done in order sometimes almost to wrench these licenses out of our hands.



23156. Sometimes you have pleas put forward that wife and children will be put on the street?—Yes; but wife and children and the aldermen and the local member and the federal member make those pleas, and God knows where the thing ends.

23157. And all these have a certain amount of strength?—Yes. We are human, and it is impossible to resist. This day I have been detained with two cases, where I have been pressed not to cancel two licenses which I am in duty bound to cancel if they come before me. These are people who have been warned and warned again, one of them particularly. He has been told: You have taken that particular corner of the street, where the young people have a habit of going Sunday after Sunday to drink; you must stop that, or your license will be cancelled. He took an oath that he would stop it, but he went on selling. When they are brought up before us, then the influences to which I refer are used.

23158. Do you often find in the exercise of your discretion as a Judge of the criminal court, appeals of the same kind are made to you for mercy on account of the families and so on?—No doubt.

23159. Do you not have to consider the question of mercy to the community?—Yes; but there is this difference: One man has been guilty of a crime against the community and he is punished, whereas liquor dealers come as heads of families who require to support their wives and families and pay their creditors, and they say they are going to be good and turn over a new leaf.

23160. I am not putting this as if the two cases were the same?—I do not mean to say that I yielded in those cases, but that I had the pressure brought.

23161. Have you also to consider the question of mercy to those young people who are injured?—No doubt I have.

23162. You wish that the Legislature would so enact the law that there could be no chance of making those appeals to you?—Certainly, so that when the number was completed, I would be able to tell an applicant: I am very sorry, but there is no room for you.

23163. Would you wish the Legislature to take similar action in regard to making it compulsory to cancel licenses and not to leave it discretionary?—I would certainly prefer to close the door on all these weak points.

23164. So that the officer would be simply the channel for the administration of the law?—I believe that discretionary power given to Magistrates is a great evil, and it is almost impracticable to exercise it. I once heard a gentleman make this argument: How is it possible for three men of lower position than many other men here to stop the torrent of the whole will of the people, when every one of influence and standing comes to them and presses them to yield. I spoke a moment ago of the federal law, the McCarthy Act, which I think had very good provisions. There was something very remarkable when we put that law into operation. I was President of the License Commissioners under that law. As the result of the applications made, it turned out that there was only one place in the Dominion that did not provide as many licensed places as the population entitled it to issue, and that place was Montreal. According to the population, we had power to grant 276 licenses, and we had 750 applications.

23165. Do you find that the law is well observed in regard to sale to minors?—I should say pretty fairly. A very limited number of cases of that kind come before us.

23166. The Sunday cases generally go to the Recorder's Court?—No, mostly to our court, because the Inspector of Inland Revenue prosecutes in these cases, while the Recorder takes the city police cases.

23167. Are there many Sunday cases?—Yes, a great deal too many.

23168. We have heard that the Magistrates are trying to inflict severe penalties on the people who violate the law on Sundays?—We have tried that.

23169. How do you find it succeed?—To-day's experience is in point. A woman who has been warned that she would have her license annulled was before us, and I suspended judgment for some time. Still she is now before the Court for selling on Sunday.

23170. Do you believe there is much illicit sale in the city?—I believe there is.

23171. Do you believe the officers try to put it down?—As to the officers of the Inland Revenue, that is, the provincial police, I have every reason to believe they do, but as to the city police, I do not know.

HON. M. C. DESNOYERS.

23172. What do you think of allowing the sale of liquor in groceries?—I believe it should not be allowed. That was one of the good points in the federal law, the separation of the sale of provisions from liquor. There is a great opportunity for a man who goes for his provisions on Saturday to buy a bottle of liquor at the same time.

23173. It is said women buy in that way?—I believe that is true.

23174. What is your opinion in regard to having a more rigid inspection of the liquor sale than at present?—That is one of the points to which I would call the attention of the Commission. That inspection should be better organized than now.

23175. The Analyst said samples were brought to him but few and far between?—I do not think there is much of that done. The inspection should be much more thorough, and people selling adulterated stuff should have the stuff confiscated, and there should be a staff to look after the business regularly.

23176. In the case of restaurant licensees selling meals and liquor, do you find that they do not comply with the law as to providing meals?—The word restaurant is simply a blind in regard to the great majority of those places. It is simply that they desire to have authority to sell liquor by the glass. The liquor is the only thing that pays them. They sell liquor for five cents a glass, and make three cents profit. A meal only costs twenty-five cents and gives a great deal of trouble. Every one wants to keep a restaurant, and when he begins, he is sure to make it a real restaurant; but the moment he gets his license that rule is not observed, that good disposition disappears. Very often we have seen places organized for restaurants with dining rooms and tables, and immediately after a license was granted, the dining room was turned into a room with a billiard table. Once I visited a restaurant and found you could not get a meal, and they said they were not in the habit of giving meals.

23177. Having to make choice between hotel and restaurant, if one of them were to be abolished, which should be abolished?—By all means the restaurant. The hotels are doing a legitimate business. Restaurants are also legitimate when people can obtain meals, but that is only at a limited number.

23178. So even with the restaurant carried on according to law and with the hotel carried on according to law, the restaurant would be the best to go?—Yes; though I would not wipe them out entirely.

23179. Take the restaurant where liquor alone is sold, and the hotel: which had better go? In some of the provinces a saloon license would mean simply a license to sell liquor. Granted that, and taking the ordinary hotels for travellers, with the bar and all: if either of those had to go, which would it be better to dispense with?—I would say the restaurant, because if a man wants a glass during working hours, the hotel would serve the two purposes.

23180. Have you considered the question of prohibition?—I have thought of it.

23181. We would be very glad if, in your own words, you would give the Commission your views as to the practicability of prohibition?—I do not believe in absolute prohibition. I believe that alcoholic liquors even have been given to us to make use of, and we must use them, of course, with good judgment; but I believe that the sale of them and the keeping of them ought to be regulated. The strongest reason I entertain against prohibition is that I sincerely believe you cannot carry out such a law. That is my belief, after my experience of trying to carry out our law. I have not seen much of prohibition countries, but I have been in Portland often, and at Old Orchard, and I found we could get liquor easily enough there. My belief is that you could not carry out the law, and if you have a law which you cannot carry out, it is simply demoralizing.

23182. What is the effect upon the people of having a law upon the statute-book which is openly and flagrantly violated?—I think it is utterly demoralizing, because it has the effect of accustoming the public to disdain the law. If one law on the statute-book is treated in that way, why not the others? It demoralizes the people in regard to other laws. If you have prohibition as a law, of course the sale of liquor must be carried on in a secret manner. If it is made in a concealed manner, there is no more inspection or regulation of it. That is why I am in favour of the inspection of liquors. Have the liquors there for sale, but be sure you have the right article and not adulterated stuff, which is simply poisonous.

23183. Would you favour a trial of this system, the discouragement of the use of spirituous and heavy liquors and the greater encouragement of the use of light wines and ales?—That is exactly what I believe in. I think the strong alcoholic liquor should be put aside in a safe with a strong key, and that you should lose the key, if you can. Keep it away from the people's reach, but give to them good light wines, Canadian wines. I think we have some Canadian wines, which could be put on any table, and good beer certainly would be better than to allow the people to drink adulterated stuff and poison themselves.

23184. Have you travelled in France?—Yes, but not much.

23185. Have you found that light wines are used much there?—Wine and beer.

23186. We are told that the use of alcoholic liquors has increased in France, and that it is because the phylloxera has destroyed the vines?—I have seen the statement, but I do not know.

23187. Do you find a large proportion of the criminal cases which come before you are directly or indirectly traceable to the use of intoxicating drinks?—Yes, a large majority, three-quarters of the cases.

23188. Persons under the influence of liquor often commit assaults?—Yes, and husbands neglect their wives; and that is coming to be a terrible thing with us. We have ten or twelve women a day coming before us complaining of their husbands.

23189. I see there are some cases before the Queen's Bench?—Yes, but the Judges of the Superior Courts do not encourage these cases. They do not regard that as a crime, but the women go to the Magistrates and tell all their troubles.

23190. And drink is at the bottom of it?—Yes, in three-fourths of the cases.

23191. With your large experience as a Magistrate and as Judge and as License Commissioner, with a knowledge of all these evils, such for example, as that three-fourths of these cases arise from the use of liquor, do you believe that prohibition would remedy those defects?—I do not believe it, for the reasons I have mentioned. If prohibition could be carried out, it might; but I do not believe it could be.

23192. You look upon it as impracticable?—Yes.

23193. Have you found in this community a growth of temperance sentiment, that the influence of religion and morals and temperance societies have had anything to do with it?—That growth is going on through the influences of the churches.

23194. There is a growth of sentiment of that kind?—Yes.

23195. You do not think prohibition would be a remedy for those evils, owing to its impracticability? Do you believe these efforts, religious and moral and the influence of temperance societies and the strict regulation of the traffic itself, would be the best means of remedying, and, if possible, removing the evils of which you have spoken?—I believe they would have that tendency.

23196. Is there any other remedy to which you can look?—I do not know of any. Of course, persuasion is one great element. The second means is by keeping alcoholic liquors beyond the reach of the masses, if you can do it, by perhaps having heavier license fees for strong alcoholic liquors. I think it is a necessary evil. People will drink—you cannot prevent them. If they were to drink beer and wine, they would not be liable to destroy their health.

23197. We have evidence as to parks and pleasure grounds in Montreal, one in particular, Sohmer Park. What do you think of the effects of these on the community?—I really think the effect is rather moralizing than otherwise, because I think people going there, and I have been there often myself, go there sober. They go for very innocent amusements, music and nonsense, which is very innocent, and they go home sober; whereas, I believe, large numbers of those who go there would go to taverns and spend their time in them, but for the existence of that place.

23198. Do you believe that in endeavouring to give effect to that natural desire which all good citizens should have for the reformation of the people as a whole, they must always take into account the wishes, habits and tendencies of those people?—To a certain extent they must; they cannot block the way entirely.

23199. And though this method may not suit you or others, yet you believe there is a large proportion of the population it does suit?—I do sincerely. Thousands of people

go there, and are satisfied to go and hear some music. They spend their evenings there and go home about ten o'clock, whereas if they did not go there, they would go to some other places.

*By the Chairman :*

23200. Some worse places?—By all means worse places. I would make one suggestion. We ought to have inebriate asylums, where the poor people could be sent. We have a good asylum, but it is a place where one has to pay \$200 or \$300 a year. We have many cases where people cannot reform themselves. Drinking becomes a disease with them, and if we had some place to send them, they might be cured. A man is brought before me as a habitual drunkard. I consider him a vagrant and can send him to jail, but that is a very poor remedy. If there were a place where I could send him, it would be better. I think an inebriate asylum, supported by the State, as necessary as a jail.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23201. Are not many people brought before you for drunkenness who come again and again?—Yes.

23202. That is to say, the apparent number of convictions does not represent the actual number of people?—No doubt.

23203. And you would have these people sent to this institution and kept there?—Yes. A man who is a real drunkard was brought before me to-day for not supporting his wife and family. He had a bottle of beer when the constable went to bring him, and he said, "I swear this is the last I will have;" but he drank it down, and he was trembling when he was brought before me. I shall send him to jail, but if there were a place of another kind to which I could send him it would be better. That is an idea I have had for many years, and such an institution is very necessary.

*By the Chairman :*

23204. Would you send people who came before you for the second offence?—No; here we generally do not make charges for a second offence. Under the license law there has been an amendment, of late years, and under that we treat some violations of the license law as *récidivistes*.

23205. Would you desire to have a definite provision so that the Magistrate must inflict the punishment?—It might be better, but we are very careful to get the records of the parties from the jails as much as we can, and dispose of our cases according to that record. We give a heavy judgment if the party has been a *récidiviste*.

23206. But if this was made necessary?—It would require a record to be kept of every case.

23207. Would it not have a good effect upon the drunkard himself?—It might, but I do not know when a man has gone so far, that it would have much effect.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23208. Does the license law really regulate the trade?—It does.

23209. Is there a considerable percentage of violations by licensees?—Yes.

23210. Do you suppose half of those who hold licenses follow the law?—I should not be surprised if there were that proportion. I often hear it said, but it is not specially stated regarding license law, that it is transgressed.

23211. There is, then, some difficulty in enforcing it?—Yes.

23212. Do you know whether the principal proportion of the violations of the law are committed by hotels or restaurants?—I think by restaurants.

23213. Are there many applicants who are refused licenses?—Not very many, because the law is so framed that the discretion amounts to nothing. If it is a man just out from the penitentiary, or one who is known to be a wicked man, we do not give the license.

23214. Do you find those who are refused licenses engage in illicit sale?—Generally they are.

23215. Would it not be just as well to license them and get some money out of them?—It might be, but they generally get somebody else as a *prête nom*, and in Montreal there are nearly a thousand, and it is difficult for the Commissioners to know who they are.

23216. There is a provision in the law which permits a majority of the people in the district to petition against the license?—Yes.

23217. Do they do it frequently?—Not very frequently. In the upper part of the town they have done that.

23218. Do they succeed?—They have succeeded, but the people seem reluctant to use that power.

23219. When the majority of the people in a district come before the Commissioners showing that they desire no license to be granted to this applicant, do the Commissioners consider that application?—The prayer cannot be general; it must be in reference to the application of one individual that the opposition must be made.

23220. I understand the application not to grant a license is to be made by a majority?—If an application is made by Tom, Dick or Harry for a license, then the residents or persons having their places of business in the ward can petition against it, but the opposition must be to each application and not a general one.

23221. In the cases where the opposition is made according to the law by a majority, is the license then refused?—Most decidedly.

*By the Chairman :*

23222. The Commissioners have no option?—No option. Generally this has been made upon a trial. We make proof of the signatures of the opponents, and if the majority is with them, we have no discretion but must refuse. In two cases lately, when making a trial of the case, the Commissioners seeing that evidently the majority of the people in the locality were opposed to it, refused the application.

23223. Do you think it would be an improvement if the applicant had to get the majority to sign for his license, so that the burden would be put on him?—In one light, it would be, but in another view it would be a hardship. He is doing an honest trade, and why should he every year have to do that? Some people think that once he has his license, he should be allowed to continue it until he forfeits it.

23224. What do you think of that?—I do not know. I have not made up my mind that it would be fair to give a general permit. It might be better to keep to the present rule.

23225. Outside of Montreal and Quebec under the present law the people of a parish may by their Municipal Council decline to issue licenses. Do you think it would be well to have that provision applied to Montreal and Quebec?—Yes, and as a License Commissioner, I would be very glad of it.

23226. That would be the people ruling themselves?—Yes, they send the aldermen.

23227. If the City Council dealt with the business, would the effect be to reduce the number of licenses granted in the city?—That is another question. Very often the City Council votes some application which, if I were to vote, I would not vote for.

23228. Do you think that it could result in more licenses being granted in Montreal than are granted?—It might. There are too many, but still we have refused quite a number for new places; for the current year, quite a number have been refused. I do not know if the three Commissioners were unanimous upon that, but from my long experience, I have made up my mind if there is no other means to stop the growth, we shall stay at the present number. It may be unfair to new people, but I have concluded that in a new locality unless there is good ground for granting new licenses, we should refuse. So we have stopped the increase, and I think there has been a slight decrease this year and last year too.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23229. You think it would be well to reduce and limit the number of licenses?—Yes.

23230. What would be the general effect of reducing the number?—The general effect would be that we could select those worthy and improve the quality of the license-holders in that manner.

HON. M. C. DESNOYERS.

23231. Would it reduce the drinking?—If there were less opportunities given to a man coming from his work to drink, I think it would.

23232. So the fewer places there are, the less temptation there is to drink?—Most decidedly.

23233. If the number could be reduced to nothing, would that be an advantage?—If you could do it, it would be ; but I do not think you could.

23234. You are basing your opinion on your knowledge of Montreal and Quebec generally, I suppose?—Yes ; and also on what I hear of the experience in places where they have tried to prohibit entirely.

23235. What is the effect of the persistent and flagrant violation of the license-law?—The effect has not come to a head yet.

23236. Is it demoralizing?—Certainly. As to those two cases to which I have referred, the parties did not consider themselves beaten. They have taken out writs against us to take the cases to the higher courts, and they are trying, not to reverse our judgments, but to kill time, so that the license year may run out.

23237. In these cases, they are fighting you Commissioners and are succeeding in gaining time?—Yes.

23238. Do you think their success has a demoralizing effect on the community?—It has.

23239. You have prevented some parties obtaining licenses, owing to their persistent violation of the law?—Often.

23240. If a percentage of violators are brought to book and punished, do you think a like percentage of illicit sellers could be also punished, if sufficient effort were made by the police authorities?—Possibly it might be done.

23241. Would it require an increase in the number of men?—Yes, and possibly more attention. The Provincial Police are very few in numbers, and I have heard it stated that some of the City Police go by those places and do not care much about them. I am not prepared to affirm that.

23242. Your position is often made difficult by the entreaties of the friends of persons who come before you as violators of the law?—Yes.

23243. Do you find that the influences brought to bear on the Commissioners in those cases are largely political influences?—No, I believe not—not the majority of them. Some of them are, but not the majority.

23244. Of course, in the case of a person charged with a crime before you, the influence brought to bear is the family influence, and your sympathy is reached?—Yes, certainly.

23245. It occurred to me that possibly political influences—I mean the influence of civic politicians, as well as that of Federal or Provincial politicians—might be brought to bear?—I do not believe there is a great deal of that, not to my knowledge, at any rate. It is more influence of a philanthropic nature. Here is a man, the head of a family, who has got a licensed place—and they generally come to us for their licenses after they have spent all they have in the world to fit up a place. They fit up a place, and then come for a license ; but we have published to the world that we will not give new licenses. Then they say : Are you going to put us on the street with our wives and families ? Then all the friends of those people come to us in their behalf.

*By the Chairman :*

23246. Have you any pressure from the owners of the buildings?—Sometimes. Not very long ago we had one on Beaver Hall Hill.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23247. The owner of the property occupied by the hotel-keeper?—Yes. I refused \$1,000 rent for a house on Bleury Street for this purpose and now I rent it for only \$800 ; so the owners are interested.

23248. Do you sometimes find property holders approach the Commissioners and urge them not to grant a license because the establishment of a saloon in the vicinity of the property depreciates the value of that property?—I have seen that alleged, but I do not know whether it is the case.

*By the Chairman :*

23249. It would more likely be the opposition of the residents?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23250. If the residents were opposed to it, I suppose the owner of the house would also be opposed, because if the residents were opposed and the saloon were established, they would remove elsewhere?—I believe there would be very few owners who would oppose if they could get 20 or 25 per cent increased rent.

23251. Do you believe the hotel bar ought to be continued?—That is for convenience sake.

23252. Is the bar for convenience, or is it used to supply guests at tables or in their rooms?—Decidedly it is.

23253. Is not the bar there because it encourages people who are not guests to come and drink?—Possibly.

23254. Does it not in that way take the place of restaurant bars?—Yes.

23255. Would you have the inebriate asylums maintained from the provincial funds?—Certainly, provincial or municipal.

23256. There was a proposition made in one of the provinces that inebriate asylums should be established and supported by men engaged in the liquor trade?—I think that would be a very good idea, and serve them right. They provide the boarders and they should pay the board.

23257. One gentleman who was asked that question said, I would believe in inebriate asylums if the liquor sellers were shut up in them. How would that strike you?—I think in 75 cases out of 100 it would be good.

23258. Do you believe in looking at it in a broad view, from your large experience and observation, that it pays a community or the State to legalize an institution which produces inmates for inebriate asylums which should be supported at the public expense?—I do not believe it is, if you take it as a speculation.

23259. There is no money in it?—No.

23260. You have said that, from your observation and experience as a police court Judge, three-fourths of the criminal cases that come before you are traceable directly or indirectly to the drink traffic?—I believe so.

23261. Do you think that the drink trade has any relation to the drink habit?—I believe it has to a certain extent. Many people acquire the habit of drinking in that way, who would not do so otherwise. In the majority of cases the habit is acquired.

23262. You have said that you think prohibition is impracticable. Do you believe that if the public sentiment of the country were educated up to the point that they would demand, by a large majority, a prohibitory law, and it was fairly well enforced, it would be a blessing to the country financially and morally?—I go further. If you could burn or destroy all the alcohol in existence, I believe the country and the world would be better, although I suppose it is necessary to have it in some cases.

23263. But for beverage purposes?—For beverage purposes. I do not believe there is any good to come from it. If we could do without it, I believe we would all be better off.

23264. Do you believe that if there were no legalized drink trade in Montreal, you would have so many cases in your court?—No.

23265. Would you have so many women, a dozen a day, applying to you in reference to their husbands?—No; certainly not one-fourth of that number.

*(Translation.)*

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23266. You have said that you would encourage the use of wine and beer. What measures would you adopt to carry out your view?—I have not considered the matter; but I believe that if the people could be accustomed to drink Canadian wines and beers, especially weak wines, it would be better for them. As to the means to be adopted, I am not posted. Perhaps this result would be obtained by raising the fees for licenses for the sale of so-called alcoholic liquors.

HON. M. C. DESNOYERS.

23267. Would you be in favour of imposing an increased taxation on alcohol?—I believe the taxes on alcohol are already very high; but I would suggest that the license fees of the retailers be increased. Nevertheless, I have not stopped to think about the means to be taken.

23268. Would you desire to have retailers licensed, or authorized to sell only wine and beer?—I believe it would be much better.

23269. But do you think such a law would be respected? Do you not think that they would sell alcohol at the same time?—Well, they would be greatly tempted to sell alcohol, and it is quite likely that they would often fall a victim to that temptation.

23270. If I remember rightly, the law in existence in Switzerland is to this effect: The State has the monopoly of alcohol. What would you think of a law that would place the manufacture, importation and sale of alcohol in the hands of the Government, and which, at the present time, would concede to licensed retailers the right to sell beer and wine? Do you not think it would be easier in this way to keep trace of alcohol through whatever hands it might pass?—Yes, assuredly, we could more easily keep control over it; but I believe that the retailer would still deviate from the right path. We would need more strict laws to enforce these enactments: we would require to have recourse to informers, and that trade is very unenviable.

23271. Or else have Government officers who would pay frequent visits to the licensed retailers of wine and beer?—Yes. They should take samples and have them analysed. They should possess the privilege of entering the shops of these licensed dealers at any time, to take a bottle and examine it.

23272. And should have the right of confiscating all alcohol found in those establishments?—Yes. I believe we would succeed, by that means, in securing respect for the law.

23273. Is there a tendency towards increased crime in the city?—Yes, pro rata to the increase of population; I do not believe it can be said that criminality is increasing much. The population increases; consequently, the proportion of crimes must follow suit.

*By the Chairman:*

23274. Do you think it desirable that the duties upon wine and beer should be reduced?—I think so.

23275. That would be an advantage?—I believe that it would.

23276. Would you increase the duties upon spirituous liquors?—I would not. I think they are high enough, but I would not reduce them.

23277. You spoke of offences against the license laws, and expressed the opinion that 50 per cent of the licensed dealers commit offences against the law?—I believe so.

23278. Do you base your opinion upon the number of cases which comes before you, or upon your observation and what you hear said by others?—Upon both. I base my opinion upon the number of cases that come before the police court, and also on the cases that would come before the police courts; as for instance, it has come to my knowledge that the officers who visit places find a perfect organization in those places, electric bells and so on. There is a watchman at the crossing, who gives a warning, and the button is touched, and when the police get there, they cannot find any evidence, but they know that the offences are going on just the same.

23279. The offences are chiefly those of selling out of hours, and on Sundays?—Yes.

23280. Do you find that the large hotels offend in that respect?—No.

23281. Do the restaurants?—Yes, and some lower class hotels. We very seldom have the large hotels brought up.

23282. You say the license commissioners have been very careful not to increase the number of licenses?—Yes; not for two or three years. I have a statement here. In 1886, the number of licenses granted was 970, or 5.20 per thousand of the population. In 1887, the number was 1,062, or 5.89 per thousand. In 1888, it was 1,123, or 5.60 per thousand; in 1889, it was 1,092, or 5.20 per thousand; in 1890, it was 1,089, or 5.32 per thousand. The population during those periods was: In 1886, 186,000; in 1887, 198,000; in 1888, 200,000; in 1889, 210,000; in 1890, 223,000. I think those



figures confirm my statement that there has been a reduction of late years. I do not mean a reduction pro rata as to population, but as to the actual figures of the licenses granted, but if you take it pro rata, it would be still greater. I have not the number for 1891, but you will see that in 1888, the number was 1,123, and in 1890, it was 1,089, and I think 1891 and 1892 would show about the same.

23283. And in that time the population has increased about 23,000?—Yes.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 14th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day, SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
REV. DR. McLEOD.

MR. E. F. CLARKE.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

SIR ALEXANDER LACOSTE, Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

23284. How long have you occupied the position of Chief Justice?—Since September last year.

23285. Prior to that, you were practising your profession in Montreal?—Yes.

23286. You have practised your profession here for a great number of years?—Since 1863.

23287. You were a member of the Senate?—I was a member of the Senate from 1884, Speaker of the Senate for one session, when I was appointed Chief Justice.

23288. You have seen, I suppose, the commission appointing the gentlemen who are here present, Commissioners to inquire into the liquor traffic?—I did not read it, but I know the general purport of it.

23289. Perhaps you would prefer to make a short statement, and so save the trouble of a number of questions?—I cannot say that I am prepared to make any statement. Of course I have my own idea of prohibition, but I have not made a special study of the question.

23290. The Commissioners are to investigate the effect of the liquor traffic on all interests in Canada and the means which have been taken to regulate it in this and other countries, and to report the possible effect of a prohibitory measure upon financial, commercial, agricultural and industrial interests?—Well, my idea has been for a long time that total prohibition is, I may say, a Utopian idea. It cannot be carried out. But at the same time I always was of opinion that we ought to impose very heavy duties on strong liquor, and let the light wines and beers go free or very nearly so. That has always been my idea, although I do not use strong liquor or light wines.

23291. You are a total abstainer, I believe?—For two or three years, but before that I did not make much use of drink.

23292. Your idea is that it would be well to place still further burdens on spirits and to leave light wines and beers with light duties?—Yes.

23293. From your observation, can you say that there is much illicit sale in Montreal?—I cannot give you any idea of that, as I have had no occasion to verify it, and my experience as a Judge is too short to give you any idea.

23294. The witnesses we have had before the Commission have been divided upon the point as to whether reducing the license fees upon the sales of light wine and beer, would not result in these places selling spirituous liquors illicitly?—I cannot say; it may be so.

23295. We had evidence before us that there is a great deal of illicit sale of liquors, and some of the difficulties of preventing it have been explained to the Commission?—I think that the best mode, and if a labourer had to pay a very high price for a glass of brandy, he would rather take a glass of wine. This is the way, I believe, in which we would prevent the sale of strong liquors.

23296. Do you think that the drinking of light wines leads up to a desire to drink stronger liquors?—I am not in a position to answer that question. A physician might do so. I believe that for a man who is in the habit of drinking strong liquors, it is better for him to leave off altogether than to continue to drink light wine. From what I have been told by physicians, I do not think that the fact of drinking light wines would tend to a desire for strong liquors; but I am really not in a position to say.

23297. You perhaps have paid some attention to the state of matters in France. For instance. Of late years there has been a very large reduction in the consumption of wines, and a very large increase in the consumption of alcohol. It has been very marked. Now, to what would you attribute that change?—I cannot say. I read an article in a French paper, where it was stated that there was more brandy and alcohol and absinthe consumed in France than in England or in Scotland, but that, nevertheless, drunkenness is less in France than in other countries. I have been in Paris several times, and I never noticed any drunkenness there. The fact is well established that there has been a large reduction in the production of wine in France, but I cannot explain the reason of it.

23298. Perhaps the price has been increased. Would that be a sufficient reason?—It might be, but my opinion would be worthless on that question, because I cannot say from experience.

23299. Do you consider the present licensing system an efficient method of regulating the drink traffic?—I believe that the drink trade ought to be licensed; but as to the mode, I cannot say. I believe there ought to be some modification in the licensing; I believe that we have too many licenses in Montreal. I believe that we require fewer saloons and more restaurants or eating houses perhaps.

23300. You think that there should be fewer licensed places in the city?—Yes.

23301. In what class would you make the reduction?—In saloons.

23302. Under the law, I believe, as it stands now, there ought to be no saloons—that is if we understand by the term “saloon” a place where simply liquor is sold. They ought all to supply meals. But we have had it in evidence here that the rule is not strictly enforced?—I should think it is not enforced.

*By Judge McDonald:*

23303. Sir Alexander, you have long experience as a jurist, as a practising barrister and also for a short period on the Bench, and you have also had experience as a member of the Senate. In your opinion what is the effect upon the morals of the community of placing a law upon the statute-book which is persistently and openly violated?—I believe it has a bad effect.

23304. Would you look upon it as an educator for good?—No.

23305. You have not had any experience yourself of the working of any prohibitory enactment?—None. I never lived in any part of the country where the Scott Act or any Act of that kind was in force.

23306. Have you had any opportunity of forming an opinion as to the effect of drunkenness upon the proportion of criminal cases in the community?—No, I have had no occasion. My attention was never called to that, and my experience as a Judge is very short. I only presided at one criminal term, and as a lawyer, I hardly ever practised in the criminal court; I always practised in the civil courts.

23307. So that you have not had an opportunity of forming an opinion on these matters?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

23308. Have you observed what effect the liquor traffic, as established, has upon the social conditions of the community?—I may say that I have observed what the effect of abuse in drinking is, but I cannot say that I have observed the effect in general upon the community.

23309. For instance, you were for a number of years a practising barrister: did you observe during your professional career that any considerable proportion of the petty offences and the more serious ones that came before the court, were attributable to drink?—Oh, yes.

SIR ALEXANDER LACOSTE.

23310. A considerable proportion?—Yes.

23311. You have expressed yourself as believing that it would be well to limit the number of licensed places?—Yes.

23312. You think that if there were fewer drinking places, the effect would be what?—That we could control them more easily.

23313. Is it not in your thought also, that a smaller number of drinking places would make less temptation to men who are disposed to drink?—I think so.

23314. And reducing the number very materially, would be an advantage you think?—I think it would be an advantage to reduce them.

23315. You have said that a law violated persistently and flagrantly has a very demoralizing effect on the community?—It has no doubt.

23316. Which do you think has the more demoralizing effect on the community, the violation of the liquor law or the liquor trade recognized and established?—As I told you before, I am in favour of regulating the liquor trade, as I think it would be better. I do not believe in total prohibition, because, as I have told you, I think it is a Utopian idea.

23317. Would you prohibit the stronger alcoholic liquors?—I would as far as possible, and encourage the use of light wines.

*By the Chairman :*

23318. By imposing practically prohibitive duties?—Yes, heavy duties.

23319. And heavy licenses?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23320. Would you license the sale of the stronger alcoholic liquor at all?—I would. I think I would license it in hotels.

23321. But you would make the license so high and the duty so high that the cost of alcoholic liquor would be very great?—Yes, so that it would be out of the reach of labourers and poor people, who spend their money in the evenings and on Saturdays.

23322. Do you think that would be a kind of class legislation; that it would be prohibiting a certain class of people who have not a great deal of money and who desire stronger liquors, and give abundant opportunity to those who have plenty of money?—I think it would be for their own benefit. I think it would be protecting them against themselves.

23323. And in that respect would be justifiable, of course?—Yes, I think so.

23324. Do you know any legalized business of like character and effect as the liquor traffic? Do you know any business that is established, recognized and legalized in the country that is a similar traffic to the liquor traffic, and which so seriously affects the social and business condition of the people?—There is none occurring to my mind. It is a special traffic and the use of liquor has a special effect, and I cannot compare it to any other.

23325. As a public man, interested in the commercial and other interests of the country, have you observed whether the liquor traffic, as established and carried on, has any effect, either injurious or beneficial, on other business interests of the country?—I cannot say. Of course there are some people who are living on that traffic, and so it is beneficial to them, no doubt.

23326. Have you observed whether the spending of so large an amount of money in liquor interferes with the other branches of business that are carried on in the country?—I do not know. It is a loss for those who abuse drink, no doubt, but I cannot go any further.

23327. You think, however, that it would be well to prohibit in some form, by heavy duties and high licenses, the trade in the strong alcoholic liquors?—Yes, without prohibiting them totally.

23328. But you would make it expensive and difficult to get them?—Yes, that is my idea. I cannot say what legislation should be made on it, but if I studied the question I might arrive at a conclusion.

23329. And you think it would be desirable to encourage the use of light wines and beer?—Yes, I think so.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23330. What do you think would be the effect of placing heavier duties on strong liquor?—I do not know what would be the effect, but I believe it would render that liquor more expensive.

23331. And reduce its consumption?—That is my opinion, but I do not know that that would be the effect.

23332. Would you favour the enactment of a very rigid inspection law in connection with the increased duties?—Yes, I believe it is very important against the adulteration of liquors.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23333. Please state your views respecting general prohibition?—Total prohibition to my mind, would not be practicable. I do not think you could by total prohibition prevent a nation from using liquor. If I wanted to make a glass of wine or liquor it would be against the law, but at the same time it would not be against my conscience. They have tried to prevent prostitution in many countries—prostitution being illicit, but they could not do it. It would be more difficult, I think, to prevent the use of liquor.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23334. Do you think it would be well, since they cannot prevent prostitution, to legalize it?—I will not answer, unless I am ordered. I will not go any further. It is enough to be responsible for the opinions I now give.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23335. We have been informed that you have in the city here, a system of city parks and recreation grounds for the people; and that in these parks light beers may be obtained, also wines, and I do not know but that they sell heavier liquors. I would like you, as a citizen, to express your opinion on this matter?—I have very little knowledge of them. I have been to Sohmer Park 4 or 5 times.

23336. From what you have seen of it, could you form an opinion?—I did not see one man there under the influence of liquor. I only went a few times.

23337. Do you think that system is a beneficial one in the city of Montreal?—I think so; but it is a matter of opinion, and I might change my mind after studying the question. I believe that the people require amusement, and I see no objection to those places selling light beer. The proportion of alcohol in Weiss beer is only, I believe, two or two and a half per cent.

*By the Chairman :*

23338. Do you feel that the provision of places of amusement, thrown open for the working classes, such as the parks, is in the interests of temperance?—Yes, I would rather send the people there than have them idle at home.

23339. You would rather have them there than in saloons?—Certainly.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23340. Do you know anything about the Maine liquor law?—I know it is a prohibitory law, but I have no experience of it. I am under the impression that when I was down in that State, they told me to go to room No. 100, if I wanted any drink, but I never saw any abuses of it.

WILLIAM B. LAMBE, Collector of Provincial Revenue for the City and District of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

23341. Your appointment is made by the Provincial Government, I think, Mr. Lambe?—Yes.

23342. What is your district?—It covers the city of Montreal and the whole district of Montreal. The district of Montreal extends from Verchères to Vaudreuil. It covers the whole Island of Montreal, the Isle Jésus and a point between the St. Lawrence and Ottawa and the counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges. The Island of Montreal includes Laval, Jacques Cartier and Hochelaga, and the district extends on the shore of the St. Lawrence to Laprairie, Chambly and Verchères, bounded by the river Richelieu. It is about 50 miles in length and about 30 miles in width.

23343. Have you any assistants?—Yes, I have a deputy, but I have also the benefit of an associate, when I call on him for his assistance, that is, the late collector, Mr. Raphael Bellemare; but he does not take any active part in the management of the business.

23344. What is the nature of your duties?—The administration of the Quebec License Law, that is, for the issue of licenses and suppression of any infraction of the law, the collection of the revenue, the collection of fines, and reporting to the Government as to what is done and the carrying out of anything they instruct me to do.

23345. You issue the license documents for this district?—Yes, both for the city and the district.

23346. And you issue them in the city of Montreal on the certificate of the Commissioners?—Exactly. The Magistrates who have replaced the old Commissioners are the two Justices of the Peace, Judges Desnoyers and Dugas, who are associated with the Recorder. The majority of these Commissioners issue the certificate, and on the application of the party I issue the license.

23347. The city intervenes in some way and collects a small amount for issuing the certificate?—The charge is \$8 to each applicant.

23348. I am anxious to know how the matter gets before the city officials, and what they do about it? The Justices are not responsible to the city, but the Recorder is, I suppose, to some degree?—Their duties are not separate as to their responsibilities. When they make up their minds to grant a certificate, they issue the document. The applicant gives them a sworn statement that he is the applicant, and that he is recommended by 25 electors in the district where he resides. They then consider it, and it is open to objection: it is posted for 15 days and is open to objection. If they see fit to grant the application, they grant it. The applicant goes to the city, and he asks for a certificate of the rental of the premises that he occupies, because his license dues are granted according to the rental he pays. They then charge him \$8. The applicant comes to the collector's office, shows his certificate, and having paid his fee he gives bonds—not in wholesale licenses but in hotel, restaurant and grocery licenses—two bondsmen to the extent of \$200 each; and the license is then issued to him.

23349. The bond is to the Provincial Government?—The bond is to the Crown.

23350. It is for the benefit of the Provincial treasury?—For the security of the Provincial treasury that any fine that is levied, if not paid by the defendant, will be paid by the bondsmen to the limit of \$200.

23351. In addition to paying the \$8 to the city, he pays a business tax for his place?—That does not come under my management, but I know that he does.

23352. Are the Provincial Police under your direction in any way?—Yes, they are under my direction.

23353. How many have you in the district?—There are six men, one is called a chief, one is called a sub-chief, and the other four are constables.

23354. Are they in uniform?—They have a uniform.

23355. Do they wear it when they are on duty?—They wear it when they present themselves before the court. They do not wear it when they strive to detect an offender, but they have a badge.

23356. They have to show that when they arrest any one?—If a man asks them who they are, the constable says: "I am a revenue constable, and my badge of office is this." Detective police signify their position in the same way.

23357. There are a certain number of the city police detailed to look after vendors of spirituous liquors?—They are required by the Recorder to do that.

23358. Have you a sufficient force under you to give effect to the law, Mr. Lambe?—It is a very difficult law to enforce. The sufficiency of the force may be questionable, but I do not depend so much on the force, as I do on the information of parties who are interested in either preventing illicit sale, in protecting themselves, or in giving information for the sake of the share they get in the fine, when it is levied and paid.

23359. Informers?—Yes.

23360. Do you find that the people who are licensed to sell liquors assist you in the prevention of illicit selling?—Sometimes, when the illicit sellers come into competition with them, they seek to maintain themselves and their rights and monopolies. A tavern keeper in the country or a tavern keeper in the city may find that a man near him is not licensed. He has paid his license fees amounting from \$400 to \$800, and he says: I don't see why that man should interfere with my business, he does not pay anything. That is not a common case, however, as there is a sort of free masonry or *esprit de corps* existing—sometimes they do, but not often.

23361. Do you refer entirely to licensed people when you say you get assistance from people interested?—I will explain to you at once that the clergy are interested, the municipal officers are interested, families are interested in protecting themselves, and people who are interested in promoting temperance give information. They may come from the highest class of society down to the informer, who informs for the sake of gain, but the majority are people who are interested in preventing illicit liquor traffic and intemperance.

23362. Do you find a large number detected who are engaged in the illicit sale?—A large number are detected, but only a small proportion of those who do sell.

23363. You think they are only a small proportion of those who do sell?—Yes.

23364. Take the number detected in one year: what proportion will they be of the people who are licensed? If you have a thousand licenses, do you detect ten in a year who are selling illegally?—I take about one thousand prosecutions in one year.

23365. For illicit sale?—Yes.

23366. Take the city of Montreal, for instance, you issue 1,100 or 1,200 licenses in a year?—I can give you exactly the number of licenses granted last year, and it has been about the same for the last few years. The year runs from about the 1st of May to 30th April, that is the term for which the licenses are granted. In the city of Montreal in the years 1891-92, there were 328 hotel licenses, 304 restaurant licenses, 596 retail shop licenses, and 10 wholesale licenses. There are also a few club licenses.

23367. Making a total of how many?—1,233, not including the clubs, and there are three that I remember now.

23368. Is the number less or more than it was for the previous year?—For the last three or four years, the number has been much about the same. There has been a diminution in one year and an increase in another. This year, up to the present time, there are 330 hotels, against 323, but the number will be about the same.

23369. Can you tell us how many places were detected selling illicitly in the city for the year 1891-92? That is the point I want to get at?—I have prosecuted some 1,200 parties for selling illicitly. Some of them were not licensed, but I cannot say that I prosecuted 1,200 parties who were licensed.

23370. How many did you prosecute for selling without a license?—I cannot state exactly from memory, but I can give you the statistics precisely.

23371. Do you think you had a thousand prosecutions of people for selling without a license?—No, because a great many of them were for selling on Sunday.

23372. Does that come within your jurisdiction?—Certainly.

23373. I thought perhaps it might be the duty of the city police to look after those cases?—They prosecute independently of the Collector. They prosecute under the Quebec License Law, and the Municipality has a right to do that.

WILLIAM B. LAMBE.

23374. From your answers I understand that a very large number of the prosecutions for illicit sale were for selling out of hours and were against persons who held licenses?—Yes, and for selling on Sunday.

23375. Can you classify the prosecutions, so as to tell the Commissioners the number against persons selling without a license, and the number of prosecutions against those who had licenses?—Yes, I will get you the particulars.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23376. Are these 1,233 licenses in the city of Montreal or in your district?—In the district.

23377. Do you know what proportion, of them are in Montreal proper?—I can give you the number of licenses issued last year in the city from May, 1891, to the end of April, 1892 : There are 154 hotel, 304 restaurant, 477 retail shops and the clubs, making altogether 935.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23378. Does that include wholesale dealers?—No, there are only about ten wholesale licenses.

*By the Chairman :*

23379. Will you please prepare a statement, and send it to the Secretary of the Commission, so that we may have the information officially?—Yes, I will make a memorandum so that I can give you what you want.

23380. Can you tell us, as a matter of fact, if many of these prosecutions were against the hotels?—Yes, a large number for selling on Sundays, and a constant repetition of sales.

23381. What class of hotels?—The Richelieu was a constant offender. Payette is a constant offender ; it is on the south-east corner of St. Gabriel and Notre Dame. Riendeau was a constant offender. Such hotels as the Windsor and the St. Lawrence Hall observe the law.

23382. Have you occasion to prosecute hotels, such as the Windsor?—Not such as the Windsor or the Hall, or the Albion, or the Balmoral.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23383. These are leading hotels?—The Windsor and the St. Lawrence Hall are leading hotels. The Albion hotel is frequented by the commercial classes, and the Balmoral is also a leading hotel. We have not had occasion to prosecute them. I did prosecute the Balmoral for being late in taking out a license, but that was on account of some financial difficulties, and not for an offence against the liquor selling law.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23384. Have your prosecutions been mainly in the east end or in the west end of the city, or about equally distributed?—I do not prosecute much in the west end of the city, because I cannot get a conviction.

23385. For what reason?—On account of the evidence that is given by the shopkeepers there. They do not take licenses for restaurants ; they take licenses for groceries and they run drinking shops. When I prosecute them, I have difficulty in getting access to their places of business, and if I have two witnesses to prove the sale of liquor, they can produce 20 witnesses to prove the contrary ; and the court has to take the evidence of the 20, although it may not be satisfied that there is much truth in the testimony.

23386. Does that prevail more in the west end than in the east end?—Yes, I can get reliable evidence in the east end. The east end is occupied by the French Canadian people, who are Roman Catholics, and their testimony is reliable. The other end is occupied by Englishspeaking people, and they are inclined to give their testimony straight in favour of the party who is prosecuted. There are a large number of operatives residing in that locality and they supply them with beer and drink.



23387. You have taken about a thousand prosecutions; can you tell us, in what percentage of the cases you were successful?—Probably in nine-tenths of them.

23388. You say there are a great number of places selling liquor that are not prosecuted?—Well, as far as I can judge, there are probably 2,000 shebeens, and there may be 4,000 altogether where they sell liquor without any license. They call them shebeens and beaneries—they call them beaneries, because they profess to sell pork and beans. They are called candy shops and fruit shops, while they are really decoy shops for assignation, purposes of prostitution and illegal selling.

23389. Do you put the number between 2,000 and 4,000, the number of such establishments selling liquor without a license in the city of Montreal?—Yes, and I may be short; it is an underestimate.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23390. What is your estimate?—From 2,000 to 4,000.

23391. You think 2,000 is an underestimate and not 4,000?—They are known as beaneries, and candy shops and fruit shops, and some of the lower ones are tobacco shops and cigar shops. I include them altogether.

*By the Chairman :*

23392. I want to be sure that I understand your answer. You say you are sure that there are 2,000 places where liquor is sold without a license, and that there may be 4,000 and possibly more?—Yes.

23393. Can you tell the Commission why more of them are not prosecuted under the law?—Because you cannot prove a case against them. They are wary and avoid exposing themselves.

23394. Do you think that a larger force of police employed for the purpose of looking after them would secure a larger number of convictions?—I do not think it. The police have no chance with them at all. The only chance there is, is by private detection and using private informers. They know the police just as well as a mouse would know a cat.

23395. The difficulty arises out of the expertness of the persons who keep such places and also out of an indisposition on the part of people who frequent them to give information?—Yes.

23396. Have you had occasion to prosecute in many cases for the illicit manufacture of liquors?—I have nothing to do with that, that falls within the power of the Dominion authorities.

23397. Has it come under your notice in the carrying out of your duties that there are such places here in Montreal?—I saw the statement made in the newspapers, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

23398. Do you know if there is any smuggling of liquor going on in the country?—There is smuggling carried on all along the line from St. Régis to the Ste. Croix River. There are houses built on the line on purpose to enable the parties living there to pass liquor from one side to the other. I had occasion to send the police out to Napierville to co-operate with the American authorities and in that way they made large seizures, but it was only done once, and the traffic is carried on all the time. Then I hear it publicly stated that there is a great deal of smuggling on the St. Lawrence, but further than that I do not know anything about it.

23399. Have you given any consideration to the question of the desirability of passing a prohibitory law, by which of course is meant a Dominion law, to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors altogether?—I have never studied the question very much, but I have my own opinion on the point.

23400. Please state your opinion?—I am in favour of a prohibitory law.

23401. Do you think it could be efficiently enforced in the present state of public opinion?—It would be very difficult, but not to say any more difficult than the enforcement of the present liquor law.

23402. Then you think that if such a law were passed by the Dominion Parliament, it would be efficiently enforced?—Oh no, I do not say that. I say it would be very difficult

WILLIAM B. LAMBE.

to enforce under the present state of civilization—very difficult indeed ; but the enforcement of the present liquor law is very difficult, because you have the same influences to try and prevent detection, and you have political influences besides to utilize it and to sanction it. I do not think the difficulty in carrying out one law would be any more than in carrying out the other.

23403. You think there would be no more difficulty in carrying out a prohibitory law than there is in carrying out the present license law?—That is my opinion.

23404. Do you think there would be a greater disposition towards illicit sales and smuggling and illicit manufacture under a prohibitory law?—Certainly there would. There would be more smuggling, there would be more illicit manufacture, and all sale would be illicit, unless such as was permitted for medicinal purposes.

23405. Would that not render it more difficult to carry out a prohibitory law than to carry out a license law, in your opinion?—No. There would be no question about the law. It would be a straight law, whereas the present law is a very uncertain law.

23406. You think it would be no more difficult to put in force than the present license law?—No.

23407. Do you think it would be productive of great benefits to the country?—Certainly, to the State and to the individual.

23408. You think it would have the effect of lessening the consumption of intoxicants?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23409. You have spoken of smuggling along the border from St. Régis to Ste. Croix, and that is really the whole line of the Province?—Yes.

23410. What do you think leads to that smuggling? Is it the object of gain?—Yes.

23411. Is the liquor cheaper in the United States than in Canada?—I do not know that it is cheaper.

23412. Is it better?—I do not know that it is, but where you have a prohibitory law on the American side, they shift the liquor over from the Canadian to the American side, and when the American officers go to detect them, they ship it back again.

23413. Is there a prohibitory law in the State of New York?—I do not know whether there is or not. I do not know whether Rouse's Point is in Vermont or New York, but they had a prohibitory law at Rouse's Point some years ago.

23414. Is there any smuggling into Canada from the States for the use of the people in Canada?—The smuggling that is done in the Gulf is for Canada.

23415. But on the main line from St. Régis to Ste. Croix?—Yes, they bring in high-wines, and it is well known that they smuggle in the Eastern Townships.

23416. It has been proved before us that the liquor smuggled in the Lower St. Lawrence is mostly manufactured in the United States. Owing to the law of the United States, that if liquor is exported within a certain period of time it escapes Inland Revenue duties, that liquor is carried to St. Pierre and Miquelon, thereby getting rid of the United States duty, and as these are free ports, they smuggle it back into Canada?—I do not know their *modus operandi*, but that might be it.

23417. Do you know whether any of that kind of liquor might be brought into Canada along the border line for the purpose of getting rid of the United States duty?—That I cannot say, because my information is derived from the late Chief of Police, who sent out men to patrol from St. Régis towards Sherbrooke ; and he reported they did bring in liquor and that it was stored in this house on the line, so that they might avoid paying the duty. When they were chased by the American officers they shifted it over the line in the house, and when followed by the Canadian authorities, they did the reverse. When the two authorities met together they made a large seizure of liquors ; and he reported that that system was carried on all along the line. That is the ground for my information.

23418. You think that it still goes on?—Yes, but I cannot say positively.

23419. Given such a law as would prevent the manufacture, importation and sale in Canada for beverage purposes, do you not think there would be a vast increase of that kind of work along the whole line?—Certainly.

23420. How would you propose to stop it?—It is difficult to stop. My reason for favouring a prohibitory law is, that it is tending towards a good result; although it looks almost as an impracticable theory, still it is tending towards a good result.

23421. In your opinion, what is the effect upon the community morally of having a law upon the statute-book that is openly and flagrantly violated?—It is the expression of opinion of a certain majority in favour of a certain course and has its weight. It is not desirable to put into the statute-book a statute that cannot be enforced, but at the same time it is always an expression of opinion on behalf of the people.

23422. Would you not think it better to educate the people upon the principle in the schools and by religious and moral instruction and the work of temperance societies, so as to bring them up to such a state of sentiment that such a law would be observed, and that the law would be the outcome of that sentiment, instead of seeking by the law to make the sentiment and have the law broken?—I would adopt the means that you suggest, and adopt the other as well, that is, the moral suasion and the religious teaching, the working of the clergy, the working in temperance societies and the working in the schools. I would use all means of moral suasion, and if you get a prohibitory law passed, it would be always an expression of opinion on the part of the majority of the people.

23423. Would you fear any effects of this kind: that the passing of the law before the sentiment of the country would enforce it, might have the effect of producing opposition that would defeat it, or lead to its repeal by the community?—There would be that danger, but I do not think they would succeed.

23424. You look upon it, that the thorough enforcement of a prohibitory law would not be practicable, but that it would have the effect of putting on the statute-book an educational law, one which would educate the people up to the point?—It is always helpful, and when we get more civilized, we will be able to maintain it.

23425. Having such a law on the statute-book, do you not think it would be the bounden duty of the community to seek to enforce it?—Yes.

23426. How would you enforce that law?—By such machinery as we use in the present license law, or such as you would devise.

23427. You state that there was only a temporary enforcement of the law upon the border to prevent liquor coming in, and that it is your belief that liquor is brought in illicitly along the frontier. Is not that the case now, when, by the law of the land, the people can get all they want without smuggling. Suppose that the people could not get any liquor, would it not increase tremendously the amount of smuggling?—Certainly.

23428. If your present supervision was only for a short period on the border, and liquor came in when you were not watching, would it not be necessary to watch it all the time?—Yes.

23429. Would you advocate that being done?—Yes.

23430. Then your plan would be to have a large force of officers employed, so that when you make a law it should be a success, so far as any such law can be a success?—Yes.

23431. Would you propose to administer such a law by the Dominion or Provincial authorities?—Probably the Dominion would be better, but having the assistance of the provincial councils would tend to make it more easy to carry out.

23432. Would you have the expense of the maintenance of this body of officers divided between the provinces and the Dominion?—These are details.

23433. And very important details to be considered, if the measure is to be a success?—I suppose they would have to be.

23434. Now, with regard to the effect of the law: Suppose national prohibition carried, and in the Maritime Provinces you found a majority in favour of it, of say, ten to one; perhaps, in the Province of Quebec, a majority against it; say Ontario might be fairly balanced; Manitoba strongly in favour of it, and British Columbia ten to one against it; in your judgment would there be a difference in the efficient enforcement of the law in different sections of the country in the ratio of the sentiment that had been shown in its favour in different provinces?—It is probable. Where you have the sentiment in favour of a particular measure, it is better.

WILLIAM B. LAMBE.

23435. If you found in the Province of British Columbia a sentiment of ten to one against it, and by the voice of the rest of the country that law was placed on these people, would it not be difficult to enforce it?—Very difficult.

23436. I suppose you think if the result could be attained of limiting drunkenness or abolishing it altogether, that it would be worth the expense that would be incurred in engaging this large body of officers and enforcing this law?—Yes; I do. What you get now by revenue would be more than compensated for by what the State would gain by the suppression of crime and the reduction in cost of the maintenance of jails and asylums.

23437. You think, of course, that asylums would have to be maintained, although there would be a large diminution?—Yes.

23438. And you consider the number of police officers would be reduced?—Yes, because any one with half an eye can see that the excessive use of alcohol leads to loss of time, waste of money, and crime. It leads to sickness, to partial insanity, and sometimes total insanity.

23439. We are told by the police Judges that 80 per cent of the offences that come before them are attributable to intoxicating drink?—Well, they have a fair opportunity of judging.

23440. What would you think, taking the license law as we have it, of a proposal that, instead of sending these people who get drunk to jail, they should be sent to some kind of an inebriate asylum, where they would be detained until they could be safely discharged?—It would be the best thing that could be done with inebriates, to put them into an asylum for that purpose.

23441. And let the State provide for that?—Yes, it would be the cheapest way to handle them.

23442. You have here, I understand, a system by which a man cannot keep a place to sell liquor by the glass and nothing else?—The law provides that meals are to be furnished where liquor is to be sold; but it is evaded by very simple means. They have a crust on the counter that will serve for a month for a crowd.

23443. We had evidence yesterday, from the Chief of Police, that there are nine such places within a short distance of each other, where he did not believe you could get a meal at all?—Yes.

23444. Supposing a law were passed that a certain class of these places should not sell liquor, which would you think it advisable to dispense with—hotels or saloons?—We call the saloons “restaurants” here. The hotels, when properly kept, are useful. Whether they are the city palaces or the country inns, they are useful and necessary. But I do not think that hotels under any circumstances should be allowed to have bars. Restaurants in the city are not only useful, but they are almost necessary, I mean the *bona fide* restaurants, where they sell food, and not the mere dram-shops.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23445. You think they are necessary and useful?—Yes, where food is sold.

23446. With a bar?—Yes.

23447. You think it is necessary in this city to have a bar, where meals are provided?—Yes; they have lunch counters, and a man may have only time to take a cracker and cheese; he may take that at the bar when he has not time to go into the dining-room.

23448. You have now in the city, under your present system, hotels with bars?—Yes.

23449. You have also eating-houses with bars?—Yes.

23450. If either of these had to be done away with, which would be preferable to retain?—I would do away with the eating-houses, of course. I do not say that *bona fide* restaurants should be done away with.

23451. Do you think that a place where they sell only liquor should be retained?—It should not be tolerated at all.

23452. Are these places less desirable than hotel bars?—Yes, they are highly objectionable

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23453. You say that complaints are made to you by clergymen, heads of families and the like. I suppose your Provincial Police also make complaints?—That is what they are principally employed at.

23454. But having only half a dozen, I presume, they are unable to cope with the illicit selling?—They are at work night and day, but, of course, they can only do a certain amount.

23455. In the case of complaints against hotels, are they made by private citizens or officers or both?—By both.

23456. Chiefly by private citizens?—In the case of hotels, we have to have the police co-operating with private parties, because they have all means possible provided for their safeguarding. For instance, they have private watchmen and telegraph signals, and they adopt every means of endeavouring to foil the police and save themselves.

23457. Does the law require that when private citizens make complaints, they have to deposit costs?—That is in my discretion. If I see that the case can be proved, I do not require a deposit; but if I see that the case is doubtful I do, or if I see that it is simply a question of spite between the parties, which sometimes occurs, then I do not see why the Government should be used to serve that purpose. I cannot refuse where a complaint is made and where there is a *prima facie* case, but I require a deposit sometimes.

23458. There is sometimes, I suppose, a case where one dealer has a feeling against another?—Yes, where they quarrel.

23459. You have no discretion at all in the issuing of licenses?—You simply issue a certificate when the Commissioners issue the license?—Yes.

23460. You said that a considerable percentage of the prosecutions are carried out to conviction: now, are the penalties enforced?—They are, unless I have instructions from the Government to remit them or to suspend them.

23461. I ask that question, because I remember that within a year, I think, I read that the Government interfered in some places and remitted fines: is that frequently done?—Yes.

23462. Do you know why that is?—They do not give any reasons.

23463. You have no discretion as to that?—No.

23464. Do you think that interference by the Government with regard to enforcing penalties is a mistake?—The law provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council after the case has been adjudged, have a right to afford relief in such a way as they think proper. There is no provision in the law that they can interfere before the judgment, but many cases are suspended by the courts before there is a judgment rendered.

23465. By the interference of the Government?—Yes.

23466. That is a violation of the law?—Yes.

23467. Have you observed whether the interference with the enforcement of the penalties is on behalf of persons who are poor and need relief, or on behalf of influential persons?—It is sometimes on behalf of parties who are poor and need relief, and sometimes in cases of hardship, when the Magistrates feel that the law is strict and that they would like to recommend that it should not be enforced, and then they make a recommendation. Sometimes it is from political influence, where the constituents ask their member of Parliament to appeal to the Government, so that they may avoid the payment of the fine. That is frequently the case, and it is sometimes done by professional men, who act as solicitors, for the sake of getting the support of their clients. If they can get a remission from the Government, they save so much. A case has come out in the court lately where there was a pecuniary interest. A candidate for Parliament solicited the remission of a fine, and covenanted that if the fine were remitted, he was to get a remission of a claim of \$50 that was against him.

*By the Chairman :*

23468. A claim against him?—He was a candidate for Parliament. A creditor of his, to the amount of \$50, asked him to appeal to the Government to get a fine remitted;

WILLIAM B. LAMBE.

he got the fine remitted, and then the case came up in court, and they quarrelled about the payment of the account of \$50.

23469. Are we to understand there was a compact between the claimant for the remission of the fine and the applicant for the seat in Parliament, so that the debt against the candidate was to be remitted by the claimant?—Yes.

23470. Are you at liberty to state the name?—It was in court, and I do not remember the names now.

23471. It was a simple case of bargain, then?—Yes, it came out in court.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23472. One man having political influence says, "If I get your fine remitted, you will cancel my account"?—Yes, and they quarrelled afterwards about the account.

23473. You say that there are in the city 2,000 illicit places, and you would not be surprised if there were 4,000. Do you think they can persist in selling in spite of the law?—They would not pay any license.

23474. They would not pay any, because they can sell without paying?—Yes.

23475. Do you think that in this view of the license law, when illicit sellers number twice as many as the licensed sellers, the license law is a success?—The license law is not a success. It is a very difficult law to enforce.

23476. Does the license law regulate the trade?—To a certain extent, yes. It is far better to have it regulated than not regulated.

23477. You think it is better to issue 1,000 licenses when there are 2,000 illicit sellers, than to let them all go free?—Certainly. But the most successful way, it appears to me, of limiting the number of licenses would be by increasing very largely the fee for licenses, and by the Magistrates refusing to renew licenses where convictions were obtained.

23478. There would not be any reduction in the number selling liquor, but there would be a reduction in the licensed places?—Yes.

23479. Would that be an advantage?—Yes, because the licensed parties sell a great deal more than the others. A licensed restaurant on the public street would sell a great deal more than a shebeen would sell.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23480. Suppose you reduced the number of licensed places and the number of unlicensed places increased, would that be a desirable state of things?—It would not be a very desirable state of things. If there were higher licenses charged, you would not only increase the cost of the liquor, but you would get a better class of licensees.

23481. Suppose you stop all licenses and leave the trade unlicensed, then the trade would not be a legalized trade. Would there be less liquor sold than under the present system?—No. If you legalize the sale of liquor, it is better to have a certain number of places under control. You have them more under control when you issue licenses.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23482. The fact is that a man having a license has no fear or hesitancy, and a certain character attaches to his place. Do you think that that fact encourages the drink habit?—It encourages the facility, and where the habit is acquired, it leads to more drinking.

23483. From your experience of the license law and the difficulties of enforcement, do you believe that prohibition could be as efficiently enforced as the license law is now?—Yes. I was going to say that if licenses for beer and wine, as in many cases suggested, were granted at a lower rate than licenses for selling all liquors, it might be an advantage.

23484. Do you think that the violation of the license law creates public opinion against the trade—that is the persistent and flagrant violation of the license law?—I do not think it has much effect one way or another.

23485. Which do you think more demoralizes the community, the violation of the license law or the legalization of the trade?—I do not think there would be very much difference one way or another.

23486. You have expressed yourself as favourable to education on the question, in which we all agree. Do you think it would be well to legislate against the evil on which you would educate the people?—Yes, it would.

23487. Do you think that the law being carried by a majority of the people, would help that educating work?—Yes.

23488. Do you know of any other business, the law concerning which, and for the regulation of which, is so flagrantly and so persistently violated as the license law?—There are regulations around almost every business.

23489. Is it to your knowledge that a large percentage of those who hold licenses violate the law?—Not a large percentage; I suppose a quarter of them.

23490. You think, however, that it would not be any more difficult to enforce a prohibitory law than it is to enforce a license law?—No.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23491. Do you think the license law is enforced here?—Very imperfectly.

23492. Why is it not better enforced?—Because it is impossible to do it.

23493. Would a prohibitory law be better enforced than a license law?—No, I do not think it would.

23494. Why?—Because you cannot detect anything. Secret drinking is difficult of detection.

23495. Would it be impossible to enforce a prohibitory law?—It would be only partially enforced.

23496. Would it be impossible to enforce it better than the liquor license law is enforced here now?—I should think so.

23497. And the condition of things that is revealed now is, that there are about 935 licenses in Montreal, and from two thousand to four thousand shebeens without a license?—Yes.

23498. It could not be much worse under prohibition?—That is what I think.

23499. You think the law is as well enforced here as it can be?—That is my work, and it would be like passing an opinion on my own work.

23500. In a city of 225,000 inhabitants, there are from 2,000 to 4,000 places where liquor is sold illicitly?—Yes.

23501. And you think the law is as well enforced as it can be?—As well as I can, and some persons think that I am too strict. Other persons think that I am too easy, and so it is pretty hard to satisfy every one.

23502. That is the picture that you present to us of the condition of affairs in Montreal?—It is difficult of enforcement.

23503. There are from 2,000 to 4,000 places where liquor is sold illegally?—Yes.

23504. And some 935 where it is sold legally?—Yes.

23505. What is the reason that the liquor license law is more flagrantly violated than any other law that is placed on the statute-book?—The aptitude of men to drink, the temptation that there is, and the habit which becomes a disease, dipsomania. Then the social idea about it is that it is not sinful.

23506. What is your opinion about that?—I have no opinion on that point. It is disadvantageous and immoral.

23506a. Is the moderate use of liquor immoral?—No, the abuse of it.

23507. Is it sinful?—No; I do not think so.

23508. What would be the effect of increasing the license fees?—It would limit the number of licenses, improve the class of licensees, increase the cost of liquor and diminish the profits of the licensees, so that there would not be so much profit in it. You would require a larger capitalist to carry on the business, and the small restaurant man who keeps a dram shop would be driven out of the business.

23509. And by that means you would crush out the saloon keepers?—Yes.

23510. That would be one of the results?—I think so.

23511. Suppose the sale of liquor were legally prohibited here altogether, would the dram shops and shebeens all be wiped out?—The dram shops would be, but not the shebeens.

WILLIAM B. LAMBE.

23512. The effect of the imposition of higher licenses would be beneficial?—I think so.

23513. Would you favour the imposition of higher duties and a more rigid inspection of the liquors that are sold?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

23514. I understand you to say that you prefer prohibition to any of these systems?—Yes.

23515. But failing prohibition, you would take the next best?—Yes.

23516. You believe the next best thing would be high license?—Yes, with rigid inspection.

23517. Would you amend the law so as to make imprisonment a punishment for those who violate it?—There is imprisonment now.

23518. And by taking away the license altogether, after a certain number of offences?—Disqualify them from holding licenses.

23519. You think that would be the next best thing to prohibition?—Yes.

23520. What revenue does this province derive from the issue of licenses, speaking in round numbers?—There has been an increase of about \$100,000 in the last three years. There is about \$400,000, but that is not all from liquor, because there are other licenses. I could get you the figures from my book.

23521. The testimony given at Quebec showed that the revenue derived from this trade was \$500,000 or \$600,000?—The city and district of Montreal collect about two-thirds of the whole amount.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

23522. How would you propose that this loss of revenue should be provided for, in case of the prohibition of the traffic?—In the first place, you would have compensation in part by less expenditure, and it would be a question of policy as to the sources from which you would obtain the deficiency. If you require revenue take it, but do not raise it out of a thing that is prejudicial to the people.

23523. You think the reduction in the cost of the administration of justice, and of maintenance of asylums, would partially recoup?—Yes.

23524. Have you any idea of the cost of the institutions now?—No.

23525. You do not know what proportion of the people found in the asylums are there from the effects of alcohol?—No. I stated that I gave these as my personal opinions, and that I had not specially studied up the case.

23526. Who would enforce a prohibitory law in the event of such a law being passed, the Provincial or Dominion officials?—I answered that it would be better to have the Federal Parliament and the provinces to co-operate.

23527. You think it would be well to have the Dominion co-operate with the provinces in enforcing a prohibitory law?—I would put the Dominion first, and let the provinces co-operate.

23528. Have you any idea what revenue the Dominion derives from this traffic?—I have not.

23529. Have you thought of what duties should be imposed to provide for that loss of revenue?—No.

23530. Are these 596 retail shop licenses necessary in Montreal?—About five out of six of them would be abundant.

23531. Would you favour the wiping out of that class of grocery?—Certainly. They are simply restaurants, and many of them keep regular bars.

23532. Is that legal?—It is illegal.

23533. You know that they keep bars?—Yes.

23534. Are you proceeding against them for keeping bars?—We do so when we have any chance whatever of convicting them. But I tell you in St. Ann's ward, it is almost impossible to convict a man. It is a manufacturing part of the city near the canal, and it is almost impossible to convict them there.

23535. You are in favour of wiping out these groceries altogether?—Certainly. That is the connection between the liquor and the groceries.



23536. Have you ever had any knowledge of licensed persons promoting the illicit sale in unlicensed places?—These shebeens are supplied from the groceries. I have a right to make a seizure of liquors in any unlicensed place. The way they work it is this: they get half a dozen of beer and a couple bottles of whisky from the corner grocery, and they put it under the sofa, or hide it in the bedroom. A seizure there is useless. What is the use of seizing such a small quantity.

23537. Does the corner grocery man act legally in supplying a dozen bottles of beer and two bottles of whisky?—Yes.

23538. Do the licensed people generally endeavour to protect themselves against the illicit trade?—Yes.

23539. We had it in evidence before us, that the licensed people get the unlicensed people to act as their agents?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

23540. Do you know whether the sale of a dozen bottles or the like to shebeen keepers is made with the knowledge on the part of the licensed grocers that the sale is to shebeen keepers?—Yes. He has more profit from selling in that way.

23541. The statement in the Maritime Provinces was, that if there were a high license, which would reduce the number of places, the holder of the high license instead of endeavouring to bring the illicit seller to justice, would sell to him?—That would likely be the case.

23542. I understand you to say that the licensee here pays his fees on the rental of his premises?—Yes.

23543. Is it difficult to find the amount of rent so as to determine the license?—Very. They file the valuations from the city books, but that rate is established by the assessors, and the assessors are imposed on and in the larger number of cases that is the minimum rate. They pass false leases, and these leases are presented to the assessors, and under instructions from the City Attorney, the assessors take these leases as *prima facie* evidence, and in that way there is fraud. In 99 cases out of 100 the rental fee is not up to \$400 and the license fee is at the minimum, whereas every one knows that double that rent is paid.

23544. You think that these fraudulent leases are quite common?—Yes.

23545. There does not seem to be any particular disinclination on the part of the licensees to defraud the Government out of the license fees?—No.

23546. I have no doubt your enforcement of the law is quite as rigid as possible. Do you believe that the chief reason that the law is not better enforced is that you have not a sufficient force?—I do not think a larger force would help me much.

23547. Do half a dozen men form a sufficient force for the whole district of Montreal?—No; but suppose you had 500, they would become known and they would be no more effective than the six. I have to depend on the parties who are interested. I cannot send these policemen from here to Vaudreuil or Verchères, a distance of 50 miles and 25 miles across. Five or six men cannot superintend the whole of that territory. I have to depend in municipalities on the officers interested or on the people, as I say, who are aggrieved, or the people who choose to co-operate with the police or who act independently, and, for the sake of the remuneration in the form of a share of the fine, lodge the information.

23548. Do you find that there is an increasing disposition on the part of the people to help you to enforce the law?—Yes, on the part of the municipal authorities and the clergy.

23549. Do you attribute that disposition to the growth of feeling against the trade?—Yes.

23550. Take the customs laws, for instance: if the customs officials within the same district had only the force you have, could they still enforce the revenue laws?—No.

23551. The increase of the force in their case helps them to enforce the laws?—Yes.

WILLIAM B. LAMBE.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23552. How is the license law enforced in the country places?—It is enforced through the district by my direction.

23553. Is it well enforced in the country places?—Fairly well, a great deal better in the country than in the city.

23554. Is there any illicit selling in the country places?—Yes, there is some.

23555. Where there are licenses, or where there are no licenses?—In both.

23556. Can you name any place where there is any illicit selling in country places?—Yes. If you go out to the Back River, Peloquin sells on Sunday and every Sunday. If you go to Côte des Neiges, you will find a man who sells there every Sunday and all Sunday. If you go to Longue Point, you will find four or five men that for the last four years have been selling without any license, openly, and all the time.

23557. And you cannot convict them?—No, when I have convicted them, the judgments have been suspended; and when I have seized, their liquors have been returned.

23558. When was the last fine returned, was it under the present Government or under the late Government?—About a month ago.

23559. Under the present Government?—Yes.

23560. What was the amount of the fine?—I think there were about four fines against the man.

23561. Peloquin?—No, Peloquin's is at the Back River. This is a man called Benoit.

23562. And the Government ordered you to give back the fine?—The liquors; not to refund the fine, because he did not pay it.

23563. You confiscated the liquors?—I had seized the liquors; but they did not confiscate them, they were returned.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23564. By order of the Government?—Yes.

23565. Have fines been remitted lately?—Not as much as under the late regime. There is a long list of fines. There are about four fines against this man Peloquin that are unpaid. There are a large number of fines against the Richelieu.

23566. Has not the present Government exacted the payment of fines?—They have given me instructions to collect them, but when I have issued the warrants, they have suspended the execution of the warrants.

23567. How many warrants did you issue?—I do not remember the names. I issued the warrants, and they were suspended.

23568. Recently?—Yes.

23569. Can your policemen enter any house during the day where they suppose that liquors are sold illicitly?—If I give them a warrant, but not otherwise.

23570. Do you know that a large quantity of liquor is sold illicitly in these shebeens of which you spoke?—In the course of a year there is a considerable quantity, but they keep a small stock at a time.

23571. Do you think they sell every day?—And every night. They get supplied regularly.

23572. May I ask if you are a member of any temperance society?—I am not.

23573. Where prohibitory by-laws are adopted in country places, do you know if these by-laws are observed or not?—That I cannot say, but there are several of our municipalities in the district of Montreal that practically issue no certificates at all. There are 19 of our municipalities that issue no licenses, and there are 65 that do.

23574. Do you think it would be better to have a license than a prohibitory by-law?—No; it has a restrictive effect. It is a prohibitory law.

23575. You believe that the prohibitory by-laws favour the cause of temperance in these municipalities?—Yes, but in our parishes the people are not addicted to drunkenness. You have a remarkably temperate and orderly people in our French Canadian population, more so than in any country in the world that I happen to know anything about. I do not compare it with Italy, because I do not know it; but in every part of Europe that I know of there are none so temperate as our French population.

23576. Have you lived in Europe?—I have been in France for a short time, and I have been in England and Scotland.

23577. Have you been in Maine?—I have only passed through it. I spent a short time in the summer season on the Atlantic coast.

23578. You do not know whether the prohibitory law is observed there or not?—No.

23579. Where were you in Maine?—At Old Orchard Beach.

23580. Did you see the law observed there?—It is 30 years ago since I was there, and there was no drinking at the Saco Hotel. I did not see any drinking there.

23581. Have you made any suggestions to the Provincial Government, past or present, respecting amendments to the license law that would enable you to enforce it?—I made reports to each Government, but no attention was paid to them.

23582. Were those reports confidential documents?—Yes.

23583. I would like very much if the Commission could get those reports.—I am hardly in a position to give them, because the reports that I make are confidential.

23584. Are the Government aware that there are from 2,000 to 4,000 unlicensed shebeens in this city?—The Mercier Government made a complaint to me that there were 2,000, and asked me if I could put an end to them.

23585. What did you reply?—I told them it was impossible to do so, and that I thought there were 4,000.

23586. Are we to understand that you have proclaimed your inability as a representative of the law to repress these shebeens?—Yes.

24587. And that there is one shebeen for every sixty of the population, besides the licensed places?—Yes.

24588. Are the Government and the public generally aware that the law is being flagrantly violated, Sunday and Monday at Back River, Longue Point, Côte des Neiges and other places?—They are only partially aware, because they are not brought into contact with it as I am. I am brought officially into contact with the thing. They have a vague idea that there is a good deal of illicit sale.

23589. I infer from what you said that these people live in summer resorts?—They are places on the drive.

23590. Are we to understand that the Government remit the fines and return the liquors?—Yes. And one of the Magistrates has stated openly on the Bench—it is not for me to criticise it or say anything about it—that it was necessary to provide places where a man could get a drink on a Sunday in driving around the country. Judge Dugas stated that on the Bench.

23591. That is a faithful picture of the condition of things around here regarding unlicensed selling and Sunday selling?—As far as I can give it to you.

23592. Would there be any hope or possibility of enforcing a prohibitory law with public opinion as it is here?—Not any better than the license law. But a prohibitory law would give you a better chance of enforcing it than does the present law.

23593. The manufacture and importation being illegal, it would be easier of enforcement, you say?—Yes.

23594. Have you ever presented the fact to the Government, that a sufficient force would be of any benefit to you. Have you ever suggested to them to give you additional men?—They asked me, and I told them I could do as much with three men as with six, and I could do as much with six men as with fifty.

23595. And your district is 50 miles by 30?—Yes.

23596. And you have the aid of the municipalities favourable to temperance?—Yes. The city police force number several hundreds. They assist the Recorder, who has joint jurisdiction with me in prosecutions, and they prosecute 200 or 300 cases in a year, and I prosecute, as I told you, over 1,000; so there is the best proof that I can give you that the 600 or 300 on the police force would not do any more than the three men.

23597. I have no reason to doubt that you do as well as any one could do under the circumstances; your judgment is that the law is as well enforced as it can be?—As well as I can enforce it.

WILLIAM B. LAMBE.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23598. May I ask you, if sometimes there are not circumstances which justify the Government in not enforcing the payment of fines?—Yes, sometimes there are.

23599. Do you think that they should exact the payment of at least three-fourths of the fines that are inflicted?—I think they should exact payment in every case, unless the Magistrates recommend to the contrary.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23600. The Magistrates have told us that they wish to be placed in such a position that they could not remit anything or exercise any discretion?—They are in that position, and yet to avoid the cancellation of licenses, which they are obliged to make after a certain number of convictions, they suspend judgment.

23601. They told us the legislation was such that they wished it were so amended that they could tell the people they had no discretion?—Why do they suspend judgment?

23602. They say, owing to influences brought to bear?—They are acting illegally.

23603. They say they wish the legislation were such that they could not help themselves but carry out the law?—As a Judge, you know perfectly well that they should not be influenced.

23604. They have said themselves that they are human beings, that they are open to sympathy?—They should not.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23605. Did I understand you to say, in reply to Mr. Gigault, that there are some instances where discretionary powers for the remission of fines should be exercised?—There are cases, but not a great many.

23606. Are these cases where Government interference has taken place after you have made a seizure, cases of that description. It is an astonishing fact that Governments will order fines to be remitted. Are there extenuating circumstances where the Government has interfered recently? Did you recommend the reduction of the fines or the return of the liquor. Are there extenuating circumstances in the instances which have taken place lately?—None at all.

23607. And the Government have actually stepped in and said: Return those liquors?—They may have had reasons that they did not give to me. They asked for my reports, and I stated the facts. I state whether the man has been convicted half a dozen times, or whether he is a gross offender, but I do not plead for or against any man.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23608. You stated, in answer to a question, that you have little or no difficulty in getting convictions in the east end, where there is a French-Canadian population, but in the west end, owing to the statements made by witnesses, it is difficult to obtain them?—Yes, very difficult.

23609. You will get two people to swear that a grocer had sold liquor and 23 will swear on the other side?—Yes.

23610. Do the 23 witnesses profess that the sale did not occur?—Sometimes they do and sometimes they do not.

23611. Have you reason to believe that these people are committing perjury?—Yes; I am discouraged from taking any prosecutions.

23612. You find that the evidence is more satisfactorily obtained from our French-speaking citizens than from the English-speaking citizens?—Yes, I am so convinced of it that I refrain very often from taking cases.

23613. Having had this experience and observation have you sought any explanation of it in your own mind?—The French-Canadians are more particular in making their statements, and the English population sometimes are more determined against the Government; and whenever it is a matter connected with the Government, they do not consider that it is a matter of very great importance. They consider that it is a matter of not much importance to make a false statement if it is against the Government, just as they commit frauds in passing goods through the customs.

23614. Is it to protect the man who is selling the liquor, or is it to assail the Government?—From both causes.

23615. We are told that there are very few licensed places in the west end where liquor is sold to be drunk on the premises?—Yes, they are nearly all shop licenses, because they are less costly and just as serviceable.

23616. Do you think there is more liquor sold to be drunk on the premises in the west end than in the east end?—Yes, largely because manufactories, sugar refineries and establishments of that kind are in the west end.

23617. Do you find also that the memories of these witnesses, as to time and place and as to what they partook of, are very defective?—Yes.

23618. Is this the case in a large number of instances?—Yes.

23619. Do you believe that in a great many of these cases it is something more than lapse of memory : is it perjury?—False statements.

23620. This must discourage you to a certain extent?—It prevents me from prosecuting in some cases.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 15th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day, SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

LOUIS E. MORIN of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

23620a. How long have you lived in this district?—I have lived in this district 62 years to-morrow.

23621. You are in business, I think?—Yes,

23622. In what business are you engaged?—My principal business is agent of Wisers's Distillery at Prescott. I am also in the fish business and in general business, but my principal business is representing the Wisers.

23623. I understand you are President of the Chamber of Commerce of Montreal?—Yes.

23624. How long have you held that position?—Since last election, in the month of March.

23625. I suppose the President is elected each year by the members of the Association?—Yes.

23626. How many members have you in the association?—There are between 400 and 500; I cannot say exactly. According to the last report I think the number was something over 400.

23627. You take cognizance of matters of trade and look after the interests of the mercantile community, I believe? Is not such the object of the association?—Yes.

23628. It is not as old an association as the Board of Trade, I understand?—Not at all; it is a new institution, only 4 or 5 years old.

23629. Have you been engaged all your life in your present business?—I have represented Messrs. Wisers for 21 years in Montreal.

23630. Have you paid any attention to the carrying out of the license law in this city?—In a general way. I do not, however, come as much in communication with the retail trade as with the wholesale, but I follow the events of the day and am naturally obliged to observe what is going on.

23631. The Wisers, I understand, are manufacturers of whisky?—Yes.

23632. Do they manufacture any other commodity?—Principally alcohol and rye whisky.

23633. Whatever liquors come to Montreal for sale arrive in bond?—Yes, everything we sell is in bond.

23634. And the duties are paid here?—Yes, in Montreal.

23635. It is sold here?—Yes, if we sell a car load outside, the duty is paid wherever it goes; but whatever comes to Montreal comes in bond and the duty is paid by the purchaser.

23636. Do you make any sales to people outside of the Province of Quebec?—Not outside the Province of Quebec. My district extends as far as Three Rivers and goes up to the boundaries of Ontario.

23637. But if you made a sale at Three Rivers, the liquor would go there and the duty be paid there, I suppose?—Yes.

23638. Can you tell the Commissioners if the consumption of rye whisky has largely increased or decreased during the last ten years?—The trade has increased generally during the last three years, but it has not increased since the smuggling operations have been conducted on such an extensive scale; in fact, it has decreased rapidly.

23639. Then during the three years preceding this one, the trade has increased?—1889, 1890 and 1891 were the largest years.

23640. Then you mean since 1891?—Business is decreasing this year.

23641. And to what do you attribute that decrease?—To the smuggling and to the high duty. The last increase of duty decreased consumption to a certain extent.

23642. You refer to the last increase in duties?—Yes, in the excise duties.

23643. What was the increase?—The increase was 20 cents per proof gallon, equal to 30 per cent per gallon on 50 O.P. We generally sell our spirits at the strength of 50.

23644. You think smuggling has some effect on your trade?—It has had a very considerable effect on the trade.

23645. And the imposition of higher excise duties has also checked the consumption?—Yes.

23646. Living in Montreal, as you have done, and taking some interest in public affairs, have you formed any opinion as to whether intemperance has increased or decreased in the city?—If we take the increased population, I do not think intemperance has increased. In my opinion it is pretty much the same as it was some years ago; in fact, I am rather disposed—I have not seen any statistics lately—to think it has decreased.

23647. If the increase in population is taken into account, you think it has decreased?—Yes, I think it has decreased.

23648. Have you formed any opinion as to whether or not the license law is efficiently carried out in the city?—I cannot give any very good judgment on that question, as I do not live in the city and only come in in connection with the wholesale trade. I live at Longueuil, and go home in the evening and I have no occasion to traverse the city.

23649. We have it in evidence that there is a great deal of illicit sale going on in the city: have you any information on that subject?—I am not well posted as to that. No doubt there may be a great deal. The licenses are too high, and this induces persons to sell illegally to make a little money.

23650. Have you any information as to the quantity of spirits made by Messrs. Wisser, at Prescott?—I cannot say exactly. I have not looked at the last statistics and can give you information only as to what is sold in Montreal.

23651. I was referring to the product of the Messrs. Wisser?—The product of Messrs. Wisser's distillery is one-fifth of what is consumed in the country; but what the whole is I do not know, for I have not looked at the statistics lately.

23652. As President of the Chamber of Commerce, you are of course brought into close contact with a large section of the commercial community. Can you tell the Commissioners if the feeling or sentiment is in favour of prohibition as the best means of checking intemperance, and as to whether that feeling has increased or decreased?—The general opinion of the mass of members of the Chamber of Commerce is against prohibition—the people with whom I have come in contact. I have found very few, exceedingly few, in favour of prohibition.

23653. By prohibition, of course, we understand a law which will prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicants?—Yes, that is the way I understand it.

23654. Do you yourself think that such a law would be effectual in checking intemperance?—I do not think it would cure intemperance; it might check it to a certain extent. There would, of course, be more difficulty in obtaining liquor, but people would institute some way of getting it. It is like everything else, they desire that which is forbidden.

23655. You think there is a disposition to partake of the forbidden fruit?—Yes, that is my opinion.

23656. Do you think there are more licenses issued in Montreal than are really necessary or desirable?—I do not think they are necessary, I think the number could be curtailed very much.

LOUIS E. MORIN.

23657. Is it within your knowledge that the illicit manufacture of spirits is carried on to any considerable extent here?—Not to such an extent as people think. There is a little of it, but it is very little compared with the quantity of spirits put on the market.

23658. What article is principally produced—what does the illicit manufacturer resort to?—The illicit manufacturers produce spirits from molasses generally, but it is on a very small scale.

23659. Do you think this business is carried on to a very large extent in the agricultural districts?—No. It is carried on by people who learn something about distilling in the cities, and then go into some hole or corner and distil a few gallons. It does not, however, take long before Excise people are after them, and the stills are broken up. The game is not worth the candle.

23660. Do you think there is any considerable manufacture of brandy carried on in the city of Montreal?—There is a good deal of it, but I think there are popular falacies as regards the manufacture of liquor here. I have had occasion to read some of the depositions which have been taken before this Commission, and there is a great outcry I find against the mixing of liquors. I do not think that is so bad as some people represent it. The basis of mixing liquor is alcohol, and starting from that we can make good brandy or anything else. This is the way it is made. If you take alcohol and reduce it, then add some colouring matter, and put in a little bead oil, you can produce brandy, gin or any other liquor. But the way some people fix them, it is impossible to make anything drinkable. There is another matter to which I desire to call the attention of the Commissioners. A great deal has been said in regard to the adulteration of liquors. The Government is trying to stop such adulteration, but they do not look at the liquors that come in from outside. If they would only look at the liquor that comes from France, especially the brandy, they would soon put a stop to that importation, because all the cheap brandy that comes in here is nothing but alcohol mixed with a little colouring matter and some little essential oil. There is a great deal more cheap brandy imported than is produced in the country.

23661. Do you think the imported brandy is adulterated?—It is not brandy at all. If you can buy brandy at \$4 a case, it cannot be good imported brandy; but they can make an article at that price and put a brand on the bottle which makes it appear to be good brandy. If you do not know what brandy is, it does well enough, and makes a drink.

23662. You spoke of brandy at \$4, do you mean \$4 a case?—Yes.

23663. Is that a case of 12 bottles?—Yes.

23664. Of what is that brandy composed?—It is composed of alcohol that comes from Germany.

23665. Is that potato alcohol?—Yes, a very cheap alcohol, and it goes into the compounding of French brandies. You have heard no doubt of Rochelle brandy, which is nothing but German spirits, a little essence of Cognac, and a little colouring matter, the whole set off with a highly coloured label.

23666. And the remainder, I suppose, is water?—They reduce the alcohol with water to make it the strength of ordinary brandy. Sometimes it tastes more of water than of brandy.

23667. In Germany, I believe, a great deal of attention has been recently paid to the question of the manufacture of alcohol. Have you followed any of the discussions on that subject?—No, but I know that a great deal of attention has been paid to it, particularly since the development of the manufacture of beetroot-sugar. I understand they can produce alcohol from the residuum. I do not know to what extent that is true, for I have never closely investigated into the matter.

23668. Can you tell the Commissioners about the percentage of alcohol in a gallon or a given quantity of Canadian whisky?—The basis on which whisky is distilled is pure alcohol. We manufacture two kinds of alcohol. One is made for medicinal purposes, which we call 65 over proof. That is a very pure spirit, in which there is not more than one or two per cent of water. The water is almost completely withdrawn. The second article put on the market is for drinking purposes, which is 50 o. p. For every gallon of alcohol, you put in one gallon of water and you have the liquor at the strength of



proof; that is drinkable and is such as is put on the market generally. But it is not often sold at that. The liquor seller after he receives it puts another gallon of water into every five gallons of what is 50 over proof. That is whisky as we generally drink it. There are six gallons of water to five gallons of whisky over proof. The 65 over proof is not sold for drinking purposes, it is sold for laboratory and for chemical purposes.

23669-70. I thought you said that to every gallon of alcohol you put one gallon of water?—Yes. Then you make the proof whisky; the proof whisky is rather strong to serve to customers who want a glass of liquor. That is what is sold to the trade for drinking purposes, because alcohol and high wines is the same thing, the only difference being that to make ourselves better understood we sell high wines for drinking purposes and alcohol for laboratory purposes. 50 over proof high wines is not strong enough to cut oil, but 65 over proof cuts oil.

23671. By cutting oil, what do you mean?—We mean that with alcohol and oil a complete mixture is formed, while if the alcohol is only 50 over proof, the alcohol will go down to the bottom and the oil will remain at the top of the bottle. It does not answer for medical purposes and other purposes for which you require a mixture of oil and alcohol.

23672. I think you said that in some cases the vendor would add another gallon of water?—That is generally done by those who understand their business.

23673. Did you say to every 5 gallons?—Yes; but if they want a little more money, they add a little more water. That is that from 5 gallons of 50 over proof alcohol or whisky they get 11 gallons of trade whisky.

23674. That would be 5 gallons of 50 o. p. alcohol and 6 gallons of water?—Yes.

23675. Is not all the whisky made inspected by a representative of the Government?—The Excise officers are in the distilleries where the alcohol is manufactured; it is afterwards put in bond and the distillers are obliged to store it for two years. The fact is that all the alcohol manufactured in this country is pretty much of the same quality. In regard to the products of the three principal distilleries of the country, that is, the Toronto distillery, Walker's and the Prescott distillery, I defy anybody to find any difference between the three articles. I have tried fifty times to do it, and I have never been able to tell which was which.

23676. Do you mean as to the ingredients?—As to the products of the manufacture.

23677. What is used principally in the manufacture?—Corn and rye, and I think sometimes oats are used, but I do not know whether the oats have been abandoned or not. I think rye and corn are the principal ingredients.

23678. Is any malt used?—Yes.

23679. Is any barley used except when made into malt?—Very likely. I know more about selling whisky than making it.

23680. Going back to the sort of supervision which the Government exercises, a recent law compels manufacturers to keep whisky in store for two years?—Yes.

23681. The object is to separate the fusel-oil from the whisky as far as practicable?—That is exactly it.

23682. At the present moment is it the duty of the officer of the Government to certify as to the character of the article before it is put on the market for sale?—I do not think it is; unless it is done at the distillery; I have never heard of its being done anywhere else.

23683. Is not some one appointed by the Government to see that whisky sent out in barrels contains a certain quantity of alcohol?—There is somebody there to see that it contains the strength at which they make the spirit. They grade the spirits, according to circumstances, up to 65 over proof, and then reduce them with water to 50 over proof, and the Excise Officer at the distillery tests the strength of the liquor and sends a certificate with it. That certificate comes down to us.

23684. If the spirit is 50 he will pass it, I suppose?—It may be less. If less, we have of course less duty to pay. The object is this: If a firm desires to send liquor from Canada to British Columbia, in order to save freight he sends it 65 over proof, and the merchant in British Columbia uses British Columbia water with which to dilute it, instead of our using St. Lawrence water and increasing the cost of freight.

23685. The excise duty is levied on the alcohol?—Yes.

LOUIS E. MORIN.

23686. Is the whisky which you ship from Prescott to Montreal in bond, then in a condition to be sold to the public, or does it undergo a process of dilution with water?—The rye whisky does not require any water; it is ready to go on the market as it is.

23687. When it comes here in bond?—That is with reference to the high wines we sell. The high wines at 50 over proof have to be reduced.

23688. The whisky consigned to you for sale, the duty upon which has not been paid, is in a condition to be sold to the public?—We sell it in the condition we get it, at the full strength. It is the buyer's business to reduce it afterwards. The wholesale merchant sells a barrel to a retail merchant. The first thing the retailer does is to take the barrel, which contains perhaps 42 gallons, and make 84 gallons out of it, and then he adds five gallons or six gallons of water more as the contents of the barrel indicate. If we give proof whisky, it is ready for drinking. It does not require more water, except the seller wants to make more profit.

23689. How much alcohol does what you call proof whisky contain?—It contains 25 per cent of alcohol.

23690. You have spoken of smuggling; of course, there has been a great deal of smuggling in the lower St. Lawrence?—Yes.

23691. Will you tell the Commissioners if there is much smuggling into Montreal and along this frontier?—The smuggled liquor does not come so far as Montreal; according to my experience it does not extend beyond Three Rivers. We are on the look out for it very closely, for it is not fair to our business. The merchants of Montreal do not favour smuggling.

23692. Is it fair to conclude that there has been very much smuggling that has not been detected by the Government officials?—Thousands of barrels had come up the Gulf before the Government began to look after it and stop it. Smuggling has been going on for three years at a terrible rate.

23693. You think there is still a good deal of smuggling going on?—Not just now. It is pretty well checked.

23694. The Government have sold at public sales the liquors which have been seized, I understand?—Yes.

23695. Can you give the Commissioners any idea as to those who purchased the liquor? Were they licensed people in the business, or were they those who probably intended to sell it illicitly?—The Government made a great mistake in selling the whisky. Lately some of it has come up from Quebec to Montreal. It has a bad effect on the trade, and the Government should not put it on the market. They should do as is done in Paris. If the Paris authorities seize adulterated wine, they empty it into the gutter, and that is what the Government should do in regard to illicit whisky here.

23696. Has it been bought by the wholesale merchants?—Yes. It, of course, enters into competition with the regular article that is produced at the distilleries and injures the trade.

23697. Can you give the Commissioners any idea as to the character of the article itself?—I have seen one or two lots, but not enough to pass an opinion on it. I have been so much annoyed at what has been going on that I have not cared to look at it.

23698. A general impression seems to prevail that this spirit is manufactured in the United States?—It is manufactured in Peoria, and this has been going on for the last five or six years.

23699. In the State of Illinois?—Yes.

23700. How does it reach the St. Lawrence?—It is manufactured generally, the greater part, in Peoria. It goes to Boston, and is afterwards sent to St. Pierre and Miquelon, where the duty is paid. That is a small matter however. Then the liquor is shipped in vessels and is brought up on the Intercolonial Railway and there are a lot of fishing vessels that sell it all along the coast. The Government has not done with the smuggling yet, but it is carried on to a less extent than formerly, for at one time it was a regular wholesale business.

23701. The Commissioners have been informed that the liquor was bought in some cases by distillers when sold by the Government, and afterwards rectified and vended it?—Distillers have bought a few lots to protect themselves. They do not want that spirit to go on the market. The law requires the ordinary distiller to keep his whisky two

years in bond, but the smuggled whisky comes in, and instead of being kept for two years and then being put on the market, it is sold almost immediately after it is made, instead of being kept, as I have said, for two years. It is a very great injustice to the trade and to the distillers particularly.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23702. In regard to inspection: does the Government inspection deal with bottled liquor which comes in from France, to which you have referred?—I do not think so. Sometimes they get an order to make an examination of spirits, but we generally see the results only two years afterwards—we get a report two years afterwards.

23703. Then, as a matter of fact, inspection is not efficient?—It is a farce.

23704. Would it be well to have those imported liquors, as well as the liquors sold at retail places, inspected from time to time?—I think it would be. I think an effort should be made to stop the importation of adulterated liquors here, and the passing of liquors under names which they have no right to bear.

23705. Then, in your opinion, the present Act does not provide efficient machinery?—It does not provide for that. The Government should take measures to stop the importation of such liquors. They are very severe against the spirit manufactured in this country, and at the same time open the doors wide for the importation of adulterated liquors.

23706. From what you say the quality of those, if the quality can be judged from what you have mentioned, is exceedingly bad?—It is not the pure article at all. Brandy is made out of raisins properly, but this stuff is made out of potato spirits, it is the product of the distillation of potatoes.

23707. Is there a low class of whisky, gin and rum sold that is similar to the low class of brandy of which you have spoken?—It is more particularly the brandy. The gin is made here. It is a small affair to make 5 or 10 gallons of gin. You take 8 gallons of whisky and you put in 2 gallons of gin, and you have 10 gallons of gin.

23708. Is that the way in which it is made here, by adding eight gallons of whisky to two gallons of gin?—Yes.

23709. Where does the original gin come from?—I am referring to how it is made in this country. The grocers generally make it themselves. As I have said, they put 2 gallons of proper gin with 8 gallons of whisky and the result is 10 gallons of gin. The gin that is imported from Holland is all right.

23710. Has the liquor the smell of whisky or of some special compound?—It is not deleterious, but you think you are taking a glass of gin and really you are taking a glass of whisky, having the smell of gin.

23711. Then apparently the smell is all that people want?—What they want is a little of something to scratch.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23712. What does that mean?—Something hot when it goes down.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23713. When was the last increase made in the customs duties on spirits?—The last increase was made last year, the session of 1891.

23714. Do I understand you to say that the increase in duty has diminished the sale?—Yes, because since that time I find the consumption of alcoholic spirits has decreased.

23715. You attribute some of the decrease to smuggling, I believe?—Smuggling helps considerably. As I have said, smuggling exists as far as Three Rivers, but it does not reach Montreal to any extent. The consumption of whisky has decreased, but the consumption of beer and porter has increased, and is increasing very rapidly.

23716. Would the imposition of increased duties on spirits further decrease the sale?—I do not think it would, because I recollect the time when we were selling whisky at 45 cents a gallon, and now it is \$4 a gallon, and yet we are drinking now more than when it was selling at that low figure. It might, however, have a slight

LOUIS E. MORIN.

effect in reducing the consumption. Just now people seem to be drinking a little less whisky and more beer, but there may be a reaction next year and instead of drinking beer they may go in more for whisky.

23717. Would it be better to continue to drink beer and light wine and leave whisky alone?—Yes, if you can induce the people to do so.

23718. Would the placing of heavier duties on strong liquors induce the people to drink light liquors, such as wine and beer?—The people who have means and who desire to have wine at their table, the people of cities, would drink the wine and beer very likely; but in the country and in the fishing districts, it would be no use giving the people beer or light wine, for they want something to scratch.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23719. Is alcohol cheaper or dearer in the United States than it is in Canada?—I think pretty much the same price. The alcohol itself in bond is a great deal cheaper in the United States than in Canada.

23720. Is the American excise duty paid on alcohol which goes from the United States to St. Pierre and Miquelon?—At St. Pierre and Miquelon they pay the French duty.

23721. Is there any excise duty paid?—There is no excise duty paid. It is sent in bond from the United States to St. Pierre and Miquelon. Instead of sending it direct to Canada, it is sent there, and it pays the French duty. It is sent in bond from Peoria to St. Pierre.

23722. Is all alcoholic liquor exported from the United States free of duty?—Yes, it pays duty wherever it is consumed.

23723. Only customs duty?—Yes; there is no excise paid on any whisky exported; it is the same in this country.

*By the Chairman :*

23724. Is there any duty charged on alcohol manufactured in the United States and exported?—No, there is not.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23725. Are the distillers given a certain time to export alcohol after it has been manufactured, or pay the duty?—Yes. At one time they had to export it or pay the duty on it within two years. They tried to send a good deal of it into Canada, but the Government here forbade it.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23726. Do the American distillers keep spirit some time before they export it?—Pretty much the same time as here. It cannot be put on the market here within two years; but, as regards whisky for export, what you make to-day you may export to-morrow. I do not know what the law may be in the United States on this subject.

23727. Is there any time within which it must be put on the market?—I do not know whether they have one or two years in which to put it on the market.

23728. Do you know if there is a good deal of smuggling from Canada to the United States?—No. Some Americans take a little brandy over in their trunks, and that is about all. There is not much smuggling going on from here there. We have no advantage to offer in regard to smuggling into the United States, because their whisky is cheaper than ours.

23729. You spoke of bead oil: what is the character of that oil?—Bead oil is an oil of which you put a few drops into an alcoholic mixture to cause a bead. It causes a bead round the glass, and that leads the purchaser to suppose that the liquor is a good deal stronger than it really is. It does not give any oily taste to the mixture, but around the glass, as I said, there is a bead. The liquor may contain very little alcohol, and yet it will show a bead, and the purchaser thinks that the liquor is up to the mark.

23730. Is it deleterious to health?—No. It is a matter of appearance more than anything else.

*By the Chairman :*

23731. Is it harmful?—No.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23732. If there was an increase of duty on Canadian alcohol, would there be more smuggling?—Yes; the higher the duty the more smuggling there would be; the Government will never be able to put down smuggling so long as they increase the duty.

23733. What do you know about Canadian wine?—I do not think much of it. Of course there is some good wine manufactured near Windsor, but I think if the manufacturers would improve the quality, there would be a much larger quantity consumed. I saw some samples at an exhibition in my own locality which I would not like to drink.

23734. Do you think it is possible to improve the quality of Canadian wine?—Yes, a good deal; it is quite possible to do so. The greediness of the manufacturers is such, however, that they do not take the trouble to do the right thing. If they would make wine like that manufactured in Windsor and some other places there would be a good deal more sold, and it would appear on the tables of the well to do and those who desire to have wine on the table.

*By the Chairman :*

23735. Is there any wine made in Quebec?—There is some wine made here, but that is the kind I am talking of. I think there is plenty of room for improvement in regard to it. Some of the wine made in Ontario is really very good, but of that made in Quebec we cannot boast, unless there are some qualities which I have not seen.

23736. Is any whisky manufactured in the Province of Quebec?—No; Prescott is the most eastern distillery in the old provinces of Canada.

23737. Was there not some time ago a distillery in Joliette?—They tried one in L'Assomption, in Berthier. They closed that, however. The way in which spirits were manufactured was on a different principle from that followed in the Ontario distilleries. There they converted the residue of beetroot-sugar into alcohol.

23738. You say it has been discontinued?—It was seized by the Government and broken up.

23739. Financially it was a failure?—It was a failure in every respect.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

23740. You have told us that you thought the number of licenses in this city should be curtailed?—Yes, very much.

23741. For what reason?—Because there are too many low grogeries and too much temptation for people to drink, by having a tavern about every six doors.

23742. If you followed that out, would you not close all the places?—I am not in favour of shutting up all the places for selling liquor, but I am in favour of having decent places, places where a man can get a good glass of liquor and not be in danger of being robbed, as is the case in too many places in Montreal.

23743. Are there any licensed places in this city where there is danger of a visitor being robbed?—In regard to licensed places it is different; the places, however, vary from the principal hotels to low grogeries.

23744. We are told that it requires twenty-five residents of a polling district to sign a paper requesting a license to be granted before one is issued?—Yes.

23745. Are we to understand from what you have said that there are people in Montreal who have licenses and who keep places in which a man might be in danger of being robbed, and who are able to procure the signatures of twenty-five other neighbours to open such an establishment?—There are plenty of them. You can always get twenty-five signatures; you can always find twenty-five people ready to sign almost anything. I have seen some application made to open taverns signed by one party, and yet the same party would sign a paper for prohibition.

23746. You have told us that you are the agent of Messrs. Wiser, and that you sell merely to the wholesale people. When you speak of wholesale, what do you mean?

LOUIS E. MORIN.

—I do not sell less than \$1,000 worth of whisky to anybody. That is my smallest sale. I do not encroach on the business of the wholesaler.

23747. Do the distillers sell all their products through agents?—The distillers of Ontario sell through agents.

23748. You sell only to wholesale men, how small a package would be covered by such sale?—The casks contain forty gallons each. I do not sell less than half a car load, which is twenty-six barrels, each averaging forty gallons each.

23749. Do you sell any package that contains liquors in glass?—No. We have some; but I do not push the sale of case liquors.

23750. Does all the liquor that leaves the distillery go out in casks?—No. A great quantity comes in glass and in case.

23751. You do not deal with it, however?—No. Our business is generally in casks.

23752. Do the distillers themselves keep that liquor which is sent out in glass, in wood for a certain length of time before it is put into bottles?—It depends on the distiller. I understand that the Walkers keep all their rye whisky in wood for a long time, and that is what causes the excellence or pretended excellence of their liquor. There are other distillers who keep their liquor in copper tanks. I think, it is however a question of taste, that rye whisky kept in wood gives better satisfaction than that which is kept in copper tanks. It has a peculiar flavour and taste of the oak, which flavour, of course, is not obtained when stored in copper tanks.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23753. Does more evaporation take place?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23754. Do your people keep it in tanks?—Yes.

23755. When they draw it from the tank, do they draw it directly into wood or leave it for a time, or do they draw it into bottles?—I cannot say. I know some of it is kept three or four years before leaving the distillery.

23756. You have told the Commissioners that the distillers send out proof whisky from the distillery which has twenty-five per cent of alcohol in it?—I must correct that mistake. It is fifty per cent, because it is reduced one to one.

23757. By whom has it been reduced?—It has been reduced at the distillery.

23758. In order to produce that, does the distiller at the distillery make the same dilution with water that a man will make who buys it?—Yes.

23759. So it is done by the distiller, instead of by the retailer?—Yes.

23760. How does the distiller get access to the liquor?—The distiller pays the duty on a certain quantity of alcohol and takes it out of bond, and account is kept of it by the officer in charge. He gets the liquor and then reduces it, and it is exported in bond. There is no money paid.

23761. Then he pays the duty before he adds the water?—If he wants to sell it free, he pays the duty. If the distiller receives an order for a car load, and two barrels are required of proof whisky, he fills the order in that way and sends so many barrels of alcohol and two of proof. Instead of paying duty on fifty, they pay the duty on twenty-five under proof.

23762. Who pays it?—The merchant pays it. It is transferred in that way; we have nothing to do with the duty.

23763. Is the duty reckoned on alcohol and half water?—All liquor is reduced to the strength of proof, and it is on the strength of proof the duty is paid.

23764. Is it alcohol and half water?—Yes, and if there is less strength there is less duty, and if it is stronger an additional duty is of course paid.

23765. You have told the Commissioners that from the addition of a certain quantity of whisky to a small quantity of gin, a larger quantity of gin is produced by the grocer, and that the gin itself is imported pure from Holland?—Yes.

23766. How is the gin itself made originally?—It is made pretty much the same as all alcohol is made, but there is the addition of juniper.

23767. The juniper gives the flavour?—Yes, and the smell. Gin is nothing but alcohol. Alcohol is the basis of all kinds of spirits.

23768. Why should not the maker, instead of adding Holland gin to whisky, simply add juniper to whisky?—There are many ways of doing things. We have not exactly succeeded in making gin such as it is produced in Holland. I recollect 40 years ago a person came from Holland here and tried to make gin, but he was not successful. I have never seen anybody since successful at that business.

23769. Then there is a secret in making gin in Holland?—Yes.

23770. You are only an agent?—Yes, I am agent for Messrs. Wisser, but I am also engaged in other kinds of business. In regard, however, to wines and beers, I do not deal in them.

23771. You have told the Commissioners about the system of making gin and also about adding bead oil to liquors?—Yes.

23772. Do all the dealers do this?—I could not say; there are some honest dealers even in the liquor business.

23773. Do you mean to say there is not any place in which a person going in and asking for a glass of brandy or whisky here could not get the real article?—It is not made by grocers generally, not by small retailers, but by what we call compounders.

23774. Who are they?—They conduct a special line of business. They will make you brandy at \$3 a case to your order, and also brandy at \$6 a case.

23775. And they supply the retailers?—Yes.

23776. They supply the retailers, but not the public?—Yes.

23777. You have told the Commissioners that you think there is an error in the public mind in regard to the harmfulness of adulteration?—There is a general opinion amongst even educated people which is quite erroneous. They think the mixing of liquors always involves the use of all kinds of poisonous articles. Such is not the case.

23778. You think the mistake is as to what you call harmful adulteration?—In regard to what I call innocuous adulteration of liquors.

23779. In regard to the harmfulness?—Yes.

23780. Because your own evidence goes to show an immense amount of adulteration carried on?—Yes.

23781. Tampering with liquor?—Yes; but it does not cause so much harm as people would think, because to hear some talk one would arrive at the conclusion that the manufacturers add all kinds of poisonous drugs to the liquor. The case is more one of catering to the public taste and eye. The basis is alcohol, and you may mix articles so as to either increase or diminish its strength.

23782. The compounders do this?—Yes.

23783. For that purpose?—Yes.

23784. Is it considered that these people will not make harmful compounds?—Certainly. They are generally respectable houses, and they are under the Superintendent of Excise. They will make mixtures of whisky either stronger or weak as desired. They will reduce whisky and use peppermint and sugar, all of which things are not harmful.

23785. Do you think it respectable that if a man wishes to procure good and wholesome liquor he should be sold a mixture of alcohol, water, sugar and bead oil?—He is the man who wants to get for \$3 that for which he should pay \$3.50.

23786. How can the man who purchases at retail tell the quality of the article?—He knows by test the quality that he could get for such and such a price.

23787. I am speaking of the consumer?—He must look after himself.

23788. You have spoken somewhat of the effect of this dilution; but you have also told us that those people want to get liquor which will scratch? Yes.

23789. You think that some want their throats scratched pretty well?—Yes, those who order brandy.

23790. But the addition of water will not do that?—No.

23791. The addition of bead oil will not have that effect, I suppose?—No.

23792. What does give the scratch to the throat?—It depends. If you take the brandy of France, that is pure alcohol. If you go down to Quebec and travel on the south shore and call at a certain parish, where there is no tavern, because the people will not issue a certificate for license, you will find the people drinking pain killer. I knew

LOUIS E. MORIN.

it was done in the North-west, but I did not know it was done in the Province of Quebec. A gentleman who has been through the district, however, told me that pain-killer was used there by people because they could not get whisky.

23793. Does good pure whisky give the scratch?—It makes a fellow jolly.

23794. But it would not give the burning sensation?—No.

23795. Is not pain-killer an expensive drug?—It is not a question of price when a man wants it.

23796. You think the compounders sell to men who are going to retail to the tavern keepers?—They sell it to the tavern keepers.

23797. Do you think the tavern keepers stop at that?—That would not be done in Montreal, where you can get whisky, brandy, gin or anything you like, but in places where you cannot get it, the people resort to all means. In cities you get just what you want and you pay no more than its value. If you want a glass of Hennessy's brandy you have to pay 15 cents for it, but if you go into a shebeen you are charged only 5 cents, but it is not Hennessy's.

23798. What guarantee has a man who gives 15 cents for a glass of brandy that he gets Hennessy's and not some mixture prepared by the compounders?—I suppose faith has a great deal to do with it, if he is not a judge. If he is a judge, he will not return, but he will go next door next time.

23799. In the rural districts, where there are licenses, have you found the same thing to prevail?—Yes.

23800. Do you think they deal in such bad liquors?—They do not deal in the best class of liquors.

23801. Do they tamper with the kind of liquors they obtain?—No, they do not understand that.

23802. Do the tavern keepers in the rural districts add a plug of tobacco to the barrel of whisky sometimes?—I have heard of it; I heard of it at the time Father Chiniquy preached here. I have never forgotten that in the church right here Father Chiniquy, when in the pulpit, described the way that liquor was made. He said that people in order to give strength to the liquor put in tobacco.

23803. Have you any knowledge of such having been done?—No.

23804. Do you know what the effect would be?—It would have a poisonous effect.

23805. Do you know the effect of a certain small quantity being added to alcohol and water; would it have the effect of giving the scratch to the throat?—I have never tried it.

23806. Do you believe it would do so?—I would not like to try under any consideration.

23807. Have you heard of the addition of blue vitriol in certain quantities to liquor?—You have had more experience than I have, but I have never heard of it.

23808. You do not know what the effect would be?—No.

23809. Perhaps you have heard of the addition of logwood to port wine?—It is not dangerous.

23810. Is it not an astringent?—Yes, it is very astringent.

23811. A small amount of it would have an effect?—That would not give the scratch.

23812. Is it not added to give colour?—Yes.

23813. You believe that is used?—I have heard of it, but I do not believe everything I hear. Since you tell me I believe it, because you tell me so.

23814. I have plenty proof of it.—Indeed.

23815. You have stated you do not think there is a satisfactory inspection. Do you think the present Inspector requires more force?—I think so.

23816. Do you believe the men with whom you deal send out pure liquor?—Yes.

23817. In justice to them, should there not be an effort made to have a thorough inspection?—Yes, I am of that opinion.

23818. In justice to those who have to consume liquor, should there be a thorough inspection?—Yes, but we want to receive the result before two years.



23819. You think the result should be given quickly?—It should be done like everything else.

23820. Do you not think there should be another inspection, measures adopted that would prevent there being sold to the public such mixtures as you have mentioned, mixtures of bead oil, alcohol and water?—There is inspection of a whole lot of things now. There is inspection of coffee, pepper and a lot of other articles, but the result is not very satisfactory. If we are not going to obtain better results, we might as well leave the whole matter alone.

23821. Do you not think this should be done?—I am in favour of having all these articles inspected, because there is too much cheating going on.

23822. You wish an efficient inspection made?—Yes.

23823. There is an article sold now in place of butter, alema, and the maker is required to place a label distinctly indicating what it is, so that people can choose whether they will buy it or not?—Yes.

23824. Would it not be fair and proper that compounders should be compelled to state on labels placed on the packages the nature of the mixtures?—The respectable distillers sell whisky and the products of their distillery in their own name and in their own barrels and cases. It is the name of the distilleries that is the fortune. If you compel the distillers to act that way and at the same time open the door to adulterations or the admission of adulterated articles from foreign countries, what is the use of your inspection. Shut the door to foreign compounds coming in and you will succeed better; and in regard to inspection, do it thoroughly.

23825. Do you think it would be right that goods sent out by licensed compounders should have labels placed upon them stating the ingredients of the mixture?—I am very much in favour of that. If you put that law into operation, before six months you will have compounding cease, because when the people go to buy liquor and find that the bottle offered to them contains nothing but a compound, they will refuse to purchase it.

23826. Would that not be for the benefit of the consumer?—Yes, for his great benefit.

23827. I suppose imported liquors are brought here in glass principally?—Yes.

23828. How would you get the proof in order to make an inspection?—I do not know. I would have them inspected here by the inspector of liquors, and I would not allow any of the liquors to be put on the market without being satisfied that they are the genuine article.

23829. We are told that the difficulty of the Inspector is that only one bottle out of a whole stock is handed to him, and there may be other liquors which would if inspected be found to be adulterated?—The way I would have the inspection conducted is this: I would examine the liquors as they come off the ship, beginning with the first lot.

23830. What would you think of an inspection carried on at the retail establishment?—Those liquors are generally not ordered from here, but are generally sent on consignment from France and they are taken from the ship and landed on the wharf. The inspection should take place there; if the inspection is not thorough, it would be just as well to leave it alone.

23831. In regard to the adulteration of liquors, some liquors are sold that instead of producing drunkenness in people, produce a kind of lunacy or almost paralysis. The man at once falls into a state of coma?—Indeed.

23832. Would not such cases indicate that deleterious compounds are used?—I have observed the different effects of liquor on different people, and it is very curious to see how differently it acts on different constitutions. I do not know enough of medicine to be able to give an opinion on this subject, but it has a curious effect in some cases.

23833. Have you had any acquaintance with the working of a prohibitory law?—I have no experience, because prohibition has not been in force here. I followed it a little in the State of Maine.

23834. You have had no personal experience?—No.

23835. During the time the Scott Act was in force in different counties, did you sell liquor there?—I never sold liquor to those counties, but I went through some Scott Act counties to study the effect of the Act, and I had a great deal of fog.

LOUIS E. MORIN.

23836. Name the places visited by you?—Prince Edward Island and Pictou and Sydney.

23837. You have travelled through Quebec, I suppose?—I have not been where the Scott Act is in operation.

23838. Then you have not been in Drummond and one or two other counties?—No.

23839. Did you send liquor into those counties?—I do business principally in Montreal and in one or two other places, including Three Rivers, but not much in the rural districts.

23840. You have spoken of Pictou: what did you see?—I saw more drunkenness there than in Montreal, if you take the proportion of population.

23841. When was that?—It was four years ago. It was about the time the Scott Act was started or went into operation. I questioned the hotel-keeper where I was staying as to the operation of the Act, and I told him I was surprised at the condition of things, as I did not expect to be able to get a glass of liquor there. He stated that at one time there were four hotels with everything conducted nicely and quietly, but since the Scott Act had come into operation there had been more drunkenness, everybody had liquor. Before that when a person wanted liquor, he could get it.

23842. Were you at New Glasgow?—I passed it, but I did not stop off.

23843. You visited Pictou town?—Yes.

23844. Did you also visit Prince Edward Island?—Yes, and I got liquor whenever I wanted it.

23845. Where did you go?—To Charlottetown.

23846. Was the Scott Act in force then?—That was four or five years ago.

23847. The Scott Act has been repealed since, I believe?—Yes, but that was at the time the Scott Act was in force.

23848. You object to the Government selling smuggled liquor in competition with regular distillers and without requiring regulations as imposed on them?—Yes.

23849. How would it answer to have liquor mixed with naphtha and thus turn it into methylated spirits?—The Government have tried that, but they received too much alcohol for the demand for methylated spirits, and they thought they could get rid of it by placing it on the market and forcing the distillers to buy it. The distillers do not want it, for it is their business to make whisky and not to buy smuggled whisky.

23850. It interferes with their trade arrangements, you say?—Yes.

23851. You appear to have a system here of parks or pleasure resorts. One of these is known as Sohmer Park. What is your opinion as to the usefulness of such places as regards the community?—I wish they were multiplied by ten, and then you would see drunkenness going down at a pretty regular rate. When a man has nothing to do, he is liable to go to a tavern. If he can go to the Sohmer Park or the Island Park with his family, it keeps him out of a tavern. The parks are great blessings to the city.

*By the Chairman:*

23852. You spoke of being in Pictou, Nova Scotia?—Yes.

23853. Do you remember what year it was?—I think it was about five years since I was there for the first time.

23854. You spoke of the Scott Act having just gone into force?—Yes.

23855. You mean it was in force?—Yes.

23856. Do you know when it was put into force?—I do not know how long it was in force, but I know it was in force when I was there.

23857. As a matter of fact, it was in force a long time before that?—I did not know. I know it was in force at that time because the first thing that struck me was the number of drunken people. I went to the hotel, and I spoke to the hotel-keeper, and said, "Can you get any liquor here? I thought it was a Scott Act town." "Is that the way the Scott Act is observed here," I said: "Look at that fellow."

*By Judge McDonald:*

23858. You have spoken of the way whisky and high wines are made, and you have said that in the whisky from Messrs. Wisser there is a certain quantity of water added?—Yes.

23859. Do you know whether in any country whisky is manufactured without high wines being reduced—take Scotch whisky, for example?—You cannot make any liquor of any kind without having alcohol as a basis. Scotch and Irish whisky have as a basis alcohol.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23860. You make alcohol in your distillery?—Yes, and reduce it.

*By Judge McDonald :*

23861. Are your whiskys all reduced alcohol?—Yes, the very finest liquors you drink are alcohol ; for example, curaçoa has, as its basis, alcohol.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

23862. Speaking of your tour through the Scott Act counties, I think you said you went to examine as to the working of the Act?—A great deal was being said about the Scott Act at the time, and I went to see how the law was working where it was in operation. I never made a special study of it.

23863. Being a representative of a distillery, it would be natural for you to ascertain the facts regarding drinking whisky?—It was more out of curiosity than anything else that I made the investigation ; it was a pleasure tour.

23864. Were you surprised to find there was so much liquor sold?—I was. I can tell you some places where prohibition exists and where a large quantity of liquor is consumed. In Gaspé there is only one hotel, and there is more drunkenness than I ever saw anywhere. Formerly there were half a dozen respectable taverns at the place, and they were for the public benefit.

23865. Speaking about Pictou and Charlottetown and other places where the Scott Act was in operation, did you have an opportunity, prior to the coming into operation of the Scott Act, to observe the quantity of liquor sold?—I have not travelled a great deal.

23866. Have you been able to compare those places under the Scott Act and under the license system?—No ; I have not studied the case sufficiently.

23867. All you know is that a good deal of illicit sale is going on where the Scott Act was in force?—Yes.

23868. Speaking of those adulterations, you agree with Dr. Edwards that the adulterations are not deleterious, that the substances used do not make the liquor more dangerous than it would be without them, that they are practically dilutions?—That is the fact. I have not read Dr. Edwards's testimony.

23869. You have said that if the analysis was carried out throughout a number of years, covering a great many specimens, it would be found that few deleterious substances were used, that the adulterations were in the main dilutions, that the liquors were weakened and were not in any way injurious to those consuming them, or at all events not more injurious than they would have been if they had not been diluted. Do you know whether the compounds used are injurious substances?—I do not know personally, because I do not have business with them ; but I do not think they do use such substances ; it would not be in their interest to do so.

23870. Do you think those adulterations are injurious to consumers?—No ; if they were more extended, they would be beneficial.

23871. Do you think they had better dilute the liquor still more?—Yes.

23872. You would not limit the dilution at all until it got down to water?—I would stop at water.

23873. You believe that would be beneficial to the consumers?—I think it would—that is, to the consumer who abuses liquor.

23874. I have gathered the impression from what you have said in regard to the tricks of the trade, that the trade evades the law whenever it can?—How do you mean evades the law?

23875. I mean in regard to dilution.—That is not evading the law. There is no law that says a dealer shall not put one pint of water into one gallon of whisky.

LOUIS E. MORIN.

23876. Is it not an invasion of the law in regard to customs duties?—There is no law against that; it is no evasion of the law, because the duty is paid on whisky according to its strength.

23877. Am I correct in gathering the impression that the trade is largely liable for deceptions to customers?—If you travel in the country, sometimes you like to take something, and if you cannot get real Hennessy's brandy, you fall back on plain whisky.

23878. Do you believe tobacco is more poisonous than the spirits, when the weed is introduced in it?—I have to believe the Commissioner who has said that it is used, but I have the idea in my head that it is not really done.

23879. You said you accepted Judge McDonald's statement, and you said that if tobacco was introduced, it would be poisonous in its character. Do you think the tobacco more poisonous than the spirit?—Ten times. I would rather drink five gallons of whisky than one gallon of tobacco.

23880. You mean tobacco in solution?—Yes.

23881. Do you believe a rough system of inspection would prevent a lot of these irregularities going on?—I am in favour of inspection. I think it would be of benefit. I also think it would be advantageous if compounders were obliged to place on their bottles, labels indicating their contents, so that if a consumer wished to purchase whisky, he would not take anything else.

23882. Suppose there was a law of that sort passed, requiring the vendor or manufacturer to put a label on the ingredients, do you believe that the law and system of inspection would accomplish the purpose, or that there would be evasions of the law?—There would not be evasions under the Inland Revenue Superintendent. If necessary, the Inspector might stamp on every bottle its value. If you go into an apothecary's shop, you find a lot of bottles which contain poison.

23883. You spoke about British Columbia and about dealers receiving forty-two gallons of whisky and making eighty-four gallons; is that dilution required in order to prepare the whisky for consumption?—The dealer might make ninety gallons out of the forty-two. If the consumer wants a whisky at \$5 or \$6, it will, of course, be stronger. If he wants a whisky at \$2, he will get a \$2 whisky.

23884. You made this statement, that dealers, wholesale and retail, take eight gallons of whisky and add two gallons of Holland gin, and sell the mixture as cheap gin, and the people take it because it smells like gin. Would the analyst be able to tell whether it was gin or whisky?—The analyst would find both whisky and gin, but I do not know whether he would be able to ascertain the proportion of gin in the whisky.

23885. Suppose it was half and half, five gallons of gin and five of whisky, would he be able to tell that it was not all gin?—I do not know.

23886. I understand you are President of the Chamber of Commerce of Montreal?—Yes.

23887. You have said that that association is composed of about 400 members?—Yes.

23888. And that the general opinion of the members of the Chamber of Commerce is against prohibition?—Yes.

23889. In what business are the representatives of the Chamber of Commerce usually engaged?—In all kinds of business.

23890. Is the liquor business the chief business represented in the Chamber?—I think I am the party most interested in the liquor business who is a member of the Chamber.

23891. You have spoken of the opinions of the members. I suppose their opinion has never been polled?—We very often have questions discussed, the liquor question among others, among ourselves, and we express our opinions.

23892. Have you any means of knowing what, in general, is public opinion?—The way I have ascertained whether the public are for or against prohibition is from conversations I have with parties whom I meet on the street, and with whom the question is often discussed, "What do you think of prohibition?" That is the way I arrive at a conclusion on the subject.

23893. Have you made any statement of the annual output of the distillery you represent; how do you arrive at the conclusion that your distillery manufactures one-fifth of the whole spirits made in the country?—That is the proportion.

23894. Do you know the number of employees engaged in the distillery?—I cannot say.

23895. Do you know the amount of wages paid?—No.

23896. Do you favour the imposition of high duties on whisky?—No, I would favour a reduction of duty.

23897. The theory has been advanced that if there were higher duties imposed on whisky and strong alcoholic liquors, and lower duties on wines and beers, it would encourage the drinking of lighter liquors?—Those people have not been in the whisky business. They talk from hearsay and not from experience.

23898. As a man long in the business and an expert, that is not your view?—No.

23899. Do you believe that the use of wines, and the encouragement of their use, and the use of beers, would diminish the consumption of whisky?—You might diminish the use of whisky among the wealthy population of Montreal, and the people who are in the habit of having wine on the table, but it would not prevent a man taking whisky even if he had wine. But if you impose a high duty so as to shut out whisky, the people would be apt to resort to pain-killer.

23900. Is that worse than whisky?—Yes.

23901. Do you know what is the basis?—I think I do, because I have sold alcohol to make pain-killer.

23902. Do you think other ingredients are more injurious than the things used in adulteration?—The others do very well for the scratching part.

23903. Speaking about smuggling liquor, you say it is a great injustice to the trade?—Yes.

23904. And you also say the liquor merchants do not favour smuggling?—I say the liquor merchants in Montreal do not favour smuggling.

23905. Would they favour smuggling if the trade was prohibited?—Yes, everybody then would be a smuggler.

23906. Is that the only reason, then, why the liquor seller is not a smuggler?—The trade is now legalized, and a good citizen must abide by the laws of the country.

23907. If the trade were prohibited, would they cease to become good citizens?—I do not think that you could prohibit the sale of liquor in such a way that it could not be brought into the country. You may pass a prohibitory law, but I do not think that would stop the use of liquor here. Instead of doing a legitimate business as we do now and respecting the laws, we would have to adopt other means to make a living.

23908. Instead of resorting to other legitimate means of livelihood, do you think the liquor seller would become an illicit dealer?—Certainly, because many of these men have been in business for a lifetime and they would be unable to earn a living at any other trade. Some of them are very respectable people. If you decided to stop the trade, they would ask you how they were going to live. If you decided not to allow them to carry on their trade legitimately, they would, of course, follow an illegitimate trade—they would do like the smuggler.

23909. Are we to understand that the law is obeyed simply because it accords with the popular view?—Of course the laws are framed at present so as to legalize the trade, and if those laws were wiped out, the people would have to do the best they could for themselves.

23910. Do you know whether it is a fact that the whisky manufactured at Peoria that comes to St. Pierre had been kept three years in bond before it was exported?—I am not aware of it. I do not suppose that such is the case, because they do not pay any duty. The whisky distilled last week may be exported this week and go to St. Pierre, where vessels will take it up, and the vessels that take it to Canada do not require any papers because they do not intend to report at any port.

23911. Is it true that whisky can be exported the day following its manufacture?—I do not know, but I am aware that it can be exported from the United States without storing it any length of time. I do not know whether they do so or not.

*By the Chairman :*

23912. Is there any export duty?—No.

LOUIS E. MORIN.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

23913. You say there is no export duty; but can it be exported within three years?—I do not know.

23914. You have spoken of French brandy?—At one time there was a considerable quantity of alcohol shipped from the United States to the south of France and returned under the name of brandy. It also went to L'Original and other places. I recollect this, which was 30 or 40 years ago. This liquor, I say, came back under the name of brandy and was sold at from \$3.50 to \$4.50 a case. There have been protective duties imposed since and the trade has fallen off, but I may say that there are even now on the market large quantities of inferior brandy.

23915. What about French wine?—The French wines do not go through the same ordeal. There are different kinds of wine, of course, but I am now speaking of brandy. In regard to the introduction of French wines: they of course would be a benefit to the country. I do not think, however, that they would be so beneficial as some people suppose. Some people think that if the French wines came in here at low duty, the people would entirely cease drinking whisky, but in my opinion they will never give up drinking whisky. If you were to visit my place, instead of giving you whisky, I might offer you a glass of wine. But people generally do not offer wine because they cannot afford to do so; they keep a bottle of whisky in the house, and almost everybody uses it more or less.

23916. If I went to your house and preferred whisky, I suppose you would give me whisky?—Yes, but there might be perhaps more wine than whisky in the house. I generally keep a bottle of wine and a bottle of whisky for the use of my friends.

23917. You do not think, however, that the general use of light wines would dispose of the consumption of whisky?—I do not think so. In the country you cannot get the people to drink wine in place of whisky. When people are hard worked they like to have a glass of whisky.

23918. Do you think if there was legislation which would have the effect of reducing the duties on wine and increasing the duties on whisky, and thus making it hard for the man who likes whisky to get it, it would be discriminating against the whisky-loving people?—I think we should increase the duties on imported liquors and allow our own domestic liquors to be used, because our domestic liquors have not been so much adulterated, and on account of the adulterations in imported liquors they should be kept out. Of course the imported liquors come into competition with our own.

*By the Chairman:*

23919. Do you arrive at that conclusion on the ground that imported liquors are largely adulterated?—The lower classes of liquors are very much adulterated. As to the high classes of liquor, of course they are used by people of means. If they use them, let them pay for them and give the country the benefit of the revenue. Let the Government reduce the duty on light wines, if only for an experiment, to see what will occur. If, after three or four years, the Government find the introduction of cheap wines and the reduction of duties do not meet their ideas, they could return to the old state of things.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

23920. Is it your opinion that the country should protect and encourage the manufacture of whisky in our own country as against the foreign manufactured article?—Certainly, that is my opinion. I would rather drink a glass of our whisky than a glass of common brandy.

23921. I think you have said that license is the proper way of dealing with the liquor traffic, and yet you said that the license is too high?—We did not talk of license at all.

23922. You said there were too many licenses issued?—Yes, but I did not talk about the price paid for licenses, or say that the fee was too high.

23923. Do you think the license fee is too high?—I must confess that I am not in a position to give an accurate opinion on that subject.

23924. Why do you think the number of licenses should be reduced?—There are too many of them. If you had fewer licenses there would be more respectable places.

23925. Which offers the greater temptation, the low groggery or the more respectable place?—The low groggery is the greater temptation. The proprietors would do almost anything to sell a glass of liquor, whereas respectable houses would not do anything wrong in order to obtain five or ten cents.

23926. To which are young men more likely to go, to the low groggery or to the more respectable house?—Certainly not to the low groggery.

23927. Will a young man begin to drink by going to a low groggery?—I will tell you how he will begin: He will get a bottle, and will go into a field and drink it there.

23928. Do you think if there were fewer licenses, there would be more illegal trade than there is now?—No. It would be an advantage, a benefit to the people who have licenses if the shebeens were closed and trade protected.

23929. Do you think that should be done?—Yes. I also think the trade would assist in protecting itself. There is a class of tavern keepers that is not what you may call first class, but there are also some very fine men in the business. I think that would help to put up the status of the tavern keepers.

23930. Do you think they would become informers against illicit sellers?—They would take means of having informations laid. They would not become informers. Of course, there are many ways of killing a dog.

23931. Do you think, from your general observation, that the retail liquor trade is an evil in any degree in its tendency on the community?—As a patriot I would rather see less liquor sold, as a good citizen I would rather see a great deal less sold, because we cannot say that the consumption of liquor is a benefit to society in general. But if we are to continue to use it, we must protect ourselves and do the best we can, and I may say that even the niggers get a kind of alcohol which they distil from a tree. If it is one of the marks of civilization to drink champagne, the man who cannot afford it will get a glass of whisky. It is a necessary evil, something like houses of prostitution.

23932. Do you think they are necessary evils?—You have to admit them, whether they are necessary or not.

23933. Would you legalize them?—That is another question. It is a very great question in Paris just now with the French Government, as to whether they will continue to legalize them or not. I have read some books that would lead me to the conclusion that it would be better not to legalize them, and I have read other books that lead me to the conclusion that they should be legalized. We have to balance opinions.

23934. From your statement you are of the opinion that the number of licenses issued for the sale of liquor should be reduced?—Yes.

23935. Then the retail trade really has an evil tendency and should be restricted?—Yes.

23936. Do you know whether the wholesale trade is in anyway related to the retail trade?—The wholesale trade is related in the way that they seek their customers in the retail trade. That is the relation that exists, and it is the same relation as between buyer and seller.

23937. You think the wholesale could not get on without the retail?—One could not exist without the other, because you require to have somebody to buy. It is just the same as a butcher could not exist if there was no one to buy his beef.

23938. Of course we could not get along without meat?—Certainly. It is one link in the long chain that forms society.

23939. Do you know any business during your long years of business experience and knowledge of the subject, that has around it the same restrictions as the liquor trade?—I do not.

23940. Do you know why the liquor trade should be subjected to such peculiar restrictions?—It has its evil side more pronounced than any other trade.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23941. In regard to adulteration of liquors: do you know anything about the properties of Scotch whisky, whisky made in Scotland and brought out here for sale?—I am not well posted in regard to it.

LOUIS E. MORIN.

23942. What is the price of the lowest grade of Scotch whisky brought out here?—I do not know exactly, but about \$5.50 or \$6.50 a case. I think it can be bought as low as that.

23943. Is that duty paid?—Yes.

23944. What is the duty on a case?—The duty is about half of that sum.

23945. What would be the duty on an ordinary case of Scotch liquor?—I could not tell you; I do not do business in that line.

23946. Would you believe that Scotch whiskys are sold free in bond in Glasgow at six shillings a case?—Yes.

23947. What kind of stuff must that be?—It is the duty that makes the high price. You can buy gin for 45 cents a gallon.

23948. Where could we get information as to the cost to the trade of putting up liquor that would be contained in a case, the cost of the bottles, corks, capsules, straw envelopes and wood for the case?—From the distillers or compounders.

23949. Did you say that the increase of duty would not decrease the sale of whisky?—That is not my impression.

23950. I asked you the question, to what did you attribute the decrease of sale, and you said to increased duty and smuggling?—Last year the duty was 30 cents a gallon less than this year. When the 30 cents was added the consumption fell. Whether the increase of smuggling or the higher duty was the cause, opinions differ; some say the smuggling and some say the increased duty.

23951. What do you say?—I say it is due to both.

23952. Then the increase of duty had something to do with it?—Yes; the increase of duty had something to do with it.

23953. With respect to the French wines, of which you have spoken: for what price are those wines sold in France to the common people?—In some years you can get fairly good wine for 50 cents or 60 cents a gallon, that is the common wine. You can get some very good from 75 to 80 cents. One reason why we do not get French immigration is because wine here is too dear. Those people are accustomed to drink wine as our people are in the habit of having a glass of whisky, and they will not come here unless they can obtain wine. If they had to pay \$3.50 or \$4 for a case of wine, or even \$1.50 or \$2, it would be no use asking them to leave their country, for they would not live in a country where they could not get wine.

23954. What would be the effects if wines were sold cheap here?—It would contribute to the reduction of the use of alcoholic spirits. The young men particularly would give up the idea of drinking whisky and strong liquor, and drink more wine; while they now pay five, ten or fifteen cents for a glass of whisky they would take wine, which would then be cheap.

23955. Do you think the introduction of light wines and beers would be beneficial?—It would.

23956. Regarding retail licenses: do you know anything about those grocers' licenses, about groceries where liquor is sold as well as groceries?—Certainly.

23957. Is such a system necessary in Montreal?—That is a great question at the present time in our locality, whether we should grant licenses to shops or not. There is a great deal of liquor drunk in our place, Longueuil, and we have studied the question a good deal. I think the evil comes from granting licenses such as you mention, shop licenses. I think, moreover, they are far too easily granted.

23958. Do you favour the limitation of the number?—Yes, and an increase in the amount paid for licenses, because I find that people instead of going into a tavern where they will have to pay 10 cents for a drink, will go to one of these groceries and buy a bottle of whisky, and they are not satisfied until they have drunk it to the last drop.

23959. Then a person will buy liquor from a grocer?—Yes. I do not know if the time will not come when we will refuse to give grocers' licenses in our locality.

23960. There are, according to Mr. Lambe's return, 477 grocers' licenses in Montreal. Are they required?—No.

• 23961. Respecting the saloon license or the restaurant license: there are 304 of them. Do you require 304 restaurant licenses in Montreal?—I do not think so.



23962. Would you favour a substantial reduction in all classes of licenses issued and an increase in the license fee?—I am in favour of increasing the license fees for the groceries. In my locality I find a great deal more evil arises from the sale of liquor in groceries than in taverns. We very seldom see a drunken man coming out of a tavern, although we see a great many people drunk.

23963. They come out of the groceries?—They get a bottle on Saturday night and go to some retired spot and drink it. There is much more evil arising from the groceries than from the taverns; instead of having five or six drinking places, there should be one or two where persons could obtain meals.

23964. Do you know anything in regard to the business of distilling in Prince Edward Island?—I do not.

23965. Nor in New Brunswick?—No, that is outside of my limits.

*By the Chairman:*

23966. Have you paid any attention to the statistics of the production of wine in France?—I have not lately.

23967. Do you believe there has been a great reduction in the quantity of wine produced within the last fifty years?—I have not studied the question lately.

23968. If I were to tell you that there has been a very material reduction in the quantity of wine produced, and at the same time a reduction in the consumption of wine and a large increase in the consumption of alcohol, to what would you attribute that state of things?—I see lately, according to the statistics published in the newspapers, that there has been an increase in drunkenness in some parts of France. That I think largely depends upon custom. People will do some things for a certain time, and then there will be a reaction and the people will do something else. The reaction against the use of whisky is an example in point. We sell less whisky now, but there has been an increase in the consumption in beer and ale. I would not be at all surprised to see in two or three years another reaction and the people come back to the consumption of whisky. At one time the people drank rum when rum was cheap, and afterwards they commenced to drink whisky.

23969. The term alcohol probably includes alcohol consumed in all spirituous liquors. I am not speaking of the consumption of brandy or whisky in particular. I find that in France the consumption was in 1880 1·12 litres and it advanced steadily until in 1890 it became 4·35 litres per capita. There was a large decrease in the production of wine in the same period. Do you think the one had any relation to the other?—I think the phylloxera has had a great deal to do with the decrease in the production of wine.

23970. It has necessarily become dearer, I suppose?—Yes, that would make wine dearer. I find that Zola, the French novelist, has written very strongly and at considerable length against the use of alcohol, and has endeavoured to show the effects of the use of it.

23971. Would you be disposed to attribute the large consumption of alcohol to the decreased production of wine, and the consequent enhanced price of it; or, as has been suggested to the Commissioners, in your opinion, has the constant consumption of wine increased the appetite of the French people for alcohol?—I do not think so. The position is not exactly the same in France as here. That country and Canada are entirely different. It is not so cold in France as here, and they can use more wine, while in a cold country like this, the people seem to want something to stimulate the system.

23972. I was anxious to obtain your opinion as to the cause or causes which have produced these results. Do you think it is the increased cost of wine, resulting partially from the reduced production, which has led to the increased consumption of alcohol; or do you think that the continued drinking of wine, which we know has gone on in France, wine being very cheap and commonly used even by servants in country houses, has led to the desire for the stronger stimulant?—I should not like to venture an opinion.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

23973. Speaking about colder climates: do you think the people in colder climates require alcoholic stimulants?—If I am to judge by Russia, I would say so, and we are

LOUIS E. MORIN.

pretty much in the same position. There is, however, ten times more drunkenness there than in Canada.

23974. Have you observed that Arctic explorers use very little liquor?—If they used a little more, it might be better for them.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

23975. Nations inhabiting colder countries use more alcohol, I believe?—Yes. Very little alcohol is used in Turkey or Asia.

HON. JOSEPH R. THIBAUDEAU, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

23976. How long have you resided in this district?—25 years.

23977. You are at the present time Sheriff of Montreal, I believe?—Yes.

23978. You are also a member of the Dominion Senate?—Yes.

23979. Your appointment as Sheriff is made by the Provincial Government?—Yes.

23980. Will you tell us briefly the nature of your duties as Sheriff?—I have to take charge of the Court-house and the prisoners of the city of Montreal and see to the assignment of the jurors, and, of course, to attend to the duties of the Sheriff as to the charge of properties and so on.

23981. Of what prisons have you charge?—The prison of Montreal and the Women's Prison here.

23982. Where are these?—Both are in the east end of Montreal.

23983. Are they separate buildings?—Separate buildings.

23984. You have nothing to do with the penitentiary at St. Vincent de Paul?—No.

23985. How are the expenses of the jail in Montreal met? From what source does the revenue come?—A special vote from the Government.

23986. And from the city of Montreal?—The city of Montreal contributes a certain amount every day for each prisoner; I think it is fifteen cents.

23987. That is for all the prisoners sent from the city to the jail?—Yes.

23988. Then is money collected from any other source for the maintenance of the jail?—No, except from the city of Montreal and the municipalities.

23989. They pay in the same way?—Yes; I think each municipality pays annually \$12 a year and the city pays 15 cents a day for each prisoner.

23990. Do you supervise all the expenditure connected with the jail?—No; I supervise the expenditure coming from outside, such as suits of clothing, coal, wood, provisions and all sorts, which are generally purchased on my orders.

23991. And the wages of the chief jailer?—The wages of the governor of the jail and his guards are all met by the Provincial Government.

23992. Their salaries are paid through you?—Yes.

23993. You have an accountant who takes charge of the accounts?—I have several accountants.

23994. Can you tell the Commission the cost of the jail, the annual expenditure?—I could not.

23995. Could you supply the information?—Certainly.

23996. I suppose a return is made to the Provincial Government of all expenses?—Yes, regularly.

23997. Are the records printed in the shape of a Parliamentary return?—I do not think so.

23998. Will you supply the Commissioners with a statement of the expenditure?—Yes. The feeding of the prisoners costs about 7 cents per head per day. As to the clothing and the heating, I cannot tell you the amount, but I know the prisoners cost for the feeding 7 cents each a day, and taking everything together about 54 cents a

day ; but if we deduct the return from the broken stone, the cost is reduced to about 32 cents per head per day.

23999. Including wages and heating ?—That is for everything. In the gross cost of 54 cents, there are several items included, especially the stone ; but when you take the returns from the stone, the cost comes to about 32 cents per head per day. I can give you the exact figures.

24000. You do not remember the total expenditure on the institution ?—I do not. It varies according to the number of prisoners. They vary from 200 to 300 and sometimes 350, and we have to send some to Three Rivers and Quebec and other places. I think it would be best to give you an estimate of what it costs per head.

24001. We would like to know how much is paid by the city and the municipalities and the amount disbursed out of the Provincial treasury for five years, if you can give that information without much trouble ?—I will let you have that information in the morning.

24002. Have you many prisoners in the jail who have committed no particular offence, but who are sent there as vagrants ?—I could not very well answer that question. Some have been there almost two years, and some are there for a day.

24003. Montreal is somewhat exceptionally placed. Perhaps there are other places similarly circumstanced, but there is no place to which a Magistrate can send a poor person except to the common jail ?—That is so.

24004. Unless a charitable institution takes charge of them, they go to the jail ?—They are never taken charge of in that way, but are sent to the jail.

24005. So it becomes a sort of alms-house as well as a jail ?—Yes.

24006. Have you taken any notice of the class of offences for which the prisoners are committed ?—No.

24007. You cannot give us any idea of the number committed for drunkenness and crimes which have their origin in drunkenness ?—No. I think I could give you an average for the last 12 months.

24008. Are the numbers committed to prison during the last 12 months less than before ?—I could not say.

24009. Living here and taking an active part in public affairs, you have doubtless observed what is taking place in the city. Can you express any opinion as to the increase or decrease of drunkenness in the city ?—I do not think drunkenness has increased at all.

24010. Do you think we have more places licensed here than is desirable ?—Decidedly so.

24011. You think a decrease in the number of licensed places would be an advantage ?—It would be a great advantage.

24012. Is there any particular class of the licensed establishments you think should be reduced, or would you make a general reduction in the whole ?—In general fairness to all classes, I think it should be a general reduction in the whole.

24013. We have had it in evidence that there are a large number of places in the city where liquor is sold and no meals or beds are supplied. Have you any knowledge of that ?—I have not, but I think there are altogether too many saloons.

24014. Would you reduce the number of saloons ?—Yes.

24015. All the places that are licensed, except the hotels bear the name of restaurants and are supposed to supply meals, but we have it in evidence that they do not ?—As to restaurants, which are supposed to supply meals : I think they do so, if not in the day, at night under the name of oysters or oyster soup or something of that kind. I think the saloons are the worst.

24016. What do you mean by a saloon ?—Places where they sell liquor.

24017. Does not the law say that every person who supplies liquors shall supply meals ?—I could not say.

24018. Do you think there are too many hotels ?—Not for the number of strangers we have in Montreal.

24019. The Collector of Inland Revenue has given it in evidence that there are from 1,000 to 1,100 licensed places selling liquor, and at least 2,000 places selling liquor without a license ?—I do not know that ; I am completely ignorant on that point.

HON. JOSEPH R. THIBAudeau.

24020. Have you observed anything to lead you to suppose that there are from 3,000 to 4,000 places in Montreal selling liquor?—I do not think there is anything like that, though I am not in a very good position to observe the number.

24021. From your observation, can you say that the license laws are fairly well enforced in this city?—I should think so.

24022. Do you consider the present system of regulating the traffic by the issue of licenses and the supervision provided now, is the most efficient way of dealing with the liquor trade?—I think so.

24023. Has it occurred to you that there is any other system by which the evils of intemperance might be reduced?—I see only one way: that is to multiply the places of amusement. I know the places that have been established in Montreal lately have done a great deal of good, and I should think that the only way to reduce drunkenness in Montreal is largely to multiply the places of amusement.

24024. In what way do you think Sohmer Park and the Island Park and the Mountain Park have reduced intemperance?—I have been living in Montreal for 18 years and have gone around town, and I have seen in the past a great number of carriages driving to places where people could get drink, while now parks which are open all the week, such as the Sohmer Park or the St. Helen's Island Park or the Mountain Park or the Montreal Park, are largely frequented by the people, and the number of taverns has diminished considerably.

24025. Have you ever seen any cases of drunkenness in those places of amusement?—I do not remember having seen one, but I am not a great frequenter of those places.

24026. You are there occasionally?—Yes, that is all.

24027. Have you given much consideration to the question of prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of spirituous liquor?—No, I have not.

24028. Have you considered whether or not a prohibitory law would be desirable?—Yes, I have thought of that often; but I do not view it to be practicable. I am perfectly convinced that prohibition would not suit this country.

24029. Your view is that it would not be desirable because it could not be enforced?—Yes, because it would not be enforced.

24030. Have you come to that conclusion from your observation of the state of public opinion, or because it would be an expensive law to work?—No; my view has been derived from other countries which I have seen, and also from the result of the Scott Act in different counties here, that I have either seen or heard of, for in all these counties liquor was sold as freely as in the counties which were not under the Scott Act. I am so well acquainted with that fact that I have taken an opportunity to vote against the Scott Act.

24031. Where the Scott Act was in force, there was still sale of liquors?—Everywhere.

24032. You cannot say whether the quantity sold was more or less than before?—No.

24033. Do you think it was want of zeal on the part of the officials appointed to enforce the law, or lack of interest on the part of the people which led to the non-enforcement of the law?—I have no opinion on that, but I think there was no serious attempt to enforce it.

24034. You mean that the people were not in favour of it?—I cannot say that.

24035. They did not enforce it?—No; that is sure.

24036. To what particular district did you refer as being under the Scott Act?—This summer I went through Chicoutimi and Saguenay and saw no difficulty in getting liquor.

24037. Does the Scott Act apply to both sections of the county?—Yes.

24038. And your observation was that the law was not observed?—No.

24039. As to the other places you mention?—I have been often in Maine in the United States, and you can get drinks there whenever you want them.

24040. What part of the State of Maine do you particularly refer to?—I went especially to Portland.

24041. Did you stay in Portland any time?—Yes, sometimes seven or eight days at a time.

24042. Did you see liquor sold in the hotels?—Others could tell you better about that.

24043. Was any attempt made to conceal it?—Certainly, in the best hotels.

24044. There was not an open bar in the hotel?—No.

24045. Did you come to the conclusion that there was a stock of liquor kept in the hotel?—I came to the conclusion that if I wanted liquor, I could get it.

24046. Have you had experience in other parts of Maine?—I have had no experience in the rural parts.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24047. You spoke of the visit you made Chicoutimi and Saguenay?—Yes.

24048. Was the sale at Chicoutimi and Saguenay as open as in the city of Montreal?—About the same thing.

24049. When you went into a room, there would be a bar in the room?—Yes.

24050. And liquors of different grades?—All grades.

24051. Are Maine, Chicoutimi and Saguenay the only prohibition places you have been in?—I have travelled in the Townships, but I do not remember where.

24052. Did you notice if the people in those two counties were a sober people?—Yes, very sober.

24053. Do you think that the sale of liquor goes on only to travellers?—I should think it is only to travellers.

24054. You do not think it is sold to the inhabitants themselves?—I do not think so.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24055. How long have you been Sheriff?—Two years.

24056. Will you give the Commission the expenses of the prison?—Yes, I will give the expenses of the prison, including the cost of prisoners, turnkeys and guards, but not including my own salary.

24057. We were told here by the Police Justices, that about 30 per cent of the cases sent to the city prisons might be traced to drink. Have you observed that?—I think they were right. No doubt liquor causes a great deal of misery in families. There is no doubt that strong liquor should be suppressed; but the question is whether prohibition would succeed.

24058. You have expressed your opinion that it would not succeed?—Yes.

24059. You think public sentiment is not ripe for it?—Is not ripe for it.

24060. Do you believe if public sentiment were ripe for it, and such a law were enforced, that a great deal of good would come from it?—Yes.

24061. You think at present that it could not be enforced?—That is my opinion.

24062. Do you think in the meantime it is well to regulate the trade by license, diminish the number of licenses, and increase the places of amusement, and also encourage the drinking of light wines such as clarets?—That is my opinion.

24063. Do you think if the number of licenses were reduced, that the number of illicit places would proportionately increase?—I cannot tell.

24064. Would that be the natural result, do you think?—I cannot say it would be the natural result; but I can say that if the places of amusement were increased, the natural result would be a decrease of hotels and saloons.

24065. That would decrease the drinking among the classes of people who frequent these saloons?—Yes, among the middle and poorer classes.

24066. I think you said that in late years you have observed that drunkenness has decreased?—I think I said that it has not increased.

24067. You do not know whether it has increased?—No.

24068. To what do you attribute the fact that it has not increased?—I attribute that to society being better organized. We have more temperance societies than we had, and the authorities have taken better care, that is religious authorities, both Protestant and Catholic; and besides that, citizens have joined themselves together and done their best to check drunkenness, and have succeeded to a certain extent.

24069. You think, then, that there has been an increased effort to promote temperance?—No doubt.

HON. JOSEPH R. THIBAUDEAU.

24070. And it has been successful?—It has been successful, and it is the best way, too.

24071. You have spoken about the Scott Act and about places that you visited in which the Scott Act was supposed to be in force. Do you know whether in these places, like Chicoutimi, there were any particular difficulties in the way of the proper enforcement of the law, whether there were local obstructions?—I do not think so. I think that the law was generally carried out.

24072. Did you have any knowledge of Chicoutimi and other places before they were under the Scott Act?—I had, but it was 30 years ago.

24073. Do you remember whether there was a good deal of drinking then?—Scarcely anybody lived in Chicoutimi then, and there was no drinking at all.

24074. You have no means of comparing Chicoutimi under license law with Chicoutimi under the Scott Act?—No.

24075. You did notice in Chicoutimi that the bars were under lock and key?—Yes, and I believe only for travellers.

24076. Then there was this difference, that in Montreal, where there is a license law, the bars are not under lock and key, but in Chicoutimi, under the Scott Act, they were under lock and key?—Yes.

24077. Would you favour the general application of the principle that is applied in the rural districts of the Province of Quebec, where a parish may prohibit licenses within its own limits?—No.

24078. You think that is not a good idea?—I think it would be a bad idea in a city like Montreal or in a large centre, because the drinking instead of being done openly, would be done in the dark, and not under the inspection of the police, and consequently the results would be much worse.

24079. Do you think that the principle is good as applied to rural districts?—My experience does not enable me to answer that question.

24080. You do not think it is a wrong principle to apply to rural districts, that the people may have a right to say whether they shall have licenses or not?—I fought against the Scott Act in the Senate, as far as Lower Canada is concerned. I said that in Lower Canada, licenses were only granted by Municipal Councils, and these Councils were more or less under the immediate supervision of the Curé, and I was confident that the clergy of Lower Canada would do their duty on that score; that they were very desirous of avoiding drunkenness amongst their parishioners, and they had well succeeded in preventing it. I said then that I preferred to see the temperance question in Lower Canada in charge of the clergy rather than in charge of the law, because a good many people would violate the law much more easily than they would violate the confidence of their priests.

24081. That was your objection to the Scott Act, as far as you are concerned?—Yes.

24082. I believe that in Lower Canada, in more than 200 parishes, licenses are refused, and it is largely I believe due to the influence of the priests, as you have suggested. Do you think that is a good form of local prohibition?—Certainly, I would prefer it to any that I know of; that is prohibition by the conviction of the people and not by law. If you have prohibition by force, the probability is that it will never be carried out.

24083. But there is both conviction and force in that form of prohibition, for the reason that the priests by their influence over the Municipal Councillors get the Municipal Councillors to refuse to grant licenses, so that any sale that takes place within the parish is illegal, while that municipal law is in force?—It shows that the people have been persuaded of the benefit of it, and I believe that there is a great deal of misery saved for themselves and their families.

24084. Do you believe that if that educational process were extended all over the country, prohibition would then be successful?—I do, and it would be a good thing if it did.

24085. You have spoken about the Sohmer Park and other places of amusement, and I think we all agree that there ought to be a multiplication of places of innocent and instructive recreation for the people. Do you believe those places would be better

if there was no drink sold?—I believe it is much better that you should limit them to the sale of beer and wines. If there was no beer at all, people would go elsewhere and take strong drink.

24086. I think we understood that in Sohmer Park, there is a regular restaurant license, and the man sells not only beer and wine, but the stronger liquors too?—That may be where the mistake has been.

24087. Do you think it would be better to have a license only for the sale of light wines and beers in these places?—Certainly.

24088. Have you observed what effect, if any, the liquor trade has upon other branches of trade in the community, whether it has a beneficial effect or an injurious one?—I do not think it is either beneficial or injurious.

24089. Is it neutral?—Yes.

24090. You have noticed, however, that it produces a good deal of poverty and crime?—Yes, but I do not think it affects other trades.

24091. Does it affect other trades in this way: for instance, a working man expends a good proportion of his money in drink. Do you think that affects the boot and shoe manufacturer and the clothing manufacturer, in that the man has not got so much money to expend for these purposes?—The saloon keepers spend the money for boots and shoes. Money, like water, will always find its own level.

24092. Some business men have said that the absorption of so much money by the saloons and liquor business generally takes a large proportion out of the ordinary channels of trade and makes the purchasing power of people less?—I have seen that stated, but I have never believed it.

24093. You do not think it has any effect on business?—I do not think it has any effect.

24094. Do you know whether the drink trade or the drink habit affects business men as to their capacity for business?—Decidedly.

24095. As Sheriff, have you noticed that any insolvencies have been attributable to the fact that the heads of the concern drink?—I have been a merchant, with one of the largest houses of Lower Canada for 25 years, and I know that a great many of the insolvencies are directly attributable to drunkenness.

24096. So in that way it affects business?—Some other firm takes its place, I suppose.

24097. But it would be just as well not to have a vacancy, I presume?—I admit that. Every sane man admits that drink is a very bad thing.

24098. Have you noticed whether the use of light wines or beers has a special tendency towards excessive drinking?—I do not think it has.

24099. You think that those who use wines and beers always keep on at them?—I think you will find just as many persons who never drink anything up to a certain age become drunkards, as you find persons who have been drinking light wines all their lives. I think the use of light wines is not an inducement to strong drink.

24100. There is a class of people who drink whisky and that kind of thing all along: do you suppose, if the whisky were prohibited and the wine and beer allowed, that they would be satisfied with wine and beer?—They might be satisfied and they might not. Our country people do not seem to have any taste for sour French wine.

24101. It has not that "scratch" which was referred to this morning?—I do not want to intimate that at all; because our French Canadian people are very sober, and they would rather do without it than take sour wines. They would take beer as a drink, but they would not take French wine. They want something with a little more body in it than that.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

24102. You say the Scott Act was fairly well observed in Chicoutimi this season?—I found it well observed.

24103. Did you find any difficulty in procuring liquor?—No.

24104. Is there any advantage of delegating a trade and keeping it under lock and key?—Around Lake St. John the population is not very thick, and it may be advan-

HON. JOSEPH R. THIBAUDEAU.

tageous to have it that way in small centres ; but in the city of Montreal or in large centres, it would be of great disadvantage. I said that in the country the restriction placed on hotel-keepers by the clergy is very beneficial. If the law restricts the sale of liquors in small centres, it has a very beneficial effect, because there the people have no way to defeat the ends of the law or the influence of their clergy. In large centres like Quebec, Montreal and Toronto, any great restriction put on the liquor traffic would nullify the desire of the promoters of prohibition.

24105. In other words, restrictive measures, such as the Scott Act, work well in rural districts, but in cities and towns it would not work well at all?—That is exactly it.

24106. If the influence of the clergy were exercised on the Municipal Councils in cities, as in the country, would it not work with equally good results?—Yes, if they had the same influence in the city.

24107. Do you favour issuing licenses for the sale of beer and light wines to these public parks, such as Sohmer Park?—Certainly I do favour it, and I think it is the best check against intemperance.

24108. Are you opposed to the granting of licenses in these places to sell stronger liquor, such as brandy, whisky and rum?—I think in places where there are so many thousands of people, the sale should be limited to light drinks.

24109. Is it your opinion that the use of light wines and beer does not create an appetite for stronger drinks?—Yes.

24110. Does the history of the French people corroborate that view?—Yes, the French people for hundreds of years have been drinking light wines and they are the most sober people on the face of the globe. I have been to Paris myself about 25 times, and I remember only seeing two drunken men, and they were two gentlemen from England whom I know very well. The use of wine is universal, and the hotels are open night and day and all Sunday, and people never get drunk.

24111. I think you said you are not in favour of prohibition, because you believe it would not be suitable for certain classes of the community?—I did not say that. I said that I thought prohibition would not be suitable for large centres of population. In the district of Three Rivers, which is under strict orders from its Bishop, there is not one single licensed hotel, and the system works well. It is the moral conviction on the part of the people that makes it work well.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24112. If that moral pressure and influence were brought to bear upon the Councils in centres of population, would there not be equally good results from it?—Certainly, a great deal of good.

24113. Could you suggest any amendments to the Scott Act that would make it workable?—I do not know enough about it.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24114. Do you think it was an advantage to the people in Maine, and to the people in Chicoutimi, that the trade was delegalized and that the people procured their liquor in an illegal manner?—I cannot pronounce on that. My experience in Maine is not sufficient.

24115. You do not know whether the people who reside at Chicoutimi have any difficulty in procuring liquor there?—I do not know.

24116. So that virtually the prohibition that exists there is of a very mild type?—Yes, a very mild type, and I think very beneficial.

24117. But more strictly enforced, it would be more beneficial?—No, I think it would be worse. My position is that prohibition of a mild type does a great deal of good ; but when prohibition takes the form of a law, which cannot be mild because it must be carried out, then I think it becomes more harmful than beneficial.

24118. You think it would be impracticable to enforce a general prohibitory law throughout the Dominion?—I think so.

24119. In the event of such a law passing both branches of the Legislature at Ottawa, would you favour granting compensation to the brewers or distillers?—Decidedly not.



24120. Nor the hotel-keepers, or saloon keepers?—To nobody.

24121. In your experience, is the hotel bar or the saloon bar more injurious? If either the hotel bar or the saloon bar had to be wiped out, which of the two do you think should go?—I would suppress the saloons, because the hotels receive boarders and give meals and have larger interests at stake; and consequently it is their own interest to enforce better rules in their establishments, than mere saloon keepers, who most of their time have all their interest on the shelves in the bar.

24122. Would any interests suffer if the four hundred or five hundred grocery licenses were withdrawn?—No.

24123. Would it be an advantage to separate the sale of liquors from the sale of groceries. We heard yesterday that there are 477 shop licenses in Montreal: is that number necessary?—No, it is not necessary. It is absurd that every corner grocery should have a license, because you see fathers in their houses in the evening sending their little children with a few cents to buy a bottle of whisky, and they keep drinking the whole night until they are drunk. If there were not such licenses, it would not be so easy for them to send their children for drink.

24124. You think that these licenses might be abolished with advantage to the community?—Yes, I think so.

24125. Would you favour an increase in the licenses to restaurants and hotels?—I do not know; I think that the licenses are high enough to-day. I do not think that the price of a license will remedy things. I think it is better to allow these people to live, but limit their numbers.

24126. Do you know anything about the adulteration of liquor?—I do not. There is one thing, however, which I wish to add, and that I know about. Of course the Protestant people are brought up with different ideas from ours, and ideas which we respect very much, but I think it would lead to a great deal of good if our parks, the Island Park and Sohmer Park and the Mountain Park, were allowed on Sundays to sell mild liquors in the restaurants. I think it would lead to a great deal of good.

24127. Are we to infer from that that there is a great deal of Sunday drinking in the houses?—It would stop Sunday drinking in private houses. It would prevent saloon keepers selling liquor on the sly; it would prevent furious driving around the city, which is done by hundreds and hundreds, just to get a glass of something strong. If they had a mild glass of beer, or two or three, it would satisfy them, they would save money instead of being obliged to hire a horse to drive around Montreal. If this were allowed, I think the citizens of Montreal would benefit by it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24128. Where is this driving that you speak of?—All around Montreal, wherever there is a road.

24129. You think it is for the sake of a drink?—Yes.

24130. You have referred to the district of Three Rivers: Is there a city of Three Rivers also?—Yes, but they sell liquor in the city, as in Montreal. The clergy here, even if they had the wish, cannot stop the issue of licenses in Montreal. In the city of Three Rivers the clergy cannot stop the issue of licenses, but in most of the rural districts there are no licenses.

24131. That is a good state of affairs?—It is a good state of affairs, no doubt.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24132. I want to understand you fully. You find a beneficial state of things in Chicoutimi and Saguenay?—Yes.

24133. Travellers can obtain what liquor they need?—Yes.

24134. The residents do not think of or look for liquor?—I do not think they do.

24135. And you attribute their not looking for it to the influence of their priests?—Yes.

24136. Supposing that the priests exercised no such influence, do you think that the residents there would also get liquor if they wanted it, as the travellers do?—Certainly they would.

HON. JOSEPH R. THIBAUDEAU.

24137. Did you notice the kind of liquor sold there? Would it be the same as you get anywhere else?—Just the same.

24138. You do not know whether any of the smuggled liquor finds its way there?—No; I do not find any there.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24139. His Worship Mayor Frémont, of Quebec, said that he spent his holidays partly in Chicoutimi, and he was not aware, until his holiday time was nearly over, that there was any Scott Act in force in that county?—Well, there is.

*By the Chairman :*

24140. In the district where the clergy exercise the influence you speak of, the people are nearly all Roman Catholics?—Almost all.

24141. Of course, in the city of Montreal we have a mixed population, and the clergy of your church could not exercise the same influence with such, if they were desirous of doing it?—Certainly they cannot. Religious bodies in large cities never have the same influence as in small centres.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24142. Why is that? I should like to have your theory about it?—I do not know why it is. People are more independent, I suppose.

24143. Do you think that greater independence is a good thing or a bad thing?—I think, as a rule, independence is a good thing, even in religious matters.

24144. You do not believe it would be better if the people in the rural districts had the same sort of independence, and resented the moral influence of their priests?—I do not know, but they have it not.

24145. And it is a good condition of things because they have it?—I do not say it is a good condition of things, but they have it not.

EDWARD BLACK GREENSHIELDS, President of the Board of Trade of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

24146. Mr. Greenshields, I think you were born here and have lived here all your life?—Yes.

24147. What is the name of the firm of which you are the head?—A. S. Greenshields, Son & Company.

24148. Which has existed here in Montreal, for how long?—Over half a century.

24149. You are at present, I believe, president of the Board of Trade?—I am.

24150. Can you give the Commission an idea of how many members belong to that body?—I think there are in the neighbourhood of a thousand.

24151. All the leading mercantile men of the city?—Yes.

24152. Have you paid any attention to the liquor traffic in the city?—I would like to say at the outset that I do not know that I will be able to add anything to the evidence, and in speaking I am only speaking my individual opinions, and I am not speaking in any shape or way as the President of the Board of Trade, or for the Board of Trade. I wish to state this, because I was summoned to appear here as President of the Board of Trade. I have no right to speak for the members of the Board of Trade as a whole, but I am perfectly willing to speak my own opinion.

24152*a*. I think the Commissioners quite understand that, but naturally in going from place to place, they seek to obtain the opinions of gentlemen who occupy representative positions, because they are supposed to reflect the opinions of the society in which they live. I do not know that there is any other method by which the Commission could obtain the views of the citizens of the Dominion at large. We quite

understand that you do not speak as President of the Board of Trade. Individually, have you given any attention whatever to the liquor business?—I cannot say that I have given any special attention to it.

24153. From your observation, do you think there is more, or less drunkenness in the city now than there was ten years ago?—I cannot speak from experience.

24154. Do you think that, as a rule, the people are more sober than they formerly were?—I should think they were.

24155. In social circles, do you think there is as much drinking as there was in former years?—Generally speaking, I should say less.

24156. Do you think there are more licensed places for the vending of liquor in the city than are really necessary or desirable?—I cannot speak on that point.

24157. We were told by the Collector of Inland Revenue for the province that there are about 1,000 licensed places, but he was certain that there were 2,000, and he thought 4,000 places selling liquor illegally. Can you understand that?—I have no information on the subject.

24158. Can you realize that such is the state of things in the city?—I read that in the papers, and I was very much surprised to read it.

24159. From living here in Montreal, you ought to be able to say whether the city is an orderly city?—I think very orderly.

24160. Do you think that the present law regarding licenses is really enforced in the city?—As far as my own information goes, I think so. Of course I heard what the Sheriff and others said, but I have no personal information on the subject whatever.

24161. Do you think that the granting of licenses under the present system of regulating the liquor traffic is the best that could be devised?—I think it is a fairly satisfactory one for the city of Montreal, if proper attention were paid to the character of the people to whom licenses were given.

24162. The present system of granting licenses, as you may know, is by a Commission composed of the Recorder and the two Police Judges. The applicant sends in his requisition for a license, supported by the recommendation of 25 residents of the polling district in which he lives, and there is time given for opposition. If the majority of the voters are opposed to the granting of the license, the Commission have no option but to refuse it. Do you think that a satisfactory way of granting licenses?—It seems a very fair way, provided the voters exercise their privilege properly in the matter.

24163. One would naturally say that if they did not exercise their privilege, it was owing to their indifference?—Certainly.

24164. Do you know of any improvement that might be made to the present licensing system?—I do not know of any. I have not studied the subject.

24165. Do you think it would be an improvement to curtail the number of licensed places?—Well, certainly. If there is such an excess of unlicensed drinking, it would be desirable to have a good deal less, and if any means could be devised by which a large number of places where liquor is sold could be abolished, it would certainly be an improvement.

24166. Do you think that the reduction in the number of licensed places would lead to a greater number of unlicensed places?—I am afraid it would have that effect.

24167. Then, in your opinion, should it be impossible for the authorities to root out the unlicensed places in a city like Montreal?—I am afraid it is a very difficult thing to do. I am not in a position to say whether it is an impossibility.

24168. The police force cope with crime fairly well?—Fairly well.

24169. Would it not be possible to have a force that could cope with this evil of the illicit vending of intoxicants?—Of course it is a difficult matter to get information in these cases.

24170. Have you given any consideration to the question of prohibiting altogether the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicants?—I do not think that total prohibition is practicable.

24171. Have you any objection to state the grounds upon which you base that opinion?—Well, it seems to be the general experience that drink will be sold, and that it is better to have the traffic regulated so that good liquors will be sold under proper

restriction. I do not think it is possible to prevent the sale of wines altogether, or spirits either.

24172. What effect do you think such a total prohibitory law would have?—I think it would cause a great deal of illicit dealing in spirits and wines, and the probability would be that neither of them would be of good quality.

24173. From a moral point of view, do you think it would be a desirable thing to have such a law on the statute-book if it were not enforced?—No, not if it were not enforced.

24174. What would be the tendency of it?—The tendency of it would be to create a great many law-breakers.

24175. Have you considered at all what would be the effect on the industrial and commercial interests of the country if the manufacture, importation and sale of liquor were prohibited?—I should think it is a question that would be very difficult to answer.

24176. You know, of course, that there is a certain quantity of barley used in the making of liquors, and a certain quantity of Indian corn and other commodities, and a large amount of capital is invested in the business. Suppose it were discontinued altogether, what effect do you think it would have commercially? I ask you because you have had large experience in commercial matters?—That is a question that it would be difficult to answer without the actual figures. There are a great many people interested in the liquor business, and these people have all to live in the country and spend money in the country and a great many of the products of the country are used in the business. I think it would diminish trade.

24177. Do you think that the growers of barley would find a market for the commodity elsewhere?—I should think not.

24178. Does it occur to you that they could produce any other crop which would be equally profitable to them?—I cannot say.

24179. The Province of Quebec gets about \$600,000 a year from licenses and fines, and of course if there were prohibition, that revenue would be taken away: does it occur to you how it could be replaced to the province?—I do not see how it could be replaced, unless it were by increased taxation of some kind.

24180. Do you see any direction in which increased taxation could be levied?—Unless we come to direct taxation, I do not see any way of increasing it.

24181. It has been given in evidence before the Commissioners, that, as a result of prohibition, there would be a large reduction in the cost of administering the law, in the maintenance of jails, and asylums in the Province: does it occur to you that that result would follow entire prohibition of the liquor traffic?—There very probably would be a certain reduction that way, but I should think there would be a large expenditure in the suppression of the liquor traffic.

24182. Have you given any attention to the figures of the expenditure for jails and asylums at any time?—Nothing, except a general idea of the estimate.

24183. You have said that you think a prohibitory law would not be successful, and therefore, it is not perhaps to be expected that you have considered the question whether, in the event of the enactment of a general prohibitory law, compensation should be granted those who have their capital invested in distilleries and brewing establishments. You are, however, in business in a large way, and I will ask you the question: If a prohibitory law were passed, it would, if it did not entirely destroy these properties, at any rate reduce their value. Do you think the owners should be compensated in any way?—I think that they should have reasonable compensation.

24184. Would you apply that principle to those who are vending liquors, wholesale dealers and others?—I do not think that would apply to the wholesale dealers.

24185. Or the retail dealers?—I cannot speak so decidedly on that point, because in a great many cases the retail dealers are simply people who are running a place for a short space of time, and it would be difficult to arrive at a conclusion as to whether they should receive compensation or not.

24186. Did you pay any attention to the discussion of the subject of compensation to publicans in England in the event of the State taking away their licenses?—I have been aware of it, but I did not pay attention to it.

24187. Am I correct in stating that there was a decided opposition to taking away their licenses without compensation?—I understood from what I read, that the feeling was that they should be compensated.

24188. Have you had any experience, by residing in a district where a prohibitory law or local option, or the Scott Act, or the Dunkin Act was in force, of the working of these?—No.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24189. I suppose that, during the long time your firm has been in business, you have occasionally made losses through insolvencies?—I can speak personally for a great many years—yes.

24190. Could you tell the Commission whether any portion, and, if so, a large or a small portion, could be attributed to intemperance on the part of the business men?—A certain number of them are attributable to intemperance.

24191. Would that be a large proportion?—A certain proportion, but I do not think it would be a large proportion.

24192. In selling goods to persons, do you ask any question as to whether they are total abstainers or not?—No, but I do as to whether they are temperate or not.

24193. If they were excessive drinkers, you would not deal with them?—No.

24194. You make no difference in the case of a man who drinks in moderation?—I make no difference in the case of a man who drinks in moderation. I make no difference between them and total abstainers.

24195. I understood, from the statement you made, that you are rather in favour of the use of light wines and ales and getting rid of the spirits?—Yes.

24196. That would be an advantage to the community?—Yes.

24197. Have you travelled abroad?—I have been in England, Scotland and France.

24198. Did you notice the habits of the people in France?—Only by reading. I understand they are a very temperate people and drink light wines in the country districts.

24199. We are informed that in this city parks are established which have become quite a resort for the people: Do you favour having such places?—I think it is a good thing.

24200. Do you think the tendency of having places of that kind is to keep many people away from shebeens?—I think all places of harmless amusement of that kind are good.

24201. What is your view in regard to providing liquors of any kind for the people at these places?—I would be in favour of giving them light wines and beers in these places.

24202. Would you think it well that the heavier liquors should not be licensed there, but only light wines and beers?—That is what I would personally favour.

24203. You spoke of a change in the social customs of the people during the last few years: to what do you attribute that change?—I think it is due to the improvement in the morals of the people.

24204. Do you think that the influences of the churches and temperance societies, and so on, have had that effect?—They have had a beneficial effect.

24205. Would you look to this influence or to a prohibitory enactment as being the best means of continuing that trend of temperance sentiment?—It would be clearly better to educate the people so that they would not wish to exceed in drinking more than in anything else.

24206. We have had before us several suggestions for the amending of the License Law: one is the propriety of separating the sale of liquors from the sale of groceries. It has been stated that women buy liquor in groceries, who would not go to the saloons, and also that in groceries an illegal sale is very often carried on. What is your opinion as to the separation of the sale of liquors from the sale of groceries?—I have not considered that question.

24207. What is your opinion as to a thorough inspection of liquors to ensure that pure liquors be sold?—I should think it would be a very good thing to have a thorough inspection.

24208. Which, in your opinion, would it be better to abolish, the saloon or the hotel license?—I should certainly keep the hotel.

EDWARD BLACK GREENSHIELDS.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24209. Your line is dry goods?—Yes.

24210. You have a large number of employees?—Between fifty and sixty. It is not a manufacturing concern; this is a large number for that sort of business.

24211. Have you any rule in the employment of clerks and others in your establishment as to their drinking habits?—No.

24212. Do you regard a man of drinking habits of less value to you?—What do you mean by a man of drinking habits?

24213. I will not say excessive drinking, because it goes without saying that a drunkard would not be so valuable to you or to anybody else; I refer to a man who drinks regularly, but is not known during business hours to drink. Do you look upon a man who drinks regularly every day as being as valuable to you?—If he attends to his business, I do not mind. He may drink at his meals or during the day, and I do not consider that he is less valuable than another man.

24214. If you came to know that one of your clerks, who was unobjectionable and regular during business hours, was occasionally given to excess out of business hours, at what conclusion would you arrive?—I consider excess in any form is bad.

24215. Have you noticed whether those who have the drink habit regularly and moderately, and are known as moderate drinkers, fall into excess?—In coming in contact with people for a long time, you cannot help coming across cases such as you speak of, and also cases of people who take very little falling into excesses. I could not possibly have had sixty people under me for so many years without coming across a man who drank too much.

24216. Do you think the percentage of that class is large?—The percentage has been very small in my case.

24217. Do you think that the legalized facilities for getting drink promote drinking amongst men. Do you think they would drink less if there were no such places?—If there were no places, they would drink less.

24218. If they were all abolished, they would not drink so much?—If there were no means of getting any, they would not drink.

24219. No means of getting any in legalized shops and bars? I do not speak about other means now. Is the multiplication of facilities for ready drinking an inducement to drink: have you observed that?—I have not observed it, but I should say it was an inducement to drink, certainly.

24220. Have you expressed yourself as favourable to limiting the number of licenses?—I certainly think there should not be an excessive number of licenses, but I am not able to say from experience whether there is an excessive number or not. You have the evidence of the Recorder on that point.

24221. Do you send out commercial travellers?—Yes.

24222. I remember seeing, I think, within this year, an account of a meeting of the Commercial Travellers Association, in which the matters of treating their customers by commercial travellers was under consideration, and a resolution was passed strongly condemning, and I think prohibiting the custom. Do you know if there has been such action?—I am not in favour of the treating system myself, but I am not aware of that resolution.

24223. It was the custom for a traveller to take his customer to the hotel bar and treat him?—It was very general, I believe.

24224. Can you tell me if the opposition to that custom is, that it was found to be injurious to the traveller?—I think the whole commercial community is drinking less now than it used to do, and there is a more sober feeling among them.

24225. Do you know whether the fact that commercial travellers were obliged to do that, had a bad effect on them?—If they were not men of strong character, it would have a bad effect on them. I have known cases of travellers who went into cities like Quebec, which is well known for that sort of thing, and they did not drink anything at all, but at the same time they paid for drink for customers.

24226. You think it is a good thing that that custom has been abolished?—Yes.

24227. As to this matter of license: the law requires that 25 resident voters shall sign the petition of the applicant. Do you believe it would be an improvement if the

applicant were required to get a majority of the voters of the district, instead of 25?—No. I think if the voters in the district have the right of objecting to a license, it is a sufficient safeguard. It is very difficult to get a majority of the voters to sign an application, and I should think it would be a very unworkable law.

24228. Is it not just as hard to find a majority to sign in opposition?—I do not think so. Those who object are strongly interested, and the others who sign in favour of an application are not so much interested. You get people to object, because they are strongly interested in the subject.

24229. The thought I had in mind was, that since the licensee is to profit by the transaction, it might be well to put the burden on him of getting a majority?—I should think that if a man was keeping a perfectly respectable restaurant, which is of great use to the community, it would be an unfair restriction to compel him to get a majority of the voters in the district to sign his application.

24230. There are some districts in which a majority of the people have filed an opposition to the application for a license, and in some cases I think we have been told licenses have been refused. Are there any licenses in your part of the city?—I am pretty near the Windsor hotel; I live on Peel street.

24231. You have said that you do not think that prohibition is desirable because you think it cannot be enforced; and that is in keeping with a good deal of the evidence that we have had here. Do you think that prohibition is desirable, if it were possible to enforce it?—I am opposed to prohibition, on the ground, which I have no doubt you have also heard, viz., that the drinking of wine is not unlawful in itself, and that it interferes with individual liberty to prevent people doing what in itself is harmless.

24232. Still you would interfere with the consumption and sale of whisky and stronger liquors?—That would be the way in which I would seek to encourage the selling of light wines.

24233. Do you think it would be an interference with the liberty of the people to prohibit whisky?—It might be to a certain degree an injustice, but not so much as prohibiting the whole sale.

24234. You say that you do not know any plan to provide a substitute for the loss of revenue from license fees and fines. I presume that in this case, as in every other case, the consumers pay the same?—They may in the end, but the province would have to raise the revenue in a more direct method.

24235. Some people have held that if the money were not expended in liquor, it would be expended in dry goods and boots and shoes, and furniture and groceries, and in that way the revenue would be made up. Do you believe there would be an increase in these lines if there were less money spent in the liquor business?—There might be a very small increase in the matter of the very poor people, if they spent money in drink that should go in boots and shoes, as you say; but I should think that would be a very small percentage.

24236. Only a small percentage?—It strikes me as a rather fanciful theory.

24237. As a business man, what do you think is the effect of the liquor trade, as it now exists, on the commercial interests, the agricultural interests or the industrial interests of the country generally?—I cannot say as to that.

24238. You have said that you thought that prohibition of the trade would have an injurious effect upon the commercial interests of the country?—I do not think I said exactly that. I think I said it would diminish the trade of the country to the extent of the liquor sold now, and that far it would lessen trade.

24239. I thought perhaps you had thought of this: whether the liquor trade as established to-day affects the various industries of the country injuriously or beneficially, or not at all?—I cannot say as to that, I have no experience.

24240. With regard to compensation, I think you said that the wholesalers and retailers should not be compensated?—If the wholesale dealers have vested interests, I think they should have compensation.

24241. Take the retailers; they have fixtures and some little money invested in the business, and perhaps a man has been in the trade for years and that it is the only business, he knows anything about, would you not give him compensation?—In my opinion there should be a Commission appointed to inquire into all these facts, if such a thing as pro-

hibition were enacted. There should be a Commission of reasonable men to find out what people have vested interests that should be compensated.

*By the Chairman :*

24242. Are we to understand your answer to be, that wherever there were vested interests, there should be compensation?—That is my idea.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24243. Would you have a Commission who would examine into the whole question, and wherever they thought compensation was proper, they would adjust it?—Yes. A man who had fixtures and had been a number of years in the business, might have a fair claim for compensation for the abolition of his trade.

24244. I suppose you mean by vested interests, capital and buildings and plant?—Yes, the means by which the men you mentioned just now earn their living.

24245. All these things which pertain particularly to a man's business and would be lost more or less to him by prohibition?—Yes.

24246. You said a moment ago that you thought that religious influences and moral influences had effected chiefly this change in the drinking customs of the people. Do you believe that temperance societies are good?—I think they do good.

24247. Do you prefer that your employees for their own sake and your own sake should belong to temperance societies?—I do not know if any of them belong to temperance societies or not.

24248. But would you prefer that they did so?—That is a question which it has never entered into my mind to consider.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24249. You do not demand from your employees that they should be total abstainers?—No.

24250. You do, however, recognize that your interests might suffer if your employees use liquor to excess?—I do not like excess in any shape. I insist upon their being moderate.

24251. You heard Sheriff Thibaudeau state that he, as a traveller, had no difficulty in getting liquor in Chicoutimi or in Portland; he said it was under lock and key, but that you could get all the liquor you required. What is the moral effect of having a law such as the Maine liquor law or the Scott Act so flagrantly violated?—The breaking of any law has a bad effect on the community.

24252. In your judgment, which would be better, to permit liquor to be sold legally in these places, or to have it sold illegally?—I am not in favour of total prohibition. I think it is preferable to have a proper legal restriction on the sale of liquor.

24253. You favour the establishment of parks, where innocent and healthful recreation can be secured for the masses of the people: Would you favour the withdrawal of licenses from these places, or would you prefer that instead of having no licenses there should be licenses for the sale of beer and light wines?—That is a question to which I would like to give some consideration.

24254. Sheriff Thibaudeau stated that he preferred the sale of light wines and beer, and that he would have it on Sunday too?—I have no experience of that, and the Sheriff evidently spoke from his public capacity, from what he had seen.

24255. You favour the separation of the liquor shops from the groceries?—I have already said that I have not considered that question.

24256. Did you see any drunkenness in Paris?—No.

24257. The use of light wine is universal there?—The use of light wine is universal, and it was on every hotel table.

24258. You do not know of any country in the world where the manufacture, importation and sale of liquor is prohibited?—No.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

24259. If there were prohibition, do you believe it would be very difficult to prevent smuggling?—If prohibition were enforced, it is my opinion that there would be a great deal of illicit drinking and smuggling.

The Commission adjourned.



MONTREAL, September 16th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day, Sir JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

JAMES JOHN COSTIGAN, Inspector of Food, Inland Revenue Department, City of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

24260. Are you a native of Montreal?—Yes.

24261. You are the Inspector of Food for the Province of Quebec, under the Dominion Government?—Yes.

24262. Do you report to the Inland Revenue Department?—Yes, direct.

24263. To what official of that department do you report?—To Mr. Miall, Commissioner, or to Mr. Macfarlane, Chief Analyst; generally to the latter.

24264. How long have you held the office?—Since April, 1888.

24265. How were you employed prior to that date?—In the Inland Revenue, as excise officer in Montreal.

24266. Will you kindly briefly explain to the Commission the nature of your duties?—The nature of my duties is to collect samples of food at stated intervals, when requested to do so by an official, or by the Department at Ottawa; that is, to get so many samples of different kinds of food, such as coffees or teas, or whatever they may call upon me to get.

24267. Would your duty include the inspection of liquor also?—Yes.

24268. What do you do with regard to these samples?—If I receive an order from Ottawa that they wish to have a certain number of liquor samples analysed, I go around the various retail stores and collect the samples. I enter the stores and ask for three half pints of whisky or wine and divide the liquor into three parts: I submit one part to Ottawa, one to the official analyst, and leave the other part with the vendor. My duty ceases then, until the official report is brought out.

24269. You leave one part with the vendor?—Yes.

24270. Do you put a seal upon it?—I put a seal upon each package.

24271. Does the vendor, from whom you take it, put a seal on?—Not generally; it has been done; they have had their own seals put on it too.

24272. Is that the law?—They have the privilege of affixing their own seals.

24273. Does not part of the regulations say that they must do it?—No.

24274. Do you only go out and collect samples when you are instructed to do so from Ottawa?—Generally so, except in extraordinary cases, where there is a special case reported to me of any particular article of food, and then I take a sample on my own account, and submit it to Ottawa.

24275. How do such reports come about?—By persons calling at the Inland Revenue office and leaving a complaint with the Collector or myself.

24276. What class of the community lay such complaints?—The complaints are few and far between.

24277. Then if a complaint is made to you by any citizen, about an article that is being vended, which is subject to inspection, you consider it is your duty to make an investigation and get samples?—Yes, as soon as possible.

JAMES JOHN COSTIGAN.

24278. Will you describe to us your method of getting samples? Do you get them from the wholesale dealers, or the retail dealers?—From the retail dealers, generally, except in special cases where I might be requested to take samples from wholesale houses.

24279. Do you, without notice, simply go into an establishment and say you want so and so?—I simply go to a store, as an ordinary purchaser, and ask, say for a pound of coffee. Immediately after I have paid the price, and they hand me over the pound of coffee, or the article I have purchased, I notify them of the object for which I have purchased, and I separate the purchase into three parcels.

24280. You pay for the quantity taken?—Yes.

24281. You pay for the full quantity, notwithstanding you leave one-third to the vendor?—Yes, it is a cash transaction.

24282. And if there is a prosecution, there may be a fine?—Yes.

24283. And the Government may be, in part, recouped by a fine?—Yes, the Government has that privilege, according to the Act.

24284. Are you careful to prevent vendors getting notice of your intended visit?—Very careful.

24285. Do you think, as a rule, when you get into the vendor's place, they know anything about the object of your visit until you get there?—For the past four or five years, with one or two exceptions, I have never been known in the stores: there may have been one or two cases that they suspected who I was.

24286. The Commissioners are, of course, more particularly interested in the question of the inspection of liquors. How many samples of liquors have you taken possession of during the last 12 months?—During the last 12 months I have taken none.

24287. Well, in the 12 months previous to that?—I think I collected 72 or 74 samples, the exact number I am not quite sure of.

24288. In Montreal?—In various parts of the province: some in Quebec, some in Montreal, some in Lachûte and so on.

24289. Were those samples all descriptions of liquors?—All descriptions of wines and liquors. All descriptions of wines, gin, whisky and rum. I take them in almost all cases in saloons, that is saloons of the lower grade, those places which are most frequented by workmen and trades people generally.

24290. Have you anything to do with the conduct of prosecutions against the vendors of adulterated liquors?—When a prosecution is entered, I have to be prosecutor.

24291. With reference to the period during which you took the 72 samples, were there many prosecutions?—No prosecutions at all.

24292. Have you had, within recent years, occasion to prosecute in many instances?—No, it is only within the last year or so that the Government has taken any decided stand in prosecutions for the adulteration of foods. During the past year they have prosecuted more than hitherto.

24293. May we conclude from what you have said, that there have been no prosecutions for the adulteration of liquor?—None that I am aware of.

24294. From your observation and experience, you have come to the conclusion that the adulteration of liquors is practised to a large extent?—The conclusion I form is that the adulteration of liquors is not so great as people imagine. The adulteration is more in the taking of various liquors, such as whisky and gin, and making rye with a little colouring, and something to give it a flavour.

24295. Is that done by licensed vendors, or by what are known as "Compounders," or by the retail dealers?—During my collection of liquor samples, I found out that as regards blending, the greater part of it was done by the saloon keepers themselves. Their general answer to my inquiry was that they had blended the article themselves.

24296. And the object was with a view of producing a cheaper article?—Yes.

24297. Do you think it would be a more hurtful article to those who consumed it?—That I cannot say. In the places I have visited, it was generally dilution and not adulteration that was practised.

24298. Do you know any cases of substances being added to liquor with the view of giving it a stronger flavour, and which would render it more hurtful?—I do not know of any, personally.

24299. Can you tell the Commissioners anything about the illicit sale of liquors or spirits?—Well, I am under the impression that liquor is sold largely illicitly.

24300. That is, sold by persons who have no licenses?—Yes.

24301. The Commissioners were told that in the city of Montreal there are 1,000 licensed places, and that there are probably from 2,000 to 4,000 places selling illicitly?—That is very nearly correct.

24302. You think that is nearly correct?—Yes, there are close on 2,000, if there are not more, selling without a license.

24303. From your observation and experience can you tell the Commissioners if the law is well observed, that is to say, the law restricting the sale of liquor within certain hours, and prohibiting the sale on Sunday: take the city of Montreal, for instance?—From experience and observation, it is my opinion that those in charge may do their part, but I think there is a great deal of illicit selling within prohibitory hours.

24304. Do you think there is now less or more drunkenness than there was in the Province ten years ago, or when you took office?—I think there is a decided decrease in intemperance; I do not think there is as much drunkenness as in former years. There is a great deal of interest taken in temperance matters by the citizens generally, and by those who are what is known as temperance people.

24305. You think the temperance workers have done good in that respect?—Yes, in reducing intemperance.

24306. I suppose the Church has also been working in the same direction?—Speaking as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, I know that they have done all in their power to lessen the evil of intemperance. As Secretary of the St. Patrick's Temperance Society, an office which I have held for eleven years, I know that the clergy do all in their power, and spare neither time nor expense to promote the Temperance Societies in their church.

24307. The late much lamented Father Dowd was, I believe, a very earnest worker in that direction?—Yes, indeed. The temperance society had only to ask him for any favour, and he was always willing to grant it, that is in regard to anything that would promote the cause of temperance in any way.

24308. From your observation do you think that the license law and the city regulations in regard to the drink traffic are well enforced in the city?—I do not think they are as rigidly enforced as they might be.

24309. In what respect do you think the officials fail?—Chiefly in regard to selling after hours and Sunday selling.

24310. Has an earnest effort been made to grapple with the number of unlicensed places?—Well, of course I cannot say anything as to that. I know there are a large number of unlicensed places, but I do not know that there has been any effort made to reduce them.

24311. Do you not consider if there are 2,000 unlicensed places and 1,000 licenses that is *prima facie* evidence that the efforts to curtail the unlicensed places are not sufficient?—I consider that there would be a great deal of difficulty in getting rid of all the unlicensed places, or the greater part of them.

24312. In what do you consider the difficulty consists?—Well, the difficulty is that it is hard to get any one that will inform on these people. The customers are generally people who would rather wink at having them evade the law than inform on them.

24313. It is difficult to get the necessary evidence to convict parties selling illegally?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24314. Mr. Costigan, I am perfectly satisfied that you discharge your duties thoroughly and efficiently, but I want to get at some matters of detail. You are under the impression that the parties do not know who you are when you go to get the samples of liquor, and you are careful to see that they get no notice. Do not you think that in the city your personality is perhaps known to these people, and that when you come into their shops they really know who you are, although you may not know them individually?—That might possibly be, but speaking of the city of Montreal, I generally select portions of it where I do not think I am well-known.

JAMES JOHN COSTIGAN.

mir93  
RICHARD

24315. I quite expect that in the rural districts you would not be known at all?—  
No.

24316. You do not wear any badge?—No.

24317. Have you any officers under you?—No.

24318. Have you any rule in selecting the places which you visit?—Well, there is no general rule, I select the place that I think may probably have a bad sample.

24319. I read with considerable interest a discussion in the House of Commons same time ago, in which a speech was made by Mr. Curran, Member for Montreal Centre, in which, speaking of the Report of the analysis made of liquor, he said, as I recollect, that the Montreal samples had been collected mainly from respectable houses that would not tamper with the liquors, and that he feared that the samples had been got from places where they were not likely to be tampered with?—I think that Mr. Curran made a mistake in that.

24320. Did you read a report of the speech?—Yes.

24321. That is a matter of some importance, and that speech having been read widely, if there is a mistake about it, it is well it should be corrected?—When I say Mr. Curran made a mistake in the matter, I mean this, that he cited the names of every wholesale house from whom liquor samples were taken, whereas, as a matter of fact, there were no liquor samples taken from these firms. In going into a saloon I ask for three half pints of whisky and they furnished me with it, and I pay for it, I then inform them of the object for which I purchased it, and they tell me that they get it from J. E. Mullin or Dufresne or other wholesale dealers. I think there was a mistake in the report, and that was what led Mr. Curran to make the statement.

24322. When you buy a sample from a dealer and note his name, do you also note the name of the wholesale dealer?—I may possibly do so.

24323. Do you ever get samples from unlicensed people who sell liquors?—No, I am not supposed to know them.

24324. We are told here that there are a large number of places where liquor is sold illicitly. Have you any means of judging whether the liquor sold in these places is adulterated or not?—I have no means of knowing.

24325. Do you ever send any one but yourself to purchase?—No, I have to purchase personally.

24326. Is there any regulation requiring that?—Yes. The Inspector must purchase, or any one purchasing a sample may cause the Inspector to prosecute.

24327. What would you think of having the law so altered that you would be able to send people to do the purchasing?—That would be a benefit in some cases.

24328. You have stated that it is over a year since any liquor samples were taken?—Yes, it is over a year.

24329. Is it that long time since you received instructions to collect samples?—Yes.

24330. When you collect and make a return, how long is it generally before the report comes out?—The analyst is supposed to send in his report immediately after he receives the sample.

24331. Is that Dr. Edwards?—Yes, Dr. Edwards, in Montreal. I give one part of the sample to him, at the same time submit a duplicate to the Department at Ottawa.

24332. Does he make a report to the local officer of the Inland Revenue?—No, to Ottawa alone.

24333. Is that report communicated to you?—Not unless there is a prosecution, and they notify me in that case.

24334. And you have no means of knowing of it except when you see it in the Blue Book?—Not unless I make a special request.

24335. You said that so far as the liquor purchased in the licensed places is concerned, you think that tampering with the liquor is generally dilution of a harmless character?—That is what I generally find.

24336. You said that the dealers, as a general rule, stated they did this themselves?—Yes, as a general rule.

24337. What would you consider an adulteration that would call for prosecution in the case of spirits?—I consider an adulteration that would be in any way injurious

to health would call for prosecution ; and I consider also, that the selling of an inferior quality for a better grade would be a cause for prosecution, even though it was not injurious to health.

24338. The mere dilution of alcohol with water you would not consider a matter for prosecution ?—Personally, I would consider the more water the better.

24339. You would not consider that injurious ?—No.

24340. The question might arise as to whether the sale was intended as a fraud on the purchaser ?—Yes.

24341. We had a witness before us, yesterday, who stated that when some people buy liquor, they wish it to “give a scratch” to the throat. Have you at any time found liquors that were adulterated with the view of producing such an effect as that ?—Not to my knowledge.

24342. Are there any suggestions you could make to the Commission as to amendments in the present regulations, which they would be enabled to bring to the notice of the Government ?—There is no suggestion I can make that would be an improvement on the existing Act, excepting, of course, that if samples were collected more generally, without waiting for orders, there might be more chance to find out adulteration.

24343. Of course the unlicensed places are outside the law altogether, but as a matter of fact they exist ?—Yes.

24344. Do you think it would be well if there was provision made for securing samples from them ?—Yes ; I believe that if any adulteration of liquor takes place, most of it takes place in these shebeens.

24345. Do many people go to these shebeens ?—Yes, I presume a great many.

24346. And you would protect that portion of the public from adulteration, by requiring inspection of liquor sold at these places ?—Yes.

24347. In other words they might be subject to a penalty for selling illegally, and also subject to a penalty for perpetrating a fraud on the people who buy the liquor ?—Yes.

24348. Have you any standard fixed for your guidance ?—No.

24349. It was suggested by, I think, Dr. Edwards that it would be a good thing if an officer were entitled to take charge of the whole stock on a man's shelves and have any portion of them he wished analysed. He suggested that there were essences and other ingredients used in what are called mixed drinks, and that while the liquor you purchased might be pure, or comparatively pure, yet there was no inspection of other ingredients ?—The Inspector has authority, if he wishes, to take any portion of any man's stock which he considers adulterated ; he need not take what is offered to him, he can take any other portion that he thinks fit.

24350. Do you generally take broken packages as samples ?—Generally flasks or bottles. The last time I collected liquor samples, I tried to get them off the shelves.

24351. But they were bottles that had been corked ?—Yes, but they had already been drawn from.

24352. Do you find in these shops that decanters are used ?—Well, bottles or decanters. Club Rye and other liquors with a good name are generally left in the bottle they came in.

24353. In cases where the liquors are open, do you buy the bottle or do you have the liquor poured into another bottle ?—I generally carry a bottle with me or get them to provide me with bottles.

24354. The bottles you take away with you are the very bottles that the ordinary customer would be served from if they came in for a drink ?—The same.

24355. Do you ever see bottles containing other articles than liquors on the shelf ?—Not excepting essences or things of that kind.

24356. As a general rule, are they willing to furnish you with samples ?—Several persons refused samples, but it was more because they thought I had not the right to take them away forcibly.

24357. Dr. Edwards told us that he did not know the name of the person from whom you take the liquor, but that you have a number ?—He does not know the name.

24358. Do you ever go to the cellars of these people ?—No.

JAMES JOHN COSTIGAN.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24359. It is your impression, from your experience, that the adulterations are chiefly dilutions?—Chiefly, as far as I can observe.

24360. And that there is no introduction of any very deleterious substances?—It might be that compounders may use these substances, but I have no knowledge of that.

24361. You have spoken about the license law : does it really regulate the trade in the city of Montreal?—Yes, it regulates the trade, but the difficulty is in the enforcement.

24362. Do you think that a law that authorizes a thousand vendors of liquor, and under which there is permitted to exist from two thousand to four thousand illicit places for the sale of liquor, regulates the traffic?—I can say that the law would regulate the drink traffic, if it were properly enforced.

24363. Do you think it is possible to enforce it and close up these illicit places?—It would be very difficult to close them up ; but apart from that, I believe they could be closed.

24364. I think you said that the licensees do a great deal of illicit selling during prohibited hours and on Sundays. Do you think that a license law which permits that, regulates the trade?—No, I do not. But that is due, I consider, to laxity on the part of the officials.

24365. We have it in evidence from the Police Magistrates and the Recorder, and I think some other officials, that the law is a great deal better enforced in later years than previously. Have you observed that?—Well, I have not observed it.

24366. It would occur to one who has heard the evidence of the officials, that if it is better enforced within the last two or three years than previous to that time, a most lamentable state of things must have existed formerly, when we have now between two thousand and four thousand illicit places, and from twenty-five to fifty per cent of the licensed places selling during prohibited hours?—From personal observation, as a citizen of Montreal, I consider there is as much selling now within prohibited hours as there was five years ago.

24367. You attribute the diminution of drunkenness to the influence of the church and the temperance societies?—Yes.

24368. Do you believe it would be well to still further limit the number of licenses issued?—Yes, I believe it would.

24369. Do you think that the further limiting of the number of licenses would increase proportionately the number of illicit liquor selling places?—No, I do not think so, if the law was in any way well enforced.

24370. It all depends on that?—I think so.

24371. From your observation, what is your belief as to the effect of the drink trade as it now exists in the city of Montreal ; generally speaking, is it good or evil?—Of course it has a bad effect, but I do not think I have ever studied the question close enough to give a satisfactory answer.

24372. Do you believe that a better enforcement of the license law would reduce the evil effects to a minimum?—I believe the better enforcement of the law would reduce the evil effects of drunkenness.

24373. Have you given any thought to the matter of the entire prohibition of the traffic?—No, I have never studied that question.

24374. You are not prepared to express an opinion about that?—No.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24375. Do you consider the present method of taking samples to be the best that could be devised to prevent the adulteration of food and liquors?—I think it is the best.

24376. Do you think the collection of samples once in a year or once in two years, and sending them to be analysed, is sufficient?—That only refers to liquors.

24377. I am speaking of liquor specially. Do you consider it sufficient to collect them to be analysed?—No, I do not think that is sufficient.

24378. It is entirely insufficient, is it not?—It is insufficient.

24379. I think you said that you are not aware that there is very much adulteration of liquor by the addition of deleterious substances to alcohol : it is more a reduction of the strength of water they practise?—Speaking in reference to the samples which I have collected, that is the result.

24380. No effort is made by the department to ascertain what quantity of liquor is sold in unlicensed places, nor even the kind of liquor that is sold in licensed places, by frequent visits to restaurants?—No.

24381. Have you had any experience of the operation of the Canada Temperance Act?—No.

*By the Chairman :*

24382. Have you seen liquor sold in places where the Act was in force?—Yes, I have seen liquor sold.

24383. Openly?—Not to say in a bar, but I could procure it.

*By Judge McDonald :*

24384. Do you know the character of liquor sold in the public parks?—No, I have never procured any samples in any of those places.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24385. In what places did you observe the working of the Scott Act?—I have said that I have seen places where the Act was in force and where liquor could be procured.

24386. Did you have knowledge of these places prior to the coming into force of the Scott Act?—No.

24387. You are not able to compare these places under license and under the Scott Act?—No. I merely state that I have seen liquor sold in places where the Scott Act was in force.

JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN, Q.C., LL.D., M.P., on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

24388. You are a member of the legal profession?—Yes.

24389. And one of the representatives for Montreal?—Yes.

24390. How long have you represented Montreal?—I have represented Montreal Centre since 1882.

24391. Your constituents are largely, I suppose, English speaking?—They are about two-thirds English speaking—that is to say English, Irish and Scotch, and one-third French.

24392. And of the English-speaking, the Irish people are proportionately the more numerous?—I think they are a majority, but the constituency is pretty evenly divided into three parts. I think that the Irish Catholics are the majority of the three parts, but there is not much difference.

24393. From your observation of Montreal, do you think that intemperance has increased or decreased of late years?—I have not noticed any increase of intemperance from my observation. There has been a large increase in population, but I do not think there has been perhaps a corresponding increase in intemperance.

24394. I am well aware, and I think perhaps the Commissioners are aware, that you have taken great interest in temperance matters?—I am a member of the St. Patrick's Temperance Association ; and some years ago, under the guidance of Father Dowd, who is now dead, there was an association formed, which embraced the Irish Catholic Temperance Societies of all the parishes of the city of Montreal. They met

JAMES JOHN COSTIGAN.

and discussed this whole question as far as they could, and they reached a programme, which might have been given to the Commission by the last witness, Mr. J. J. Costigan, who was Secretary of the Association.

24395. An association of temperance bodies?—Yes, I think they called it the Irish Catholic Temperance Convention.

24396. Would you like to have that handed into the Commission?—Mr. Costigan, the last witness, has got it. I read it in the House of Commons, and it is printed in the *Hansard*. I think the first article of the programme was that, after due consideration, they felt that prohibition would not be effective for the purposes they intended. They were strongly in favour of a strict analysis of all liquor sold for consumption; they were in favour of a reduction of the number of licenses in the city, and some other matters, which I forget at the moment.

24397. Are these your own views, Mr. Curran?—Well, of course, I discussed the matter with Father Dowd in reference to prohibition. The subject was very much agitated and discussed in the press and elsewhere, and I had several discussions with him. He was a man of very large experience, and I had very great respect for his views. We were all convinced of the terrible effects of the abuse of intoxicating liquors, and I agreed with him that I did not think that prohibition would have the effect that its advocates pretended it would have.

24398. You agreed, I suppose, to the programme to which you have referred?—I agreed to that programme.

24399. It looked to the improvement of the present laws, rather than to a radical change, as the most effective way of dealing with the subject?—Yes. We did not see, in the first place, how it would be possible to enforce a prohibitory law, if a law of less stringency could not be enforced. Any great object of that kind can only be obtained by gradual process, and if public sentiment was not such as to enable a rigid enforcement of the laws that we had for the suppression of intemperance, we did not see how it would be possible to enforce a more stringent law. The following is the programme of the Irish Catholic Temperance Convention, to which I have referred:—

Platform of principles of the Irish Catholic Temperance Convention of Montreal, adopted 9th September, 1888, and afterwards ratified by each of the societies forming the said convention.

That this Convention is most desirous to forward the cause of temperance, in adopting all wise and legitimate means to remove the curse of drunkenness from our midst.

This Convention is not prepared to say that prohibition would accomplish the desired effect, expecting better results from moral suasion than from extreme legislative action.

That as a means more effective, and more practical, this Convention suggests as a common ground work for united efforts the following:—

(a) A strict licensing system in regard to persons and places.

(b) The careful analysis of all liquors sold and used.

(c) The total separation of the liquor traffic from all other kind of trade, making it a distinct line of business in itself.

(d) An effective police named by the Government, distinct from the city police, to enforce and stringently carry out the laws governing the sale of liquor.

(Signed)

REV. M. CALLAGHAN, S. S.,  
For St. Patrick's Parish and St. Patrick's T. A. B. Society.

REV. S. STRUBBE, C.S.S.R.,  
For St. Ann's Parish and St. Ann's T. A. B. Society.

REV. J. J. SALMON, P. P.,  
For St. Gabriel's Parish and St. Gabriel's T. A. B. Society.

REV. S. LONERGAN, P. P.,  
For St. Mary's Parish and St. Bridget's T. A. B. Society.

JAMES J. COSTIGAN,  
Secretary of Convention.

(A true copy.)

(Sd.) JAS. J. COSTIGAN.

24400. Is it your opinion that the existing license law is fairly well enforced in Montreal?—I think it is fairly well enforced, but a great deal more might be done.

24401. I take it from what you have said that you would reduce the number of licensed places?—Well, if the statement be true that there are so many unlicensed places as have been mentioned, I think the first efforts of the officers of the law should be to exterminate these. I am not aware of the existence of all these places. If I were told



there were 1,000 places in Montreal where liquor is sold illicitly, I should perhaps believe it, but I can hardly credit that there are 3,000 or 4,000 places where liquor is sold illegally.

24402. Would you advocate the extinction of these places?—I would like to see the public sentiment strong enough to back up the officers of the law in enforcing the law as it stands. When we have reached that stage of the matter, then it will be the right time to take another step. But if the officers of the law declare themselves powerless, for want of public sentiment behind them to enforce the present law, I do not see how they are going to enforce a still more stringent one.

24403. Have you given thought to the financial side of the question?—Well, I, as a public man, was expecting from this Commission to get statistics on this subject. We have had a great deal of sentimental discussion so far on the matter, but really to get at the statistics as to what would be the effect on the revenue of the country and on the trade of the country is the important matter. It would naturally have a revolutionary effect.

24404. Admitting the evils of the abuse of intoxicating liquors, what do you think would be the effect of the entire stoppage of the trade, on business and financial operations throughout the country?—It would certainly have a very serious effect. I think it would throw back the temperance cause, in the first place. We have a great many people who are not total abstainers but who are zealous in promoting the efforts of the temperance societies. There are a great many people preaching prohibition who are not total abstainers themselves, and I do not think that is honest. I think the first thing a man should do is to apply the rule to himself, and live the example.

24405. I gather from what you have said that you believe the influence of the church and of temperance societies to be best calculated to bring about reform of the evils arising from intemperance?—There is no doubt about it that the influence of religion is that which has the most powerful effect. You have to educate the people. You have to raise their moral views, and it is through the efforts of temperance organizations, supported by the churches, that that result will be reached. As for a prohibitory law, unless the people look upon the use of wine and other intoxicants as immoral, you cannot expect to carry out such a law as that, and I do not believe you will ever educate the people to that extent. I do not think that prohibition can ever be carried, that is my honest opinion; it can never be enforced, it may be carried.

24406. Do you look upon it as partaking too much of the character of coercion?—I think the majority should rule; but if the law was carried, it would be repealed after a time.

24407. You think that prohibition would be impossible unless there should be a large majority of the people in favour of it?—Yes.

24408. Your view of it is, that it would be wrong, unless there was a majority in favour of it?—Certainly.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24409. You have been in public life for a good many years, and have also been, I understand, a practising barrister. You have stated to us that you believe that a general prohibitory law if passed could not be enforced?—I do not think it could.

24410. What is the effect on the community of a law upon the statute-book which is flagrantly violated?—It brings law into contempt.

24411. Do you consider it an educator for good or evil?—I think it has a very bad effect.

24412. You have spoken of the difficulty of enforcing a general prohibitory law, taking the Dominion as a whole?—Yes.

24413. I am going to put a case to you: Take our Dominion as constituted, running from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Suppose a vote was taken upon this question, and the Maritime Provinces voted ten to one in favour of prohibition, your Province voted against it, Ontario for or against, but British Columbia gave a majority of ten to one against prohibition, would you hope to enforce it in any measure in British Columbia?—No, I would not hope to enforce it. I would not hope to enforce it in the Maritime Provinces.

JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN.

24414. Even with ten to one in favour?—No.

24415. Would you consider that the tenth part who are opposed to it would still go on as if there were no such law?—Yes. They go on when they have the Scott Act. There is a great deal of drinking done in places where the Scott Act is in force.

24416. Have you ever been in places where the Scott Act was in force?—Yes.

24417. How did you find it observed?—I did not find it observed at all.

24418. Liquor on sale?—I saw it sold. There was no trouble about getting it. They did not keep their bar opposite the street window, but you could march into the place where it was sold.

24419. I suppose you do not know as to whether liquors are adulterated or not?—I know there is a widespread feeling that adulterated liquors are sold.

24420. I read a speech delivered by you in the House of Commons, in which you said that the samples that had been examined were taken from respectable dealers whom nobody would expect to sell liquor which had been tampered with?—I saw a Blue Book with the names of J. E. Mullins & Company and Dufresne & Mongenais and some others from whom samples were taken, and I came to the conclusion that it was useless to go to such places to find bad liquor. We have had an explanation of that from the officer who takes the samples, and a very efficient officer he is. He has also explained why there is such a small amount of inspection done. We have 1,000 licensed places in this city for the sale of liquor, and I think that the inspection of liquor should go on all the year round. The drinking of liquors is going on every day and inspection should go on every day. We learn now that a year has passed since any inspection was ordered, and therefore my statement in the House, and the views of the temperance people are fully borne out, that there is not a proper inspection. The inspection is not made often enough. The officer does his duty. There cannot be a better officer than Mr. Costigan here. He does what he is told, but if the law were enforced and liquors were frequently analysed, then we would know the true state of affairs. You take physicians and others who attend people in delirium tremens, and they will tell you what their views are about liquors being adulterated.

24421. It seems to me that Dr. Baker Edwards told us that 12 samples were from Montreal city at the last analysis?—They are not sufficient.

24422. We have evidence before us, that there are a certain number of licensed places in Montreal, in which there is a constant fraud perpetrated upon the authorities in the way of a pretense of meals being furnished, but in which nothing but liquor is sold. Do you think that in places of that kind, where the parties show themselves to be capable of that amount of fraud, there should be a special effort made to analyse the liquors?—I think there should be analysis made all over, in all places where it is sold. Those who sell good liquor will not object to it.

24423. Of course it is a deplorable fact that has been stated here, as to the number of unlicensed places in the city, and you find yourself almost unable to believe that it can be true; but taking the facts as they are, do not you think that liquor should be obtained from these places and inspected?—Undoubtedly liquor should be obtained for inspection everywhere it is sold.

24424. Have you considered the question of places of amusement, the parks that are now in existence in Montreal, as to whether they are beneficial or otherwise?—Parks are very beneficial, of course.

24425. Do you think these parks have been a benefit to the city?—Certainly.

24426. Would you grant such places licenses for the sale of any kind of liquor?—Personally I would prefer that they should not sell liquor; but speaking as a man who would like to see evils reduced to a minimum, I believe that the sale of lager beer for instance, something that is nearly harmless, will probably take the people there to enjoy themselves rationally, who, if such liquor could not be had, would go elsewhere and take others with them and indulge in something far more injurious.

24427. What would you think, for the country as a whole, of the encouragement of the use of light wines and ales, and trying to do away with heavier liquors?—I do not believe in encouraging light wines, or ales, or anything of that kind.

24428. But granting that liquors of some kind would be used, which would you prefer?—Well, it stands to reason, and we all know that if light wines and similar beverages

ages were used, they would have no injurious effect. It is the abuse of light wines, and so forth, that is injurious. People begin on light wines, and they end on strong brandy.

24429. Then I understand your position to be this : as far as your own view goes, if you could, you would put an end to the drinking of intoxicating liquors altogether, but that you look upon it as an impossible thing to do in the present state of society. Is that a fact?—Yes ; I consider that if people could be induced to abstain from intoxicating liquors, the vast majority of mankind would be benefited. There are some people who require wine—I think so, although I am not a medical man. But from my own limited experience, I think some people are benefited by wine or something of that kind ; however, the overwhelming number are injured by the use of liquor.

24430. Holding that opinion and looking upon it as impracticable to properly enforce a law which would have that end in view, what general plan would you suggest as being the best to get rid of the evils of intemperance?—I do not know of any plan by legislation. The first thing you have to do is to educate the people, which is done principally through the efforts of the clergy. Take, for instance, this last spring. We had a visit from the Paulist Fathers of New York, who preached a retreat at St. Patrick's church. They did a vast amount of good, and there were hundreds who joined the temperance societies in consequence of their preaching. We have such men as Father McCallen, the head of the temperance society, who do a vast amount of good.

24431. I have read in the press that the beneficial effects of Father Mathew's crusade on the community are still to be found in this country?—Yes ; that is a fact.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24432. I think you said that the effects of prohibition on the business of the country would be revolutionary?—Naturally it would be, just for the time. It would change the methods of business.

24433. It would be a shock at once?—It would be a shock.

24434. Have you observed what is the effect of the liquor trade, as it now stands, on the business of the country?—Well, ever since I have been observing anything, the trade has been going on in the same way. There has been no change. If we had changed from one state of affairs to the other, I might be able to answer you ; but as we always have been in a state of society where liquor has been manufactured and sold, I cannot answer you.

24435. There has been a steady tendency towards increased restrictions about the trade, I think?—Yes ; for instance, the Sunday law.

24436. And the law prohibiting sale during certain hours?—The law prohibiting sale during certain hours has been changed, and the law has increased the license fees and limited the number of licenses.

24437. Would you conclude that these steadily increasing restrictions are made in consequence of some injurious effect which the trade has upon the commercial affairs of the country generally?—Well, in the first place, with regard to Sundays : the people all feel that nothing should be sold on Sundays, more especially intoxicating liquors, which lead to disturbance when they are abused, and the desecration of the Lord's Day. Public sentiment is strongly in favour of that restriction. But I will just say to you, to show what public sentiment is, that I doubt very much if the ordinary citizen saw a man going into a place on Sunday, knowing that he was going to take drink, that he would inform upon him. However, I think that public sentiment is strong enough to complain if a person were seen coming out of a place on Sunday in a state of intoxication. I think that most citizens would give information under those circumstances. Public opinion has been educated up to that point, but there is no public sentiment, for instance, with regard to liquor generally, that would induce the ordinary citizen to become an informer.

24438. Do you think these increasing restrictions are on account of the evil effects of the trade upon the social condition of the people?—I believe so.

24439. Have you observed that the liquor trade, as it is carried on, does affect injuriously the other business of the country?—I do not like to give any evidence that seems to favour what is against my principles. But you will observe that in places where the Scott Act is in force, a great many complain of the falling off of ordinary

JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN.

business. In the first place, you cannot get a decent hotel. The hotel-keepers, whether it is from one reason or another, allow their places to become very inferior as to accommodation and everything else. We, temperance men, are not generous enough to give them all the support they would otherwise get.

24440. We had it in evidence at St. John from an hotel proprietor that he could not run his hotel without a bar, and he was asked: "Do you mean to say that the non-drinkers who patronize your house fail to pay for what they get?" He said, he would not like to put it in that way, but he observed that the teetotallers had great appetites. You say, we temperance people. Do you think, Mr. Curran, that we do not pay at hotels for what we get, and that the patrons at the bar have to help to feed us?—I do not know enough about hotel-keepers to answer that question. We pay them for what we get, I suppose.

*By the Chairman :*

24441. It becomes a question as to whether you are charged enough?—I do not know what the reason is. I answered the question as to my experience as to these things, and I say to you that in a great many places they have repealed the Scott Act in towns because they felt that the business was suffering. That is stated; it may be or it may not be, and I do not know how much truth there may be in it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24442. Since you have been speaking of the Scott Act: in what places have you observed particularly the working of the Scott Act?—Well, I was down in New Brunswick lately.

24443. Did you observe the working of the Scott Act?—Is Fredericton under Scott Act?

24444. That is the original place where the Scott Act was adopted?—Well, it is a very bad starting point.

24445. The Scott Act has been in operation since 1879 in Fredericton: did you have an opportunity of observing Fredericton previous to the Scott Act?—No, that was my first visit to Fredericton.

24446. You did not know its condition under license, and are not able to say whether it is better or worse?—No, but I say this: that I think that where the law is violated as the Scott Act is down there, it has a bad effect on the administration of the law generally.

24447. You think that the open violation of the law has a demoralizing effect?—Yes, I think so.

24448. Do you think that law generally is an educator?—Law ought to be an educator. There are certain laws that have a good effect, but to which people require to be educated. A law like this, where the liberty of the subject is, no doubt, interfered with—every one admits that—ought only to be enacted when the sentiment is such as to back up the law.

24449. That is true of all these laws?—Sumptuary laws I think they are called.

24450. Would a prohibitory law be a sumptuary law, in the correct sense of the term?—No, I think it is a misnomer; but you know what I mean, I suppose.

24451. The continuous violation of law has a serious effect, you think, in that it breeds contempt for other laws. What do you think is the effect of the persistent violation of the license law in Montreal?—Well, the law in Montreal does not reflect credit upon those who have its administration in hand. That opens up the whole question of the appointment of the police and such a wide field that it would lead us into a dissertation to which there would be no end. If the law as it stands now were honestly administered, there would be a great improvement. I cannot see any reason, with the great majority of the citizens of Montreal, order-loving and law-abiding, why the law should not be enforced.

24452. There is a fault somewhere?—There is a fault somewhere.

24453. I think you said that what is needed more than anything else, is the education of the people and good example?—Yes, that will be done by religious and moral teachers.

24454. The church must be the chief agent?—Yes.

24455. Do you believe that a law in accordance with the principles taught, will help the teaching of the platform and the press and the pulpit?—The teaching of the pulpit, as I understand it, is that the people should abstain from the abuse of liquors, and the law stands in that light now. I do not think the majority of ministers of religion advocate prohibition. I do not think that there are three per cent of the population of Canada who think it is contrary to good morals to use intoxicating liquor.

24456. Do you think that a considerable proportion of the teachers of religion advocate total abstinence for the individual?—Well, I do not know about that, I cannot say.

24457. While they may not say that the drinking of the glass of wine is in itself a sin, yet they advocate, as a judicious measure for the individual, total abstinence?—Yes, they do.

24458. Do you believe that a law in accordance with that teaching would promote that teaching?—Not until you have a large majority in its favour.

24459. Would you do this: Would you, as the majority increase and the sentiment strengthens, strengthen the law along the line?—If we were able to carry out the law as it now stands, then we could go a step further; we might, for instance, then reduce the number of licenses and increase the fee. I know there are temperance societies urging the wholesale reduction of licenses and the increase of the fees largely; personally, I am afraid they are too sanguine about the results.

24460. Do you believe, speaking of the license law, that it would be an advantage to have an earlier hour for closing, for instance? I do not think the houses close now till 11 or 12 at night. Do you think it would be an advantage to the working man to close them earlier?—I think so. I voted for a law to that effect myself.

24461. A portion of your constituency are labouring people in the factories?—I represent the wealthiest and the poorest of our people. I represent the section of the city that we are sitting in now.

24462. You have a good many mechanics amongst your constituents?—Yes.

24463. Do you believe that it would be an advantage to the working people if on Saturday evening the liquor stores were closed at six or seven o'clock?—I voted for that in the House of Commons.

24464. Do you know if there is any considerable prohibition sentiment in your constituency?—I do not think there is very much.

24465. You know, of course, that the license law, so far as the rural constituencies of Quebec are concerned, provides that by municipal by-law there may be a refusal of licenses?—Yes.

24466. Do you think that is operating well?—I do not like to speak of that.

24467. Had you the same opportunity of observing the result in that case as you had of observing the Scott Act?—No. My experience in regard to the Scott Act was largely in Ontario.

24468. Where it has been repealed since?—In some places it has been repealed since. Since I have been elected to Parliament I have travelled a great deal in Ontario, and I happened to be in counties where the Scott Act was then in force.

24469. You said, I think, that prohibition could never be enforced?—I am afraid not, unless there is a great deal of progress made in public sentiment.

24470. If that change in public sentiment did take place, and if it were made clear that a change in public sentiment had taken place and that it was strongly for prohibition, do you believe that then there could be a fair enforcement of prohibition?—Undoubtedly if public sentiment is educated up to it, you could enforce any law with the public back of it.

24471. If that state of things some time came to be, and prohibition were enacted, do you believe that the enforcement of it would be productive of a great deal of good?—I think it would, if the evil did not break out in some other place.

24472. Do you believe it is the duty of Government to make it difficult for people to do wrong and easy for people to do right?—Yes.

JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN.

24473. And that the majority, I think you have already said, should govern?—Yes, but I do not think they should tyrannize. If you get me into that, I have strong views about many questions.

24474. You think minorities have rights as well as majorities?—Yes.

24475. You do not believe that the minorities should rule majorities?—I do not believe they should. You understand, of course, that minorities have rights, and that majorities should be considerate of them.

24476. You have said that you would not encourage the use of wines or beers or other kinds of liquor?—Yes.

24477. Do you think that the laws should discourage these things in so far as it is possible to enact laws?—I think the laws should discourage anything that has a tendency to do injury, and the law does discourage the use of liquor by its restrictions upon the sale. I am under the impression—to make a long story short—that you cannot enforce any such a law as total prohibition.

24478. You think not?—I honestly believe it. I have seen a great deal of the evil effects of intemperance, and I know that it makes people feel very strongly and makes them sometimes go to extremes.

24479. Yes, there is a danger of extremes even in a good thing?—No doubt about that.

24480. Moderate drinking, you said was not wrong, of course?—No.

24481. Do you think that those who are in the habit of drinking in Montreal—and I presume there is a large class—should have any measure of protection against themselves?—Yes, the law protects them against themselves. Their friends and relatives can have them interdicted, and can give notice prohibiting a saloon keeper from selling them liquor under heavy penalties. I have seen people interdicted myself. The law is not asleep upon the matter.

24482. Do you know any legalized business of like character and like effect as the liquor trade in this country?—I do not know of any other similar traffic.

24483. Is there anything of so hurtful a tendency which is legalized and protected as that business in this country?—I do not know of any other. In dealing with matters of that kind, we have to take human nature and society as they are; there is the trouble.

24484. And try to improve them?—Yes.

24485. Allusion was made to Father Mathew, and I have a question to ask in that connection. He did a great work no doubt, the effects of which abide. Do you know what his views were on prohibition?—I do not, but I know the effect of his mission was to close nearly all the distilleries in Ireland. Unfortunately, however, the famine broke out, and public works were established and the sale of liquor was allowed near these public works. You will see that recorded in Sullivan's "New Ireland."

24486. It is recorded that he expressed his regret that he did not take advantage of the sentiment to close up all liquor manufactories?—I do not know that.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24487. You mentioned the city of Fredericton as one of the places you visited. How did you find the Scott Act enforced there?—Well, I noticed that there was no difficulty for any person who wished to get a glass of intoxicating liquor to procure it.

24488. That was the actual condition there?—That is what I saw.

24489. The Act was disregarded?—Oh, yes.

24490. No doubt there is a strong temperance sentiment in that city?—Yes, there is a strong temperance sentiment in that city, and there is a very strong anti-Scott Act sentiment there too.

24491. How do you account for the state of things in Fredericton in view of the strong temperance sentiment there?—I account for it in this way: that those who are temperance men will not act as informers. They would like to employ some one else to do the "dirty work," as they call it.

24492. But there is a police force there, and there is the regular machinery for the government of the municipality. Is that machinery not effective to enforce the Scott Act?—It ought to be, if the public sentiment were there.

24493. But there is a strong public sentiment?—As I told you also, there is an anti-feeling, and the fact of the passing of the law divides the people into two camps. I knew that there had been a great deal of difficulty down there and that some people had been imprisoned.

24494. Did you hear the details of their imprisonment?—I know that there had been a great fight between the parties, and being down there, I wished to find out for myself the facts. I was told that the Liquor Commission had been sitting down there and that is how the subject came up, and that one of the Commissioners thought that it was a very moral place and the others were not of that opinion. I went into a bar and got a glass of ginger ale and others were drinking, whisky and gin and so forth.

24495. Of course that was in the hotels?—Well, I am not an informer.

24496. Were you in Fredericton long enough to form an opinion as to the actual state of things and the causes?—It was only a casual visit, but I know something of human nature.

24497. How long is it since you were there?—It was in the latter end of August, since the visit of the Commission.

24498. It was alleged that there was a spurt of drinking during the visit of the Commission, but you evidently saw drinking going on while you were there. What is your opinion of having the Scott Act, such as it is in Fredericton, where it has been in force for thirteen years?—I honestly think it would be better to have a license law, rigidly enforced.

24499. Did you ever know in any civilized country of people who, having been convicted again and again of flagrantly violating the law and committed to prison, have been given the privilege of having visitors calling to see them, and having a bathroom, and having their meals served them in prison, having the furniture from their hotel and wearing their own clothing. What effect would such enforcement of the law have upon the community?—It brings the law into contempt.

24500. I believe that is the way these hotel-keepers were imprisoned: do you know of any other law, the penalties of which are enforced in a similar way?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24501. Do you know whether the imprisonment of all offenders was not of that sort as described by my colleague?—I do not know.

24502. You are not able to compare Fredericton under license with Fredericton under the Scott Act?—No.

24503. Are you in a position to say what the effect of the law has been in Fredericton?—Not, except in a general way. If the law is disregarded first of all, and if, when the penalties are inflicted they are not carried out and so on, I think all that has a bad effect.

24504. You think a high license law would be better than that state of things?—I think so.

24505. If it were enforced, the same as it is in Montreal, would that be an improvement?—I think so. I think Montreal is in a better position than Fredericton in that respect.

24506. Are you prepared to compare Montreal with Fredericton, you having an intimate knowledge of Montreal and only a casual knowledge of Fredericton?—Well, I went about Fredericton a good deal. I think in Montreal or any other place, a high license system would have a better effect than prohibition without enforcement.

24507. You do not believe prohibition is practicable?—Not in the present state of society.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

24508. Have you been in the State of Maine?—Well, not of late years, but I have been there since it was under the Maine liquor law.

24509. What was the condition of things that you found under the Maine liquor law?—I forgot the name of the place where I spent two days. There was one hotel, where the bar was in full blast.

JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN.

24510. That was in the State of Maine?—Yes. They had a bar in the hotel down stairs. I went there on some legal business. I know the liquor is very bad there, because I saw people literally paralyzed. I never saw people so utterly overcome by intoxicating liquor as I saw there.

24511. Were you in Halifax this season?—No.

24512. What has your experience been as to Maine and those parts of New Brunswick you visited, as to the effect and operation of this local prohibition?—Just as I have stated; I think that a high license would be better for the morals of the people.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24513. You think prohibition in Maine is a failure?—I do not know. I am not prepared to say any more than I have stated here.

*By the Chairman:*

24514. There is no doubt that the majority of those who took an interest in the question, and had the right to vote, voted for the Scott Act or it would, not have been in force. From your observation whilst there, the Act was not enforced? Would you draw the deduction from these two facts that those who had voted for the Act did not take the necessary means to enforce it?—I may say that a great many people are anxious to see a law passed at any rate. There is that sort of feeling, that their side should win, and they want to carry it.

24515. If they were in a majority to get the law passed, should they not possess energy to see it carried out, if they were really in earnest about it?—If the majority in a place carries a law of that kind and will constitute itself into a vigilance committee, and each man will live up to his principles, the law can be carried out.

24516. May we conclude that the parties who voted for the Scott Act in Fredericton were not in earnest in carrying it out, or if they had been, they might have enforced it?—They may be perfectly earnest in so far as their conscience is concerned; they may think they have done their duty when they voted for the law, and let some one carry it out.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24517. Is a law not enforced when there are violations of it?—It depends altogether on circumstances. It is not enforced if it is persistently violated.

24518. Well, if there are attempts, more or less faithful to enforce it, and still violations occur, do you call that a law not enforced?—Nearly every law is broken, but there is a distinction as to whether the law is disregarded generally.

24519. You do not mean by enforcement, absolute enforcement?—Not at all.

24520. So that violations more or less frequent are not a proof of the failure of a law to fulfil its purpose?—Not at all, unless it becomes generally known to the public that the law is disregarded.

24521. Would you look upon indifference as to the enforcement of a law as evidence that the country cared very little about it?—Did not care sufficiently about it to see it enforced.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

24522. Did you say that the illegal sale in Fredericton was confined to hotels?—I did not say it was enforced.

24523. What do you say of the condition of things where an alderman of the city of Fredericton would take you around and show you a drink shop, not an hotel, in full blast with two men having their coats off and their sleeves rolled up, selling all kinds of liquor?—That is a flagrant violation of the law.

24524. Would it be possible, if there was a strong sentiment for the enforcement of the law, for such a condition of things to exist?—Not in the face of the majority.

24525. Can you give us any explanation of the reason why that state of things exists there, where there is a strong temperance sentiment?—It is clear that it is because the two camps are in a state of warfare.



24526. Would that not make it more difficult for those people who sell so flagrantly?—As I said, these people who vote for prohibition do not follow up their work when they have carried the law.

24527. Ought they to be expected to take off their coats and act as constables and prosecutors?—I think the sentiment ought to be the same, and must be the same in regard to these things as it is with regard to theft for instance, as was very completely explained on the floor of Parliament once. If a citizen sees a person commit theft, he hands him over to a policeman.

*By the Chairman :*

24528. That is an absolute sin?—And people regard it as such.

24529. Do people regard taking a glass of liquor as an absolute sin?—No. I do not believe that, outside of those who are very active in the cause, people who would like to see liquor prohibited would go and inform upon those who are engaged in the traffic.

24530. Would they inform in case of theft?—They would arrest the thief.

24531. Generally speaking, you attribute the non-enforcement of this law to the lack of public sentiment?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24532. Do people regard the violation of the law as a sin?—For instance, there is a law against larceny, incendiarism and such offences.

24533. Those crimes are sins?—Yes.

24534. But do people regard the violation of the liquor law as a sin? For instance, would it be a sin for a man to sell liquor in Montreal on Sunday? I am not sufficient of a theologian to say, but I think it would be a very serious act against his conscience.

24535. There is this other question in reference to the Fredericton place to which certain persons were introduced by an Alderman, and you were asked if you thought that was a flagrant violation of the law: I would ask you, what would you think of an Alderman who prepared such a show for visitors and took them to it?

MR. CLARKE.—He did not prepare it?

REV. DR. MCLEOD.—Who did prepare it?

THE CHAIRMAN.—You need not answer the question unless you like, Mr. Curran.

*By Judge McDonald :*

24536. You do not ask to be protected against the question, do you?—The question is entirely in a different position from what the President of the Commission apprehends I look on it. If a man prepared a thing of that kind, he would be doing very wrong. If, knowing certain things to exist, he wished you and the other Commissioners to realize exactly what that condition is in the country before arriving at a decision on such an important matter, I think it would be his duty to let you into the whole secret.

24537. But if a condition of things like that were made for the occasion, to give an impression?—If it was an organized demonstration, it would be wrong.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24538. Was there any demonstration to lead you to form a conclusion when you were in Fredericton?—No, I have stated on oath what I saw.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24539. Do you think that such a state of sale could be found in Montreal on Sunday?—I do not know of any such place at present. I know that some time ago there was one place in Montreal where liquor was sold on Sunday all day.

24540. Would that indicate a failure of the license law?—That would indicate that the officers of the law were not performing their duty.

24541. Would the other case indicate that the officers of the law were not performing their duty?—Certainly. And those who followed up the history of the place know whether it is possible to enforce a liquor law that would prohibit. I am satisfied that

JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN.

the law regulating the liquor traffic here and prohibiting it on Sunday could be enforced, if the officers of the law would do their duty. I think, however, that it is fairly well enforced for such a large city as this.

24542. Is it the duty of citizens to carry out the law, or is it the duty of officers?—I think it is the duty of citizens to help the officers. They are bound to do it.

24543. Is it the duty of the citizens to carry out the revenue laws, or must the Government provide the officers?—They must provide the officers; but a citizen who knows that the law is being violated and who believes in his conscience that the law is a good law, has a right to assist the officers.

24544. How many citizens are there who help the officers in carrying out the revenue laws?—Just the number that are equal to their duty.

24544a. Are there many?—I do not know what the particulars are in that respect. If you ask me the question: do I think a great many people would like to protect the revenue laws? I think that a great many would.

*By the Chairman:*

24545. You think that a majority of the citizens of Montreal would desire to help the officers in carrying out the law?—I think so.

24546. You spoke of a place where liquor was regularly sold on Sunday?—Yes.

24547. Could you tell us how long that state of things continued?—It continued for a good while.

24548. Did the law ultimately reach it?—I cannot say, but I have not seen any cases before the courts for a good while.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24549. Do you know whether there is a general feeling throughout the country against informing in cases of smuggling?—There is a general feeling against informing as a practice.

24550. I think I noticed in the papers on Monday that there have been complaints made against certain parks for selling liquor on Sunday. Does that prove the law a failure, or simply that the officers do not do their duty?—I happen to know that in the case of the two public parks there is a conflict of authority. The public parks in so far as the refreshments were concerned, were hired out to two persons who undertook to supply refreshments, and the city of Montreal received a pretty large bonus for the contract, and it authorized the sale of Weiss beer. Originally when the Mountain Park was established, the Local Government issued the license. They could not issue a beer license, because there was no such license under our system. That license was issued by the Treasurer, the present Judge Würtele, with the understanding that Mr. McClannaghan, the keeper of the Mount Royal Park, was not to sell anything but lager beer or Weiss beer. I believe that Mr. McClannaghan has lived up to the letter of his contract. I understand a similar state of things exists with regard to the Island Park, and that is the way the difficulty arose.

24551. But the Sunday sale was certainly against the law. The city had no right to give that privilege?—It had no right to be given, but if such a contract had not been entered into, I do not think liquor would be sold there at all. The city made a contract to that effect.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24552. You have said, and said properly, that if an Alderman of the city of Fredericton prepared such an exhibition as that referred to, he would be wrong in doing it. There is no evidence that such a thing has been done. Would it be possible in the city of Fredericton for an Alderman or anybody else to get a bar prepared with a stock of liquors in it and two men selling and a crowd to sell to just for the purpose of showing sale to a member of the Commission?—I cannot say anything about that. My experience is that Fredericton is a nice place, that there are good people in it who are very moral and all the rest of it.

24553. Do you think it would be possible for an Alderman to get up such an exhibition?—I do not know.

*By the Chairman :*

24554-5. Supposing such a thing to have taken place, you would not look upon it as evidence of a very strong prevailing sentiment in favour of prohibition?—No, I do not think that prohibition could be carried out in Fredericton.

WILLIAM ROBB, Treasurer of the City of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

24556. For how long have you held the office of City Treasurer of Montreal?—For three years.

24557. And you were in the employ of the Corporation prior to that?—I have been in the department for nearly thirty years.

24558. What was your previous position in the Corporation?—Controller, and previous to that Auditor. I have risen from the ranks, so to speak.

24559. You are familiar with the accounts of the city?—Yes.

24560. Can you tell us the number of licenses issued, and the amount of revenue the city gets from licenses. Can you give us the number, say for five years?—The average is one thousand licenses per annum for the past five years.

24561. Will you just read out the figures year by year?—In 1886, 970; in 1887, 1,062; in 1888, 1,123; in 1889, 1,092; in 1890, 1,089. I have not the figures for 1891: I think that about 1,080 would be about the number for 1891.

24562. What was the population of the city during those years?—The population of the city is more or less of an estimate.

24563. Read out the population for the same period?—1886, 186,000; 1887, 198,000; 1888, 200,000; 1889, 210,000; 1890, 223,000.

24564. Are those figures correct?—They are correct as far as we can judge. The estimate for 1891 is about 240,000. The statement contains the amount received by the city from the issue of licenses.

24565. Will you read the figures?—1886, \$7,760; 1887, \$8,496; 1888, \$8,984; 1889, \$8,736; 1890, \$8,712.

24566. Can you give us the figures for 1891?—I am sorry I have not got them with me, but I will send them to the Commission.

24567. What are those figures in another column of that return?—They are the arrests per 1,000 of the population.

24568. Is that the number of arrests in the city?—Yes.

24569. Will you read them out for five years?—In 1880, 6,310; in 1881, 6,435; in 1882, 6,977; in 1883, 7,226; in 1884, 6,319; in 1885, 5,728; in 1886, 6,490; in 1887, 7,497; in 1888, 8,155; in 1889, 8,778; in 1890, 9,087.

24570. Is there a column showing the number of arrests per thousand of the population?—Yes, it shows thirty-five per thousand of the population.

24571. Is there any other information given by the return?—No, nothing beyond that.

24572. How much is the charge for a certificate for a license?—The city charges \$8.

24573. That includes the certificates for grocers and hotel-keepers?—Yes, for all parties selling liquor.

24574. To what officer do they make application?—The Collector of Inland Revenue is the party to whom they go to get the license. As soon as he gives it to them, he demands a certificate as to the rental, and they come to the City Hall for that.

24575. They pay the same tax for carrying on their business as other establishments in the city?—Yes, they pay irrespective of their trade.

24576. That is a city tax?—Yes, the city taxes the same to all.

JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN.

24577. We have been told by the Collector of Inland Revenue for the Province that there are at least two thousand unlicensed places, and there are perhaps four thousand unlicensed places where liquor is being sold in this city. Have you any knowledge on that particular matter?—I have no personal knowledge of it.

24578. But if so, the city is losing a very large income?—Unquestionably, and the Government a much larger income.

24579. And no class in the community but the illicit seller is being benefited?—None.

24580. Who is responsible for putting an end to this illicit selling, the municipal body or the provincial body?—I think both are interested; but primarily, it seems to me, that it is the duty of the municipal police to put a stop to it.

24581. If the statement made with regard to these unlicensed places is correct, it is an undoubted fact that the city is losing a revenue of at least \$16,000 a year?—Unquestionably.

24582. That revenue would pay for a large increase in the police force?—It would.

24583. An increase in the police force would probably result in a decrease of these unlicensed places, and also a decrease in the number of breaches of the law for selling on Sunday and out of hours?—Unquestionably.

24584. That is your opinion?—Certainly.

24585. We hear very frequently in Montreal that the city finances will not permit of a large increase in the force, but this is one way in which the police force might be increased without being an additional tax on the inhabitants, is it not?—It is, but it is a very undesirable way of doing it. The converse of that is equally true, that the diminution of these places might do away with the necessity of an increase of police.

24586. An increase in the police force would have the effect of diminishing them probably in the end?—Possibly.

24587. Do you think there are too many licensed places in the city of Montreal or not?—I think possibly we have too many.

24588. You no doubt have paid great attention to the present system of regulating the liquor traffic in the city of Montreal. Will you kindly tell us if you think it is satisfactory?—I think it is not satisfactory, and I do not think that any of the parties that are connected with it feel it is satisfactory.

24589. In what respect does it fail?—It fails in the difficulty which the License Commissioners realized in their attempt to restrict the traffic. That difficulty arises from influence brought to bear by outside parties in favour of applicants, and their humane consideration, if I may so speak of it, for the position of the applicants themselves. If they refuse licenses, they are afraid the people would not be able to maintain their families in any other way, for a long time; at all events, I think this has something to do with the granting of a number of the licenses.

24590. Is there any other point in which you think the system fails?—No. Of course if the number of licenses were restricted, the evils which flow from the trade would be reduced.

24591. Is there any difficulty in punishing offences against the liquor law?—The same influences. I think, if you want to have my opinion, that there ought to be an absolute radical change in the whole system. If we must have saloons at all, I think that the law ought to definitely limit the number according to the population of the place, and that the municipality should have a right to indicate the locality where they should be maintained; and that being done, the licensee should not be subject to the opinion or feeling of any man or body of men. If a revenue must be derived from the liquor trade, then the higher revenue that can be obtained from it should be obtained from this restricted number of licenses.

24592. Would you have regard to the character of the applicants?—Unquestionably, yes.

24593. Do you think it would be an advantage if the residents of the city had the same power as the residents of counties and parishes to adopt local option?—If the majority objected, there should be no license granted in any district.

24594. Is that not the law at present in regard to polling districts?—I am not sufficiently familiar with it to say. I think, however, that it is not the majority of the

people who can prevent a license : I think that if a saloon keeper obtains the signatures of a certain number, he can get his license. It is very desirable that the people of a certain section of the city should have the same power with regard to preventing licenses as counties and municipalities possess.

24595. Have you thought over the question of the total prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors?—In common with most people, I have thought over it a little.

24596. Do you think such a law would be desirable in the present state of public opinion?—As a direct answer, I would say, unquestionably, it is desirable.

24597. Do you think it would be efficiently enforced, if passed?—No. I do not.

24598. Do you think it would be more efficiently enforced than the present license laws?—Not than the present license laws. I think that a license law may possibly be framed which might have an equally good effect with prohibition ; I do not think that prohibition would be successful. I say so, in the first place, because I have not much faith in the virtue that is obtained only by restriction ; and in the second place, I have a very strong feeling that that tendency which is inherent in human nature, to very wrongly desire what is kept from us, would produce a very different result from what is expected by those who are in favour of prohibition.

24599. Do you think that people drink as much liquor as they did years ago?—I think that the drinking habits are increasing every day.

24600. Do you think that more people abuse the use of liquor, or that there is more liquor sold?—I refer to the general use of liquor. I think it is becoming greater every day, and leading, of course, to a greater proportion of those who abuse it.

24601. A greater number who give way to intemperance?—Yes.

24602. And in a greater ratio than the increase of population?—I think so.

24603. From the statement which you have made, is it shown that offences increase in the city to a greater extent than the ratio of increase in the population?—No.

24604. Have you given any consideration to the evils which flow from the adulteration of liquors?—I am convinced in my own mind, from what I see around me, that a very great deal of the evil arising from the abuse of liquor must arise from this adulteration.

24605. To your knowledge is there any rigid inspection in the city?—No.

24606. Do you think a rigid inspection is desirable?—Very much so.

24607. And that benefits would flow from it?—Undoubtedly so.

24608. You have told us that you think the number of licensed places should be decreased, and that the unlicensed places should be suppressed?—Yes.

24609. Do you know anything of the difficulties which the police have in suppressing these places?—No, I am not aware of them particularly.

*By the Chairman :*

24610. Have you the report of 1891?—I have filed it with the Secretary.

24611. Will you tell the Commissioners the number of licenses issued in 1891?—942.

24612. What was the revenue received?—\$7,586.

24613. That is a reduction, I believe on the previous year?—Yes.

24614. What was the population estimated at?—240,000.

24615. What is the number of arrests made?—I have not the number ; I have not the police report here, but I will send the number to the Commissioners. (Police report of 1890 handed to witness.)

24616. You have there a statement of the total arrests in 1890?—Yes. I find the number to be 9,087.

24617. What immediately follows that statement?—Arrests of prisoners tried before the Court of Queen's Bench.

24618. Is that number included in the 9,087?—I presume it is, but I am not certain.

24619. I see a statement further on of licensed and unlicensed places?—Yes, licensed and unlicensed taverns in the city.

WILLIAM ROBB.

24620. In regard to unlicensed places, would it not be the duty of the police to take some steps to have the parties breaking the law arrested?—Certainly it would be their duty to report them at once, and it would be the duty of the Chief to take action.

24621. You have no special information about that, I suppose?—No.

24622. There was a considerable reduction, I observe, in the number of licenses issued in 1891, as compared with the number issued in 1890?—Yes.

24623. Assuming the figures to be correct, the number of licenses issued in 1891 was the lowest since 1885?—I believe so.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24624. Are 900 odd licenses necessary in the city for carrying on business?—Not in my experience.

24625. There are 477 shops licensed, they are groceries?—Yes.

24626. Do you favour the granting of licenses to grocers?—No.

24627. You think the authorities should cease issuing grocer's licenses, as there is no necessity for them?—I believe there is no necessity for them.

24628. Then there are 304 restaurant licenses. Is food supplied in all those places?—If they are *bona fide* restaurants, that seems to be the most legitimate use of a license that we have.

24629. And there are 154 hotel licenses issued: are all those necessary?—If they are *bona fide* hotels, they would perhaps be justifiable too.

24630. If a reduction is to be made in the total number of licenses issued to hotels and restaurants, would you favour the reduction of the hotel licenses or the restaurant licenses?—The restaurant licenses.

24631. Does the city of Montreal contribute sums annually to the maintenance of institutions for the indigent poor of the city?—Nothing whatever.

24632. In the returns submitted as to the number of jail inmates and the arrests, are people committed to jail whose only crime was that of being infirm and poor, included in the number?—They are included in the number.

24633. Does the city contribute a certain sum per head for the maintenance of prisoners?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

24634. Is it 15 cents per day for all committed from the city?—About that sum.

24635. Can you tell the Commissioners how much that amounts to per annum?—The cost of the maintenance of prisoners in 1891 was \$12,900.

24636. At what page of the accounts can we find that?—At page 10 of the Controller's account; that is in the second series of numbers. There is an appropriation of \$12,000 and an expenditure of \$5,200, which leaves the second half year's payment unpaid; but when that was subsequently paid, the proportion for that year would be as I have indicated.

24637. Would not that exceed \$12,000?—It would be something over \$12,000.

24638. Will you supply the Commissioners with a statement of those payments extending over a period of ten years?—Yes.

24639. I notice on the same page an item for maintenance of orphans \$1,500. What does that mean?—That item refers to children whom it is not desired to commit to jail and some of whom are sent to the Montefiore Asylum, and some to the Ladies Benevolent, Catholics being sent to one and Protestants to the other.

24640. Those are children whom it is not desirable to send to jail?—Yes. We pay half their board in those institutions, in the same way as we pay to the Government a sum for those people sent to jail. I can send a statement of this expenditure to the Commissioners, if they desire it.

24641. I think you answered my colleague to the effect that the city made no contribution for the maintenance of the poor?—Yes.

24642. Does the city make any contribution to hospitals?—None whatever. The only appropriation made is \$400 annually given to the Society for the Protection of Women and Children, its object however being somewhat different.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24643. Then the sums expended by the corporation for charitable purposes are the sums contributed to aid in the maintenance of the indigent poor in the jail and those orphan children. Are those the only sums given by the corporation for charitable purposes?—We do not regard that as charity.

24644. Those children, you say, are some Roman Catholic and some Protestant, and this \$400 is the total sum contributed by the corporation annually for charitable purposes?—There is no sum outside of that, except for the maintenance of the insane, which might, perhaps, be classed in the same category. Those insane persons who are committed by the Recorder or the Mayor of Montreal to insane asylums are paid for, to some extent, by the city. The Government pays a proportion, and the city is charged with a certain proportion of the expense.

24645. Do you know anything about the conduct or the management of your public parks?—Yes

24646. Do you favour the giving of licenses to them to sell liquor?—No; certainly not; most decidedly not.

24647. They are licensed, are they not?—They are licensed in the sense that they are authorized to sell Weiss beer, or whatever it is called, but only to that extent.

24648. Is it supposed to be a temperance drink?—That seems to be a disputed question just now.

24649. It was intended, I suppose, that no intoxicants should be sold?—Yes.

24650. And you favour exclusion of intoxicants from the parks?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

24651. The licenses are issued by the officers of the Provincial Government, are they not?—The licenses to sell intoxicating liquors are issued by the Provincial Government.

24652. Has the city any control over their issue, or the officials?—The city had control when it gave authority to sell.

24653. Do you mean authority to issue a license: was that more than the granting of a certificate?—I beg your pardon. I do not understand. There was no certificate, so far as I can remember. I do not see how a certificate could be given to enable the restaurant keepers of the park to get a license from the Government, because there is no basis of rental to which we could certify. I do not think, therefore, he could have got, or they could have required a license from the Government. The city authorized the restaurant keeper of Mount Royal Park to sell this Weiss beer, or as it turns out, they licensed him to sell it. Therefore, although the city had control over the matter when it granted the license, having given a lease or entered into a contract renting the premises to sell beer for a given length of time, it appears that the city has dispossessed itself of the power to deal with the matter during the period of that lease.

24654. The lease is for the keeping of the building in which the beer is sold?—Yes; the maintenance of a restaurant there, and the selling of refreshments of a given kind, including this beer.

*By Judge McDonald :*

24655. You have stated that you thought if steps were adopted towards limiting the number of licenses and giving them only to persons of approved character, this would be an improvement on the present system?—Yes. I base my opinion on the hypothesis that it is necessary to have a revenue from that source. I think it is a great pity that we have to raise any revenue from such a source at all, but if we must raise a revenue from liquor licenses, then, I think, they should be issued in the way I have stated, and for the reasons I have stated. If, in the first place, the number of licenses in the city were limited on the basis of population, or any other method that might be adopted, and the localities in which they were to be placed determined, the majority of the proprietors, in value and number, having the power, as I have stated, to object to licenses,—if the licenses were to be issued on those conditions, then I say, most decidedly, put them up at auction and get the highest price possible for them.

WILLIAM ROBB.

24656. In that case would you expect to get a municipal revenue as well as a provincial revenue?—No. I had in mind at that time the provincial revenue.

24657. In such a case as that, would you propose that when a license was once granted to a man he should be required year after year to obtain the consent of a certain number of electors to its being renewed to him?—I had no thought of that, but at first sight it seems to me to be quite sufficient to make the continuance during good behaviour.

24658. You understand that in one province of the Dominion, where there is a law that a man in the first instance has to obtain a certain number of signatures of persons to his petition before he can get a license, it is suggested that after he has obtained a license he shall retain it so long as he pays the fee, or until it is taken away from him?—That would be a very suitable plan.

24659. People come to your department, I suppose, for particulars as to rental in order to make an estimate for provincial duty? Is that the regular way in which the assessment is made?—That is the actual assessed rental.

24660. Is that rental what the assessor thinks is a fair rental?—It is the assessor's valuation.

24661. It may not be the actual rent paid, I suppose?—It may or it may not; as a rule it is the actual rental, because the assessors are careful to obtain the actual *bona fide* rental in each case. If a man puts his rental altogether below the actual value of the premises, the assessors are not bound by his lease, and can assess him at a fair rental value.

24662. Is it done by ascertaining the value of the property and putting a certain percentage on it?—Yes, and it is that value which is entered on the assessment roll, and it is a copy of that which forms the certificate of which I speak.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24663. Speaking of the rental: we had it in evidence yesterday that fraudulent leases are very prevalent. Do those fraudulent leases give the assessors considerable trouble?—They do not take any trouble in regard to them. The assessors, under the law, are exempt from being bound by leases in which the rental is altogether out of proportion to the value; they simply ignore them.

24664. Do I understand you to say that if you had to choose between the hotel and the restaurant, you would prefer the restaurant?—If the license was to be granted to one or the other only, I would grant it to the hotel, and would withdraw it from the restaurant.

24665. Why do you prefer the hotel license to the restaurant license?—I do not prefer it, I take it as the lesser of two evils.

24666. Which is the lesser of the two evils?—I think a person can get a meal in a restaurant without any great injury, even if he gets liquor with it; but I can quite understand a case of a person arriving at an hotel, cold and wet, when the use of liquor would be less objectionable, and perhaps more justifiable than on other occasions. Then, if liquor has to be used at all, let it be used there, especially if it has to be confined to a certain place.

24667. Have you given thought to the matter as to which, the restaurant bar or the hotel bar, is the greater inducement to drinking?—I think they stand about on a par so far as that is concerned.

24668. I judge from your evidence that you believe the multiplying of licenses is the multiplication of inducements to drink?—Unquestionably.

24669. And really you think it would be better to have neither the saloon license nor the hotel license for the sale of drink?—My personal feeling is that I should like to see the whole thing done away.

24670. Do you think prohibition would be possible, if the sentiment of the people were up to the point?—No.

24671. Do you think it is possible by a process of teaching to bring the people up to the point of prohibition?—Yes. I think that is a very important direction in which to work. In that connection, it has sometimes struck me that the way in which our illustrated and comic papers deal with the question of intemperance is an incentive to



drinking habits rather than otherwise, and is the promoter of evil. When papers like *London Punch* represent drunkenness as a trifling matter and throw a glamour over it, instead of looking at it in the more serious aspect which it presents to the unfortunate relatives of the drunkard, they do an immense evil and encourage drinking. I think a great deal of good might be done by our newspapers in the way of holding this up to horror and opprobrium rather than throwing the glamour of attraction over it, and making it appear as being something very desirable.

24672. You have expressed your opinion that there has been an increase rather than a decrease in drinking during late years?—Yes, judging from what I have seen myself, and I am thrown in contact with young men in connection with my business, and that is the impression I have gathered.

24673. Do you think the license system is responsible for the increase of drinking?—Of course, that is a somewhat difficult question to answer. I suppose the same amount of drinking would exist if there were no licenses issued. It is not the licensing that causes the drinking. Supposing liquor was absolutely free, I daresay there would be the same amount of drunkenness, so it is not the licensing which creates it; but, if we had prohibition of it, of manufacture and importation, that would restrict it.

24674. I speak of the license system because that system seems to provide and legalize facilities for drinking?—Yes.

24675. And in that view, might it not be fair to make the license system responsible in a certain degree for the increase in drinking?—No, I hardly think it would be fair to hold the present license system responsible for it.

24676. I think you would restrict the number of licenses very much?—Yes.

24677. That would be with a view of limiting the opportunities so far as drinking is concerned, I suppose?—Decidedly so.

24678. In that view, is it fair to say that the present facilities have a certain measure of responsibility for the amount of drinking and for the probable increase that has taken place?—The facilities afford the necessary system, certainly.

24679. Do you think that, if the number of licenses were limited, there would be a proportionate increase of illicit places?—I think so.

24680. I think we have it in evidence that there are 1,000 places licensed, and there are from 2,000 to 4,000 illicit places, though you have expressed a doubt in regard to that?—No; I did not express an opinion. But it was startling to me to learn that from 2,000 to 4,000 illicit drinking places are in the city, and since we separated I have been turning the matter over in my mind, and it presents itself to me in this appalling way. If there are from 2,000 to 4,000 unlicensed places, we may place the number at 3,000, taking an average. If there are 3,000 of these unlicensed drinking places, it must cost at least \$500 a year to maintain the man who keeps each unlicensed place and his family, that being a very low estimate. Five hundred dollars a year for 3,000 places means \$1,500,000 annually. To enable those men to make \$500 a year each, they must sell, at all events, \$1,000 worth of liquor, and that would be at a very large percentage of profit, a very low estimate. The consequence is, that we have the fact that \$3,000,000 are paid over the bars of these unlicensed taverns. The whole of that amount is paid by the lower and working classes, because those 3,000 taverns are exclusive of the licensed places, to which the better class of persons resort. Here we find ourselves with this fact: that, at the lowest estimate which it is possible to imagine, \$3,000,000 are paid by the poorer and working classes of labour during the year in those places alone, if the statement is correct that there are from 2,000 to 4,000 of them. Yet last year this city was turned upside down, and there was almost a rebellion in consequence of the pretended inability of the poorer classes to pay a water rate, which does not amount to one-eighth part of that sum of money. So that I think, if those parties who are interesting themselves about the poorer classes, and we hear a great deal about parties interesting themselves about the poor workingman at the present day, would endeavour to have the expenditure on liquor reduced, instead of crying out and pretending that the people are not able to pay a water rate, the revenue of the city would be very much improved, and the health and morals of the people too.

24681. You say that is a most appalling state of things?—When you come to think about it, it is frightful.

WILLIAM ROBB.

24682. I think you have given us a statement to the effect that the city pays towards the maintenance of prisoners who are committed to jail, \$12,900, at 15 cents per head per day?—Yes.

24683. We have it in evidence that 80 per cent at least of the commitments are caused by drink, directly or indirectly, which would make something over \$10,000 expenditure that drink had caused, taking this payment of 15 cents per head; and the city received in 1891 from licenses, according to the record, \$7,536; so there is no balance goes into the city treasury from this source?—None whatever.

*By the Chairman :*

24684. What amount do you collect from fines?—In the Recorder's Court we collected last year, 1891, \$23,000.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24685. Would you regard that other item of \$3,500,000 added, which you estimated as a charge against the poorer people for their drinks?—Unquestionably.

24686. The revenue, so far as the city is concerned, received from the liquor traffic, is not a considerable item: in fact, there is no money accruing to the city from it, I believe?—No money accruing to the city from it.

24687. Looking at it broadly, and you have to deal as City Treasurer with financial matters and the financial side of the city affairs, and have done so from 30 to 40 years, do you believe that the revenue which the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Municipal authorities receive out of the liquor trade costs more than the amount obtained?—If it does not cost more, it costs a large proportion of it.

*By the Chairman :*

24688. Do you mean directly?—I mean directly and indirectly.

24689. Take indirectly: how do you estimate it?—Taking the revenue of the Dominion Government and the revenue of the Provinces and Municipalities, we must consider the total amount paid for police, jails, asylums and so on, and there would still be a difference between revenue and expenditure. There would be something to the credit of the revenue account.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24690. Still you believe that directly or indirectly it costs, if not as much, very nearly as much to get the revenue that is derived from the liquor traffic as it is worth?—Yes, I do. Of course it is a very difficult thing to consider the effect indirectly as regards the Government and the revenue.

24691. Does it affect the people?—Yes.

24692. Against the small proportion of revenue it may give to the Government, is it not necessary to consider the interests of the people both financially and morally?—Unquestionably.

24693. Speaking of the license law as a law for regulating, do you think the license law as it operates in Montreal really regulates the trade?—It cannot be said to do that; no.

24694. There being a considerable percentage, estimated at from 25 to 50 per cent, of the dealers violating the law, would it not seem that the license system does not regulate the trade? If the country were under prohibition, do you think in Montreal there would be 4,000 to 5,000 places selling liquor, which is the number now licensed and unlicensed?—Under prohibition it would be quite feasible to utterly suppress them. If there was no means of suppressing them, I daresay there would be as many.

24695. Is it presumable that if there was a prohibitory law, there would also be provision made for the enforcement of the law?—Yes.

24696. Nobody would expect absolute and entire enforcement, I suppose. Do you think, with such provision as might be made, the enforcement would be such that it would be impossible for so many drinking places to exist as there are now under license, legal and illegal?—I do not think it is possible.

24697. In that view, would prohibition be a failure if the number of places selling was reduced?—You mean it would only be a comparative failure.

24698. Would it be more of a failure than the license law now is?—No, I do not think it would.

24699. Would there be this advantage, that the trade would be delegalized and that it would be regarded as an evil thing?—Precisely.

24700. And in that way it would be an educator of the people?—Yes, certainly.

24701. Have you observed the effect of the liquor traffic, as it exists at present, on the other business interests of the community, whether it is beneficial or injurious?—The question as to its effect on other business interests of the country has to be answered in a very particular way, if I can answer it at all. It must be considered, first, in its effect on the people who are conducting the other businesses of the country; and, unquestionably, inasmuch as every one who gives way to the undue use of liquor is thereby unfortunately rendered less able to attend to his own particular business as it should be done, the reflex action of that on all the other business interests of the country may be injurious.

24702. Beyond that, have you observed whether the absorption of so much money in what is generally regarded as an unproductive enterprise is injurious to the industrial and general commercial interests of the country?—It cannot possibly be otherwise.

24703. You spoke a little while ago about the large number of young men with whom you have come in contact and their drinking habits. Have you observed whether any proportion of the young men do, without any thought of serious consequences, fall into drinking habits, on account of the trade being legalized, who otherwise would not become accustomed to drink?—I consider that 90 per cent of all the failures, financial and physical, in the working capacity among young men that have come under my own observation, have been caused by drink.

24704. Do you include young men in all grades of society?—Yes, young men of all grades.

24705. It is scarcely necessary to ask whether you think it is desirable, so far as possible, to check a trade which produces such lamentable results?—I do most heartily.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

24706. Does the corporation receive the fines imposed for violations of the municipal by-laws?—Yes.

24707. Do you know if there is an increase or decrease in the amount of those fines?—I cannot recollect the figures at the moment. If the Commissioners desire a statement, I shall be very happy to submit one.

*By the Chairman :*

24708. Could you make a distinction between the offences for which the fines were imposed?—Yes, we should at all events distinguish between those offences against the by-laws and those which might be called criminal.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24709. Would you favour the enactment of a prohibitory law?—Personally I would. I would run the risk of failure or non-failure. I think for its educational effect it would be worth trying.

24710. Would you favour the compensation of those engaged in the trades of brewing and distilling, and the wholesale and retail sellers?—Yes, all that would have to be taken into consideration.

24711. Would you distinguish between a wholesaler and a retailer or between brewers and distillers, or would you treat them all alike, and compensate all?—I would certainly adopt a scale of compensation based upon the amount of business done and the length of time they have been in the trade. I would try to arrive at something like a fair estimate of the amount they had been deprived of temporarily.

24712. Did I understand you to say that the license system was a failure?—In the sense that it does not control the trade or prevent illicit establishments flourishing, it certainly must be regarded as a failure.

WILLIAM ROBB.

24713. Do you know anything about other municipalities of the Province?—No.

24714. Or the enforcement of liquor laws there?—No.

24715. Do you know anything about districts where local prohibitory laws have been in force and where the Scott Act has been adopted?—No, nothing whatever.

24716. Do you know anything about the condition of things in Maine?—I have been there frequently, but I have not seen much that is worthy of remark, unless you have any direct question to put to me with regard to Maine.

24717. Do you know if the prohibitory law is observed in Maine? Have you had sufficient experience to be able to answer this question, whether the prohibitory law has wiped out the liquor trade?—My information is altogether hearsay, and I have no personal knowledge. I have been in hotels where I have been told that liquor was sold as freely as in Montreal or anywhere else; but seeing I do not use it myself, it did not interest me.

24718. Have you any reason to doubt the accuracy of such a statement?—I have heard it so often I think it must be correct.

24719. Would you consider a prohibitory law which permitted such a state of things to exist, a failure?—A partial failure.

24720. I understood you to say that you would take the course of bringing into force a prohibitory law, even though it proved only partially successful?—Yes. I think it better to throw the stigma of prohibition upon the trade, even although it might be a partial failure, rather than encourage the trade.

24721. You think the delegalization of the trade would be beneficial?—Certainly. I think placing over the door of taverns in low parts of the city signs containing the words, "Licensed by the Government to sell spirituous liquors," conveys to the minds of the illiterate masses at all events the idea that the trade must be a very excellent one or the Government would not license it; and therefore I think that the general delegalization of the trade would be beneficial, and that would be the object of enacting prohibition.

24722. In the meantime, would it be better not to license places at all, to withdraw the Government's sanction and let them have free trade?—No, while the trade does exist, I think it better to take all the precautions possible to restrict it by license, but still it is one of the evils inevitable from licensing the trade.

24723. Can you conceive a condition of things where it would be better to permit free trade than to regulate and restrict and control it by license?—Yes, I can even say that. I said a little while ago that I thought our illustrated papers made a very great mistake in throwing over drinking customs a glamour, and I think that if society were to be less lax than it is in regard to the drinking customs of people, and would frown upon them and treat the person who could not conduct himself properly at a dinner table as a person unfit to be there—I say if society frowned down on drinking in that way, I can conceive a state of things where absolute free trade in liquor would be better than either prohibition or license. I also said a little while ago that I did not use liquor myself and therefore I was indifferent as to what was said in Portland. I am not a teetotaler, I do not say I never take it, but I mean I do not habitually use it as a beverage, and I may not use it once a month. But I can conceive, as I have said, a condition of things where free trade would be really beneficial.

24724. Do you mean as an educator?—Yes, as an educator.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24725. In favouring prohibition, would you favour it for a limited area or the whole country?—I do not know; I have not thought of the question in that light. At the moment I think I would not favour it for a limited area. It seems to me that where a certain district is treated differently from the rest of the country, it is apt to create the idea that a stigma is placed on it, whereas if the whole country was committed to prohibition, the feeling would be altogether different.

24726. In order to throw a stigma on the trade, to cause the delegalization of the trade, you would be willing yourself to risk the consequences?—I would.

*By the Chairman :*

24727. Do you place reliance on the statement made to the Commissioners that there are perhaps 4,000 unlicensed places in the city?—As I say, it struck me with very great surprise. I should scarcely think there are so many.

24728. You have expressed the opinion that it is desirable to reduce the number of licensed places. Do you think it is still more desirable to reduce the number of unlicensed places?—It is desirable to shut them up altogether.

24729. Is the statement correct, that they are largely in excess of licensed places, for if so, must they not be doing an immense amount of harm?—Certainly.

24730. Is it the fault of the administration of the law that those unlicensed places are not shut up in a city like this?—It is the fault of the administration of the law.

24731. Do you think the city is at all blameable for not taking greater interest in the subject?—I do.

24732. Do you think the city would take greater interest in the enforcement of a prohibitory law than it does in the enforcement of the present law?—I think it would.

24733. What is your reason for holding that opinion?—It is something more to work for. There is a feeling of helplessness in working against the saloon license, which discourages people, and therefore I think that a stronger public feeling would be created in favour of universal prohibition.

23734. Would it not be necessary to have a majority of those entitled to vote to favour prohibition before you could expect that result?—Certainly.

24735. Prohibition which was not put in force by the will of a large majority of the people would be rather a weak measure, would it not?—It would be very difficult, it might be unwise to carry it out.

24736. I think, in answer to a question, you said you thought under prohibition the evils resulting from the liquor traffic would not be greater than they are now?—They would not be so great.

24737. Unless you could really secure very considerable advantage from the adoption of a prohibitory measure, do you think it would be advisable to make such a radical change as prohibition would inevitably entail?—Only if there was a reasonable prospect of success made manifest.

24738. Do you think if prohibition were carried without a very strong sentiment being in favour of it, it would result in advantage. I speak of advantage in the sense of checking the evils of intemperance, which we all deplore?—It might do so temporarily, but it would be apt to result in failure if there were not a strong public sentiment behind it.

24739. And the failure would be bad?—It would be more disastrous than not having attempted it.

*By Judge McDonald :*

24740. Have you thought of this: with the abundant facilities for drinking that are afforded in Montreal, with the large number of places now selling drink and no difficulty felt now in getting drink, how can it be necessary to have unlicensed places to furnish a supply?—There is no need on the part of the customers.

24741. Do you think it is the temptation to make money that leads people to establish these illicit places?—Undoubtedly it is the desire to make a living in the easiest possible way. These men are non-producers. If there are 3,000 of those men keeping unlicensed taverns, the poorer classes of the people are maintaining those 3,000 non-producers, and the easy mode of life offers inducements to try and open unlicensed places so as to avoid the high license.

24742. It seems almost impossible to believe there are so many unlicensed places as has been stated, but we have received this information from the officials of the city. Accepting that evidence, as we are bound to do, how can those men expect to get customers?—It would appear to be difficult, but it is a very marvellous thing that those places no sooner open than they have crowds of customers immediately.

WILLIAM ROBB.

24743. How do the people find them out?—It looks as if the young men were waiting to throw money into any man's pocket so soon as he opens a saloon, it does not matter where.

24744. Do you think that the social customs of the people have changed and that there has been a decrease in drinking?—I think so, especially among the better classes of the people.

24745. You think there has been a change for the better?—Yes, a very great change for the better.

24746. Have you noticed, for instance in travelling, that the use of liquors on steam-boat tables and at the tables of hotels is much less than it was in the old times?—I think so.

24747. In what class do you think the increase is taking place?—Chiefly among the young people and the working class. I repeat, that the reason it is increasing so much among the young people is this fact to which I have already alluded, that in almost every paper you take up, especially the illustrated papers, the question of drinking is treated in an amusing and an attractive manner. You take up a novel, even a standard novel such as Dickens and Thackeray, and you find the drinking habits of the people are portrayed as desirable and as creating a great amount of happiness and amusement. Almost all the papers of the day, especially the illustrated papers, follow suit, and that is the reason to a great extent why our young men are led into drinking habits that are most deplorable to all, and that is the reason why the increase is largely confined to the young people.

24748. No doubt drinking is treated as a matter of fun and amusement in some of the works to which you referred, but must it not be remembered that those books were written 30 and 40 and some even 50 years ago? Do you not think that the writers at that time were reflecting the state of society as it was? Take such a book as Dickens's "Pickwick Papers," which contains a great deal of that kind of thing. Do you think that book was an honest reflection of the state of society at that time?—Yes. I think the drinking habits among the better classes of the people then were very much greater than they are now, just as I say there is a decrease now. The better class are seeing the evil of drinking and the necessity of setting a good example, and therefore their habits are different.

24749. Do you not find among the higher writers of fiction nowadays an absence of that evil to which you have called attention?—Perhaps there is not so much of it, but it still pervades almost all their works.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24750. I understood you to say that the increase has been confined largely to the humbler and poorer classes?—Yes.

24751. Do you think that class reads illustrated papers and novels such as Dickens and Thackeray?—Perhaps not; but if you take any class of literature which comes into the hands of those people and look at the reference to the drink habit, you will find that it is treated in the way I have indicated.

24752. The evidence shows that the drinking habits and customs have changed generally in all grades of society. Do you think it has been due largely to the influence of the churches, moral and religious teaching and the influence of the temperance societies?—There is no doubt about it.

24753. Those influences have affected this city, I suppose?—I am very much afraid this city is no exception to any other city.

24754. The testimony shows a very substantial improvement all along the line. That is the reason why I ask the question respecting Montreal?—I am afraid the evil is universal.

24755. Do you think that notwithstanding all the religious and moral teaching and the influence of temperance societies, drinking is increasing among young men and the humbler ranks of the population?—Yes; the good influences are, however, opposed by evil influences, so good and evil are travelling along side by side, with a very much more marked line of demarkation between them than existed previously. I think that must be apparent to every one who thinks over the subject.

*By Judge McDonald :*

24756. Is it not a fact that in the British army there has been a tremendous change for the better ; has not the same change taken place in the navy ?—Personally I have no knowledge of it, I have read of it and I have heard of it, and I suppose it is true.

24757. Has not this change taken place among the sailors of the navy particularly ?—Yes, I believe so. I think that the scientific treatment, or the treating of the temperance question from the scientific point of view has done a great deal towards bringing about the result. The experiments on men, soldiers and sailors, as to their power of endurance under treatment with different kinds of stimulants has done away with the false impression which formerly existed, that alcohol gave strength and endurance, whereas it has been found to be the very opposite. Members of the Commission no doubt have read the reports of experiments, in which men were tested under certain quantities of brandy and other stimulants and also on coffee or milk, and evidence was taken as to the amount of work it was possible to do under each stimulant. These experiments and the results obtained from them have tended to show both the army and navy that a mistaken opinion prevails as to the advantage of alcohol.

*By the Chairman :*

24758. The statement you made a short time ago in regard to the enormous amount of money that must be spent in the places selling illicitly would indicate that there is an enormous demand for intoxicants in the community, I suppose ?—Yes.

24759. Or there would not be so many unlicensed places ?—Yes.

24760. Do you think those unlicensed places are brought into existence simply from the fact that they sell liquor cheaper than the licensed places ?—I think it must be so.

24761. You think that the licensed places are sufficient to supply the demand, and the unlicensed places obtain a trade and at least obtain support owing to selling liquor at lower prices ?—Yes, I think that must be the explanation of it. If liquor was not got cheaper in those places than in the licensed places, it is scarcely likely that the unlicensed ones would have sufficient trade to keep them in existence.

24762. And there would be a large increase in the price paid ?—There would naturally be a large increase. If it is the fact that there are 3,000 unlicensed places selling to the poorer classes, and these were closed, no doubt a large portion of the poorer classes would go to the licensed places to get liquor. On the other hand, there might be a large proportion who having the temptation taken away, would not think of obtaining drink.

24763. Do you mean they would not take it at all ?—Perhaps so ; or instead of obtaining two or three glasses for a certain amount, they would obtain only one glass perhaps. Therefore, there would be a great reduction in the consumption, while at the same time there would certainly be an increased trade for the licensed vendor.

WILLIAM SANDILANDS, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

24764. Are you a native of Montreal ?—Yes.

24765. What is your present occupation ?—I am machinist in the Canada Rubber Company's works.

24766. Have you occupied that position for any length of time ?—For about ten years.

24767. Are you an officer of any organization of workingmen ?—I am an executive officer.

24768. Of what organization ?—Of what is known as the English speaking district of the Knights of Labour.

24769. Are you a Master Workman ?—Yes.

WILLIAM ROBB.

24770. Of Montreal?—Yes.

24771. Can you tell the Commissioners how many members there are in your organization here?—That I am not at liberty to state.

24772. It is a large number, I suppose?—There is a large number in Montreal.

24773. Do the members belong to all branches of the labouring classes, from the manual labourer to the highest class of skilled labour?—Yes.

24774. You have an entrance fee, I suppose?—Yes, there is an entrance fee.

24775. Have you any conditions as to temperance or any arrangements for inculcating temperance principles on your members?—Not generally; but there is a qualification required for membership in the order, which I have marked off in the constitution governing the order. It is this: No person who sells or makes a living or any part of it, by the sale of intoxicating drink, either as a manufacturer, dealer or agent, also any member of the family, or who tends bar permanently or temporarily can be admitted or recognized in the membership of this order. That is section 128.

24776. Do you make any special efforts through your executive body to induce members of the order to become members of temperance societies?—There is no special effort made in that direction other than that it is our duty to elevate them as men. Men are to a certain extent degraded before they enter our ranks, and we want to make men of them.

24777. Do you expel members who take a glass of liquor?—A man who is not fit to walk in society as a respectable man, cannot remain in the order known as the Knights of Labour.

24778. Do you exact total abstinence on the part of your members?—No.

24779. Do you expel any member who is known to habitually over indulge in intoxicants?—We do. There is a law to that effect.

24780. Have you any objection to tell us what that regulation is?—Any man who acts unbecoming a Knight of Labour is not fit to associate with any human being.

24781. Then, practically, he must keep sober and be capable of taking care of himself?—Yes, and capable of taking care of his family. He is in no condition if he is habitually addicted to drink, to associate with the Knights of Labour.

24782. How long have you been connected with the brotherhood?—Seven years.

24783. Within that time, can you tell the Commissioners if there has been any improvement in the direction of temperance on the part of the members?—There has been a great improvement, there is no question about that, in the appearance of the men. This is shown in a member very soon after he enters the order. He comes probably into our ranks not very well dressed and to a certain extent untidy in his appearance. After he has been in our ranks we find that he gradually becomes better and takes better care of himself. Those who remain with us, as a rule, take good care of themselves, and they remain with us, except they enter the order to serve their own purposes, and of course there are a few men who wish to use the institution.

24784. Have you any temperance organization connected with the order?—There is no special effort made in the direction of temperance.

24785. But one of the things to which you object is intemperance on the part of your members?—Yes. I will read a condition which bears on what you have said:—No local assembly or other assembly or member shall, directly or indirectly, give, sell or have any ale, beer or intoxicating liquor of any kind at any meeting, party, ball, picnic or entertainment whatever appertaining to the order. The regulation then goes on to state the punishment for breaking the law.

24786. Are these laws thoroughly carried out?—Without such laws, the order would not be in existence to-day.

24787. You say you have no temperance society directly connected with the order?—Not directly, that I am aware of.

24788. Although you endeavour to make your members men, you do not make any special effort to make them teetotallers?—A man becomes intelligent and knows his position and tries to live up to it, and when he does that, he naturally leaves alone whatever is going to drag him down.

24789. Have you any organization in connection with your society which endeavours to bind the members together to abstain from the use of intoxicants?—We have not.



24790. Do you think the present licensing system, about which no doubt you have heard and read a great deal, is a satisfactory method of regulating the traffic?—I think not, so far as I am individually concerned, though I must admit that I have given the matter very little study, on account of being at work during the day and engaged with my labour organization work at night. I think the authorities are too lax in issuing licenses, and too many licenses are issued in the vicinity of large manufactories where the labouring class resort.

24791. Then do you think if there were fewer licenses issued, it would be an improvement?—I believe it would be.

24792. Would you favour the imposition of a still higher license fee on the vendors of liquors?—Yes. I would certainly place the sale of liquor in the position that the liquor itself would not be so accessible to the general public.

24793. You think that would be an improvement?—I believe it would probably be an improvement.

24794. You have heard, I dare say, a good deal about unlicensed places in the city. Do you think there are from 2,000 to 4,000 such places where liquor is sold?—I really do not believe there are half that number in Montreal.

24795. The statement was made here that the number of unlicensed places selling liquor was probably 4,000?—I believe there is not that number within a long way, because Montreal citizens, and as a rule the working classes, do not use so much liquor as they did in the past. They cannot afford to do it. The price of liquor has been raised to such an extent that they cannot afford to indulge in drink. The claim has been made that it is the working class who patronize those shebeens or illegal places. We all know, however, what the workingman is. When he begins to drink, he does not consider his family, and he visits the saloons. The claim made that it is the working class that supports these places is unfair and untrue, because the working classes who do drink have no thought of themselves. I believe if there is any patronage given to those places, it comes from those in the higher classes of life. Those establishments, as a rule, are in out of the way places. I know the working classes do not support those illicit places, and I do not like to see such prejudice shown against the working class and their organizations.

24796. Is it not pretty much the same with all classes of drinkers, that they would not like to be seen going into those shebeens; or do they go to the first place they happen to come to?—That is the natural way with man.

24797. And the multiplication of those places will offer inducements to drink? I suppose you realize that if a man passes a licensed place and afterwards calls at an unlicensed place, the man who pays license is unfairly treated?—Certainly, I believe the license should protect the man that pays for it, and that the city should extend that protection.

24798. You have stated that you are one of the officers of the Knights of Labour, and that there is amongst the members now much less intemperance than there was some years ago. Do you believe that applies to the working classes generally?—I believe it does.

24799. You use the term working classes as it is generally applied?—Yes, those who live by labour.

24800. From your observation, do you think that the license laws are well enforced here?—I do not think so, or the claim would not be made by one of the officials that that there are 4,000 unlicensed saloons in the city. In my opinion 400 would probably be nearer the figure.

24801. Have you had any experience of any district where either the Scott Act or local option was in force?—I have never given that question a thought.

24802. Do you think it would be an improvement on the present system if we had total prohibition, by which is meant the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicants of all kinds, except for medicinal, mechanical and scientific purposes?—I do not think it would be an improvement. I believe people have to be educated up to anything before they can receive it quickly, quietly and satisfactorily. Whenever too much restriction is forced on them they will rebel against it, and naturally seek other

channels in order to secure what they think they have been improperly and unfairly deprived of.

24803. Do you think that view is shared very generally by the working class?—The working class as a rule would like to keep their children—that is my personal conviction in regard to the matter—to a certain extent educated up to the great drawback connected with liquor, or the use and abuse of it. That is their main object, and certainly I hardly believe it would be a fair test of the question to totally object to the sale of it.

24804. Do you think if the manufacture and importation of liquor were prohibited, such would have the effect of immediately stopping illicit sale?—I believe it would be even more largely consumed by the wealthy class, because the liquor would be at a high price. While smuggling goes on now, there is certainly not as much as there would be if prohibition took place. It would be much harder to prevent smuggling then.

24805. Do you object to prohibition because it is of the nature of coercion?—I do not object to it on that ground. My education has been since I have been connected with the Labour Party, and before that I had studied very little of humanity, that no man is prepared to accept anything as granted, and that, especially if he is fully educated, he is going to rebel. He does not understand the matter submitted to him; he must understand it before he will yield and accept it.

24806. Do you think a time might come when prohibition might be accepted and carried out?—Yes, through education, in our societies and churches, and more especially on the part of the Government.

24807. Are there any other classes, besides liquor dealers, excluded from your membership?—Yes, there are lawyers, capitalists and bankers. I did not finish reading the clause. It continues: No lawyer, banker, professional gambler or stock broker can be admitted. I put capitalists under the head of professional gambler—the majority of them, but of course there are exceptions.

24808. That is your classification?—Yes. There are, of course, some exceptions; but we do not allow exceptions to be made or other persons to be admitted, unless the local association says they are men who will live up to the order.

24809. Then you do make exceptions?—Yes, there are exceptions made.

24810. What body has the power to make exceptions?—Each local assembly judges whether the applicant should be allowed to come into the order, whether he would live up to the wishes of the order, that is to advance humanity in general.

24811. Then the local body being satisfied, you would admit any member of any class you have mentioned to membership in your society?—Certainly, provided they were satisfied.

24812. Does this rule in regard to exceptions apply to liquor sellers?—No; there are no exceptions in that case, other than employees in and about breweries can be organized into an order, but the owner and proprietor of a brewery cannot be admitted.

24813. Are there no exceptions to that rule?—No; and no one who tends bar permanently or temporarily can be in the order.

24814. Do you know if the system of paying men in saloons, say on Saturday night, exists to any extent in this district?—I do not think it does at present. It has been reported that last year along the river front men employed in shipping have been paid their wages in saloons. They received their wages in a room, and had to pass from the room down through a saloon.

24815. Do you refer to men employed by the stevedores?—Yes. That complaint reached us.

24816. Do you think that was a very objectionable proceeding?—I most certainly think it was.

24817. Did your body take any action in regard to it?—The only action taken was a recommendation to the stevedores that they should treat the men properly, and not pay them in a saloon. I might say that we, to a certain extent, keep ourselves in touch with employers of labour.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24818. There are several points raised in connection with the administration of the license law, and I wish to ask particularly in regard to a few points. One is as to

whether, in your opinion, the present law is broken by the dealers selling on Sunday. Do you think that practice exists to any great extent?—I may say personally that I have been in one or two places in the city on Sunday where liquor was sold. I think it is done to a great extent. I have seen people drunk on Sunday, who certainly did not get liquor at their own homes.

24819. In the places you speak of, were the places closed, or were they open?—At the places to which I refer, you could walk right in.

24820. I presume you consider the sale on Sunday is an evil which ought to be stopped?—It is the greatest evil in the city at present.

24821. Would you favour the prevention of the sale on Saturday night as being evil?—Certainly.

24822. Would you favour a rigid enforcement of the law that would prevent sale on Saturday night and all day Sunday?—Yes, on Saturday night at a certain hour and all day Sunday.

24823. Do you think that would be the wish of the working men of the city?—It most certainly would be in accordance with the wish of the working men. Further than that, they would like to see the number of licenses reduced.

24824. Do you think you are expressing the opinion of your fellow workmen in saying you would like to see the number of places reduced?—I believe I am expressing the opinion of the majority of working men.

24825. It has been stated that it would be a wise act to prevent the sale of liquor in places where groceries are sold. It is stated that men go in there and buy liquor who would never think of going into a saloon or liquor shop. What would be your opinion as to keeping the two sales separate?—Liquor should never be allowed to be sold in grocery stores. In Montreal and through Canada women do not go into saloons. In the old world they do, but as I have said, it is not so here. However, if liquor is sold in groceries there is no check, because they can go into grocery stores on the pretense of purchasing groceries and buy liquors at the same time, and the men will know nothing about it until their wives are to such an extent controlled by the use of liquor that they are past redemption. I believe the sale of liquor should be separated from the sale of groceries.

24826. You think that should be done without doubt?—I am positively sure it should be done, and I am certain that this goes on.

24827. In expressing your view as to the separation of the sale of groceries and liquors, do you believe you are voicing the sentiments of the large proportion of the working classes?—I believe so, because I believe a large proportion of the working men have received some little good out of the order and have sufficient intelligence to know the exact position they sustain in life.

24828. Have you any reason to believe that in those groceries there is any sale of liquor sold to be drunk on the premises?—I have reason to believe it.

24829. You believe that that goes on?—Yes.

24830. Another matter that has been brought to the attention of the Commissioners is that of selling liquor to boys: do you think that the law against sale to minors should be rigidly enforced?—Yes. And the youth of our land should be properly protected.

24831. Have you reason to believe that part of the license law is also broken in regard to the sale to people under age?—In many cases not knowingly, but in other cases they sell it even to boys, so long as they get the sale.

24832. It has been stated that there should be more rigid inspection of liquors sold than prevails at the present time, in order to see that the liquor is pure, and not only should the inspection be more rigid but more frequent than it is now. Have you given any thought to the subject?—I think it desirable. A man paying for an article should get it pure and be protected.

24833. We have been told that there are certain persons licensed to compound and mix liquors. Do you think it desirable in such cases that the persons who sell those compounds should be required to put on the labels a description of what the article is. If a man asks for whisky, should he not be able to obtain it, instead of being served with

a compound made by one of those firms of compounders?—I think there should be a Government Analyst to examine liquors, if it is necessary that they should be sold, and see that nothing is sold that is injurious to the public health.

24834. You are no doubt aware that there is at the present time a law against the adulteration of food. The idea is put forward that it is desirable to prevent the sale of injurious liquor. We have it in evidence that a certain quantity of alcohol is taken, a certain quantity of water is added, a little pure gin is also added, and it may be that a little bead oil is added also, and the mixture is sold as real gin. Do you think it right that the law should require in that case that a label should be placed on the bottles stating that the mixture is one of high wines or alcohol, with a little gin, bead oil and water, so that the man may know what he is buying?—The contents should be stated on the bottle, if it is not possible to prevent such mixtures being sold absolutely.

24835. Another question raised before the Commission is as to the class of liquors drank. Some witnesses have favoured enactments by which heavier duties would be imposed upon the stronger liquors, whisky and brandy, and low duties would be levied on light wines and beers, and thus light wines and beers would be brought in at low duties and at cheap rates with a view to encouraging their sale and discouraging the sale of the heavier liquors. Have you considered that question?—I have looked into that question to a certain extent since the Royal Commission has met, and more especially since light drinks have been offered for sale. But I have come to the conclusion that Weiss beer and lager beers are intoxicating and tend to lead to the commission of greater crime. I consider that crime is connected with liquor, and that the appetite for liquor tends to grow on the individual. I consider a man should not be encouraged in anyway to use light wines or other liquors.

24836. Would you prefer that he should use heavier liquors?—I would not have any man encouraged to drink liquor at all.

24837. Then you would put all liquors on the same footing?—Yes.

24838. We have had our attention drawn to certain places provided in the city for the use of the public, public parks. Do you know anything as to the working of them?—I do not know much about the working of them. I have been in one of them, Sohmer Park.

24839. Will you give us your opinion in regard to that park?—I might give my opinion from my connection with the Labour party, and in giving my opinion I do so not as a member of a church, but as a man who does not attend church. I have been to Sohmer Park on Sunday. I would always go there if I could. I had no objection to the performance, which I considered harmless amusement; and in regard to the sale of liquor, I took very little notice of it. But I saw a thing which naturally follows the sale of liquor, and that is gambling, throwing the stick, and other games of that kind which always follow in the wake of the sale of liquor, and which mean a loss of money to the working class. The sale of liquor in all places of public amusement should be strictly prohibited.

24840. What do you think of the place itself?—The place is a place of amusement.

24841. And it is one that can be frequented by the working classes on week days, I suppose?—I have no objection to it other than the sale of liquor there.

24842. From what you have said, you would object to any kind of liquor being sold at public parks?—Yes, any liquor that was intoxicating.

24843. Beer such as lager and Weiss beer?—Yes, at places of public entertainment it should not be allowed.

24844. Have you noticed the effect of Weiss beer on the people?—Not on others than myself.

24845. Have you partaken of it?—Yes, I am not a thorough temperance man.

24846. What was the effect?—After taking two glasses I was stupid; not only so, but it disagreed with my stomach. I afterwards left it alone.

24847. In so speaking you refer to the effect on a man who is not given to the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage?—Yes, because I am not given to the use of alcohol as a beverage.

24848. Do you know whether lager produces the same effect?—I believe it is all tarred with the same stick.

24849. You think all these drinks vary more in name than in anything else?—That is about it. There has been a liquor called root beer put on the market. These sellers try in every way to avoid the question of liquor license. That beer is nothing more, however, than common small beer; it is manufactured and sold in many places under another name.

24850. Is root beer put forward as practically a temperance beverage?—It is claimed to be so.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24851. You think it is simply small beer?—Yes. My brother keeps a temperance grocery. He told me when it was first introduced, he had drunk that beer, and it was the same as small beer.

24852. That is sold as a temperance drink you say?—Yes.

24853. By people who profess to sell only temperance drinks?—It is sold at some of the apple stalls and at the confectionery stalls.

*By the Chairman:*

24854. They are not licensed?—No license is required.

*By Judge McDonald:*

24855. Is there much drunkenness among the working men who are employed in the establishment where you work?—It is exceptionally free from that. During the 15 years I have worked in the establishment, there have not been less than 1,200 people employed, including women and children. It is an exceptional establishment in this respect, and how it happens to be brought about I cannot say.

24856. Have you worked all the time in Montreal?—Yes.

24857. You say the number of persons who have been given to intemperance has been limited to a small number?—Yes, but it has been no less a drawback to those who were addicted to the habit.

24858. Among those to whom you refer, were there any addicted to the habit to any considerable extent so as to cause trouble to their families?—Certainly so.

24859. Do they lose much time from their work?—I have three cases in mind in which they lost a good deal of time. I am now talking of men who are very much addicted to drink.

24860. Do you find it is among that very class, men whom you would call skilled labourers and especially good men, you find those who are addicted to drink?—I look upon those men as being a great detriment to the advance of the price of labour.

24861. In what way?—In many cases their employers are very unprincipled. They do not consider the rights of a workingman. They use the example of a man who is an intelligent and skilled workman though addicted to drink, as a means of keeping down the wages of the other employees. Another man in the same line of business has to accept the wages offered, because that man is willing to accept them. This man through his drunken habits tends to place other man in the same rank. I may say that so far as I am concerned there are only four in my line, that is the line of machinists.

*By the Chairman:*

24862. Were those three men to whom you referred connected with the company by which you are employed?—They are connected with the company at present.

24863. And how many employees are there altogether?—There are about 1,200 or 1,300.

24864. Is there much loss of time to others by those men of whom you have spoken?—The firm is inconvenienced in regard to getting help on that account.

24865. Are they liable to lose their employment on account of being sometimes under the influence of liquor?—They do not lose their time exactly, but they have to work harder in order to overtake the work. There is a certain amount of freemasonry, and we try to keep the places open for the men.

WILLIAM SANDILANDS.

24866-67. How is it that an organization such as that to which you belong will permit 3 or 4 men who are given to intemperance to influence the scale of wages?—From the mere fact that we are not sufficiently strong to regulate the scale of wages ourselves. If we were, we would regulate it.

24868. Would you regulate those men out of employment?—Yes.

24869. If the skilled men had sufficient power, would they regulate the wages so that they would be given to men according to their deserts?—I mean if we were sufficiently organized and educated, for education will follow organization, we would put those people in their proper position in life, so that they could not do injury.

24870. The men are not, then, sufficiently educated on the question to know how to deal with the matter in that way?—They are not sufficiently organized. Those in our ranks are organized and educated so as to handle the question, but they are not sufficiently numerous.

24871. I think you stated there had been since this organization commenced here an improvement in the customs and habits of the men who work?—The men in our ranks undoubtedly. A great many men are benefited through the influence of organized labour.

24872. Do you not think that the influences of religion have been favourable to the promotion of temperance for many years past, and that those influences have grown stronger of late years?—Not so much as they should have been.

24873. Do you think there has been an improvement?—There has been an improvement.

24874. Do you not think that the temperance societies have been doing noble work among the people, trying to induce them to become temperate?—I believe they are performing a necessary work.

24875. Then those influences, in your opinion, have been for good?—They have led to good results.

24876. I understand it to be your opinion that drunkenness is not increasing in Montreal?—Not as regards the class of which the last witness spoke, and of which he knows nothing.

24877. He seems to think that such is not the fact in regard to the labouring class?—To a certain extent he does not move in that class.

24878. You consider you have a better means of knowing the state of matters in that class than the last witness?—Yes, as I live in that class.

24879. Knowing that class, you do not agree with all the views put forward by the last witness?—I think it is a prejudiced view, and any independent person in Montreal should know it. I believe every man moves in a certain circle, and he can only speak in regard to that class with which he is in sympathy, and even in that case he is sometimes a little prejudiced.

24880. The generally expressed opinion has been that an improvement has taken place among all classes in the city?—That is the general opinion.

24881. Are there any suggestions you can make to the Commissioners in regard to this traffic?—I was attempting to make a suggestion in answering a question, and it was in connection with preventing saloons being placed in the immediate vicinity of large manufactories. They should be prevented from being placed within a quarter of a mile; or even I would put it half a mile, of any large factory, but a quarter of a mile would cover the ground, because many a man on leaving his work with his pay in his pocket would take it home, instead of, as the present time, spending it in drink at some adjacent saloon. A workingman will not go a quarter of a mile for a drink, but instead of going there he would go home. The saloons are too convenient, and they are encouraged too much in the vicinity where the working classes live. There should be less of them in those districts. I would be much in favour of all the saloons in Montreal being placed where the wealthy classes live, right in the centre of their districts, and that would be the means of removing the saloons sooner than anything else.

24882. Suppose a law were passed doing away with either the hotel or the saloon bar, which in your opinion would it be better to get rid of?—I think there would be very little choice in the matter.

24883. You would propose to get rid of both of them, I suppose?—There would be very little choice on that question.

24884. Would you get rid of both?—I am not in favour of the immediate removal of either.

24885. Do you look upon them as necessities?—According to the present state of the city, I do; that is to say, until the people are educated. Let some steps be taken to educate the people up to their needs, and then they will understand the question.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

24886. You think a remedy is desirable as soon as it is obtainable, I believe?—I think so.

24887. You have stated that the educational process will bring that about?—Yes.

24888. You have made a statement with respect to the number of employees in the place where you are employed, and you have stated the number as 1,300?—Yes.

24889. Among those 1,300, you say there are only three or four who drink?—There are only three or four who have caused trouble.

24890. By excessive drinking or irregularity?—Yes, through the use of intoxicants.

24891. Is there any considerable proportion of the 1,300 employees boys, girls or women?—I could not state the number.

24892. Is there a considerable proportion of the 1,300 boys, girls and women?—There are a great number of the employees who are women.

24893. Would half of them be women?—I believe half would be women.

24894. Have you observed about how much time the average drinking man would lose, say in the course of a month, on account of drinking?—I have not.

24895. Would he lose one day a month, or ten days a month?—I do not believe it would average that.

24896. I may explain that by a drinking man I mean, not a man who is habitually drunk, but a man who drinks regularly, every day he drinks, and then there are other men who drink to excess. Take an average of these men, some of whom drink more and some less, about what would be the average time lost by such a drinking man?—My reason for stating that I did not believe there was one day lost by the average drinking man, as you have explained, in a month was, because I believe employees cannot afford to lose one day's pay a month outside of the money they expend on liquor.

24897. You think that besides spending money for liquor, they cannot afford to lose one day a month?—Yes.

24898. Do you notice this, that employers of labour do not generally employ men who are likely to lose time on account of drink?—Not to such a great extent as they should do.

24899. You think it would be better for the other working men if they did this more?—It would be better for their own interests.

24900. Have you noticed that the men who drink regularly, I do not now refer to the man who gets drunk once in a while, but to the man who drinks regularly one, two or three glasses a day, whether that man's wage-earning power is diminished, taking a period of years?—I have not been observant enough to be able to express an opinion on that matter.

24901. Do you believe that the use of liquor is more injurious to the workingman than it is to other people?—I do in one sense.

24902. Why?—Owing to the hard manual labour the workingman has to perform. The motions of the body cause a certain churning in the stomach which otherwise does not go on, say with a man who is at his desk. The use of liquor in such a condition of the stomach causes the liquor to fly to the brain of a man who is at hard manual labour, and it injures him more than it does a man who is not so actively employed.

24903. Is that one reason why you protest against saloons being in the vicinity of factories?—That is one of the reasons.

24904. Still you think the workingman more disposed to drink than another man?—I do not think so.

24905. Do you believe the regular use of liquor is injurious to the workingman, physically and mentally?—I believe it is, and to any other man.

WILLIAM SANDILANDS.

24906. You spoke of the case of a stevedore who paid his men in a room, to reach which the men had to go through a saloon. Was that an exceptional case, or are there a number of such cases?—That was an exceptional case which came under my notice, but of course there may be many others.

24907. That has been stopped, I believe?—Yes.

24908. Do the men pawn their pay tickets for liquor, intending to redeem them on Saturday night?—It has been shown that pay tickets have been sold for the purpose of securing liquor.

24909. Do you know whether the employers or stevedores have endeavoured to prevent the men thus dealing with their tickets?—I do not believe that stevedores have taken any active measures to stop it.

*By the Chairman :*

24910. Do they issue pay tickets?—Yes, they do in some cases.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24911. Have any considerable proportion of accidents in your factory been due to the drinking of employees?—I would not like to express an opinion on that point, because as regards accidents in factories, it is a pretty hard matter to say often to what they are attributable.

24912. You have said that it is of special importance to educate the people up to the evils of the drink trade in order that they may be able to protect themselves. Do you believe that the people, being educated up to the point where they would demand a prohibitory law, would then be prepared to enforce that law, and it would be of great benefit to the working classes?—I believe at that time a prohibitory law would be unnecessary.

24913. You mean the people would protect themselves without such law?—Yes, they would be able and willing to do so.

24914. Do you think a prohibitory law would help in the education of the people?—I have already said, no ; I do not believe it.

24915. You say that the influence of religion and of moral teaching and of these societies have been beneficial to the working classes in general. Do you believe that if the laws were framed in accordance with the desires of your society, they would help along the working classes generally?—They would help along our society and also all classes of the people.

24916. I suppose you do not believe in enacting a law that operates in favour of one class to the detriment of another?—We do not ; we try all in our power to level down those laws.

24917. You have said that workingmen regard it as a good thing that their children should be protected against these evil things, and in the interests of their children they would not like the saloon influence to prevail in opposition to home influence. Is that the substance of what you say?—That is what I intend to say.

24918. Do you think it would be beneficial to the growing boys, if there were no temptations placed in their way by having saloons established in their vicinity?—I believe so. You educate the mind in a certain direction and it is apt to follow that line during life. It is owing to saloons being so close and handy to workingmen that they use them.

24919. Do you think it well to have the traffic legalized and to familiarize the young people with it, or is it not apt to lead them wrong?—I do.

24920. I have read somewhere the utterances on the subject of Master Workman Powderly. Do you know what his position is in regard to prohibition?—I do not. I certainly would not express what his views are, because he is the Master Workman, and he will not express an opinion while all the rest of the world are in fog on the subject. He will not place himself in such a position ; he is too wise to do that.

24921. Still I have seen utterances by him with respect to the drink trade and the effect upon the great mass of the people. Do you, as a Master Workman of your district, know what Mr. Powderly's views are?—Not as to his opinion on prohibition. I suppose he still writes a letter weekly to the "Journal of the Knights of Labour," and in



one of every two letters he takes up the question of the liquor trade. So he knows full well the harmful results to the workingmen, as does any average workingman who studies his duties to the organization.

24922. Do you know anything that is so antagonistic to the interests of the workingmen as the drink trade?—The only other problem that is equal to it is the combination of capital.

24923. Do you think capital and the drink trade are comparable?—Yes, as regards their harmful effects on the human family.

*By the Chairman :*

24924. Is it the use or the abuse of liquor you consider to be so harmful?—The abuse of it ; it is in regard to checking the abuse, that I am speaking.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

24925. Why is it your society excludes (without making any explanation whatever) bar-tenders and tavern people and the like? Do you regard them as dangerous to the interests of society and the well-being of workingmen?—We do, because they simply come in, as a rule, to advance their own personal interests, just the same as we exclude capitalists, gamblers and the like.

24926. You think they desire to join the society for their own personal gain?—Yes ; they are dangerous to the organization. In fact they are of no benefit to the organization, in fact they are of no benefit to the human family whatever. Bar-keepers become so hardened after they enter the trade, and become accustomed to handling liquor, that they are no use to humanity whatever.

*By the Chairman :*

24927. What is your reason for excluding the lawyers?—I might say that we do not altogether exclude them. There is a law excluding them, but the organization judges as to their admission. If a member of the society becomes a lawyer and lives up to the principles called for by the order, he can remain in it ; but if not, he must retire. Lawyers as a rule—and I think you will agree with me in this—possess a better education than ordinary workingmen, and I may say that to a certain extent they do not feel themselves in touch with workingmen. They do not wish to help to advance humanity as they should.

24928. Have you in your order no exception in regard to their becoming members of the society?—We have this,—if they live up to the laws of the order.

24929. Do you permit lawyers under any conditions to become members?—I do not believe there is any other exception, that I can remember.

24930. Is the ground of excluding them this, that they are not in sympathy with your class?—No, we consider them an unnecessary evil, the same as liquor. That is owing to the corruption of society.

24931. Do you consider lawyers unnecessary?—They are necessary owing to the corruption of society in which we live.

*By Judge McDonald :*

24932. Do the capitalists stand in the same position?—In pretty much the same position. The capitalist is a little better off, we allow him in our ranks ; but the association or branch that admits him is to be the judge as to his admission. We recognize capitalists in our association as a necessity.

24933. You want to regulate the capitalist also?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLèod :*

24934. I suppose your society desires to adjust the relations between capital and labour?—Yes, they misunderstand each other too much now.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24935. If there were a better understanding between capital and labour, I suppose both would be better off?—Yes.

WILLIAM SANDILANDS.

24936. Did you hear the evidence of Mr. Robb respecting increased drunkenness in Montreal?—A gentleman raised as Mr. Robb was raised, has an antagonistic feeling to the workingmen, and when he gives an opinion regarding them, he speaks of something of which he knows nothing.

24937. You do not agree with him that there has been an increase in drunkenness among the working classes?—I do not. If Mr. Robb had taken the trouble, if he thought the working classes occupy such positions as he has indicated, to have gone up to the Exhibition grounds on Labour Day, he would have seen a large number of people, not less than 10,000, who were most sober and orderly. When we were attacked on the ground that we had liquor on the field, the temperance papers which advocated that we should refrain from having liquor on the ground, did not come forward and laud our efforts to suppress the sale of liquor. If they would support our society they would do more good, for our society is doing more towards educating the people on this question than are the churches.

24938. You have spoken in regard to the policy pursued by employers in regard to keeping men who are addicted to drinking to excess. —If the impression rests with the Commissioners that I simply singled out my employers, they make a mistake.

24939. Were you speaking of employers generally?—Yes.

24940. You stated that they deliberately retained men in their employ for the purpose of acting as a barrier to the advancement of workmen in the same line of trade with those who are excessive drinkers?—They use them for that purpose unquestionably.

24941. The evidence that has been submitted to the Commissioners is to the effect that employers of labour generally prefer to have sober men, and do not employ men who are addicted to drinking, that is drinking to excess, if they can find sober men. Your experience as a workman appears to be altogether different. Are you sure that your statement is correct?—In what I have been saying, I have been talking generally. I say there are exceptions. To say that an employer of labour does not know his own business in regard to employing men, and that he makes serious mistakes, is absurd. Generally speaking employers do not make such errors. The complaint, however, has come to me in my official capacity that it is owing to the employment of men who are excessive drinkers that wages are kept down. In fact I have known of two instances—McDonald's Tobacco works and the Canada Rubber Company, where the employment of such men has been detrimental to the advancement of the others; and of course, it cannot help being so. I do know not that these employers used them in the cases referred to, but I have known them to be used. The foreman of a large foundry in Montreal told me personally that the proprietor himself had put on a man who was addicted to liquor to keep down the rate of wages. That was a case in Montreal.

*By Judge McDonald :*

24942. He was receiving equal wages although he was addicted to drink?—He was not of as much value, as if he had been constantly at his employment.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

24943. That is your deliberate opinion?—Yes.

24944. Which in your opinion, exercises the more injurious influence, the saloon bar or hotel bar?—I have seen as much liquor sold in the hotel on Sunday illegally as in the saloon. That is so far as my personal experience goes; I have not had much experience, because I do not use it much.

24945-46. Do you say that liquor is sold illegally to the same extent in the hotel as in the saloon?—Yes. In my vicinity the people patronize the grocery stores on Sunday.

24947. Which of the two places in your opinion does most injury to the community, the hotel or the saloon?—The saloon.

24948. If the saloon or the hotel had to be suppressed, which would you suppress?—Looking at the question from the point of view of benefiting the working classes, I would suppress that which does them the most injury, and that is the saloon; but I should like, if possible, to have both suppressed. I have stated that neither the saloon nor the hotel was beneficial in that respect.

24949. If the hotel provides meals and sleeping accommodation while the saloon does not, is not the hotel more beneficial?—It is more beneficial provided they keep within the bounds of the law, but in this city, such is not the case.

24950. Do you think there is a general disregard of the provisions of the liquor law?—Both in large and small establishments.

24951. You think the law is generally disregarded?—Yes.

24952. Do you think the license law is a failure?—I have seen quite a crowd going into the St. Lawrence Hall at a time, going in to get drinks; they assembled there for some purpose at all events. I know large places in this city where people collect regularly on Sunday, and they have no more respect for the law there than in the poorer districts.

24953. Then there is a general disregard of the law, and if so, do you consider the license law a failure?—In fact the whole laws of the city are to a certain extent ignored.

24954. Are the great majority of the men employed with you in the rubber factory total abstainers?—I cannot say that: but I might say, speaking generally, the men are as a rule sober. They are exceptionally so in the Canada Rubber Company's works.

24955. And you think that drunkenness and drinking have decreased in a measure instead of increasing during the last ten years among the working classes?—Yes.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 17th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day at 10 a.m., Sir JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
REV. DR. MCLEOD.

MR. E. F. CLARKE.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

WILLIAM DARLINGTON, of Montreal, blacksmith, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

24956. In what establishment are you employed?—In the Royal Electric Light Company.

24957. Are you a native of Montreal?—No.

24958. How many years have you been here?—Nine years and nine months.

24959. Are you connected with any of the labour organizations?—Yes, with the Knights of Labour.

24960. What is your position in that body?—I am Chairman of the Executive Board, and an organizer.

24961. For the city?—For one-half of the province.

24962. Do you belong to the same branch of the order as Mr. Sandilands?—Yes. I should like to say before I proceed that I do not represent the order here. Not having had an opportunity to consult the members, I only represent myself.

24963. We presume that an officer of the order knows something about the feeling of the working classes respecting the liquor traffic and the license law?—Yes.

24964. You heard the evidence given by Mr. Sandilands?—Yes.

24965. Do you generally agree with what he said?—Mostly.

24966. Is there any particular point in his evidence to which you take exception, or would you like to deal with the subject from your own standpoint. Of course, the Commissioners desire to avoid going over the same ground again, if possible?—There were several points not touched upon by Mr. Sandilands that it is desirable to inquire into, in my opinion, and I will be as brief as possible in referring to them.

24967. The Commissioners will be glad to hear your statement.—In regard to the matter of prohibition, I may say there was a question asked of Mr. Sandilands in regard to the position of General Master Workman Powderly. He is a prohibitionist. I know it. He does not believe in liquor in any shape or form.

24968. We may possibly have an opportunity of hearing Mr. Powderly before we get through our inquiry, and it will be a matter of gratification if the Commissioners are afforded that opportunity?—I may say that the labour organizations of Montreal, from my experience, have done more to reduce drunkenness than any other institution, or all the other institutions put together. As an illustration of that, Mr. Sandilands told you about Labour Day, when there was something like 10,000 people on the Exhibition grounds, and from that number not one arrest was made. It was difficult to find on the whole ground one drunken man.

24969. When was that?—It was on Labour Day this year. I believe that long hours and poverty do more than anything else to cause drunkenness; in fact, do more than all the other causes put together. That is my experience, and I have come in contact with many men on many occasions. I may mention the printers as one class. They have to work in the afternoons sometimes for two or three hours at distributing type, and again at night from 7 o'clock until almost 5 o'clock in the morning. They inform

me that it is a matter of impossibility to do their duty unless they have some kind of stimulant. After they get through their work in the early morning, they are over tired and cannot rest properly unless they have something. I am not a teetotaller. Working at the Royal Electric Light Company during a period of six years, I have found that if I work ten hours a day I do not need to take any stimulant, but when I work as long as fourteen, fifteen or sixteen hours in the twenty-four, when I wake up in the morning after going to bed, I find, unless I take some stimulant, I am not fit for my day's work. Overwork seems to drive men to drink.

24970. In the Royal Electric Company is it compulsory to work those long hours, or do the exigencies of the business you are engaged in demand them?—It is in the interests of the business. In several lines of work there is only one man employed at one particular thing, and it is impossible to call another man to do his work for a short time.

24971. I suppose he does not possess the necessary technical knowledge?—Quite so. You cannot call on a new man to do work right away. Of course you have to oblige your employer as much as possible in these matters. I think it can be proved by statistics that where men work shorter hours they drink less. Here are statistics compiled by Professor Leon Levi, which show that in England, where the hours of labour have been reduced during the last twenty years, the consumption of alcohol among the labouring classes has been reduced from 12 per cent to 11·66 per cent, which shows conclusively that with reduced hours and healthy recreation the workingmen go less to the saloons. There is another drawback in Montreal especially—I have not had experience in other cities in Canada—and that is the total absence of places of recreation for workingmen to visit. There is no reading room for the working classes, only one or two isolated places, like the Grand Trunk Reading Room, and you must be employed by that company to be able to use it, but there is no public reading room. The public parks also are not sufficient, and so when a man comes home after he has been ten hours at work there is no place for him to visit except the saloons. There is nothing, I say, for a man to fall back upon, and the result is that men, who naturally want some amusement and recreation, go to the saloons. I think if there were more parks and reading rooms and places of attraction, where innocent amusement could be obtained, there would be less liquor used. In regard to our parks, Sohmer Park and places of that kind, I believe that six days a week are sufficient to labour, and I do not think, while I agree there should be places of recreation open, there should be liquor sold in any shape on the Sabbath, which should be a day of rest.

24972. Would you close up such a park as Sohmer Park on the Sabbath?—It should have no more privileges than other public parks. I do not think that Sohmer Park has any more right to sell liquor than a saloon, and especially when it involves labour on the Sabbath.

24973. Then you would not permit them to sell liquor on Sunday?—I would stop them from selling anything on Sunday.

24974. Whether intoxicants or otherwise?—Yes.

24975. With regard to some of the amusements which are carried on in Sohmer Park, would you put an end to them on Sunday?—Yes, because they entail labour on some one.

24976. You would have the parks open, however, so that people could enter them and take exercise and recreation there?—I would.

24977. But you would have no kind of trade going on, no vending of anything and no amusement?—Yes, that is my idea.

24978. Have you considered the question of prohibition at all?—So far as prohibition is concerned, I do not think that at the present time the people are ready for it; but at the same time there are a large number of people willing to have the matter decided, and I would certainly be in favour of putting it to the popular vote and give the public the opportunity of voting whether they would ask for prohibition or not.

24979. Do you not consider that they have that opportunity at every election?—At the general election?

24980. At every election—I mean the people of every electoral district?—Party politics have too strong a hold on people to cause them to lay their party aside for pro-

hibition, which shows that the prohibitionists are party politicians, although they may be in principle prohibitionists.

24981. Suppose there was a special vote, and there was a considerable majority polled in favour of a prohibitory law, do you think the politicians would still throw aside that bait and vote for their candidates irrespective of whether they were prohibitionists or not. You say that you think that political questions override the prohibition issue?—I do.

24982. The vote if it did indicate that the people were largely in favour of prohibition, would not necessarily do away with the state of things which you mention as existing at the general elections?—No, I do not think that it would, any more than the actions of the politicians after the vote was taken would be closely looked after. If the politicians in power should ignore that vote, then I think that it might have a certain effect upon them.

24983. But still, as a general principle, if there was a strong public sentiment in favour of prohibition, would it not make itself felt at the general elections?—It should, if the prohibitionists were consistent.

24984. I think in that address by Professor Leon Levi he argues in this way: that when trade was good and the labouring classes were working full time and getting good wages, they consumed more food, and tea and sugar and so on, and also that they consumed more liquor?—If you were to read the pamphlet I have referred to right through, it is almost entirely composed of extracts from Professor Levi's report, you would find that the labouring classes consumed more clothing, that they had shorter hours and had better wages, and that the production increased in some cases 200 per cent; the higher the wages, the more the production increased, because it enabled them to become larger purchasers, and drunkenness was materially decreased.

24985. You quote Professor Levi as advocating places of amusement and recreation for the people?—I quote him to show that shorter hours have a tendency to make men more sober.

24986. And you add then yourself that places of amusement also operate in the same direction?—Yes.

24987. Do the working classes avail themselves at all of the Fraser Institute for reading purposes?—Very little.

24988. Can you give us any reason for that?—Yes, as a rule they have to work, as you are aware, until 6 o'clock at night, and a majority of them have then to walk one or two or three miles to their homes. The Fraser Institute is not in a centre where the working classes live, and if you had to walk from the Canadian Pacific shops to Point St. Charles, when you got home and had your supper, and perhaps read the paper, you would find very little time left to go to the Institute. I believe that if there were free libraries established in every ward, they would be well attended.

24989. The Fraser Institute is a free library?—Yes, but if the libraries were established near the men's homes, they would go there instead of to the saloons.

24990. Would you also advocate the lending of books out of the library?—Certainly.

24991. Do you know anything of the Free Library in Manchester?—I do about the one in Birmingham, in England.

24992. There any one who gets a certificate of two householders can get books out of the library, I think?—Yes, you can get books by getting a letter from any citizen of repute; of course, there are quite a large number of libraries in Birmingham. I know that in going down town and travelling around, instead of going to a beer house, I would go to a library and read.

24993. The Grand Trunk Company have a very good library at Point St. Charles, and I think a very excellent place for the men to sit and read?—Yes, but it is confined to the company's employees.

24994. Is there any other large establishment in the city having a library for their employees?—I do not know of any.

24995. From your experience, can you say that the license laws are well enforced in the city of Montreal?—They are not enforced at all, not worth speaking about.

24996. You have heard the statements made about the unlicensed places selling liquor, numbering all the way from two thousand to four thousand or more?—I think that has been exaggerated.

24997. You think there are not so many?—I do not think there are more than two or three hundred.

24998. In what particular respect is there neglect to enforce the license law?—You can get liquor in any part of the week, or any part of the night or day; you can get liquor by the glass in groceries, you can send children for it, and I do not know in what other ways the law could be violated.

24999. You think the provisions of the law prohibiting the sale after hours and closing on Sunday are neglected?—I know it.

25000. And that groceries sell liquor by the glass, and allow liquor to be taken away in too small quantities?—They sell it by the glass.

25001. Do you think there are a large number of places selling liquor in the city which are not licensed?—From my own experience, I have never come across but one. Of course I do not know. Men whom I work with have told me of one or two places, but from what I have heard from other men, the principal places where liquor is sold are brothels, but outside of them, I believe there are very few places.

25002. Can you make any suggestion for the improvement of the present law?—Improve the labouring classes, reduce their hours of labour and make it possible for them to get higher wages. Give them counter attractions of innocent amusement, and I think the liquor traffic would die of its own accord.

25003. You have spoken of the efforts of the labour organizations to promote temperance. I personally know something of that, and without endorsing them to the extent you have mentioned, I know that they have done a great deal to promote temperance, and I have been very anxious to have representatives of these labour organizations before the Commission to ascertain what steps they are taking to promote temperance among their members. Will you kindly tell us, what your order does, as an order, to promote temperance?—In the first place, when a man comes into our order, he comes there to benefit himself personally. Then we teach him that he has to assist others, to benefit his fellow-man. We have a rule laid down that a man must be dressed in a neat and tidy manner; we have no uniform. A man must attend the meeting. If a man has been an habitual drunkard, which lots of them were previous to joining the organization, they come there. They must be dressed neat and tidy, they must not be seen on the streets drunk or they are liable to be expelled, and the result is that men get into the habit of coming to our meetings, they dress better, and the fact of spending money to get dress prevents them going to the saloons, and their families are better off. Thousands of women, and this is the best and most reliable evidence, say that their husbands were never so good as since they joined the order of the Knights of Labour. They learn to respect themselves, and they gain the respect of others. Of course if men spend money on clothing, and take the money home to their wives and families instead of spending it on liquor, I think that is a good temperance move.

25004. I think it was said that you have no temperance organizations connected with the order?—We do not directly teach temperance, but we try to get men to respect themselves and to keep away as much as possible from drink.

25005. Have you any objection to tell us how many members there are in your order?—I have no objection. In the English speaking order there are about 1,100, and then there is the French speaking order besides. I do not think the English Knights of Labour number more than 1,100 at present.

25006. How many French?—I do not know.

25007. Does that include all the English speaking members of the Society in this district?—It includes all in the city; I think 1,100 would include the whole.

25008. Your branch only extends to the city?—The district here covers Montreal and down as far as Three Rivers. I only include the people of Montreal—the English speaking people—in the 1,100. I do not know the number of the French people.

WILLIAM DARLINGTON.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25009. Do you know anything of the quality of the liquor that is vended in these unlicensed places?—No, I must say that I only knew of one, and they only sold beer.

25010. You spoke of the sale of liquor in groceries by the glass as being common. Do you favour the granting of licenses to grocers to sell liquor?—I think liquor should be kept separate altogether from groceries.

25011. Then you would favour an amendment to the law that would wipe out these corner groceries?—Yes.

25012. I think your general conclusion was, that the shortening of the hours of labour, and the affording of greater facilities for the working classes to get out into parks and open spaces where they could have recreation, afforded the best possible means of reducing drunkenness among them and improving their condition?—Yes.

25013. Did you hear the evidence of Mr. Robb, City Treasurer?—I did.

25014. Did you agree in his statement that drunkenness has increased among the working classes?—No, I do not think Mr. Robb knew what he was talking about in that respect.

25015. You believe that drunkenness has decreased among the working classes?—I do.

25016. I understood you to say that you would take away the privilege of selling intoxicants from the keepers of public parks?—I would.

25017. Would you favour running the cars on the Lord's day to take people to the parks?—I would abolish labour in every respect on the Lord's day, if I had my way. I think the Lord's day was made for rest.

25018. You think that the parks should be open on the Sabbath for those who can get to them, but facilities should not be given to take them to the parks?—Parks should be where every person could get to them easily.

25019. You are opposed to street cars running on the Lord's day?—I am opposed to labour in every respect on the Lord's day.

25020. And you are opposed to street cars on Sunday?—Yes.

25021. You spoke with reference to the taking of the vote of the people as to whether a prohibitory measure should be presented to Parliament and considered. Is there any obstacle in the way of ascertaining what the feeling of the people of Montreal or the feeling of the people in any district of Quebec is, by preparing a petition for the introduction of a vote on the Scott Act, or by taking advantage of the local option law in the province; is there any difficulty in doing that?—I do not think there is any difficulty. I think if the people will not take sufficient interest in any public question like this to cast their vote one way or another, the matter is not worthy of consideration.

25022. Have you had any experience of the working of any local prohibitory measure, the Scott Act or local option or so on?—No.

25023. You do not know anything at all about them?—No.

25024. You said that you thought the statement that there were from two thousand to four thousand unlicensed places in the city of Montreal, was incorrect?—I think so.

25025. Was not the gentleman who made that statement in the best position to give authentic information on the matter?—I cannot give you any better statement than from the men with whom I am in daily contact.

25026. Was not the Collector of Provincial Revenue in the best position to make an authoritative statement? Was he not in a better position than you are to know the truth?—I do not think so. You must get the information from men who use these places, and who know that the information is not going to be given to any body else. A man would be more apt to tell you the truth about where he can get liquor than he would be to tell a revenue officer.

25027. That information would only refer to a locality?—I come in contact with persons from all over the city during the week.

25028. You think that Mr. Lambe's statement is exaggerated?—I think so. Outside of what we call brothels, I do not think there are more than three or four hundred such places in the city.



25029. Respecting these saloons : are they a source of greater evil and danger to the working classes than the hotels?—If I had the abolition of one or the other, I would abolish the saloons.

25030. Why?—Because the hotels are necessary.

25031. Is not the saloon necessary, that men may go in and get drinks?—It is not so necessary that they should get drinks. The hotel answers the purpose for travellers as well as for taking drinks, if you want them.

25032. I think you said, too, that drunkenness was promoted and caused by the poverty that existed in certain classes?—I find it here, and I have found it in England also, that in bad times when work was scarce you found men going to music halls or concert halls or public houses in order that they could drown their trouble in a shilling's worth of whisky for twenty-four hours, whereas a shilling's worth of bread would not do, and they take the whisky or the beer in preference. I have found that was the rule and not the exception. I find that here around Griffintown and Point St. Charles, if the people get little wages, it seems a hopeless task for them to live decently; they cannot take money enough home to live properly, and they live for an hour or two on liquor.

25033. They have abandoned hope and taken to drink?—That is it.

25034. Would a law placing a heavier duty on spirituous liquors such as whisky, brandy and gin, and placing a lighter duty on light wines and beers so as to encourage their use, be an advantage to the working classes?—Well, that is a question which requires consideration.

25035. Would you consider such to be class legislation?—I think a more stringent law to compel the vendors to sell pure liquor would be better.

25036. I asked you in regard to the quality of the liquor sold in these unlicensed places, but you did not know; do you know anything of the quality of the liquor sold in the licensed places?—Indeed I do. Some of it I would be afraid to drink. I believe some of it is poison diluted or very little better.

25037. Would you favour the enactment of stringent regulations to guard against adulteration?—The most stringent. I think a man who sold a stronger poison than whisky under another name should not be fined, but should be jailed.

25038. Would you favour the enactment of a prohibitory law, that would prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of spirituous liquors?—No, I would not. I do not think that any particular body of men should say what the other should take.

25039. But as the evils are so great which flow from the excessive use of liquor, are not people who are impressed with the magnitude of the evils justified in endeavouring to educate public opinion to pass a measure that will prohibit the introduction of liquor?—I think that the people who abuse it should be restrained in some way.

25040. How would you restrain them?—By putting them in some kind of an asylum where they would have to work sufficiently to keep them, and at the same time not allow them to have liquor; but I do not think that 75 per cent of the people should be deprived of something they want because a small percentage abuse it. There is not one per cent of the people of Montreal drunkards.

25041. You favour the taking of a plebiscite: suppose it should show 55 per cent in favour of a general prohibitory law and 45 per cent opposed to it, would you enact the law?—Although it may be harsh on the minority, I suppose the majority must rule, even in matters respecting eating and drinking. If a large majority of the country say that certain things must occur, they will rule, the same as when the Conservatives get a majority they rule and the Liberals must stand to one side.

25042. And Parliament would be justified in passing a measure of prohibition if 55 per cent of the electors supported a measure of that kind?—Then I think the question should be left to local option.

25043. The people have the privilege now of passing on the question by local option, and they can have the Scott Act applied?—It is a very critical question to decide upon, without due consideration, and the decision will inflict hardships on some, no matter how it goes.

25044. You have watched the movement in favour of local option in England?—I was there when that law passed.

WILLIAM DARLINGTON.

25045. Do you favour the compensation of persons who are engaged in the trade?  
—No.

25046. If a prohibitory law were passed would you favour compensation to brewers and distillers?—Not one cent. Nobody forced them into the business.

25047. And on that account you think they are not entitled to any compensation?  
—Not at all.

25048. You are opposed, yourself, to a prohibitory law?—I do not believe in prohibition.

25049. Would you vote against it if the measure were submitted?—I believe I would. I believe it should be brought about in a different way.

25050. What would your way be?—Reducing the hours of labour; elevating the labouring classes to a position where they would not buy liquor, and when they did not buy liquor, the brewers would not brew it.

25051. The traffic would die a natural death, and the use of liquor would not be so general, and the trade would diminish gradually, is that your opinion?—I believe it is. It is better than forcing a man to do something he does not want to do.

22052. Would you favour the education of the masses in the way you have suggested rather than by a measure of prohibition?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

25053. In looking at this publication Mr. Darlington, I think it refers to some other lecture by Professor Leon Levi, than the one to which I referred. The one to which I referred was published in the Journal of the Statistical Society, a good many years ago, and it pointed out just what I have mentioned. There was an increase in the consumption of liquors and food and other things, which he attributed to good trade and good wages?—This pamphlet was published a few years ago. It shows that from 1867 to 1883 the consumption per head of alcoholic beverages diminished, while that of the non-alcoholic beverages greatly increased.

25054. Do you think that spirits are more partaken of by the upper than by the poorer classes?—In England, but not in Montreal.

25055. You think that gin and whisky and brandy are more largely partaken of by what are called the upper classes in England than by what are called the lower classes?—Yes, I know it from experience, or rather I know that so far as the labouring class are concerned they seldom call for hard liquor in England. It is beer nearly all the time at home.

25056. I should agree with the conclusion that more wine is drunk by the upper classes, but I think the second statement is more open to question. You think that more parks for the labouring classes where they get recreation would be a great improvement in Montreal?—Yes, if they had time to go there.

25057. You advocate shortening the hours of labour?—Yes.

25058. Do you think it is desirable that places should be provided to which habitual drunkards should be sent to be treated with a view to their cure?—I believe there should be some kind of an asylum where they should be put and made to work and kept away from liquor.

25059. With a view to their reformation?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25060. Would you like, Mr. Darlington, to make a statement as to what Chief Master Workman Powderley's views are on this question. Have you got them authentically?—I have nothing more than that I was in his company for a couple of days when he was here, and I heard him speak publicly. He dined with the Mayor, and I had a practical illustration whether he drank anything. He is totally against the use of intoxicating liquor in every respect. He is a prohibitionist in all forms.

25061. You know that his chief interest is in the welfare of mechanics and workmen?—Yes.

25062. Do you think that his advocacy of prohibition is because he believes that the delegalization of the liquor traffic would be a great benefit, financially, morally and physically to the workingmen?—Mr. Powderley's views on that question are these: He

thinks that if men would not drink, they would have more time for talk, and they would in a short time elevate themselves to such a point that they would not need to drink.

*By the Chairman :*

25063. Has he expressed any views to you, Mr. Darlington?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25064. Do you know whether he believes in the prohibition of the trade by a restrictive enactment?—It is a question in reference to that. If prohibition would prohibit, then he is in favour of it. I have no written statement from Mr. Powderley on the subject, but he expressed his opinion in Montreal.

25065. Have you noticed whether mechanics and labouring men lose any portion of their time on account of their drinking habits, that is whether they drink regularly or in moderation?—Well, if you take it as a general thing, say you take a shop with 200 men in it, you might find three or four men in a fortnight who would lose two or three days on account of drink; but as an average I do not think you find among the mechanics that they lose as a rule one day in six months, that is taking them all through.

25066. Take one man who has the drink habit?—I have known one man in our shop, and I suppose that fellow as a rule lost two days a fortnight for the last six years.

25067. He drank to excess?—Yes.

25068. Take a man who does not drink so excessively as that: say he drinks in the morning and at noon and at night, and he keeps that up. Is that man likely to lose some time?—I know one man who takes his beer regularly, very regularly, and he hardly ever loses a day in the year.

*By the Chairman :*

25069. Is he a good workman?—Yes.

25070. Does his work well?—Yes, in fact he was promoted to be a foreman lately.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25071. Do you find men who have the drink habit regularly come by and by to be less good and reliable workmen?—Not unless they go to excess. I do not find the man who takes one or two glasses of beer a day depreciates in intelligence or anything else.

25072. Do you find that there is a deficiency in them. For instance, take 100 men who drink regularly, and who take beer or spirits two or three times a day: would any number of these one hundred men turn out to be excessive drinkers?—No. As a rule there are a number of what we call moderate drinkers who take a glass or two a day, and I do not know they go to excess.

25073. They never come to be excessive drinkers?—I do not say never come, but I do not know of them.

25074. Take the man that loses two days a month or four days a fortnight, or the men whom that man represents, were they men who always drank excessively, or did they commence in a small way?—I believe from the time they started, they started out excessively.

25075. Do you believe there is no gradual leading up to that excessive drinking?—I believe there is, but I have not observed it.

25076. But men, on account of excessive drinking, do lose time?—Yes.

25077. You think an excessive drinker would lose three or four days a month?—Yes.

25078. You have said, and I think there is a good deal of force in it, that poverty causes drinking and other wretchedness, and that low wages and long hours discourage men and they take to drink?—Yes.

25079. Now, do you believe that drink makes poverty and other distresses?—Sometimes.

25080. You referred to the Labour Day demonstration, when there were 10,000 men on the grounds, and when there was not a drunken man present. Did you prohibit the sale of drink on the ground altogether?—Yes.

WILLIAM DARLINGTON.

25081. Do you think that if liquor had been sold, it would have been difficult to prevent drunkenness?—I believe there is a class of men who would have come there, who did not come because they could not get drink.

25082. Amongst those 10,000 men who were present, if there had been the free sale of liquor, do you think some of them would have been induced to drink?—The probability is they would.

25083. Do you think there would be less drinking among all classes of people if there were fewer saloons around the city?—Yes, I believe there would.

25084. Your evidence concerning the effect of shorter hours and better wages is exceedingly interesting. You have said that instead of drinking more, the working people, with shorter hours and better wages, would drink less. Do you believe that drinking would be diminished amongst any class of them if there were no facilities for drinking or fewer facilities for drinking in the shape of saloons and bars of various kinds?—If they could not obtain liquor, of course they would have to drink less. There are men who really in their hearts desire to refrain from drink, but they have the appetite and not strength enough to resist, and when they come in contact with liquor, they are overcome. I believe there should be a far less number of saloons around the homes of the workingmen than there are; there are too many of them, especially along our wharfs and docks, where the workingmen congregate.

25085. Mr. Sandilands told the Commission something about the payment of workingmen in a room over a saloon?—I heard of that, but I cannot remember the man's name now. Some of our members had to go into that place, because the stevedore's brother-in-law kept the saloon.

*By the Chairman :*

25086. You remonstrated against it?—I may say that we have asked that a law be passed preventing the payment of men in saloons.

25087. The desire of your society in seeking that amendment of the law is to protect men against the inducements of the saloons?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25088. You have said that it is good to keep men away from saloons: do you believe that it would be good to keep the saloons out of the reach of the men?—I said so.

25089. I think you have said that the license law, as it exists, does not really regulate the trade at all?—It does not.

25090. Do you believe that the liquor trade, as it now exists, interferes with the welfare of the workingman?—I do.

25090*a*. Of course you believe that a change in the condition of the workmen by shorter hours and better pay, would strengthen them against the saloons. Do you think it would be also an advantage to remove the saloons, if public sentiment were in favour of it?—To a large extent; I do not think that one-fourth of them are necessary.

25091. You have expressed an opinion as between the restaurant and hotel: if you had to choose between either, would you abolish the restaurant?—I would abolish the saloon.

25091*a*. And leave the hotel?—Certainly.

25092. Do you think that the hotel bar is any better than the saloon bar?—It may not be, but they are not so numerous, and there is an advantage in the hotel.

25093. Hotel bars are not for the accommodation of guests, but for the accommodation of people who go to drink there?—Yes.

25094. And in that respect they are like the restaurant and saloons bars?—Very much the same.

25095. You have also said that it would be a good thing to restrain the excessive users of liquors, that is to put them in places where they would have to work and be relieved of the ill effects of their drinking habits. Do you think it would be equally well to restrain the sale and not have the necessity of restraining the users?—I do not think that a large majority of the people should be deprived of something if they want it because a few men make asses of themselves.

25096. Because a few make fools of themselves, you do not think it would be well to restrain a great many who do not make fools of themselves?—I do not think it would be just.

25097. Still you believe that the majority should rule?—Yes.

25098. If it should appear some time, say 10 or 20 or 50 years hence, that a very large majority of the people throughout the country should favour the delegalization of the drink trade, do you think it would be proper to enact prohibition then?—It would not be a matter of what I thought, the minority would have to bow to the majority.

25099. Is it right that the majority should rule?—There is a great deal of injustice often done to the minority by the rule of the majority, but it is the only way we have of running the institutions of the country.

25100. It would not be proper for the minority to rule the majority?—Certainly not.

25101. It would be proper for the majority to be considerate of the wishes of the minority?—Only just.

*By Judge McDonald:*

25102. In answer to Commissioner Clarke, you stated that if 55 per cent voted for prohibition and 45 per cent against it, it should and would become law and that people would have to submit to it. Now, take a law in regard to such a matter as this, to prohibit men from partaking of beverages, and 55 per cent voted for it and 45 per cent against it. While it would become law, do you think that it could be efficiently enforced?—No, because I do not think it would be just.

25103. Do you not think that a minority, if such a law were placed on the statute-book, would really rebel. I do not mean appeal to arms, but would rebel against it?—Yes, they would get the liquor somehow.

25104. Do you not think that it would be a greater evil to have a law on the statute-book constantly broken in that way, a greater evil in its effect on the community as an educator, than to have the present system? In other words, what is the effect upon the community of having a law upon the statute-book that is openly and flagrantly violated?—Probably a law like that would be like some of the laws in Canada at the present time, a disgrace to the country, a disgrace to the Legislature and a disgrace to the people. A law not properly carried out would be a disgrace to the people.

25105. I look upon you as a representative man, and I wish you to explain what you mean by the minority having to yield to the majority. Suppose a law were passed by the majority declaring that all the people of Canada should go to one particular denomination for worship, and 55 per cent voted for it and 45 per cent against it, do you believe that the 45 per cent would submit to it?—It would wipe out all freedom.

25106. Therefore, when you speak of a majority ruling, you mean to say that if the majority pass a measure, it must become law, but you would not consider it a good law?—I would not say it was just.

25107. In answer to a question by Dr. McLeod, as I understood it, you said that you considered that the license law was not at all enforced as it ought to be. Do you think that there should be some system of restraint on the liquor trade?—Yes. As far as restraint is concerned I look upon the liquor trade something like Mr. Robb does—it is either right or wrong to have liquor. If it is right to have liquor, a man should not be taxed for selling it; if it is wrong to have liquor, it should not be allowed to be used.

25108. Take the present state of Charlottetown, P.E.I., without license but subject to a police enactment as to the matter of sales. What do you think of that system?—I think that would be preferable, providing they had proper supervision over the manufacture of liquor. I think in the Island of Arran they have the same kind of law. They have a privilege by some old statute whereby they are allowed to manufacture whisky and sell it without license, and in fact they seldom or ever see a native of the island drunk; only strangers visiting the island drink too much whisky and get intoxicated. Pure liquor without any license, but with proper police supervision and proper provision against adulteration, is better than prohibition.

25109. You have spoken of the great evil of drunkenness indirectly, and I may state that when this Commission started out on its work it did so with the unanimous

WILLIAM DARLINGTON.

agreement that drunkenness is a great evil. We all consider that drunkenness is a great evil. You have told us that you know of but one man who is drunk as often as twice in a fortnight and regularly so?—In the establishment where I am working I only know one man who makes a practice of losing one day or two days time in the fortnight. At the present time the staff has been largely increased, and I cannot speak for the new men.

25110. How many are there employed now?—Four hundred.

25111. How many were there previously?—Two hundred.

25112. You said there might be other men who would lose perhaps a day or two in a year?—Yes.

25113. I ask you whether you would consider it right to restrain 198 other men from using liquor because two men would abuse it, or would you take those two men who abuse it and take care of them?—I do not think that either of the men that I refer to, and particularly one of them, should be restrained. One of the men, as I said, takes his beer regularly; but he was promoted to be foreman recently, so that it shows that his intellect is not impaired. I do not believe it would be right to restrain the 198 for the sake of the two.

25114. If it became necessary, you would restrain these two men?—Yes, and let them work where they could not get liquor, and let them work for their living there.

25115. In other words, I understood you to say that you would restrain the excessive users of liquor?—Yes, the men who abuse liquor.

25116. I understand that your order—and I mean the whole of the mechanical class of the community—are doing all that you can to promote temperance and get rid of drunkenness among your fellowmen?—We certainly discourage drunkenness in every form.

25117. Having that object in view, and being anxious to promote temperance and diminish drunkenness, do you think that prohibition would aid in that result?—We have not even taken the matter into consideration.

25118. Why not?—Prohibition is a question which we think will solve itself. As I have already explained, it can be done by reducing the hours of labour and alleviating the condition of the working classes, so that they will not require drink.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25119. From your experience as a workingman, do workingmen who are total abstainers lose less time than men who take a glass of liquor occasionally?—I do not think they do.

25120. Are they better workmen as a rule?—Not as a rule.

25121. You said that you agreed in some measure with the City Treasurer, that the question should be asked: Is it right or wrong to have liquor, and if it was right, that it should be sold as are other commodities?—That is what I said.

25122. What do you believe? Is it right or wrong to take liquor in moderation: Is there any sin about drinking in moderation?—Under present circumstances, I believe that liquor is a necessity. A man working sometimes nine, or ten or eleven hours in front of a furnace or fire, and who has got to be at work the next day is unnerved, and unless he takes some stimulant, oftentimes he will suffer from insomnia. If you are constantly taking oatmeal and water or plain water, it acts upon the inside in such a way that you want some stimulant to counteract the effect of it.

25123. I wish to ask you regarding the saloon and hotel bar business. The doctrine has been preached that the hotel bar is more injurious than the saloon bar, and the reasons advanced are these: That young men frequent hotel bars ostensibly for the purpose of seeing guests or travellers in the hotel, but really to get into the bar to drink, and consequently there is more danger to the young men from the hotel than the saloon bar. Do workmen frequent hotel or saloon bars?—As a rule, workmen frequent saloons, ten to one more than hotels.

25124. And consequently the reduction in the number of saloons would accomplish greater good than in the number of hotels?—Yes. If a man had to travel far to get a drink, he would not go unless it was absolutely necessary to do so.

25125. Is it to your knowledge that the licensed vendors assist the unlicensed vendors?—That is not to my knowledge.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25126. Do you know whether the company for which you work declines to employ men who are excessive drinkers?—I have pointed out that as a rule those men who are excessive drunkards are weeded out and are the first men to be discharged; that is when they are habitual drunkards. One of the men to whom I have alluded as being a regular drinker, is a very good workman and very attentive every day. He works night and day overtime; any time he is asked to work he works and works well. I suppose that is the reason he is retained. As a rule, I do not think I have ever come across a more sober lot of men than the men I work with.

25127. The company does weed out excessive drinkers?—The company will not have them.

25128. Do you know if they have had to get rid of some men?—At a time like now, when they are very busy, they have to take in all classes of men. I suppose that the man who drinks heavily will be the first to go when the work gets slack.

25129. Could you say what ratio of men has been discharged for drunkenness during your experience of 7 years?—I could not say.

25130. Do they decline to engage such men?—They have no occasion to employ excessive drinkers, because they can get men who are more reliable and more regular.

25131. Men who are steady in their habits?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25132. If a man was a total abstainer, and poor workman, would he be engaged in preference to a man who was a moderate drinker and a good workman?—They would engage the man who was a moderate drinker and a good workman.

25133. Do you know of any establishment in this country, or in the old country, where men who are unreliable because of drinking habits or lack of knowledge in their trade are retained if better men can be secured?—No.

25134. Do you know of any place where men are taken in and given steady employment who are irregular in their habits from drink, or are incompetent men?—I have seen men who were kept on.

25135. Do you know of any industrial establishments, where men who are irregular are kept at work, when other men who are regular can be secured?—These men are always weeded out. I believe there have been men who have been abstainers, or nearly so, and who scarcely touch liquor, who have been more irregular in their habits than the men who are moderate drinkers.

25136. How is that?—I do not know, perhaps from laziness. They would be late four or five times a week.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25137. Take two men, and one is just as good a workman as the other, but one does not drink, and the other is an excessive drinker, to which man would the ordinary employer give a preference?—The man who does not drink.

25138. That is not because of the employer's interest in the moral welfare of the man, it is just business?—Sometimes the employers interest themselves in the men.

25139. The employer looks at the value of an employee to him?—Yes. There was one thing touched upon yesterday which I think some people are under a misapprehension about, and that is the amount of good done by the clergy in Montreal.

25140. Do you think there is not much done?—Very little.

*By the Chairman :*

25141. You mean in the way of advancing temperance?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25142. There seems to be a general belief that a very great deal of good is done by the clergy in this respect?—It is more assumed than real, from my personal knowledge. There are several men who work where I do at the present time, and

some who work at other places, who have been led by these gentlemen who preach temperance to join temperance societies. Some join for six months, and some for two years, but the general result is that some only keep the pledge for a week, and some for a month. Of course it was nothing to their credit to give their word and break it. I have seen on one or two occasions men who were moderate drinkers join the temperance organization, and after keeping it up for a month, they get upon such a "bust" that they lose their job. Another thing is, that at the present time, there has been a large number joining these institutions; but the working classes have not the same confidence in the clergy now as they have had heretofore. Of course, workingmen to-day are beginning to read and understand for themselves, and they know that the clergy is simply a profession, the same as a lawyer or a doctor, to make money out of; the workmen know that the clergy preach religion instead of Christianity, and they have lost confidence in them and treat them as hypocrites.

25143. Is that the general belief of the workingmen's societies about the church?—So far as the society is concerned, I do not know, but the workingmen feel that the church is a religious institution without Christianity, and that the clergy is simply a profession, got up for the purpose of making money in some instances, and in the others; for preaching in the interest of capital against labour. I wrote, what the *Witness* called a lay sermon, to Archbishop Fabre and some other clergymen, and the Rev. Mr. Kerr shortly afterward acknowledged to me that Christianity had been diverted from its true path, and that it was being used in the interests of capital against labour. The working classes understanding these things, and being reading people, they are able to find out that there is very little Christianity in the churches and in the clergy, and they have no further confidence in them. They find out in reality that the Knights of Labour preach more Christianity than the churches.

*By the Chairman :*

25144. I think you have said you are not a total abstainer?—No, I am not.

25145. Do you go to church?—Sometimes.

25146. What church do you usually attend?—My children usually go to Mr. Kerr's church.

25147. And you, yourself?—Very seldom; probably on an average twice a year.

25148. Are you a member of any church?—No.

25149. Not a communicant?—No.

25150. Some questions were put to you about the employment of men who are given to intemperance. Do you know of any large establishment in the city where they refuse to employ men who are not total abstainers?—No.

25151. I made a note here of your remarks in reference to your own employment, where you are subject to a great deal of heat especially in the hot weather. Do your employers supply you with any sort of drink, do they supply you with a mixture of oatmeal and water?—No.

25152. I know that oatmeal and water is supplied in blacksmiths' shops and places where there is great heat: do you think that is a wholesome drink?—Yes.

25153. Do you think that ice water for a man who is overheated is a dangerous beverage?—I do.

25154. And calculated to produce sickness?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25155. Have you lived in England?—Yes.

25156. Have you been in the east end of London?—Yes, but only for a few days.

25157. How long ago?—Ten years ago.

25158. Do you know that in the east end of London the clergy have gone right down among the people and lived and laboured among them, doing their utmost to raise them from their state of misery and degradation, to bring them to happiness and comfort?—I believe there are some instances of that. One instance I could recite: About five years ago, a gentleman in Liverpool was at a meeting, called for relieving distress, and in speaking he said that the working classes were drunken. The Dean of Liverpool said: If we placed you in a backyard, in a two or three story tenement, with



five or six children and give you 18 shillings a week with miserable surroundings, you would probably drink also.

25159. How long have you lived in the city of Montreal?—Ten years.

25160. Do you not know that in the city of Montreal there are clergymen who have done the same thing,—gone down among the sick and the poor and the degraded and done their utmost to elevate them and lead them in the right path, using kind words and the influences of religion?—I believe there are some kind men among the clergy. I believe there are some Christians among them.

25161. I ask you whether you do not know, within your experience of Montreal, of clergy who have done this?—I am not acquainted with many of them, outside of Mr. Kerr, who I believe is a very kind gentleman, so far as that goes. I do not know of any of them who have made any great sacrifices, and I do not know of any great sacrifices that Mr. Kerr has made.

25162. Will you assert that the clergy of this city confine their visiting to the rich and prosperous and neglect the poor and indigent?—I do not presume they do.

25163. Do you know yourself, in your experience of this city, of the clergy going among the poor, and not only with kind words, but with temporal comforts, trying to improve their position?—I have known some cases of that being done and the people being charged for it afterwards.

25164. Do you know of any case where the people were not charged?—No.

25165. You know of no case in this city where the clergy have relieved the poor and needy and not charged them for it afterwards?—I know of no case where they have gone without fee or reward.

25166. Give us an instance of how they were paid for it afterwards?—It is among the Catholic clergy, and it would not be right to speak of it. I could give you the names of people among whom the clergy have gone, but where they charged church dues afterwards.

25167. That is altogether another thing. Your statement was in effect that clergymen have relieved the temporal necessities of the poor and then charged them for this relief. That has nothing to do with church dues?—That was not the way the question was put.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

25168. You did not mean that?—I would not insinuate that the clergymen would relieve distress and charge for it.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

25169. Do you think that the mass of the people are better for abstaining from attendance at church and following the sermons given from the various pulpits? Do you think the masses are elevated by abstaining from attending church?—I do not think they would be any worse by staying away. I believe that the majority of people are no better for going to church. The clergy, as a rule, are the friends of the capitalists and are wholly against the workingmen, perhaps not wholly against them, but they are more the friends of the capitalists than of the working classes.

25170. Do the priests of St. Ann's Church distribute relief to the poor and needy in that locality?—I would like to ask where they get it from? The credit is due to those who subscribe the money.

25171. Do you know any of the clergy of this city who are growing wealthy?—Well, probably they are not of the saving class; but if I had half the salary that some of them have, I would grow wealthy in a short time.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

25172. Do you believe that the clergy of Montreal, as a rule, are in favour of the drink traffic?—I do not think they are.

25173. Do you think that their opposition to the drink traffic is to the detriment of workingmen?—No.

25174. Do you think that their opposition to the drink traffic is in the interests of capitalists?—No.

WILLIAM DARLINGTON.

25175. How do you account for their opposition to the drink traffic?—Probably they want the poor people to save more money so as to be able to give more to the church.

25176. Yet you say they do not save the money they get?—I did not say what they do with it, nor do I know what they do with it, nor do I know whether they grow wealthy or not; I know that now and then a Bishop dies, and he leaves a few thousands to his friends.

25177. You say that, if you got the same salary as the clergy, you would grow wealthy?—I would not assume to have such a salary, if I were a clergyman.

*By the Chairman:*

25178. May I ask if the article you referred to was published in a newspaper?—It was published in the *Witness*, and, if you do not mind, I will send you a copy.

RAPHAEL BELLEMARE, Inspector, Inland Revenue for district of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

25179. What is your present office?—Inspector of Revenue for the district of Montreal.

25180. How long have you held that office?—Since it was erected, in 1887.

25181. Please explain briefly to the Commissioners your duties?—The nature of my duties is to inspect the offices of Inland Revenue. There are eight revenue divisions in my district: St. Johns, Montreal, Three Rivers, Sorel, Terrebonne, St. Hyacinthe, Sherbrooke and Valleyfield.

25182. How often do you visit these different places?—About four times a year.

25183. With what object?—The object of checking all the books and all the transactions during the three months, and to see that all the money has been remitted and that the goods remaining in bond are there.

25184. Have you anything to do with looking after the illicit manufacture of spirits?—There is no distillation at all in my district.

25185. Is there any illicit distillation?—We have revenue detectives looking after that.

25186. Have you any special detectives in Montreal?—We have one very frequently here from the Department.

25187. Do you consider it any part of your duty to prevent the illicit distillation of spirits?—It is part of the duty of all our officers.

25188. Have you detected any illicit distillation within the last two years?—Not myself, but some of our officers have detected four or five during the last two years.

25189. What was the character of the manufacture being carried on in places where it was detected?—Generally out of molasses. One year we found about 30, but that is a long time ago. I think in the year 1868 we seized 30 illicit stills.

25190. Were they in the city or country districts?—Mostly in the city, they were making whisky.

25191. Have you any reason to believe that the illicit manufacture of liquors is carried on to any considerable extent?—I do not believe it is carried on extensively. I believe they attempt to do it in some places yet, but I do not believe they can make any money.

25192. Is it your duty to inspect liquors which are manufactured in the district?—We have officers attending to that, and they act under the instructions of the Collector.

25193. Your duty is rather to see that the Collectors are performing their duties?—Yes.

25194. Have you anything to do with the obtaining of samples of liquors and sending them to the Public Analyst?—There is a special officer, Mr. Costigan, for that work.

25195. Have you any special knowledge as to how that work is performed?—I believe the analyses are reliable. I do not know much about them.

25196. We were told in evidence that there were only 12 samples of liquor taken from the city of Montreal, and in fact in the whole district, in the last couple of years, and that a period of a year has elapsed since any samples were taken for analysis. Do you consider that inspection sufficient?—I do not believe that is enough. I thought it was done oftener.

25197. Apart from your official capacity and as a citizen of Montreal, do you not think there should be a more efficient, or rather a more frequent analysis of liquor sold for consumption?—Yes; but I do not believe that deleterious liquors are sold in great quantities.

25198–99. You have been a long time in Montreal and must know something of public sentiment with regard to the liquor traffic. You have heard the statement made with reference to the number of unlicensed liquor places in Montreal. Do you think that there are 2,000 or 4,000 such places?—I believe that perhaps there are a thousand, there are at all events hundreds, because prosecutions are taken out every week and almost every day against parties for selling liquor without license.

25200. The Collector of Inland Revenue for the Province of Quebec gave evidence to the effect that there were from 2,000 to 4,000 and probably more than 4,000 such places in Montreal. Do you think there are so many?—I hardly believe it.

25201. Is there an officer whose duty it is specially to look after these places, apart from Mr. Lambe, who is Collector of Inland Revenue?—There is "Mr. Chevallier, Chief of the Revenue Police, who has five or six men under him, and their duty is mainly to look after infringements of the revenue law.

25202. From your observation, do you think that there is more drunkenness in the community than there was ten years ago?—I do not believe it. I was informed lately that it was less, and my impression is that drunkenness is decreasing.

25203. Do you think that the existing liquor laws are fairly well enforced in this city?—I believe all the exertions that can be made to enforce them are made, but it is not easy to enforce them.

25204. If there are from 2,000 to 4,000 unlicensed places, that would be pretty strong evidence that the laws are not well enforced?—I am not quite sure about that.

25205. You think that there are not so many?—I do not believe there are so many.

25206. There are a class of licensed traders in liquors called compounders. Can you tell the Commission anything as to what their connection with the trade is?—They receive licenses as compounders from the Inland Revenue Department, and they compound different liquors. We have no officers attending these places. The names of the compounders are put on the casks.

25207. What is the license fee?—It was \$50, but it was raised, and I think it is \$150 now.

25208. How many are there in Montreal?—I think there are three.

25209. Is it any part of your duty to look after them?—We have no regulations concerning them; we have only to look after the products they are sending out in the country.

25210. Is there any officer appointed by the Dominion Government to look after those establishments?—Every officer is by law authorized to visit them, but there is no special officer.

25211. What would be the object of visiting those places?—To see what liquors they make. They make a preparation of whisky with the spirits manufactured here.

25212. The materials that the compounders use must come from the manufacturers or be imported?—Yes.

25213. Therefore, it may be fairly concluded that they have to pay the imposed duties?—They have.

25214. What, then, is the object of the Government looking after them?—The principal object is that the liquors may not be adulterated so as to be injurious to health.

25215. What check has the Government got that they do not use something in making their compounds which has not paid duty?—Analysis is the only check.

RAPHAEL BELLEMARE.

25216. One of those establishments in the city might use something else than alcohol in making their compounds. Does the Government claim or exercise the right to have samples analysed?—I think so.

25217. Would it be a loss to the revenue if they were using articles that were really not recognized as spirits, and making a decoction out of them and selling it as whisky, brandy, or gin? Would that be a fraud upon the revenue?—Not if a duty is paid on these articles.

25218. Suppose they were making some compound (not brandy), and selling it as brandy?—Of course it would diminish the revenue. Last year an illicit still was found in connection with one who was mixing liquors as a licensed compounder: he was making whisky in one apartment, and had his compounding-room in another. He was, of course, defrauding the revenue.

25219. Are there any special means taken to watch the operations of these compounders?—Regulations are to be made, but have not been made yet.

25220. What is everybody's duty is nobody's duty, and if it is the duty of all the officers of the Government, perhaps no one may consider it his special duty to look after them?—There is an inducement to officers to do so, as they have a share of the fine if they can detect a fraud. We have officers who are disposed to avail themselves of that advantage.

25221. Do the Government in any way take into account what these compounders turn out?—They make no returns. They only pay their license fees.

25222. Do you recollect what kinds of compounds are used by the illicit compounders?—I cannot recollect.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 19th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met here this day, JUDGE McDONALD, presiding.

*Present :*

MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.

MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

JAMES JOHN COSTIGAN, of Montreal, recalled :

WITNESS—In my evidence on Friday last, I stated that there were no samples collected within the present year. I should have stated that there were sixteen samples of liquor collected in March last.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25223. Collected where?—In Montreal and district.

25224. Have they been analysed?—Yes.

25225. Has a report been published of the analyses?—Yes.

25226. May we get a copy of it?—Yes. They were merely the regular distillery samples ; bottles put up by the distillers themselves with capsules.

25227. These are not the kind of samples we would like to have analysed. Did you take any steps to secure samples of liquor sold in compounderies and low grogeries?—This was a special list, and I think Dr. Edwards made the analyses.

25228. Do you think it was a proper place to look for bad liquor in these unbroken packages?—No. This was for a special object of the Department, I believe.

25229. As a matter of fact, there has been no analysis of liquor sold in saloons and such places since the analyses made a year ago?—No, but as Dr. Baker Edwards stated, samples have been taken. I make this statement so as to have my evidence coincide with his.

JOHN MEAGHER, of Meagher Brothers, wine merchants and compounders, Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

25230. How long has your firm been doing business?—We have been wholesale wine merchants since 1882, and we have been obliged to take out a compounder's license during the last few years.

25231. From what authority?—From the Federal Government.

25232. That license is issued under a Statute and gives you authority to compound liquors?—It does.

25233. Does it prescribe at all the ingredients that should be used?—Not that I am aware of.

25234. Does it limit you as to the kind of liquors that should be compounded?—Not that I am aware of.

25235. Will you kindly state what is done under it?—We make ginger wine, fruit syrups and so on. Those making ginger wine in Europe are called mixers, but they are called compounders here, which seems to be rather an offensive term to some people. However, I may state that we are quite prepared to drink anything we make in our establishment. We only sell to the wholesale trade and what we call jobbers, and we do not

JOHN JAMES COSTIGAN.

sell to saloons or stores. We know nothing at all about the vitriols and those kinds of poisons that were spoken about here as being put into liquor ; of course, we do not know what others do, but I believe this talk of adulteration is very much exaggerated.

25236. The materials that are used by you are harmless?—They are to the extent to which they are used. For instance, they put in ice creams, the same compound we use for flavouring ; it is used in such a small quantity that it does not hurt any one. Of course if a person drank a gallon, I do not know if it would hurt them or not, but I do not think it would. It is said to be a fruit essence. I refer to raspberry essence.

25237. Do you make gin?—We make Tom gin ; just the same as they do in England. My brother was over there and studied the manufacture. We make it to the best of our knowledge and belief the same as do they in England, and we are willing to let you have a sample such as we sell to the wholesale houses to show that it is just as pure.

25238. It is in evidence that a certain quantity of high wines or alcohol is taken as a basis and diluted with water, a small quantity of gin added to that to give it a flavour, and then “bead oil” added to that?—We do not use it at all.

25239. It is stated that its effect is to cause a bead to come to the top so as to make the liquor appear stronger than it is?—We do not use it at all. If a wholesale man asks us the strength, we tell him. They generally do ask the strength, and know that they are getting value.

25240. Setting aside “bead oil,” would gin be compounded in that way in your premises?—Yes, gin is compounded in that way. It is very often mixed with Canadian spirits.

25241. Could the pure gin be obtained from Holland?—Certainly, we are agents for Holland gin ; we bring it out for the people who get it in bond.

25242. What is the object of the compound?—It reduces the price and weakens the strength. It is to supply a demand that has been since I have ever heard anything about the wine and spirit trade. We do not do any compounding on goods we import ; but if there is a demand for cheap gin, we sell it.

25243. The compounded gin is cheaper than the Holland gin?—Yes.

25244. And it is known by the name of Tom gin?—Yes, Tom gin is known by the name of Tom gin.

25245. Do you know anything as to how it is with the ordinary consumer who asks for Tom gin or Holland gin?—Holland gin and Tom gin are quite different things. The Tom gin is sweetened. For instance, in compounding you take the best whisky you can buy in Canada and the best imported whisky, worth three times as much a gallon, and mix one with the other. That would be compounding according to the law as we understand it. If you put water in anything it would be compounding.

25246. Then you are not able to say as to what is done by the retailers?—I have no experience at all with them. We do not do any business with them, but I believe, after all that has been said, the enthusiasm of some people carries them away to say too much in reference to this matter. I do not believe there is as much adulteration as people imagine. I have never seen anything of this vitriol, and have never heard of it, except from one man who came to our office once and represented that he was from the Government. He said he knew we did our business correctly, but others did not, and that there were some who used oil of vitriol. We never heard of it.

25247. Would that adulteration, such as you have heard of, be completely foreign to the business of a licensed compounder?—It ought to be.

25248. And if guilty of it, he would be guilty of fraud?—I think so. Putting in tobacco or anything of that kind would, I think, be a criminal offence.

25249. How long have you resided in Montreal?—Since 1871.

25250. Have you been an observer of current events among the people?—Generally speaking, I have.

25251. What is your opinion of the character of the people on the whole as to sobriety?—I think our people are very good, and compare favourably with any people in the world. Take the wholesale trade in Montreal : I do not believe that two per cent of the wholesale trade in Canada are drinkers or ever get drunk. You have such men in it as Hudon, Chaput Frères, Lewis, Alderman Farrel and others. They are testing liquors all their lives, but none of them go to excess. Two or three of my brothers in the business do not drink at all, and I hardly ever drink myself.

25252. Do you think there is an increase of sobriety in Montreal during the last few years?—I think there is, in fact I know it, for in many branches of the trade business has decreased.

25253. What do you think of the views that have been put forward with reference to gradually diminishing the sale of the heavier liquors and encouraging light wines and ales as popular drinks?—That is a pretty extensive question, and I do not think I am competent to deal with it. I think that people who will not be restrained by the ordinary laws of religion will not be restrained by any laws that man can make. If they want these strong liquors, they will manage to get them.

25254. Do you think such a plan would change the tastes of the people?—I do not think so. I think there are numbers of people who would never become accustomed to drinking claret.

25255. Do you think nationality would have anything to do with it?—It might. I think Scotchmen and Irishmen would want perhaps more ardent spirits.

25256. And I suppose climate would have some effect too?—Yes.

25257. Do you know anything about the parks in this city?—I was only in Sohmer Park twice, and there did not seem to be any drunkenness. The people appeared to be drinking Weiss beer.

25258. Have you any suggestion that you can make to the Commission in regard to the liquor trade?—I have not, except that if samples could be found with oil of vitriol and other such things in them, the parties should be punished. The people who believe that these articles are put in liquor should make it their duty to help the Revenue Department to convict the guilty parties.

25259. Do you think it would be in the interest of the public and of the trade, if samples were frequently collected and sent for analysis?—It would be in the interest of the public and of the legitimate trade.

25260. According to the official evidence, it is stated that a very large number of persons are engaged in the illicit trade?—I have no way of determining that at all.

25261. Do you think it would be well if samples could be obtained from these people, to have them analysed?—I think so, but it would be a very difficult matter for the Department. Everything should be done to make people conduct their business properly.

25262. Have you ever considered the question as to whether there are too many establishments in Montreal selling by retail?—The opinions vary so much upon the subject that I have never given the question any particular thought.

25263. It has been stated here, that there are something over 1,000 licensed places in the city at the present time?—I am not in a position to give any opinion of value upon that question.

25264. Have you any opinion as to the separation of the sale of liquor from the sale of groceries?—The Government ought to be able to know how that works. Men like Dufresne & Mongenais, and Fraser & Viger are very respectable grocers and would not do anything contrary to law. I was in Kingston about three weeks ago at the establishment of a Mr. McCormack, a leading wine merchant there. A young woman came in and asked for a bottle of something, and he would not sell it to her, because he did not think she was of age. She said she was; but he replied: You may be, but I would like to be more satisfied on the subject before I sell to you.

25265. The sales of groceries and liquors are separate in Kingston?—Yes. I have only dealt with Mr. David Crawford and Fraser & Viger and Dufresne & Mongenais since I have been housekeeping, and I am quite sure they do not do anything against the law.

25266. These are grocers of the highest respectability?—They are. Of course I cannot say what is done in other places.

25267. Taking the system of saloons and hotels, and supposing a law were passed to abolish either, which, in your opinion, would it be better to do away with in the interest of the community, the hotel bar or the saloon?—I fancy there would be more need of the hotels, where people can get food as well as drink.

25268. Do you know anything of the importation of adulterated liquors?—I do not, but I know that they bring in very cheap liquors from France. I think I saw a quotation once of about \$1.40 a case in bond, or about seven francs for a dozen bottles.

JOHN MEAGHER.

25269. Would that be brandy?—Yes.

25270. Taking out the cost of bottling, labelling and so on and freight, could you form any idea of how much that would be a gallon?—I think the stuff would cost about 75 or 80 cents a gallon.

25271. It could not be pure liquor at that price?—It might be pure spirit. In Germany you can buy pure spirit 50 O.P. for 30 cents a gallon. This stuff in the case would be 30 or 40 underproof, so that you could figure up what that would be.

25272. What is this spirit made from, do you know?—They tell me it is made from potatoes and such things, I do not know positively.

25273. What is the character of the liquor made from potatoes?—I cannot say. I do not know that I ever drank any of it. I do not know that it would be at all poisonous. It would be a spirit something similar to the corn spirit, I fancy.

25274. Would that go through rectification?—I do not know; we do not rectify.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25275. Do you know anything about the operation of the Scott Act in districts where it has been in force?—No. We have never done any business in Scott Act counties when the Act was in force. There is only about a quarter of our business that comes under the compounding of liquors; we are agents for such firms as Graham's wines, Ivison's sheries. We take orders from the trade and never see the goods half the time, as they go through in bond to the purchasers.

25276. Would you have any means of knowing if adulterations of liquors take place in these shebeens?—I have not, any more than you might have.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25277. What is this "bead oil"?—I do not know what it is; we do not use it.

25278. Does your business enlarge from year to year?—I do not think it has enlarged for the last ten years. It is my opinion that the trade has been generally getting worse. Our business enlarged because it was a young business, but it would be no increase of the trade because we got new agencies. I think generally speaking the consumption of liquor is falling off.

25279. You think it is true of the liquor trade at large, that the business is diminishing?—Yes, in fact I know it is.

25280. I suppose that you would consider there is a relation between that fact and the fact that drunkenness is diminishing?—Yes.

25281. Is there anything in the law that limits compounders as to what they should use in compounding?—I have paid no particular attention to the reading of the law, and I cannot say whether there is or not. I think it is to be taken for granted that they would not use anything injurious to public health.

25282. Is there anything in the law which requires you to make a statement of the materials that enter into the compounds?—Not that I am aware of.

25283. The mixing of the Canadian spirits with Holland gin is simply a cheapening process?—That is all. I am sure it does not make it any more injurious to health, because our Canadian spirits are just as good as the gin spirits, and gin I believe is made from spirits flavoured with juniper.

25284. Are compounded liquors sold as imported liquors?—Not by our firm. We always tell purchasers the liquor is compounded, and in fact we have to put in on the label.

25285. Your parcels show that it is compounded liquor?—Yes; we always state on the label that it is manufactured and compounded by us.

25286. I have heard it stated that at least one compounder in Montreal was found to have an illicit still in connection with his business?—I saw it stated.

25287. And that bottles with a quantity of sulphuric acid were found in the establishment, which was used for bringing up the strength of the alcohol. Do you know anything about that?—I do not know anything about it. Our liquors are made just as pure as any liquor in the world. We sell the best ginger wine imported; but we also sell our own ginger wine, which is just as pure, and we state on the labels that it is our compound. We think we make it in exactly the same way. The man who makes it in England is a very wealthy man, and he has made millions out of it. He spent half a million dollars on his billiard room, and he made it all out of ginger wine.



25288. Do you think that excessive drinking in Montreal is decreasing?—I do.

25289. Do you think evils in any degree result from the drink trade?—I think there are a great many abuses of drink.

25290. Do you see any relation between the wholesale trade and the retail trade?—In what way?

25291. In the evils which result from the trade?—I do not think there is any wrong in the business itself; and if I did, I would not be in it. I think people abuse liquor the same as they abuse any other gift of the Almighty. Many people do all sorts of things which are wrong, but I do not think the people who do right should be held to be blameworthy.

25292. You have said that the wholesale traders are not excessive drinkers?—They are not. They are most exemplary men.

25293. To what do you attribute that?—To their wisdom.

25294. Is it to their knowledge of the inevitable effects of the articles in which they deal?—They keep right on that question on account of the same principles of good which keep them right in every other dealing in life. There are good men and bad men in the world, and I think that a man who would not be good on account of higher motives, would be pretty difficult to reform by any local restrictions you might put upon him.

25295. There is evidently a large class of people who are not good because they are not actuated by that higher motive. Do you think it is well to establish a trade that provides facilities for the indulgence of these men's baser appetites?—I cannot answer your question the way it is put. I can answer you, that I believe when our Lord made wine, he intended people to use it, but he did not intend them to abuse it. He knew the consequences.

25296. Do you believe our Lord is responsible?—No, not at all; I think man is a free agent.

25297. Speaking about ginger wine: is that made from spirits at all?—There is nothing more harmful in it than there would be in a cup of tea, so far as I know.

25298. There is a strong tendency to excess in a large proportion of the people?—There seems to be.

25299. You do not care to answer the question whether you believe, looking at the matter in a broad way, it is a proper thing to establish a trade which provides facilities whereby men may easily indulge their appetites?—You might ask the same question about a man who makes guns and razors, because some people cut their throats. Such a man would be equally responsible for making the razor because somebody cut his throat with it.

25300. What I want to get at is, whether you believe the drink trade as established, is good?—I think it is a perfectly proper and legitimate trade.

25301. It is legitimate because the law authorizes it?—If I thought it were bad, I would not be in it.

25302. I want to know whether you think there is a better way of regulating the trade. We are a Commission to examine into the effects of the liquor trade, and I want to get at the facts?—I quite understand that your motive is a good one, and I do not mean to resort to any subterfuges in the least. I have spoken to a man who is a temperance lecturer, a minister of the church and an exemplary man, in one way. He told me once when the Scott Act was in force in a town in Ontario, that he found more harm from it than when they had license, and he had quite changed his mind on the subject.

25303. Speaking about the license system: do you believe it regulates the trade?—I think to a great extent it does, but it might possibly be carried out more effectually.

25304. You cannot think of any other system that would better control the trade than the licensing system?—I do not know of any, from the experience we have had. When they put the Scott Act in force in Ontario, it was the result of public opinion; but public opinion has changed entirely on that matter.

25305. Do you think the license system itself regulates the trade?—It does to a great extent. I think a great majority of the men who hold licenses want to do what is right, but there are some who abuse the privilege shamefully.

JOHN MEAGHER.

25306. We have it in evidence that a considerable number of those who hold licenses violate the prohibitory provisions of the license law?—There should be some means to restrain them from doing that ; they should not do it.

25307. A law that permits such a thing as that can scarcely be called a regulation of the trade?—Not a perfect regulation.

25308. Comparatively, you think it regulates?—Yes.

25309. Why is it that the liquor trade needs to be subjected to all these restrictions and prohibitions?—Because people abuse liquor.

25310. Is there any other trade that has to be subjected to the same restrictions?—I think there are much worse evils than the liquor trade, which are not restricted.

25311. Is there any branch of business in the country which is subjected to the same restrictions as the liquor trade?—Not that I am aware of.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25312. Do you not think that the inspection of liquors from unlicensed places would have a good effect?—It would ; but it would be just as difficult to get liquors from them as to detect them selling liquors.

25313. Can you explain how it is that these places cannot be suppressed?—I suppose there are so many of them to watch that it is found a difficult thing to get men for that purpose. I think the intentions of the officers and the Government are all right, but it is a very difficult undertaking to catch so many people.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25314. Is the present system of inspection efficient to protect the public against adulteration?—I can hardly say whether it is or is not, but I should think there ought to be more inspection.

25315. Do Inspectors go to the right places to look for adulterated liquor?—That I do not know. I suppose they go where they are told to go by their superiors.

25316. They go to the leading business men?—If they only go to distillers or to the best people, that would not be a criterion.

25317. Is the demand for ginger wine and syrups increasing or decreasing as the demand for stronger liquors decreases?—I think it is rather decreasing.

25318. To what do you attribute that?—To the temperance sentiment of the people that has been worked upon by religious men ; they are having a very good effect.

25319. Have you resided for any length of time in a place where a prohibitory law was in force?—I resided in Worcester, Mass. I was in the railway contracting business then, and I know that you could get anything to drink at almost any time. One of the men in the business used to drink a good deal, and he could get it any time he wanted it.

25320. Was there a prohibitory law in force?—There was supposed to be. Liquor was sold, and the only difficulty was that a person had to go through several doors and through a billiard room to reach where it was.

25321. Your experience of the operation of a prohibitory law is confined to that?—Yes, and I was only there for a short time.

JOSEPH LOUIS VINCENT, Collector of Inland Revenue, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

25322. How long have you held your position?—Since 1879.

25323. You are appointed by the Dominion Government?—Yes.

25324. Have you any colleague in the office?—I have some deputies.

25325. What is your district?—The Inland Revenue district of Montreal. The duties of my office are to receive the duties on the spirits and tobacco manufactured in Canada. The goods are in bond, and there is an officer at each factory to survey the manufacture of the goods placed in bond, and the duty paid on them as they are required to be taken out. Nearly all our spirits come from Ontario, excepting of course, those which are imported.

25326. Have you any statement showing what amount has passed through your hands last year or for a period of years?—Yes. I submit to the Commission a table taken from the official records. (Appendix 1.)

25327. What kind of spirits are mostly referred to in that table?—Mostly whisky received from Ontario, from Gooderham & Worts, Walker, Wisser, Corby and Seagram.

25328. The agents of these people pay the duties, and get the liquor out of bond as it is needed?—They sell to wholesale merchants here, and the merchants take it as they want it.

25329. Where do you live?—In Longueuil.

25330. Do you see much of Montreal in its social aspect?—Not a great deal; I am all my business time in my office and my spare time is spent at home.

25331. Is there a license law in Longueuil?—Yes.

25332. What are the habits of the people there?—They are a sober class of people, but of course some drink to excess. There are licensed taverns and hotels.

25333. Supposing that a law were to be passed to do away with the hotel bar or the saloon or restaurant bar, which would you prefer should be abolished?—I would prefer to abolish the saloon and retain the hotel bar.

25334. Have you any experience of the sale of liquor in groceries?—Not a great deal; I never thought of the question at all.

25335. Are there any suggestions you can make or ideas you can give to the Commission in reference to the liquor trade?—I know very little about it. I believe our Department is pretty well regulated, and I think our system is as good as we can make it. The inspection of foods belongs to our department, but it is not in my branch.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

25336. How many firms in Montreal do compounding?—We have three in Montreal.

25337. Did you hear the evidence of Mr. Meagher?—Yes.

25338. Are the other gentlemen who are compounding engaged in the same class of business?—I believe so. I do not know that they sell the same liquors all through, but a good many of the articles are the same.

25339. According to Mr. Meagher's evidence, there is no deleterious compound, to any appreciable extent, mixed with liquors?—I believe that to be the case. Their liquors are subject to analysis, and of course they are responsible for their samples.

25340. Is the present system of inspecting liquor efficient?—It is efficient in a certain way, but I think more samples might be taken.

25341. Do you believe that adulterated liquor is sold in Montreal?—I assume that there might be some, but I really do not know. I do not believe it would be made in those compounding places.

25342. The samples secured from Meagher's establishment would not be likely to be adulterated?—No; I presume they would make good liquors to keep up their good name. The samples for analysis should be taken from low grade places where they

JOSEPH LOUIS VINCENT.

might adulterate their liquors. The liquor in places where it is sold illegally and the lower class of saloons is more likely to be adulterated.

- 25343. Do you know anything of the nature of the compounds that are mixed into liquors?—No. It is their secret what they use. We have the names of articles used in compounds, but we do not know the preparations.

25344. Do you believe that drunkenness has increased or decreased in the city of Montreal?—I do not think it has increased; I do not remark that it is any worse than it was years ago.

25345. Is it not better?—I cannot say.

25346. Do you know anything about the public parks?—Not much; I was only in them once or twice.

25347. Do you think that the introduction of light wines and beers and the imposition of heavier duties on the stronger liquors would be beneficial in the cause of temperance?—Yes, that is my opinion.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

25348. Do you know anything about the compounder who was stated here to have an illicit still on his premises?—Yes.

25349. Was there such a case?—Yes.

25350. Was it confiscated?—Yes.

25351. Was he or was he not a licensed compounder?—He had a license as a compounder.

25352. He was making his own alcohol?—He was making part of his own alcohol.

25353. Do you know anything about the finding of sulphuric acid in the place?—It was pointed out to me; I do not know if it was given to me by the seizing officer.

25354. Who was the seizing officer?—Mr. John A. Watkins, and Mr. Charles Barker.

25355. They would know all about it?—Yes, one of them counted everything and marked everything down.

25356. Is there a good deal of drinking in Longueuil?—No more than in any other place. There are some men of low class who drink excessively.

25357. Have you any licenses there?—There are three licenses in the place.

25358. Is it a small place?—About 3,000 population.

25359. Do you know if there are any unlicensed places there?—I do not know of any.

25360. Is drunkenness very apparent in the place?—No; there are I suppose about ten people who drink regularly. We call them the drunkards of the place. All the money they get is used for drink.

25361. Have you ever had more than three licenses there?—There used to be six.

25362. How did they come to be reduced: did the people want the number reduced?—The people wanted to reduce them, as they thought the smaller number would be better for the morals of the community.

25363. Has there been an attempt to increase that number since it was reduced to three?—There are attempts every year.

25364. But they did not succeed?—Not yet.

25365. Do you think it is an advantage to have a smaller number of licensed places?—I believe so.

25366. It would be an advantage to have even less than three?—It might be. When I was in the Council, I worked to reduce the number as low as ever I could.

25367. Have you observed that the licensed trade, as it exists, is a considerable injury to the community in which it exists?—I have not observed; I cannot say.

25368. You think it was a greater injury to your community to have six licenses than three?—Yes.

25369. You cannot say whether if that number of three was reduced, it would be a still further improvement?—I do not think so, because it would promote illicit trade, and it is harder to catch illicit traders than a man who has a license. When a man has a license, you can watch him.

25370. Do you know whether, since you reduced the number to three, there have sprung up illicit places instead of the three licensed houses you wiped out?—I do not know of any.

JOSEPH CARSON, Montreal, Secretary of the Dominion Alliance for the Province of Quebec, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

25371. How long have you lived in Montreal?—Twelve years.

25372. How long have you held your official position?—Going on four years.

25373. What is the object of the Association?—The suppression of the liquor traffic.

25374. Is there any adopted code of rules or system for that purpose, or is it general means?—General means. We have a Provincial convention annually, and also a Dominion convention, at which the policy or plan of work is decided upon and carried out.

25375. It may be changed from time to time?—Yes.

25376. But the platform, if I may use the term, is the suppression of the liquor traffic?—Yes.

25377. Has this society provincial branches?—The society of which I am a Secretary is a provincial branch. We have county alliances.

25378. You have county alliances, provincial alliances and then the Dominion Council?—Yes.

25379. Have you ever lived in a Scott Act county?—I have not lived in any.

25380. Have you been in any?—Yes.

25381. What has been the result of your observation?—Well, the counties, of course, of which I have had most experience are, the Counties of Richmond, and Drummond, and Brome. The Dunkin Act is in force in Richmond County, and the Scott Act in Drummond and in Brome. My experience, as far as the County of Richmond is concerned, is that the Act has been very vigorously enforced and has produced wonderfully good results.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25382. Is that the Dunkin Act or the Scott Act?—The Dunkin Act.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25383. You think the result of it has been a diminution in the consumption of liquor?—Yes.

25384. Has there been an increase of sobriety amongst the people?—Yes. I was in the county at one time for a month, during one contest, and I obtained a pretty good idea.

25385. Had you been in it under a license law? I want to know if you can give a comparative statement?—No.

25386. You found them a sober people?—Yes.

25387. Did you see any open sale of liquor?—No.

25388. Were you there on business connected with the Alliance?—Yes. When you ask if there was any open sale, I may say that on one occasion in an endeavour to enforce the law, we went there decided to take advantage of the provisions of the law which permits of a search being made of the premises; and for that purpose a number of the friends of the Dunkin Act in the county and friends from the city met in the town of Richmond, and had warrants previously prepared to search premises, and the whole town was searched, wherever it was suspected that liquor was sold. We divided ourselves into search parties. I may say that I think five members of our Executive went from the city, and we met the workers there. In only one place did we find any large quantities of liquor, and the parties were fined somewhere in the neighbourhood of three or four hundred dollars. We took all the liquor, shipped it on a cart and put it out of the town. Afterwards, when the case came into court, we got an order of the court condemning the man for having liquor on his premises, and the entire quantity of liquor was destroyed in the town of Danville.

25389. In other places small quantities were found?—Yes, it was all seized and taken away.

25390. Were any steps taken to ascertain the quality of the liquor, as to whether it was pure or adulterated?—No.

JOSEPH CARSON.

25391. That has been your experience of the Dunkin Act in Richmond?—Yes.

25392. You had experience of the Scott Act in Drummond?—Yes.

25393. Taking the two Acts, which do you think the more efficient?—I think perhaps the Scott Act is more effective than the Dunkin Act.

25394. Will you state what provisions are better?—There is one provision in the Dunkin Act by which all penalties must be of the same amount, \$50. You go on fining \$50; you cannot bring a second offence and double it or a third offence and put the man in jail.

25395. Which has the better machinery for carrying the Act out?—The machinery for carrying out the Dunkin Act is about the same as that for the Scott Act.

25396. In the case of the Dunkin Act, there is no communication had with the Government?—Yes, it is a Dominion statute.

25397. Is there any communication with the Government for leave to submit it to the people?—It cannot be submitted now; it can only be retained in those counties where it was in force before the Scott Act came into operation.

25398. Under the law, the counties submitted it themselves?—Yes, by the County Council.

25399. When you came to Drummond, what did you see there? How long were you there?—I was in Drummond on several occasions; I spent two weeks in the county at a time, that is about as much as I have been there.

25400. Was it in connection with your work for the Alliance?—Yes, entirely.

25401. You were in different parts of the county during that time?—Yes.

25402. How did you find things there?—The Act did not work so well in Drummond as in Richmond.

25403. To what do you attribute the difference?—I think it was largely because there are more French Canadian people in Drummond than in Richmond, and we found it more difficult to enforce the law in the sections where they were more numerous. In the town of Drummondville there has been a good deal of liquor sold.

25404. What is the population?—I have no idea of the population, but it is a large town. There are a few manufactories there, a tannery and some mills. It is a town of at least 7,000 or 8,000 population. Liquor has been sold there, and it has been very, very difficult to enforce the law in that town. I may say that when the Scott Act was carried in Drummond County it was carried by the large majority of 1,000 or 1,200; but there have been difficulties in the way of enforcing the law there that have been something tremendous. I may say that in one matter where the prosecution was brought before two Justices of the Peace and we were prosecuting, the Government interfered, and suspended the commissions of the Justices of the Peace while they had the cases before them.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

25405. What Government?—The recent Mercier Government.

25406. For what reason?—For the simple reason that they did not want their friends prosecuted.

25407. Those were the men who were selling the liquor?—Yes.

25408. Were they ordinary Justices of the Peace?—Yes.

25409. Could the matter have been brought before other Justices?—Well, those were two prominent Justices of the Peace. Of course the prosecution could only be taken in Arthabaska, if taken before the regular courts. I may say that one of the Justices of the Peace who had his commission revoked, was a man standing pretty high in the community. He was the returning officer when the vote was taken, Dr. Bernard; he stood pretty high.

25410. Did you say that the commissions of these Justices of the Peace were revoked because the Government did not wish to have certain men prosecuted?—I have not any doubt, because it terminated the cases.

25411. I think you stated that was the reason why the commissions were revoked?—There was no other reason we could see.

25412. It is conjecture on your part?—It is simply judging from the results. The case was delayed sufficiently long so that the time had expired, and the case could not be taken.

25413. Were there any means by which you could have brought it before other Justices of the Peace?—We could not take it before another court after we had brought it before them.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25414. That was the difficulty at Drummondville?—Yes.

25415. Were you through the rural parts of that county?—Yes.

25416. In the rural districts you say the Act was more easily enforced among the English speaking people than among the French?—Yes. I may say that in the portion of the county bordering on Richmond, the law was well enforced. In all that section along there, near to the County of Richmond, where the law was specially well enforced, the law was very effective.

25417. They were the same class of people, to a certain extent, as lived in Richmond?—Yes, mostly. Take the village of Ulverton, right in Richmond County: the temperance sentiment is very strong and there is no liquor sold anywhere in that section.

25418. There has been a vote taken recently in Drummond?—Yes.

25419. And a vote adverse to the Act?—Yes.

25420. Were you there during the campaign?—Yes. Of course, as you have already noted, there have been very serious irregularities in the matter, and it is still before the Government.

25421. Do you think the irregularities affected the polling of votes?—Yes, a large number stated so to me, and a great many of those who came to vote were, I believe, confused by the nature of the ballot. When the vote was taken three years before, the the ballot read, for the Act and against it. When it was submitted this time, the ballot read, for the petition and against the petition, which was irregular; and in instructing the electors how they were to vote, we told all the electors to mark their ballots for the Act. Of course when they went into the polling place they looked at the ballot paper and it read for the petition. There is no doubt that this confused the voters, and that a great many voted for the petition who were in favour of the Act.

25422. You believe that owing to the confusion in the ballot, people voted differently to what they intended?—No doubt.

25423. Have you been in the County of Brome?—Yes.

25424. How long has the Act been in force in Brome?—I cannot say exactly. It has been in force for a very long time. I do not think they ever had license in that county.

25425. Has any attempt ever been made to repeal it?—Once or twice there have been attempts to get up a petition; in fact there was one petition filed, but it was contested and it was thrown out, and there was no vote taken.

25426. What is the state of affairs there?—In the County of Brome, the Act is fairly well enforced. There are some sections where it might be better enforced, but the general sentiment of the county is excellent.

25427. They are temperance people?—Yes, throughout the county.

25428. Do you find a difference in that county between the towns and villages as to the observance of the Act?—There are not many large towns in the County of Brome. Knowlton is the largest town.

25429. How long have you been in Brome?—Well, I have been in Brome a great many times. I suppose a fortnight would be as much as I have spent there in connection with the Alliance work.

25430. The opinion you have formed from your observation is, that the Act is fairly well enforced and is beneficial there?—Yes.

25431. You have heard a good deal of the evidence that has been given here, and you understand very well the drift of the questions that will be asked. Taking, in the first place, the social habits of the people, how have you found them during your residence in Montreal, between the time you came here and the present time; has there been an improvement, or the contrary?—I decidedly think there is a very noticeable increase in temperance sentiment in the city.

JOSEPH CARSON.

25432. And in temperance habits?—Yes.

25433. Would you say that intemperance has decreased, or would you say there has been an improvement from a less number of people drinking, or how would you put it?—I think there is certainly a growing increase in temperance sentiment. I do not think there has been very much decrease in the quantity of liquor consumed or in drunkenness, but it is more generally looked upon as a disreputable thing to drink. At one time it was considered quite a respectable thing for a man to drink liquor, and it was not thought much of if he drank. Now if a man gets drunk he is ostracised from society.

25434. You think that society has been, and is being permeated with a temperance sentiment which is influencing it for good?—Yes.

25435. To what do you attribute this influence?—Certainly largely to the religious influence of the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, and to temperance organizations of one kind or another, and largely to the influence of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. I believe that the work of women is doing as much as anything.

25436. Is there any temperance education in the schools in this Province?—There is supposed to be, but it is practically ignored.

25437. What would you say as to that?—I should say that it ought to be made one of the standard subjects in the schools.

25438. With that done, and with the other influences that you have spoken of, apart from any question of prohibition, do you think we might look for a great change in the sentiment of the public on this question?—Yes, without doubt.

25439. Coming back for a moment to those counties where a prohibitory law is in force, I might ask you if you found that the temperance societies still kept up their work; or did you find, in any place, that they thought after passing the Act, their work was accomplished?—I found it to be the case that when they carried the Scott Act they thought their work was done, and it required considerable work to get them to take up the work again and see to the enforcement of the law. I think the temperance organizations are much more vigorous now along that line.

25440. Have you many temperance organizations in Montreal, or are they all under one rule?—No, there are several. There are the Sons of Temperance, the Good Templars, the Royal Templars, the Church of England Temperance Society, and the Irish Catholic Temperance Society, which are doing a grand work. Father McCallen and Father Strubbe are the leaders, and Senator Murphy is the president of it.

25441. Of what church are you a member?—The Methodist.

25442. We have had their official declaration on this matter, made at the General Conference in this city?—Yes. I ought to have added just a word about the Juvenile Temperance Societies and the good work they do. They have Bands of Hope and Loyal Legions, and others. The juvenile work I consider of great importance, and temperance is being brought in largely to our Sunday School work, which I consider very important.

25443. You have spoken of the habits of the people: might I ask you what is your opinion of Sohmer Park and these other parks, as to whether they are beneficial or the contrary?—I think they are very beneficial apart from their liquor selling. But I do not think liquor selling is essential in them, and I think it is wrong.

25444. You would prevent them from selling all intoxicating liquors?—Yes.

25445. Do you know, if what are admittedly intoxicating liquors are sold there?—At Sohmer Park they have a regular restaurant license, which permits them to sell all kinds of liquor. They might sell whisky or brandy, which I believe they do on all days except Sunday, but on Sundays I believe they confine themselves to the sale of Weiss or lager beer.

25446. Do you know anything as to the effects of Weiss or lager beer?—I cannot speak personally as to that, but I know that a great quantity is sold.

25447. Is the Weiss beer manufactured here, or is it imported?—It is manufactured here by Reinhardt.

25448. Now we come to the question of the observance of the license law. Will you kindly state your own views with reference to that?—I think so far as the license law is concerned, there are some very good features about it, as a license law.

25449. Pardon me, if I ask you, in the first place, are you opposed to a license law on principle?—Yes, I am decidedly.



25450. Given a license law or the untrammelled sale of liquor, which would you have?—Personally, I should rather have the untrammelled sale than license.

25451. You consider the license law is an evil in itself?—Yes.

25452. Subject to your opinion on that, now as to the observance of it?—As to the observance of the law, I may say that, of course, you have all the evidence before you as to the mode of securing licenses and all that. I have had a good deal to do in this matter of taking advantage of the provision of the law in regard to opposing licenses; the clause in the license law which gives a majority of the electors the right to oppose. We have tried to take advantage of that law in several parts of the city, but we found it next to impossible. We were successful in a few cases; but it is next to impossible to make it effective, for the reason that the applicant simply puts in twenty-five signatures, without some people knowing very much what they are signing. He gets that number quite readily, and if he does not do it himself, he employs some one, and this person is paid so much a name, deposits it in the court, and swears to the correctness of all these names. That is all the liquor man has to do. On the contrary, when we file our majority opposition we have to go before the License Commissioners and undergo a formal trial, just as rigid as if it were a case of theft, and in which we must establish legal proof on every point. We have to establish the fact that the parties who signed the opposition were personally known to us as we got their signatures, and any amount of trouble is given to us by the License Commissioners.

25453. Is it part of the law or their system?—There is nothing in the law which says we are to undergo this. It simply says that when the majority oppose, the license will not be granted; but in order to get what they call legal proof, they subject us to this sort of thing, and we have sometimes been three or four weeks fighting out an opposition to one place.

25454. Are you placed under oath before the License Commissioners?—Every witness is put under oath as he is brought forward. This work is divided up and each worker secures a certain number of names, and as they have to be sworn to before the Commissioners, they have to come and give their evidence, which is under oath.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25455. Have you the right to attack a petition?—Yes, we have the right to attack a petition; but the petitioners are not obliged to establish their names, any more than simply what the declaration declares. The application for the license goes on to say, among other things: "We the undersigned know these parties and these premises and know they are fitted according to law, and have signed our names to it." These forms are prepared and people sign without knowing anything about them. For instance, there was one case where the man put in an application, and the people all signed that they knew the premises and that they were everything the law required, and as a matter of fact the front of the building was not put in; and the Commissioners accepted that.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25456. You suppose that some of the people sign without knowing what is in the form?—Yes. More than that; we have established the fact that the men who get these signatures do it as a business. They get half a dozen or more applications, and they get the people to sign them; and we proved in one case that one man made it a regular business and swore to the name himself. We proved that there was a great deal of perjury and forgery, and the man was sent to jail for two or three years. It is a good provision of the law which gives the residents the power to oppose, but it is next to impossible to make it efficient.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25457. What change would you suggest?—That the majority of the electors should be on the petition of the applicant.

25458. Would you require that from year to year, or that when once he has obtained a license, he should not have to renew it?—He should have to obtain it every year, if the trade is an evil; and it is recognized as an evil, to a certain extent when you require a certain number of people to approve of it.

JOSEPH CARSON.

25459. Would you limit the number in each polling district?—Decidedly.

25460. Would you limit it as to population or territorially?—There ought not to be any licences in the residential parts of the city, and if they were considered necessary in the business part, one in every polling subdivision would be sufficient. These polling subdivisions embrace sometimes 200 electors.

25461. Granted that you have licenses, what is your opinion as to doing away with the hotel or the saloon bar?—I do not think to the drinking classes it makes much difference; but to a young man, beginning his drinking habits, I consider the hotel is infinitely more dangerous than the saloon, because of the seeming respectability about the hotel, which does not attach to the restaurant.

25462. Do you mean the saloon or restaurant where liquor is sold?—There is no place in the city legalized for the sale of liquor alone. They are licensed really to give meals, and then liquor is permitted.

25463. Would that lessen the number of hotel bars?—If there is to be license in a hotel, liquor should only be furnished to guests at the table, and there should be no bar.

25464. What do you think of the restaurant system?—The restaurant system, apart from the bar, is of course a necessity.

25465. But suppose it were desirable that there should be one licensed place in each subdivision, would you make it a restaurant or a saloon?—I would make a restaurant where there would be food, but no bar. If the people believe that liquor at meals is necessary, as some people do, then I would have it served at the table; but to simply stand up at the bar and drink, I cannot conceive that of any use at all.

25466. Granted a license law permitting the sale of liquor for beverage purposes, would you have any bar for drinking alone?—No bar.

25467. Any liquor sold should be served with food and partaken with food?—Yes, that would be better.

25468. Were you present when the Chief of Police gave his evidence and spoke of nine places near each other, where he did not believe a meal could be obtained?—Yes.

25469. Do you agree with that evidence?—I believe that applies even farther than what the Chief intimated. I believe the number of places where meals are furnished in restaurants is very few.

*By Judge McDonald:*

25470. Have you any experience as to whether the law forbidding sale to minors is observed?—Yes. The law provides that no liquor should be sold to a minor, and there have been a number of prosecutions entered but very few convictions secured, because the dealers manage in some way to establish that the sale is not to a minor but to somebody else, and that the minor is simply a messenger. They can always get witnesses to prove that.

25471. You think in that way there is an evasion of the law?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

25472. As a matter of fact, the sale is to an elderly person?—In many cases the sale is to a minor.

25473. Is it a matter of fact that there are many instances of young people under age going to buy liquor for their own use, that is in quantities?—Why yes. In most cases the liquor habit is formed before a man is 21 years of age.

*By Judge McDonald:*

25474. It is, I presume, difficult to prove sale to minor when the liquor is not consumed?—Yes. I remember on one occasion I saw a boy coming out of a saloon, and I took the boy by the collar and marched him into the saloon, and asked the keeper why he was selling whisky to this boy. I told him that he would have to answer for it, and after hesitating for a moment, he said, I have an order to sell to him.

25475. What provision would you make in the law to meet such a case as that?—I would extend the provisions of the law so as to prevent the sale or delivery to a minor.

25476. Would you prevent it to a person under twenty-one or of more tender years?—I would not restrict it to any age. There is another provision of the law which

says that no liquor shall be "knowingly sold" to a minor. There is another difficulty. You must prove that when the liquor seller sold the liquor, he knew that he was selling to a minor. It is a very difficult thing to establish that the man knew.

25477. What is your experience as to the observance of the liquor law?—I think that the liquor law is better observed now than formerly. I know that for a very long time it was openly and outrageously violated. I made it a point myself to go around and visit some of the saloons on Sunday evening, and I found them in full blast with the bar tenders behind the counter. In one case I remember three bar tenders were in their shirt sleeves selling all the liquor they could possibly sell on a Sunday night.

25478. Was it done openly?—Yes. Of course they had their spotters at the door, but if you could manage to get by the spotter you could get inside and get drink.

25479. Do you think that was done to any great extent?—Yes.

25480. Was it confined to any localities?—No, it was pretty general. I do not mean to say that every liquor seller violates the law, but it was very general. I remember on one occasion going in on a Sunday night to the Central Police Station. There had been a good deal of talk of the law being pretty well enforced and so on, and I went to the Central Police Station and asked the officer in charge to give me two officers in plain clothes. I said to him: You say you cannot find out where the law is violated, but if you will give me two men I will show you a dozen places within a hundred yards of the Central Station where it is now being sold on Sunday. He told me he had no men for that purpose.

25481. To what do you attribute the better observance of the law on Sunday?—To the new Government. I consider the new Government are trying to make things a little more effective; I mean the new Provincial Government.

25482. Is it enforcing the law?—I think it is trying to do so now.

25483. On that branch of the subject you heard what the Police Magistrate swore, that they are now cancelling licenses of people who sell on Sunday after a second or third conviction?—They do nominally. From the Bench they say: Your license is cancelled. But unless they send a certificate from the Bench to the Collector of Provincial Revenue, the license is not cancelled. I know of many cases where the licenses were cancelled from the Bench, but never were cancelled really.

25484. The License Commissioners have told us that they would prefer the discretionary powers to be taken away from them and to have the law declare that the licenses should be cancelled after a certain number of convictions?—I think that would be a great improvement.

25485. What do you think in reference to the sale of liquor in grocery stores?—I think it is a very great evil.

25486. Do you think it is true that women get liquor in that way who would not otherwise get it?—No doubt.

25487. Have you any experience of that in the work in which you are engaged?—Yes. I have frequently complaints from women who come to me and say that their husbands get liquor at the grocery store and drink it. This applies not only to downtown but to uptown grocers as well. I do not know that I have personal experience in regard to women getting liquor; I do not remember any case just now.

25488. You say their husbands get it and drink it on the premises, which is contrary to the law?—Yes, some rather prominent people have complained to me in that line. Reference was made the other day to the fact that there was a provision in the law that a wife could notify a liquor seller that he must not sell liquor to her husband, and that then he cannot do so unless under a heavy penalty. It is next to impossible to get a wife to do that against her husband. She would bear all kinds of hardships rather than do it.

25489. As to the adulteration of liquors, can you give us any expression of opinion?—I have no idea of that; I have no means of knowing about it. I do not know whether it is different here to anywhere else, but I know that liquor produces terrible results in this city.

25490. Have you any opinion as to the number of illicit liquor places in the city?—I know there are a great many, and I have heard a good many opinions expressed

about the matter here. I do not know anybody who is in a better position to form an opinion on that matter than Mr. Lambe. He is the official charged with that work.

25491. Do you think that anybody could really fix the number?—I suppose not. I know that the citizens have an organization in the city for the better enforcement of the law, and they have their Inspector going around making an examination and visiting all these “beaneries,” and they have prepared a report. I suppose Major Bond, who is President of that society, will likely be before the Commission, and he will give you evidence on that line.

25492. As to that question of adulteration of liquor: if there is to be a license law and if liquor is to be sold, would you prefer a more rigid and frequent inspection of liquors than there is now?—I do not take any stock in that.

25493. You think it would do no good?—No. I think that liquor is as bad as they can make it, and it would not make much difference in its effect.

25494. I suppose you know people who have partaken of liquor in what might be called moderation for very many years and have never become drunkards?—I suppose I do know some, but my acquaintance among those people is limited.

25495. Do you think they might not be more injuriously affected by impure liquor?—I think the worst thing in the whole business is the alcohol. I do not think you can make it any worse than it is.

25496. Worse than bead oil? It is the essence of alcohol, is it not?—I never heard of it until I heard of it now.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25497. Why would you not favour the inspection of liquors?—For the simple reason that you cannot make alcohol any worse than it is.

25498. Yes, you can. You can make the drink worse, and more injurious in its effects by permitting the foulest kinds of compounds to be sold. Are you opposed to the inspection of liquor so that people who drink may get pure whiskey, gin or brandy, or do you prefer that they should be poisoned by vile stuff?—I cannot conceive of anything being worse than alcohol, I think that alcohol is the worst.

25499. Do you think it worse than sulphuric acid, vitriol and things of that kind. Are we to understand that you prefer that there should be no inspection, and that people should be permitted to drink all these compounds that are sold in licensed and unlicensed places, rather than an attempt should be made to give them pure liquor. What is your opinion on that?—I cannot give an answer.

25500. But you have already done so?—I simply say that alcohol is the worst. I believe that the sulphuric acid will kill a man quicker than alcohol, but alcohol will kill if you give it time.

25501. Is it your opinion that there should be no inspection?—I would not favour the inspection of liquor.

25502. You surely have some opinion as to whether it would be well for these people to drink a less vicious liquor than a more vicious. Would it not be better to prevent them drinking this poisonous liquor?—I believe it is quite necessary to have inspection of food; but as to the inspection of liquor, I do not believe that any very great good is going to result from it.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25503. Perhaps you think that the viler the compound sold, the quicker you will get prohibition?—I do not know.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25504. Do you think that the use of the more vicious liquor so-called would sooner cure people of the drink habit?—If this vicious stuff was taken, such as has been referred to, I do not think a man could stand it very long—it would kill him.

25505. If there is a license law and you have not prohibition, would you favour the use of the heavier liquors or light wines and ales?—I have given some thought to that, because there are so many people who favour it. I find that many educated French people, who come from old France, are strongly in favour of that; but my

opinion is that the use of the lighter wines is simply toying with the evil, and very soon people will find that while they were formerly satisfied with wine and ale, they want something stronger and acquire a taste for alcohol. I have known so many young men who have started that way.

25506. You do not think it would do any good in the promotion of temperance or suppression of drunkenness?—No.

25507. What is your opinion as to whether a general prohibitory law, preventing the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, could be fairly well enforced?—My opinion is that the only really effective remedy for temperance is the total prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of alcohol for beverage purposes.

25508. You think it is the only remedy that can be looked to in that respect?—The only measure that could effectively produce the results we desire.

25509. Would you favour its immediate passage? Do you think the country is ready for it at the present moment?—I think that if the law were passed and put upon the statute-book, it could be enforced now as effectively as most laws that are put upon the statute-book. I do not think it would utterly crush the liquor traffic. I believe it would be a severe struggle for a little while in the matter of enforcement, but I believe that the benefits that would arise from it would be so many that people would say that it is a good law and we will enforce it. I believe that many who are now its opponents would rally to its support as soon as they began to see the benefits arising from it.

25510. It has been given in evidence that in connection with the Scott Act there are two points of view: one is, that there are many people who would vote for a prohibitory law but who will not vote for the Scott Act, because they do not consider it goes far enough. It has also been stated that some of these people, it is supposed, do this to evade voting for the Act at all, but that others have that feeling. Again, it is stated that there are quite a number of people who support the Scott Act because under it people could get liquor for home consumption, and they would not vote for a prohibitory law that would do away with liquor altogether. Have you considered these questions?—Yes. I believe that the expression of opinion throughout Canada on the Scott Act was the honest expression of the opinion of the people in favour of a prohibitory law. The Scott Act did not accomplish all that they thought it was going to accomplish. I believe that great numbers of people are in favour of a national prohibitory law, which would be very much more effective than any local option or local prohibition could possibly be.

25511. Therefore, you think that if submitted to the people, prohibition would be carried, and that it would be fairly well enforced?—I think so.

25512. Have you thought of the difference of sentiment as between a large majority in its favour in the Maritime Provinces and a large majority against in British Columbia and a medium of feeling in the central parts of Canada?—Yes, of course there would be very great difficulties in the way. No question about it, there would be very great difficulties in the way of the passage of a prohibitory law, but I believe that the benefits would be so apparent and so enormous and so speedy that the people who are now opposed to it would come into line and would be favourable to it.

25513. Is the result of your consideration that it would be advisable to leave it to legislation by Parliament, or to take a direct vote of the people of Canada on the subject?—I believe it should be a question in Parliament.

25514. Would you make it a question on which the representatives in Parliament must take a stand?—Yes.

EDWARD JOHN HEMMING of Drummondville, P. Q., advocate, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

25515. You are a Doctor of Laws, I believe?—Yes.

25516. Of what University?—Of McGill College. I am the oldest Doctor of Laws in the Dominion.

25517. Have you held any judicial position?—I have been for five years District Magistrate of Arthabaska, which means about the same jurisdiction as a County Judge in Ontario.

25518. How long have you lived in the County of Drummond?—I have lived in the County of Drummond about 35 years.

25519. What law has been in force there with regard to the liquor traffic?—Up to a few days ago we had what was called the Scott Act, which had been in force for six years.

25520. And before that, what law had you?—We were under the ordinary license law of the Province of Quebec.

25521. Have you ever had the Dunkin Act applied to your district?—No.

25522. When the Scott Act was submitted, were you a resident of the county, and have you been a resident ever since it has been in force?—Yes. We tried to repeal it three years ago, but did not succeed.

25523. Were you favourable to the Scott Act or otherwise? Did you look upon it as a good measure?—From the very commencement of that legislation I have been opposed to it on principle.

25524. Why?—For many reasons. First, I consider all that kind of legislation is in one respect unconstitutional. I think that the Government has only a right to protect the lives, liberties and property of the subject, but it has no right to infringe individual rights, unless such individual rights should be harmful to the community or to society in general. Of course if a person gets drunk or anything of that kind, or does any overt act by which he injures his neighbour, the Government has a right to make a law and punish him accordingly. But otherwise I do not consider that the Government has anything to do with sumptuary laws, and no right to say what I shall eat or drink, unless possibly in the case where people are very ignorant in regard to poisons, and it is necessary to provide restrictions for their sale in order to prevent accidents.

25525. You thought the Act unconstitutional. Did you approve of it as a measure promotive of temperance?—So far from believing it to be such, I may state what took place on the first introduction of the Scott Act in Drummond County. The clergy of all denominations, Roman Catholic, Church of England, Methodist and all the rest came together to endeavour by their exertions and otherwise, I will not say by undue influence, but by the influence they possessed, to make the people introduce and adopt the Scott Act. I myself in the village of Drummondville held an office in the church, and I disagreed with my Rector, and I told my Rector that I thought he was making a mistake, that my impression was that if the people passed the Scott Act and thereby did away with the four hotels we had in the town of Drummondville, the result would be that we would have a number of unlicensed hotels and other places there. He told me I was speaking in favour of drunkenness, and all the rest of it. The question went to a vote. The people voted in favour of it and carried it, and I was the only man who voted against it at the poll where I registered my vote. Every drunkard and almost every other man voted in favour of the Scott Act. I only mention this to show that from the very beginning I acted on principle.

25526. What was the result?—The result has been exactly as I anticipated.

25527. In what way?—At the present time, instead of four licensed hotels, we have between twenty and thirty what you call shebeens. Liquor can be had without any difficulty or any hesitation by anybody who chooses to go into any of these places, and they do go there. I cannot say that from my personal knowledge, because I live a little out of town, but I am satisfied there is more drunkenness now than there was before the Scott Act went into force. So far as outward appearance goes the condition

is much about the same ; but in reality we had free trade in liquor under the Scott Act, no restriction whatever, no supervision by means of licenses to see that the liquor was not adulterated, or anything of the kind, and the people were at the mercy of those who sold the liquor. I consider that by the action of the Scott Act during the past six years the people of the town of Drummondville have become so demoralized that they have come to look upon law as not worth the paper on which it is written, for it has been broken by everybody, even by the highest officers in the place. It will be very difficult to get rid of that opinion. At the last election, which took place only a month ago, we voted down the Scott Act by a vote of two to one ; but I am very much afraid that it will take a year or two to get rid of these shebæns. People have come to learn that they can carry on the trade, even though they may be prosecuted sometimes. The prosecution of such people, so far as my experience goes, does not do much to prevent the sale of liquor illegally, because you have a class of men in the trade who do not care the slightest about being condemned and tried, and if they cannot raise the amount of their fines they go to the United States.

25528. Was the tendency of the Scott Act to place the selling of liquor in the hands of a lower class?—Yes. You may force it down to a still lower class by continually prosecuting the parties, but you will always find men ready to sell, because there are very large profits attached to the sale, and consequently there are always men to be found who will take the risk.

25529. How is it in that portion of the county outside of Drummondville?—I see very little of it myself since I have no longer to travel as District Magistrate, and I do not often leave my own home. But I know they do sell liquor in all those places, because since last election I understand certain parties have made a raid on all the old houses, and all people who were believed to be selling liquor without a license have been summoned. That has been done by concerted action on the part of some persons ; I do not know by whom. So it is clear that they have been selling liquor illegally at Kingsley, Lavalley and other places.

25530. In regard to the causes that led to the repeal of the Act by the vote recently given, is it true that the ballots were not in proper form, and that people thought they were voting to retain the Act when they were actually voting against it?—I had no vote, being disqualified as returning officer. There is no reason why a returning officer should not have an opinion on temperance matters, but such is the law. I happened to see one of the ballots, and what I saw was this : It was not in the form of the ordinary ballot, but on the top were the words, "For the petition," and on the other side, "Against the petition."

25531. It is stated that the people thought the words, "For the petition," meant in favour of the Scott Act, and that they marked their ballots accordingly?—I cannot say what a person might think, but it was very clear to any man who had a head on his shoulders.

25532. Do you think the sentiment is favourable to or against the Act?—I am satisfied it is against the Act, and the clergy are now opposed to it.

25533. Do you know anything of the character of the liquor sold under the Act, whether it was pure or not?—I could not say. Of course we know very well that the less reputable the place is the more probability there is that the liquor will be adulterated.

25534. I understood you to say that the state of things in Drummondville under license was better than it was under the Scott Act. Was there more drunkenness before or after the Scott Act?—I never go out at night and am a great man to stay at home, so I do not see people when they get drunk. I do not believe, however, there is much difference.

25535. Do you know anything about Richmond?—I know the county.

25536. Do you know anything of the working of the temperance law there?—Just from what I see in the newspapers.

25537. Are there many French people in the County of Drummond?—I suppose about four-fifths are French.

25538. The opinion has been expressed before the Commission that if a law were passed so that it would make it more difficult to obtain heavier liquors and at the same

time encourage the use of light wines, such a change would be beneficial?—I would be most decidedly in favour of it. I think that light wines and ales are not only not harmful but are beneficial. Undue drinking of hard spirits is harmful, and everything that would have a tendency to prevent people drinking hard spirits would be a decided advantage.

25539. Have you found during your residence in your section that there has been considerable change in the social habits and customs of the people in regard to drinking?—When I first came to the County of Drummond you could not get a glass of beer, nothing was drank except white whisky. That was the only liquor you could get here thirty years ago. Now you can get beer as well as spirits. There has been a great change in that respect.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25540. Comparing the County of Drummond under the old license law with the county under the Scott Act, what would be the difference as regards the social conditions and the drinking customs of the people and drunkenness?—It is very difficult for anyone to say, for you may ascribe the results to different causes. I myself have seen a wonderful social revolution since I have been in the Townships. When I first went to the Townships, Drummond had a very bad reputation socially. There were a class of people there who were rascals. But they have disappeared, and the upper part of the county, which I have not visited for some years, has become quiet and peaceable and settled by law abiding people. I ascribe that change to the influence of the Church. At the time when I went to the county there was only one church, and it was hardly attended at all, but now the place is almost covered with churches. Of course other influences may have had some effect, and I admit that probably the Scott Act in places far distant from towns and villages has a tendency to prevent people having liquor, for the people never see it and remain quietly on their farms.

25541. Do you think the Scott Act in the rural districts of the county has assisted in any degree the Church in its efforts for the moral improvement of the people?—I can hardly think so, because I do not think a law like the Scott Act, which I believe is the only criminal law on the statute-book in which the *particeps criminis* is not only exempt from punishment but actually paid for being a partner in the crime, can aid much in raising the morality of the people.

25542. So you do not attribute any of the improvement in the condition to legislation?—I think, taking it on the whole, I am opposed to the Act, although I am hardly prepared to give an opinion for the country parts in which I have not lived for many years. I am opposed, however, to the Act on principle, even supposing the results were in some respects beneficial. The object, as I understand it, is to remove temptation from the people. If that be the case, I am not fond myself of what I call cheap philanthropy ; I am not fond of a philanthropist who is always thinking of his neighbour and who is not willing to exercise any self-denial himself. As I understand the Scott Act, it enables any person with a little money to import as much liquor as he likes for his own use and to drink it when he pleases ; in effect, it says, we are respectable people and will not get drunk, but you poorer people must not be tempted and allowed to do anything of that kind. I do not like class laws.

25543. Do you think it is an advantage to remove the temptation from a certain class of the people?—My firm and full belief is that by no coercive legislation whatever can you ever make a man morally good. It is very well to remove temptation, there is no doubt about that. We all pray to be delivered from temptation ; but at the same time if you take a wrong course, you are really doing more harm than good.

25544. Do you believe it would be well to have the liquor trade in Drummond free and untrammelled?—That is a peculiar question. Theoretically I would say yes, but practically I would say that those places require a certain amount of restriction and regulation.

25545. Why does the drink trade require a certain amount of restriction?—From the weakness of human nature. The only course, I think, by which the action of the temperance people can be justified is by considering the drinking of spirits and of wine as a crime. It is not a crime. The Legislature, according to my view, has no right to



interfere, and I believe that only by elevating the moral tone of the people through the clergy, and by education and otherwise can we hope to secure any improvement so that individuals will be able to control themselves like men. But if you try to make a man good by Act of Parliament, even though it may have a good effect on a few, it will not as a rule have a good effect; on the contrary, it will really cause more harm than good, because a certain class of the people will be brought up and educated to have a thorough contempt for the law.

25546. Speaking of the efforts to elevate men morally, do you believe it is good to have legislation in accordance with those efforts, and that help will come from it?—If the laws were put on the right basis, yes. I look at the drinking question as a religious question. I cannot consider it to be in any way a crime to drink; it is a question of the use and abuse of anything. The abuse may be a crime and the use of it no crime whatever. I am one of the old fashioned Conservative people brought up in their youth to believe in the Bible, and I cannot myself agree to a principle which states that our Saviour was a criminal. Our Saviour, if we believe the Bible—and I think it is a great comfort to a great many people—not only by his precepts but by his example dealt with this question, for he drank fermented liquor.

25547. Do you believe it is a proper thing and constitutional to restrict the trade by limiting the number of licenses?—I think so.

25548. Does that restriction involve the whole question of prohibition?—Of course. You can, by adopting that view, reason out anything; but we must also remember that nothing is perfect in this world, and we must act as men with common sense. If I find a certain amount of restriction of the liquor trade is beneficial, and perhaps absolutely necessary, it does not follow that the trade should be prohibited and people using liquor should be punished and, in my opinion, no individual, whether temperate or intemperate, should be allowed to misstate the declarations of the Bible and observe that such is law. If the two systems were put before me, and I were compelled to choose between prohibition and free trade, I would say, let us have free trade.

25549. I base the question on your statement that such legislation is unconstitutional?—I say it is unconstitutional, namely, because the only ground on which you might say that you should prohibit a man from using those things which the Creator has given him, was because somebody else might, by his example or otherwise, get into trouble. I think the Act to which I referred is unconstitutional.

25550. You say it is wrong to enforce such an Act unless harm might occur to your neighbour or to society at large?—Yes.

25551. Is the liquor traffic as it exists and is licensed harmful, in any degree, to society?—I think it is, as it exists.

25552. Then is legalization for its restriction justifiable?—I think that all Acts in the direction of prohibition have tended to demoralize the people generally.

25553. You think all attempts towards prohibition have demoralized the people more than the trade as it exists?—Certainly.

25554. In what way?—Such legislation has taught everybody that law is nothing but waste paper. They have that example before them every day of their lives.

25555. That the law is waste paper?—I was for five years on the Bench and I saw a great deal of this. I had instances of prosecutions brought before me, and I must confess I never could understand the principle which the Legislature followed when they placed those restrictions in the license legislation regarding the Province of Quebec. They actually subverted the whole principle of criminal law. They said a man might be condemned for an offence with which he was never charged. They said that a man should be called upon to prove the negative. Such a proceeding is wrong, and is against every principle of British law. The answer given is, that it is impossible to secure proof unless you are an informer, a man who tempts another to commit a crime. But is that sufficient reason to say that you should subvert the whole criminal law? I think not. We all know the difficulty that exists in convicting a man on a charge of murder; but are you going to legalize lynch law? Is lynch law in the country considered to be a necessity? Let us know it if it is a necessity, but do not let us put it on the statute-book.

EDWARD JOHN HEMMING.

25556. You have said that violations of the Scott Act were very general, and that even the chief officers of the county were, openly, parties to such violation?—Certainly.

25557. Do you charge that against the law or against those parties?—Against the law. I was opposed to the enactment of the law. I do not consider myself bound by that law, which is an unconstitutional law and an infringement on the liberty of the subject. I hold, therefore, that there is only the letter of the statute to prevent a man from infringing the law by taking a glass of beer, when the law says he shall not do so.

25558. You said that as returning officer in the County of Drummond, you were prohibited from voting in the recent Scott Act elections? Was that because the law so provided, in the same way as the Scott Act proclaimed that liquor shall not be sold in the district? Does that necessarily subvert the law?—Not necessarily. The right to vote is a privilege accorded to the individual. If the Legislature thinks it should not be accorded, a man has not a right to vote. These restrictive laws respecting the liquor traffic, however, have practically no effect. They are *ultra vires* even of the Legislature.

25559. That is a question which has yet to be decided; however, you have expressed your opinion.—I am giving you my personal opinion.

25560. You say that the chief officers of the county who were parties to the violation of the law, were not responsible, but the law was responsible for their acts. Do you believe that every man is a law to himself?—Unless he may be doing some injury to his neighbour.

25561. Is the liquor trade an injury to the community?—Not necessarily.

25562. Is legislation for the restriction of the trade based on the belief that that trade is an injury to the community?—Not more than the trade of a butcher. We are so constituted that men all over the world make alcohol. If you will read Stanley's works you will find that beer is made even in the darkest parts of Africa. Men, according to the earliest records of human history, have always had stimulating drinks, and man was created with that desire. The only question to be considered is the abuse of alcohol. No man has a right to abuse the gifts of the Creator in such a way as to do an injury to his neighbour. If he does, he is liable to come under the law.

25563. Is there a strong tendency in man to what you call abuse of strong drink?—I cannot give you any better experience than my own. My own life has been a pretty long one.

25564. Is yours an average experience, do you think?—I do not think many people have had a better experience than I have. I am not a teetotaler, as you may imagine, but I certainly consider myself a temperance man. I do not keep any alcoholic liquor in my house, and my beverages are tea, coffee and milk. I do not say I do not drink if a friend asks me when I may visit him; but I am not in the habit of taking intoxicating liquors, and I do not take them except at meals.

25565. As a Judge during several years, did you observe that any considerable proportion of crime, petty and grave crime, that came under your notice as a Judge was traceable to the drink trade and the drink habit?—The only crimes I could say that were traceable were assaults, even up to murder. We all know that after a man has been drinking heavily he is not his own master and he may go further than he intends to do, and in drink he may kill a man, which in his sober senses he would not do. As to other crimes, so far from it being an incentive to them, I believe that all the higher crimes, such as burglary, forgery, fraud and the like are done by the most abstemious people on the face of the globe. They have to train their nerves in such a way as to have them always under control; they cannot afford to lose command of themselves.

25566. Then it is for business purposes that they abstain?—Yes. That is what I believe. I never had anything to do with these gentlemen except in the dock; but that is my opinion.

25567. Were there any illicit places in Drummond when there were four licensed hotels there?—Not that I know of.

25568. Had you an intimate knowledge of Drummond at that time?—I ought to have; I have lived in Drummond ever since I came to the Townships.

25569. Do you think there were no illicit places when the county was under license?—I could not say there were not, but not to my knowledge. Everybody could get what

he pleased when those three hotels were there, and there was no necessity to go anywhere else. When those hotels were shut up, each person started his own little hotel.

25570. Do you believe the delegalization of the trade had any educational effect on the young people of the community?—I do not think it had any effect, except in the way I have already stated.

25571. You know something, I believe, about Richmond?—By passing through it.

25572. Has the Dunkin Act been in force in Richmond, and has it had any effect?—I do not know sufficient about it to be able to give an opinion.

25573. In what case is a man compelled to prove a negative?—I believe there is a clause in the Quebec Act to this effect, that if an offence shall not be proved, it is left to the discretion of the Magistrate to say whether or not the defendant is guilty of some offence.

25574. Is that not the license law?—Yes. I look upon all such legislation as wrong.

25575. Then it is not in the Scott Act?—I could not say. I had no idea of being here or I might have prepared myself to answer such questions.

25576. You made the statement in a very positive way, and I thought you had some case in mind?—That was years ago. It is the idea that remains in my mind as to how the law was when I administered it.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25577. Do you know whether there were any shebeens before the Scott Act was adopted?—I could not say; I do not know personally that there were any.

25578. Was it your experience that the Act was better enforced in the English than in the French portion of Drummond?—The Scott Act affects the whole country.

25579. Was it your experience that the Act was better enforced in the English than in the French portion of the county?—I live in the French portion. In the English portion they have no large towns. I do not suppose there is very great difficulty in small villages and in the country parts in enforcing the Act to a certain extent, but in a place of any considerable size, such as a fairly sized town, it is practically impossible to enforce it.

25580. The statement was made this morning that the difficulty of enforcement was in some measure due to the number of French people residing in the county, and it was stated further that the Act was better enforced in the English than in the French portions of the county?—That is because in the English portion there are no large villages.

25581. What has brought about the change in sentiment in Drummond?—It is on account of the Act having proved an utter failure. At the last vote there were two to one against it, while previously the vote had been almost unanimously in its favour.

25582. Do you favour an amendment of the Act taking away the privilege now enjoyed of purchasing liquor and bringing it in for domestic use?—Certainly not; that would be a still greater infringement of the rights of the subject.

25583. Would that not tend to a more efficient enforcement of the Act?—People would be more conscientious if they did that, that is those who advocate the principle of the Act, but I am opposed to the principle.

25584. Were you on the Bench when the Act was in force?—I left the Bench in 1878. I was on the Bench from 1873 to 1878. The Scott Act was not in force in Drummond, but there were local municipalities which had by-laws that carried out the same idea.

25585. What was your experience as a Magistrate in regard to the effect of the Act at that time?—That it caused perjury to be plentiful.

25586. How did the convictions for drunkenness during the Scott Act period compare with the anti-Scott Act period?—I never saw a comparison made.

25587. You do not know the convictions during the period before the Scott Act? Do you think there was less drunkenness then and fewer convictions for drunkenness than during the Scott Act period?—Convictions depend a good deal on different circumstances. If the people were left to themselves there would be no convictions, and it is only by having an organized association you secure convictions. A man does not like to inform against his neighbour.

EDWARD JOHN HEMMING.

25588. You spoke about the disappearance of drunkenness. Was that the result of the adoption of the Scott Act?—No, it was long previous to that.

25589. Are there less spirits consumed now than there were 30 years ago?—I should say so, because a large quantity of beer is drunk, whereas formerly only spirits were used.

25590. What is the effect of a law on the statute-book that is flagrantly disobeyed?—I think it is very harmful and very demoralizing.

25591. Would you favour a general prohibitory law?—Certainly not, because it would make matters still worse.

25592. It would be a worse condition of affairs?—Yes.

25593. Worse than under license?—If you pass a prohibitory law, you will not only have men selling but illicit distilleries as well.

25594. Worse than under the license law?—License is the only way of dealing with the traffic. If you ask my opinion on the question, I say I am in favour of high license in view of the present state of society, so that the people who sell will be interested in keeping down illicit sale by others.

25595. During the Anti-Scott Act period do you know any cases where licensed people supplied unlicensed sellers?—I know nothing about the trade.

25596. Then you think a remedy for the evil is the adoption of a high license system?—Yes.

25597. Do you favour a system of rigid inspection?—Yes, particularly as to the quality.

25598. Was any attempt made while the Scott Act was in force in Drummond to establish temperance hotels?—We have always had temperance hotels, but the result has been that there has not been a decent hotel in town.

25599. Why?—Because a man cannot keep a hotel open without a bar.

25600. Then the hotel-keepers do not charge enough for accommodation?—No. There is a certain rate established in the country districts and you cannot depart from it; for instance, people pay a quarter of a dollar for a meal. If an hotel-keeper tried to charge any more, people would not go there.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25601. You say those hotels have bars and that they sell as openly as under license?—They have not licenses; I was speaking of the shebeens.

25602. You say the hotels sell in open violation of the law?—A hotel-keeper told me the other day that when the Scott Act was introduced he had \$600 to the good, and that he had not only lost that but he was now \$600 to the bad.

25603. The Scott Act did that?—So he says.

25604. And it is therefore bad?—It was bad for him.

25605. And you say there are other people who sell openly?—The people went to the shebeens instead of going to him.

25606. And that, of course, was not profitable to him?—It was profitable to them, otherwise there would not have been so many of them.

25607. Do we understand that the hotel men have not sold any liquor under the Scott Act or have sold liquor?—As much liquor has been sold in Drummond since the Scott Act as before.

25608. Do you mean sold by the hotel-keepers?—Not so much by them.

25609. Then they have observed the law; is that the case?—I do not believe they have observed it, except to a certain extent. We had one case two or three years ago where the bar was kept open in the same way as we had bars previous to the introduction of the Scott Act.

25610. What steps were taken to punish the violator of the law?—Six convictions were got against him, but the result was that they were all set aside on *certiorari*.

25611. If the bar was closed did not that show that the law had some grip?—Of course the law has a certain amount of grip. It forces people to do acts in an underhand manner. The Scott Act had no grip on the masses of people. They got as much liquor as they wanted, only they were forced by the law to obtain it in a way that was wrong in one sense, and as every man would try and evade the law, it made him ultimately despise the law.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25612. Was it not an advantage to the young men to make the trade disreputable during six years?—Certainly not.

25613. Why not?—If the law provided that the people engaged in the trade shall be perfectly reputable, there would be no difficulty about it. It is because the people who go into the business are not reputable that liquors are adulterated and people tempted and liquor is given to drunken people and wrong acts are done in every respect, but secure high minded men to take charge of the trade and a change will occur at once. You should secure respectable men, instead of, as at the present time, men who are endeavouring in every way to make five cents and do not care to whom they sell.

FREDERICK WILLIAM JOHNSTON, of Sault Ste. Marie, Judge of the District Court of Algoma, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald :*

25614. How long have you lived at Sault Ste Marie?—Two years.

25615. Where did you live before that time?—At Goderich, in Huron County.

25616. What law is in force in Algoma with regard to selling liquor?—The license law of Ontario.

25617. What law was in force in Huron when you were there?—The Ontario license law. I had passed through three years of the Scott Act.

25618. How did the Scott Act work?—In my opinion it worked very badly indeed.

25619. Was there any difficulty found in enforcing it, or was it well enforced?—It was not enforced at all, to my mind. Hotels went on selling liquor the same as they did during the license period before the Scott Act.

25620. Were licenses granted to vendors under the Act?—Yes.

25621. Were many of such licenses given?—There were two in the town, which had a population of 4,000 people.

25622. Can you state how the vendors acted in your county?—I boarded at the hotel during the whole time the Scott Act was in force, and I saw no difference whatever in regard to selling liquor. Liquor was sold openly over the bar, the same as at any other time. The men kept their places open, and it was considered the rule to pay one or two fines of \$50 each in the year, and in this way they got over the ordinary license, and each man would save \$50. They were quite willing to pay.

25623. Did the officer make himself a party to such a state of things?—There was a Police Magistrate there at the time and an Inspector. I know cases in which I was acting as solicitor defending some of the men, in which the Inspector—and this was a common thing—went about with papers already drawn up, and he would go to the hotel man and say: “I have the papers and the information against you, and you had better settle up.” The man would then pay \$50 fine, and that would be the end of it.

25624. Do you know of any person being imprisoned for the third offence?—I do not think there were any. I lived in the county town.

25625. How did the Act work there?—I looked upon it as a perfect farce.

25626. In what way?—In every way. The first day the Scott Act came into force the liquor men in the town sold. I know of a case in which a man said he wanted a drink, and he walked over to a store where one of the men licensed to sell under the Scott Act was, and he quietly filled up a certificate. The certificate ran in this way: “Give bearer (———), one quart of whisky for medical purposes. (Sgd.) —— M.D.”

25627. Did you find these certificates were given for any large quantities?—They were given *ad libitum*. I know one man who got a certificate for one barrel of whisky. It was said to be for medicinal purposes.

EDWARD JOHN HEMMING.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25628. Would you not look upon that as being done in a joke?—I do not think it was done in a joke, because I saw the certificate. It was shown to me by the party who had a license to sell.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25629. Was that the fault of the law or the fault of the vendor?—I cannot say, but such was the fact.

25630. Would you consider the law to be responsible for an Act such as that done by the vendor on a physician's prescription?—That is what I cannot say. The law says that liquor shall be given on a physician's prescription, and he is supposed to be a reputable man, and that is the end of it.

25631. Would you call a barrel a proper quantity to be given for medicinal purposes?—Some men require more and some less.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25632. Did the man get the barrel all at once?—No.

25633. Do you know whether there are cases in which men fill the orders and get the liquor from time to time?—Yes, I have known a man who had a standing order. He handed in an order to get one gallon of whisky, and took it out in smaller quantities.

25634. You said the Scott Act was in force there for three years?—I was living in the County of Bruce, at Walkerton. In Huron and Bruce the Act was voted on the same day and was carried by a majority of about 2,000 in each county. Its adoption was actually prayed for in the churches, and the female portion of the community took an active part in carrying the Act, and I know men who were drunkards voted for it. At the end of three years it was repealed by a much larger majority than that by which it was adopted in each county. It was defeated by a majority of about 3,000 in each county.

25635. So it remained in force, how long?—Only for three years.

25636. Did you see the operation of the license law in the same counties before the Scott Act was carried?—Yes.

25637. Did you notice whether there was any diminution in drunkenness under the Scott Act?—There was more drunkenness under the Scott Act than under license. To my own knowledge hotel men sold whisky, and they also sold whisky to farmers by one gallon, two gallons or three gallons at a time. You could buy it from the hotel men. The farmers took it home. I remember once being at Wingham at the Caledonia games, when every hotel was in full blast, and you could get anything to drink you called for.

25638. What is the effect on the community of a law that is daily openly and flagrantly violated?—It is very injurious.

25639. What was the effect on your community?—It was injurious, I think.

25640. You now live at Sault Ste. Marie, and that is under the license law?—Yes.

25641. What kind of people are there: are they sober and industrious, or is there much drunkenness?—The law is not strictly carried out. We have a very large district, a very large frontage. A great source of evil there is giving whisky to Indians; that is a serious trouble undoubtedly.

25642. That is contrary to law?—Yes.

25643. Is that law not enforced?—It is hard to carry it out. In that respect it is something like the Scott Act and cannot be carried out. I have seen great difficulty experienced in regard to securing convictions, and in applying the rule as regards sale to Indians, to which very heavy penalties are attached. White men buy the whisky and give it to Indians.

25644. How large is your district?—Over 800 miles long, and it stretches back to the north pole.

25645. In case of the passing of a prohibitory law for Canada, a law prohibiting the importation and manufacture as well as the sale of liquor for beverage purposes, would there be any chance of smuggling in your section?—Prohibition could not be carried out in that district.

25646. Why?—It is too close to the frontier. As it is now, smuggling is going on all the time.

25647. There is water communication between your district and the United States, I believe?—Yes, it is a very short distance from the Sault to the American Sault.

25648. Do you find the influence of the Church and temperance societies has been beneficial among your people?—Yes.

25649. Do those influences tend to promote the cause of temperance?—Yes.

25650. Do you know whether temperance literature is used in the schools there?—Yes, in our public schools.

25651. You have only been there two years, I think?—Yes.

25652. Do you think you have been there long enough to observe any change in the social habits of the people?—Since I have been there, they have voted on a local option law.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25653. What is the population of your town?—Close on 3,000. I may say that I am in favour of a license law properly and efficiently carried out. The number of licenses issued should be limited and a high license fee should be imposed. That I think would be in the public interest. I would also strongly recommend an inspection of liquors.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25654. We have had a good deal of evidence in regard to adulteration. Do you know whether in Huron the character of the liquor sold was pure or adulterated?—In the country it was pretty bad.

25655. Have you the same trouble at the Sault now?—No. I think in the best hotels they have good liquor. You can obtain liquor from the bottle itself, and of course in that way the chances of adulteration are reduced.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25656. Were there any legal difficulties in the way of the enforcement of the Scott Act in Ontario: I refer to any alleged legal difficulties?—There were no difficulties there. The difficulty was that no man respected the law.

25657. Was there an Inspector?—There was a Police Magistrate and Inspector.

25658. Were there any special or particular difficulties in the way of the enforcement of the Act there?—No. The trade, however, was perfectly openly carried on in Goderich at the four hotels there, and you could look in at the front door and see bottles on the counter.

25659. And you say an Inspector was appointed to put a stop to the sale?—Yes, in the county. He would go to a man, and would tell him that he had a warrant for him; the man would hand over \$50, and the Inspector would walk out.

25660. Was the Scott Act an educator, and did it have a beneficial influence on the young people?—By no means. I saw myself a number of young men get orders and go into liquor stores and get bottles. There was more open drunkenness than I ever saw before the Scott Act.

25661. What has been the condition since the repeal of the Act?—Everything has gone on well.

25662. Were more places selling liquor during the Scott Act than before?—I would not like to say, I do not know. You could get it in the taverns.

25663. Were there any shebeens?—No.

25664. In the event of a prohibitory law being enacted, do you think that the brewers and distillers should be compensated for their loss of plant and property?—I think they should be. They have invested their money in the trade, and I think they should be compensated.

25665. You believe, I understand, in enacting a law with high license and rigid inspection?—That is what I advocate.

25666. You are not in favour of a prohibitory law, I understand?—No.

FREDERICK WILLIAM JOHNSTON.

25667. Did you receive a copy of the circular sent out to the Judges?—No. I think one was sent to Judge McRae.

25668. Are there any saloons in Goderich?—No. And there are none at the Sault.

25669. So you have no opportunity of making a comparison between the evil effects of the saloon bar and the hotel bar?—I do not think there is much difference whether liquor is obtained at a saloon or tavern.

25670. It has been stated that the hotel bar is a more dangerous place than the open saloon; that while men go there ostensibly to see people, they really go there to drink?—I do not think that.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25671. Do you remember whether there was illicit sale when licenses were issued in Huron?—Not in our town.

25672. You do not know about the county at large?—I know about it pretty well, but I never heard of that, to any extent.

25673. Were any licenses issued in the county?—I could not tell you.

25674. Any issued in your town?—I think about eight or ten.

25675. Do you know how many illicit places there were after the Scott Act went into operation?—I do not think there were any, because the hotels went on selling.

25676. But they were not licensed?—Certainly not. Every hotel that was open before the Scott Act still carried on the sale.

25677. Do you say that the places that were selling previously went on selling in the same way after the Scott Act came into force?—Yes, in the whole country.

25678. They simply became illicit sellers, whereas previously they were legalized sellers?—Yes.

25679. Do you think any illicit places sprung up?—Not to my knowledge.

25680. Do you think in a county like Huron it would be easier to enforce absolute prohibition than partial prohibition under the Scott Act?—It would be more difficult. I do not think it could be carried out.

25681. I have a brief statement here in regard to Huron. In 1883 and 1884 the License Act was in operation. In 1883 there were five arrests, in 1884 four arrests. In 1886, when the Scott Act was in force, there were four arrests and in 1887 there were none. So the number does not appear to have largely increased?—I do not believe that statement at all.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25682. What is your statement? I observe it appears to be a sworn statement given before the Prison Commission?—It is absurd to suppose that in a population of 70,000 at that time there were only four arrests for drunkenness.

25683. Was it the number of commitments to gaol?—It will be found there were far more than that number.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25684. You have spoken about the sale of liquor to Indians. Do you mean the sale of liquor to Indians by licensed dealers?—By both licensed and unlicensed.

25685. Do you regard the license law as a means of really regulating the trade?—To a certain extent it regulates the trade, of course.

25686. There are violations of the license law by licensees?—Yes, everywhere.

25687. Just as there were violations of the Scott Act by those who had no authority to sell at the time?—Just the same as at the present time.

25688. Is there much illicit sale at the Sault by those who have no licenses?—No, I do not think there is; not to my knowledge.

25689. Is there not illicit sale after hours and on the Sabbath and to Indians?—Yes.

25690. Do you observe frequently that men who hold licenses do not obey the provisions of the license law?—They do not.



25691. Is that the character of the trade generally?—I should not like to say generally.

25692. Is it so from your own observation?—I, of course, speak from my own observation.

25693. You have spoken about the benefits that have arisen from Church influences in the direction of temperance. Do you think the trade as it exists antagonizes the influence of the Church towards the moral improvement of the people?—I could not say that.

25694. Is not the object of these Church influences to improve the condition of the people?—That is supposed to be their object.

25695. Do you think the trade as it exists is helpful to those Church influences?—I think if the Church would devote its energies to having the law carried out, it would be better.

25696. Do you think the Church should devote itself to seeing the law carried out?—I do not know, but it appears to me that that would be a good measure.

25697. Did the people of your community adopt a by-law last year to prohibit the sale of liquor in shops?—Yes.

25698. Was that a good step?—I do not think so.

25699. That was the separation of the drink trade from the sale of other articles, I suppose?—I only arrived there just about the time the change had taken place. I think it was brought about by some of the churches, especially by the clergy, and it was carried by a small majority, fifteen or twenty. There were three licensed places for the sale of liquor, and of course their licenses were taken away, and the business thus fell into the hands of the hotel men. If a man wants a gallon of beer he has now to go to the hotels to get it, instead of getting it at a store. This gives a monopoly to the hotel men, and in this way I do not think it is a very wise step.

25700. Do you think it desirable to limit the number of licenses in any place?—Yes.

25701. Was not that a limitation of the number of licenses?—It meant giving the hotels a monopoly and cutting off the other places that had then the right to sell liquor.

25702. Why do you think it advantageous to restrict the number of licenses?—Because I think if you had a certain number of places (I would not give a monopoly) which were licensed and had an Inspector of liquor, those licensed men would protect themselves and they would see that the law was properly carried out, and that shebeens and illicit places did not exist.

25703. I think you have already said that the men holding licenses do not strictly carry out the provisions of the law, but violate those provisions?—Yes. That is because they have not a sufficiently large license to pay. If there was a heavy license, they would see that their own interests were properly protected.

25704. Do you think if they had a larger license to pay, they would not be so anxious to sell to men?—No. I think they would look after the trade themselves, and they would endeavour to protect themselves.

25705. Have you had any opportunity of observing high license?—Nothing more than the Ontario license law.

25706. Is that high license?—Fairly so. I vote for increasing the license fee.

25707. There are two theories put before us. One is that if there was a high license, the men who were given authority to sell, after paying a high fee, would determine to protect themselves against illicit sellers by informing on them, and in this way would assist in punishing them. Then again there is another theory, which is that high license would be the means of creating illicit sellers, because there are different grades of drinkers and different classes. And it is considered that the licensed men might supply the unlicensed men, and thus one man who had a license might be practically running two or three saloons?—I do not think that would be the effect.

25708. Do you think the holders of high licenses would become informers on illicit sellers?—They would protect their own interests and be more careful in doing so.

25709. Is there prohibition in Keewatin?—Yes; but it is a long way from us. I do not know anything about prohibition there.

FREDERICK WILLIAM JOHNSTON.

25710. Speaking about the law in regard to the selling of liquor to Indians, do you think the law should be repealed?—There is about as much free sale to Indians as if the law were repealed.

25711. But I suppose you think it would be better not to repeal the law?—That is not for me to say, but for the Government and the people to say. I should not like to set up my own private opinion on that point.

25712. Do you see any reason why liquor should not be sold to Indians as well as to any other men?—I should not like to say about that.

25713. Did you have anything to do with the Scott Act in Huron?—How do you mean?

25714. Were you a lawyer practising at that time?—Yes.

25715. Were you prosecuting attorney in cases?—No. I defended a good many men.

25716. Do you know whether difficulties arose in connection with enforcing the law growing out of appeals and cases before the courts?—No. We had no appeals and no special legal difficulties to contend with.

25717. Were there many convictions?—As I have mentioned to you, there were convictions of the hotel-keepers when the Inspector came round; but they were settled out of court. There was often conflicting testimony in the cases if they did come into court, and there was a little perjury committed occasionally.

25718. Was there much perjury?—Yes, a good deal.

25719. Do you make the law responsible for that?—I do not know.

25720. We have heard about perjury in Scott Act cases. Do you say that you would make the law responsible for the perjury?—I would not make the law responsible.

25721. Do you think perjury is in the man himself, and the law simply furnishes the occasion for it to be committed?—That is for each man to say for himself.

25722. As a practising barrister or Judge have you observed whether there is a larger proportion of perjury in liquor cases than in ordinary criminal cases or even in civil suits?—I should not like to say.

25723. But in Huron there was not a great deal of perjury, because, as you say, there were not many cases brought before the court?—There were not a great many taken into court.

25724. Do you think those people practically pleaded guilty?—I have explained that hotel-keepers by paying one or two fines of \$50 each could save \$50 or perhaps \$100 as compared with license, according to the number of fines they paid.

25725. Was the arrangement made between the licensed vendor and the hotel-keeper?—I cannot say about that. It was done by the Inspector.

25726. Was the arrangement between the Inspector and the licensees?—It was e.

25727. A man paid his fine and then he was allowed to go?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25728. Then the result of local option has been to drive the trade into the hands of the hotel bars?—Yes. They keep on selling.

25729. You have no saloons at Sault Ste. Marie?—No.

25730. You have driven the trade into the hands of hotels only?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25731. How long have you been a Judge?—Two years.

25732. Have you observed during those two years in your judicial experience that any proportion of cases that have come before you are traceable to the drink trade and the drink habit?—I generally find that when men have committed a crime, they say that they were drunk at the time; they put that forward as an excuse.

25733. Do you think they believe that in that way they will obtain a less penalty?—That is my idea.

25734. Have you observed in conducting cases and in trying cases that the number of offences committed bears any proportion whatever to the extent of the drink trade

and the drink habit?—No doubt some portion of the crime may be attributed to the trade or to drinking, but I would not like to say what proportion.

25735. You do not think that the fact that men were drunk should have an effect in mitigating the penalties imposed?—I do not think so. If a man cannot control himself in regard to taking liquor, he should not drink at all.

REV. THOMAS G. WILLIAMS, D.D., of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

25736. You are a minister, I believe?—I am a minister of the West End Methodist church in Montreal.

25737. Do you reside in Montreal?—Yes.

25738. How long have you resided here?—A little over four years.

25739. Before that time, I believe, you resided in the Province of Ontario?—Yes.

25740. Within the last ten years where have you resided?—At Pembroke, Brockville and Prescott. I resided in those places during the nine years previous to my residence in Montreal.

25741. When you first resided in Prescott what law was in force respecting the sale of liquor?—The license law.

25741*a*. Was it in operation during the whole of your residence in the County of Leeds and Grenville?—Yes.

25742. During your residence in those counties was the Scott Act carried?—Yes.

25743. But I believe it did not come into effect until later on?—Yes.

25744. When you were in Brockville, what law was in force?—The Scott Act was in force when I arrived there. It went into operation in May; I arrived in June.

25745. Was it in force during the whole of your term of residence?—No. It was repealed, and the license law came into force the May previous to my leaving there, May, 1888.

25746. Then you came to Montreal, where there is a license law in force?—Yes.

25747. During your residence in the County of Leeds and Grenville had you an opportunity to contrast the working of the license law and the Scott Act?—No, no more than by visits I made to Pembroke.

25748. Had you an opportunity during your residence in Renfrew to compare the Scott Act with the license law in other parts of Ontario?—Yes.

25749. How did you find the working of the Scott Act compare with the working of the license law?—I found it very different indeed. I found when I arrived in Pembroke that in the town and in the townships adjoining, the law was what I would call very thoroughly enforced. There were some outlying townships in the remote south-western and possibly the south-eastern parts, almost unsettled places, from which the report came that the law was violated. The Inspector, however, was a very vigorous and energetic man, and he set forces to work by which he reduced even the outlying townships to a fair degree of subjection to the prohibitory clauses of the Scott Act. Then the Inspector was superseded. The Act under which he was appointed, the so-called McCarthy Act, was declared *ultra vires*, and he was superseded by an Inspector appointed by the Ontario Government. There was what was termed an interregnum for three months between the suspension of the officer and the appointment of a new officer. The law was not successfully enforced under the new officer. The temperance men were asked by the Mowat administration to nominate an Inspector. Inasmuch as we were applied to in that way, we concluded it would be nothing but courteous to the administration to nominate one of their supporters as Inspector. We did so, and we nominated a good sound supporter of the Mowat administration, an efficient man. Our nomination was not acknowledged even; but the old Inspector, who was a

FREDERICK WILLIAM JOHNSTON.

declared opponent of the Scott Act, was reinstated in his office—I mean the Inspector under the license system became Inspector under the Scott Act. Under his regime I am not aware of any energetic effort being put forward on his part to enforce the Act. He declared—he did not declare to me but he declared to some one in high authority—that he was not a detective, but that if cases were brought under his notice he would enforce the law. I went and saw Mr. Manning in Ottawa, and I made a statement to him of the state of affairs in Pembroke. He told me he would see the Inspector and insist on the discharge of his duties. Mr. Manning went there, and I saw him in consultation with the Inspector, but I did not see any improvement in the Inspector's efficiency.

25750. Did he remain in office?—Yes, he is in office at the present day.

25751. Is he again under the license law?—Yes.

25752. In Pembroke there is a Police Magistrate?—Yes.

25753. Did you find him an efficient officer?—Yes, he is an efficient Magistrate in every respect.

25754. Were you there when the repeal vote was taken on the Act?—Yes.

25755. As a resident and one interested in the Act, to what do you attribute the repeal of the Act?—That question has been asked very frequently, and we are constantly asked it. I have to come to the conclusion, and I did so at that time, that the cause of the repeal of the Scott Act in Renfrew had several factors. One was the indifference of the supporters of the Act. The majority seemed to proceed on the assumption that the law must hold within itself the energy to enforce itself. They did not consider that it had been enforced as it should have been. Another reason I thought contributed to the repeal of the Scott Act was the persistent statements made on the part of opponents of the Act as to its inefficiency and its frequent violations. But the principal reason I attribute is the gross ignorance of a large proportion of the voters of the county on the question, or at all events a large proportion or a large number of those who have recently gone into the county and have not reached the standard of intelligence I have found elsewhere.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25756. Were they persuaded to vote for the repeal of the Act?—Yes. I was not there at the time the Act was voted on. I even asked the question myself as to why it was repealed. The answer given to me was this, that the German women exercised influence over their husbands to keep them at home in the first contest. That, however, is not a sufficient answer in my opinion, as there did not seem to be a sufficiently large German vote to account for the large majority for repeal.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25757. Then when that Act was adopted there was a heavy vote unpolled that come out when the question of repeal was submitted?—There was a heavier vote unpolled than there should have been.

25757a. There was a heavy vote unpolled at the time of the adoption of the Act, but this vote came out when the question of repeal was submitted, I suppose?—I think there was more energy displayed by the opponents of the Act on the repeal than they displayed when the Act was submitted, because at the time it was carried there was a temperance sentiment, a regular wave of temperance passing over Ontario and in fact the whole Dominion, and the people seemed to be under its influence.

25758. Did you receive a copy of the circular sent by this Commission?—I believe it came to my address, but I was away at the time.

25759. Did you answer it?—No. I will answer it.

25760. Taking your evidence, apart from what your answers may be to those questions in the circular, do you consider the effect of the Scott Act was beneficial?—I can have no doubt on that point, although I looked at it with a jealous eye. I wanted to know the real effect, the honest effect of the Scott Act, and I wished to learn any failure on the part of the Act to accomplish its purpose, and to know whether it was really successful or not. Perhaps I had better state what I know of the county. First, as to Pembroke. I resided there for about two weeks over three years. I was pretty

active in visiting. I lived in the eastern end of the town, but I was generally through the town every day. During the three years the Scott Act was in force in Pembroke I saw but three drunken men on the streets of the town. Two were on foot, and the third was in his sleigh. I immediately made inquiries, for I determined if possible to find out where they had obtained liquor. One, as nearly as we could ascertain, obtained liquor in the town. He bought liquor and went home in his sleigh drunk. The other two were drunken men who came over from Desjardins on the Quebec side of the river. So during those three years, I only saw three drunken men on the streets. I was frequently at the hotels and spent considerable time in visiting the sick, men brought down from the shanties injured or sick. I think I saw another man drunk in one of the hotels. I know the streets were quiet, I never saw any brawling, I never heard any drunken rows. The town was remarkably orderly. The police records were thoroughly changed. The number of convictions for violations of the license law under the last year of license in the County of Renfrew—I cannot give you the figures for the town just now—were 137. That was the number of cases for violation of the license law. In the first year of the Scott Act there were 62 convictions, and the second year 64. This was not on account of the slackness of enforcement, but I attribute it to this, that the very people who had the license law, and who had clamoured for it, had the facilities for transgressing the law, and this tempted them to do so. They would sell on the Sabbath and at other times illegally. I am now speaking of license holders. There were some illicit sellers among the 137. I could not tell you what proportion of the number were licensed. I found the town remarkably orderly and quiet. It is an orderly and quiet town anyway, and the Magistrate is very efficient, and whether there is a license law or the Scott Act in force order in the town is very efficiently maintained. Regarding the county outside, I heard various statements respecting open violations of the law, especially in the town of Renfrew. I never went purposely to see, but I was invited by a friend to go into the hotel, where the chief transgressor was said to reside and carry on business, to dinner. I went behind the screen to hang up my coat on the way to the dining-room. When I had hung up my coat, I saw along the passage what was a bar. It was a secret place, a place which a man must know in order to reach it. There was a man standing in front. He asked for something—I heard his voice. The other man reached down his hand under the bar and brought up a bottle and poured out something, and the man drank it. That was the way in which at that place the sale of liquor was carried on, and yet it was stated to me that liquor was sold openly. My testimony here will corroborate the testimony of other witnesses before this Commission, although I find that if they are antagonistic to the Scott Act and to the Maine liquor law they say that the law is openly violated, and that the sale is the same as it was before the adoption of those Acts, yet, with the exception of Judge Johnston, I have not heard one who did not, after he had stated that liquor was sold as openly as before, state that a man had to know where the place was in order to be able to get any liquor. So far as regards Renfrew my evidence would corroborate the evidence of those who declare that liquor was sold there, although in my opinion it was sold secretly, I have had some experience also in regard to Eganville. I was told it was a bad place as regards selling liquor. I went there on other business, and I remained over night. There may have been drunkenness, but I did not see it. I made special inquiries from respectable men in regard to that matter, men who were not in favour of the Scott Act. I asked whether liquor was sold openly. The reply I received was that no doubt liquor was sold, and a man who knows where the places are can get liquor when he wants it, but it is not sold openly. I also visited Brudenell, and took my dinner at the hotel. The Scott Act was the subject of conversation at the dinner table, and the consensus of opinion, as expressed by those at the table, without one dissenting voice, was that the Scott Act had improved the hotel accommodation, as was evidenced by the very table at which we were sitting.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25761. At what place was that?—At Brudenell. The matter was very thoroughly canvassed, and yet the opinion was strongly in favour of the Scott Act. Then I went on to Cambermere. I did not know whether liquor had ever been sold there. I was

under the impression it had not been; then to Park Lake in the vicinity of Killalee, which I have spoken of before as a place where the Inspector under the McCarthy Act instituted a prosecution against a man for the sale of liquor, and received a telegram: "Have been served with summons for violation of Scott Act. Send names of witnesses. If guilty will remit money," with his name signed to it, showing that the Scott Act was a terror to evildoers even there. He did not remit the money without the names of the witnesses being given. My impression of the Act in Renfrew was that it was enforced. I heard a commercial traveller, who was travelling on the train from Pembroke to Brockville, declare that in every Scott Act county into which he went liquor was sold as freely as ever. He was asked how it was in Renfrew, and he said in Pembroke he was at the Copeland House and he found liquor sold over the bar openly, and he could get it anywhere. I knew that to be a falsehood, because matters of this kind had come to my personal knowledge. I thought the Scott Act was more thoroughly enforced in the town of Pembroke and the County of Renfrew than the License Act was in any town or county in which I had resided.

*By Judge McDonald:*

25762. Then you are at a loss to account for the repeal of it?—I say it puzzled me, but I give those various causes as conspiring together to cause the repeal.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

25763. But about the Inspector, I thought you had to remonstrate with the Chief Inspector as to his dereliction of duty?—I did.

25764. Was it after this complaint that the law was better observed?—I said I never saw any improvement in the action of the Inspector afterwards.

25765. Yet it was better enforced than the license law?—Yes, but I do not say it was done by the Inspector.

25766. By whom then?—It was done ostensibly through the Inspector.

25767. Through whom then?—That was the question the Inspector often asked, but he never got an answer to it. The Inspector said he would act if information were given to him, but he would not act otherwise; he would not seek for evidence. I am not at liberty to say anything further.

25768. I do not understand that there was anybody else?—Yes. The efforts made by those interested in the matter were set on foot by private individuals. They were known to me, but it would not be proper to mention the names, and your question aimed directly at the names.

25769. I asked the question because you said the Inspector was not energetic or was lazy?—I did not say he was lazy. I said he was indifferent and would not act the part of a detective. The fact is his sympathies were not with the Scott Act.

25770. We can scarcely reconcile that statement as to the efficiency of the enforcement of the Scott Act with the statement you have made in regard to him and his action, unless he was aided by the citizens?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

25771. You are not in a position, I suppose, to explain how the Scott Act came to be repealed in other counties in Ontario, as you have no personal knowledge of them?—No.

25772. Have you had any experience of the local option system in municipalities in the Province of Quebec?—Yes.

25773. In what counties?—In the County of Huntingdon.

25774. Will you inform the Commission of the working of that system, and the result?—The instance to which I refer is a place in which I resided under the license system. That was the form the temperance effort took. There was a vote of the people taken as to whether the Council should grant licenses or not. That vote was in favour of no licenses, and consequently no licenses were granted in the township. It came to the knowledge of those interested in the enforcement of the law that four men were transgressing the law. Action was taken against them, I do not know how frequently, but it resulted in the closing of all four establishments. If I remember rightly, in two

cases the liquors were seized, and fines, which are heavy in the Province of Quebec, were imposed, and no favour was shown. There was no interference such as we heard mentioned in evidence the other day. Two of the men stopped their business and two others went to the States.

25775. Have you reason to believe that the sale of liquor was wholly suppressed there?—Wholly suppressed is a strong term, but it was so thoroughly suppressed that I never heard of its sale afterwards.

25776. What was the extent of that municipality?—The ordinary township.

25777. Ten miles by ten miles?—I think so.

25778. Has that state of affairs been kept up?—I do not know.

25779. What was the vote?—It was very close. It was difficult to get our side, the temperance side, to the polls, but by strenuous efforts they were brought there.

25780. How did you find it in the County of Renfrew in regard to the old temperance societies continuing their work—the Sons of Temperance and the Good Templars Order?—When I heard that question asked of Mr. Carson, I tried to think whether I had definite information on that subject or not, and I do not think I have.

25781. You came to Montreal in 1888 and came under the license law here. Have you taken an active part in temperance work in the city of Montreal?—I have endeavoured to help the temperance movement as much as I could.

25782. It has led to your looking into the working of the law?—Yes, to some extent.

25783. As to the license law, do you look upon the licensing of the traffic as sinful?—I do.

25784. And if it is done, you look upon it as an evil or a necessary evil in this present state of circumstances?—I do not look upon any evil as necessary.

25785. How do you look upon it?—As an error in legislation.

25786. In your opinion there should be no license law?—No.

25787. Should there be total prohibition?—I think so.

25788. We have had put before us the deliverance of your church, adopted at your general conference in 1890 held in Montreal. Does that give the views of the Methodist Church of Canada?—Without any doubt.

25789. And your personal views also?—Yes.

25790. Speaking of the license law, do you believe that improvements might be made in it?—Yes.

25791. Take, as Mr. Carson did, the method of granting or applying for a license; what difficulties or evils are there in connection with that?—So far as the method of granting these licenses in Montreal is concerned, I sympathise with what Mr. Carson said, that the license holder ought to be compelled to obtain the signatures of at least a majority of those in the district in which he resides. The principle of government is that the majority should rule. Another point I anticipate: I say they should get the license and the signatures every year, because the population is constantly changing, and if the higher class of the population goes into a district, there should be no dram shops at all.

25792. Should there be no licenses in the residential parts?—There should not be any at all.

25793. But taking the facts as they are?—I think of the young man coming to his home in the residential part of the city, and I think of his danger there. I also think of his danger in the business parts. I am afraid to say which is the worst, when he is going home wearied with his toil or at business, and all I can say is it should not be anywhere.

25794. Your answer is that those places should not be permitted; but that if any are allowed, they should be away from men's homes?—I think so. Then there is a difficulty, because home influence has a great deal to do in restraining young men from evil.

25795. Do you think one reason why there are not saloons in the residential parts of the town is that the people there do not want them?—I think they do not want them near their homes.

25796. Applicants cannot get twenty-five people to sign?—Probably. As a minister, I do not want a saloon near my church; as a teacher, I do not want it near my

school-room ; as a parent, I do not want it near my home, and I do not want it near business places.

25797. There are people, I suppose, who have liquor in their cellars, and yet would not sign for a license?—I do not know.

25798. You have heard the question asked whether the hotel bar or the saloon bar is the more dangerous? The difficulty is precisely similar to that of locating saloons. I was speaking at a temperance meeting one night last winter, and I spoke of the evils of the high-class hotels, as well as of the low class. I said a man did not begin his career in Joe Beef's saloon and graduate in the Windsor, but probably he commenced in the Windsor and graduated in Joe Beef's saloon. A young man said a few years ago, he began in the Windsor and ended by being ejected from Joe Beef's saloon. He had reformed, through Divine Grace, at the time he was speaking. That makes it difficult to say whether the hotel bar or the saloon bar is the more evil. I do not see any more reason for a bar in connection with a hotel than for one in connection with a blacksmith shop.

25799. What is your experience in Montreal as to sale to minors?—I heard the Mayor state that minors had been disguised in order to decoy or deceive some liquor dealers into selling liquor to them. I heard one of those minors make this statement. He was asked if he had been guilty of practising any deception, and he stated in my presence that he was guilty of no deception whatever. I hear a great deal of complaint in regard to this, as Mr. Carson has said. I heard in my own neighbourhood of a man who tried to prevent the sale, and he was told the same. The delivery was to the child and the sale was to the parent, so the law was evaded. I heard a great deal of that. I know nothing of it from my own knowledge.

25800. Would you favour the recommendation of Mr. Carson, that there should be no sale or delivery to a minor?—I should by all means.

25801. Do you know anything about adulteration?—I have heard a good deal of testimony which I consider reliable; but I am not a tippler myself and am not brought immediately into contact with it. I have heard, on reliable evidence, that there is a shameful and villainous amount of adulteration. In Pembroke, I heard that in one case, where a man was accused under the Scott Act of selling intoxicating drinks, his wife was put in the witness-box and swore that he did not sell any alcoholic drinks. Both he and his wife bore testimony that he bought a bottle of stuff in Montreal, having arranged for its purchase through a commercial traveller. This was sent up to him, and he put eight gallons of water in this stuff and sold it, but it was not alcoholic drink. He was asked how he knew it was not alcoholic drink, and he answered, "Because I bought it in Montreal myself with that stipulation." This bottle was not more than the length of my finger, and he made eight gallons out of it. He said it did not make them drunk, but it made them dizzy. So there must be some sorts of abominable stuff sold.

25802. You have heard some statements as to the use of tobacco and logwood and other stuffs?—Yes, on statements I should not doubt. I have heard the particulars of people going to a "bee" a little late, and the whisky being exhausted or nearly so, water was poured into a tea-cup and some lumps of bluestone were dropped into the cup.

25803. Have you heard in your own church of some wine called port wine being found to be adulterated?—I have heard where the sediment has been found to be logwood, but I have not for years used alcoholic wines in my church.

25804. Coming to the question of the groceries; if liquors are to be sold at all, would you separate the sale of liquors from the sale of groceries?—I would. I have knowledge of the deplorable effects on respectable women, who have been wronged in consequence of the sale of liquor in groceries—women who would not go to a saloon or hotel to purchase liquors, but have ordered them with their groceries.

25805. Do you know anything of the sale of liquor on Sunday?—Yes; I have seen myself, in respectable hotels, the sale of liquors at 11 o'clock on Sunday night.

25806. In more than one place?—Yes; in more than one place.

25807. If liquors were to be sold at all, would you favour an inspection of them to prevent adulteration?—Yes, I would. I think a careful inspection of liquor would be of value. From the evidence that has been given before this Commission, and from cir-



cumstances with which I have been familiar before, I am forced to the conviction that there are instances in which men give drugged liquors to their customers with most deleterious results. I would favour an inspecting officer going not to the manufacturer, not to the wholesale dealer, but to the hotels and the saloons, and dropping in on them unawares and seizing liquor and carrying it off, and having a systematic arrangement in this regard.

25808. It was suggested by one officer that if, instead of buying a bottle, the officer took charge of the whole stock for the time and make his own selection, it would be better?—I think it would be a wise provision.

25809. As to those parks, Sohmer Park, Mountain Park, and the park on the Island, what is your opinion?—My opinion is that the performances there are not of the most elevating character; but they may be higher in character than the people who attend them, both morally and intellectually. I do not think any liquor should be sold there on any day, or that they should be kept open on the Sabbath day. I do not think the best way to elevate the people is to violate any of the commandments of the decalogue.

25810. Did you know Montreal before any of those parks existed?—I think so.

25811. What did the people who go there now do at that time?—I cannot say, but I know since Sohmer Park has given its exhibitions on the Sabbath day, it has been with fear and trembling that I have driven, for it has been, with danger to my life from the drunken people driving in from the Back River. I fancy Sohmer Park is frequented by those who cannot go out of the city on the Sabbath day without inconvenience.

25812. Do you know anything about lager beer and Weiss beer?—I do not use liquor.

25813. Have you seen the effects of them?—Weiss beer or any other beer with  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent of alcohol can intoxicate, perhaps not an old soaker; but a young man can drink  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent beer, perhaps not sufficiently to make him drunk, but if he continues it, he will want five per cent of alcohol the next year. These liquors stimulate a taste for intoxicants.

25814. You have heard the view put forward in favour of getting rid, as well as may be, of the sale of the heavy liquors and encouraging the consumption of light wines and ales?—I think the less liquor of any kind we have sold the better. I have never made any particular study of the effect of wines, but I have endeavoured to examine the effect of beer and ale and porter on the human system. The testimony of Dr. Reed, of England, and the late Dr. Abernethy, of England, shows that they both declare that the excessive and continued use of beer is more thoroughly destructive and undermining to the constitution of men than the use of hard liquor or whisky. I have asked that question of some of the leading physicians in Ontario, and I have yet to meet the first man who says the use of beer is less injurious than whisky. Without a solitary exception, they have declared that the continued use of beer is more detrimental to the human system than the continued use of whisky. They have told me that when a confirmed beer drinker is attacked by disease, he is far more liable to collapse, and irredeemably collapse, than a habitual whisky drinker, and I have that on the evidence of gentlemen, now leading physicians, whose names I could mention. So, I cannot conscientiously favour the sale of beer. Another objection I have to the sale of beer and light wine is, that many a young man would commence to drink beer and light wine who would give whisky a wide berth, and the taste simply develops itself. I speak from a knowledge of friends of my own in past years.

25815. Have you had any experience yourself in foreign countries?—No, but I will avail myself of this opportunity to state what was stated to me. I met the Rev. J. H. Dixon, of St. Jude's church, and asked him his opinion as having been in France, and asked him to give me authority for expressing an opinion on the subject.

25816. Have you any opinion as to the number of illicit places?—Not from personal knowledge, but as you received the statement of Mr. Carson as to the employment of a detective from New York, I would state that he was brought up here by the Citizens League, of which Major Bond is one of the most active members; and after a careful inspection of some parts of the city, he said to us there were from 800 to 900 places where liquor was sold illicitly. The statement was challenged most emphatically by the Chief of Police. I believe our Inspector, Mr. Lambe, stated that the Mercier Govern-

REV. THOMAS G. WILLIAMS.

ment chided him for not enforcing the law. The Chief said there might be \$2,400 to \$4,000 more collected, and there might be a number of private houses where the people would send to corner groceries.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25817. I did not hear the Chief of Police say anything about private houses.—I understood him to say so.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25818. In reference, then, to the question of a prohibitory law itself, do you favour the passing of such an Act?—I do.

25819. Do you favour it at the present time?—I do.

25820. Do you believe that a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of liquors, if passed at present, could be enforced?—I believe more efficiently than the present license law in the city of Montreal; and if in the city of Montreal, why not in the Dominion of Canada at large?

25821. So that it would be a success, as you would call it?—I believe it would.

25822. Have you considered the question at all in reference to different sections of Canada, the far east and west, observing the preponderating feeling in its favour in the Maritime Provinces, the balance of feeling in Ontario, with Quebec and perhaps British Columbia against it?—British Columbia is a small province. There is a peculiar position in British Columbia. When I see the state of affairs in the eastern provinces and the sentiment in Quebec and in Ontario, when I see the last vote that was taken in Manitoba, I cannot doubt that a prohibitory law could be enforced. And I also judge of that from conversations I have had in Montreal. Speaking to a gentleman in connection with the Inland Revenue department, and not a prohibitionist, in Montreal, he said he could enforce a prohibitory law in Montreal with the present provisions in six months. I spoke to a gentleman in the Customs in the Province of Quebec, and he said: "Within three months I could stamp out the liquor trade and enforce a prohibitory law in my whole district." These are statements made by men now engaged in the enforcement of the law. I asked if the same force were employed in the enforcement of a prohibitory law as is employed in the enforcement of a Customs law, if it were made as much to the interest of the officers, in each case, would it be a success? "Undoubtedly" they both told me.

25823. If you tried that mode of enforcement, by what officials should the law be administered, provincial or federal or what?—That is a matter of detail.

25824. As to the difficulties in the County of Renfrew: when you laid the matter before the officers, did that do any good?—No.

25825. How would you meet such a state of things?—I would break up the political combinations.

25826. That was the reason?—I think so.

25827. If a prohibitory law were passed, do you think remuneration should be made to brewers and distillers?—Well, if you would adjust the burden in the proper way, I would not object to remuneration. If those who have provided for the sale of liquors be compelled to bear the whole tax and those who had suffered should be relieved, I would not object.

25828. How would you get at it?—That is hypothetical.

25829. Suppose there is a revenue of seven or eight millions to the Dominion of Canada, the people have to make that up?—I am not a statesman. I leave to statesmen the solution of such problems. When Sir Leonard Tilley stated that the revenue from liquor was four million dollars, he said that if they passed a prohibitory law, he, as Finance Minister, would have no difficulty in making up the loss. I have no doubt our wise financiers would make up the loss.

25830. As the country as a whole would have to lose the revenue and make it up in some other way, from what class would you take the amount to give those people for the loss of their property?—I would fine those who made money out of the liquor traffic, and let them reimburse those who suffered. I find from Sir Joseph Hickson that when they introduced a new system on the Grand Trunk, they did not deem it necessary to

reimburse the parties. Compensation was not considered. But I would not hesitate for the sake of obtaining a prohibitory law, and I would not be unwilling to bear my share of taxation, to remunerate men who have invested money in plant. I would not object to that personally.

25831. Do you mean those who have licenses from year to year?—I would not take them into account at all.

25832. There was a matter put before the Commissioners by the Magistrates themselves, that they wished to see their discretionary powers taken away?—I am sorry that Magistrates, gentlemen occupying the positions they do, feel it necessary to make such a request; but in the interests of the public I hope it will be granted. I think it would be a godsend to the public if the Magistrates had no discretion.

25833. As to the drink trade itself: as a minister of the Gospel, having had experience among families, you might make a statement to the Commission as to how you have found the influence of the traffic socially and in the family?—The church of which I have the honour to be a minister demands total abstinence of every member of the church. Consequently we have not a large number of cases of that kind to deal with; but I have been looking over my experience, especially for the last 25 years, since I have had charge of these fields of labour, and I have found it extremely difficult to discover more than four or five cases in which I have been compelled to take steps, disciplinary steps, where serious trouble arose in the family, which did not come from the use of intoxicating drinks. It is extremely exceptional to be called upon to do anything in the way of discipline, except in consequence of the use of intoxicants. It is to my mind the one great curse that stands in the way of the Gospel.

25834. In that connection, and in your experience, do you find there has been in the social customs of the people a change for the better?—Yes, very good.

25835. That where liquor was used freely, it is now used sparingly?—Yes. There is a very great change.

25836. To what do you attribute that?—To the increased enlightenment of the people on this moral question and to the increased stringency of the license laws, because with their increased stringency, there are difficulties and obstacles placed in the way of the liquor seller, and every obstacle is so much of a testimony against the traffic; and the legislation of the past years, together with the moral influence of the church and the educating influences of our schools, Sunday schools especially, and the various organizations, especially the W. C. T. U., all these combined are elevating the sentiment of the public, and as the sentiment rises, the liquor traffic goes down.

25837. Would you favour an increase in temperance education in the schools?—I would.

25838. We have been told that there is very little of it?—Very little in this province.

25839. Have you any suggestions to offer not covered by the questions asked of you?—I have been depending almost altogether on the questions.

25840. You have had a large practical experience in this matter as a minister and a citizen; therefore, I would be glad that any suggestions you could make should go on the record?—I would favour all legislation which has for its object the limiting of the liquor traffic; every suggestion in the way of limiting the number of licenses and making a rigid inspection. High license I do not believe in. I do not believe, from the knowledge I have and from the testimony given here the other day from one of the officials of the city—I think it was Judge DeMontigny—that it would diminish the sale of liquor, and from the testimony in parts of the United States, high license has not diminished the sale of liquor or the crime which is the product of the sale of liquor. I favour a rigid inspection of liquor both in illicit and legal places, and I also believe in limiting the number of licenses.

25841. Would you prefer a license law or the free sale of liquor?—I have heard some thoughtful men say they would prefer the free sale of liquor, but I cannot bring myself to that. I think every restrictive clause in the license law is a prohibitive law, and in that sense I favour a license because it coops it up in narrower bounds.

REV. THOMAS G. WILLIAMS.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25842. Does a license law regulate the trade?—I have thought of that. Evidence has been given here by Judges, men who know well of what they speak, and weigh their words carefully. When I hear their statements before this Commission, and read the testimony of Chief Justice Coleridge and scores of others, I cannot think that any traffic which is the cause of from seven-eighths to nine-tenths of the crimes of the country, can be said to be well regulated.

25843. You have said, however, that you think you would prefer license to the free sale?—Yes.

25844. So I would like to find your opinion as to whether license makes the trade different from what it would be under free sale, whether it regulates or limits these deplorable results?—I fancy it does. Under free sale, I think the opportunities for the obtaining of liquor would be greater; but that is precisely the same question as to the difference between saloon and hotel bars.

25845. Have you found that the license law does diminish drinking at all?—I do not know that it diminishes drinking. I am not in a position really to form an opinion, for I have never seen free sale. If I had experience of the two, I could compare them.

25846. You can compare the Scott Act and the license system?—Yes, from personal knowledge.

25847. And that is to the advantage of the Scott Act?—The Scott Act, the Dunkin Act, the withholding of licenses in every instance, has been incomparably superior to the licensed sale.

25848. And the enforcement is as easy as that of the license law?—I may have exaggerated views on that subject, but I cannot see how it could be as easy to enforce a license law when the liquor is in the hands of men who will violate the law if they can make money out of it. They can do that more easily under the license law than if the holding of liquor subjects them to punishment.

25849. That is your theory; but what is your observation?—My observation has been that the license law has not been as well enforced as the Scott Act has been. There have been cases during the time the Dunkin Act was in force in a certain place where I resided when it was very laxly enforced, but the predominating testimony I would give is that the license law was not as thoroughly enforced as the Scott Act was where I have lived.

25850. Is it, then, your observation that wherever there has been a licensed sale, there has also been an illicit sale or an illegal sale by licensees?—I have never lived in a place yet in which licenses were granted that I did not know of abundance of transgressions of the license law, and abundance of transgressions by those who held licenses themselves.

25851. Have you found that it is characteristic of the trade to disregard the law?—I know of no class of men of whom so large a proportion are subject to the process of fining as the licensed liquor sellers.

25852. Then as to the effect of license on public sentiment: what is that on young people especially?—I have heard various opinions on that, and the legalising of the traffic is generally supposed to be a protection, and to give respectability to the traffic. I know when the Scott Act came into force in Pembroke, the result was to make drinking more disreputable than it was before. I asked a gentleman from Pembroke the other day, what was the result of the re-establishment of the license law, and he said drinking had increased largely because the facilities had increased, and they had not to sneak around to get the liquor as they had under the Scott Act.

25853. Are there any circumstances under which you would give your consent to a license law?—That is a very hard question to answer, but in a Christian community, with a law abiding people, with Judges who have, as any Judge ought to have, some sense of the dignity of their office and some moral obligation to enforce the law which they swear to enforce, there could be no hesitancy in refusing licenses, because under such circumstances a prohibitory law could be made effective.

25854. Would you personally give your sanction to the sale of intoxicating liquor by license, under any circumstances?—No, I would not.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25855. Then would you favour free sale?—I would be between the devil and the deep sea.

25856. Which would you favour?—I could not give an opinion.

25857. These questions have been raised by advocates of temperance?—I could not imagine a condition of things where I would consent to license, and I could not consent to free sale.

25858. But if you had to consent to one or the other?—That is hypothetical.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25859. In Charlottetown, the Scott Act was repealed, and for eighteen months afterwards there was free sale of liquor without let or hindrance. The people refused to license the trade and also refused to limit the number of those who sold liquor; but at the last session of the Legislature they passed a bill which put the traffic under certain regulations?—Is there no law there against selling liquor by anybody? That is a very peculiar state of affairs, and I would like to think it over.

25860. You had knowledge of the Scott Act being brought into force and took part in the campaigns in its favour, and you know something about its repeal. Is the reason for the repeal that the people who voted for the Scott Act expected almost total prohibition under that measure?—My impression is that is correct, and that the people felt that the Scott Act was the very next step to prohibition.

25861. You have said there were various reasons that caused the repeal. Do you think that the discovery of the partial character of the Scott Act and of the many difficulties in the way of its enforcement led to the people getting discouraged because it did not accomplish all they thought it would accomplish?—I have heard that statement made as a reason why persons would not vote for it again.

25862. Do you believe that politics entered into it at all?—I think so.

25863. Do you understand the repeal of the Scott Act in various Ontario constituencies to mean that the people in those constituencies did not want prohibition?—No.

25864. What do you understand by it?—I said that there were various reasons which conspired to cause this repeal.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25865. I asked you some questions in reference to the County of Renfrew, and then passed to other counties of which you had no knowledge?—I think some people were disappointed, because they thought the Scott Act was a prohibitory law, and it would be a prohibition law if it were adopted by all the counties.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25866. We in the east heard from the west that Ontario was disgusted with the Scott Act, that the people of Ontario had found that prohibition was a fallacy and wanted to go back to the license system. I wish to find out from you whether the repeal of the Scott Act in these various places may be truly understood to mean that the people did not want prohibition?—I do not think that. I do not think it was a vote against prohibition, but it was a vote against a law which promised what the people thought would be prohibition, and through its ineffectiveness did not give it.

25867. Do you think the people who voted originally for the Scott Act, if asked to vote for a general prohibitory law touching the importation and manufacture as well as the sale, would vote for such a law?—From the testimony of men with whom I have come in contact, I think they would very largely; and I have talked with those who were not in favour of the Scott Act and who said to me time and again, we would not vote for the Scott Act, but we would vote for a prohibitory measure.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25868. What did you think of those men at the time?—I thought some were telling the truth and others were excusing themselves, or trying to do so.

REV. THOMAS G. WILLIAMS.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25869. Do you think the Scott Act people would vote generally as heartily for a general prohibitory law?—I think so.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

25870. Would you favour the prohibition of the importation of fermented wines for sacramental purposes?—Personally, I dare not use, conscientiously, fermented wines for sacramental purposes, for reasons I did not state; but I do not wish in all circumstances to force my personal views upon others. I believe there are those who conscientiously hold that if the alcoholic property is absent from sacramental wine, they do not administer the sacrament.

25871. I speak of fermented wine and unfermented wine; I do not speak of alcoholic wine?—I always thought that any fermented wine must contain alcohol. Do you speak of fermented wine in which there is no alcohol?

25872. I spoke only of fermented wine?—If you will import wine that has no alcohol in it, I will not object to its importation.

25873. But in regard to wine, which is the pure juice of the grape, and is kept for two or three years, and has fermented in consequence of its age, without any addition of alcohol: would you object to that?—If the gentleman will prove to me that it is possible to have fermented wine in which there is no alcohol, then I will understand the question; but, as I understand, when wine ferments it generates alcohol in itself, and there is enough alcohol to make a man drunk without adding even a moderate quantity of spirits.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25874. Is your idea of a prohibitory law, a law to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale for beverage purposes, but not for medicinal, scientific and sacramental purposes?—I do not desire to force my peculiar views of alcoholic wines on others.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25875. I have had figures placed in my hands, showing that in Renfrew there were 1,748 votes cast for the Act and 1,013 against it, giving a majority of 730 in favour of the Act, and a total vote of 2,766. On the second occasion there were 1,670 for the Act, 78 less than on the first occasion; and the vote against the Act was 2,560, or 1,562 more than on the first occasion, nearly 20 per cent more against the Act on the second ballot than on the first occasion. A similar state of things occurred in other counties. Did you think the fact that the Act did not accomplish all those people thought it would accomplish was the cause of that revulsion in public opinion?—I think it was one of the causes.

25876. There were 2,766 votes cast in the first case and 4,250 in the second case. Would not this be an indication that when a fairly large vote was cast, the majority of the people were opposed to it?—That opens a very wide question, to which there are many aspects, which we canvassed at the time of the repeal, and upon which we could not take any irrefutable position; there are so many contending influences at work.

25877. The first was a very small vote, 2,766?—There has been a constant increase of immigration into that county during these three years. The Canadian Pacific Railway was at first only constructed a short distance west of Pembroke, and as the road extended west a larger tide of immigration began to flow into that county. There was a larger population in the county three years afterwards. The fact is the Act was repealed by a majority vote, and I cannot account for it, except that there were various influences at work.

25878. You said the license law was not as thoroughly enforced as the Scott Act was, or as the Dunkin Act or local prohibition?—I say that my experience has been that the license law in the places where I have resided for the past 25 years has not been as thoroughly enforced as the prohibitory laws have been. Here in this city there has not been a witness who has not deplored that the license law is not and cannot be enforced. Mr. Lambe said that there are from 2,000 to 4,000 illicit places in this city where liquor is sold, and another calculation gives from 800 to 900 places. The fact that

it is proposed that there shall be an inspection in places where liquor is illegally sold, shows irrefutably that the license law is a failure. How can we say it is effective?

25879. And yet the people after an experience of three or six or nine years of the Scott Act in Ontario took up the reintroduction of the license law, which according to you is not as well enforced?—Very well.

25880. As to the opening of the parks on the Sabbath, you have heard the evidence given by a workingman?—I heard the evidence of one.

25881. How do you suppose these men will spend their Sabbaths if the public parks are closed? The testimony of the Judges was that substantial benefit has resulted to the working classes because while before the opening of those parks, they went from tavern to tavern drinking on Sundays, the facilities given them of going to those parks had resulted in good?—I heard that.

25882. You think the parks should be closed on Sunday?—Yes.

25883. What would you do with those people?—I think we would settle that by obeying God's law.

25884. You think that God forbids the opening of those parks on Sunday?—I think if God's law were observed, it would be all right.

25885. Do you think it is a violation of God's law to have an open place where people can enjoy themselves by sitting under a tree and getting fresh air on Sunday?—I cannot conceive a park kept open for the public without its entailing unnecessary labour, and from my knowledge of the parks, I cannot agree with all that has been said as to the elevating character of the entertainments given there. I cannot conceive that men climbing ropes and going up in balloons and drinking lager beer or Weiss beer can be elevating.

25886. Did you say you would have the parks closed entirely on Sunday?—Such parks as are before the Commission to-day should be closed, in my opinion. If you refer to the open parks of the city where men can go and sit and chat with their families and have the fountains playing in front of them, it is another thing.

25887. Would you favour that?—I am not discussing that.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

25888. Is there a park of that kind in the city?—Certainly; there is one in front of the Windsor hotel.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

25889. Is there an admission fee charged?—No.

25890. Would you favour the running of street cars to these parks where there is no admission fee charged?—I am opposed to street cars running on Sundays.

25891. I do not know so much about Montreal, but in Toronto we have public parks where there are no tight rope performances on Sundays?—These parks to which reference has been made are not public parks in that sense.

25892. Is not the Mountain Park a public park?—That is another thing. It is just the same as the Viger Gardens and the same as your park in Toronto.

25893. Would you favour the closing of the Queen's Park in Toronto on Sunday?—No.

25894. What about the Island park?—Where they run a razzle-dazzle and break people's legs on Sunday, I do not favour that.

25895. I asked you if you would favour the opening of public parks where no fee was charged?—If you mean a park such as that in front of the Windsor hotel I think it should not be closed, but Sohmer Park and Royal Park are private speculations owned by private individuals.

25896. They are private parks, then?—They are owned by companies, and an admission fee is charged. I have gone into Sohmer Park on a week day. I understood by a private park you meant a gentleman's own park, but this is a park owned by a company, kept for public amusement.

25897. I thought that they were public parks and that the Council had given them certain privileges?—There is an admission fee and you have an entertainment, and there is a menagerie, with another fee to pay, and then there is a bar.

REV. THOMAS G. WILLIAMS.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25898. As to the Island Park ?—I never was on St. Helen's Island.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25899. Does that belong to the city ?—I do not know.

25900. You said there was a razzle-dazzle where they break people's legs ?—I do not know what that is, but I think it is one of those contrivances with wooden animals.

25901. There are no public parks, except the Mountain Park and one or two other small ones ?—No.

25902. The others are really private parks ?—Yes, as you understand the term.

25903. I understood you to say you were in favour of the inspection of liquors ?—I am. There is one more statement I wish to make. It has been said repeatedly that the Scott Act is a prolific cause of perjury. I have had something to do with enforcing the Scott Act, the license law, the local option law and the Dunkin Act. I have never been able to discover the slightest difference as to the disposition to perjury in the one case more than in the other. I do not know that the Scott Act produces more perjury than the license law, or that the license law produces more than the Scott Act. The man who wants to cover up his sin will perjure himself.

REV. GEORGE DOUGLAS, D.D., of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

25904. What position do you hold in connection with the Methodist Church ?—For the last twenty years I have been Principal of the Theological College.

25905. And before that ?—I have had a very wide experience as a pastor in Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston, and this city.

25906. You have heard the evidence of the Rev. Dr. Williams ?—I have.

25907. Are you able to speak, from your own experience, as to all the points on which he gave evidence ?—No ; I have lived in this city for the last 29 or 30 years ; therefore, I have no experience of the action of the Scott Act.

25908. Have you of the Dunkin Act ?—No.

25909. Nor of any prohibitory law ?—Nor of any prohibitory law, except the observations I have made while I have resided more or less extendedly in the State of Maine.

25910. Would you give us that experience in Maine ?—My experience is entirely in favour of the Maine law. I would not say that liquor could not be obtained at the hotels, but I affirm that the entire of the liquor establishments were closed, that you could not obtain liquor unless you were in the secret how to obtain it. The advantage of the Maine law is a mighty educating force on the rising generation.

25911. In what places have you been in Maine ?—In Portland, in Orchard Beach ; I have been in some of the islands along the seaboard, and have had occasion of wide intercourse with the clergy, and with those who were engaged in the administration of the law.

25912. Your experience in Canada has been under a license law ?—Under a license law.

25913. And have you had any practical experience in the way of looking after the enforcement of the license law, or the granting of licenses, or anything of the kind ?—No ; I have had no direct connection with the administration of the license law, and my knowledge is simply that of a city pastor and one engaged in moral reform.

25914. Taking your experience as a minister of the Gospel, do you concur in what Dr. Williams has said ?—I quite agree, even with greater emphasis in some of the departments. I would emphasize the point that in my experience, in this city, the effect



of the liquor traffic on our young men of the best families has been pathetic and appalling. I can think of some of the best families in which one son after another has gone down to a drunkard's grave and to an appalling end.

25915. Do you agree with Dr. Williams in his opinion of the operation of the license law in this city?—I entirely concur.

25916. Are you opposed yourself, on principle, to the granting of licenses?—Well, now, as you were sifting Dr. Williams, I will say this: that I regard license as an evil, and I regard free liquor as an evil. Now, of the two evils, anything that tends towards the limitation is of advantage, therefore; if we must have evil, I would be inclined to limitation rather than licensed conditions.

25917. Granted that there must be a license law, would you favour the limitation of the number of places?—I would emphatically.

25918. Both according to territory and population?—Yes.

25919. Have you formed any opinion as between the saloon bar and the hotel bar?—I say they are both evil. If you wish to institute a comparison as to which works the great evil, why take the Windsor, working ruination amongst the highest families, and the ordinary saloon, operating on a lower stratum; but I cannot draw a line between the detrimental effects.

25920. In case of the passing of a prohibitory law, what is your opinion as to granting compensation to brewers and distillers?—I am utterly opposed to compensation, because I find that the Government of this country changes its tariffs and works ruination on manufacturers and others without recognizing the obligation of compensation, and I fail to discover why we should compensate the makers and vendors of ruin.

25921. As to the separation of the sale of liquor from the sale of groceries, what is your opinion?—I am emphatically in favour of that, because, as a pastor, I have known the unspeakable ruin which is brought into families under cover of the grocery, which would not likely have occurred if there had only been a saloon.

25922. Do you know anything of sale to minors?—I know it to have worked ruination in children. I have had the experience of a minister's son, who came within a shade of being ruined by the common sale to minors. I would inflict the heaviest penalty on the violation of the law there.

25923. Do you know anything about the question of adulteration of liquor?—When I was free from my limitations, the limitations under which I suffer now, I witnessed the adulterating processes in some houses; but I attached no importance to that, because I regard alcohol as the vilest of all pests that can be wielded to destroy human life.

25924. Do you know if liquor is sold much in unlicensed places?—Only by the testimony of specialists; nothing personally.

25925. How long have you resided in Montreal?—Nearly 30 years.

25926. Have you observed in that time any change in the social habits of the people in regard to the drinking of intoxicating liquors?—I have noticed that that part of the community which is under moral and church influences has certainly risen in the scale, that is, they have more completely renounced all connection with the liquor trade. On the other hand, where religious influences have not been operating, I think that a demoralizing process is going on in this city. I take it that the city is becoming worse and worse where moralizing influences do not avail.

25927. Have you formed any opinion as to the use of light wines and ale?—The worst case of delirium tremens I have ever witnessed in my pastorate proceeded from beer drinking; and as to light wines, they educate the taste, benumb the conscience and I might say inevitably strongly tend to the habit of habitual intoxication.

25928. Have you any suggestions to make to the Commission further than are contained in the answers you have made to the questions which were sent to you?—I really cannot say I can add much or anything. I think that to increase the educational work on temperance in the schools, and, of course, for the Government to enforce its supervisions for the protection of the public, loyally and honestly, and thus open the way for the introduction of prohibition, would have good effects.

REV. GEORGE DOUGLAS.

25929. You are a believer in prohibition?—I am emphatically, as the only alleviation of the curse of intemperance.

25930. I suppose you have done practical work in connection with intemperance?—Yes.

25931. Would you favour the immediate enactment of a general prohibitory law?—I would favour the immediate enactment of such a law, and believe that, as Dr. Williams asserted, it could be infinitely better administered and executed than the license law.

25932. That is comparatively, but taking it positively, do you believe it could be well enforced?—I think that if there was loyalty in the Government to the law, it could be as thoroughly enforced as vaccination was enforced in this city, notwithstanding that tens of thousands were antagonistic to the process.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

25933. Do you know any church which does not try to promote temperance?—I know of no churches that are not favourable to temperance, but there are some of the churches which favour moderate drinking, where there are no excesses. That is their definition of temperance. Others associate the idea with prohibition. All churches are favourable to temperance, some churches to moderate drinking and some to prohibition.

25934. Do you not know that every church would rather have abstainers than even moderate drinkers?—Well, I have no doubt they would. Still, at the same time, there are some that do not insist upon it. I think there are magnificent men in every church; magnificent men preaching in Notre Dame Cathedral and in our churches generally; still there is upon us the necessity of touching upon that point.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

25935. What is the duty of your church on the subject?—The duty of the 15,000 ministers and 830,000 persons in Canada is almost to a man in favour of prohibition. There may be some what we call *non ultra* men who may think there ought to be a process of education; but there is absolute unity, as authenticated by the chief council of the church, our late general conference, in favour of total prohibition.

25936. You believe that the majority of your church hold that law would be an important factor in the educational process?—I think they believe it to be fundamental.

25937. Do you think law is an educator?—I emphatically do, because the Maine law, on the authority of Neal Dow, educated almost every family in favour of abstinence from liquor.

25938. Do you believe prohibition would be of great benefit to the country, not only morally but financially?—I think it would lift up Canada to the proudest place among the nations. If seven millions of duty is taken out of the pockets of the people, what must be the principal, two or three hundred millions, that confers no advantage whatever. This, if saved, would enrich Canada beyond all estimate of financiers. And we must consider the expense in the administration of justice, which largely arises from the effects of the liquor trade.

25939. You believe, then, that the money that is now absorbed by the liquor trade would naturally diverge itself into other channels and become a source of large profit to the country?—I know in the case of Maine, the augmentation of wealth there has placed that northerly and comparatively barren State in the position of the wealthiest, *pro rata* to the population, in the Union.

25940. It is sometimes said that a law persistently and flagrantly violated has a demoralizing effect upon the people. Which do you think would be more demoralizing, a law which is fairly good, enforced, or a license law?—I unhesitatingly think that a law which tolerates liquor is far more demoralizing than a righteous law which tends towards the good. I look upon a prohibition law, even if violated, as holding in it elements of law and gradually educating, if there is an element of righteousness in the Government, towards the operation of that law and working towards its enforcement.

25941. Do you regard it as the duty of Parliament at present to pass a prohibitory law?—I do.

25942. It is claimed that public opinion is not in favour of such a law, and the reason given is that the people do not send to Parliament men who are in favour of it. Would you favour a plebiscite?—I most certainly would. I think it is the only method of redeeming the question from the contentions of political parties. The claim has been made that men's political proclivities were so strong that they subordinated their convictions in favour of temperance interests. I am clear on that.

FREDERICK WALDEMAR HOOSLEP, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

25943. Where is your home?—Bergen, Norway.

25944. And your calling?—Captain of a steamer.

25945. How long have you resided in Bergen?—Ten years.

25946. Will you tell us what the law there is in regard to the sale of intoxicating liquors?—In Bergen we have the Bolag. It is an institution, where the authority is given by the municipality of the State to the people in town, particularly to rich merchants, who can go in for that thing. They buy the shares.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25947. It is a monopoly of the liquor traffic for a city?—Yes, and of whatever is made out of it they get 20 per cent, and the rest goes to the benefit of the State.

*By Judge McDonald :*

25948. Is there an inspection of liquors, to see that they are pure?—Yes ; the Inspectors are employed by the Government.

25949. Do they inspect thoroughly?—Yes, very thoroughly. There is a chief Inspector for every city, and a sub-inspector and several agents who go around from time to time and see there is nothing done beyond the regulations and rules of the Bolag.

25950. Is there any time at which they have to close?—From 5 o'clock on Saturday night until Monday morning at 7 or 8 o'clock, I am not sure which.

25951. And on ordinary days?—They open the liquor stores at 6 in the morning and close at 8 or 9 o'clock. There are cafés kept open, where a better class of people go, and they are kept open till 9, but the restaurants or liquor stores, where the lower class of people go, are kept open until 8.

25952. How long has this system been in force?—It is in different towns in Norway. In Tromsø, which I left when I was 16, and I am 31 now, there was no Bolag. Ten years ago, I visited it, and there was a Bolag there. Now we have it in all the towns in Norway.

25953. Is there less drunkenness than there used to be?—I am sure of it. I said to-day that when I was a boy we used to throw snow-balls at the drunken people on the streets. Every day, and especially on Saturday, you would see lots of drunken people ; but when I went back to my birth place, I could not see a drunken man.

25954. How large is Bergen?—It has a population of about 50,000.

25955. Does the law work well there?—It works splendidly. The labouring class have no power to buy after they get their money, and they do not look ahead and get a gallon before hand.

25956. They cannot get liquor on credit?—I suppose they could, but they have no forethought. They do not think ahead.

25957. What kinds of liquors are mostly consumed?—Brandy they call it. It is Norwegian brandy made out of corn, and is very cheap.

25958. Is it a strong spirit?—Yes, very strong.

REV. GEORGE DOUGLAS.

25959. Do you use light wines?—Only the upper classes, not the lower classes. They drink beer.

25960. Is there much beer drunk?—Yes, lots.

25961. Is it lager beer?—The beer is the same as the German lager beer.

25962. Have you travelled much?—Yes.

25963. Do you find as you get further north that the people drink more liquor?—In England they use the same liquors as we use, and have not the restrictions that we have.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

25964. Is there any restriction as to the number of those places?—Yes.

25965. How many places are there in Bergen?—I cannot tell you exactly, but there is one place for so many people, and the municipality gives the grant to those people who have the right to sell the liquor, and says you have to put one place there in one quarter of the city, and another place there and another place here.

25966. Would there be 50 places?—No. I think 10, if there are so many.

25967. These places are controlled by a monopoly?—Yes.

25968. Who receive 10 per cent on their capital and hand the balance over to the municipality?—Yes.

25969. And there has been a substantial advantage to the people generally by the introduction of the system?—Yes.

25970. Was drunkenness very prevalent in Bergen before the introduction of the system?—Yes.

25971. And there has been great improvement since then?—No doubt about it, in every town in Norway.

25972. Was there a system of inspection before the introduction of this new plan?—Yes.

25973. Was it as efficient as now?—No.

25974. Then the reduction of the number of places, the inspection of the liquor and the regulation for the early closing on Saturday and week nights have brought about the beneficial results you speak of?—Yes.

25975. Did your people ever consider the question of prohibiting the traffic entirely?—Yes; there are parishes, and one little town in Norway with 2,000 inhabitants, Hangesund, where the importation of liquor is entirely prohibited.

25976. How does the system work in that town?—It does not work at all.

25977. How is that?—They get the liquor imported, any way. I think the system of the Bolag is the only system that can work anyway satisfactorily.

24978. The prohibition in this small town, according to your knowledge, is not successful?—No.

25979. Is the Bolag more successful than prohibition in towns of the same population?—Yes, I think it is no use to entirely prohibit.

25980. Why?—Because the people in Hangesund I hear get the stuff imported in 5 or 10 gallon barrels and have it just the same. I was in Hardanger Fjord; there are large hotels, and I noticed that I could not get a glass of grog if I bought the whole hotel; and there were three or four large hotels—large tourist hotels—in every place, and it was impossible to get a glass of grog. That is in the country.

25981. And the hotel is well conducted and clean?—I should think so, beautifully clean.

25982. And no liquor is sold?—No liquor. You get beer and claret, but no brandy or whisky.

25983. You have light wine and beer?—Yes, but not the heavy stuff.

25984. Have you been in any country where prohibition is the law?—I have been in no other country except Norway and Sweden; but the difference is that in Sweden the profit goes to the Government, while in Norway it goes to the municipality; and if you ever should go to Norway and see what that surplus has done to the benefit of the towns, you will say it is wonderful. In Bergen, there are roads and parks and everything constructed out of what we call brandy money. It has been all done from liquor money.

25985. Is the sale of beer given to this Bolag?—They can sell beer or anything.

25986. Can any one else sell beer?—Yes.

25987. Then the monopoly only refers to the stronger liquors?—Yes, alcoholic liquors.

25988. But as to the sale of beer?—It is granted, and the sale of clarets and sherries is granted to the hotels.

25989. It is only brandy and gin and rum that are sold under the monopoly?—Yes.

25990. Would you favour prohibition?—No.

25991. Why?—Because people will get liquor all the same.

25992. How would they get it in the interior?—In the interior it is very difficult. I saw that, because I was not able to get it myself. There were lots of tourists there—there were two Norwegian lieutenants and two English tourists. I had a bottle of liquor which I brought from Bergen, and they were crazy to make my acquaintance in order to get a little grog. They could not get it for money or love.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

25993. How many places were there in Bergen for the sale of liquor before this new law?—Any amount.

25994. One or two hundred?—I cannot say. Before this the big liquor dealers had their licenses for a life time, and the municipality had to buy them out at a very high price in order to get the right. I know a widow whose husband had a grant for selling liquors for his life time, and they had to pay her a heavy sum to get her to drop out of business.

25995. Do you know of many places that sell illicitly?—No.

25996. Are there any such places?—If there are any, I have never seen them.

25997. Did you ever hear of their being brought before the Courts?—If there are any, they are so few as to be of no consequence. There may be a private house here and there, but they are of no consequence publicly.

25998. Are there any in the country where there is no Bolag?—No; it is started in every parish in Norway. We can easily count the parishes where they have prohibition.

25999. The municipality is making money out of it?—Not a cent; it goes to the benefit of the public.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26000. I understood you to say that in country places there were no Bolags, only light wines and beer were sold?—That is so. A Bolag means stores; but in the country there is prohibition of strong liquors, but they can sell claret and beer.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26001. Do they have to obtain a license?—Yes, and they require a license in the city, where they cannot sell a glass of beer unless you take a piece of sandwich. A man can take a glass beer but only if it is served with a sandwich.

26002. Are there many places in the country where they do not have licenses to sell claret and beer?—Yes.

26003. There is a good deal of temperance work in Norway?—Yes.

26004. Are there many temperance societies?—Yes.

26005. The Good Templars are very strong there?—Yes; there are a lot of Good Templars, and they work very well in Norway.

26006. Is there any strong feeling in Norway in favour of prohibition?—I cannot say exactly that there is a strong feeling against it, but I think every one agrees with the system we have got.

26007. You think it is a good system?—There is no doubt about that.

26008. But are there many people who want to do away with even those Bolags?—No, not at all.

26009. Do you know whether there are any number of people who would like to prevent the sale of wine and beer?—No, not at all.

FREDERICK WALDEMAR HOOSLEP.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

26010. I think that besides the Bolags some merchants are authorized to sell by wholesale ?—At least forty litres.

26011. Any person can obtain a license to sell wholesale ?—Yes.

26012. Does not the Government speak of taking the profits for itself, instead of giving them to the municipalities ?—Yes ; they are talking about that now.

26013. Are the regulations which govern these Bolags very well observed ?—Yes ; they are very strictly observed.

26014. They are not allowed to sell to minors ?—No.

26015. Nor on Sunday ?—No.

26016. And the Government has a good many agents to see that the law is well observed ?—Yes, there are lots of them. There is a head Inspector and sub-inspector who never go around, but there are agents always going round. There are detectives who go round and try to find out if there is any violation of the law, and I do not think there is anybody who dare break the law.

26017. What is the character of the servants employed by these Bolags to retail liquors ?—They are almost all teetotalers.

26018. Is there not a regulation that no servant of a Bolag shall sell to any person who seems to be under the influence of liquor ?—Yes ; that is very strictly observed.

26019. And is not a servant who sells to a person under the influence of liquor very severely punished ?—Yes.

26020. Or a servant who sells to a minor ?—Yes.

26021. These Bolags obtain the privilege of selling liquors, for how many years ?—Six or eight years, I am not sure which, this Bolag got the grant for. They may alter the laws. The last Bolag had it for ten years, and then things were altered a little, and the new Bolag got it for six or eight years, I am not sure which.

26022. And strong drinks are sold only in towns ; and in country places, even where there are hotels for tourists, no strong drinks are sold ?—None at all.

26023. Only beer and light wines ?—Yes. If you even go to a hotel on Saturday night after five o'clock and you feel sick at the stomach, you cannot get a drink of brandy.

26024. Has the Government very severe laws about the adulteration of drinks ?—Yes, very severe. They are inspecting and taking the degrees every now and then. I do not know how often, but very often. They take the degrees of alcohol and everything, and examine the liquors.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 20th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day, JUDGE McDONALD presiding.

*Present :*

MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.

MR. G. A. GIGAUT.

RICHARD WILLIAM HENEKER, of Sherbrooke, P.Q., on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

26025. I believe you are a Doctor of Civil Laws ?—Yes, and I am Chancellor of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, and Chairman of the Board of Trustees, and I am also Chairman of the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction for the Province of Quebec.

26026. What is your business, or profession ?—I am Commissioner of the British American Land Company.

26027. We understand that you have visited Gothenburg in Sweden ?—Yes, I have.

26028. Will you kindly make a statement of what you know in regard to the Gothenburg system, and what you learned there in regard to the previous state of affairs ?—In 1866 I had occasion to visit Sweden on the subject of immigration—that is in regard to emigrants coming from Sweden and Norway to this country. I obtained letters of recommendation from the Colonial Office to all the different Consuls both in Sweden and Norway, and to the Ambassador at Stockholm. These brought me into communication with many leading persons in the country, and amongst others with the editor of the *Journal of Commerce* at Gothenburg. In the course of conversation as to the state and conditions in different parts of Sweden, and especially in regard to the condition of the city of Gothenburg, he mentioned to me the wonderful change that had taken place in the city in consequence of the introduction of a totally different system of administration as regards the liquor traffic. Previous to the time that this new administration came into force, Gothenburg had an evil reputation, as being one of the worst places in the world for drunkenness. As a seaport, exporting timber to various ports of Europe, the vessels of all European nations centered there, and the sailors were obliged to get what they wanted in the way of accommodation at places that were called the cellars—large places, not necessarily underground, but under very large buildings. Those places were there called the cellars, and they are generally called the cellars in Germany. The liquor traffic was in full force, and the condition of those places was, to use the language of the editor of the *Journal of Commerce*, a perfect hell. No person could go through them without his life being endangered. The place was of such evil repute that the respectable people of Gothenburg—and it is a place of great respectability, and of high position—determined, if possible, to put an end to it, and for that purpose they formed what we now call a syndicate. They ascertained from the Council of the city to what extent the city revenues were benefited by the licenses charged in connection with those places. They ascertained also the rental of those places, and they determined not to injure anybody, either the corporation of the city on the one hand, or private individuals on the other, but they burdened themselves with the full charge for the amount of the whole of the licenses paid to the city as well as the rental charge of those cellars ; and they disclosed the scheme to the city authorities. The scheme was, in a few words, as follows : They were to have the monopoly of the liquor trade as regarded those places in Gothenburg. No licenses were to be issued except to them. Their view was that mankind will desire to use spirits and alcoholic drinks,

RICHARD WILLIAM HENEKER.

that it is a natural desire, and that if the trade were only regulated no harm need accrue. They, therefore, determined to supply alcoholic drinks of different kinds, but of the very best quality, free from adulterations of any character; but they also determined to regulate the sale of those in such a manner as to prevent any evil accruing from them. They cleansed all those cellars; they purified them; they made them bright and clean in appearance, and they did not allow any dirt to accumulate in any part of them; and they placed a man at the head of each who should not be interested in the sale of intoxicating drinks. One condition of his employment was that should anybody be found on the premises drunk, and should that drunkenness be traced to him, or should it be found that he had given drink to any one who came into his place in a state of intoxication, he would be immediately discharged without question, and some one else would be appointed in his place. Besides, coffee, tea, and everything that a man needed in a humble way for the purpose of satisfying his ordinary requirements, was provided, all of the very best quality. In order that I might completely understand the matter this gentleman, the editor of the *Journal of Commerce*, took me through the cellars, and I found that these places, which had been unfit for any respectable person to pass, were as clean and as comfortable as possible, in every respect as respectable as any hotel of good character. I would not have hesitated to take my breakfast or any other meal in those places, being perfectly sure that the meal would be of good quality and that everything would be clean, and being at the same time satisfied that nothing would occur that would offend either the ear or the eye. I went through these places, and I found that all that the editor had represented with respect to them was perfectly correct. I was wonderfully impressed by what I saw, and I have since learned that the good effects which were commenced as long ago as 1866 have been continued ever since, and that not only have they continued in Gothenburg, but the system has been copied in various other cities, and therefore that which began in Gothenburg has become so widespread as to now have the name of the Gothenburg system attached to it. The system is not new, and it must have been known for a great many years. It has been discussed in the English press, and I myself was so impressed by it that on my return to Sherbrooke I delivered a lecture on Sweden and Norway and took advantage of the circumstance to give the whole particulars of the scheme, feeling that the public mind should be informed, in the view that it afforded a remedy for the frightful trouble which affects all communities—excessive drunkenness. In brief, that is the statement I have to make to the Commission.

26029. How large a place is Gothenburg?—40,000 or 50,000 inhabitants at least; it is quite a large town, and a very important town; in fact, one of the most important towns in Sweden.

26030. I understand it is a large shipping port?—Yes.

26031. The population, I suppose, is of a mixed character, such as is usually found at seaports?—Yes.

26032. The population is largely composed of seafaring men, who are coming and going?—Yes, and they are always changing. It is a large port, and a great shipping port for timber in Sweden. In order to show the importance of it, I may explain that from Gothenburg there is a series of canals, something like our canal system in this country, leading from there to Stockholm. A great many lakes are made use of in connection with the canal, and in this way it is connected with the interior of Sweden, and is a very important port indeed.

*By Mr. Gigault:*

26033. Outside of that Company, are liquor dealers authorized to sell wine and lager beer?—I cannot tell you; I can only speak in regard to the Gothenburg system.

26034. Do you know if in Gothenburg other persons are authorized to sell lager beer and wine?—That I do not know. I can only give you particulars of this system, which was brought to my notice, and which I investigated on the spot, and I cannot tell you further; but in regard to the license system applied to the particular class of places which we call saloons, they are entirely in the hands of this syndicate of which I have spoken. Mr. Dickson, and other men well known in England, who although English born are really Swedes, men of very high character, have gone into this enterprise, and



they have taken the whole of the responsibility. I think also in connection with this matter I should mention, as showing the philanthropic motives of those at the head of the system, that after payment of all expenses the profits were devoted to the relief of the poor of Gothenburg.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26035. Do you know anything as to whether there is any provision made for the inspection of liquors there?—No.

26036. As regards your own view, did you see any drunkenness in the city?—No.

26037. Have you lived in England?—Yes, I lived in England until I was 32 years of age.

26038. Taking a seaport in England about the same size as Gothenburg under the English system, and taking Gothenburg under its own system, how would they compare?—There would be no comparison: The English system is vicious to a degree.

26039. You mean there would be more drunkenness in the English seaport?—Yes. I saw no drunkenness in Gothenburg. The places there where the seafaring men got their food were clean and tidy places where anybody might go, and you could pass through them without any trouble, or without being afraid of meeting with anything to offend either the eye or the ear; whereas you cannot go into any seafaring town in England—and I know a good deal about the seaports in England, especially in regard to naval ports such as Portsmouth—you cannot go into such places in Liverpool or Southampton without meeting with spectacles which would offend both the eye and the ear at almost any moment.

26040. Have you lived in any county or place in which prohibition has been in force?—No. In Sherbrooke we have never had Scott Act or prohibition.

26041. How long have you lived in Canada?—Thirty-seven years.

26042. During that time have you noticed any improvement in the habits of the people in regard to the use of intoxicating liquors?—My own impression is that the habits of the people have improved. My idea is that there is not as much drunkenness as formerly.

26043. Do you find that in the social habits of the people intoxicating liquors are used to a less degree than formerly?—Very much less.

26044. Have you travelled in France?—Yes, I know a great deal about France, in fact there is scarcely any part of Europe in which I have not travelled.

26045. Take France: we have been informed that almost all the people there use wine of a light character at all times?—Almost all the people there use wine; but I am sorry to say that in the north of France during recent years, or within the last 20 years, the use of spirits has greatly increased. This has not been the case so much in the south of France, where the wine is largely produced, and where it is used as a matter of daily diet or as part of the food of the people. The wines are exceedingly cheap, and are used, as I say, as part of the food of the people daily. In the north part of France, however, spirits have come very much more into use, with evil effects.

26046. It has been suggested to the Commission that owing to the destruction of the vines by the phylloxera the wines have become dearer, and that this has been followed by the use of spirituous liquors?—Spirituous liquors are certainly more used in the north of France, but I never noticed their use to any large extent in the south of France. The ordinary wine of the country is exceedingly cheap, and the common labouring people use it with their meals. The same is the case in Italy, and I have been all through Italy, and lived there nearly 12 months.

26047. How about the supply of drinking water in Italy?—It varies according to the place; in some places it is very good, especially places near the Appenines, and in others, especially places near the lowlands, it is poor.

26048. Are there any sections where the population are dependent on water caught in cisterns and stored away?—I do not recollect any such places. I know that in Naples the water is very bad, and that they use large quantities of sulphur water.

26049. From your experience, supposing the people are going to use alcoholic drinks, would you favour and encourage the use of light wines and ales, doing away with

RICHARD WILLIAM HENEKER.

heavier spirituous liquors?—I am perfectly satisfied, looking at the natural craving that man has for the use of those liquors, apart from the fact that in some cases medical men approve of them (I know there is a difference of opinion among physicians on that point, and that some medical men disapprove of them while others approve of them and prescribe them), my strong belief is that the use of ales and light wines would prevent drunkenness to a very large extent.

26050. Can you make any suggestion to the Commission in regard to the subject matter we have on hand; can you make any suggestion with a view to improvements in the license law?—It is a very serious matter, and I simply give you my views.

26051. Take the license law: Have you had anything to do with the administration of it?—No. At one time I was Mayor of Sherbrooke, and we had a special license committee, but the only thing I can say is that I have always disapproved of the sale of spirituous liquor by grocers. I believe if it is desirable that licenses should be granted, they should be given simply to the people who keep hotels or restaurants, a sufficient guarantee being given that they are not mere drinking saloons. Anything in the shape of drinking saloons I conceive to be exceedingly bad. I think the city of London, with its gin palaces, so-called, is one of the most grievous sights a man can behold.

26052. Supposing the sale of liquor must be maintained, would you retain the saloon or the hotel bar? Which would you do away with?—The saloon bar.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26053. To what do you attribute the increase in the use of alcohol in the north of France?—I have no means of knowing.

26054. Is it attributable to the fact that the people have continually used the wines of the country?—I think not. I do not think myself that the use of ordinary light wines leads to the use of strong drink. In places where wine is produced, it is regularly consumed as part of the daily food.

26055. Do you consider the fact that the Italians and the French have used wine for generations has created an appetite for strong drinks, and that the increased quantity of alcohol now used is due to the appetite thus created?—I do not think so. I do not think the use of wines will induce a taste for strong alcoholic drinks.

26056. Would you favour the passage of a prohibitory law?—I conceive the passage of a prohibitory law is a dangerous proceeding to the people.

26057. Why?—Because I think it would be impossible to carry it out, and you should never have on the statute-book a law in which the people themselves would not join and help to carry out.

26058. And you believe that the moral effect of totally disregarding a law on the statute-book is very bad?—Yes, that has always been my opinion.

26059. Have you had any experience in the State of Maine?—I have had experience in Maine. I was at Lewiston, a large manufacturing town. I had been visiting various mills there and became drenched with rain, and without thinking of where I was I went into my hotel where there were a number of people sitting round the stove, and I walked up to the man in the office and said, "I want a glass of hot brandy and water." He looked at me, and the people began to smile. I at first wondered what the cause was, but it gradually dawned on me that I was asking for something uncommon in the State of Maine. The man fixed his eye on me, and gradually I saw that his eyes went round. I followed the direction of his eyes and went into a back room, and they there gave me what I wanted.

26060. Then the sale was not open?—It was not open, but it was to be had in a room at the back of the bar.

26061. You experienced no difficulty in procuring it?—None whatever, except there was a smile pervading the people in the room when I asked boldly for what was against the doctrines of the State of Maine.

26062. Have you had any opportunity of watching the results which flow from the operation of the local option law?—I have had no experience.

26063. In the event of a prohibitory law being passed, should those engaged in the trade, the brewers and distillers and hotel-keepers, be compensated by the State?—

That is a broad question. I think if a business, which the State has authorized and permitted to grow, and in which a certain class have invested large sums of money, is abolished by the State, compensation should be granted. That, however, is merely a general impression I entertain.

26064. Why was the Gothenburg system introduced?—Simply to try and make respectable what had been—as I have told you in the opinion of the editor of the *Journal of Commerce*, been considered a disgrace—what he called a hell. The object was to try and make the place respectable, so that any one could go there without trouble.

26065. The trade before then was disreputable?—The whole place was in a disreputable condition no doubt, but I saw it in its improved state.

26066. And the scheme was to change it from a disreputable place into a reputable one?—Exactly. They undertook to make it reputable, and they did so, but not for the purpose of making money out of it.

26067. Would the delegalization of the trade produce better results in the long run than the making of the trade better and the people more respectable?—The result was as I have told you. A place that was disreputable was made reputable, so that any one could live comfortably there.

26068. What about adulteration of liquors: is there any law against it?—I cannot tell you.

26069. Would you favour the enactment of a law for the appointment of an Inspector of liquors, so as to prevent adulteration?—I think so. There should be a strict inspection not only of liquors, but of every class of food, not in regard to liquors only.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26070. I think you said the license system prevails in Sherbrooke, where you reside?—Yes.

26071. How does that operate: does it really regulate the trade?—No, I do not think it does. I think there is a vast amount of drinking in Sherbrooke, particularly on special occasions when there are large gatherings of the people coming in from outside. I will give you an instance of that. We lately had an agricultural exhibition there, which brought there a large number of people. No liquor was allowed to be sold on the exhibition grounds, and therefore the people did not obtain any there. I was present, and I saw no signs of intemperance. I happened, however, to go to Quebec on the same night by train, I went by the Quebec Central, and there were large crowds going down, especially people from the asbestos mines. The train being late we did not leave till one or two o'clock in the morning; but it happened that I went through some of the cars, and it was dreadful to see the condition of the people. They must have obtained their liquor after the closing of the exhibition, between that time and the leaving of the train.

26072. What is the population of Sherbrooke?—Something over 10,000; 10,200 I believe.

26073. How many licenses are granted there?—I cannot tell you, but there are a great many licenses granted, not only to hotels, but to saloons and groceries as well.

26074. Do you know whether there is much illicit sale of alcoholic liquors?—I do not know, but I should think there is very little, because the people can obtain all they want at licensed places.

26075. And I suppose everybody can get a license who wants one?—Yes. The City Council is supposed to exercise control, but practically there is very little control.

26076. Do you know whether any violations of the license law occur as regards sale after hours and on Sabbath?—I do not think so. We do not hear of many cases; occasionally there is one, but the District Magistrate enforces the license law with great strictness.

26077. I believe you have a college in Sherbrooke?—Bishop's College is in Lennoxville, which is three miles away.

26078. Is there not a large school there?—Yes, there is a large Roman Catholic school there.

26079. Do you know whether the drink trade and the drinking places in Sherbrooke have any injurious effect on the students?—No. I know as regards the

RICHARD WILLIAM HENEKER.

Bishop's College school that the authorities are exceedingly strict. I happen to be connected with the school as Chancellor of the University and Chairman of that particular part of the Board which has charge of the school. Some time ago two of the boys were found to be intoxicated. I ascertained the particular person in fault; he lives in Sherbrooke and is a store-keeper, and I had him brought before the Magistrate. His plea was that he did not know they were boys belonging to the school and that they were under age; but I took so much notice of it, and I took such strong grounds in regard to it as to have stopped any disposition to sell to the boys. The school authorities also have become more stringent in their regulations as to boys coming into Sherbrooke, except under charge of a master.

26080. Do you know whether the responsibility of those in charge of a large number of students is increased by reason of the establishments for the sale of drink in this community?—Of course, no person can be in charge of a number of students and not have his responsibility increased by the fact that licenses for the sale of liquor are granted freely. That is a matter of course.

26081. Have you any knowledge of Richmond?—I have no knowledge of the condition of Richmond as a place, but I believe the Scott Act is in force there, and I know that offenders have been brought up for infringement of the Act and have been punished. I know that from the records we possess.

26082. Do you know whether the law is fairly well enforced there?—I do not know. I know there are strong advocates of temperance there, who use every possible influence they can bring to bear to prevent infringement of the Act.

26083. Under the Quebec license law there is a provision by which municipal counties may pass by-laws giving prohibition, or at all events refusing to grant licenses in parishes. Do you know any such parish, either in your county or in an adjoining county, where there is municipal prohibition in operation?—I do not. I have not any such knowledge.

26084. Do you think, taking the condition of the country as you know it, that legislation which would provide for the general sale of light wines and beer, and exclude strong alcoholic liquors, would be as effective as prohibiting the sale of strong liquors?—I object to prohibition *per se*.

26085. So you would not even prohibit strong liquors by making free the sale of light wines and beer?—No, I would not. I believe the prohibitory system is wrong *per se*, and it never could be carried out properly.

26086. You think it would fail to prohibit?—Yes. Again, there is a disadvantage in regard to light wines. They are quite expensive, and that alone would forbid their use to any very large extent. Lager beer and other light beer are not so expensive, but then care would have to be taken to see that they are free from adulteration. There is great danger of adulteration in beer. I know, from having lived in England, that it is a constant habit of people who sell beer to adulterate it, so as to make it more suitable to the palate of the customers and create a thirst. All these matters would have to be carefully guarded against.

26087. The theory is put forward that the encouragement of the use of light wines and beer would be the means of gradually reducing the consumption of strong liquors?—I consider that is a theory only, because, as I have said, light wines are too expensive to come into general use. The cost of light wines would prevent their general use, but the tendency of those who are in a position to afford light wines is to use them, and their use tends to take away the taste for strong drink.

26088. Then you would not prohibit even the sale of strong drink? Would you limit the number of places licensed to sell any kind of liquor?—I would.

26089. Would you increase the license fee?—Yes, I would put the license fee as high as possible, and limit the number of places permitted to sell. I would also invariably convict the drunkard when I found him.

26090. And not the drink-seller?—Yes, I would also punish the drink-seller. If I found any man who had given liquor to a drunken man, he should be very severely punished.

26091. You mean a man who sold liquor to a man to make him drunk?—He cannot be punished, but I would punish the drunkard.

26092. Then you would authorize the man to sell liquor to make him drunk, and you would then punish the drunkard, and you would punish a man if he sold to a man after he was drunk?—I would authorize the sale of liquor because I conceive you cannot help yourselves in that respect, and the man who sells liquor does not do it necessarily to make a man drunk, but he sells it because the man wants it, and he does not know whether it is going to effect him injuriously or not, for it may effect him beneficially. But I would punish the drunkard and any man who was found selling a man liquor after he was drunk.

26093-4. You have said that a prohibitory law would be impossible of enforcement, also that a law persistently and flagrantly violated has a very disastrous effect on the community. Having thought over the question doubtless, which do you think would be more disastrous to the community, the violation of a law that prohibits the drink trade, or the drink trade itself as already established and existing?—My impression is the violation of a prohibitory law; that which violates law and causes people to take the matter into their own hands, and not a mere provision on the statute-book, is the worse evil of the two.

26095. Do you think the drink trade does demoralize to any extent the community?—I do.

26096. But you think a prohibition of the trade, and a violation of the prohibition would still more demoralize it?—My belief is it would not prohibit.

26097. Do you believe this, that a law against an admitted evil creates a strong public sentiment against that evil?—It depends very much on how the law is administered. One of the evils of a prohibitory law is that it creates a class of informers. Those informers indulge in every conceivable trick in order to obtain the penalties which the law gives, and we all know that in every class of life—and you are obliged to have informers to carry out a law—the public sentiment is against those informers. They do not exercise their calling, at least you can call it so, for the benefit of the public, but for their own personal benefit. We all know that. There are informers against various laws in the old country, and where you have informers you are sure to have evils against which the public mind will revolt.

26098. Suppose there is an established trade, or anything which tends to injure the community, is it really a reprehensible act that a citizen, as a citizen interested in the public welfare, should lay an information?—No, not if he does it from public motives. I am not speaking of that, but I am speaking of the class of informers.

26099. Of course, there is a class of informers that act from merely mercenary motives?—And there is great danger from that class.

26100. But there may be another class of informers?—No person can possibly be accused of doing wrong, who from public motives and from a desire to benefit the people presents a state of facts.

26101. You have expressed yourself as favourable to a rigid license law. In such a license law there would be prohibitory provisions as to sale at certain hours, and on the Sabbath, sale to minors and to drunken people and the like. Are those prohibitory provisions wrong *per se*?—I do not think the prohibition of the sale to minors is wrong, that the prohibition of the sale during certain hours is wrong, or the prohibition of the sale on Sunday is wrong. I think a great many of these provisions are right in themselves—but that is not prohibition.

26102. It is partial prohibition, is it not?—It is limited prohibition, but it is not prohibition *per se*.

26103. Is the principle of prohibition involved in the partial prohibition?—I do not think so.

26104. The wrong is not to prohibit up to certain limits, but to prohibit entirely?—Exactly. The one is a mere regulation of the traffic and the other is the absolute prohibition of it.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26105. As a matter of fact, does not every license law contain a great deal of prohibition in a certain sense and certain degree?—Yes, it must do so. Any law, or any

RICHARD WILLIAM HENEKER.

license law regulates the conduct of the people. The intention is, not to have license, but liberty, and to control the people within the scope of the law.

26106. Can you conceive of a condition of things under free sale more beneficial than that obtainable under a license law?—I do not think so. I think there should be a license law for the protection of the people, but it should be accompanied by stringent provisions regarding adulteration and the regulation of the trade. I do not think the law should allow everybody to do as they please. I do not call that liberty, but I call it license.

GENERAL NEAL DOW, of Maine, U.S.A., on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

26107. Where do you reside?—Portland, Maine.

26108. Do you hold any official position in the Government?—Not now.

26109. What positions did you formerly hold?—I was twice Mayor of Portland, and I was a Colonel and afterwards General in the United States' service.

26110. Do you follow any business?—No; I retired from business some years ago.

26111. I believe, General, that it is the sense of this Commission that you should be allowed to make a statement, and afterwards any Commissioner would be at liberty to ask you questions. Please proceed with your statement in regard to the Maine law.—I shall be very glad to make a statement. I suppose there was no State in the Union where more liquor was consumed in proportion to the population than in Maine. That arose very largely from the fact of two great industries being carried on there—one being the lumber trade, which you all know about in Canada, and the other being the fisheries, which you also know all about here. The lumbermen were employed in the woods during the winter cutting down the trees, and drink would form a regular part of their rations; and the fishermen had rum as a regular part of their rations. The result was that poverty and pauperism were with the people of Maine. An immense quantity of liquor was consumed there. There were a great many distilleries in the State; seven of them were in Portland, and two breweries. They made rum from molasses imported in large quantities from the West Indies; and they made whisky from potatoes, and some of them made apple-jack, or brandy, from apples. Now, there is not a distillery or brewery in Maine, and there has not been one for a good many years. At that time, large quantities of West India rum were imported. This rum came to us by the cargo. A great many cargoes were received every year, and it was a regular trade. A large fleet of vessels was regularly employed in the West India trade. They took fish and lumber out and they brought back molasses, which was converted into rum; and also West India rum. Now, there is not one puncheon of rum imported into Maine, and there has not been any imported for very many years. So the volume of the liquor traffic has rapidly diminished. The result of that change has been this: that while Maine was undoubtedly the poorest State in the Union in the olden time, it is now one of the most prosperous. The volume of the liquor traffic is greatly reduced. The savings of the people from that traffic are such that the State has become very flourishing. I know all about our poverty in the olden times. Our industries, aside from fishing and lumbering, were on a very small scale, and our people had not sufficient capital to carry on the trade. I know all about that personally. Our industries have since then very greatly multiplied and extended, and we have abundant capital to carry on all our business, and there is besides a large amount of surplus capital which seeks investment outside of the State. A great deal of Maine capital is all over the country for investment. So that Maine has so much changed as to realize the idea of John Bright, who said a good many years ago that "if the evils of intemperance were put away from England, the country would no longer be recognized as the same." That prophecy has proved true in regard to Maine. The whole face of the country has changed. Instead of being poor, as in the

olden time, with her houses and churches and meeting-houses and school-houses in a dilapidated condition, as a general rule; no such condition prevails now; all has been changed. Not very long ago, on going to Boston by rail, a gentleman who sat beside me, whom I did not know, but who knew me, said: "I am from Iowa, but I am a Maine man. I had not visited Maine for twenty years before, and I really did not know Maine when I came back." The prophecy of John Bright is fulfilled. Now there are indications of prosperity everywhere. I heard to-day one of the Commissioners ask a question of a doctor about the moral effect of prohibition. This is it: In olden times, in all meetings of the people drink was used. At all dinners drink was as necessary as salt on the table, or anything else. I formerly attended public dinners myself, and, although I have been a teetotaler for very many years, I remember when bottles were on almost every dinner table. Now we can have great public dinners held, and the thought of having drink there does not occur to any one. For dinners held by the Board of Trade, at which you have men engaged in business attend, drink is never thought of. General Grant was in Maine with the members of his Council and a great many officials and dignitaries from different parts of the country, and several dinners were given to him, but there was no drink. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, living in Augusta at the time, gave a grand dinner, but there was no drink. So that the moral effect of prohibition has changed the whole character of the State in that respect. It was formerly a respectable thing to drink. The prohibition law in Maine was enacted in 1851, nearly forty-one years ago. Within six months after the enactment of the law the jails in the Counties of Penobscot, Kennebec, Oxford, Franklin and York were almost empty. When I visited York jail, the keeper, as he put the key into the lock, apologized for keeping his hens there. He had no further use for the jail. In regard to the jail in Cumberland, where I live, and which is a county that has a large population, it had been overcrowded many years, and articles had appeared in the newspapers urging the building of a new jail. I visited the jail within four months of the enactment of the law, and there were only four persons there, three of whom were rumsellers who were there for violations of the law. All this was during the first year of the enforcement of the law, and it was then vigorously enforced. There has been a laxity in the enforcement of the law at different times since. It is quite safe to say that the quantity of liquor sold in Maine now is not one-twentieth as much as it was before the law was passed. It is quite within the mark to make that statement. Portland is the largest city in the State, and it is within the truth to say that the quantity of liquor sold there now is not one-hundredth of what it was before. We had seven distilleries and two breweries, and we had many cargoes every year from the West Indies, which the people brought over for their own use. Now whatever liquor is sold there, is sold on a very small scale, and on the sly. I can hardly give you a just impression of it without telling you a story. Two or three years ago the Episcopal Bishop of Maine brought a gentleman to my house, who had come from Western New York, desiring to make inquiry in regard to prohibition. I said to this gentleman: "How long have you been in Portland?" He said, "One week." I said, "Then you have been long enough here to form an opinion as to the effect of prohibition, from what you have seen and heard." "I think it is a failure," he said. I asked where he was staying. He said, "I am staying at the Falmouth Hotel." I said, "Do they sell any liquor there?" He said, "No." I asked: "Have you tried to get liquor there?" He said, "Yes, but I cannot get any liquor there." I said, "Did you try anywhere else?" He said, "I went to the Prebble House." I said, "Did you get any there?" He said, "No, they were afraid to sell any." I asked him, "If he tried anywhere else?" He said, "I went to the apothecary's shop, but they would not sell to anybody." I asked him, "Did you try anywhere else?" He replied, "I went to the barber's shop, and they know everything that is going on, and I asked them to tell me where I could get a drink in Portland." "I do not know of any place," the barber said. I said to the visitor, "You have been in Portland one week, and you have tried all these places, and have failed to get liquor, and yet you think the law is a failure?" He said, "I was in the park the other morning, and I saw a man lying drunk with a bottle by his side." I then said, "Is it to be held, then, that the Maine law is a failure simply

GENERAL NEAL DOW.

owing to this circumstance?" I added, "Do you know whether the man bought the liquor in Portland, or brought it by steamer from Boston—steamers are arriving every morning?" He did not know how that might be. "Still," I said, "is that any ground for coming to the conclusion that the law is a failure, and that it had better be abolished, and a license law introduced." "No," he said, "that would be very different." I said, "Consumption is a very dangerous disease, and almost every one dies of consumption. If there should be a remedy discovered, which would be the means of curing nineteen consumptives out of twenty, would that be considered a failure?" He did not answer. I said, "My friend, that is what has happened in Maine. There is only one-twentieth of the liquor sold that was sold here before. We are saving directly and indirectly at least \$24,000,000 every year, which but for this law would be wasted in drink, as it was in the olden times. In the old days the people of Maine spent in strong drink the entire value of all their property; now it is far within the truth to say that \$1,000,000 would pay for all the liquor smuggled into Maine and sold in violation of the law. So the saving to the people of Maine has been very great, and has been the means of making the State prosperous, as it was not in the olden days. We expect to achieve still greater success in the future. The liquor sold there now is the result of certain deficiencies in the law, and we have been trying to have those deficiencies corrected. The English law can be enforced much better than the law in Maine. We have not there summary trials and convictions, as in England, and perhaps in Canada, but they are very long trials in the United States. The constitution requires that every man shall be tried by jury, and so when a man is convicted of selling rum he appeals, and there is a delay of a year or two, and I may say that facilities are given for delays. Besides, the courts have discretion in regard to the administration of the law, and as the lawyers press the Court so much, the Judges are very apt to be lenient in the administration of the law. So the liquor traffic is not entirely excluded from Maine; but it is safe to say that in more than three-fourths of our territory, containing more than three-fourths of the population, the liquor traffic is practically extinguished. In all the rural districts and smaller towns and villages, there are no grog-shops and no liquor traffic. A whole generation has grown up without having seen the effects of liquor, and there are men and women who have never seen a drunken man.

26112. The municipality of Portland have, of course, statistics of their various civic works and services?—Yes, I suppose so; there are no statistics in relation to pauperism, except the reports of the overseers of the poor every year. I am sorry to say that in Maine they have never been as careful as to statistics as they are in Massachusetts.

26113. Could you supply the Commission with statistics from the Police Department in Portland for a number of years?—I think I can get them, and I will send them to you when I get back.

26114. We shall be much obliged to you, because it has been alleged that in proportion to the population there has been more drunkenness in Portland than in this city, and the statistics would be a guide?—It is not a temperance man who told you that. Do you remember the great Englishman Dr. B. W. Richardson, who says the man who has the alcoholic habit loses all conscientiousness as to what is and what is not.

26115. I suppose those who have the statistics will naturally have a desire to state the facts?—Yes; I suppose they are honest men, but they would make them lie if they were not.

26116. Has the diminution in the consumption of liquor been confined to the State of Maine. Is there as much strong liquor drunk in Massachusetts and other States, where prohibition does not obtain, as there was twenty-five or forty years ago?—I cannot say.

26117. Is there as much rum brought into any State of the Union, except perhaps New York, as there was twenty-five or forty years ago?—I should say the habits of the people or of certain classes of the people have changed for the better.

26118. The evidence in the Maritime Provinces showed that there was a much larger direct trade in rum with the West Indies formerly than there is now?—We have not any in Maine now.

26119. You had in past years?—Yes, on a large scale.



26120. I suppose the criminal statistics would show what use is made of the jails right along?—Yes; ex-Governor Dingley took some pains a few years ago to ascertain the comparative amount of crime in Maine and in the other States, and he tabulated that in his journal and, no doubt, could supply it. His name is Nelson Dingley, jr., of Lewiston, Maine. He is a member of Congress.

26121. He prepared statistics?—Yes; I have suggested to a good many people to send there for statistics. There is one remark I would like to make, because I think it desirable to have it go into your report. Dr. Heneker said he would punish the drunkard more. I think he is mistaken. I would not object to the punishment of the drunkard if it would do any good, but the drunkard is already punished by loss of reputation, loss of fortune, loss of health and loss of family, and he is often punished by death. You cannot punish him any more. I was in England at one time at the town of St. Ives, and the London papers came down with a report from Mr. Hughes, the author of "Tom Brown at Rugby," and he recommended the punishment of the drunkard, and I said the drunkard is punished now more than any other man. If you made a drunkard lose a finger, there would still be some men who would be willing to lose a finger in order to get drink. After the meeting a man got up and said: "What the speaker says is true. I would give a finger in order to get a glass of liquor, and I cannot help it." I say, punish the man who makes men drink; the drunkard is punished enough, and has to pay 10 cents for an 8 cent drink.

26122. You are credited with being the father of the Maine law, and you have, no doubt, considered it more than any other person in your State who has made it a study. Do you find that the law permitting liquors to come in as they do for private consumption tends to prevent your getting the full benefit you wish; in other words, if public opinion would permit it, would you stop importations for private consumption?—I would require to think over that a little. We do not want any more than we can help to interfere with the private habits of people, except so far as they interfere with the public good. We think we are warranted by law in interfering in every way when the public good is endangered. I was talking once to John Stuart Mill, who asked me if I thought we should not let people drink as much as they liked, provided they did not interfere with others. Then he said, "You should have places where they can get it." I said, I disagreed with him, because the places where they get the drink inflict more injury on people than all other sources of mischief combined. If they can get their liquor in any way consistent with the public good, though we would not advise them to use it, still we would not object.

26123. Would you agree that a prohibitory law for the whole of the United States, such as you have in Maine, should be passed?—Yes, that is what we are working for now.

26124. Where would the people get their liquor then?—That is their lookout.

26125. Is the manufacture of liquor prohibited now?—Yes; we have not one brewery in Maine now.

26126. Any in New Hampshire?—The manufacture is not prohibited there.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26127. Do you think it is possible to get a fairly accurate statement about the poverty in the State?—No, there are no statistics about that. If you were to ride through the State, as I did in working up public opinion all through the State, you would have seen the miserable condition of things at that time, and now you would see the prosperity and thrift that prevail everywhere. The whole face of the State is changed.

26128. The statement has been made that there is more poverty in proportion to the population in Maine than in certain States named that are under a license system, and it would be desirable to get accurate statistics as to the poverty which is a public charge?—I am not sure whether that could be done. It can be done in regard to Portland.

GENERAL NEAL DOW.

26129. Do you think the information could be obtained for all the larger cities and towns?—I rather think so.

26130. To what source should we apply for that information?—To the Overseers of the Poor. Direct your inquiries to the Overseers of the Poor at Portland, Falmouth and other places. Talking about Portland, we must include a very large surrounding territory depending upon Portland, with some 60,000 or 70,000 people, where no liquor is sold, not even on the sly. There is Scarborough, Cape Elizabeth, Westport and some other places.

26131. When you say there is no liquor sold in Portland, you do not mean to say there is not some illicit sale more or less?—No, I do not.

26132. Is there a persistent and fairly successful prosecution of illicit vendors?—There is.

26133. We understand you to say that the trade has been driven mainly into the hands of most disreputable people who are not averse to going to jail occasionally?—Entirely so. Men who are not afraid to go to jail and to be put in the jail dress—half red and half black.

26134. Is it possible to get a statement of the actual consumption of liquor in Maine?—No, because what comes in is smuggled secretly into the State.

26135. How do you reach the conclusion that not one-twentieth is now used of what was formerly used?—It is only those who remember the old state of things who could state that. For instance, we had a great number of distilleries.

26136. How many?—We had 35—some of them large. Those in Portland were large distilleries and great quantities of West Indies rum were imported, and now there is not a gallon.

26137. Do you regard the vote on prohibition as an expression of the people's opinion in regard to the drink trade?—It is partially so. On the part of those who voted, it was so; but many prohibitionists and temperance men did not vote because they thought it was not a proper thing to put into the constitution.

26138. Is it a fact that year by year, during the thirty or more years the prohibition law has been in force, the punishment of violators of the law has been more stringent?—Yes.

26139. Do you regard that constantly increasing restriction as a fair indication of the views of the people in favour of restricting the drink traffic?—Yes; I think so.

26140. Would it not be an expression of opinion that the law being violated more or less, the people were determined to have the violators punished?—Yes, that is the feeling. In 1857 we petitioned the Legislature to inflict the penalty of jail for the first offence. The Legislature referred that to the people, and the people supported it, seven to one. The next session it was repealed, as a political dodge. They paid in that way to get the rum vote.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26141. How long ago was that?—It was passed in 1857, and repealed in 1858.

26142. The rum vote was a factor eight years after the passage of a prohibitory measure?—In the large cities, more or less. I suppose the rumsellers in Portland can control 300 or 400 votes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26143. I suppose the rum vote is a factor in the State now?—Yes; there are many men in the State who hate the Maine law and vote against any one who favours prohibition. At the last election in September, they went against the Republican party, but that party won in spite of them.

26144. Can you explain why only 4,000 votes went in favour of the Prohibition candidate?—I will tell you a story. I was walking on the street the day after the election, and met a doctor of divinity. He said, "It will take you a long time to accomplish what you may do by these methods." I said, "The reason is that men such as you do not help; if you would help, we would win all." Many temperance men stand aloof; they do not like to make enemies, and men who have interests directly or indirectly in

the traffic are numerous, and there is sort of a stigma attached to what may be called a reformer. It is thought that reformers are after office, and these people do not know or do not observe that reformers never get office.

26145. Is it not the general feeling throughout the State that the Republican party is the temperance party, and that the Prohibitionist is playing into the hands of the other side against the Republican party, which has been the prohibitionist party?—I do not know that I ought to say that. I was talking to a lady in the cars. She was a tremendous Republican and so was I.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26146. Are you a Republican yet?—In regard to all but the rum. She said, “Many people are under the impression that the Prohibitionist candidate is going to be elected President and Governor.” I said, “I regard that as impossible, but I think we shall have the balance of power, so that the Republican party cannot get on without us, and we will say ‘Here is our price for our votes.’”

*By Judge McDonald :*

26147. What about the Democratic party?—You cannot kill that, or it would have been killed before this.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26148. This question is more important in regard to the next election than all other issues?—It is now more important—our drink bill amounts to \$220,000,000 annually. All the other public questions are not to be compared to that.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26149. Is any one justified in concluding that the 4,000 votes given for the Prohibitionist candidate for Governor shows the strength of the prohibition party?—No. A large majority of the vote would be in favour of prohibition, if it were drawn out.

26150. Then why is it that only 4,000 prohibitionists voted for the prohibitory candidate and the great mass of prohibitionists voted for somebody else in the State of Maine?—I cannot say. I will tell you a story. I was walking down Congress Street, and a very influential man, a member of the Congregational Church, and in every way a representative man, a temperance man, said, “Mr. Dow, I have been very much disappointed that in 50 years the temperance cause has made so little progress.” I said, “Mr. ———, do you know the reason?” He said, “No.” I said, “When you come to a square vote, you vote for the rum people.”

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26151. Did you state Mr. Blank?—Mr. Blank, I said. If you want to know his real name was Mr. Clarke.

26152. What was he?—Republican. I said, “Mr. Clarke, you are a very busy man and have not time to attend to these matters, and others are spending their time on them but we have a right to expect that you should help us, instead of going over and helping the devil and his imps.”

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26153. The Republican party is the dominant party in the State of Maine?—Yes.

26154. The Republican party gave this law to Maine?—No; a Democratic Senate and House and Governor and all. I went there myself, and there were 13 persons on the Committee, and after I said my say, the Committee rose and the Chairman said, “I propose to support this Bill as it is”; and they were unanimous. He said, “Unless this Bill comes before the House at the next sitting, it cannot pass.” I had it printed at once, and on the next day, 31st May, 1851, it was passed by 18 to 10 in the Senate and by 86 to 40 in the House.

26155. That was a Democratic Legislature?—Yes; all Democrats. After that the leaders of the Democratic party repented, and tried to put the Democratic party on the

GENERAL NEAL DOW.

rum platform, and the result was that they went down, and have never come to the surface since.

26156. The Republican party became the prohibitory party?—There was no Republican party then. It was the Whig party. Six years afterwards the Republican party came into existence, and have been theoretically in favour of it since.

26157. Was not the law repealed once?—Yes.

26158. How long was it in operation before that?—It was repealed, I think, in 1855, and it went into operation in 1851.

26159. Was there a popular vote in regard to prohibition before it was re-enacted?—Yes; it was referred by the Republican Legislature to the people.

26160. And the people said they wanted it?—Yes; by a large majority.

26161. And they have never said anything else since?—No.

26162. And there are a great many people who vote for prohibition when a direct question, but refrain from voting for a prohibitory party as such?—Yes; the vote on the constitutional amendment shows that.

26163. They seem to have an unwillingness to make a prohibitory party?—Yes. The temperance people in Maine as everywhere else are mostly Republicans, and they do not want to do anything to antagonize anybody, because the Democrats might then come into power.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26164. Politics have something to do with men?—Yes; a great deal.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26165. If men voted prohibition and elected a certain number to the Electoral College, they might leave the rest of the State with a majority in favour of the Democrats and give them power?—The only way in which that could be brought about would be to put the Republicans in a minority, so that they could not elect Republican electors.

26166. Supposing Maine elected prohibitionists to the Electoral College and it was the only State that did so, would they not join the Republican candidates and vote not as prohibitionists but as Republicans?—No; that would be dishonest. They must stick to their men; but it might prevent the Republicans having a majority in the Electoral College, and that would throw the election of the President into the House of Representatives, and that has a Democratic majority.

26167. The electors for electing the President do not all meet in one place?—They meet in their own States, and appoint some person to carry the result of the vote.

26168. They would have to vote for the man for whom they are elected to vote?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26169. Was there an attempt made this month by the Democratic party to bring this issue before the electorate?—Yes; they proposed, if they got a majority, to re-submit the constitutional amendment to the people to have it rescinded and to have a local option law passed; and the result of the election has been an overwhelming defeat to them and to their propositions.

26170. Has the Republican majority in Maine been larger or smaller than in the last few years?—Smaller.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26171. Do the great mass of prohibitionists think it is not necessary to form a prohibitory party at present?—A great many do, and I formerly thought so. I did not join the prohibition party for ten or twelve years after its formation, because I hoped to carry this through the Republican party, and I said it would be easier and cheaper and speedier; and I did not change my view until I saw it was impossible to accomplish our purpose through the Republican party.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26172. Could you accomplish it through the Democratic party?—We never think of the Democrats in connection with prohibition.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26173. Have you no Democrats who are prohibitionists?—Yes ; many voted for us at the last election.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26174. Do you find it difficult to get officials who will faithfully discharge their duty?—We do. We have Sheriff Cram in Cumberland County, who has faithfully done his duty ; so the Democrats did their utmost to turn him out, and got a great deal of money from Boston and New York, but they failed to do it.

26175. Where the officials are true men, the law is well enforced?—Yes.

26176. Do these political considerations and contentions enter into the matter of the appointment of officials?—Not openly, until the last time in Cumberland County ; and the man the Democrats proposed in place of Sheriff Cram gave it to be understood that he would not interfere with the grog shops.

26177. If officials are not faithful, are steps taken to remove them?—Not as much as there ought to be. The law provides that Judges of Courts and Sheriffs, who are unfaithful in the discharge of their duty, may be turned out ; but it is not done.

26178. Do political considerations interfere?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26179. By whom are the officials elected whose duty it is to administer the Maine law?—By the people.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26180. What are the chief indications of the prosperity of the State—the savings of the people?—That is one very important one. You see no shabby buildings now ; the buildings are all painted. In the old time, you would see none painted, and shingles off the roofs, and doors hanging by one hinge, and clapboards off, and rags stuck in the windows, instead of glass, and school-houses and even meeting-houses in bad order. Now that is all gone. The houses are all painted.

26181. Are the industries of the State flourishing?—None more so anywhere than in Maine.

26182. How about the savings bank accounts?—They are larger than ever before. When the law was enacted, I am not sure if we had any savings banks—certainly not more than one. Now we have many.

26183. How do the savings compare with those of the people in other States?—They are not as much as Massachusetts, which is a richer State.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26184. What makes it richer?—There are more wealthy men there, and they have more manufacturing towns.

26185. Are they more heavily taxed than the people of Maine?—I think not. In Boston the tax is not so large as it is in Portland, but while Boston spends a great deal of money, it is a very rich town, I think the richest in the United States in proportion to its population.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26186. Massachusetts once had a prohibitory law?—Yes.

26187. And it was repealed?—Yes.

26188. How do you account for that?—It was all right, until they commenced to enforce it in Boston, where it had not been enforced. It operated admirably in the rural districts, but Boston controls Massachusetts as Paris controls France.

GENERAL NEAL DOW.

26189. Was the law amended to permit the sale of beer?—I do not think so in Massachusetts, but it was in other States. It was emasculated very much.

26190. In what States is prohibition the law?—In Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, Kansas, Iowa, North and South Dakota—seven.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26191. Is there prohibition in Georgia?—No more than three-fourths of it. There is local option in Georgia, in North and South Carolina, Mississippi, Tennessee and Kentucky.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26192. How does local option work?—Very well.

26193. How is the law enforced in Vermont and New Hampshire?—In Vermont it is not very well enforced in some places. I have urged them to have their law amended in some particulars, and they will. In New Hampshire, it is the same.

26194. It is a fact that in many places in Massachusetts they vote no license, do they not?—Yes, and it has a very good effect. In Cambridge, the site of Harvard University, they have had for years local option, well enforced.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26195. How far is Cambridge from Boston?—It is across the bridge.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26196. Do your Governors make reference to prohibition in their addresses?—Always.

26197. What is the nature of their references?—The great benefit morally as well as materially resulting from it. We have the deliverances of the Republican Party at their State Conventions, in which they have always statements in favour of prohibition. They take pride to themselves for the steps they have taken in favour of prohibition, which has bestowed so many benefits on the State of Maine. That is the general form.

26198. How old are you?—Eighty-eight last March.

26199. Eighty-eight years of abstinence?—No; when I was a young fellow 18 or 19 years of age, and went into company, it was the universal custom to have wine, and on such occasions I have tasted it; but since I was 19, I have been a teetotaller.

26200. Seventy years of abstinence has not damaged you physically or intellectually?—No.

26201. Do we understand you to say that prohibition in Maine does effectually prohibit, notwithstanding the violations of the law?—Yes. I can say that the benefits derived to the State and the people from prohibition are so great that they cannot be measured by any mode of computation known to us.

26202. You said the Democratic party were suggesting a local option law in place of the prohibitory law. Do you believe any such system could be as effectually carried out as this prohibitory law?—No; I think it would be productive of a great deal of mischief to have a local option law there or a license system.

26203. Do you believe that national prohibition could be more easily enforced than State prohibition?—Yes, as an aid, it would be, because it would prevent the importation and the transfer of liquor from State to State.

26204. You think prohibition, surrounded by the free sale of liquor in other States, is more difficult to enforce than total prohibition?—Yes, I know New Hampshire is an uncomfortable neighbour, because it has breweries.

26205. New Hampshire is a prohibitory State, but it has breweries?—Yes, it did not prohibit the manufacture, as we do.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26206. Do you prohibit the transport of liquor?—No.

26207. It can be brought from New Hampshire into Maine?—There is very little now, I think, and it is on the sly. I have seen whole carloads going through the streets and the officers did not interfere, but they do now. I saw the other day

in the paper that a cart was seen with a barrel, and an officer chased it, the driver having whipped up his horse. The officer was named Plummer, and he is a very sharp man. He jumped into the cart as it turned a corner, and they tipped it over. The officer was not hurt, but the driver was. That is the way they hunt it out now, as in England they hunt rats with ferrets.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26208. Then, the law has made it disreputable?—Yes, it is like a house of ill-fame.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26209. Did this happen in Portland?—Yes. Plummer went into a shop there to seize liquor, and the man ran up to the roof and slipped and fell two stories and hurt himself very badly, and was caught.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26210. Do you think the feeling in favour of national prohibition is growing rapidly?—Very rapidly.

26211. Have you an opinion as to how soon you may look for it?—I can tell the day.

26212. We would like to have that—it would save a lot of trouble to know?—When we can persuade the churches to take a part in regard to this sin and shame and crime. Their influence is so great that it will be accomplished. You may have heard of Joseph Cook. A week ago I had a letter from him. He publishes a monthly review, and wanted an article from me as to the attitude of the churches in regard to prohibition. I said that I did not want to write that, because others were better able to do it; but, if there was no one else, I would do it. The movement is going to bring the churches face to face with this great question, so that they may see that it exists by their sufferance. *The Christian at Work*, published in New York, had a short article in which it said, "The liquor traffic, now in force in the United States, continues by the permission of the membership of the churches. When they go and vote, 'Go,' it will go." That is the point at which we may bring the churches to us.

26213. But you cannot say the exact day?—I cannot name the day, but we hope it will be in the near future.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26214-5. Speaking of the gratifying improvement you have seen in Maine in regard to buildings, churches, school-houses and so on, do you find the same change in the State of New York?—There cannot be, because they consume a great deal of liquor.

26216. Do you know that personally?—No.

26217. But you infer that it is so because they consume a great deal of liquor?—Yes.

26218. Has there been a similar change in Massachusetts?—In Boston, intemperance is very bad.

26219. I am speaking of the buildings and school-houses.—Boston is a very rich place, and their school-houses are of a very high order.

26220. And through Massachusetts generally?—Yes.

26221. Do you not find that while all religious denominations are agreed as to the evil of intemperance, they take different views as to the method of its removal?—I do not know but one, and that is the Episcopal Church, which hangs aloof from this movement.

26222. How is the Church of Rome?—It is coming very fast around to our view. Many of the ablest men in the Catholic Church are on our side. There is Archbishop Ireland, for instance.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26223. What are the views of Cardinal Gibbons?—I have not heard his name mentioned in connection with our movement.

GENERAL NEAL DOW.

26224. There is Houlton; do you know it?—Yes. It is a border town. New Brunswick lies on the other side of the line. It is six miles from the line. I have been at Houlton, but it was 45 years ago. It is a very prosperous town now, but when I first went there it was a very poor hamlet. I have never heard, and I cannot say anything in regard to Houlton in connection with violations of the law. The law may be violated for aught I know, but I never heard it spoken of. I have heard Bangor, Waterville, Bath, Belfast and Rockland spoken of in connection with violations of the law.

26225. One or two witnesses, or more, who have given evidence before this Commission, have sworn that in Bangor open bars may be seen?—I do not know about that. I cannot say personally, but I think that is a mistake. I do not think there are open bars such as we understand them in Boston, New York or Montreal. They are places on the sly, more or less.

26226. Other places spoken of are Old Orchard Beach and the contiguous beaches?—Yes. I think no liquor is sold at Old Orchard Beach now. It was sold there formerly. There was one man, a hotel man there, who was imprisoned for twenty months for selling liquor. There has been no liquor sold there this year.

26227. How long ago was it that the man was sent to jail?—I think it was ten or twelve years ago.

26228. Is it since then that the sale was suppressed?—I think only last year. Last year and this year liquor was sold more or less on the sly.

26229. Then we have heard that one difficulty in regard to liquor is that it is brought in on the cars or wagons which are dropped at certain places, and the people go out and get it?—That has been done; but a law was passed at the last session of the Legislature forbidding liquor being dropped out of cars, except at the place to which it was directed. Formerly it was dropped out in that way you have mentioned. If liquor was directed to Portland, instead of being taken there, it would be dropped out of the car five or six miles out of the city, and persons would go there and get it.

26230. It has been stated, or I have read it, for instance, that a car would be detached in passing through a wooded country years ago, and teams would go out and parties would bring in the liquor?—I never heard but one case of that sort. That was reported three, four or five years ago. A car of beer was brought into Portland and seized by the Sheriff. The conductor of the train ran away with the car. The case was compromised in some way.

26231. Then we had before us a witness at St. Stephen, a Judge of the State of Maine, and he mentioned two or three points in connection with the law in regard to which I should like to ask you some questions. One was, that owing to the fact that imprisonment followed as a penalty in every case, juries were slow to convict. His idea was that if there were fines imposed, convictions could more easily be obtained?—No Judge in Maine would tell us that story, because it is not true. There are no parties that juries are more ready and prompt to convict than those engaged in the liquor trade. Not long ago in Portland a jury brought in a verdict to convict, and the Judge tried to set the verdict aside for the reason that the testimony did not support the verdict. I took special pains to investigate that matter, and I found the jury was right and the Judge was wrong.

26232. Was there any appeal in that case?—No, it was set aside.

26233. Then the people have no redress in cases of that kind?—No redress.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26234. We have been told that another difficulty in your law is that there is a system of United States licenses, and that the people have to pay \$25 for such license?—It is not a license, but a special tax. It is a special tax on all persons who sell or manufacture liquor, but it does not protect them from the State law. It is rather an advantage to us in Maine, and the people of any prohibitory State, because the law of the State of Maine provides that the payment of the tax shall be *prima facie* evidence that they have violated the law, and the burden of proof is cast on them to show that they have not sold any liquor.



26235. So a man here has to run the gauntlet of the United States law and the State law?—Yes.

26236. If he sells without a United States license, he is liable to be punished under the United States law, and if he takes such a license out, he is liable to be punished under your law for selling?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26237. Do the Federal officers look after the United States licenses?—The man who pays his tax is obliged by law to have his receipt posted up so that everybody can see it. If it is not posted up, he is liable to a penalty.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26238. Do you know what revenue is derived by the United States Government from the State of Maine under this head?—I have been looking into that matter recently, and I find that it amounts to about one and a half cents per capita.

26239. What is the population of the State?—The population of the State is a little over 600,000.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26240. Is the payment of the United States tax an advantage to the holder in this: If convicted under the State law for selling, and it turns out that he has that United States receipt, he is exempt from any penalty for violating the United States law?—If he has paid the tax he is free as regards the United States law.

26241. Otherwise, if a man is convicted under the United States law for selling, he is also convicted under the United States law for not having paid this tax?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26242. The amount then is about \$10,000?—Yes.

26243. That goes to the United States revenue, I suppose?—Yes.

26244. How do you explain the fact that there are so many of these licenses issued?—The apothecaries all take them out. They are obliged to sell liquor in their business, and as I have said, they all take them out. That has been explained to me by the officers themselves. If rum sellers are convicted and driven out, as they are every day, more or less, other men will come in and take out licenses. So some shops will represent four or five liquor licenses in the course of a year. That may seem very strange, but it is simply due to the fact that the penalties are not sufficient. The liquor trade in Maine, as elsewhere, provides a large margin of profit in Portland, Bangor and other towns, but not in the rural districts. A single fine of \$100 will make an end of the matter as regards a country seller, but it is not so in Portland. Liquor is sold for the profit there is in it, and not for the fun of it, and the law should be constructed, if it is intended to suppress the traffic, in such a way as to take all profit out of it. The fines should be sufficient to take all profit away, and make it an unprofitable business, not only unprofitable but uncomfortable, and there would be an end of the liquor traffic.

26245. In connection with the imprisonment in jail, does the penalty of hard labour go with it?—Yes, always.

26246. Then a man convicted of selling liquor contrary to law is put to hard labour and placed in jail clothing?—Yes.

26247. What would you think of a system of this kind for the punishment of offenders against a prohibitory law: When a man was placed in jail, instead of being placed in an ordinary cell, he was allowed to occupy handsomely furnished apartments with a bath-room attached; he was not placed on hard labour, but was allowed to have meals brought to him from an hotel; he was also allowed to have a telephone placed in his apartments, which was connected with his own place of business; his friends were allowed to come and see him, and if they stayed rather late, the jailer went to bed and left him the keys, and in other ways his stay was made pleasant?—Do you mean to say that anything of that kind occurred in Maine?

GENERAL NEAL DOW.

26248. No. But would it surprise you that such a state of things occurred?—Yes. I was down at Delaware not long ago. They have a peculiar system there. I went round to the Court house. I saw an arrangement there that would stop the rum trade, it was the whipping post.

26249. They have that law in Delaware?—Yes. It would not perhaps do in Maine, for I do not think public opinion is in favour of the whipping post.

26250. Would you favour it?—Yes, because I am not afraid of public opinion.

26251. Then do you think, if public opinion did favour it, it would be a good mode of punishment?—Certainly.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26252. You would not carry out that punishment because public opinion is not ripe for it?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26253. If public opinion was ripe for it, you think it would be a good remedy?—Yes. One dose of it to a man would cure the whole thing in the State. I went with certain proposed amendments to the last Legislature. I said: If you will pass these amendments, in six months there will not be one grog shop in Maine. They did pass one amendment. It was to make the same penalty all through for all offences against the law: \$500 fine and costs and one year in jail. If the \$500 fine is not paid, another year has to be passed in jail. I said that if the Legislature would pass that amendment there would be an end to the liquor traffic. My proposal was, that it should apply also to illegal transportation. If a man transported a gallon of whisky or beer he should be fined \$500 and costs and a year in jail, and if he could not pay the \$500 he should pass another year in jail. The Legislature, however, did not apply that all round.

26254. You think it would be an improvement if that penalty were made to apply to every offence?—Yes.

26255. Do you think that would make the law more workable and effective?—Yes.

26256. Suppose a man goes from Montreal to Old Orchard Beach, and he carries with him liquor in his bag or his pocket, would that be contrary to law?—No; the law forbids the sale only.

26257. We were told by a Judge in Maine that there was nothing in the law to prevent people in Maine from having liquor for their own individual use, getting liquor from Boston, Montreal or elsewhere?—That is so. The law is against the sale and the supplying of it for sale.

26258. You spoke of transportation—that is for purpose of sale?—A. Yes.

26259. And express companies and individuals handling it for private use would not be liable?—No.

26260. Upon whom is the burden of proof?—The burden of proof rests on those to whom the liquor is sent. Recently, within one week or two, several packages of liquor were seized that were directed to individuals. The individuals came forward and said that the packages belonged to them, and of course they had to be delivered up.

26261. Will you explain the position of the State vendor and the sub-vendors, as to how the system is worked?—The agencies you mean. So long as the doctors know so little about the physiological effects of alcohol, it is necessary to have some places where it can be bought for medicinal purposes as well as for mechanical purposes, because the majority of the people of Maine labour under the impression that liquor is good in case of sickness. Over in England they are learning better than we are. So we are obliged to have some places provided where liquor can be purchased without violating the law. These are agencies. The town may or may not have an agency for the sale of liquor. In Portland we have one. Then there is a State agency, which purchases all liquors for the use of the local agencies.

26262. Is the State agent required to obtain liquors from any particular place or establishment?—No.

26263. Is there any test of the purity of the liquors themselves, or is the whole matter left to the State agent?—It is left to him. The law requires that the liquor shall be pure.

26264. I suppose he is under some kind of bond?—Yes, he is under bonds.

26265. Are the druggists of the town agents under bonds?—They are all under bonds.

26266. Are the penalties heavy in regard to them if they sell for other purposes than for medicinal purposes?—Yes.

26267. On whose authority do they sell?—They sell on the express authority of the law.

26268. If an agent is not in sympathy with the law, may he not be very liberal in this matter?—I have seen two or three such cases. A man comes in, and says he wants a pint of rum for medicinal purposes. The apothecary writes down his name and gives him a pint of rum.

26269. Is there not also a city agent?—There is a municipal agent.

26270. You have mentioned that in some cases a person has gone into an apothecary's shop and asked for a certain quantity of liquor for medicinal purposes; the name has been written down and the liquor has been handed to the applicant?—That was in Portland.

26271. Who appoints the city agent?—The Mayor and Aldermen of cities, and the select men in towns.

26272. Do the doctors have to give a certificate in any case?—No. There is no provision in the law for a doctor's certificate. An apothecary is not allowed to sell.

26273. Does the doctor give a prescription for liquor?—If the doctor thinks that his patient should have strong drink, he gives a prescription, and the person sends to the agency and gets it. The agency considers the prescription is an indication that it will be used for proper purposes.

26274. Do you find that the doctors violate the law?—I never heard of it.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26275. I thought you said that the apothecaries took out a United States revenue license?—Yes.

26276. For what reason?—Because if they sell without that, they will be prosecuted by the United States authorities, and they are very sharp.

26277. I thought you said they could not sell?—They keep liquor for the purpose of compounding medicines, but they cannot sell it under the law. They cannot sell it now.

26278. They cannot sell the alcohol itself?—No.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26279. They could sell it in a mixture that is compounded?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26280. I was speaking of the doctors: do they give their orders direct to the agent?—No. They give prescriptions in the ordinary way. They would order a certain quantity of liquor and state that it was required for medicinal purposes, and the fact that a doctor's prescription was given would indicate that it was required for medicinal use.

26281. Am I to understand that you have never known of a case in which a doctor has given prescriptions to people to enable them to get drink, and where it was not needed for strictly medicinal purposes?—I never heard of it.

26282. To what quantities are the doctors limited?—No quantities are named.

26283. In one section of Canada we were in a town where there were certificates given for medicinal purposes in this form: Give A.B. two gallons of spirits for medicinal purposes. On the back of it in some cases there was put the word "repeat." Are you acquainted with such a state of things?—No.

26284. You never heard of such a state of things?—No.

26285. You think the doctors observe the law?—Yes.

26286. And do not help to evade it?—No, I never heard of it in that way. In 1884 we had a popular vote in Maine on the introduction of prohibition into our con-

stitution ; we had a vote on the constitutional amendment as it was called. The result was that a majority was given in favour of it, to the number of 47075, this affirmative vote being three times larger than the negative vote. This happened after thirty-two or thirty-three years experience of the results of prohibition.

26287. What was the total vote?—I do not remember.

26288. Was the vote given as large as that given at the Presidential election?—No.

26289. Then all the people who voted on one did not vote on the other?—No.

26290. How do you account for that?—A good many are totally indifferent on the question of prohibition. At the election in last September the whole vote was only 3,000 or 4,000.

26291. What is the vote under normal conditions, cast by the State of Maine?—It will be something more than 60,000.

26292. Was a candidate selected by the prohibition party for the Presidential contest?—Yes.

26293. How many votes did he receive?—That election does not take place until November. There was voting for Governor last September, and the vote was less than 4,000.

26294. As I understand the question, the Maine law does not prohibit the importation by private individuals or families of liquor for domestic consumption?—There is no State authority that can prohibit the importation. The importation is entirely a national affair. What the law of Maine does is to forbid transportation after it crosses our line ; then the State can take hold of it. If you bring it into the State, you cannot afterwards transport it.

26295. Is there any barrier to a citizen purchasing liquor for domestic use?—No ; anybody can buy it.

26296. How is liquor looked after in the State?—It can be purchased, but not offered for sale. If any is offered for sale, it is of course liable to be seized.

26297. So the law does not prohibit the importation of liquor for beverage purposes by families?—Not for private use. The law is against the sale and the keeping for sale, and the illegal transportation.

26298. Has any attempt been made during the past forty years to take away from the people of Maine this privilege they now enjoy?—No.

26299. Would you favour an amendment of that kind?—No. The people are not prepared for it.

26300. What do you understand by the term prohibition?—We understand by the term prohibition that drinking shops are forbidden, that saloons are forbidden and the sale of liquor for beverage purposes is forbidden and so on.

26301. Is there any restriction, under your definition of the term, to be placed in the way of people purchasing liquor for beverage purposes and bringing it in for domestic use?—No.

26302. You do not favour legislation that would stop that?—No, because public opinion is not prepared for it. In countries like ours and England and Canada, public opinion must always be consulted. No matter how important a measure may be, it would be unwise to attempt it very much in advance of public opinion. The law is educational.

26303. Are we to understand, then, that the prohibition you advocate is a prohibition of the sale?—Yes, and keeping for sale.

26304. But not prohibition for domestic purpose?—Not prohibition for domestic use.

26305. You draw a line between the two?—Yes.

ROBERT REFORD, of Montreal, merchant, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

26306. Are you President of the Chamber of Commerce, or do you hold any position of that kind?—I do not. The only position I hold is director of the Bank of Toronto. I am a steamship owner.

26307. What line?—Three lines. I am agent for four lines. The Donaldson, the Glasgow, the Thompson to the east coast of England and the east Mediterranean, and the Ross Line to London and Antwerp. We also run boats to the east, China and India.

26308. Have you anything to do with the employment of men?—We have a large number of men employed in the loading and unloading of vessels.

26309. Are those stevedores?—Those who boss the men are stevedores. We call the men ship labourers.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26310. How long have you resided in Montreal?—About five years.

26311. How have the present liquor laws been enforced?—Very badly.

26312. Can you suggest any amendments to them?—I think it is due largely to the laxity on the part of the officials. I think these laws are fairly framed, but they are not enforced as they should be.

26313. You think the laxity has been due to a lack of zeal and energy on the part of the officials?—Not altogether to that, but to a large number of the officials, both the Aldermen and the policemen being rather in favour of laxity in the enforcement of the law. Young men and boys respectably dressed go about at an early hour in the morning and drink.

26314. Are they strangers?—No, they appear to be citizens of Montreal. I would not have believed it if I had not seen it.

26315. Is the observance of the law on Sunday better now than it has been in the past?—I do not think it is, but I am not much about the city on Sunday.

26316. We have had some statements in reference to the parks, and it is said that the opening of the parks has had a beneficial effect?—I have not been to any of those parks, but I have heard accounts of what has been going on from people who have been there; they asked me to go, as those places were places of harmless amusement. They were trying to create a favourable impression in my mind about Sohmer Park and Mount Royal Park and others. I think they are about the worst places in the city.

26317. You do not favour the licensing of them?—I do not. I think they are debasing in every way.

26318. Would you favour the running of cars to them on Sunday?—No, I would oppose the running of cars on Sunday at any rate. I think the workingman is entitled to his day of rest as is any other man.

26319. Would you prevent him having an opportunity to go to those parks?—I would give him the Mountain park and other parks of that kind.

26320. How would he get there?—He could walk there, as I have always done.

26321. You think the interests of the working people would be advanced by preventing the running of cars?—I do.

26322. Do you know anything of the character of the liquor sold in Montreal, whether it is adulterated or not?—Yes, it is all adulterated, every drop of it. The people talk about pure liquor. It is simply, in my opinion, absolute rubbish. There is absolutely no pure liquor except what a man makes for himself from the grapes that he pulls from his vines and from which he makes wine in his own vineyard.

26323. What do you mean by adulteration?—Take France. They have had the phylloxera there, which has very badly damaged the vines during the last ten years. The result is that the amount of home made wine in France has very greatly decreased. How is that made up in Canada? The French people have got all the diseased fruit from Greece and other parts of the Mediterranean, and a very large portion of the French wines are made to-day from diseased fruit, from diseased currants and spoiled

ROBERT REFORD.

fruits taken from other places. In addition to that, they buy from America immense quantities of pure spirit or alcohol, which is taken over there and comes back to us in the shape of brandy, and that is mixed with the wines in order to make them keep.

26324. Has the increase in the consumption of alcohol in France been caused to any extent by the failure of the vines in consequence of the action of the phylloxera?—Simply as a matter of opinion, I think so.

26325. Would you favour legislation to induce the use of light wines and beer to take the place of stronger liquors?—I might as a last resort, but I would very much rather favour the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of liquor.

26326. Did you hear General Dow's statement as to the privileges given to the people of the State of Maine to bring liquor in for domestic use?—Yes.

26327. Would you favour that for the Dominion of Canada?—I think such a law would be entirely beneficial to all concerned.

26328. Would you favour a law depriving the people of the right they enjoy in the State of Maine?—I would at any hazard deprive people of the right to kill themselves.

26329. You would prevent the importation of liquor in for domestic use?—I would.

26330. We have had it in evidence that there are 300 or 400 groceries where liquor is sold in Montreal. What is your opinion with regard to the sale of liquor in grocery stores or shops?—I do not think the danger is so great from the sale of liquor in grocery shops, though it is very great, as it is in the taverns.

26331. Then if the question was whether licences should be granted to taverns and restaurants or to groceries, which would you strike off?—The taverns.

26332. Would you leave the grocery?—I would prefer leaving the grocery, with very strict lines to guide it, so that liquor should not be drunk on the premises.

26333. You would prefer the grocery to the tavern?—Decidedly, for this reason: A young man meets a companion in the street. He says, "Come in here and have a drink." And the young fellow gets two or three drinks, and he goes out of that place a drunkard and makes a fool of himself. That occurs in the taverns, but it could not occur in a grocery, if no drink was allowed to be taken on the premises. Consequently, a great deal of the temptation which now affects young men would be done away.

26334. Does the grocery do harm in giving facilities to women to obtain liquor?—I am afraid that is very largely the case.

26335. Do you not think the evil under the system you refer to would be less?—Less harm than under the tavern system.

26336. As between the restaurant or saloon and the hotel bar, if a recommendation is made to wipe out either the restaurant and tavern or hotel bar, which would you favour?—The hotel bar does not do so much mischief as the promiscuous tavern.

26337. Or the restaurant?—These restaurants are simply taverns.

26338. If it were a question between the restaurant bar or the hotel bar, which would you prefer to wipe out?—The restaurant, for this reason: The restaurants in the city of Montreal now are becoming places where a number of our clerks go for their mid-day meal, and if they can get drink there, they waste their time and come back to their duties in the office very frequently in a muddled and incapable condition. The people who frequent the hotels are not clerks or people who are going through their daily work, but travellers, people who are in the city on business or on pleasure, and their drinking does not affect the people generally, so much as does drinking by our sons in restaurants.

26339. But if you were told that our sons or our young friends take advantage of the opportunities that hotels or places for travellers or strangers afford them to visit ostensibly to see these men, but really to get into the bar, whereas if they visit a restaurant, it is generally understood that they are going there for liquor, what would your opinion be?—I think young men going into restaurants every day ostensibly for their lunch—generally the hotels are away from the business parts of the city, hotels like the Windsor and the Balmoral—would not have time also to visit those places without their object becoming very soon apparent.

26340. How about the evening, after the business of the day is over?—Then I can understand that the bar of the hotel, if it is open to the young men, can be just as dangerous as the bar of the restaurant.

26341. Not more dangerous?—Not a bit.

26342. Would it be an advantage to impose higher license fees and reduce the number of drinking places?—Decidedly. But the main remedy is a proper administration of the laws and the curtailing of the license system. We have here ten taverns where we should have but one at most. We see these men constantly brought up for giving drink to minors, and the penalties inflicted are much too light. In fact the man's license should be taken away from him for ever if he violates the law in that respect. I think the city of Montreal makes a great mistake in licensing such a large number of places.

26343. You would favour the adoption of local option in Montreal?—Decidedly.

26343*a*. The Provincial Government gets a considerable revenue from the sale of liquor, and the city does not get much?—The city of Montreal has to bear the expense of keeping a vigilant watch on those people.

26344. Not altogether?—Almost all.

26345. Have you had any experience of the Scott Act or the Dunkin Act?—No.

26346. Have you had any experience of the operation of prohibitory laws anywhere?—No.

26347. Do you know of any place where there is prohibition in the sense in which you understand it?—No, I do not.

26348. Have you visited Portland in the State of Maine?—Yes.

26349. What was your experience there?—It was some years ago, and certainly drink could be found there. When I was there, I unfortunately was stopping at Cape Elizabeth, and a friend of mine was very ill and the doctor ordered brandy, but I had great difficulty in getting it, and then it was an abominable mixture of alcohol.

26350. When was this?—Ten years ago.

26351. Were you staying there for any time?—I was staying at Cape Elizabeth, which is across the bridge from Portland.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26352. You have a good many men in your employment?—A good many.

26353. Does the drink habit and the drink traffic interfere with these men?—Very largely. Nearly all the accidents on our ships are attributable to drink. The work is to a certain extent dangerous. We work at night in discharging heavy goods, and occasionally carelessness will cause a piece of iron to fall against a man or a man will fall, and these accidents almost always are attributable to drink.

26354. Do you take care that your engineers are men not given to drink?—I have nothing to do with the engineers, except that I have a personal interest in most of the ships, and I have strongly endeavoured to impress on my co-owners that it would be a benefit to them and to the ships in every way to have total prohibition on the ships. On one line we allow no drink at all.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26355. What line is that?—The Donaldson line. And the men are better in every way.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26356. And that determination is, while you have an interest in the moral welfare of the men, a business matter?—It is largely business. Of course, we do our best to help the men as far as we know how.

26357. But you think prohibition in the steamship is profitable from a business point of view?—Most decidedly.

26358. As to the ship labourers and others working about the wharfs: do you find they lose time and are irregular and are less valuable to you as employees because of the drink habit?—Certainly; there is no man, no matter how good he is, who is of much use when he is drinking.

26359. What do you think about the drink places in the vicinity of the wharfs?—They are a curse. I have known men work for some time and receive from 25 to 30 cents an hour, who would go home in the fall without a cent. The drink places in the vicinity of the wharfs are a disgrace to Montreal!

ROBERT REFORD.

26360. You think the drink traffic is not beneficial to the industries of Montreal?—No, nor in any other place in the world.

26361. If the drink trade were prohibited, do you think the country would suffer by the loss of revenue?—I think that for every dollar the Government, either provincial or Dominion or municipal now pay out, three dollars would be returned.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26362. How do you think they pay out three dollars now as compared with one dollar that would be required, you say, under prohibition?—In asylums, jails, hospitals, accidents on railways and on the streets, by which people are killed.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26363. Is there a lessening of the wage-earning power of the men in consequence of the drink trade?—Certainly there is. The same occurs everywhere. Take the city of Glasgow, where occasionally, during a boom in the ship-building industry, the wages reach very high rates. Perhaps the men would earn £6 a week each, but really they would only earn £2, because they would spend the rest and devote the balance of their time to idleness and drunkenness.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26364. In that case, would it not be better to lower their wages?—No, but it would be better to put temptation out of their way and allow the poor men to keep sober.

REV. ARTHUR FRENCH, of Montreal, Clerk in Holy Orders, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald :*

26365. How long have you resided in Montreal?—Since 1878, as a clergyman.

26366. Have you during that time acted as a clergyman?—Yes, continuously since 1878.

26367. Have you done parochial work and parish duties, including visiting?—Yes.

26368. Have you found drunkenness in Montreal to be a great evil : have you found much of it?—No greater evil than elsewhere ; it is an evil everywhere.

26369. With what church are you connected?—With the church of St. John the Evangelist.

26370. Then, speaking comparatively, you do not think there is more drunkenness in Montreal than anywhere else?—No. In all places it is one of the great difficulties with which clergymen have to cope, it is at all events one of the evils.

26371. It is one of the evils, I suppose, with which you are constantly contending, with a view either to reducing it or abolishing it altogether?—Yes.

26372. State what you consider to be the best means of reducing or abolishing that evil?—Individual work, work with the individual. I have had some special work in that direction, acting with the individual, or acting on the individual. I think that is the best way of dealing with this evil. You cannot, of course, lay down a general rule ; even two men or any number of men must be treated differently.

26373. Have you considered the question of what is commonly called a prohibitory law?—Yes. For two summers during my holidays I spent my time in Cornwall, where a prohibitory law was in force.

26374. Was the Scott Act in force?—I think so. It was in 1888, the second time I was there ; I was also there in 1885.

26375. How did you find the law work?—Very unsatisfactorily ; I was struck with the unsatisfactory condition of things. I remember a special instance, which left an indelible impression on my mind. I had to get some methylated spirits for a sick child who had



the whooping cough and I had also to get some brandy. I could not get methylated spirits unless I obtained an order from two Magistrates, which I, being a stranger, had of course some difficulty in obtaining. While I was going about, I visited one of the principal hotels, and I was struck with the fact that a well-known resident was drunk on the platform. That was about 3 o'clock in the afternoon. In consequence of that, I made some inquiries, and whatever success may be obtained elsewhere, there is no question but that drunkenness was very rampant that year in Cornwall. The facts I have mentioned left an indelible impression on my mind.

26376. Have you had any experience of a prohibitory law elsewhere?—I remember at one time I was at Knowlton. I do not think it was the Scott Act that was in force, it was in 1883, but it may have been the Dunkin Act. I went to spend the summer there, and I had a friend who was not a teetotaler, but was a thoroughly steady fellow, and was accustomed to take his glass of beer. I knew there was prohibition in force, and was surprised to find that drink was sold there. I cannot really say that prohibition acts efficiently.

26377. In your opinion, what is the effect on the community of having a law on the statute book that is openly and flagrantly violated?—I think the moral effect is far worse than if there was no Act of that kind in existence. The moral effect is bad.

26378. Then, in your judgment, the only way to reach the curse of drunkenness, or to decrease it, is by work on the individual?—Yes; and then there is the work among the publicans themselves. I was a clergyman in England before I came out here, working in one of the large manufacturing districts, in the parish of Wolverhampton, near Birmingham, in the black country. The liquor question was, of course, before us constantly. I consider that a good publican can be the means of doing a great deal of good, and I found such to be the case in that parish. If we had the proper class of men in charge of the public houses, and if the Magistrates did their duty by enforcing the license law and punishing offenders, the moral effect would be really good and the public houses would be thoroughly respectable. On the other hand, a bad publican is a very serious matter to the community. We had to depend on the working classes for Sunday School teachers in that parish. In our school there were 1,200 children. There were living in our parish at least 10,000 people. We had in our Sunday school many daughters of publicans, and girls of their class who serve beer in public houses, and there was no doubt whatever that those girls were thoroughly respectable. I never hesitated to go into a public house, or to go into a tap room.

26379. How long have you been in Montreal?—Since 1878.

26380. Have you found during that time that the social habits of the people have changed, in the direction of temperance?—No, I have not noticed that.

26381. Do you think there is as much consumption of intoxicating drinks as there was when you first came here? Do you find more people are now total abstainers, and fewer people take liquor to excess?—I think there are more total abstainers than when I first came here. There are a number of people who have taken the pledge to abstain from all liquor on New Year's day, in order to set a good example. There is a marked improvement in that direction. In regard to general living, I do not know that there has been any.

26382. Are you connected with the work of temperance societies?—We have a temperance society in connection with our church.

26383. Is that the Church of England Temperance Society?—Yes, with a double pledge.

26384. How does that work?—Very well indeed.

26385. Will you please state to the Commission, as a clergyman of the Church of England, your opinion as to the use of wine in the Holy Communion?—We have no option in the matter, we must use fermented wine.

26386. Unless it was fermented, you would not call it wine, I suppose?—Certainly not. The wine is fermented, of course.

26387. We have already had evidence in regard to the action taken by the Canadian Church through its Synod, in regard to this matter?—Yes.

26388. To the same effect that you have stated?—Quite so.

REV. ARTHUR FRENCH.

26389. Have you ever travelled in France?—I have been in France.

26390. Have you noticed anything in connection with the habits of the people there? We have been told they use light wines and that those are the common drink of the people, particularly in the South of France.—Yes.

26391. Did you see those wines in use generally?—Vin d'ordinaire is the wine of the peasant, and it is in general use.

26392. A suggestion has been made to the Commission, that it would be an improvement if instead of our people drinking strong alcoholic liquors, they would drink light wines and beers. Have you considered that question?—I think the consumption of beer is decidedly preferable to the consumption of strong liquor.

26393. Something has been said about the practice in England: I suppose you are aware that much beer is consumed in England?—Yes, a good deal.

26394. Are you aware that in the parish in England of which you have spoken, there was much beer consumed?—Yes, a great deal.

26395. What was the effect, was it harmful to the people?—No, I think there was no harm when the beer was good.

26396. In Montreal we have had various license laws; have you had any experience with regard to their working? The first point is in regard to obtaining licenses. It has been stated to us that the signatures of twenty-five people have to be placed to the application?—I think that is very faulty indeed.

26397. How would you have the matter arranged?—I would have the licenses restricted in proportion to the population.

26398. That would lead to a diminution in number?—No doubt.

26399. Are there too many, in your opinion?—Yes, most undoubtedly.

26400. We have been further informed that twenty-five people are required to sign an application for license, and that every year, in order to retain the license, a similar number of names require to be signed. It has been suggested as an amendment that a majority of the people should be required to sign the license, instead of the number prescribed at present.—That might be an injustice in another way under certain circumstances.

26401. Have you thought of any plan preferable to the present one, or would you do away with the signatures of the people in getting licenses?—I would have the number of licenses strictly limited, and I would be inclined to place greater powers in the hands of the Magistrates and not in the hands of the people.

26402. The two sitting magistrates, Mr. Dugas and Mr. Desnoyers, have drawn our attention to the fact that their discretion has been largely taken from them with regard to putting the law into force. They have simply to administer the law. They have also stated that they have been approached by influences in regard to granting licenses, but that they have practically no discretion after the terms of the law have been complied with.—I would rather leave the matter in the hands of the authorities. If a man's record could be established as being good, and if his license fee was regularly paid, the law should allow the license to be continued. Care should, of course, be taken that not too many licenses were issued, but only a fair and proper number. I think the popular vote is not a desirable one.

26403. We are told there is difficulty in Montreal in the direction of selling liquor to minors. Have you had any experience in that way?—I have seen boys intoxicated, who must have been minors, and they must have obtained the liquor in public houses. Care should be taken that the law is not broken in that respect.

26404. You think the law should be thoroughly enforced?—Every breach of the law should be prosecuted and the law should be strictly enforced.

26405. It has been said that some responsibility should be placed on the buyer?—I would place the whole onus on the seller.

26406. Have you had any experience in the working of that part of the law which prevents sale on Sunday, and are you aware whether the law is observed in that regard?—I think that there is a possibility of that being a hardship. We are not now taking up the question as to whether drinking intoxicants is right or wrong. We will admit that it is used, and for the sake of argument we will admit that it is right to do so. If a man has the right to have a barrel of beer in his house, simply because he is able to

pay for it, I do not see why on that admission the poor man should be precluded from having a single glass.

26407. Would you limit the sale to certain hours on Sunday?—Most decidedly.

26408. Have you noticed if the Sunday law is broken?—Undoubtedly it is.

26409. Have you any idea whether liquor is adulterated?—It is impossible for me to say.

26410. You have no knowledge on that subject?—We presume it is, but we do not know.

26411. Another argument put forward in connection with the license law is as regards the advantage of having the license fee itself made higher, in connection with the restriction of the number?—I do not know what the effect of that would be. It would no doubt have the effect of making the men who paid high license very careful in regard to illicit sale being permitted to go on around them.

26412. It has been suggested that one effect of high license would be, that the man having invested so much money would be apt to deteriorate his liquors, and sell liquors which were cheap to him at a very high price to the consumer?—I am not strongly in favour of high license, if the number of public houses is not strictly limited.

26413. Another argument brought forward is in regard to the question of separating the sale of intoxicating drinks from groceries, and not permitting the sale of liquor in groceries. It is said that this combination works injury.—I think the separation would be an improvement.

26414. Have you ever considered the question as to whether licenses to sell liquor should be taken away from either the hotel bar or the saloon bar? Do you consider, in the interests of the community, the hotel bar or the saloon bar is the less injurious? Suppose a law to be enacted to abolish one or other of them, which would it be better to abolish, the saloon bar or the hotel bar?—I have not considered that question.

26415. Has your attention been called to the parks which are in the city, Sohmer Park and Mountain Park?—I have been at Sohmer Park more than once.

26416. What is your opinion of the effect on the city of having a place like Sohmer park?—It is quite possible to be the cause of a great deal of evil under one guise or another. I have read in the papers a great deal about Sohmer Park. I have never, however, seen anything objectionable there, and I rather expected to see something objectionable. I have been there three or four times.

26417. Would you favour the granting of licenses to sell liquor there, to sell lager beer or sell spirituous liquors?—I would have no sale of liquors there, any more than in any concert hall or similar place of entertainment.

26418. In one province visited by the Commission we found a peculiar state of facts. The people of Prince Edward Island had been very strongly in favour of prohibition, and enacted a prohibitory law. It was passed for the whole Province in the different counties and in Charlottetown. Some time ago Charlottetown repealed the Act. The Legislature of the Island would not grant a License Act, and in fact it was stated that some of the citizens of Charlottetown requested that no license law should be passed, and consequently for one year there was free rum. Last February the Legislature passed a special enactment for Charlottetown, in which it provided that liquor should be sold in a room in the front of the building, open to the street, and that no chairs or tables should be in the apartment and nothing else should be sold except liquor, and that there should be no screens permitted; further, that the place should close at ten o'clock in the evening and at seven o'clock on Saturday and should not be open on Sunday. That new law or regulation went into force on first July last. Granting such a state of facts, would you consider the state of things better than a license law limiting the number?—I would prefer a license law limiting the number.

26419. Are there any suggestions you could make to the Commission in regard to this matter?—No. There is one matter on which, however, I should like to make a remark. In a conversation I had on the subject of fermented wine at the Holy Communion some years ago, it was stated that at that sacred moment a drunkard might be seized with a burning thirst, fall away and get on a terrible spree of intoxication. Of

REV. ARTHUR FRENCH.

course that is a very serious matter, and it is a matter we must look at from a practical point of view, discarding all ideas of sentiment in the matter and of deep religious feeling. I should like to quote one case that I watched very carefully. He is a man who is a very serious drunkard unquestionably, a man of full years, not an old man, a man whom I would not trust away by himself with money in his pocket because he would have a glass of beer no matter the condition in which it might place him. I have for a lengthened period administered the Holy Communion to this man. He was for a considerable time very closely under my eye, so that I might know the effect on him, and I had opportunities at the time of asking him if he ever felt such an effect in his case as had been mentioned. There is another case I know of in which the same result is borne out; yet this man is a thoroughly depraved drunkard, and unless he is properly looked after, he will go wrong. He has become a drunkard, although everything has been done for him that was possible. The very small modicum of wine that pass the lips has not, at all events, in this case and in the other case had the effect suggested.

26420. Then there was a certain influence or protection over them?—I have excluded the idea of Divine Grace, which is quite possible.

26421. Do you think that great difficulty occurs in this regard?—I have watched those cases most carefully.

26422. Have you formed any opinion on the question of prohibition, as to the principle of it, as to whether prohibition is justifiable?—I am one who very seldom takes wine or beer or anything else in that line as a beverage.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26423. You have said that the Scott Act, as you observed it in Cornwall and also the Dunkin Act as you observed it in Knowlton, was very unsatisfactory?—The law in Cornwall was very unsatisfactory. There was nothing of the kind at Knowlton and everything was very well conducted.

26424. Did you know Cornwall under a license law?—I had been there.

26425. For any length of time?—No. I have, however, frequently been at Cornwall.

26426. Were you there as long during the period when license was in force as you were during the Scott Act period?—No.

26427. Are you able from personal observation to compare Cornwall under license with Cornwall under Scott Act?—I was in Cornwall taking duty about one year, and I believe the Scott Act was in force there. I am told the condition of affairs is very much more satisfactory now, and that there is not as much drunkenness seen on the street as there was then.

26428. That is information given to you and not your own observation?—Yes, that is information given to me. It is information gained from residents.

26429. Were they people who had favoured the adoption of the Scott Act?—That I could not tell. I was interested in the question, and asked them for information.

26430. You have known places under license law, of course. For instance, you know Montreal under license law. Now do you think that the sale of liquor in Cornwall was as free and untrammelled as it is in Montreal under license?—You could get liquor anywhere in Cornwall.

26431. Do you say that liquor was openly sold?—No.

26432. Then the law did restrict, in that it made the sale more or less secret?—There was probably as much liquor sold as previously, for there was no difficulty in regard to obtaining it.

26433. But you say it was not sold with the same openness as under license?—Liquor is never exposed for sale; you have always to ask for it.

26434. Is it not exposed in Montreal?—You go into a saloon and you ask for it.

26435. You do not know that liquor is exposed for sale?—I could not say.

26436. My idea is that the liquor is exposed for sale.—You could get it as easily in Cornwall as in Montreal.

26437. Was it there in the same way, or was it simply there if you wanted it and called for it?—It was in Cornwall if you wanted it and asked for it. I never asked for it.

26438. Your belief is, from your observation or from information, that it was there for any person who wanted it and called for it?—I believe there is no secret about it. The leading hotel man said it paid him to pay the fine. That liquor was more or less sold is notorious.

26439. Were there any particular difficulties in the way of a more rigid enforcement of the law?—I only can say in regard to what I saw about me.

26440. You are not able to compare Cornwall under license with Cornwall under the Scott Act?—I am informed by clergymen and old residents in regard to the facts.

26441. You do not make that comparison from your own observation but from information you have received?—So far as I can see, it has been decidedly better since the Scott Act has been repealed.

26442. But you said you had not been in Cornwall, or not so frequently, while the License Act was in force, but from information obtained, you thought it was more satisfactory under license?—A person might be five weeks in a place, and yet in one day he might have evidence such as I had, evidence that would make the thing perfectly clear. Having got that evidence, even although he had been only one hour in the place, he would be able perfectly to satisfy himself.

26443. Do you think that one case that came under your observation established the whole case?—No exception ever proves the general rule.

26444. Have you personal knowledge of other instances similar to the one you have mentioned?—A man, who was a terrible drunkard, told me that the first time he was ever invited to a bar was in Portland, Maine, as a boy. He had nothing to drink; he went in with a man, who had something to drink. He does not, however, date his fall from that time.

26445. Do you understand that if a young man entered a bar for the first time in Portland, where there is a prohibitory law, the prohibitory law should be held responsible for that action?—It indicates that the law is ineffectual, and because ineffectual, it is worse than if no law was in force.

26446. Do you consider the existence of a bar in a prohibitory community a proof of the utter failure of a prohibitory law?—Not the utter failure.

26447. Is it proof of the comparative failure?—It is a proof of the failure in that particular.

26448. I think you have said that the drink trade is an evil thing, as you have observed it?—I say so now. I think the drink trade is an evil. I would not like to say very particularly as to the evil.

26449. Generally considered, is the drink trade evil in its effects?—Yes.

26450. You have said that a flagrant violation of law is very demoralizing. Do you think the authorization of a trade, which you say is evil in its effects, is more demoralizing than the violation of a law which is designed to check that evil?—I think that the evil of the liquor trade is in violating the law. I did not say that the liquor law is evil; I said the liquor trade is evil, but not as theoretically laid down by the law.

26451. Is the legalization of the liquor trade less demoralizing than the violation of the attempt to check the evil thing?—What I consider the evil in the liquor trade is not legalization but violation of the law. What I mean by the trade is as we see it in operation.

26452. What is there in the liquor trade that is evil?—Is it not illegal to sell a drop of liquor to a drunken man?

26453. It is also illegal, I believe, to sell to a minor?—Yes.

26454. It is also illegal to sell after certain hours?—The day before yesterday I was standing with the Bishop of Nassau in the St. Lawrence Hall, where we were sending a telegram. A young man walked in. I had before known him by name, and I knew he was a man of considerable standing in Quebec. He was evidently under the influence of liquor; I knew it from his voice and from the way in which he looked. He met a man, and he said to him—for I watched him—"Come and have a drink?" The man said, "No, I will see you some other time." This young fellow then went into the refreshment place. I was astonished to see him come back almost immediately afterwards. Unless I know anything to the contrary, my belief is that the man was refused

liquor. I thought this was better than I had expected, because many a man is given liquor under such circumstances. He afterwards came out and spoke to me.

26455. Do you think it would have been evil for the bar tender, because it was illegal, to have sold to that man who was evidently under the influence of liquor?—Yes.

26456. Would it be evil on the part of some other bar tender to sell to a man until he got into that condition?—It is possible for a man to have one or two glasses and not show any signs of liquor, to go into an open bar, as men do every day, and obtain some liquor. A man going through the large liquor vaults in connection with the London docks may not take one drop and come out intoxicated.

26457. Then the things to which you object in the liquor trade, as being evil, are those that result from violation of the liquor law?—Certainly. I think the liquor law should be amended.

26458. Do you believe the liquor trade if it keeps within the four corners of the liquor law, is perfectly good and right?—In that sense it is not evil. The law is good. But the law is faulty in that there are too many public houses, more than are needed.

26459. Why are there too many?—I think in the same way as we have a law that no butcher shop shall be in existence within a certain distance of the market, the number should be limited and restriction should be imposed, for we know that liquor is a temptation.

26460. You say that you would restrict the number of licenses and lessen the number very much. You give us as a reason the statement that there are more than there should be. If every licensee would conform to the requirements of the license law, would there be any objection to there being a large number of licensees?—It would be easier with a small number to see that the law was properly carried out, than with a large number.

26461. Do you believe that too large a number of licensees or licensed houses affords too many facilities and temptations to drink?—Yes.

26462. You think that if there was a diminished number, the temptations would be less?—I think that my experience as a clergyman is that if a man wants liquor, he will get it.

26463. You think it well to provide a place where he can get it?—No.

26464. Then why have licensed places?—Because I think alcohol is one of God's gifts, and I do not know why the law should withdraw it.

26465. Do you believe the liquor of commerce is God's gift?—I am not an analytical chemist.

26466. What is your opinion, from your general knowledge and your general observation as a practical man and as a minister coming in touch with men? Is it your belief that the liquor bought and sold, wholesale and retail, is one of God's creatures?—One has to be in the wholesale or retail business to know that. On the general principle of fermented and intoxicating drink, I do believe it is one of God's gifts.

26467. I thought you had investigated the character of liquor?—I cannot be responsible for that.

26468. Do you believe that God is responsible for the compounds that are on the market to-day?—We are coming down to a very small point.

26469. It is a very essential point.—No. I think we should consider the broad question of intoxicating drink, whether wine being used in a certain way may have a certain effect on a man; I think that is the question. I could not answer the question you put about compounds and so on. I have no knowledge of the fact that there are compounds manufactured.

26470. I only asked you the question because your answer to the previous question was to the effect that liquor as sold is one of God's creatures?—No. I think that God makes and man mars to a very great extent.

26471. Then if all were good publicans, there would never be an intoxicated man?—Not on account of the retailer. A good publican would never knowingly sell liquor when the effect would be evil.

26472. Do you think that the drink trade has a good moral effect on the citizens?—I certainly have had publicans under my pastoral care, who have had no immoral effect on the community.

26473. What is the moral effect of the drink on the drink sellers, as you have observed them?—Many of them are good, well-living people, who are anxious to do their duty.

26474. Have you found many of them to be such?—In West Bromwich we had quite a number. In a parish of 10,000 there were not more than half a dozen families who were very well-to-do. The publicans were our aristocracy.

26475. Was it because they had the money?—They were our aristocracy.

26476. Were they monied people?—We had plenty of money in the Black country.

26477. Did you observe whether in proportion as they grow rich, the large class of the people grow poor?—No. The only thing that made the people poor was the exhaustion of the coal and iron at different points; that was so far as the Black country was concerned.

26478. We have had it in evidence from a gentleman, an Englishman, and a large employer of labour in the English mining districts, that the use of beer by the people was more objectionable than the use of liquor. Your evidence seems to be to the contrary. Did you notice any bad publicans in the English district of which you have spoken?—Yes, plenty of them.

26479. Were they more numerous than the good ones?—I should not like to say that. One bad man will become notorious where a dozen good men will not be known in any walk of life. The effect of a bad publican is, of course, evil.

26480. Have you noticed in Montreal whether the publicans stand in the same class and are of the same sort as they are in England?—I only know one.

26481. And what is the position of the one?—I only know one publican, and his character is unimpeachable.

26482. Then you do not know the others?—No. I cannot recall anything in regard to those men except in regard to one.

26483. And he observes every provision of the law as applied to his business?—I think he exercises a very good influence.

26484. Is it within your knowledge that publicans violate the law?—I have never been inside a public house here, as you can well understand. But that person is under my pastoral care, and I am perfectly certain he is very conscientious. He to-day keeps a well known public house here and occupies a position of authority, and I do not believe that the law is broken there in any respect. I have never been at the house. In England, however, you can go into the public houses in your parish.

26485. You cannot do it here, I suppose?—It is different here.

26486. Why?—The countries are different.

26487. Is it because there is a different state of feeling towards the trade here than there is in England, and that the persons in the trade are regarded in a different light?—I am inclined to think so.

26488. You have spoken about a good publican. What is a good publican?—I think he is a man who tries to do his duty in that state of life to which God has called him; a man who never tolerated the slightest sign of drunkenness on his premises or who knowingly sold liquor to any one on whom it would have that effect.

26489. Is it that which prevents clergymen from visiting those houses?—I think so. In England a publican is more respected than here.

26490. In which place do you think public feeling is the more correct?—There is a better class of publicans there.

26491. Do you think it would be better if public feeling towards the trade in Montreal was as it is in England?—Yes. I think the chances are that if the trade was not frowned upon as it is, there would be a better class of publicans.

26492. Have you ever examined into the matter as to why, gradually, society has come to frown down on the trade in this country? It was not always so, and yet it is so, as you have observed. I think it has always been so. There are a number of people who are brought up to frown down on the liquor trade. The Church of England is part of a large minority on this question. I do not mean to say one word of disrespect to any one, but I believe the Church of England is broader than any other religious body. I think the individuals are so as a class.

REV. ARTHUR FRENCH.

26493. For what reason?—I cannot give the reason.

26494. In what respect?—In that respect—regarding such things as social amusements, the amusements of the young and everything of that kind.

26495. Do you not know that there is a very large section of the Church of England that takes quite as radical ground regarding the drink trade as people of any other Christian denomination?—There are many such in the Church of England, men who are venerated and admired. I would not like to say there is a large section, but I know there are many individuals, a very great number of individuals.

26496. Speaking about amusements and Sohmer Park, to which you have referred: do I understand that you think there should be some sale on Sunday?—No. I think liquor is out of place, and also the sale of liquor in groceries. I hold that liquor should only be sold in proper places and under proper restrictions.

26497. I think you said there should not be sale of liquor in Sohmer park?—Yes.

26498. Did you say you thought there might be some sale of liquor on Sunday at certain hours, in order to give the poor people a chance?—Yes. Let them take a jug to the bar and bring it home and have it.

26499. You think that Sunday sale then would be perfectly correct?—If the rich man should have his beer on Sunday, the poor man should likewise be allowed to have it.

26500. Why should you prohibit the sale of liquor in Sohmer Park?—Because it is out of place. You go there for amusement and to hear the concert, and not to get refreshments.

26501. Are there not a lot of people who go there to enjoy themselves, and is not part of their enjoyment a glass of beer or whisky?—People go there for change and amusement.

26502. Speaking of a licensed sale: I understand that you would place more power in the hands of the Magistrates and less in the hands of the people?—Yes.

26503. Do you believe the majority of the people ought to rule?—Not necessarily. The minorities are more frequently right than the majorities.

26504. You would not have an applicant get even twenty-five signatures to his application?—It might be necessary to get twenty-five signatures in order to establish his character, and it might be necessary for them to say that the applicant was a man of good character. The whole thing rests on the man's character.

26505. I think you said you would have a rule by which a certain number of places would be designated in a certain district, according to population?—Yes.

26506. And the Magistrates or the Commissioners would have power to designate the licensees that were to receive the certain number of licenses for that district. Suppose the majority of the people in that district were not desirous of having any license granted, should their decision be over-riden?—I think the community has the right to have a liquor place.

26507. Has it the right to say that it will not have a liquor place?—I do not think it has so much right to say that it will not have liquor places as that it will have them, and decide on a certain number.

26508. Under what circumstances would you limit the authority?—I would choose capable and able men to do this special work.

26509. Would you give them authority to establish one, two or three licensed places in a district against the expressed wish of the people?—No.

26510. Then you do believe the people should say whether they would have licenses granted or not?—They would have considerable weight.

26510a. If the majority said that it was against the interests of private families that there should be licensed places, should not their voice be sufficient to prevent the issue of licenses?—Their voice should be heard; but the question would have to be decided by the Magistrates.

26511. You spoke about a man who was under your care?—No, was under my notice and knowledge.

26512. Was he a victim of the drink habit?—Yes.

26513. He had to be watched, for he could not be trusted with money?—He could not be trusted with money.



26514. Do you think a measure of prohibition thrown about that man so that he would not be given money or allowed to go away from home, would be good or bad, as being an interference with his liberty?—Just as sure as money was given to him, it would have an ill effect; but he would come to the communion.

26515. Would it not have been better for that man to have been allowed to procure liquor?—If a man goes so far as that, you always know how to find him.

26516. Do you think it a good thing to establish a trade which creates and perpetuates that class of men?—I do not think the trade creates or perpetuates that class.

26517. Do you think the legalization of the trade does not create it?—Unless you mean that you are going to prevent the manufacture, and there is for the future to be no intoxicating liquor anywhere in the world, you cannot prevent it.

26518. Would you favour the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of strong drinks for beverage purposes?—Do you mean absolutely sweep liquor away?

26519. Would you favour such a law?—I could not say I favour such a law, but I think if it were possible to do so, it might be desirable.

26520. Do you think it would be a good thing?—No.

26521. If it were possible to enforce it?—I do not think it is possible.

26522. Do you believe that if there were such a prohibitory law, fairly well enforced, it would do good?—It seems impossible. I have never yet known where it was possible to enforce a prohibitory law; so it is impossible to say what the effect would be.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26523. A witness in New Brunswick mentioned one place in which such a law is in force, namely, in the Fiji Islands?—Yes. The effect might be good on those people, who are in a state of tutelage.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26524. Is that a desirable state?—They know nothing about it.

26525. You have had a number of years' experience as pastor in this country and in England, and I can readily understand that the pastor comes more nearly in touch with the people and with their inner life than any other man, knowing more intimately their inner life and all matters that interfere with their well-being, I should like to ask you if, from your experience as a pastor, you have observed that to any extent, and if so to what extent, the drink trade and the drink habit are responsible for crime, immorality, poverty, domestic troubles, neglect of children and neglect of religion?—It is one of the serious causes of all of them, but not the only one.

26526. Is it the chief one?—There are others. I do not want, however, to minimize the evil of it, but there are others quite as great.

26527. At what point in the list would the drink trade and the drink habit appear, first, second or third?—I would not put it in that way, several of these causes being equal. It is, however, a very serious evil.

26528. Do you believe that if the drink trade could be overthrown, the drink habit would be diminished and that a large proportion of the unhappy events that occur in all grades of society would gradually disappear?—There cannot be any doubt that there are many lives ruined by drink.

26529. Have you observed the evil effects of the drink trade and drink habit not alone among the lower and less cultured class, but among all classes of society?—It is an evil among all the classes, but it is not the only evil. There is the evil of chloral, morphia and opium in its various forms, all of which have a more destroying effect than liquor.

26530. Have you observed that the opium and drink habits are almost always combined?—No.

26531. Not always?—No.

26532. I do not mean to say that all the young people are guilty of opium eating. But have you observed this, that almost all the opium users also take drink.—I know there are such cases. I have had fallen women come to me and sign the pledge. I have

REV. ARTHUR FRENCH.

known them by their dress and so on, and they have by no means been sudden wrecks or anything of that kind. I speak as a clergyman, and I say that there are fallen women of the very worst kind who never touch a drop of liquor from the beginning to the end of the year.

26533. But the testimony is to the effect that fallen women, as a rule, are addicted to the drink habit?—One would presume so.

26534. Granting the drink trade to be full of evil, do you believe a law against that trade which is aimed at the evil, would have any effect in forming and strengthening public opinion against that evil?—No, because there are the bad effects resulting from a law being openly violated. An inoperative law is always bad.

22535. Do you believe, admitting the drink trade to be an evil thing, that because a law was violated, it would be better to legalize that evil than to allow the law to continue?—Not to legalize the evil part of it—it is not essentially evil.

26536. You distinguish between the evil and the good part of the law: which is the good part?—I may give this instance, the selling of wine for the Holy Communion.

26537. I was speaking of the trade in intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, not for any other purpose?—That part can be extended to cover a great deal of good.

26538. We want to leave that out. I ask you which is the good part of the law?—The permission of the use of alcohol for medicinal purposes. Suppose a man could do work better by taking a glass of beer, should he not be allowed to do so, whether that is exactly a medicinal use or not?

26539. Who is to be the judge? If I could tell you my own personal persuasion, aside from my position as a Commissioner, I would say that I do not believe it has medicinal uses.—You see that the term medicinal may be rather extensive.

26540. Do you believe that the drink trade as established is for the furnishing of liquor for medicinal purposes?—I do not quite understand you.

26541. Leave out wines for sacramental purposes, wines for medicinal purposes—I mean medicinal purposes in the sense of being prescribed by medical practitioners—and alcohol for mechanical purposes: will you tell the Commissioners what there is good in the liquor trade as carried on for supplying liquors for beverage purposes?—Many people are able to do work better from having a glass of beer at dinner.

26542. Are many people not able to do work as well as if they drink?—In my experience I have not known any harm to come from the taking of God's gift at meals. I have known a great deal of harm to come from "nipping."

26543. Would you shut up the saloons where liquor is sold over the bar and permit the sale only in quantities to be taken home and used at meals?—Certainly not. I would try and educate my people, and I would do my duty by the individual. I would endeavour to show him that in walking along St. James Street it is not necessary to go into bars, and that regular times to have refreshments, whether meat or drink, are desirable.

26544. I can understand that you endeavour, no doubt, diligently and faithfully as a minister, to educate your people into habits of sobriety and self-control. Do you believe that the drink trade, as established, hurts you in your teaching and antagonizes your efforts?—I think a good deal depends on the training of the individual. He can use or misuse alcohol.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26545. Do you think that if membership in a religious community be denied to a man because he engages in the sale of intoxicating liquors, it has a tendency to throw the trade into the hands of undesirable persons?—Undoubtedly; that is to say, he cannot present himself at Communion because he sells liquor.

26546. Would the existence of such a rule as that, used as a test for membership in a religious body, have the effect of throwing the trade into the hands of undesirable people?—Yes. With this man his religion comes first. He must have the Bread of Life. If his clergyman does that wrong, still he must have the Bread of Life, and he will throw the responsibility for the wrong on the clergyman. Some men, however, do not seem to care to receive the Bread of Life.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26547. Do you think it would be advisable to make the trade as disreputable as possible?—I do not see the object of doing so.

26548. It is contended by some that if you make the trade disreputable and keep it disreputable, the tendency is to make it more dangerous to the community?—No; because a publican who does his duty will be respected.

26549. In regard to adulterations: Some people hold the view that alcohol, when adulterated, is very much more injurious, while others again say that it makes very little difference whether the people get alcohol pure or adulterated?—I am told that there is alcohol in everything, even in water.

26550. What is your opinion about selling adulterated liquor?—The purer a thing is the better it is in every way.

26551. You believe in making the trade as reputable as possible, and granting licenses only to respectable people?—Yes.

26552. By restricting the number of places, and by enforcing the law against sale to minors, and by a better inspection of liquors sold—these are the measures you would adopt in dealing with intemperance?—Undoubtedly.

26553. Would you favour a general prohibitory law?—No.

26554. In the event of a prohibitory law being passed, a law that would prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, should those engaged in the trade, the distillers and brewers and hotel-keepers, be compensated by the State, for any losses they might sustain on account of such legislation?—If the principle of compensation is recognized as in other walks of life.

26555. But you think not otherwise?—No. If any other industry was closed down, and there was compensation given, I do not see any reason why brewers and distillers should not receive compensation.

26556. You were asked if there were any difficulties in the way of securing efficient enforcement of the Scott Act in Cornwall. Were there any difficulties of which you are aware?—No.

26557. There are certain difficulties in the way of carrying out all laws, of course; but were there any particular difficulties in Cornwall?—Not so far as I know.

26558. The condition of things you saw at Cornwall under the Scott Act was, in your opinion, no better than the condition of things after the law was repealed?—There was a great deal of drunkenness in Cornwall. I was struck by it.

26559. Do you prefer the present condition of things under license to that which prevailed under the Scott Act?—So far as I am able to judge, I do.

26560. Do you know any country where the people are prohibited from bringing in liquor for domestic use?—We have had the case of our North-west.

26561. But the prohibitory law has been repealed there?—Yes. I only know what everybody else knows about here.

26562. The law in Maine does not prohibit men bringing liquor in from outside?—No, nor the Scott Act.

26563. Do you know any country where there is such rigid prohibition, except the Fiji Islands?—No.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

26564. The prohibitionists consider alcohol as an evil and not as a creature and a gift of God, and yet they consider it useful for medicinal and sacramental purposes. If it is useful for those purposes, how is it that it is an evil and not one of God's creatures?—That is a difficulty I cannot explain. One assertion seems to contradict the other.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26565. I think you said that a tavern-keeper in Cornwall said it paid him to pay the fines imposed?—That is what I was told.

26566. You do not know how frequently the tavern-keeper was fined?—No. The time of which I spoke was I think 1888.

REV. ARTHUR FRENCH.

J. H. CARSON, of Montreal, was recalled and further examined.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26567. I think you have said you were Secretary of the Dominion Alliance for the Province of Quebec?—Yes.

26568. Is that a political organization or non-political?—It takes an interest in politics only in so far as the question of prohibition is concerned.

26569. Is it associated with either of the two chief political parties?—No.

26570. Is it a political party in itself?—No.

26571. So it is non-political?—It is non-partizan. It is political as prohibition enters into the contest, that is all.

26572. I think in the course of your examination reference was made to the form of ballot used in the recent Richmond or Drummond County election?—In the Drummond County election.

26573. What was the blunder as to that ballot form?—The blunder was committed by the Returning Officer or the Government official at Ottawa. In the proclamation which was issued by the Government the vote was called to be taken upon the petition, for or against the petition. That was the way the proclamation read. The Returning Officer in preparing the ballot prepared it for or against the petition.

26574. Then the blunder would seem to have its origin in the proclamation?—Yes.

26575. That would come from the Department of the Secretary of State?—Yes, at Ottawa.

26576. Coming down to the questions that have been asked you respecting Montreal: with what success have attempts been made to prevent the issue of licenses?—I know of only four licenses that we were successful in preventing being granted, in all our work extending over four years, and previous to my official connection with the Alliance.

26577. You have explained the difficulties of conducting opposition to the granting of licenses?—Yes.

26578. Do you believe from your knowledge of Montreal, and especially your knowledge of matters connected with the liquor traffic, that the non-licensing sentiment is growing perceptibly?—Only in certain sections I think; that is to say where licenses have not been previously granted. The sentiment is growing strongly against granting licenses in sections where they have not previously existed; but I do not think there is any change in the sentiment in other sections.

26579. How do you account for that?—Simply on account of the demoralizing effect of the trade.

26580. You believe that it creates a condition of sentiment favourable to itself?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26581. Do not people live and do business in the district where there are licensed places?—Yes.

26582. Do they not see the beneficial effects of non-licensing in other districts, and do not such effects tend to induce them to make an effort either to cut down or abolish licenses?—It may possibly have that effect, but that is a question that has often come up, as to why you should stop issuing in a certain section where the people appear to be opposed to licenses, and not abolish them in places where licensed houses are doing more harm. The only answer I can give is, that in those places where the most harm is being done the people seem to be strongly influenced by certain conditions, so that you cannot get them to sign petitions opposed to licenses. We cannot get them to sign; it would be impossible to get majorities in those places, and we have tried it.

26583. I think you have said that you would not have any licenses issued in the residential portion of this city?—That is if licenses are to be issued at all, I would confine them to business sections.

26584. Why do you make that proposition?—For this reason: If to a certain extent restaurants where meals are given are a necessity in the business part of the

city, they are not so in the residential portion. I do not think the selling of liquor is necessary anywhere, but restaurants are necessary in the city.

26585. About Sohmer Park and the like: do you know whether many convictions for illegal sale have taken place?—Only recently there have been some convictions in regard to the sale of Weiss beer.

26586. Do you know anything about the charge that boys had been used to entrap liquor sellers?—I know about all that, because we have heard a good deal about it. When the law was passed limiting the sale of liquor to persons over 21 years of age, it was well known in this city that the sale of liquor to young men was going on to a very large extent. Two young men, both members of a temperance society, in the interest of their fellow young men, started out to make an investigation on their own responsibility. They visited most of the hotels and restaurants, and in each case took a bottle in with them and asked that a glass of brandy should be put in it. They got it and took it away. When the cases were entered for trial, the question came up for consideration. Some one raised a report that those young men, in order to get this liquor, had disguised themselves by the use of false moustaches. I knew both young men intimately, and in order to establish the fact that there was nothing of the kind done, they not only testified themselves, but they went before a Commissioner and took an affidavit to the effect that there was not a word of truth in that report. We made very strict inquiries about it, and we found there was nothing in it, it was entirely wrong.

26587. Something has been said about the Law and Order League. What is that League?—It was found some time ago that the law was being violated very extensively and very flagrantly, and a number of gentlemen formed themselves together, or rather a Committee of the Alliance was formed, for the purpose of enforcing the law. At that time there was a provision in our license law that a prosecution could be instituted in the name of any person, that any individual could initiate an action. If the Government refused to take action, then this could be done by an individual. This committee was formed and detectives were employed, and they went through the city to see if the law was being violated. It was found that the condition was terrible, that the violations were frequent. Prosecutions followed and a great many fines were imposed. Then when it was found that the liquor people would be put to a great deal of trouble in the matter, an amendment was made to the license law, withdrawing the right of private prosecution, and an individual has not now that right.

26588. Does the League now exist?—It was thought that as the matter of the enforcement of the law was a matter in which every body could take part, whether prohibitionist or not, and as that society was formed to secure the enforcement of the law irrespective of prohibition, it was thought that it might become a society of citizens generally, and the work has been conducted on those lines since.

26589. What work?—The work of enforcing the law.

26590. What law?—The license law.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26591. Who are the officers of the society?—Major Bond is President, and Mr. Timmis is Secretary.

26592. Did the League do much work?—It has lately been bringing its influence to bear on the officials of the city rather than trying to enforce the law themselves.

26593. From your official connection with the Prohibitory Alliance in Quebec, are you able to state what is the prohibitory feeling in this province. Are you able to express the feeling of the people in regard to prohibition, whether a feeling favourable to prohibition is in existence and whether it is growing?—I think outside of the cities of Montreal and Quebec, and perhaps Sherbrooke, and one or two large towns, the feeling in favour of prohibition in the Province of Quebec is pretty general. I know that in many portions of the province the priests are very strongly in favour of it, I mean the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, and the people are in favour of prohibition; they are, in other words, in favour of granting no licenses, but placing the traffic under municipal

J. H. CARSON.

control. That is my experience over a large extent of the Province of Quebec. I believe the feeling in that direction is growing every year. I may say with respect to municipal prohibition, that there have been so far great difficulties in the way. The law provides that any Municipal Council can pass a by-law to the effect that no licenses shall be granted. In Huntington the Town Council passed such a by-law. Action was taken by one of the people who formerly held a license to compel the Municipal Council to grant a license.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26594. On what grounds?—I forget what the grounds were. But at all events an appeal was taken to the Court of Appeals, and the Court decided that the Council was perfectly within its rights to pass a prohibitory law. But before they would go that far the Council decided that they would not go to the expense of litigation in the matter, as considerable expense would be involved, and before the matter could be pushed further the Alliance had to become responsible for all the costs in the case. Then an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, and we had to follow that and guarantee the costs in order to carry the case forward. I mention this to show the difficulties in the way of enforcing municipal prohibition.

26595. You spoke the other day about the cancellation or suspension of the commissions of certain Justices while a case was pending?—Yes.

26596. What was the alleged reason for that suspension?—There were no reasons alleged. There was a notification served on them that their commissions were suspended. They were suspended sufficiently long that the time allowed by law in connection with the case had expired.

26597. Were there some other difficulties?—I think in Brome or Drummond there was the case of an information being laid in the name of the Collector of Inland Revenue.

26598. Was that under the Scott Act?—This case which I wish to mention was in the County of Richmond. An action was laid against two or three parties for violation of the Dunkin Act. The information was laid on the complaint of the Collector of Inland Revenue, under the section of the Scott Act which permits that to be done. Cases were taken against a number of parties. One particular case was that of Arthur Simpson against John F. Sinnett. When the case was called the prosecutor filed his plea: that defendant did on 13th April last sell spirituous liquors. Then defendant pleaded that Simpson, the Collector and an officer of the Department of Inland Revenue, has no right to bring or lay the present complaint; that Simpson is an officer of the Federal Government and has no right to do so; that if the case was to be brought, it should be brought in the name of the Collector of Inland Revenue for the Province of Quebec. The technical point as to the jurisdiction of the complainant was thus raised. The case was suspended for one week, and at the end of that time the complainant, Arthur Simpson, Collector, came into Court and made this declaration: the complainant, under instructions from the Department of Inland Revenue at Ottawa, having heard that the subject matter is within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government, declares his discontinuance, and doth discontinue the complaint and prosecution.

26599. Was that a direct interference on the part of the authorities at Ottawa with the execution of the Act?—I have here a copy of the court record certified by the Judge who had the matter in hand.

26600. Is there any question as to the legality of a complaint being made in the name of the Collector of Inland Revenue?—No; the Scott Act distinctly states that prosecutions may be taken in his name.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26601. When was that case up?—In 1886. I desire to mention it now to show the difficulties in the way. It is a wonder, in view of all the difficulties in the way of the enforcement of the Dunkin Act in Richmond, that it was enforced so effectively.

26602. Was the attention of the Government drawn to the interference on the part of the Inland Revenue Department with the Collector?—Not that I am aware of.

26603. Was this matter brought up since?—Not that I know of.

26604. Has the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue been directed to the fact that the Department interfered?—Not to my knowledge; I do not know. After the withdrawal on the part of the prosecutor in this case, the temperance people were disgusted and disheartened, and I do not think any further action was taken in the matter.

26605. You spoke the other day of the efficient enforcement of the Dunkin Act in Richmond. You said the Scott Act was enforced in Drummond and in Brome?—The difficulty in the enforcement of the law in Drummond County was, that the responsibility for the enforcement of the Act was put on a different authority. So there has been no prohibitory law in the County of Drummond at all. The County Council passed a resolution to the effect that fines in all prosecutions in the county taken in the name of a priest or a clergyman should go to those parties for further prosecutions under the Act. The prosecutions there, in order that the prosecutor may obtain the fines, must be taken by a clergyman or a priest, and, as a fact, the prosecutions have been taken in most cases by the clergyman and sometimes by the priests. Father Marchand, in Drummondville, prosecuted some of the men in his own name, and that was a very difficult position in which to put him.

26606. Was the Act carried in Drummond by a large majority?—In the first place it was carried by only 120 majority.

26607. The Council is empowered to appoint officers to enforce the law?—That may be so, but in Richmond it has been different.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26608. What are the provisions for the enforcement of the Dunkin Act?—Practically they are the same as in the Scott Act.

26609. The Dunkin Act was passed in 1864, before Confederation, when the matter of license and revenue was in the hands of the old Province of Canada. After the union and up to the passing of the McCarthy Act, all those matters were left to the respective provinces. Was not that the point: was not that a temporary arrangement as to the jurisdiction of the Court? Do you not think the question really was whether this was a matter for the Dominion or the provinces, as to which had the right to enforce the law, Confederation having taken place in the meantime? The Scott Act provided that the prosecution should be the same as under the Dunkin Act; but was there any provision in the Dunkin Act which, after Confederation, left the matter with the Dominion?—The Scott Act was a Dominion statute.

26610. The Dunkin Act was passed by the old Province of Canada. It applied to both Upper and Lower Canada. Confederation was carried, and the Dunkin Act still remained in force, did it not, until the Scott Act was passed?—Yes.

26611. But at Confederation the Dunkin Act did not extend to New Brunswick or Nova Scotia?—I suppose not.

26612. And therefore as Confederation brought about a different state of things as to the management of the license law, each province was left to manage its own system. Is not that the reason why a Dominion revenue officer and not a provincial officer should be appointed to enforce the law?—That was the point, but our legal advisers claimed that the local officer had perfect right and jurisdiction in the case.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26613. I suppose that opinion was given after consultation with the Department of Justice at Ottawa. There was nothing done to take the matter further?—No.

26614. The attention of Parliament was never drawn to the fact that the Department interfered to stop the proceedings?—Not that I am aware of. There may have been some correspondence, but I am not aware of it. In Richmond County they appointed a prosecutor, and he has been doing his work very efficiently and faithfully, and that is why I think the Dunkin Act has been such a great success in Richmond County.

26615. Is it not because public opinion supports him and supports the Council in appointing an Inspector?—I do not know that it is that. What makes the Act a success is that it is efficiently enforced.

J. H. CARSON.

26616. Why was not the Scott Act enforced in Drummond: why did not the majority provide the machinery to enforce it?—It was because the temperance people did not believe it was their business to see to the enforcement of the law, whereas in the County of Richmond, largely through the efforts of one man who has the money, the time and the inclination and has stood by the law, the law has been made a success; and when the Dunkin Act was before the county last, the only question was whether the Act could be efficiently enforced. It was sustained by 510 majority in that county, and it has been enforced ever since.

26617. Do you not think that the Act having been carried by a large majority, the Municipal Council would be representing the people in providing officers to enforce it?—They ought.

26618. When the temperance people found that no steps were being taken to put the Act into effect, did they turn out the members of the Council and put in others?—There were attempts made to enforce the law; but the clergyman who tried to enforce it, when he drove to Drummond and put his horse in the barn of a friend, found that they cut the tail off the horse and cut his mane, and threatened to do the same thing with him.

26619. If the people who vote for the Act will put men in the Council to enforce the Act, they will be relieved of the responsibility of enforcing the Act. Why do they not do that?—I do not know.

26620. When there is a large majority in favour of the Act, that majority is omnipotent. Why do they not provide officers to enforce the law?—Unfortunately even in municipal elections, party lines are drawn so tightly that you cannot get the people to vote directly on this question.

26621. It seems to be a misfortune that after the passage of the Act, you cannot get men to enforce the law?—My opinion is that no law can be efficiently enforced unless the people who pass the law provide for its enforcement.

26622. That is quite true; but it is inexplicable why the machinery provided by the Act has not been set in force. Is it the fear of additional taxes that deters Municipal Councillors from appointing Inspectors and constables?—I do not think so.

26623. There was evidence given in the Maritime Provinces to that effect?—That point has never come up in this province.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26624. Has there ever been any question as to the salaries of the officers?—No. In Richmond, they simply provide that the prosecutor shall have the office, and that prosecutor does not get a cent out of it. He is a man who is very friendly to our cause; he is a carpenter, I think, in business. Whenever a case is reported to him, he makes an inquiry and I think he is reimbursed in some way by the temperance organization. The Women's Christian Temperance Union is very strong there.

26625. Do you favour the parks in Montreal being kept open on Sunday?—No. Dr. Williams did not distinguish between the parks. The Mountain park is free.

26626. Is any liquor sold there?—Weiss beer is sold there.

26627. Is that a public park?—Yes.

26628. Why is liquor sold there?—Because the Council in giving the privilege of selling refreshments, required of this man that he should sell beer.

26629. It was the act of the Council?—Yes, and he has been fined, and he is coming back on the Council for damages.

26630. Do you think the public parks should be closed on Sunday?—Where a fee of admission is charged, yes, such parks as Sohmer park and the park on the Island, where it is necessary to take a ferry to get there.

26631. How would you provide facilities for people to get to those parks?—Our Mountain park would give facilities sufficient for all the people.

26632. Would you give facilities for the people to get to the Mountain park?—No.

26633. You have heard the evidence of one of the Magistrates, that it would be better for the people to go to the park and get their amusement than to remain in the city where they would get strong liquors?—I would let them go to the Mountain park



by walking; but I would not provide any facilities which would require labour on the part of any of our people.

26634. Not even on the part of any of the men who run the electric cars?—No.

26635. What amendments would you propose to the Scott Act?—The most important would be its enforcement, and it should be the duty of the Dominion Government to enforce it.

26636. The Inland Revenue officer now has power to enforce the Scott Act?—Yes.

26637. Take the County of Drummond: is there any Inland Revenue officer in that county?—I do not know.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26638. We have Inland Revenue districts including five or six counties?—I do not know about that.

26639. Would it be a good amendment for the Governor General not to declare the Act in force until he had reasonable assurances that the requisite money had been provided by the municipalities for the enforcement of the Act?—No. I would make it a tax on the Dominion Government.

26640. Do you think it would be fair to make the Dominion Government pay for that?—Yes, because it is a Dominion statute.

26641. Are not the Dominion laws enforced by the provincial authorities?—The provinces have to enforce other laws.

26642. The Canada Temperance Act is put into operation by the vote of the municipalities?—Yes.

26643. Is it not reasonable, if the municipalities take that action, that they should be asked to provide the money to supplement the amount raised from fines?—It might be.

26644. Do you think it would be reasonable to ask the representatives in Parliament of counties where the Act had been defeated to pay money to enforce it in other portions of the Dominion where it had been adopted?—It might not be reasonable to ask the people to pay the money, but the appointment of the officers should be made by the Dominion. The further away you take the appointment of officers from the locality the better.

26645. Do you think it would be better to insist that there should be a majority of all the votes on the roll cast in favour of the Act?—No, because it is very difficult to get the people to the polls on any question, and on this question it is more difficult than on any other to get them to express themselves.

26646. Would you favour an amendment to deprive the people in a Scott Act district of the right to import liquor for domestic use?—No. I do not know that there has ever been an expression on the part of prohibitionists other than there should be an interference with the manufacture or sale. I do not know that there has been any attempt to interfere with a man's private right of drinking what he chooses, but it is the legalized sale and manufacture and the legalized traffic to which we object.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26647. If you interfered with the manufacture, the man could not get the liquor for his private use?—Where they got it from, General Dow said, would be no concern of ours. I consider the public have a right to say it is an interference with their liberty to say what they shall eat or drink, but to say that an interference with the traffic is an injury to the community is another thing. I would not apply the law to the private use of liquor by people.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26648. Would not the prohibition of the manufacture be an interference with the rights of private persons?—Yes, to a certain extent.

26649. You would prohibit the manufacture?—I would.

26650. Is it not class legislation, when the Scott Act allows people who can afford it to bring in liquor, while poor people are deprived of it, because they cannot afford to bring it in?—There may be something in that which looks like class legislation, but I do not know how you can get over it.

J. H. CARSON.

26651. Would it be a more honest and satisfactory test to take away these privileges and let it be prohibition without any of these privileges?—I would prefer that there should be none. I think it would be more thorough and effective.

26652. Would you favour an amendment to take away the selling for gain on the part of the liquor vendor and to give him a salary?—I should say it would be an improvement.

26653. Could you suggest any other amendments?—The matter of the penalties is one.

26654. You have heard the statement as to jurors leaning to the side of the licensee where it was question of imprisonment?—I would not make more than a fine for the first offence, but after the first offence, that is after the warning, I think there should be imprisonment.

26655. Do you know why there have not been more prosecutions for third offences when, if the party was found guilty, he would be liable to imprisonment?—I think it is from kindly sentiment to the poor victim.

26656. Has not the revenue something to do with it?—It would be better if he were in the jail and the province paid the expenses.

26657. But they are not jailed?—They should be. I say the reason is that the authorities have sympathy for the party.

26658. Is there anything else you can suggest as amendments to the law?—Nothing that I think of in connection with the Scott Act.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26659. Do you find that that feeling of sympathy exists towards violators of other laws?—There is always an amount of sympathy, but not to the same extent.

26660. Does it not seem to you that, in connection with this trade and this business, there seems to be a different state of feeling from that which prevails in regard to anything else we have to deal with?—It seems to be really so.

26661. Speaking of the ground you take as to non-interference with men bringing liquor in from other places for their own private use, it was intimated in some places that some people who voted for the Scott Act did this kind of thing. They brought in liquor for their own use, and voted for the Scott Act, so that in fact they were preventing their neighbours, who could not import the liquor, from purchasing it, while they themselves got supplies into their cellars. Do you think, as a man acquainted with the principles of the law and interested in the subject, that it would be desirable to put an end to that state of affairs?—I have found very often that those very men who bring in liquor for their own use and use it themselves are very strongly in favour of the Scott Act and the Dunkin Act. One man said at a meeting that he was not a total abstainer, that he liked a little something before he went to bed; but, said he, "I would not take a thousand dollars and have a saloon opened here, because I know what it would mean to myself personally and to my friends, and although we use it ourselves, it would mean ruin to others; and therefore, I think we should support prohibition."

26662. What is the effect, if it is found out, of such action by people of that kind who take liquor themselves and refuse it to others?—Certainly the influence of a person who uses liquor at all is injurious to that extent. Their use of it weakens their influence on others.

26663-4. Do you know anything of the law in the Fiji Islands?—No.

REV. ANDREW G. COURTICE, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

26665. You are a Minister in what denomination?—Methodist.  
 26666. How long have you been a Minister?—I was ordained in 1885, but started out in 1880.  
 26667. In what other places have you been besides Montreal?—Toronto and London.  
 26668. In Toronto, in what church?—Parliament Street Church.  
 26669. In London?—Dundas Street Church.  
 26670. In Montreal?—Dominion Square.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26671. Have you had any opportunity of observing any community or communities under prohibition, as provided by the Scott Act or the Dunkin Act?—No.  
 26672. Have you observed the condition of communities under license?—Yes.  
 26673. What is the result of your observations?—In almost every way, I think the system is indefensible. I do not know any way in which I would make an exception.  
 26674. What are your objections?—Financially, I do not think it is a prudent way of raising revenue. Socially, I think it intensifies evil influences. The social life that gathers about the licensed houses has that tendency, and morally and religiously I think it is bad.  
 26675. As a pastor of some years' experience, have you observed that the licensed drink trade is responsible for any proportion of the vice, crime and ignorance, the neglect of the institutions of religion and the domestic unhappiness which are too prevalent?—Yes, I have.  
 26676. Do you think it is in a large degree responsible for it?—Yes, in most of the cases where I have been called upon to look into homes in need, the liquor traffic has been in a measure responsible for it.  
 26677. What do you think is the effect of the establishment by law of the drink trade upon the community, including those who never patronize it?—I think it has a bad effect. It leads to a wrong state of thought as to the traffic. It leads some people to be indifferent and others to be favourable, because it is legally sanctioned.  
 26678. Have you observed what its effect is upon the young?—I could not make any specialized statement as to the effect on the young different from the effect on older people.  
 26679. Have you observed that a thing which is made legal is usually regarded as right?—I think that is the fact with the whole community, old and young.  
 26680. Do you think familiarizing the community, old and young, with the drink trade is beneficial to it?—No.  
 26681. In any of the communities where you have lived, have you taken any part in trying to enforce the liquor laws and reduce the drink trade?—Yes, in London and Toronto, I was connected with an attempt to reduce the number of licenses and to enforce the laws in regard to the drink trade, but more especially in London.  
 26682. What was the mode of procedure?—Endeavouring to get the Council to reduce the trade.  
 26683. What was the result?—In both cases, it was very beneficial. In the paper I sent to the Secretary, you will find the figures which I had then.  
 26684. Why do you favour the reduction of the number of licenses?—There are different reasons. Partly because the fewer the number of places, the less men will drink. I have known that the destruction of a place which was the resort of certain people led to their giving up the drink habit. The principal result is, I think, an education to temperance. I look more to that than to the reducing of drinkers.  
 26685. Do you believe that a prohibitory law is desirable?—Yes.  
 26686. Do you believe, as far as you can judge, in the present state of public opinion, a prohibitory law would be possible of enforcement?—I believe it would. It

REV. ANDREW G. COURTICE.

appears to me that things are coming into that shape that people more than ever see the necessity of enforcement, and that will cure a weakness that existed in the past.

26687. Would you consider that a prohibitory law, violated as the license law is now in Montreal, would be a failure?—In some degree it might be an improvement on the license law. A prohibition law not enforced more than the license law is, might still be an improvement.

26688. Would the law have an educating effect?—In a small degree perhaps in that case. The best educating effect is when the law is enforced.

26689. Is there any educating effect in a law which is passed against an admitted evil, though there is no enforcement or only a partial enforcement of that law?—I have no experience to enable me to give an opinion on that. It would only be a guess.

26690. You have no means of knowing anything about adulteration?—No.

26691. Have you any opinion about the liquors of commerce as God's gifts?—I do not consider them as God's gifts.

26692. The attitude of your church is defined and pronounced on this question, is it not?—Yes.

26693. It is favourable to prohibition?—Yes.

26694. Have you observed at all the effect of the trade on the traffic?—I have to some extent.

26695. What is the result of your observation?—It is not good. That would go over a longer period than my ministerial career. Some families with whom my father's family were acquainted, and some young men with whom I went to school, were connected with the traffic, and the influence was not good.

26696. Does it dull the moral sense?—Yes; it leads to wrong views of life, and to indolent views. It takes the life out of them.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26697. Have you any suggestions to make to the Commission as to any amendments to the license law?—The method of amendment I would pursue as a step to prohibition, would be, first, the wiping out of all saloons; secondly, the wiping out of grocery licenses; and thirdly, the wiping out of bars whether in restaurants or hotels, this simply being a means to prohibition.

26698. Then where would you have the sale?—That would bring it up to prohibition, and we would have no sale.

26699. I asked you what amendments you would propose to the license law?—That is moving up.

26700. Step by step?—Yes.

26701. In the order you have mentioned?—Exactly.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26702. In the matter of obtaining a license: An applicant for a license in Montreal has to get the signatures of twenty-five persons, and the only way to prevent an application being granted is an opposition by the majority of the ratepayers. Do you think it would be a fair change to require the applicant to get a majority of the ratepayers to sign his application?—Yes. I have seen that work very favourably in Ontario.

26703. Have you seen in Ontario the effects of that local prohibition provided for under their license law?—No, none that would warrant me in giving an opinion.

26704. In the event of a prohibitory law being adopted, do you think it would be any interference with the liberty of the subject?—No, I do not look upon prohibition as interfering with the liberty of the subject at all.

26705. How do you view it?—It deals as other laws do with what shall be allowed for public sale and what the people shall be solicited to buy. If that is cut off, it is not necessarily an interference with the liberty of the people. We prohibit the sale of corrupted meat. We do not allow that to be put up for sale; but if a man in the exercise of his personal liberty eats it, he can. The law does not interfere with personal liberty in eating or drinking, but it prohibits the solicitation or purchase.

26706. Have you, as a minister, noticed the effect the liquor business has on other businesses?—Yes; I have paid some attention to that.

26707. What is your view?—As far as I can gather any information, it is injurious to other lines of commerce and manufacture; but I find it immeasurably difficult to get detailed information on the subject; that is, it would need so great an amount of work on the part of an individual to gather all the facts that only one deeply interested in the temperance cause would do it. It would be necessary to go over the books and see the bad debts and so on. There are very few who will give you the facts and search for evidence, but they will rather give you an opinion. I know cases where the ceasing of the drink habit by the cutting off of a saloon has turned people into drug stores and so on.

26708. Large revenues are derived from the drink trade—customs and excise revenues and license fees and the like. Have you given thought to the question of the means by which the deficit might be made up, or whether it costs much to get those revenues?—I think the cost of the traffic balances or overbalances the revenue.

26709. Have you thought how the revenue would adjust itself if the item were cut off?—I am prepared to be directly taxed for my portion of it, and that settles my conscience in the matter. Apart from that, I think it is the business of the Finance Minister to work it out, but personally, I am prepared to be directly taxed for any share of revenue which is necessary.

26710. Do you think this country could afford to forego those revenues from a financial point of view?—Yes.

26711. Do you believe in a few years the revenues would so adjust themselves that there would be no burden of taxation on the people?—Yes; they would after a certain upheaval had taken place.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 21st, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day at 10 a.m., JUDGE McDONALD presiding.

*Present :*

MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.

MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

REV. ALFRED LEON SENTENNE, of Montreal, parish priest of Notre-Dame, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

26712. How long have you been parish priest of Notre-Dame?—Nearly ten years. I was previously parish priest of St. James. I was born in Montreal, and have always lived here.

26713. You say you have always lived in Montreal. How long have you been a priest?—Thirty-five years. I am sixty-one years of age.

*By Mr. Gigault :*

26714. What do you think of the working of the liquor license law in Montreal?—I think it needs greater surveillance by the police, and the law should be administered without preference being given to anybody. This applies especially to the enforcement of the law on Sunday. Very often on Sunday certain hotel-keepers are allowed to sell, and appear to have a preference over others who respect the law. I have been consulted by a woman who keeps a public house. She said to me: "I am not wealthy, but if I listen to my conscience and obey the law, I am ruined, because my neighbours sell liquor on Sunday, and of course they attract all the people there. I repeat that I will be ruined on account of the negligence of the authorities, by which the law is not observed."

26715. Do you consider there are too many liquor sellers in the city of Montreal?—I have with pleasure noticed that the number has been diminished this year, and I think there are yet too many, chiefly low canteens.

26716. What measures should be taken in order to diminish their number?—First, I would like moral influence to be exercised by means of the educational profession and friendly and benevolent associations. By education, while we will not secure immediate results, we will form good habits among the people. We will form the tastes of young people, and get them accustomed to the use of light drinks, such as cider. I have visited Paris, and there I did not find any drunkenness. People are very dissipated, but drunkards are scarce. I have also been in Normandy, where there is a large production of cider, and I did not see drunkenness there. I believe that in Canada the production of cider should be largely increased, and if the use of that drink was more general, it would take away from the people the disposition to use strong drinks. Education might also help to form the tastes of the children by accustoming them not to use tobacco. The use of tobacco, and especially the chewing of it, perverts the taste of the children and brings them to desire something stronger. The use of tobacco vitiates the taste, and they very soon wish to add the use of liquor. Therefore we must endeavour to turn our people from the curse. We may not see the consequences immediately, but good results will come gradually with time. Give the children a horror of taverns and teach them to evade them. Do this by persuasion, by preaching against all abuses and excesses, and by all means which can be inspired by religion. Associations may help a good deal in forcing temperance habits, chiefly mutual benefit associations, if they have a regulation that drunkards will not be admitted or retained as members of them. The drunkard, feeling that he is isolated as regards society, will most likely abandon his bad

habits: One means of decreasing drunkenness certainly is to diminish the number of liquor selling places in order to diminish the occasion for drinking. No licenses should be granted to taverns in the neighbourhood of factories. Hotels should be closed during certain days and at certain hours, on Saturday evenings immediately after the working-men are paid, and, of course, on Sunday. I do not believe that drunkenness is increasing. Groceries selling liquors often lead to gross abuse. A woman, who would not enter a saloon, would go to a grocery store, and under the pretext of purchasing groceries, would buy liquor at the same time, or she might send her children to buy groceries and at the same time buy liquor, and thus abuses creep in which are against temperance. I would favour an increase of the duty upon alcohol, and also an increase of the license fees, and the adoption of other measures that would lead to the prevention of the abuse of strong drink. People have a higher opinion of themselves if they go to hotels, than if they go to low places, in order to take drink. I would rather have high license in order that the selling of liquor might be restricted to hotels on a good footing, and in order that people might not be induced to go to low dens. If a man goes to a low dive, it, of course, tends to degrade him.

26716a. What do you think of the private parks in the city?—Generally, it is the wish of the people to have public parks in the city. The workingmen who have been confined to their shops all day, need to breathe the pure fresh air, and they require public parks in which they can obtain recreation. If you ask my opinion about private parks, I say that they are not on the same footing. I find private parks that are run in private interests, or in the interests of their owners, are dangerous. I have never been to Sohmer Park. If that park is run in private interests, it is, of course, dangerous. The owners of private parks will try to satisfy even the perverted tastes and sentiments of the people, and will endeavour to satisfy their curiosity. People are always the same, and they always like amusement, and the owners of these parks, run for the individual benefit of the owners, will sometimes resort to attractions that involve abuses, and these tend to degrade the people rather than educate them in the right direction. They are dangerous in that respect. They are more dangerous still when they are open on Sunday, because the people, being attracted there, will neglect their religious duties. On Sunday the people will not only avoid work, but instead of making it a day of prayer, make it a day of dissipation. If private parks are allowed to be open on Sunday it may lead to the opening of theatres and other places of amusement, and people will neglect completely their religious duties. I am speaking now only of private parks, but I am not speaking more particularly of Sohmer Park than any other private park. If such private parks and places of amusement are allowed to be open on Sunday, abuses will come, and working people may say that if they are not allowed to go to the theatre also, they will work on Sunday. I am not especially against Sohmer Park, but I am speaking against all parks of this private class. On Sunday let the public parks be open and let the people resort to them. We have the Mountain Park and the Island Park, and we have others in centres where the population reside, and of course additions would be satisfactory. It is impossible that men can always be in the house, and for workingmen who have passed all their week in work-shops and stores, it is a good thing that they should have fresh air on Sunday. I am not opposed to parks, but I am opposed to private parks, because there are abuses connected with them.

26717. You specially refer to private parks, whose object is to make money?—Yes. Private parks are based on speculation. I am not specially opposed to Sohmer Park as a resort during the week, but it is dangerous on Sunday. I am thoroughly opposed to the sale of drink in those parks on Sunday and also on other days.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26718. If the practice of selling liquor on Sunday is allowed, why should not taverns also be allowed to sell?—In private parks they will sell at the beginning only temperance drinks, and the abuse will come afterwards. I look upon that practice as a dangerous one. I do not say it is a bad thing, but it is dangerous.

26719. What is your opinion concerning a general prohibitory law?—I believe it is too radical a measure to be enforced effectually, and I believe it to be impracticable.

REV. ALFRED LEON SENTENNE.

When we ask too much, we are apt to get nothing. From what I hear, experience has proved that such a law has never been successfully enforced. In my opinion complete prohibition is against human dignity. We must not make an automatic machine of man, and take away from him his liberty of action. If a man voluntarily comes and tells me, "I will be a total abstainer," I congratulate him, but I will not force him against his will to adopt such a course. Drink in itself is not an evil, it is the abuse which makes it evil. Drink, I say, is not evil *per se*, and consequently we cannot prohibit completely the use of it. Complete prohibition is a demoralizing principle, and I will prove it. It is a bad thing to accustom people to violate laws, and we all know that almost everywhere that a prohibitory law has been enacted, it has been openly violated. Prohibition itself is a violation of the principles of law, and therefore such a measure is demoralizing. I am against the abuse of liquor, but I am not in favour of complete prohibition. There is not even complete prohibition as regards the sale of poisons; they are sold in drug stores, but their sale is not completely forbidden. While drunkenness is one of the greatest scourges of the community, at the same time it is not a sin to take alcoholic liquor, to the extent say of one or even two drinks. Sometimes, however, it may be a sin in this way; if a man who is addicted to drink takes only one drink, it may be a sin, because thereby he places himself in danger.

26720. Have you found that abuse of liquor is very general?—No. I have not come to the conclusion that it is very general. I resided formerly in the parish of St. James, where there are a great many good families. In Notre-Dame parish there are some cases of drunkenness, but drunkenness is not general.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26721. Have you observed any considerable proportion of domestic trouble or wreck of lives traceable to the use of drink?—Yes, a good deal.

26722. From your observation, do you think the liquor business is in the hands of reliable men, or do they abuse the trust they have under license?—In general, liquor sellers, being interested, abuse their position and sell liquor to persons who are already under the influence of liquor.

26723. Have you observed whether the liquor trade has any hardening effect on the men engaged in it?—Yes, very often.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26724. If a man becomes a persistent and continuous drunkard, do you think he should be placed under personal restraint in some institution?—I believe it would be a very good thing. We must use every means in our power to stop such an abuse.

26725. You would have him placed in an inebriate asylum?—Yes.

26726. I believe there is one at Belmont, near Quebec?—I have heard about that.

26727. Do you think that the denial of persons engaged in the liquor trade from the sacraments of the Church and the rites of religion, has the effect of throwing the traffic into the hands of evil people?—No doubt it does so, but the denial of the sacraments to persons who sell illegally has often had the effect of compelling them to abandon that illegal traffic.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26728. You are opposed to prohibition, I understand?—Yes, to complete prohibition.

26729. And you are opposed to it, I understand, because you think it impracticable?—Yes.

26730. I also understand that you would favour the imposition of heavy duties upon strong liquors?—Yes.

26731. And the imposition of higher license fees?—Yes.

26732. And the separation of the sale of liquors from the sale of groceries?—Yes.

26733. And the closing of those places on Sunday, and the discouragement of private parks, especially on the Sabbath?—Yes.

26733a. And you would also favour a substantial reduction in the number of the lower class restaurants and saloons?—Yes, and the sale of liquor in private parks, as being dangerous; I do not say it is bad, but it is dangerous.



ANDREW CULLEN, of Montreal, Chief Detective of the Montreal City Police, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald :*

26734. How long have you held your present position?—I have been in the detective force since 1865. I have been Chief Detective during seven or eight years.

26735. Before you were appointed detective were you a constable on the police force?—I was. I went on the police force on September, 1865.

26736. Then you have had a very long experience as a police officer?—Yes.

26737. Have you had any experience in any police force except that of Montreal?—Yes, I was in the Irish Constabulary.

26738. In what county?—In Leitrim. I am a native of Clare County.

26739. How long were you in the Irish Constabulary?—I was there for three years and four months.

26740. Was any part of your duty of a detective nature?—I was on ordinary constabulary duty.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26741. You have resided in Montreal during a very long time?—Yes, I have been here since 1856.

26742. What age are you now?—I am close on 60 years.

26743. During your long public service, you must have had special opportunities of ascertaining how the liquor license laws are enforced in the city of Montreal?—Yes, I have.

26744. What is your opinion respecting their enforcement?—My opinion respecting the enforcement of the liquor license laws is, that there is a good deal of slackness in their enforcement. If I was asked in regard to that matter, I would say there are two classes of people who enforce the law. The one class is composed of officials who are paid a fair salary, and whose business it is to carry out the provisions of the law. The second class comprises informers, who must be obtained in order to enforce the law.

26745. Is the method of obtaining licenses the best that could be adopted?—I have taken an interest in trying to prevent people, in some cases, getting licenses, and yet they have obtained them; so I do not bother myself in regard to this matter now, because I have found it to be of no use.

26746. Notwithstanding your representations as a police officer, you say the authorities have granted licenses to parties whom you did not deem worthy of them?—Such is the case. If I had my way, I would compel all applications for licenses to be forwarded to the Chief of Police, and let the Chief of Police call in his officers and go over the names. When I say that a certain man is not fit to have a license, he should be brought face to face with me before the Commissioners, and the matter should be entered into. For example, to-day a party came to the station and complained that he went into a saloon with a woman whom he picked up on the street. The two drank liquor, and so soon as he left, he found that he had lost his money. I have not been at that saloon, but another officer has been, and the proprietor does not seem to know anything about a woman being there. I do not believe that, because a woman cannot go into a saloon except with the knowledge of the proprietor. I asked the officer in charge how the man said the woman got liquor, and he said that the proprietor declared he did not know. We have made over forty complaints against the house or that individual, but he still gets a license.

26747-8. He obtains a license notwithstanding the representations made by the police authorities that he is an unworthy person to obtain a license?—Yes. What I wish is this: In the first place, I would give no license to a single man, no matter how good his reputation might be. I would not give a license to a man who lives with a woman as his wife, and who is not his wife. In the next place, I would not allow a man to have a saloon who keeps private rooms, where men and women are allowed to go. If I had my wish there would be no liquor sold; but that I do not ex-

ANDREW CULLEN.

pect will be brought about, and so I desire that the number of saloons shall be limited. We have too many saloons in Montreal and the number should be very much restricted. The sale of liquor should also be removed from groceries. I could tell the Commissioners any number of cases showing the evils of the use of liquor, but the recital of them would take a much longer time than the Commissioners can give me. I will mention, however, three instances showing the evils of liquor. I have been instrumental in having two men sent to the penitentiary lately, one for conspiracy and perjury. Liquor brought these parties to that position. The next instance I would mention is that of a man in prison for highway robbery. Liquor brought him to it. The third man killed another in the penitentiary, and he himself was hanged in the jail at Montreal. Liquor brought him to it. There is another case I may mention, where a woman respectably connected, became separated from her husband through drink. Ultimately she was sent to jail, and while there she became acquainted with another who had been married like herself. On leaving the prison she visited that woman one day. They had picked her fellow up on the street. They sent for liquor. The husband of the woman who was living in the house went out. The two women and the men then got drinking, and a quarrel ensued. One woman took an axe and cut the head off the other and put it in a trunk. We arrested her. We had no evidence against the man, except what she could give. Consequently he was acquitted. I believe if we had been able to obtain evidence against him, he would likewise have been sentenced to be hanged, and no doubt the two would have been hanged the next morning. That very morning, at the very time the woman would have been hanged, he was drowned at the Grand Trunk basin. The woman was sent to penitentiary for life. Another case I may mention is that of a man, his wife and family. The parents were notorious drunkards and they had several children. They were so poor that the corporation cut off their water. It was very cold weather at this time of which I am speaking. They got drunk one day and began to quarrel, and scattered their clothes and other things over the floor. Two children, I believe their ages were three and five, were found in the morning by the neighbours locked in each other's arms, apparently as if they had been trying to keep each other warm, and they were frozen to the floor. They were, of course, dead. There was so much ice that the neighbours had to get warm water before they could take them from the floor. The father and mother were also lying on the floor, with their hands and feet frozen. I saw them in the hospital; the man had his fingers frozen and the woman had her toes frozen. Some time afterwards I was in a corner grocery and she came limping in and got drink there. This, I remember was the day afterwards. She did not care; she had her drink. These are sample cases of the evils of drinking.

26749. Would you favour the transference of the issue of licenses to a Board of Commissioners, or would you favour an amendment to the law which would leave the Commissioners no discretion in cases where no complaints were made by the police?—There is hardly a man in public office with whom the liquor trade has not a great deal of political influence. I would be glad if all people engaged in the sale of liquor were disfranchised so that they would have no political influence or take any part in politics. They have great influence, and people who are courting their influence do not want to incur their animosity. People in public office oftentimes may be threatened by politicians or asked for favours, and it is pretty hard to refuse them. Our present Commissioners in Montreal are very good; but they say the number of licenses is not limited and what can they do. Applications are brought up, and they have no discretion except to grant licenses: but no man should be granted a license except he carries on the business. I explain that by saying that John Brown may be a very respectable man and may have no difficulty in getting a license; but there may be a notorious rascal who could not get a license, and he says "John Brown, you get the license in your name, and rent the business to me, but the business will go on in your name." There are places in Montreal licensed, but the man who obtained the license has no control over the place, and the people who have control could not get a license. If the man is not attending to his business behind the bar and in every other way, the license should be taken from him. I have known people come here from the States and goodness knows where else. They had money

and acted as saloon-keepers, but the people who had the license exercised no control. These are people I should like the police to have authority to deal with.

26750. The license law, then, is in a very unsatisfactory state and is very inefficiently administered in Montreal?—It is in a very unsatisfactory state.

26751. According to the testimony of Mr. Lambe, there are 154 hotel licenses, 304 restaurant licenses, 477 shops, besides clubs. Is there any necessity for that number of licenses?—No; I would reduce the present number 40 per cent.

26752. Would you strike out the shop licenses; would you deprive people who sell groceries from selling liquor?—I would. I asked a grocer why he did not give up selling liquor, and he said very truly that if he gave up selling liquor, he would sell no groceries, because his neighbours sold liquor as well as groceries.

26753. But if they were all put on the same plane?—If they were all on the same footing, one would be in the same position as another. Of course, I get acquainted with all classes of the community. I was in a second-hand store, and a woman came in and put down a package of flour. "10 cents," says she. "No," said the dealer, "5 cents." When she went out I asked, "What is that?" He said that the woman was a great drunkard, and that she will pay for no liquor, but she will pay for groceries. She gets the groceries and sells them for liquor. I said, "Why did you not give her 10 cents?" "No, I gave her only 5 cents, so that she will only have one glass." The poor man who was her husband paid his grocery bill, and a portion of it went in liquor in this way.

26754. Is the law respecting the sale of liquor to minors frequently violated?—I do not know about that. There is another feature to which I desire to call attention: billiards or what is called free pool. There is no such thing as free pool. They charge nothing for the table, but the players must play for cigars or liquor. I would desire that there should be no rooms or billiard rooms where liquor is sold, because it is the beginning of crime. They learn there to smoke and drink, and when they go into offices to earn their living they find they have more practice in spending money in vice than in earning it.

26755. Is the saloon or hotel more injurious to youth?—The saloon.

26756. Respecting the observance of the Sunday law: is it reasonably well observed by the hotel-keepers?—With some hotels it is. In fact, I have nothing to do with them, but I judge by what I see. I think it is pretty hard to get a conviction, because the evidence must be so clear. The law says the bar must be closed on Sunday. When a man keeps his bar open so that you can walk in without lock or key, or without breaking anything, I think it constitutes a crime. For instance, a bar is open and half a dozen people are in it. A policeman goes in, but he does not see them drinking or paying for drink. A great many people keep a watch outside, and I have known places where there are fellows watching outside all Sunday. I know a place where an ex-policeman was watching. He knows all the people, and he knows that a tip or a knock from him will make everything quiet. Before I was a detective, it was after the Sunday law came into force, we enforced the law pretty strictly. Still there was a good deal of drunkenness going on, but we did as much as we possibly could.

26757. Has the law been changed since then? Is it more difficult to enforce now than it was in your time as a constable?—It has not been changed. Then if a bar was open and people were in it, it was considered to be against the law. Since I have been a detective, I have nothing to do with that work.

26758. Surely that would be *prima facie* evidence?—A great many people have a screen behind the bar and a side way in, and you will hear some one behind who, I suppose, is the proprietor.

26759. Then the law is not well enforced in regard to Sunday selling?—There are some people, I believe, who do not open on Sunday.

26760. Is it not well observed now?—No, it is not. These people come into a restaurant or hotel and want lunch. You will get a lunch ticket for a cent. You will go then and get as much liquor as you want as refreshments. I say that any place where liquor is given on Sunday to a guest or a man not a guest, except on a doctor's certificate, is just as guilty as if the liquor were sold to a stranger.

ANDREW CULLEN.

26761. Do you know anything of the quality of the liquor sold?—I do not.

26762. Would you favour the imposition of a higher license fee?—I would favour high license and the limiting of the number of saloons, and the consideration of the character of the people who apply for licenses.

26763. You would not allow the trade to be made disreputable by putting it in other hands?—I would not have disreputable people.

26764. Would you make it as respectable as possible?—Yes, by giving licenses to respectable people who would observe the law.

26765. What percentage of the cases that come before you are directly or indirectly traceable to drink?—I would be inclined to think not a percentage but all, because I have known the children of very respectable people, people who have used their endeavours to bring their children up as well as could be, who have committed themselves; it is not from the example they get at home, but from the example they get outside. You will have a boy getting \$10 or \$12 a month. His people may be poor. They have educated him, and there is nothing left for him but his education, good example and good character, and they have tried to make him follow the good example. He gets into the free pools, into the livery stables and follows the footsteps of other young rowdies, and he thinks he must be as good as his neighbour. Where does he get the money, unless he steals it from his master? He must give the money he earns at home, and he must dress respectably. We went on one occasion to a very respectable man and told him his son had been arrested, and he said he wished his son was dead rather than be guilty of theft.

26766. So the opportunities of going into these pool rooms and billiard rooms create a desire to smoke and drink, with disastrous results?—Yes. Then further as to the percentage. Many a person who is a criminal might tell you that drunkenness did not bring him to it. That might be true, but it might be the drunkenness of his father or mother that brought him to it. The poor children at home will watch their father, and if they see him staggering, they often leave the house to avoid hearing their mother's cries when the father is beating her. They take shelter in barns and stables to avoid going home, and then they steal a loaf of bread perhaps if they are hungry. They may not blame liquor for their crime, but it is the liquor used by their parents all the same.

26767. Are the people who are brought up for serious crimes, such as forgery, people who drink?—They are not drunkards generally, but they are not temperate people. They must keep their heads level for their business. I went to see a party not long ago who was serving in the penitentiary. There were three others there who were ex-convicts. I knew them all, and we talked. He said, "You don't drink." I said "No." He said, "Well, smoke." I said, "It would be better for you if you did not drink. You have been in the penitentiary twice; did you ever know any one belonging to a temperance society who had been in the penitentiary?" Another said, "I was in the penitentiary eighteen years, and I never knew a member of a temperance society in it."

26768. What about the parks? Do you favour giving facilities to the people to get to those places?—I would rather have them public places.

26769. Would you favour the sale of liquor in them?—I would not favour the sale of liquor anywhere.

26770. One of the Judges said it was better to allow beer to be sold there, and allow people to go there on Sunday, because before those parks were opened, they spent their time in the saloons or taverns drinking strong liquors?—I would like to stop both evils. I would not have a tavern-keeper simply fined for Sunday selling, because he may make as much profit on a Sunday or two as would pay for the fine. I would have every conviction on straight evidence. The first time I would have him fined heavily; the second time he was caught, the penalty should be imprisonment for a long time, and the third time, I would deprive him of his license and imprison him again.

26771. Have not offenders in Ireland to bring their licenses and have their convictions marked on them? Would that not be good?—I think so.

26772. You are not in favour of having these private parks open on Sundays and liquor sold in them?—I would not have liquor sold anywhere, and I desire the public parks to be open at all times.

26773. Would you favour the passage of a law that would prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of liquor in the Dominion?—I do not know that I would, because it is impossible to bring the people to total abstinence.

26774. Would it be a move in the right direction?—For my part I wish there was not a drop of liquor on the face of the earth, but I am afraid you could not get the people to come to that.

26775. For that reason you would not favour the passage of a prohibitory law?—No, because I have never asked anything that I did not think I could get. I think it would be of no use asking for what could not be got. Let there be an inspection of liquor

26776. For adulteration?—Yes.

26777. You would favour, if liquor is to be sold, the sale of pure liquor by respectable people in a limited number of places, much smaller than the number in this city at present, and that the hours for sale should be shortened?—Yes.

26778. You would favour the stoppage of the sale of liquor in all public parks and places of amusement?—Yes, I would, and stopping sale after 10 o'clock in all places.

26779. You would make a special rule for Saturday night?—I would say 7 or 8 o'clock.

26780. Do you think the amendments to the law, such as you suggest, would be, under the circumstances, the best measures that could be adopted?—I think that is what should be done.

26781. Have you had any experience respecting the operation of the Scott Act or the Dunkin Act, or any local prohibitory measures?—No; I have not been in those districts, but from what I hear, there is a great deal of liquor sold there; and that is why I would dread to have prohibition here.

26782. But there are illicit places here?—I believe so.

26783. Would it be worse under prohibition than it is now?—I have no doubt the people would have stimulants no matter where they got them.

26784. You think the present condition of things is better than it would be under prohibition?—I think so, and if the authorities looked strictly after the enforcement of the law, it would certainly be so, because you cannot make every one a total abstainer.

26785. Do you think you would have much difficulty in enforcing the law?—No, providing politicians did not interfere. If politicians and aldermen and people of that class did not interfere, I think it could be done, especially if severe punishment were inflicted on those who were caught.

26786. You would remove the issuing of licenses and the enforcement of the law as far as possible from the influence of those in authority who have to appeal to the people from year to year?—I certainly would.

26787. And would leave the enforcement to the police department?—I would make it so that they must act according to their instructions. The Magistrates here are willing to do their duty, if they possibly can.

26788. Can you form any idea of the number of illicit places in Montreal? Mr. Lambe said there were 2,000 to 4,000, and probably nearer 4,000 than 2,000?—He has a right to know, but I would not say so. First and foremost 4,000 houses is a large number, for each of those places must be a dwelling house, and you would scatter 4,000 of those through the city. I know there are some people here carrying on little shops that sell liquor, and these may be numbered among them. I would not say there are 2,000, but Mr. Lambe has the best right to know.

26789. Do you think if your Department were asked to make an enumeration of the illicit places, they would have difficulty in making a reasonably accurate report?—I think the Police Department could do so. The city is divided into fifteen divisions. There are a sergeant and two acting sergeants in each of those stations and so many men, and their district is not so large that they could not form an idea. For instance, in this district, where we now are, what we call the Central District, I do not think there are many places where they sell liquor without license, because there are so many licensed places in it.

ANDREW CULLEN.

26790. There is no necessity?—No, I do not think so.

26791. In the event of a prohibitory law being passed by the Dominion, would it be a reasonable request of the brewers and distillers to ask compensation for the loss they would sustain by being driven out of the business?—Individually, I think they ought to have made money enough out of the business already.

26792. You would not favour compensation, then?—I would not.

26793. Nor compensation to the hotel-keepers?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26794. Do you think it would be well to ask the liquor sellers to compensate the families that have been impoverished by them?—It would be more reasonable.

26795. Have you any reason to believe that a great proportion of those who hold licenses violate the provisions of the law as to selling after hours and so on?—I think a great many do, but I cannot speak so much of saloons as of those who drink liquor. There are many saloons here in which I was never in in my life, and I never go in without having some business to take me there.

26796. Your official duties do not lead you to look after the illicit sellers?—No, my duties have nothing to do with liquor, except the hatred I have towards it, and its use.

26797. In searching for suspected persons, do the officers in your department find them congregate about liquor shops a great deal?—Some might and some might not. A man who sells liquor likes to keep as few people around the place as possible. The man's money is welcome. What I know as a fact, I state, but my opinion may be mistaken.

26798. Taking people guilty of the higher crimes, burglary and so on, while they are drinking men, do they not, when committing these crimes, generally abstain from drink?—No; but they know to what extent they may drink. They want a glass or two to brace them up and give them nerve.

26799. They will not get drunk?—No; even amongst thieves and burglars, a drunkard is despised, because he may give the thing away.

26800. He is not a safe man?—No; he may blab or talk. They do not care for a man who loses his head.

26801. It is in order to be thoroughly prepared for their business that they do not get drunk?—No. They do not ask a man for his pledge card, but they do not want him to get drunk, because he might give them all away.

26802. You do not believe that the license system in Montreal really regulates the trade?—It does not.

26803. Do you think it wise to legalize a trade which produces the results you have mentioned, continuously?—Of course, I do not think it is right. I do not favour the use of liquor in any shape or manner. But what can you do? You cannot make teetotallers of them or force them into abstinence. There is one thing I believe, and that is that drunkenness is greatly on the decrease. I have been acquainted with ministers of all denominations in the city, and there is a great deal of credit due to them for the manner in which they are working against the use of liquor, and they are succeeding to a great extent. Some time ago a man thought himself a brave fellow to drink and get drunk. Then it was considered he would be a mean man who would not get drunk, but now it is a mean man who will; and the young people have more idea about temperance than their fathers had.

26804. Is the feeling of the people against the drink trade changing?—I do not think so.

26805. Do they look upon it as a less reputable or respectable trade than formerly? The saloon-keeper is not looked upon now as such a big swell as he used to be when he was a big man in politics.

26806. Do you think that in case of many of the groceries, the grocery is a cover for the sale of liquor?—I know they depend as much on the liquor as on the groceries in many cases. If the liquor could be separated from the grocery, it would be a benefit to the community.

26807. Do you think that the drink shops as they are established are a temptation to boys whose parents have carefully brought them up?—Yes, especially when there are billiard rooms and so-called amusements.

26808. If it were possible to abolish the liquor shops, do you think crime would diminish a great deal?—I do certainly.

26809. Have you noticed that juvenile criminals, boys caught at petty thefts and girls who began street-walking, are largely children of parents who, because of their drinking habits, neglected their children?—A good many of them are honest, hard-working parents, many of whom had not the opportunity of getting education themselves but had a good character, and said they would give their children what they had not—education. While they think they are doing all they can for their boys, some of the boys think that the old man and the old woman are beneath them.

26810. They look down on their parents?—Yes; their parents do not know those round dances and do not go to parties and do not smoke cigarettes and do not dress in fine clothes and have not so much grammar as they have. These are the lads who want style, and instead of going into the machine-shop they may get to be a messenger in an office; but the boy knows where the free pool is and the livery stable. The mother is a good honest woman, but she does not know how to go to a party or a dance, and her daughter does.

26811. Then to get money to carry out this style, they sometimes get light-fingered?—Yes.

26812. It would seem almost to be a mistake in those cases for parents to educate their children?—Yes, education is lost upon some people. But how can you discriminate? I do not blame the tavern-keepers for that. Girls do not go to those places, but the young scamps who take the girls away do.

26813. Take these young Arabs about the streets: are they generally the children of parents who have neglected them entirely?—A good many are children of parents who make home miserable, and as soon as the children can get away and get on a coal cart they will do it. I have known some such boys who have turned out very respectable, good boys. I know a young man who told his father one day, “Understand me, you are not to abuse mother any more; you have been doing it long enough, and notwithstanding you are my father, I will not allow you to do it”; and he kept his word. He said, “If you were as good as my mother, we would have a comfortable home.”

26814. You have expressed your fear that it would not be possible to enforce prohibition. But if public sentiment, taking the whole country over, came at some time to be strongly favourable to prohibition, and a law were enacted prohibiting the manufacture and sale and also the importation of intoxicating liquors, and such a law were well enforced, would good results follow?—I am sure they would, if public opinion were in favour of such a law.

26815. You believe public opinion in Montreal is not in favour of it?—I do not think it is in favour of it.

26816. But any law is better enforced if the officials are free from political influence?—Yes, if they get honest men to enforce the law. If I had a certain salary or allowance for my services, and was low enough or mean enough to take a bribe from one of those people, I would be in his power, not only in regard to himself but to his cousins and his relations and all who are engaged in the trade. If I took a bribe from him, he would take good care to get some evidence that I did so.

26817. If you did it once, you would be in his power always?—Yes, for ever; and not only in his power, but in the power of his friends. I recollect that we were looking after Sunday selling when two tavern-keepers had a quarrel. One of them complained that the other kept open every Sunday. The police went and caught that man who was complained of, and they went into the other man's place and caught him also. One was fined \$10 and the other \$20 because it was the second time he was caught. That is what I call fair and impartial work.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26818. Is it a good thing to have an applicant for a license compelled to secure the signature of a number of residents in the subdivision where the licensed place is to be kept?—I think so.

ANDREW CULLEN.

26819. It has been stated that where an applicant is compelled to get the signatures of 20 or 25, or a certain proportion of the residents of the division in which the licensed place is to be situated, he is virtually in their hands during the year, and if they so desire, they can make him break the law; he is under a compliment, as it were, and the people who sign will not be over scrupulous in observing the law?—I do not think there is anything in that, because in many places a man will get his 25 signatures pretty freely, and in other places the signatures may cost him many 25 glasses.

26820. Afterwards, do you think they exercise influence to get the licensee to break the law?—I do not think so.

26821. Would you favour compelling the applicant to get the signatures of the majority of the residents?—I would. If there were more signatures protesting against the application than he had, I would not give a license to him. Suppose he had 25 signatures, and there were 26 from the same division who protested against him, I would not give a license to him.

26822. The law now is that the majority must object?—Yes, I believe so. Another thing is I would not care how respectable a man was, I would not allow him to have a license to sell liquor within a certain distance of a church.

26823. Or school-house?—Yes.

26824. Or factory?—That is another thing. I have known a saloon here, and I venture to say he has not 20 customers in a year. It is isolated from any dwelling; but it is beside some factories. I will tell you where it is—it is on St. Patrick Street, right behind Redpath's sugar refinery.

26825. The trade is derived from the employees of the sugar refinery?—Yes, and other factories. A man going into a saloon and putting his hand in his pocket and paying for a drink, can, of course, obtain it, but oftentimes he would have nothing in his pocket, and would not drink if he had neither credit nor money. But when you are working in a factory you are known. You come into the saloon and take your glass, and it is marked down to you until pay day, and oftentimes there may be a dispute between the tavern-keeper and the customer, and I dare say the customer will be right. The tavern-keeper hardly ever misses putting down what he got and possibly a little more, and the bill comes pretty high when it is to be paid. If he had not that bill to pay he could take more money home to his family. I would put taverns away from factories.

26826. Would you favour licensing places with billiard and pool rooms? Are they licensed now?—Yes.

26827. Would you favour a system of licensing them?—No, I would favour putting them away altogether from saloons.

26828. Billiard and pool rooms where liquor is sold?—I do not mean the Windsor or the St. Lawrence Hall.

26829. Why make an exception?—Because they are away from the bar altogether, and a man who goes there can spend a quarter of a dollar. This is different from the bar-billiard room, where you see these ragamuffins playing billiards and smoking cigars and taking drinks when the family have not enough to eat at home.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26830. While you would favour prohibition if you thought it would put an end to the consumption of liquor, you think it would not have that effect?—That is it.

26831. You think if there were such a law, people would still find means of getting liquor?—I do.

26832. So a strict regulation and a strict inspection is the best thing we can hope for?—Yes.

26833. You gave us an illustration where two men and two women went into a drinking place and one man lost a pocket book. Had they been there long?—About two hours.

26834. They might have taken a good deal of liquor in that time?—I asked one man what he usually drank, and he said brandy.

26835. Take such a place as that: What kind of liquor do you suppose is sold there?—I do not suppose it is the best. I suppose it is liquor containing a good deal of poison.



26836. You believe there are degrees of badness in the liquor sold in this city?—I do.

26837. Have you noticed what some of the witnesses have spoken of—the governor of the jail and others—the different effect liquor has upon some men, that instead of making them drunk, it stupefies them at once or makes them crazy?—If you take liquor out of the same decanter, it may have different effects on different people. I have no knowledge of liquor myself, I am proud to say.

26838. You have spoken of the people who commit the more serious crimes, and you said that forgers and burglars and men of that kind are generally moderate drinkers?—They generally are.

26839. Have you ever known regular drunkards to be charged with such a crime as forgery?—I do not recall a case to my memory, though such might have occurred.

26840. Do you find that men who commit assaults upon others, upon women, upon children and offences of that kind almost all have drunkenness connected with them, directly or indirectly?—Assaults on men are generally committed through drunkenness.

26841. Have you considered the question of the feasibility, where a man has become a confirmed drunkard and has been sent to jail again and again, of locking that man up in an asylum for inebriates?—If a man is a confirmed drunkard and means to be a drunkard, and is ready to sacrifice anything to get liquor and see his wife and children starving, I would not fine him or send him to jail, but I would give him 25 lashes as hard as I could.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26842. Generally, do you favour the flogging of the hotel-keeper?—I was talking to a very prominent minister, and I said that a man who meant to be a drunkard and would sacrifice everything for liquor, if he repeated the offence, I would double the dose of punishment.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26843. If that did not answer, would it be better that he should be shut up?—I have seen people in those inebriate asylums brought down to face the bill—at Longue Point and the Christian Brothers. They do very well for a while; and I asked one what makes you go in again to drink that cursed liquor, and he said, “I cannot help it; something comes over me.”

26844. Would you flog that man?—No, I would not.

26845. Were you taking him to an asylum?—I was.

26846. Do you think that was the best course?—It was with that poor fellow; but not with fellows who are nothing but avaricious animals. With a poor unfortunate fellow who must drink and who will do anything for it, I would do everything for him; I would help him.

WILLIAM EVANS JONES, of Richmond, P.Q., journalist, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald :*

26847. Richmond is in what county?—In the County of Richmond.

26848. What is your occupation or calling?—Editor of the *Richmond Guardian*.

26849. Do you hold an official position?—I am Justice of the Peace for the Province of Quebec.

26850. Is that a Stipendiary?—Yes, and I have been so for thirty-two years.

26851. What law is enforced in the County of Richmond with reference to the sale of liquors?—The Scott Act now; originally it was the Dunkin Act.

26852. How long was the Dunkin Act in force?—Until 1877, in April.

26853. Was there any interim between it and the Scott Act?—No.

ANDREW CULLEN.

26854. When did the Scott Act come into force?—The Dunkin Act was amalgamated with the Scott Act, and we took a repealing vote in December, 1888, under the Scott Act.

26855. With what result?—The Act was confirmed.

26856. Has it been voted on since?—No.

26857. So the present law is the Scott Act?—Yes. A prohibition Act has been in force since 1877 without interruption.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26858. I understand it is the Dunkin Act which is in force in Richmond County?—It is amalgamated with the Scott Act. It is the old by-law that is in force.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26859. You mean the Scott Act machinery is used for its enforcement?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26860. What vote was taken in 1888?—To attempt to repeal it. There had been previous votes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26861. That attempt failed?—Yes.

26862. Will you give the Commission a general statement of the history of prohibition under the Dunkin Act in the County of Richmond?—I have everything pretty well in memory, but the Commission will I suppose have no objection to my referring to notes. The Act was adopted by the County of Richmond, under the provisions of the old Temperance Act of 1864, in April, 1877, when it was carried by a majority of 134. Three years later it was submitted to a repealing vote. I am not clear whether it was in October, 1879, or April, 1880, but about that time. The repealing vote was defeated by 110 majority. I may say the movement for repeal then came and all subsequent movements for its repeal, as well as all the opposition and obstruction to its enforcement, have come solely from the town of Richmond, which, being the largest municipality, necessarily exercises a large influence over the county, and particularly over a vote. The opponents of prohibition then appealed to the Local Legislature for and obtained an Act of Incorporation as a town.

26863. When would that be?—That was in the session of 1882, in the month of June. The Act took effect on 1st July, Dominion Day, when the town was incorporated. The incorporation of the town took effect under the Towns Corporations General Clauses Act of the Province of Quebec, with a special Act, having some additional provisions not included in the general Act. One clause of this Act was that the Town Council of Richmond may pass a by-law for the issue of certificates on which to obtain licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquor (copied entirely from the provisions of the Municipal Code); and accordingly, the Town Council issued certificates to eight persons for tavern licenses only, hotels as they call them. Immediately they were issued, the temperance party (I was going to say we, and I may say so, for I took a very prominent part in it) at once raised the question of the power of the Council and also of the Collector of Inland Revenue to implement the action of the Council for the issue of licenses. We did that by attacking the sellers.

26864. When the Town Council had issued the certificates, did the provincial authorities issue the licenses?—Certainly, relying on the new powers. The theory they took was that a special Act of incorporation annulled the Dunkin Act, the town having been taken out of the municipal government of the county. We at once raised the question by summoning the whole eight with five or six or more cases each, and took them before the court. This was the first time the question had been raised in the Province of Quebec. It was not raised in Brome and Missisquoi, where there were towns that went out of the county to get rid of the provisions of the Dunkin Act.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26865. What was the result?—The question came before the district Magistrate at Sherbrooke, and he gave an intimation that he would deliver judgment, and it became known that he was going to declare that provision of the Town Act to be *ultra vires*, and that the Dunkin Act was still in operation over the whole county, notwithstanding the incorporation of the town. The parties then got out a writ of prohibition to prevent the Judge rendering judgment, and Mr. Justice Brooke dissolved the writ of prohibition, and Mr. Justice Rioux gave his judgment, which killed the combination. The town of Richmond issued the certificates again. The authorities were advised by their lawyer that they had better issue them again and go to appeal against that judgment, having missed the opportunity in the first instance. They again issued the certificates, and in the interim the town went to the Legislature for a Bill to remove doubts. The Legislature had simply incorporated into the Town Act the provisions of the general Act, and the new Bill, which was also passed, read this way:—“Whereas doubts have been expressed as to the right of the Town Council, etc., be it enacted that the Town Council always had and have power to issue licenses,” and so on. They thought they were perfectly safe then. That went before the Courts in the same way, and Mr. Justice Rioux and Mr. Justice Brooke afterwards declared this *ultra vires* of the Provincial Legislature, which again established the Dunkin Act in our town.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26866. Did this mean stopping the sale?—Not at all. The following May, that is in 1884, they came before the Council again, and the Council said, “We will give you certificates for what the paper is worth. Pay the \$200; we guarantee nothing. You can go to all the courts in the country; we give the certificate without prejudice to ourselves.” These fellows took their certificates and tendered their money to the Collector of Inland Revenue, who refused to take it. They got out a writ of mandamus to compel the Inland Revenue Inspector to issue the licenses, but they never went any further.

26867. Did they compel him to issue the licenses?—No, they did not go any further. When they went for their mandamus, they could not get it.

26868-69. Did they after all these struggles stop selling?—They professed to stop selling, and as far as exposing was concerned, they did. They closed their bars, but we were on the watch. We got the county to appoint a county prosecutor. We had a very vigorous organization, and we found they were still selling and we prosecuted one after the other, prosecuted and prosecuted and continued to prosecute, and during 1888, 1889, 1890 and 1891, we instituted and won 393 suits, that is after November, 1888, up to May, 1891, or three and a half years; we lost 14 cases.

26870. What was the effect of those prosecutions?—We obtained judgment for more than \$20,000, and the effect was to shut up the whole business. We let them off with \$3,350 and \$2,000 of costs, and the balance is still hanging against them.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26871. What do you mean by saying “let them off”?—In this way. We never took an isolated prosecution. We used to take 20 or 30 against each individual, letting them go on for two or three months. Our prosecutor would watch and get convictions in every case or a confession. These were private prosecutions undertaken by the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, with which no one else had anything to do.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26872. Who received the money?—We got two-thirds of the money, and we generally collected enough to give the Government the third, which was their share. We would say, We have convictions against you for \$1,260; pay \$300 and costs, which will be enough to pay the Government; if you sell again, we will collect the whole amount. In two or three cases we have done that, but in other cases they have cleared out; fourteen have left the country and four of them we have jailed.

WILLIAM EVANS JONES.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26873. Do we understand that from 1882 to 1888 this continual struggle went on?—Yes.

26874. Did you not have another repeal vote?—We did in 1888, after all these matters were settled.

26875. What was the result of that?—The Act was sustained by a majority of 510.

26876. And it is since then, that those prosecutions have been going on?—Yes. We had a number of prosecutions before, under the old Dunkin Act, which was passed in 1864, before Confederation, and the officer charged with the prosecution was the Collector of Inland Revenue. That was not the Collector of Provincial Revenue, but the Collector of Inland Revenue and we had to avail ourselves of that officer's power. We instituted a number of important prosecutions, and the Government ordered him to abandon the prosecutions; on other occasions political influences have been used.

26877. Do we understand that since 1888, when the law was re-enacted by a strong vote of 510 majority, these prosecutions have been successful, and have succeeded in driving the traffic out of Richmond?—Completely.

26878. We had it in evidence, if my memory is not at fault, during the first days we were here, I think from the Chief of Police, that he had been at Richmond on a couple of occasions at any rate, and he found liquors on sale in the hotel—not an open bar; but liquor was to be obtained there?—He came out there in December, 1880, or 1881, when Mr. Chapleau appealed to the people. No doubt he told the truth.

26879. But there is a different state of things now from that prevailing in 1888?—My impression is that he was not Chief of Police at that time.

26880. He was there campaigning?—Yes.

26881. You say that the prosecutions since 1888 have succeeded in driving the liquor trade out of Richmond. Do you mean to say there is no sale of liquor in Richmond?—Most decidedly.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26882. Do you mean to say if a man stated that within two months he had bought liquor in Richmond, he would be stating what was not true?—No. I can understand that an old customer coming to the hotel might get a bottle.

26883. But if he said he had purchased and paid for liquor in Richmond within two months, would you say he was telling an untruth?—No. I know there was some sold two or three days before the last Exhibition, which took place on the first and second, but it was sold in a place no better than a pigsty. It was sold away under a barn.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26884. I saw a place in the station house the other day which looked like a bar I saw bottles and the like.—You cannot get anything there. They are all temperance drinks. The Grand Trunk Railway will not allow the people even to sell lager beer there; that has been brought about through our efforts, because they were our greatest opponents. Even after we shut up the bars, the Grand Trunk permitted that place to be used at all hours.

26885. But it is not now?—No, because we completely shut it up.

26886. What is the effect of this law upon the town in the way of crime? How does Richmond since 1878, compare with it before?—You ask me to state as a Magistrate?

26887. Are you the chief Magistrate?—I am the only one.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26888. Do you try any of those cases?—I did; but I am an enthusiastic temperance man and felt I could not be impartial, and so I turned them over to the district Magistrate. I used to be consulted beforehand, and I thought it indecent and improper that I should be the sitting Magistrate, and I ceased to be, though I did try several cases before.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26889. You know about them: will you make a statement in regard to them?—I will confine myself to what we call police offences, that is, cases I can adjudicate upon finally, not those that have to go to the Queen's Bench for trial. These comprise drunk and disorderly cases sent to the lock-up. Drunken persons for furious driving, and that is a very common offence; indecency while in a case of intoxication, a few cases of neglect to provide for family, resulting entirely from the dissipated habits of the father, common assaults not accompanied with bloodshed (in all cases from drunkenness) and the use of abusive language to men and women, all these are directly traceable to drink. Of that class of offences the average number adjudicated by me for 6 years previous to 1885, that would be from the time we originally commenced the prosecutions under the Dunkin Act in 1879, was  $30\frac{1}{2}$  per annum. I take May as the commencement of the license year: from May, 1885, to May, 1886, 37 cases; from May, 1886, to May, 1887, 39 cases. During all this time the Act was nominally in force.

26890. But it was a dead letter?—Partly. From May, 1887, to May, 1888, and the broken period up to November, the offences were 86. The Act became effective in November, 1888, and from 29th November, 1888, to May, 1890 (I am taking in one year and a half), I had 17 cases. From May, 1890, to May, 1892 (I do not know why my clerk made it two years, but he has for some reason) I had 13 cases. Since May, 1892, I have had none at all.

26891. What is the population?—The population of the town is 2,500, but I adjudicate for the county. My practical jurisdiction would extend over 7,000 people.

26892. Has there been an increase of population?—A slight increase.

26893. I mean in the town?—Yes, a slight increase, but not very much.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26894. What is the population of the county?—Some 14,000, I guess.

26895. Your jurisdiction extends over 7,000?—My practical jurisdiction; my jurisdiction covers the whole Province of Quebec.

26896. Where could we get these statistics for the other districts?—There are none. I do not think the local Magistrates do anything in any of the other places except in the Township of Shipton.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26897. In the census returns, I noticed in 1881, the population was 1,571 and in 1891, 2,056, an increase of 500?—We cut off a piece of township territory and added it to the town.

26898. Then the population within the limits of the town has increased?—Yes, and the limits of the town also.

26899. And yet the statistics show that crime has decreased?—That does not affect it. I adjudicated in that territory before and since.

26900. Your jurisdiction extends over all the county?—Except over the French, and there are no breaches of the Act in the French part of the county. The priests do not allow it.

26901. What is the chief business of the town of Richmond?—It is chiefly a railway town.

26902. Has there been an improvement in the habits of the railway men?—It is a subject of common remark that our public gatherings present a wonderful contrast to what they formerly did. We have the Secretary of the Agricultural Society here, who might confirm what I say, that with our agricultural shows, which are somewhat more ambitious than the ordinary country shows, where 4,000 or 5,000 people gather, not only had I no occasion to interfere as Magistrate, but the policeman has not taken a person into custody for two years certainly, if not three. It used to be common for me to have a whole batch of drunk and disorderly cases, 13 or 14 of a morning, the day of an exhibition. It was a very bad place at one time, and the college was almost closed for want of pupils.

WILLIAM EVANS JONES.

26903. What college have you?—The St. Francis College.

26904. Why was it almost closed?—The place had so bad a name.

26905. What is the condition of the college now?—No one has any objection now, and the college has a large number of pupils.

26906. Your belief, in brief, is that the Dunkin Act is enforceable with proper officials?—I would undertake to enforce it anywhere as easily as the laws against larceny; there is not the slightest trouble.

26907. It is said to be more difficult in towns to get a majority vote for a prohibitory Act, and then to enforce it?—That is so.

26908. How was the vote in Richmond town?—Against it, but there was no opposition anywhere else.

26909. Yet the Dunkin Act, notwithstanding the majority of the electors are against it in the town of Richmond, is enforceable, and is enforced without difficulty?—Certainly. I think there are more thieves than drunkards in Richmond County, and yet it is a moral county, as moral as any other.

26910. I suppose the churches and temperance societies have aided in bringing about the changed condition?—We must, I suppose, believe so; but until we put the machinery of the law to work, and particularly get the women to work, the churches do not seem to make much impression.

26911. We had this testimony from Mr. Gibson, the largest employer of labour in his town, that the religious influences there were good and did good, but that they alone would not have taken the grog shops out of the town unless they had the law?—I entirely agree with him.

26912. You say there are as many thieves as there are, what?—Those who break the law.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26913. Then the law with you is a complete success?—A complete success, and with the same chances it can be made a success anywhere else.

26914. The public sentiment is so strongly in its favour that it can be enforced?—Yes, and particularly in the country parts. The only opposition to it is in the town of Richmond.

26915. Are there any persons in the rural districts who consume liquor?—They used to do it.

26916. But now?—I think not.

26917. Were those persons who used to be fined during the time of exhibitions from the rural districts?—Yes, many of them.

26918. Where are they now?—I suppose they cannot drink because they cannot get liquor.

26919. But cannot they get it elsewhere?—Our trouble is that we are surrounded by wet territory.

26920. Then they do get it?—Very few.

26921. Would you like to expand the limits?—Certainly.

26922. Would you like to amend the Scott Act, so as to prevent persons buying liquor and bringing it into the county?—Yes; but it would be almost impossible to pass that law. Parliament would scarcely entertain that.

26923. Why not?—I can only say that there is an indisposition to press these local option laws. I think there are tens of thousands of persons who would go for total prohibition, but who are opposed to local option laws.

26924. Why?—Because the liquor may be obtained from neighbouring places.

26924a. But take a local option law that brings about such a complete enforcement and change, why would not the people around prefer to have it?—They do to a certain extent. In the vote in the County of Drummond, the whole of the townships on the border of Richmond voted to sustain the Scott Act.

26925. You might have some hope for the City of Montreal?—I am not very sanguine about the cities.

26926. What about Sherbrooke?—I think it could be carried there.

26927. In reference to the provision of the old Dunkin Act as to the two counties joining on a second vote?—We never tried that. There is such a provision, but we never tried it.

26928. What would you think of such a provision?—I should certainly be favourable to it.

26929. So you would keep adding to the territory?—Certainly.

26930. Would you require then that each county should vote for it?—I would prefer the counties voting separately, so that each county would have the benefit of its own vote.

26931. Supposing in Richmond the law was enforced and in another county it was not enforced, would you not be afraid, in a cumulative vote, that the other county would swamp your vote?—You need not be afraid of that, because the people of Richmond would see the adjoining county taken care of as well as this. We have a temperance sentiment which would bear down any opposition. I hold this theory, that as prohibition has been enforced in a county like Richmond, it may be enforced anywhere, for the following reasons: that we have more obstructive elements and more obstruction than ordinarily exist in any county. As to the Grand Trunk, I admit that up to 1888 the Act was only very indifferently enforced. I hold the Grand Trunk Railway Company altogether responsible for that. We closed up the saloons over and over again, and the Grand Trunk opened their bars and resisted every effort we made. We were not anxious to fight the Grand Trunk, because we would have had to put our hands in our pockets to do so. If the Grand Trunk had closed their bar in 1888, as they did last year, we would have had the same condition as we have now, but the old toppers used to go down there and get their drinks.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26932. What induced the Grand Trunk to close their bar when they had previously refused?—We went down and made a direct appeal to Mr. Mercier. The Company claimed to have rights under a special Act which is called the Buffet Act; and they took this ground, that the Company held its charter and its rights under an Act of the old Parliament of Canada, and amongst their rights was the right to have restaurants where liquor might be sold. But we got the best opinions in the world that that did not carry a right belonging to the Provincial Legislature, to issue licenses. We then appealed directly to the Government, and their law officer decided that even in a Scott Act county the Grand Trunk Company could not sell liquor. The town of Windsor Mills is a factory town almost as strong as Richmond, but fortunately we have the Canada Paper Company there, and their men dare not get drunk, and they have always aided us more than any one.

*By Judge McDonald:*

26933. Would you say there are more people who steal than people who drink in Richmond?—No, that would be going too far.

26934. They get it from outside and put it in their cellars?—Yes; but they only get it in very small quantities.

26935. Do you find the same difficulties in the way of the enforcement of the law against stealing?—No, certainly not.

26936. You find a different state of public sentiment, then, in this matter?—Certainly.

26937. You think you have put matters in such a shape that the public sentiment in regard to the traffic is the same as in regard to theft?—Yes, we can get as much moral support.

26938. I understand that, given the same facilities in other parts of the country, you would bring about the same results?—Yes, with the same organization.

26939. And you think it could be expanded so as to be made a national matter?—Certainly, I do not see why it should be more difficult of enforcement than any other law.

WILLIAM EVANS JONES.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26940. Are there any other municipalities in which this law is in force?—There is Danville, there were two in Melbourne and New Rockland and in Kingsbury—all populous villages. In Danville there were 4 votes against and 119 in favour of the Act. In Kingsbury, I think the vote was solid, with the exception of one or two. In New Rockland, there are many people who used to be very much addicted to drink. The large majority are not now so much so as other people. In Melbourne, there was a strong vote. In Shipton and Melbourne and Danville, there was a prohibitory law under local option.

26941. What was the majority?—510.

26942. And what was the vote cast?—2,010 or 2,012 altogether.

26943. And the tavern vote was in the town of Richmond?—Yes. It looks a small number to the total vote of 4,000, but there are three townships which have always maintained police regulations and total sobriety, and many of them said, “In Richmond they can do what they like—we are all right.” There was nothing to be gained, except in Richmond and Windsor Mills, because elsewhere was all right.

26944. Notwithstanding the adverse vote, the law has been thoroughly enforced?—Yes.

26945. Has that been due to the authorities or to private individuals?—To private individuals; the authorities have been against us, with the exception of Mr. Mercier.

26946. What about the Municipal Government?—That is the worst we have ever had. The Town Council of Richmond were the greatest opponents we had.

26947. Notwithstanding the opposition of the Provincial Government after the defeat of Mr. Mercier’s Government, and the opposition of the Municipal Councils, and the antipathy of the people?—And Dominion Government and all the members representing that section of the country.

26948. Notwithstanding all that, and with the hostile vote in the town of Richmond, you have succeeded under that Act in wiping out the liquor traffic?—Yes.

26949. What would you think of a town where the majority would be two to one in favour of the Act, and yet the bar rooms are wide open?—It would be because the temperance people are not well organized. I repeat, give me and one or two of my associates, 20 of the women of the Christian Temperance Union who worked it in Richmond, and we would clear the traffic out of the whole Province of Quebec.

26950. How many years litigation did you have in fighting the rum sellers?—Ten years.

26951. And a handful of people of Richmond have demonstrated that the law is practicable and can be worked out?—We have splendid results in the county because we combine.

26952. Can you suggest any amendments to render the Act more efficient and workable?—I would abolish the druggists’ license clause. We have more trouble with them than anything else.

26953. How would you have liquor sold for medicinal purposes?—I cannot answer that. It is very difficult. I know that physicians betray their trust.

26954. Would you favour some one being employed and paid a salary and the profits given to the municipality?—I think that would be a better system.

26955. Would you make higher penalties?—Yes; you could not make them too high to please me.

26956. Would you withdraw the privilege by which individuals are able to get liquor for their own use?—Yes, I know of a case where a doctor sent a standing order to a druggist, and with that a fellow got liquor for a year or a year and a half, as he wanted it.

26957. Are there many such cases?—I do not know; the one is enough to disgust me. Two mothers came to me. Their little boys had applied for drink, and I discovered that one of the little fellows had been sent with a doctor’s certificate by a man who is himself the father of a family. He took his little friend with him and got drunk.

26958. Do you know anything about Drummond?—I know the Government interfered there to defeat a prosecution and actually cancelled the commissions of the Magistrates.



26959. What Government?—The Mercier Government, and yet he allowed them to act afterwards.

26960. Was the Act enforced in Drummond?—It did not need to be, except in the town of Drummondville.

26961. What was the trouble there?—Largely the same difficulties we had to contend with. The liquor influence was strong.

26962. Was the Act enforced in Drummondville?—I am afraid not. They had no temperance organization and then the worthy priest who had been there and who would have done his best, left. We lost the best apostle of temperance we could have, and his successor did not take the same interest.

26963. You say the Scott Act can be enforced?—Certainly, I cannot understand why the Scott Act cannot be enforced as well as the Act against thieving.

26964. You would be surprised to hear that it is generally disregarded?—I have no difficulty with it.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26965. With the great benefits that have resulted from this Act, how do you account for the election of Members of Parliament and Municipal Councillors who are opposed to it?—There is no question in the town of Richmond as to that.

26966. But in the time you speak of?—The liquor men then ran the Council.

26967. And the Members of Parliament?—Yes, the same thing.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

26968. It is not surprising that Richmond town elected rum Councillors, because that town voted against the adoption of the Act?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26969. Is Richmond a county by itself as regards the Dominion Parliament?—No.

26970. But it is for the Local House?—Yes.

26971. Who represents it in the Local House?—He is a Roman Catholic; he is not a prohibitionist, but he is a strong help to us. He is a man of abstemious habits himself.

26972. What about the representative of Richmond and Wolfe in the Dominion Parliament?—He would vote for prohibition to-morrow.

*By Judge McDonald :*

26973. So the prohibition men have elected their candidates?—We can do it at any time, but we have no necessity.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26974. Was that question raised at the last election?—No.

JOHN EWING, of Melbourne, P.Q., on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

26975. What is your residence?—Melbourne, which is across the river from Richmond.

26976. What is your occupation, or calling?—I have been Registrar of the County of Richmond for two years.

26977. How long have you resided in Melbourne?—I was born there, and have resided there for the most part ever since.

26978. Do you concur in the testimony given by Mr. Jones?—Yes, as far as I have knowledge. I would like to add one thing. He referred to me as Secretary Treasurer of the Agricultural Society of the county. I have been that for the last two years. We had two exhibitions, and besides being Treasurer of the society, I was Manager of the exhibition. At the last exhibition, and at the exhibition before, we had about 4,000 people present, and we had not a case of intoxication, not an arrest; and it was a matter of contrast between that condition and the state of things we had some years ago.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26979. What was the condition of things at such public exhibitions you speak of in the years before the Dunkin Act was enforced?—We were in the habit of having drunken men on the Exhibition grounds, and general disorder in the town on the night of the Exhibition.

26980. Sometimes it is said that hotels cannot be very well carried on unless there is permission to sell liquors. Has Richmond town or county suffered in its hotel accommodation by reason of the enforcement of the Dunkin Act?—We had seven places licensed, and we have nominally seven hotels, besides the Grand Trunk restaurant. Four of these are now converted into private residences; three of these are doing the business with the same accommodation, minus the bar.

26981. And making it profitable?—Yes.

26982. Do you find the patrons of the hotels complain of the lack of the accommodation they had before?—No, there is plenty of accommodation.

26983. Where is Danville?—Twelve miles from Richmond.

26984. Is it a town?—Yes; the registry office is in the town of Richmond.

26985. What is the condition of Danville?—Danville some years ago took the lead in the prohibition movement in the county, and I was informed the day before yesterday that whereas some seven or eight people under the Dunkin Act were selling liquor, and from fifty to sixty hogshead of liquor a year were sold in Danville, they do not believe a barrel is brought in, because there is practically none sold except through the drug store.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

26986. Do you know that yourself?—I believe it to be true, but I do not know it myself.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

26987. You say you corroborate Mr. Jones's statements as to the changed condition of things in Richmond?—Yes.

26988. What is your belief as to the desirability of a general prohibitory law and as to the possibility of the efficient enforcement of such a law?—I believe it is generally admitted that the use of intoxicating liquor under the license system is an injury, financially, morally and socially.

26989. Is that your own belief?—And that being the case, I cannot see why it is not desirable that it should be prohibited. I see no reason why it should not be prohibited, and a general prohibitory law as equally and as fairly enforced as any other law. I believe that a statement to the contrary portrays a state of anarchy which does not exist, from the experience we have had in Richmond.

26990. You believe there are reasons why a prohibitory law would be more easily enforced than a local law?—I think it would be, because it would be more general in its nature, and there would be machinery for the proper enforcement of it.

26991. Have you any knowledge of the condition of the farming population?—Yes.

26992. Are you a farmer yourself?—I have considerable to do in farming operations, and I am a small farmer now.

26993. Comparing the condition of the farming population, as to their homes and financial condition and otherwise, years ago, when there was a freer sale of liquor than there is now, with their condition under enforced prohibition, what is your observation as to the difference?—That there is an improvement as far as that is concerned. I know many farmers in the County of Richmond who have ruined themselves through their drinking habits, but who to-day are sober men and are working up and endeavouring to improve their positions.

26994. What are the effects on their families?—The old story as to the general effect.

26995. You think these same men, under enforced prohibition, are getting on their feet?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

26996. Do you say that these three hotels which now exist in Richmond do not sell liquor?—I do not believe they do.

26997. You swear that they do not, to the best of your belief?—To the best of my belief.

26998. Has the rate of board per day been increased in those hotels?—I do not think so, perhaps the price of meals has ; I dare say it has.

26999. If the price of meals has been increased since the sale of liquor has ceased, of what would that be an indication?—They are \$1.50 per day houses.

27000. Of what would that be an indication?—It means that they are making men pay for their meals such a price as enables them to provide good food, comfortably served. In many of these hotels before the whisky business or the bar business was abolished, their sole attention was given to directing their customers in that way, and the table board was neglected.

27001. Does that justify the statement of hotel-keepers, that hotels do not pay without the bars?—I am certain they pay better with the bars, because liquor selling is a profitable business.

27002. Was it because the bars were a good business that the price of meals was increased when they were abolished?—I suppose it was.

27003. Do you know anything about the Maine liquor law?—I do not.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27004. As to the moral effect upon the drink sellers and their families : have you noticed anything?—Yes.

27005. What is the effect?—Four of our hotel men in Richmond, a few years ago, were well-doing respectable men, and to-day they are wrecks morally, physically and otherwise.

27006. By drinking themselves?—Yes.

27007. And their families?—They have been scattered and very much injured.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27008. Are they still there?—No, they have gone away ; one is about there, the others are away.

27009. As regards the men in the trade who increased their price for meals and have continued to do so : how did the trade affect them in their habits and character?—One of them is a new man, the others were not what would be called dissipated men.

27010. Did they take liquor at all?—I think so.

27011. Have they improved in appearance and in their habits, and so on?—I do not know ; I think they look as well as before.

JOHN EWING.

27012. Do they get liquor privately?—They have the right; we are only twenty-five miles from Sherbrooke.

27013. You do not know?—No.

27014. As to those farmers who have been reclaimed: do they ever get liquor from Sherbrooke and other places?—I have no doubt that occasionally some of those men do, but the majority of farmers go into the town; where liquor is exposed, the temptation is too great for them, but they will not put themselves out of the way to get it.

27015. They were not slaves to the vice?—They were slaves when they came into contact with it.

27016. But not so much as to go a long distance to get it?—No.

27017. Do you know anything of the provisions of the Maine law?—No.

27018. Would you favour such a law as that for the Province of Quebec or for the Dominion of Canada, in preference to the Scott Act?—I think the wider the area the better.

27019. You know nothing of those provisions?—No, except that there are provisions for imprisonment, as I think there should be.

27020. General Neal Dow says that the same provision, in effect, prevails in Maine as that which prevails here under the Scott Act: that people can get liquor for private use?—Yes, I know that.

27021. Do you think that is desirable?—If we had prohibition in the Province of Quebec, and had to send to Toronto and bring liquors down for use, I do not think it would do much harm.

JOHN FREDERICK REDMOND, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

27022. What is your occupation or calling?—Bookseller at present.

27023. How long have you lived in Montreal?—All my lifetime.

27024. How long have you been engaged in the business of a bookseller?—Sixteen years and a little over.

27025. Are you a member of any labour organization?—I have been connected with the Knights of Labour for eight or nine years.

27026. Have you been engaged in mechanical work?—I worked in a foundry business for some years.

27027. Have you book binding in connection with your business?—No.

27028. Have you books of all kinds?—Yes.

27029. And stationery?—Yes.

27030. Taking your recollection as far as it goes, do you think there has been a change in the social customs of the people in regard to drinking?—I think it is rather on the increase in this city.

27031. Do you think drunkenness is on the increase?—I do.

27032. To what do you attribute that?—Principally to the great number of saloons.

27033. Have you found that there has been an influence of the church, and the temperance societies trying to bring about a better state of things?—I have always found it so.

27034. Do you think that that has done good all along the line?—It has done a great deal of good.

27035. You think too many places are licensed?—My own opinion is that all bars should be abolished, that the Government should secure control of the traffic and establish three or four distributing places where they would sell by the measure to people who require it for their own purpose, if they do require it.

27036. Unless there was a change in the mode of obtaining licenses, would you favour the present system of having 25 persons to sign for a license?—There are 17 or 18 licenses in the locality where I live, and in others there are none.

27037. You would fairly distribute them?—Yes.

27038. Would you have them in any residential parts of the city?—I would.

27039. Would you divide them in subdivisions?—I think four or five places would be sufficient for a city like Montreal.

27040. Would you have the liquor sold by the municipality of the province?—By the Federal Government.

27041. And the person who sold it would be merely employed?—Employed by the Government.

27042. So that it would be no gain to him?—That would be a guarantee of the quality.

27043. And any profits would go to the general Government?—Yes, as a source of revenue.

27044. What would you say as to the inspection of liquor for quality?—The Government taking hold of it would guarantee the quality.

27045. Would you favour such an inspection as would lead to the sale of pure liquor?—Yes, certainly.

27046. Do you think there is any adulteration now?—I cannot say.

27047. How is the law observed on Sunday?—I cannot say. I believe there are infractions of all laws.

27048. How is it as to sale to minors?—I do not think that is very much sold.

27049. Taking the present system of license, would you favour the suppression of the sale of liquor by grocers?—Yes.

27050. Have you thought of the question of high license?—I do not think that is a remedy.

27051. If either the hotel or the restaurant bar had to go, which would it be better to remove?—I can hardly distinguish between the two.

27052. What do you think as to the saloons?—I think they should go.

27053. Have you observed at all, as a citizen of Montreal, what the effect of the liquor traffic is upon the business of the city, upon families and so on?—I have no opportunity of comparing Montreal with other cities.

27054. As a whole, do you find evil is caused by the sale of liquor to families and so on?—There must be in some cases. I have not made the matter a study.

27055. Do you know whether there is much unlicensed sale of liquor in this city?—I am sure there must be quite a number of unlicensed houses, but I have no idea how many.

27056. Have you ever considered the question of the treatment of the persistent drunkard, who is taken to the police court and sent to jail and then goes back again, whether it would be advisable to send such a person to an inebriate asylum?—I think it would be of benefit in a great many cases.

27057. Have you any knowledge of the parks in the city, such as Sohmer Park and others?—Yes, I have been there often.

27058. What is your opinion in regard to them?—I think they are of great benefit. Many young men go there and pass the evening or Sunday. They may drink lager beer there, but otherwise they would be drinking hard liquors in taverns.

27059. Would you favour the sale of spirituous liquors there?—I would not.

27060. Would you favour the sale of ale?—It would be better not.

27061. Or lager?—I do not see much harm from the use of lager; but if liquor is sold, it is difficult to distinguish between the liquors.

27062. Billiards and pool are played?—Of course, I think liquor should be only sold in three or four places, and that by Government employees.

27063. But taking the license law as it is?—If the present license law is continued, I do not think the license should be restricted.

27064. Have you considered whether it is advisable to do away with heavy liquors and to favour the sale of light wines and ale?—I should think that if the people have to drink something, the lighter the drink the better it would be.

JOHN FREDERICK REDMOND.

27065. Have you had any experience of prohibition countries?—None.

27066. Have you considered the question of prohibition, that is the prevention of the manufacture, importation and sale of spirituous liquors as beverages?—I have thought of it, but I hardly see how it could be imposed in cities like Montreal, and it is hardly just to our neighbours to pass such a law. It is an infringement on their rights.

27067. Suppose such a law were enacted for Canada, and the distilleries and breweries were closed by the adoption of that law, would you favour granting remuneration for the plant that they had put into their business under the existing law?—I do not understand under what conditions they hold their licenses. With due notice, I do not think they would be entitled to much remuneration.

27068. You would give them sufficient notice?—Yes, sufficient to wind up.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27069. Why do you object to the licensed drink trade?—Because liquors can be had with too much freedom.

27070. And for that reason, you would have the Government establish certain places. Would you have a large or small number?—A small number, and liquor not to be drunk on the premises. Let each person register for what he wanted.

27071. For home consumption as well as for medicinal purposes?—Yes.

27072. Have you observed the effects of liquor on mechanics generally?—I have seen many of them under the influence. It has a bad effect.

27073. Does it interfere with their wage-earning power?—The drinking class are a hindrance to those who work and to the labour unions.

27074. You think upon all classes of men the drink habit has an injurious effect?—It depends upon the quantity.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27075. What do you understand by the term “drink habit?”—Continual drunkenness, I suppose.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27076. I do not mean a man who drinks to excess whenever he can get liquor. I mean the man who is a habitual drinker, not often, not perhaps at any time to what is regarded as excess, but who drinks some alcoholic liquor every day. Have you observed whether that affects the man injuriously in the long run in his wage-earning power?—I do not think so. In some employment, such as rolling mills, I think a little liquor helps a man.

27077. Have you observed whether moderate drinking has a tendency towards the excessive use of liquor?—Of course we notice people who start to drink a little and afterwards drink a good deal, but it is not the rule.

27078. Is it true in any considerable percentage of cases that the drunkards are recruited from the people who began and continued for some time to be moderate drinkers?—Of necessity, I suppose, that is true.

27079. Do you think it would be of advantage to working men as well as to all other classes of men, if the drink habit were less general amongst them?—Yes, it would.

27080. You think the facilities for drinking are too numerous?—Yes.

27081. You think the legalized places for the drink sale are a temptation to men who would otherwise drink less?—Yes, they would drink less if they drank it all at home.

27082. Have you observed that drink shops in the neighbourhood of manufactories are a strong temptation to men, who waste their money in them?—I do not know. They are a temptation, but I believe saloons in the neighbourhood of factories do better than those which have no such feeder.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27083. What proportion of the working class in your experience are addicted so much to drink that they partake every day of liquor?—Most workingmen are moderate drinkers and take a little, but those who drink to excess are a very small number.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27084. Do many men drink to excess?—I do not think so.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27085. As to those parks : would it be in the interest of the masses of the people if the municipality owned those parks, instead of private companies?—I think it would.

27086. Would you give facilities to people to go to them on Sundays ; in other words, would you favour the running of cars on Sunday?—Certainly.

27087. Do you think the employment of men to work on Sunday to enable people to get to those parks would be a good thing?—I see no harm in working for the public good.

27088. Would you favour facilities being given to people to get to those parks, to places where they could have fresh air and have a rest?—Certainly.

27089. Has drunkenness increased of late years amongst the working people of Montreal?—I see more drunkenness to-day than I did 20 years ago, but the population has increased so much that I suppose that is the cause of it.

27090. But amongst the working class, is there more drunkenness than there was 20 years ago?—I think it is about the same.

27091. Do you think if the working classes were given shorter hours, it would be a benefit to them and cause a decrease in drunkenness?—It would.

27092. You are not one of those who believe that giving higher wages and shorter hours would be the ruination of working men?—No, they are those who work for small wages and who work long hours and get tired, who take drinks on their way home to supper.

27093. You think the sale of liquor should be undertaken by Government and the profit should go into the public treasury, and it should be under Government supervision and nothing but pure liquor should be sold?—Yes.

27094. You are not in favour of prohibition?—I do not believe it to be practicable. I would like to see it in force if it could be carried out.

27095. It would be a good thing if it could be enforced?—Yes.

27096. But do you believe it could be enforced?—I do not.

27097. Do you know anything about the operation of prohibitory laws such as the Scott Act and the Dunkin Act?—I was once in Cornwall at the time the Scott Act was in operation. I did not think it was well administered, but I do not know much about it.

27098. You have never been in Maine?—No.

27099. Or out at Richmond?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27100. You would like to see prohibition enforced. Do you believe if public sentiment were at any time educated up to demand prohibition, that enforcement would produce good effects?—I do not think it would be just to the minority, but I think the idea of the Government having their own places for the sale of liquor would do more to decrease the consumption of liquor.

27101. But all our laws are the expression of the will of the majority and the minority have to submit to them. Would not that be the same in this case?—There are many who would like to see prohibition who would not vote for it, as it would be forcing other men against their will.

27102. Would you like to see it if it could be enforced?—Yes.

LOUIS Z. BOUDREAU, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

27103. What is your residence?—337 St. James Street, Montreal.

27104. What is your occupation or calling?—Printer.

27105. Do you hold any official position of any kind in the Municipal Council?—No.

27106. Or in any organized bodies?—I do in the organized labour body. I am President of the Trades and Labour Council here.

27107. How long have you lived in the city?—I was born here, and have lived here all the time.

27108. How long have you been in the printing business?—Since 1875.

27109. Are you conducting it for yourself?—I have for a short time.

27110. Before that you were employed in the same business?—Yes.

27111. How long have you been President of this Council?—Two years next December.

27112. Before that you were a member of it?—Yes, off and on for five or six years.

27113. What branch did you represent?—The Typographical Union.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27114. As a resident of Montreal for many years, have you noticed whether drunkenness has increased among the working classes or not?—I have not noticed any particular increase. In my own trade, I believe drunkenness has decreased in the last ten years.

27115. You have heard the evidence of Mr. Redmond respecting the giving of facilities to the people to get out to breathing places, parks and places of public recreation on the Sabbath. Do you coincide with him?—Not altogether. I am not in favour of Sunday work of any kind. I believe in shorter hours, thereby giving us time for recreation on week days that we have to take now on Sundays.

27116. You are not in favour of providing facilities to enable the people to go to the parks on Sunday?—No; I am in favour of having all the time for recreation on week days.

27117. You would not make any special provision to take people to the parks on Sunday?—No.

27118. Some Magistrates have stated that those parks were a benefit, in that, if they were not in existence, and until they were in existence, the people on Sunday would remain in the city and drink strong drinks in the hotels, but the opening of the parks and giving the facilities to reach them have decreased drinking in the bars and hotels in the city?—That may be, but I have no practical experience.

27119. Do you favour the licensing of the trade?—Yes, I believe it should be licensed, but not as it is in the City of Montreal.

27120. What is your view?—I think we have altogether too many saloons in the City of Montreal. Almost every one can get a license.

27121. Would you favour a reduction of the number?—Certainly a very great reduction of the number of drinking places and the early closing of them on Saturday at 7 and 11 o'clock every other night.

27122. Is there a law in Quebec by which licenses are given to grocery stores: do you favour that?—No.

27123. Would you separate the sale of liquor from groceries?—Certainly, from every thing else.

27124. Would it not be better to deal with this trade by suppressing it by the passage of a prohibitory law?—A prohibitory law would be of no use unless you could prohibit it all over. A prohibitory law would be useless in Montreal when you could get it in Ste. Cunégonde. It would be of no benefit whatever.

27125. But a law for the whole Dominion prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor?—I am not prepared to go that far.

27126. Why not?—From my experience here, I do not believe they could prohibit it. They cannot enforce the license law as it is now.



27127. Would it be good to make the trade disreputable by closing up the licensed places and having nothing but illegal sale in Montreal; would that be beneficial?—I think certainly not.

27128. Would not many who go in and drink because the trade is legal refrain from going into illegal places?—Some would, and others would go into those places, and it would be hard to get them out again.

27129. What would be the result of delegating the trade and making it illegal to sell liquor?—I think it would decrease the trade very considerably, but many of the evils would exist unless the law was strictly carried out.

27130. Could it be strictly carried out?—I doubt it.

27131. Would it be a benefit to stop it altogether?—It would be a benefit.

27132. Would you favour the enactment of a prohibitory law?—I would be glad to see one carried out.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27133. As a printer and having knowledge of men in your line, have you noticed that they, together with other mechanics and people, have suffered more or less by the drink habit?—Yes.

27134. Do you think that men in your line are drinking less of late years than they did formerly?—I think so.

27135. It has been stated often that the fact that compositors have to work late at night is an inducement to drink?—Certainly; the morning paper printer has inducements which an evening paper printer has not. He needs a stimulant. He works too long and wants a drink.

27136. And the drink being at his hand, he naturally indulges that desire for a stimulant?—That is true.

27137. Have you noticed that any great percentage of printers have really been wrecked through strong drink?—I know a few cases among my own craft where men have been wrecked through strong drink: they are the exception, however.

27138. Do you think that the drink habit, where there is not steady drinking, not excessive drinking, affects their wage-earning power by weakening their energies?—I have not noticed it any more than in others who do not drink. As they get older, the wage-earning power decreased.

27139. You do not think the drink habit ages them?—I have not so observed. The people we meet in the Trades and Labour Council are not drinking men as a whole. They are a good class of men.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27140. Are they total abstainers?—Some of them are.

27141. Others are moderate drinkers?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27142. Is the tendency towards total abstainers?—Yes, I have just attended the congress in Toronto, and it was noticed that there were more total abstainers there than ever before.

27143. I suppose in the rules of your union, there is something that encourages sobriety?—There is nothing in the rules of the Council proper, but the Council has taken an active interest in temperance legislation in times past in conjunction with temperance organizations in this city.

27144. That would indicate that they are in favour of better temperance legislation?—Yes, they are in favour of temperance legislation. They have never expressed any definite opinion outside of that.

27145. As to the Knights of Labour, we are told that there is not a temperance pledge, but there is an understanding that the men shall be sober?—That is true of the Knights of Labour.

27146. Is that true of your Typographical Union?—We do not go as far on the temperance question as the Knights of Labour do. The Union is a labour organization altogether.

LOUIS Z. BOUDREAU.

27147. The Knights of Labour take in all workers?—Provided they are men of good union character, provided they do not scab or rat as we call it. For instance, in case of a printer who would violate the rules of the union, there would be a decided objection to his election as a Knight of Labour.

27148. The officers of the Knights of Labour said that if a Knight of Labour persisted in getting drunk, he would be ejected?—If he was a confirmed drunkard he could be put out of the order for that, I think.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27149. Have you ever considered the question of the use of light wines and ales with a view to getting rid of the heavier drinks?—I do not think that would have a tendency to get rid of the heavier drinks. I think it would lead to the use of heavier drinks.

27150. Have you ever had any experience as to the adulteration of liquor, or have you reason to suppose that liquor is adulterated?—I have no practical experience.

27151. Have you seen effects on men which would lead you to suppose liquor was adulterated?—I have seen men in a condition which would lead me to believe they were poisoned.

27152. Would you be in favour of a strict inspection frequently?—Yes.

27153. Have you considered the suppression of the sale of liquor in billiard and pool rooms?—Yes; I am strongly in favour of that.

27154. Have you any opinion as to the treatment of the persistent drunkard?—I think it would be advisable to pass a law to send him to a place for a lengthened term.

27155. We would be glad if you would give us some statement of what in your opinion would be the best means of minimizing the evils of drunkenness?—I think that the saloons should be arranged so as to have only one door, no side door or back door, so that you could see right in and see who was at the bar. I think that would have a tendency to decrease the drinking habit.

27156. Have you ever considered, supposing the saloon bar or the hotel bar had to be abolished, which should be dispensed with?—The saloon, decidedly.

27157. You have places here which are called restaurants, that give meals?—I class them with hotels. They have sleeping and eating accommodation.

27158. I mean without sleeping accommodation?—I think the restaurant could best be dispensed with.

27159. Is there any other thing you think of besides the abolition of the screens and having open windows?—I believe if a man who violates the law had his license taken from him for the rest of his natural life, it would tend to make him respect the law.

27160. It would lead to a better class of men getting into the trade?—Exactly.

27161. In Charlottetown, they have a police regulation under which no licenses are granted and any one is permitted to sell, but they must have only one door leading into the bar, without any seating accommodation, liquor must be sold in that one room only, and nothing else must be sold there except oysters and cigars. These places must close at 10 o'clock every night, and at 6 o'clock on Saturday nights, and there must be no obstruction to a view of the whole interior from the street. What would you think of that as an experiment, or would you prefer some mode of regulation that would limit the number of places, and make a choice of those who sell, adding the restrictions that you have spoken of and which they have there in reference to securities and other things?—I would favour the limiting of the number.

27162. Taking the good points of their system and adding the limitation as to number, it would be a beneficial plan?—I think so.

27163. If you were to limit the number, necessarily they would be licensed to sell?—Why not license the house instead of the man.

27164. Would you favour such a plan as limiting the number of houses and having them selected with those other limitations added?—Yes, I think that would be a good thing.

27165. Do you think that would be better than total prohibition?—I hardly believe it would, if you can get total prohibition. In the event of getting total prohibition, it would be better still.

27166. Do you mean to get it and work it out?—I mean total prohibition not only in name but practically.

27167. Do you believe that prohibition, if carried, could be enforced so that people would not get liquor?—No, I do not think so; I have had no experience in any prohibition town.

27168. But taking the mass of the people?—I do not think it could be enforced.

27169. If it could not be enforced, would you think this licensed system better?—Yes.

27170. You heard what Mr. Redmond said about the Government selling liquor?—Yes.

27171. We have evidence that in Norway the sale of liquor has been taken away from the kind of people who sell it in Canada, liquor is purchased by the municipality and steps are taken to see that it is perfectly pure liquor; the men who sell it are employed for the purpose and paid salaries. If they sell to drunken people or to minors, they are turned out. The profits go to the community at large and are used for parks, buildings, asylums and roads. What do you think of that system?—I rather like that system. You say it is in practice now?

27172. It is in practice in Norway. We have evidence that in Bergen with 50,000 people, there are only 10 of those places, and ales and light wines do not come under that regulation; also in Gothenburg in Sweden a similar system has prevailed for 25 years or more and is still in existence. Considering such a system which would make the public the vendor of liquor, only permitting the man paid a salary to sell it, with the liquors pure and thoroughly analysed and the profits going to the community, do you think that better than any scheme you have heard of yet?—Yes, better than no curtains.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

27173. There is no reason why this trade should not be handled by the Government and the profits go to the country?—None.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27174. There would be no occasion for those curtains and so on to prevent people seeing them?—No.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 22nd, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day, JUDGE McDONALD, presiding.

*Present :*

MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.

MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

ALEXANDER S. WALBRIDGE, of Mystic, parish of Saint Ignace de Stanbridge, County of Missisquoi, P.Q., on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

27175. What is your occupation or calling?—I am proprietor of the Mystic Iron Works. I am a maker of implements, tools and machinery.

27176. How many men do you employ?—I have generally from 10 to 15, the number runs all the way from 5 to 25. I cannot operate my shop with less than 5.

27177. How long have you been in business in that place?—I was brought up there. I have also worked in the United States and had charge of shops there. I have been a manufacturer for about 23 years; I have had charge of men about 40 years.

27178. What line of manufacture do you make?—Machinists' tools, boilers, engines, general machine work; I also make a few agricultural tools.

27179. Do you carry on your business by water power or steam?—By both.

27180. What is the population of the village where you live?—About 150 inhabitants. There are two churches and a school-house and a high school there.

27181. On what line of railway is it? Is it on the short line to St. John?—Yes. It is between Stanbridge and Farnham.

27182. Can you tell the Commissioners what law is in force in your municipality in regard to alcoholic liquors?—Prohibition.

27183. Of what kind?—Prohibition by our Council; we shut out licenses.

27184. Then your Council does not grant licenses?—No, nor does the parish of Saint Ignace de Stanbridge.

27185. How long has such been the law?—Ever since it was established—three or four years; but in the town of Stanbridge we had the Dunkin Act in force a long time.

27186. Is that still in force in your parish?—No.

27187. What became of it?—They wiped out the Dunkin Act by a small majority before they divided the township of Stanbridge.

27188. Have you voted on the Scott Act?—Yes.

27189. When?—Five or six years ago.

27190. With what result?—It was afterwards defeated by 25 majority; of course, the French voted against it.

27191. Are they generally opposed to that kind of law?—In that municipality they are.

27192. We have had evidence in Richmond that the Dunkin Act was well observed?—Yes.

27193. You say the Dunkin Act was repealed?—Yes.

27194. The Scott Act then was tried and repealed?—Yes.

27195. And the parish in which you reside is under the prohibitory clauses of the Quebec License Act now, and no licenses are granted?—Yes.

27196. Are the members of your Council elected as temperance men?—Yes, and they refuse to grant any certificates.

27197. How long has that been the case?—I think four or five years.

27198. How have you found the system work?—In a first-class manner.

27199. Had you any licensed public houses before that?—We had, but that was some time ago.

27200. How long before?—When Stanbridge was all together.

27201. How long is it since you had any licensed houses in that part of the country?—Right in that portion of the country it must be ten years ago since there were any licenses.

27202. How long since a licensed house has existed within the little village of one hundred and fifty inhabitants in which you live?—I think ten or fifteen years.

27203. Have you any house of entertainment for travellers?—Yes.

27204. How many houses have you?—Only one in Mystic village.

27205. Is it well kept?—Yes.

27206. What does the house charge per day?—The charge is twenty-five cents a meal.

27207. I suppose some charge is made for a room?—If you stay over night I think twenty cents is charged.

27208. Then the rate is about a dollar a day?—Yes.

27209. Can you obtain good meals at that house for travellers?—Yes.

27210. Does the man do any other business?—He keeps a boarding-house. This is what you might call a boarding-house, because he has no license.

27211. He has some rooms, I suppose, that he can let to travellers?—Yes.

27212. How many rooms has he for the use of travellers?—I think he has furnished eighteen rooms.

27213. How many boarders has he?—He will have from one to five.

27214. Is he mainly dependent on the travelling public?—On travellers and boarders together. The railway men stop there a good deal, and, of course, he obtains some transient travellers.

27215. Is he himself a teetotaler?—The keeper of the house is a widow. It was kept by a man, but she bought him out.

27216. How long is it since the man sold it to her?—Six or seven years ago.

27217. Was he a total abstainer?—Yes, and a very close one.

27218. Do you believe it is a good temperance house?—Yes.

27219. Do you think any intoxicating liquor is sold in the village?—No, none in the municipality. I offered five dollars if a glass of liquor could be bought in the municipality.

27220. To whom did you make that offer?—I made the offer in the *Witness* office to-day.

27221. How far would a person have to go in order to obtain liquor?—They would have to go to Bedford.

27222. Have you made such an offer elsewhere?—I have made the offer in my own village, that I would give five dollars to any one who would point out where liquor could be bought.

27223. Do any people have liquor sent there for their own use?—Not much. I think the French people have the idea of keeping liquor for medicine, but not for use or sale.

27224. Then the English people do not use it to any extent?—No. We have one or two men who, when they want a spree, go to the next municipality to get liquor.

27225. What is that municipality?—Bedford.

27226. How far is it?—Twenty-two miles.

27227. Then have they to go twenty-two miles in order to get it?—There are four licensed places in Farnham, the next station.

27228. How large is Farnham?—It is a town of five or six thousand inhabitants; it is nine miles away.

27229. I suppose the people in your section sometimes go to Bedford?—Yes, and one or two of them sometimes go to Farnham by train, and have a spree. My moulders are the worst class of people I have to deal with.

27230. Why is it? Is it because there is anything in the employment of a moulder, exposure to great heat or heavy work, that causes him to drink?—I do not think so. I had one moulder who told me, and he was a temperance man, and I have three total abstainers among the moulders, that when he was moulding during a hot day in July,

ALEXANDER S. WALBRIDGE.

he was in the habit of going and taking a drink. I call him a temperance man, and I never knew him to drink at a bar or outside.

27231. Do you mean he was a total abstainer?—Yes, he was a man who did not take it, I supposed.

27232. Was he intemperate?—I call him a temperance man; I never saw him drink at a bar. Moulding is very hard work on hot days, and this man said he would go and take a glass of brandy on such a day. I call him a total abstainer; he takes it as a medicine.

27233. Have you any other men who take it in moderation?—You will find such machinists come along once in a while; but I do not keep them.

27234. Will you not keep any man who takes alcohol at all?—No. We discharge them and let them go.

27235. Do you discharge them unless they are total abstainers?—Yes, or if they drink so as to interfere with work.

27236. If a man is not a total abstainer, do you always dismiss him?—No.

27237. Do you unless you are hard pressed?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27238. Are all your men total abstainers?—No. I have one who is not a total abstainer. The moulder to whom I refer, during one and a half years, I only saw him once under the influence of liquor.

27239. Why do you keep him?—Because I cannot fill his place. If I could fill his place I would let him go.

27240. How long was it since he was under the influence of liquor?—Perhaps three months ago.

27241. In the course of a year and a half, you have seen this man once, you say, under the influence of liquor?—Yes, he has been with me nearly two years. His wife had a child—he is a Frenchman—and in consequence of that event perhaps he took too much. I knew he was under the influence of liquor.

27242. Then you say that he has been in your employment during two years and that during all that time, except one occasion, when his wife had a child, he was not under the influence of liquor, and yet you say you would discharge him and engage another man?—I would have discharged him then if I could have filled his place.

27243. Would you discharge him now?—As he has not drunk any since then, I desire to give him another trial.

27244. Have you any other men in your employ, except those two, who take liquor? Not at present.

27245. Have you had any?—Yes.

27246. Are all your men, except these two, total abstainers?—Yes.

27247. How many are they at the present time?—The number varies from eight to nine men.

27248. And two of them are not total abstainers?—One of them, the man who took liquor after moulding, is not in my employment now.

27249. How do the other men get along with the moulding without the use of liquor?—They get along all right.

27250. If you had two men applying to you for work, both equally good, one man a total abstainer and the other man one who took liquor, which would you prefer to employ?—I would take the total abstainer as being the more valuable man.

27251. If two men offered themselves to you, one a better workman than the other but not a total abstainer, which would you take?—It would depend a little on the work. If the drinking man could do more work and better work than the other, of course that would make a difference. But if the total abstainer could do the work, I would take him. Sometimes I find a first-class man can do work that another man cannot, and I am obliged to take him.

27252. Then you find one man, sometimes, a much better workman than another, and on that account you are obliged to employ him?—I would, as a rule employ a total abstainer by all means, as I consider he is the more valuable man. I remember losing twenty-five dollars on a casting on account of a man who drank.

27253. When was that?—It was nine or ten years ago.

27254. Was moulding going on at the time?—Yes, we were moulding. Something went wrong, and I let him go.

27255. You sent him away?—Yes, we lost twenty-five dollars on the casting.

27256. How does your municipality compare with Bedford?—In Bedford they have one man in jail for murder.

27257. And at Stanbridge, how is it?—We have had one. Twelve or fifteen years ago, in our village a man was arrested for a similar crime, he having committed murder, while under the influence of drink.

27258. You say he committed murder while he was drunk?—Yes. I say he committed the murder, but he was not held for trial.

27259. Have you at any time yourself, apart from the twenty-five dollar instance which you have mentioned, suffered loss owing to men in your employ having drinking habits?—Yes. I had a moulder who came to my place seeking employment. He was a splendid man. I was afraid of him, however, on account of his drinking habits. I talked to him, and I gave him one dollar and twenty-five cents a day, which is very low wages. I said to him that he had to stop drinking. He was a splendid moulder, and there was nothing in the country to beat him. He was in debt four hundred dollars. He had lost his house and place at Bedford entirely through drink. He had quite a family, but he must have his spirits. He reformed generally. So long as he was in my sight there was no trouble; but when he was not in my sight it was difficult for him to resist temptation, and there was always danger of going astray. When he did get drunk, however, he took care not to burn up the house, but he dropped asleep. He paid up the four hundred dollars and he got his place back again, for I told him when he worked it out, he could have it. He did work it out. Then he also had twenty-five acres of land, half of which was paid for, and he had five cows and a yoke of oxen all out of debt. He had a brother who came down to see him, and he was a drinking man and of course my man got on the spree. He came up to my house when under the influence of liquor, and I gave him notice to quit; I said, go. I could not keep track of him any longer. He was with me eight years. He went to Drummond and was there two and a half years, and he buried his wife, and he is now in the United States.

27260. How long ago was that?—Fifteen years ago, since he came into my employment. He was there 8 or 9 years.

27261. Have you any suggestions to make to this Commission as to how the prohibitory law in your municipality can be made more workable?—It works first-rately there now.

27262. Do you know anything that would make it more workable?—Yes. If you had prohibition outside.

27263. I mean as to the machinery of the law?—The only thing that destroys its effect is the fact that we are surrounded with liquor which soaks into the municipality as a sponge.

27264. Then, so far as your own municipality is concerned, you find the law complete in itself?—Yes.

27265. Then you do not need any better law than the present law?—Not for that class of people.

27266. What are you going to do with respect to the other classes?—Stop the manufacture and sale in the country.

27267. Then your idea is to stop the importation, manufacture and sale of liquor in Canada for beverage purposes?—Yes, just as you stop the manufacture and sale of counterfeit money. We have had counterfeit money manufactured in this country in large quantities, but they have prohibited it and carried out the law.

27268. Have you seen the men?—I saw one man in handcuffs who was in charge of the police.

27269. Were they people who were in the habit of getting drunk?—I was not sufficiently acquainted; I saw them with handcuffs on in charge of the officers. I melted up their machinery.

ALEXANDER S. WALBRIDGE.

27270. Then you made good use of the metal?—Yes. The officers of the law have prohibited the manufacture and sale of counterfeit money.

27271. You favour the prohibition of the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors?—Yes. I think the people who are now in the habit of drinking will not be altogether prevented from obtaining liquor, but it will materially help the young generation. Its beneficial effects will be felt gradually; of course it will not be carried out all at once.

27272. If you pass a prohibitory law, how are the people going to get liquor after that?—Of course we are near the boundary line, and people can easily drop over to the other side.

27273. In what State?—In Vermont and New York.

27274. You think people would go over there and get liquor?—They have a prohibitory law in Vermont. I know some of our people go over there in considerable numbers; it is surrounded with a liquor selling country, and the liquor soaks in like a sponge.

27275. Can you get liquor in Vermont?—Yes; but respectable people hate to crawl down into a black hole to get it. A man who has any self respect in him will not do this; you cannot buy it there as you can in Bedford.

27276. Then you think the principal effect of a prohibitory law would be, that while the people who now use liquor would get it in some such way as you have described, the rising generation would not use it?—Yes, if the United States and Canada adopted prohibition, we could keep out liquor.

27277. You would hope then for a complete enforcement of a prohibitory law?—I think the feeling in favour of prohibition is growing in the United States.

27278. Have any efforts been made to bring public opinion so as to make prohibition easy and complete?—No, except by adopting the Scott Act.

27279. I understand it was tried and repealed?—It was tried in our county, and it was defeated by 25 votes. Had the Bishop been on our side, there would have been no trouble at all.

27280. How many votes were polled?—I cannot tell you exactly.

27281. Were 2,000 votes polled?—I could not say.

27282. Suppose 2,300 votes were polled, which I understand was the number, and the Act was adopted by 25 majority, would you expect to be able to enforce a law with such a strong sentiment among a certain section of the people against you?—Of course, it would be more difficult to enforce a law than if there was a large majority in its favour. At the same time under the old Dunkin Act we commenced in that way, and we carried it out for a number of years.

27283. Is the licensing of the hotels at Bedford a sin?—It is the cause of sin.

27284. We have had some witnesses before this Commission who have held that the licensing of the trade is itself a sin as a matter of principle?—There is no harm in keeping liquor, but it should be kept in the drug stores as is any other medicine.

27285. If you had to choose between a license law and free sale or selling as you please, which would you have?—It is a pretty hard question to answer. I have expressed an opinion like this: if there was free sale of liquor, it would bring about such a terrible state of things that it would bring about the adoption of prohibition at an earlier date.

27286. Then it would not be for the common good to have free trade in liquor?—I do not know what the effect of it would be. In my opinion, free liquor would make outrageous work, so that the people who are luke-warm now, would adopt prohibition quickly.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27287. Then you think free liquor would help on prohibition?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

27288. How many votes were cast at the last Dominion election in your county?—I cannot remember.



27289. What proportion of the average vote was polled, if 2,300 votes were given for and against the Scott Act, when the Act was submitted?—I could not tell you.

27290. You say that local option under the license law works very well?—First rate.

27291. The people are in favour of prohibition and their views are reflected by the members of Council who are elected by the County, and who refuse to grant certificates for license?—Yes. In that municipality there are a great number of farmers, and that may be the reason for their action; they are in favour of having no liquor.

27292. How far away is a liquor dealer?—Two miles.

27293. Are there any other villages in the neighbourhood other than those of which you have spoken?—Yes, there is Notre-Dame de Stanbridge.

27294. Is liquor sold there?—Yes.

27295. Are there liquor shops all round you?—Yes, except on the east you have to go some distance, as it is a wild country.

27296. The people in your own municipality, I understand, have the right to keep out liquor?—If they wished to have liquor it could be had close at hand. We have, however, very few drinking men in our municipality; in fact, I do not know of more than one drunkard in it.

27297. The people of your parish have voted that liquor shall not be sold legally, and that they will not grant certificates?—Yes.

27298. And you say the system has worked well?—Yes.

27299. Is there any reason why the people of other municipalities should not adopt the same system?—No, nothing at the present time, if the people are ripe for it; but in the village we find there is a different class of people.

27300. Do you know anything about the operation of the law in Vermont?—I am somewhat acquainted with Vermont. You can get liquor over there.

27301. Is Vermont under a prohibitory law?—It is prohibition I think. You can get liquor, but respectable people do not like to go into those dark holes to get it. Liquor is not kept in sight.

27302. Do you believe in making the trade disreputable by delegalizing it, by taking away the sanction of law from it and making it illegal?—A few might be opposed to it.

27303. Are you in favour of making the trade disreputable by taking away the sanction of the law to it?—It is a pretty hard question to answer. I do not wish to answer it, for I have not fully settled the answer in my own mind.

27304. I understand that you are in favour of a general prohibitory law?—Yes, because we have tried prohibition, and there is nothing to prevent its being carried out. We have tried it, of course, on a small scale, and it has worked well.

27305. Does it work well in your township and parish?—I think the principal reason why it works well there is that the people are largely of the farming class.

27306. Do you think a law, if the people opposed it, would work well, or that it would work well even if the people in the parish adjoining were opposed to it?—Yes, I should think so.

27307. Notwithstanding the fact that the people are opposed to it, or a large portion of them?—If we judge this matter by experience, I do not see why such should not be the case. We have a prohibitory law in regard to many other matters, and it works well, and there is nothing to prevent a prohibitory law in regard to liquor working well.

27308. You say that local option has worked well in your case. Is that because the people are in favour of it?—The majority of the people are in favour of it.

27309. And yet you are of the opinion that the law would work well notwithstanding the fact that the people were opposed to it?—A few might be opposed to it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27310. Does the fact that the law works well prove the people to be in favour of it?—When we first commenced, I must say there was a strong moral influence favour-

ALEXANDER S. WALBRIDGE.

ing prohibition. When we tried prohibition in 1864, which was the first time we undertook to do it, we carried it by going around and lecturing throughout the country, and urging temperance principles. We did not succeed very well the first year or so, and it was a constant fight. The moral effect was good, but legally, we did not succeed very well. It was a new thing, and some of the people were prejudiced against it.

27311. Do you find that now while you succeed in enforcing the law, the successful enforcement has any effect upon the people in proving to them that prohibition is a good thing?—Yes. I think the moral effect is very beneficial in that way. The people who oppose it are, as a rule, old drunkards.

27312. From your knowledge and observation of the working of a license law years ago, and your observation of the working of a prohibition law now, do you believe the condition of the community is generally improved under prohibition?—I am satisfied of it. There can be no doubt about it.

27313. And you believe it is possible to successfully enforce local prohibition?—Yes; but I would take the whole Dominion too.

27314. You believe a general prohibitory law would be as easily enforced as local prohibition?—Local prohibition would work better in some cases than in others, depending on the class of people in the district. I do not think you could carry out the law over the whole Dominion when you first commenced to enforce it, any more than you could any other prohibitory law. The officers of the law were not able to stop counterfeiting at one time, but they gradually got the upper hand.

27315. Do you believe it would be well to have a prohibitory law for the whole Dominion?—Yes.

27316. And do you believe it would work its own way?—It would not be perfectly carried out at first, but in time it would be.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27317. The state of facts in regard to your locality, I understand, to be this, that by going two miles people can get liquor?—Yes, any amount.

27318. Would you, if you had a prohibitory law put in force, seek not only to prohibit the manufacture and sale for beverage purposes, but also to prevent people bringing it into the country?—Pedlars would bring it in.

27319. Do you wish a law to be enacted that would prevent them being able to bring it into the country?—I do not think you could make a law to prevent them bringing it in. They would smuggle it in over the frontier.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27320. Do you think smuggling would prevail under prohibition?—Yes. The people living near the frontier, especially drinking men, would smuggle it in in small quantities for their own use.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27321. Under the Scott Act and the Maine liquor law people are allowed to purchase liquor and bring it in for their own use in their own houses. Would you make that illegal?—Yes, I would. I would not allow it to be sold except in drug stores, the same as any other medicine. It is, of course, a question as to what you would do with regard to the French people, who look upon it and use it as a medicine. I would not propose to oppose them in their opinion.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27322. Supposing these people thought it medicine and that it did them good, would you prohibit the use of it?—Not if they wanted it for medicine only. The first business of my life was selling whisky in the country. That was in Mystic Village. Yet I never drank liquor more than I might take a glass of brandy for summer complaint, when I could get nothing else. If it is necessary that you have alcoholic liquor at all, it should be kept in the drug stores and sold there, and it is not necessary to have it in private houses.

HUBERT R. IVES, of Montreal, manufacturer, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

27323. In what particular line of manufacturing are you engaged?—I am engaged in iron manufacturing.

27324. How long have you resided in Montreal?—Since 1859, during a period of 35 years.

27325. Have you been in the iron business all that time?—Yes.

27326. You are an employer of labour, I suppose?—Yes.

27327. How many men do you employ?—About 300.

27328. What particular line of manufactures do you turn out?—A portion of our trade is the foundry business—it is the larger portion.

27329. Do you employ many moulders?—Yes, quite a number.

27330. Take the first general question in connection with the liquor traffic: have you found in your business relations so far as your men are concerned, that you are injuriously affected by the liquor trade?—No doubt it has been so.

27331. Have you had men in your employment who have been addicted to drink?—Yes.

27332. The last witness told us he had been in the iron business as an employer, and that his moulders, or at least one of them, claimed that in moulding, owing to the heat, he needed liquor. Do you know anything as to whether that feeling is entertained by the men?—I do not think there is any necessity for anything of that kind.

27333. Do you find among your men that any particular class of workingmen use liquor more than others?—It has been my experience, as well as the experience of most manufacturers, that foundry labourers are addicted to intemperance or to the use of liquor; that is to say, that perhaps the larger percentage of intemperance is among that class, rather than among other classes of workingmen.

27334. In that class is there a larger percentage of intemperate men, or do the sober preponderate?—So far as my observation extends, I think the percentage of intemperate men among that particular class is a little larger than in the same number of other classes of men.

27335. Taking the men as a whole, is the larger portion intemperate or sober?—I think they are intemperate as a class.

27336. In your business have you found that owing to intemperance on the part of some of your men, other men have been kept back in their work? Is your work of the kind that one man's work depends on another man being in his place?—Yes. We have been inconvenienced and suffered more or less loss at various times from certain men being absent.

27337. Have you any rule as to the habits of the men whom you employ?—We intend to employ only sober men.

27338. You do not raise, however, the question of total abstinence?—No; as long as our men are sober men, that is the only condition we make.

27339. Are men in your employment of different nationalities?—All nationalities are well represented.

27340. Do you find any difference in the habits of Canadians as compared with people who come across the ocean?—No. I think, however, the Canadians are quite as temperate, sober and energetic as the others.

27341. Coming to the general question of the liquor traffic, have you noticed whether, during the years you have known Montreal, there has been any change in the social customs of the people in regard to the use of intoxicating liquors?—I have not noticed any increase.

27342. Have you noticed a change the other way, that there is less liquor used on social occasions than there was formerly?—I cannot say I have. I do not see very much change; that is, of course, my personal experience.

27343. Have you noticed any change on the trains or at the steamboat table in regard to the use of liquor?—I do not think there is very much difference in that respect.

HUBERT R. IVES.

27344. Have you paid much attention to the working of the license law in the city of Montreal? One witness before us has spoken as to the mode of obtaining licenses. It has been stated that a person applying for license cannot secure one unless he gets a petition signed by 25 persons in his polling subdivision, and if a license is to be refused him at the instance of the people, a majority of the ratepayers or voters must sign against the granting of it; and I may say that various suggestions in this respect have been made to the Commission. Now, I desire to ask you whether you have considered this question at all?—I think the law is a very fair one, if properly carried out. I think, however, there are too many places licensed, and that the number should be very much reduced.

27345. You think, then, there should be restrictions as regards number?—That depends very much on the character of those applying for licenses.

27346. Would you make any difference between residential and business portions of the city? We understand that very few licenses are granted in the residential part and that in one municipality, Côte St. Antoine, there are no licenses granted.—I think that question should be left to the polling district, and to the wishes of the people there.

27347. In regard to observing the law itself, our attention has been called to several matters. One is as regards the Sunday observance of the law, it being claimed by some witnesses that the law in that respect is not observed as it should be. Have you noticed whether such is the case?—It has not personally come under my notice that there has been any infraction of the law in that respect.

27348. What about the sale of liquor to minors? Have you had your attention called personally to that matter?—I am not personally aware of it, although I have seen cases where, no doubt, drink has been sold to minors.

27349. Another suggestion has been put forward, and that is, that the sale of liquor should be separated from the sale of groceries. It has been stated to the Commission that women will go to groceries and buy liquor who, of course, would not be willing to enter saloons. What do you think in regard to such a proposition?—I hold the opinion very strongly that no grocery should be licensed to sell liquor over the counter.

27350. It has been suggested by Detective Cullen that it would be well to separate the sale of liquor from billiard rooms and pool rooms?—It is quite possible it would be a benefit, although we do not do so now. I am not, however, prepared to give an opinion on that point. Of course, his opinion would be better than mine.

27351. Have you thought over the question as to the desirability of imposing a high license fee?—I think there should be a high license fee imposed in order to increase the respectability and standing of the men who make application for license.

27352. Another suggestion made is, that there is a great deal of adulteration practised in regard to liquors and that inspection is needed. It has been stated that impure liquors are sold and that harmful effects are produced thereby. What is your opinion on that point?—I should think there was adulteration in the direction of reducing the liquor with water, if you can call that adulteration. In my opinion, the strength of the spirits is reduced by the retailers.

27353. Suppose a law were to be passed to abolish the sale of liquor in saloons, restaurants, or to do away with the hotel bars; if either was to be wiped out, which would it be better to abolish?—I should think that in case of equal respectability there would be no difference.

27354. Then you do not pronounce any opinion on that subject?—I do not know that I could express an opinion as to the relative merits of them. I think, however, it is almost impossible to keep a hotel without a bar.

27355. Have you heard the evidence of witnesses as to whether there is much illicit selling in unlicensed places?—No, and I have no knowledge on that point.

27356. An opinion, I suppose, would be merely guesswork on your part?—Yes.

27357. Another question that has been brought before the Commission is as to the treatment of the persistent drunkard. We have such in all towns and cities. We find that there are men who get drunk and are sent to jail for a few days, and almost as soon as they leave jail get drunk again, and the same process is repeated. It has been suggested that such men should be restrained and placed in an inebriate asylum under certain restraints. What is your opinion as to the treatment of such persons?—There

is no doubt that in many cases that is the only way those persons can be restrained, for they have no self-restraint themselves.

27358. Have you considered the question of parks, such as Sohmer Park, which, as you are aware, is in this city?—I think anything that tends to provide legitimate amusement for the people is beneficial.

27359. Do you know whether men such as you employ find recreation and amusement there?—I think they do.

27360. What is your view as to the selling of liquor in such places. Do you think there should be sold there all classes of liquor, or that the sale should be confined to lager beer?—As a matter of opinion, I think sale at such places should be confined to light liquors, light wines and beers.

27361. Take the question generally as to the use of liquors. It has been suggested by some witnesses that if the laws were so framed as to restrict, so far as possible, the use of the heavier liquors and make more easy the use of light wines and beers, it would possibly tend to the advantage of the people. Have you considered that question?—I think it is a very difficult problem to settle.

27362. Have you had any experience in foreign countries?—I have frequently been abroad.

27363. Have you been in France?—Yes.

27364. Have you noticed the habits of the people there?—Yes. The first time I was in France was in 1856, and I may say that I travelled all through Europe at that time. The use of the light wines of the country and light beer seemed to be general, and they were even given to the children at the table. You might say in fact that they were used as generally as water and milk are used here. That was my observation at that time, and there was very little intemperance.

27365. It has been stated before the Commission that in certain sections of France there has been an increase in the use of the heavier liquors; and that wines, owing to the phylloxera having destroyed the grapes, have become more expensive than formerly. Have you any knowledge in regard to that matter?—I think that the classes of wine drunk during the time to which I refer, have become more expensive and probably more difficult to obtain, and that wine has been replaced by what is more or less objectionable.

27366. Have you been through Sweden and Norway?—I have not.

27367. We have had before the Commission evidence as to the system prevailing in Norway, by which the public take the sale of liquor into their own hands, or rather a syndicate take it, employing persons on salary. Under that system, after a certain percentage has been deducted, the surplus or profit arising from the trade is applied for public purposes and goes towards the cost of roads, public works and hospitals. And in the opinion of witnesses, the system has proved very satisfactory. Have you ever considered the advisability of adopting such a system?—I should think when the time comes that the Government assumes control of all railways and all public works, it will be time to consider this latter question.

27368. Have you considered the question of the enactment of a prohibitory law?—I think such a law would be impracticable.

27369. First, we will take the question of principle. As a matter of principle, what do you think of a prohibitory law?—I do not think I approve of it.

27370. For what reason?—There are many men who conscientiously use spirits and wines in various forms and who think they have a perfect right to do so, and they do so for their own benefit and pleasure. I do not think they should be absolutely prohibited from doing so.

27371. Then you say you do not think such a law to be practicable; do you mean it would be impossible to enforce it?—I think so.

27372. Connected with this question is another, namely: suppose a majority of Parliament or of the people enacted such a law, to put an end to the manufacture of liquors in this country, do you think the brewers and distillers should be remunerated for their loss of buildings and plant?—In my opinion, they should be.

27373. Are there any other matters you have considered in connection with this question, either as regards the license law or otherwise?—I do not think I have any

HUBERT R. IVES.

suggestions to offer. I am strongly in favour of confining the trade to respectable people.

27374. Then you favour licenses being only granted to respectable people, and the licenses being limited in number. Would you favour high licenses and thorough inspection?—Yes.

27375. Would you favour inspection being frequently made?—Yes, that would be my opinion.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27376. Do you think the license system, as it at present exists and is enforced, does control or in any way regulate the trade?—I think it does somewhat. I think, however, it has been abused. In my opinion, if it were properly enforced, it would be satisfactory. But the License Commissioners, I presume, are doing their best, for great pressure is brought to bear on them from various points and various sections of public opinion. It is difficult for them to properly carry out strictly what the law lays down.

27377. It has been given in evidence before this Commission that while 1,000 places are authorized to sell liquor in this city, there are all the way from 2,000 to 4,000 illicit places selling. It has also been given in evidence that of the 1,000 persons authorized to sell all the way from 25 to 50 and 75 per cent, the estimate varies, violate the provisions of their licenses. Do you think that a license law which is disregarded in that way regulates the trade?—That is not the fault of the law, but it is the fault of the execution of the law. The public are as much responsible as are the officers.

27378. Would you attribute part of that to the character of the trade?—I would attribute part of it to the character of the people carrying on the trade.

27379. Do you think the fault should be attributed to the character of the trade?—I do not think it would be fair to attribute it to that cause, under the present state of society. I do not think liquor dealers should be condemned as a class.

27380. Do you know of any other trade which is legalized that, to the same extent, seems to violate the law for its regulation?—Probably not.

27381. To what would you attribute that fact: to the laxity of the law, to the character of the men in the trade, or to the effect of the trade itself?—I think it due very much to public opinion, to the general laxity of the majority of the people.

27382. Do you know whether the license law in Montreal or elsewhere has been at any time better enforced than it is now?—I am not aware that it has been.

27383. It seems, then, that the license system does not very effectually regulate the trade, as there is a good deal of illicit selling and a good deal of violation of the provisions of the law by the licensee?—I do not see that the system is chargeable with that.

27384. Since the licensees have violated those provisions of the law, is it proper to continue the licensing system, which has seemed to be a failure?—Would it not be better to adopt some other method, some one of the half dozen other methods that may be suggested; or would you continue the license system?—I am decidedly in favour of the license system.

27385. But you would lessen the number of licenses and increase the amount of fees charged?—Yes.

27386. Do you think if the number of licenses were reduced, there would be a larger proportionate increase of illicit places?—I should think the proportion would increase, according to the statistics, which I was surprised to hear, for the number appears to be very large. On the principle of a high tariff increasing the smuggling, undoubtedly the illicit places would be increased, and it would require more attention on the part of the officers possibly to prevent those illicit places.

27387. If the officers seem, for some reason, whether it is due to the pressure brought to bear on them, political pressure or otherwise, to be unable as yet to enforce the license law as it exists, does it occur to you that it would be more difficult to enforce the law if the restrictions were more severe?—I have no particular suggestions to make on that matter, but it would occur to me that there should be a competent staff of men appointed for this purpose only. I think it is altogether too much to expect the ordinary

policeman, as he is going his rounds, to regulate a trade which is so difficult to regulate. In the first place, this matter is above him, and in the next place, it is a very great tax on him. It is altogether too much for a man in his position.

27388. Then you think there should be a special force employed for this purpose?—That is the only suggestion that occurs to me at this moment.

27389. I think you have said, as an employer of labour, that you have no doubt that the liquor trade does injuriously affect the workingmen?—There is no doubt but that it affects business, that is, that business is affected injuriously by intemperance.

27390. It involves a loss of work and a loss of time?—Our intention is to employ only sober men, but oftentimes, when there is a scarcity of skilled labour, we are obliged to take such labour as we can obtain. There are a floating number of men who are well known to all manufacturers, who are well known to be drunkards, and whether this number increases or not I cannot say; but there is, I repeat, a certain number of men floating about who are drunkards, and intemperance is probably confined to comparatively few.

27391. Do you find that every drinking man loses a percentage of his time every month or every quarter by reason of drinking?—Not the average drinking man; unless he is an intemperate man, we do not see any loss from his drinking.

27392. Have you observed whether the average drinking man eventually loses his wage-earning power in some degree?—If he is an intemperate man he certainly does; by losing time, he loses his ability to earn wages in the same way. However, many of those intemperate men are very skilful. And we are often obliged to employ them, knowing their defects, and that they may cause us trouble.

27393. Have you noticed whether the existence of saloons in the vicinity of your works affords too strong a temptation to your men?—I certainly think there are too many of those places.

27394. Then it would probably be better for the men if they were not so easily reached?—Yes, particularly by the grocery class.

27395. I think you said you would leave the question as to the issuing of licenses to the people in the district, as is done in the case of Côte St. Antoine. Would you leave the matter to the will of the people in every district?—I do not favour prohibition. I do not know that I would favour giving this power into the hands of the people in those districts, unless it was carried by a very large majority.

27396. Take Côte St. Antoine. Suppose the people by a majority decided that they were unwilling to have licenses granted there, I understand you to say that you would then allow no licenses to be issued?—Yes, if that decision were given by a large majority. If any district which proposes to free itself from that trade should say, by a large majority, that it was the sentiment of the community that there should be no licenses issued, that decision of the people should be respected.

27397. In any district?—Yes. It is not a course that I would approve of as a general measure.

27398. Speaking of drinking, you say you have not noticed that the drinking customs have changed or that there has been any diminution in the drink habit. Do you regard the drink trade as having any relation to, or responsibility for the drinking habits as they exist to-day?—That is a broad question. It becomes almost a moral or philosophical question. It is in fact too broad a question for me to express an opinion on.

27399. As a business man, have you observed whether the liquor business, as it at present exists, has any effect, whether beneficially or injuriously, on any business of the city or country at large?—I do not know that the effects can be charged directly to it.

27400. Neither effects one way nor the other?—It is very difficult to express an opinion on that point without having certain facts before me to specify the cases.

27401. You think you cannot answer that question in a general way?—I could scarcely do so.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27402. You speak of having visited Europe several times, and that when you first visited France you were impressed by the fact that the people used wines universally,  
HUBERT R. IVES.

used wines as our people use milk or water. Were the people a drinking class?—No. I saw no case of intemperance that I am aware of; no drunkenness.

27403. Then, the universal use of wine did not promote drunkenness?—So far as my observation at that time went, it did not.

27404. The license system in Montreal is not apparently as successful as in other cities in preventing the illicit trade. Have you had experience in other cities to enable you to form a comparison between the law as it is observed here and elsewhere?—I should like to qualify my last statement with respect to France. You did not ask any question with regard to my later visit. I think I saw on my later visit more intemperance in France. I am now speaking of France alone.

27405. When was your last visit made?—Three years ago.

27406. Then you say you noticed more intemperance among the people the last time you visited France than you did some years before?—I think the use of absinthe and spirits had increased somewhat.

27407. To what do you attribute the increased consumption of absinthe and spirits: was there a taste for stronger drink cultivated by the use of wines in the past years?—I should not think it could be that. I do not think the taste for spirits would be cultivated by the use of the light wines of the country and by the use of beer. I would not imply that, but would say simply, as a matter of fact, that I noticed a change as regards the use of strong drink.

27408. Has the partial failure of the grape crop by phylloxera had anything to do with the increased consumption of alcohol?—I am not aware that such is the case, except by reading that various new methods of making wine are now in vogue.

27409. The French people have been drinking wines for hundreds of years and have only quite recently increased their consumption of alcohol. The reason I ask you this question is to obtain your view of the cause which led to the increased consumption of alcohol?—I should say that my previous answer covered the point—that it was now more difficult to get that class of wine which the people got before, because it is too expensive and out of the reach of the common people.

27410. I understand that, in your opinion, there should be high license, so that respectable men, men of good character, might obtain license, and thus improve the character of those engaged in the trade. Am I correct in assuming that to be your view?—I think that would tend to do so.

27411. You believe that the trade should be made as respectable as possible, I suppose. Do you hold the view that making the trade disreputable would be advantageous?—I do not think so.

27412. I understand you to say that you would favour a reduction in the number of licenses issued. I believe there are about 900 legalized licensed places, 487 shops, 304 restaurants and 154 hotels. You would be in favour of making a substantial reduction in that number, I understand?—I would.

27413. Would you favour a rigid inspection of liquor, so that the liquor sold in all those places might be reasonably pure?—I think so.

27414. These are the recommendations, I understand, that you desire to make to the Commission?—Yes.

27415. And you are opposed to a prohibitory measure?—Yes.

27416. Will the total abstainer, in your judgment, lose less time than a man who drinks liquor in moderation? What has been your experience on that point?—I do not think that as regards the moderate drinker there would be any difference—I do not think so. There are comparatively few, I believe, who are total abstainers.

27417. You do not think that total abstainers lose less time than those who use drink in moderation?—I do not think there is any difference.



MOSES PARKER, of Montreal, iron founder, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

27418. How long have you resided in Montreal?—I have resided here almost all my life.

27419. How long have you been engaged in the iron foundry business here?—39 years on Saturday next.

27420. What line of the iron business do you carry on?—At present I run a foundry for myself. I formerly was employed by William Rodden and William Clendenning.

27421. What kind of work do you turn out?—General castings.

27422. How many men do you employ?—I employ 60 men at present.

27423. Are your works situated within the city limits?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27424. You have heard Mr. Ives's statement generally I believe. Do you agree with him that prohibition is impracticable?—Personally I am in favour of prohibition.

27425. Do you think it is practicable?—I believe it is. The liquor traffic is like many other things, harmful to the general community.

27426. Do you think a general prohibitory law, if enacted, could be fairly well enforced?—Perhaps not at first, but it could eventually be carried out, in my opinion.

27427. Would you favour the passage of such a law?—I would if the majority of the people favoured it; I would favour a prohibitory law.

27428. Do you believe it could be carried out if adopted by a bare majority?—By a large majority of course.

27429. Would you favour the passage of such a law if the majority of the people expressed themselves in favour of it?—Yes.

27430. Do you think it would be fairly well enforced after a time?—Yes.

27431. Do you think those engaged in the trade should be compensated for the loss sustained: I refer to brewers, distillers and wholesale dealers?—I do not think they should be. They entered into the business to make money. If the business does not succeed, they must bear the same loss as other tradesmen.

27432. If a law were made to prohibit the importation as well as the manufacture and sale, you see no reason why brewers and distillers should receive compensation?—I do not see why they should. They would not lose their property.

27433. As an employer of labour, do you agree with Mr. Ives or differ with him respecting the answer he made regarding the moderate use of liquor by workingmen generally?—I prefer answering separate questions.

27434. Do the men in your employment, who are total abstainers, lose less time than the men who drink in moderation?—I do not pretend to employ any men who are not temperate. When I want an extra man I take the best I can get.

27435. Do you ask men whom you employ whether they are total abstainers or not?—If I know a man has been a drinking man, I ask him if he has given up drinking.

27436. If you do not know it, do you ask him if he is a total abstainer?—No, but I prefer a total abstainer. He does not get drunk.

27437. What is a drinking man?—A man who drinks habitually.

27438. How many of your men are total abstainers?—I do not know.

27439. Do you know whether they use liquor in moderation?—I do not know.

27440. Are total abstainers better men generally than those who drink in moderation?—They work more regularly.

27441. Are they better workmen?—A poor workman who works regularly is more to be depended upon than a good workman who does not. I do not think the average run of mechanics are total abstainers.

27442. What percentage of your men lose time from the excessive use of liquor?—All my men are good men. They work on the average 6 days a week.

27443. That is about full time?—Pretty nearly full time. I select my men.

MOSES PARKER.

27444. You know the men?—Yes, in the iron line.

27445. Has drunkenness increased or decreased amongst your men?—Decreased, I am quite sure of it.

27446. To what do you attribute the decrease?—I attribute the decrease to a more intelligent looking at the effects of drinking generally. I think men are beginning to think more for themselves, as to what will improve their own position, and the position of their family, and that is one thing which is helping men to be more temperate than in former years.

27447. If there were fewer places for the sale of liquor in Montreal, would that be of advantage in promoting temperance, as less temptation would be offered?—I think it would; but if a man wishes to get liquor, he will get it whether there are few or many places.

27448. You heard what Mr. Robb stated about there being 930 odd licensed places where liquor is sold here. Do you favour a reduction of the number of these places, or would you give a man all facilities for procuring liquor if he is going to have it?—I would not relax any of the stringency now placed on the traffic. I would make it more difficult than now.

27449. How?—I would wipe out the groceries. I would allow no grocery to sell liquor. I think the standard of liquor sellers should be raised. They should be more respectable men, if liquor is to be sold.

27450. Would a higher license fee have that effect?—Possibly.

27451. Would there be a corresponding increase in the illicit sale, if there were a higher license fee and a smaller number of licensed sellers?—I do not think there would.

27452. It would be a substantial advantage to wipe out the grocery license?—I believe the grocery license is a great curse.

27453. Do you know anything at all, from its effects upon those who use it, of the character of the liquor sold in the groceries and lower class saloons and restaurants?—I have known really first class men go down year by year until they became drivelling idiots almost through excessive use of liquor.

27454. Would you favour the rigid inspection of liquor?—If it has to be sold it should be pure, and they should charge a large enough price to make it up.

27455. Would you favour taking over the sale of liquor by the State, and selling it at depots, putting the profit of the trade into the general coffers, or handing it to Municipalities and applying it to street construction, the relief of the poor, or similar purposes?—I could hardly answer that question. I do not think Governments generally make a success of business.

27456. In Norway and Sweden that system has produced great results?—I never heard of it till this morning.

27457. As an old resident of Montreal, what is your opinion of these parks, such as Sohmer Park and the others?—I have never been in Sohmer Park and do not know anything about it.

27458. Have you been able to come to the conclusion as to the benefits of these parks or the reverse?—The parks are all right, and amusements are all right, but I would not allow liquor of any description to be sold there.

27459. Would you favour giving people facilities to get there on Sunday?—I am not in favour of the parks being open on Sunday. There are plenty of open places round us in the country on Sunday without these places of questionable amusement.

27460. Would you favour giving facilities to get into the country on Sunday?—I think a man who works six days a week, if he wants to take his family to the country should have that privilege.

27461. Would you provide street cars and steam cars and steamboats?—The street cars are a sort of institution. I do not think they could be got rid of. I do not think that steamboats and railways should run, though there is no more harm in running them, but I do not think it is necessary for a man to travel very far to get fresh air around this city. He can walk up the mountain, or out to the country east or west. I am not in favour of Sunday work of any description.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27462. Have you noticed that drinking men lose a certain portion of their time by reason of drink ?—Undoubtedly.

27463. Are you able to give an estimate of the amount of time that the average drinking man loses : I do not mean a man who gets drunk as often as he can, but one who habitually takes his grog every day ?—Not only myself, but all employers of labour I think keep their steady hands all the time. When they are obliged to take any extra help, they take the best they can obtain, but when the rush is over, the man who loses time goes out ; so it is almost impossible to say how much time a man loses who may be working in the fall and out of work all the winter.

27464. So he does not get so many opportunities to work ?—No, when business is slack.

27465. He is the emergency man ?—Yes, if you like to put it that way.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27466. You do not know among your own men who totally abstain and who are moderate ?—I do not know as a matter of fact. I know there are one or two who are total abstainers, but most of them take a glass of beer occasionally.

27467. Do you mean by drinking men, men who drink to excess ?—I mean drinking men.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27468. You do not refer to those 45 men, though they are not total abstainers ?—No, they are not all total abstainers. I have from 45 to 60 men, and when I want 15 or 20 extra, I take the best I can get.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27469. Do you find that the habitual use of liquor in moderation tends to excess in men to any extent ?—I think all habits grow on a man, not only in the line of liquor, but in almost everything else you like to speak of.

27470. You think prohibition would be a benefit to workingmen and their families ?—I think it would.

27471. I have here a presentment of a Grand Jury, of which you were a member in 1889. The last clause says :—

“ We notice that the laws against Sunday selling and selling liquor in shops are being openly violated. The officials whose duty it is to enforce these laws are apparently unable or unwilling to do so. This condition of affairs calls for the attention of the proper authorities. The number of licenses is far too great, and we urge the License Commissioners to refuse to grant licenses where not required for the public.”

Do you know if anything came of that ?—I think not.

27472. That was the unanimous view of the Grand Jury at that time ?—Yes, though one or two were drinking men.

27473. You believe that the License law, as it exists and is operated, does not regulate the trade particularly ?—We have a License law, and I believe if it were carried out, truly and honestly, there would not be so much illicit or illegitimate drinking as there is.

27474. But judging by this presentment, it is not carried out very well ?—I am sure it is not.

27475. Have you knowledge of any license system which has regulated the trade ?—I know nothing except in Montreal.

27476. And you do not think the Montreal license system has done so ?—I do not think it has. I believe if the Government license the sale of this liquor when men become inebriated and drunkards, the Government ought to provide a hospital in which to take care of them.

MOSES PARKER.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27477. You mean the man who is in jail and out of it, who takes a turn between the saloon, the police court and the jail?—That man ought not to be sent to jail, but to a place provided by the Government, where he can be cured. I believe drunkenness is a disease like any bodily disease that grows on a man from year to year, and the more he drinks the worse he gets.

WILLIAM WALTER MOORE, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald :*

27478. What is your occupation or calling?—Proprietor and Manager of the Lyceum Theatre.

27479. How long have you lived in Montreal?—The last time, 12 years.

27480. How long have you been manager of the Lyceum Theatre?—About 2 years, but it existed before that, for 5 or 6 years, and I was then proprietor of it.

27481. In what part of the city is it?—The east end.

27482. On what street?—Corner of St. Catherine and St. Dominique streets.

27483. Is it a place where performances are held?—The usual performances, operas sometimes, burlesques sometimes. At present it is variety.

27484. Is any liquor sold in connection with it?—I have a beer and wine license, the only one in Canada.

27485. Is that under the law of the Province of Quebec?—That is beer and light wine. It does not include port or sherry or any strong wine.

27486. How long has that license been in existence?—Five months.

27487. At present are there any licensed places in the neighbourhood of the theatre?—Yes.

27488. Many?—Yes, I am right in the very heart of them. I can throw a stone into 10 windows at least.

27489. Hotels or restaurants?—Both. All the night restaurants of Montreal are in that immediate vicinity.

27490. Can you state whether the law which requires that they shall supply food as well as drink, is carried out?—In one only to my knowledge. They are all restaurants. There are no hotels.

27491. Does your license require you to provide food?—I suppose it does; it is called a restaurant license for the sale of beer and wine only. I have not attempted to sell food, and do not think I will.

27492. Have you any demand for it?—No, except for sandwiches.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27493. Do you supply that demand?—No.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27494. Are there many persons who take ale and wine at your place?—Yes; they cannot get anything else; there are very many.

27495. Is there any preference that you notice as to the tastes for ale or light wines?—Half would take spirit if they could get it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27496. But you do not sell spirit?—No.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27497. But do the larger number take wine or ale?—The larger number take wine. We only sell claret, or I have a right to sell native wine.

27498. Are the people mostly French or English?—Mostly English, though it is in a French quarter, but a number of French come.

27499. Are they mostly people who attend the entertainment in the theatre?—Yes, they cannot get into the bar unless they attend the theatre. I do not open the bar to the outside public. I keep out drunken fellows anyway. I have two of my own police there, and no one can get into the theatre if he is drunk, and he cannot get into the bar unless he goes there from the theatre.

27500. Many of these people, then, will drink either during the interim of the theatrical performance or afterwards?—They can get it at any time. There are five or six sections in this theatre, and there are two only in which you can get served. In those two sections you can sit and smoke and be served.

27501. How do you find that answer so far as the habits of the people are concerned? Do they keep within the limits of sobriety?—First-class. I had a year's experience without a license. I then gave pass checks, and it is only necessary for a man to stand at the door of the Academy of Music or the Queen's Theatre to see what is drunk between the acts. The Academy of Music and the Queen's, any night, will more than half empty themselves between the acts, and we all know where the people go; they go to the Oxford. They guzzle three or four drinks, one after the other, because they have only three or four minutes to do it in, and it is the same after the second and third acts as after the first.

27502. Are those hard liquors?—Yes, mostly spirits, and they take all they can in order to rush back to the theatre. The first year I had the same experience; I gave pass checks, and the people went out and got liquor, and I had a great deal of trouble. A man paid his money to come in, then got his pass check and went to the saloons. He came back and I could not refuse him, as he had been in that night. In the first year I had three or four cases of men who got out in that way and drank too much, and I refused to let them in again. Since I have had this license, I have not given any pass checks. You drink my stuff or you do not get any; and in the five months I have not had a single complaint, or found it necessary to turn out one man for drunkenness.

27503. Do females partake of refreshments in your theatre?—Not yet, but I wish they would. Montreal is a long way behind the times in amusements, and they have not got quite used to this kind of thing, and you have to educate them up to it. Sohmer Park has done a good deal towards that.

27504. There are two sections where liquor can be brought to the theatre and then there is the regular bar?—Yes, there is the bar; but no ladies sit in either of those two sections.

27505. You think the influence of this system is in favour of temperance?—Most undoubtedly.

27506. Do you know of any other place where this is carried out except in Montreal?—Yes.

27507. Where?—In New York.

27508. In Europe at all?—In England, yes, in all the Music Halls.

27509. Have you been at Sohmer Park?—Many times.

27510. What do you think of it and such like places, are they beneficial for the people?—Undoubtedly; no question about it.

27511. Would you have the sale of liquor there?—I would stop the sale of hard liquor. If the sale of hard liquor were offered to me I would not have it; I have had too much trouble with it.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27512. Do they sell hard liquor at the Parks?—On week days.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27513. Are you allowed to sell on Sunday?—No, nor any one else, except Weiss beer.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27514. On Sunday can you get Weiss beer?—Yes.

WILLIAM WALTER MOORE.

27515. That is an intoxicant?—I do not think you can get drunk on it. I am in favour of light wines and ales in places of amusement.

27516. It is stated that the encouragement of light wines and beers would encourage temperance?—I think it would. You give a man, married or single, a place to sit down and smoke—and I think smoking is much worse than drinking—and you give him a glass of beer every 10 or 15 minutes, or perhaps two or three in the course of the evening, and he will have to get out of my place at 12, and out of Sohmer at about 11. In Montreal, before Sohmer Park was established, there were many more saloons, and a young man would go there and drink in a bar the vilest stuff he could get, because there was only one place to go to, the Theatre Royal. He would go there one night a week, and there was only the saloon besides in which to pass the time. If you provide a place of amusement where the man can get a cigar and a glass of ale, it is much better.

27517. If you supplied public libraries and reading rooms would not that be better?—They would want the beer all the same.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27518. What about the parks being kept open on Sunday?—I should say, yes.

27519. Under the present regulations as to selling Weiss beer?—Yes.

27520. If they were closed, what would be the result?—The people would go back to the saloons and shebeens. It is certain that you do not close the saloons on Sunday.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27521. Do you mean that the law is not enforced?—It cannot be. It is no use asking the clergymen about that. I go round, and I know there is hardly a saloon that I cannot get into on Sunday.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27522. As to the law as now in force in Montreal: do you know anything of the mode of obtaining licenses in regard to getting signatures to the application?—Yes.

27523. Have you had any experience?—Yes. You have to obtain 25 signatures of voters in the polling district in which you are. In my case I got 51 out of less than 150, but it is necessary to get 25.

27524. Was any opposition made to your application?—None whatever.

27525. Did you obtain those signatures yourself?—They were obtained for me.

27526. Do you know the practical working of that regulation, whether it is troublesome or easy?—In my case it was quite easy. In the west end the people are controlled more or less by Churches and one thing and the other, and it is harder there.

27527. Is your section a residential or a business section?—Residential, purely so.

27528. Taking the license law as it is observed in Montreal, you have said that it is not well observed on Sunday?—No.

27529. Do you know whether there is much sale to minors?—I do not think so. Any decent place would refuse to sell to a boy.

27530. An opinion has been put forward as to the advisability of separating the sale of liquors from groceries?—Most undoubtedly.

27531. It is said that women go into those places and buy liquor who would not go into a saloon for the purpose?—To my mind the very curse of liquor in Montreal is the corner grocery. I have experienced some of the effects myself and have watched the effects outside, and I say the corner grocery is the curse of Montreal.

27532. Another point taken up by the Commission has been the influence of the hotel bar and the saloon bar, whether if either had to be done away with, it would be in the interest of the community and of temperance to abolish the hotel bar or the restaurant bar?—I cannot say anything about the interests of temperance. I do not see how you can do away with either very well. If you do away with either, it will not stop the sale of liquor, and the proof is the Sunday business.

27533. If one had to be done away with, by which would the general public be most inconvenienced, the closing of the hotel bar or the saloon bar?—There are lots of straight saloons where there is no restaurant at all.

27534. Take the saloon in its general acceptation?—By all means let the saloon stay. The restaurants have a right to run all night. I know at least 25 restaurants that run all night long. You ask for a sandwich and take a quarter of it, for which you pay 5 cents, and that gives you the right to call for what you want to drink. I think that is wrong.

27535. Take the place where nothing else but liquor is sold to be drunk on the premises, would you be in favour of abolishing that or the hotel bar?—I am in favour of a straight saloon. Separate the food from the saloon. At the same time you must have some places where you can get food and something to drink.

27536. Would you maintain the hotel bar?—Yes. The hotel bar is generally a straight saloon bar. You get nothing else in it but liquor, and on Sunday you have to make a pretense of being a guest, because otherwise they will not give you a drink.

27537. Do they sell on Sunday?—They all sell on Sunday.

27538. In their bars?—I do not know any hotel bar that is open now on Sunday. The Richelieu used to be and the Riendeau used to be, but they work another way now.

27539. Then as to separating licenses for liquor from places where billiards and pool are played?—If you do that, you close up the billiard halls.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27540. Then there are places of this kind which are only a blind for the sale of liquor?—Yes, they sell what they call “big cheese.”

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27541. What is that?—They have other names for it. The *Gazette* calls it “pig iron.” It is a mixture sold, and in Scott Act towns too, out of a pitcher on the counter, and it is rye whisky and ginger ale mixed.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27542. It is a pretty heavy dose?—No, it is pleasant and nice.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27543. Do I understand you to say that you believe if the sale of liquor were separated from places where billiards are played, the billiard rooms would have to close up?—I think a great many of them would.

27544. You think those who resort to billiard rooms as a general thing want liquor at the same time?—To some extent it would be a question of locality. Close to the theatre there was one place, which I am very glad to say is closed now, because it was the resort of boys. I went in there once or twice, and there were from 40 to 200 boys there; I did not see a man in the whole place. They take two or three drinks and get noisy. I should say close the places like that, by all means.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27545. But if they do not get noisy?—No boy has a right to drink in any case. But in the west end, where the people are better educated, I should say a billiard hall would be all right. Take the Windsor, where you can get a drink. If you drive the young men out of places like that, you drive them into places much worse. They must have places to visit in the evening.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27546. Do you mean that it is necessary there should be places where intoxicating liquor is sold?—No. I am not in favour of hard liquor at all; and I am not in favour of it in connection with places of amusement.

27547. Have you had any experience of high license?—Yes, in Boston.

27548. What was the effect?—It did not work. There were any number of she-beens. I was in Boston when there was high license and also when there was a prohibitory law, and neither worked.

WILLIAM WALTER MOORE.

27549. Was that total prohibition?—Yes, it was supposed to be, but it increased the number of shebeens.

27550. And the high license had the same effect?—Just the same.

27551. Would you favour free trade in liquor?—No; I would have a fair license, but I would choose the men to whom the licenses should be given.

27552. Do you know anything in reference to the adulteration of liquors in this city, whether there is adulteration of a harmful character?—There is no doubt in my mind that adulterated liquor is sold, because in some of the places there is the vilest stuff sold, vile enough to poison you. They all adulterate more or less, with the exception of a few saloons.

27553. We are told that the liquor in some places has such an effect upon men that it must be something of a poisonous compound as it produces a sort of immediate lunacy?—I think so. A few years ago I knew two or three places where they manufactured their own stuff, one place at the corner of St. Lambert's Hill and Craig Street. That man is dead now, and he ought to be. His name was Alphonse Lafortune.

27554. Do you know what compounds are used?—I do not. I know a friend of mine, a chemist, manufactured brandy and sold it.

27555. Would a thorough inspection of those places, frequently made, with an analysis of the liquor, be beneficial?—I certainly think so. So long as you sell the liquor, the Government ought to see it is sold pure.

27556. Is there much illicit sale in Montreal?—I do not think anything like as much as there was three or four years ago, especially in the east end.

27557. We have been told by the Revenue Officer that there are from 2,000 to 4,000 places in Montreal where liquor is sold illicitly?—The statement is absurd.

27558. Have you any knowledge to enable you to say so?—Yes. In the last 10 years I have always been wandering round, and I drink, though I would like to see the man who would say I am a drunkard, but I am inquisitive. Eight or nine years ago there were fifty different places where I could get a drink, and there are none of that kind now; and I say Sohmer Park has made that change.

27559. Has it led to the closing of those illicit places?—Yes. Young men can go there and spend 10 cents for an evening's amusement, and 10 cents more for two glasses of beer, and then go home.

27560. Have you considered the question of the treatment of the habitual drunkard, shutting him up in an asylum instead of allowing him to go in and out of jail all the time?—Yes; I would have an asylum, and close up the persistent drunkard, especially in the case of the married man.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27561. What would you do with his family?—What is he doing now? If he would leave them alone, it would be something, but as a rule he does not. I know one case of a persistent drunkard, who is unfortunately related to myself, and the poor unfortunate woman his wife will go out and work hard and earn a few dollars scrubbing or washing paint, and she will buy meat and bread for her five children. There is no doubt there is something wrong with the children; the eldest boy I think is all right, but there is something wrong with the other four, and I say it comes from the whisky. I have known repeatedly after she had got her meat and bread, that her husband would come and snatch the meat off the stove, and those children lying round at the time helpless. I should like to call the attention of the Society for the Protection of Children to such a case as that.

27562. Some people say you should shut up the liquor from the man, instead of the man from the liquor?—You cannot do that. What right have you to shut up the liquor from me? If you stop my glass of whisky, the next thing will be that you will stop my steak, because I like it, and then you will dictate to me what clothes I shall wear. I would say, close the man up, say for a month at a time.

27563. Would not the restrained desire lead him, when he came out, to greater excesses?—Granted. Close him up next time for three months.

27564. You are opposed to prohibition on the ground that it is an interference with your personal liberty?—Undoubtedly.



27565. Would it not be better to close up this drunkard for twelve months at the start?—Perhaps. Make the punishment fit the crime.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27566. Suppose the majority of your fellow citizens came to the conclusion that it would be better to shut up the liquor?—Then, I should want to leave the country.

27567. Have you been in any place, except Boston, where prohibition was in force?—I have been all over the world, except Australia.

27568. Do you know of prohibition in any part of Canada?—Yes, in Cornwall, Ontario. I got all the whisky I wanted; it was sold openly at the bar there.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

27569. When was this?—Five or six years ago.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27570. Were the bars open?—Open, running full blast. They were selling terrible stuff, out of wooden pails.

27571. In bar rooms?—Yes, in the American Hotel, in the very centre of the town. I think that day when they used the wooden pails, 1,500 people went from Montreal to see the lacrosse match. But I have been on business there, and I never had any difficulty to get liquor while the Scott Act was in force.

27572. Do you know anything of the system of licensing in England?—No. I know you can get liquor day or night, and all day Sundays, and there are certain hours when the door is wide open. I guess it is the same as here, that they close the door and close you inside.

27573. It was stated by one witness that there is a part of the world where a prohibitory law has been put in force, and that is in the Fiji Islands?—I have not been there. I do not mean that I have been in every small country or island.

27574. Have you been in Norway or Sweden?—Yes, I have been up the Baltic.

27575. Have you observed the working of the Gothenburg system?—No, but I know they sell very good gin there.

27576. Have you been at Bergen?—No. In the Cattegat it is mostly brandy that is drunk; they sell any amount of it, the children drink it.

27577. It has been stated that boys have been dressed up to look like men in order to buy liquor. Do you know anything about that?—Yes, five or six years ago the Law and Order League did that. You can find it from a judgment of Judge Dugas. The son of the Rev. Thomas Gale, of the Dominion Alliance, was engaged by the Law and Order League, with another named Harris or Harrison, and the two went into the different saloons and got drinks. They claimed they did not drink the liquor, but put it in a bottle and brought it out. There were two or three convictions at first, and then the Judge saw it was a fraud, because this young man named Gale certainly looked more than 21 years. This was when the Law and Order League were very virtuous.

27578. I asked you whether boys had been dressed up to look like men?—I do not think they dressed them up on purpose, but they looked more than that age.

27579. You do not know of any such case as dressing up?—I do not know of any cases except those two.

27580. You do not think there is any sale to minors going on to any extent?—No, I do not think so.

27581. You spoke of one place that was near your theatre where they sold to boys?—Yes.

27582. Why should there not be others?—I mean in saloons. I have seen boys frequently refused.

27583. You approve of forbidding the sale to boys?—Undoubtedly.

27584. It has been said that this plan is adopted: That boys go in and make out that they have been sent by their parents and are mere messengers, and so obtain liquor?—To carry it outside.

27585. It has been suggested that the law should be amended to provide that licensees shall neither sell nor deliver to minors?—I can give you another case which

WILLIAM WALTER MOORE.

will answer the question. In the case of these two young men, they went into a place at the corner of St. Dominique Street, and saw a boy about 14 years of age. I know the case, and was called as a witness, but did not testify. He came from Fogerty's boot and shoe store and was sent by his father for a can of beer. One of these two young men was present and laid the information, and this man was arrested. He is now in the insane asylum. Judge Dugas dismissed the case, because the boy was only a messenger.

27586. But are there many boys who get liquor who are not messengers, but represent themselves as such?—Of course most of this trade is in beer in the can. It is generally where the man has an apprentice and sends the boy between 12 and 1 o'clock for his beer.

27587. You do not favour a law which would prevent the delivery to minors?—I favour stopping the corner grocery.

27588. You would not have sale to minors, but would not impose the restriction of preventing licensees delivering to minors? You would not punish a dealer for delivering liquor to a boy who said he had been sent for it?—That is different to the corner grocery business, because in 99 cases out of a 100 the boy goes there for his mother. It is different in the vicinity of factories.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27589. You would not prevent a father sending for it?—No, under certain conditions, because he is at work, and it would be much better for him to have his glass of beer for dinner than to get it in the bar.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27590. Taking your own branch of business with the sale of beer and light wines, have you any suggestions to make to the Commission as to changes in the law, modifications or otherwise, or as to difficulties in the working of the system?—No, speaking of my own business I say every theatre should have a license for the sale of beer and wine, as I have. That would do more to stop the Oxford than anything else. I am not speaking against Mr. Curran; he and I are good friends, and the Oxford is run on good principles, and they comply with the law thoroughly; but if the places of amusement adopted the same style as I do, and had a license for the sale of beer and wine, it would stop the sale of a great deal of hard stuff.

27591. Do you think it would prevent drunkenness?—I do.

27592. Has that been the effect with you?—Undoubtedly. The proof is this: I employ 80 people. Last season I had more or less trouble. Either my performers or the ushers or the public would get drunk. An usher would sneak out and get vile whisky that had been concocted down in the cellar I guess, and come back drunk. Now no one goes out, because if he does he cannot get in again, and I have had no drunkenness in five months.

JAMES CROSSLEY, of Montreal, city editor of the *Montreal Gazette*, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

27593. How long have you lived in Montreal ?—Off and on for 20 years.

27594. Do you consider it your home ?—Yes.

27595. Have you travelled much through the country ?—Not much through Canada, but I have been in Woodstock, Hamilton, Toronto, and a good deal in the United States during the last six or seven years.

27596. Have you been in Europe ?—Yes ; I am an Englishman.

27597. Have you been in France ?—Yes.

27598. Have you been in Sweden and Norway ?—Yes ; I have been pretty well around the world. During four years I was a sailor.

27599. Commencing with our own country : have you been acquainted with the operation of the license law in Montreal as a citizen ?—Yes, as a citizen.

27600. Have you recently observed the mode in which licenses are obtained ?—Yes.

27601. From your knowledge of the working of this system, what opinion would you express in regard to it ?—I do not think it is satisfactory. I find that men of poor character easily obtain a license, while men keeping first-class saloons have great difficulty in obtaining a license.

27602. Do you consider the fact that the applicant has to obtain the signatures of 25 of the ratepayers in the neighbourhood, affords much of a safeguard ?—No, but that depends upon the size of the ward. It is of course very much more difficult to obtain that number in the East Ward than in larger wards like St. Antoine with 15,000 voters.

27603. What change would you recommend in the system ?—I should hardly like to say ; I have not gone deep enough into it to recommend a change.

27604. Then I understand that you see difficulties in regard to the system, but you have not settled in your mind as to any amendments that are desirable ?—Quite so.

27605. Did you hear the evidence of Detective Cullen ?—No.

27606. Do you know anything as to the observance of the license law ?—I think it is fairly well observed.

27607. Do you think the places are closed on Sunday ?—The law is fairly well observed. It is well observed by the better class of places. It is thoroughly observed by the best class of places, the one class to which any one of my tastes would go.

27608. How is it observed among the lower class of saloons ?—I think the law is broken a good deal, although not so much since Sohmer Park was established as it was before.

27609. What influence, in your opinion, has Sohmer Park and such places on the public ?—I think a good influence.

27610. Has that been your experience in Montreal ?—Yes. It has certainly reduced the arrests for drunkenness in that district.

27611. A great deal has been said that was simply an expression of opinion before the Commission ; I understand that is the result of your experience ?—Yes.

27612. Taking that view, do you think that such parks are a benefit to the public ?—I think so.

27613. Have you noticed the effect of the sale of liquors there ?—I have never seen drinking in any of the parks.

27614. They have a license, I understand ?—Yes. I have never seen a drunken man there yet.

27615. Have you been at Sohmer Park on Sunday ?—Yes, Sunday afternoons.

27616. Are there many people attending there on Sunday ?—Yes, there are very large crowds.

27617. Before Sohmer Park was established, where did the people go on Sunday ?—To the small groceries, and they would stay and drink in the back rooms on Sunday afternoon. Sohmer Park has been an outlet for that.

JAMES CROSSLEY.

27618. What kind of drink is sold there?—Lager beer, Weiss beer and ginger beer.

27619. Have you noticed any drunkenness as the result of these liquors?—No; you cannot get drunk on Weiss beer.

27620. I understood you to say in connection with the Sunday observance of the license law, that you think the effect of having such parks has been that the Sunday law is now better observed than it was formerly?—Yes.

27621. The people thus have a place to which they can resort and no longer go to the saloons on Sunday?—They do not go there.

27622. Have you noticed sale to minors at the licensed houses in this city?—I do not think there is much sale to minors. It is very difficult, however, to judge the exact age of a French-Canadian boy. Very often you find he is 20 or 25 years of age when he only looks 15 or 16.

27623. You think the licensed dealers are very careful not to sell to minors?—Yes.

27624. Did you hear evidence of witnesses to the effect that children are often sent by their parents at noon-day hour to get beer?—Yes. They will frequently send little girls for their beer, but it is only given to them when it is known that they come from their parents for it.

27625. It has been suggested that sometimes those children deceive the dealers and pretend that they have been sent when such is not the case, and it has been said it would be a wise provision if the law were amended so as to prevent sale or delivery to minors?—They make take a sip out of the beer can as they go home. The saloon-keeper has generally a pretty good idea of those to whom he sells liquor.

27626. Have you considered the sale of liquor in groceries, and what is your experience in that matter?—I am strongly in favour of the sale of liquor being confined to saloons alone, and kept out of groceries. My experience with the poor class is that they go to the groceries and stay in the back rooms during the day, even all day sometimes, but very seldom go to a saloon or restaurant.

27627. Granted that licenses should be removed either from saloon bars or hotel bars, from which would you take the license?—I do not know. There is as much drinking going on in your best hotel bars as in the saloons.

27628. You put them, then, on the same footing?—Yes.

27629. Granting equal respectability, you think no more harm is done by one than the other?—No, certainly not.

27630. Have you any knowledge of the working of high license laws?—No.

27631. You do not know what the effect of imposing high license would be?—My idea is that it would have the effect of causing the adulteration of liquors.

27632. And your view is that men having to pay a larger sum would take more money out of the trade by adulterating the liquor?—They would have to adulterate the liquor or raise the prices.

27633. Have you reason to believe that adulteration of liquors prevails to any considerable extent?—I do not think so; I think there is very little adulteration beyond the addition of water.

27634. We are told that there are places in the city where vile compounds are sold?—Perhaps so.

27635. This has been admitted by the last witness?—Yes.

27636. Have you ever seen the effects of such liquors on persons you have met?—They seem to have the effect of causing stupefied intoxication. That is produced by amyl alcohol and potato spirit.

27637. It has been stated before the Commission that some people after taking this compound become prostrated?—I once tried the effect of this particular form of alcohol on myself. I took ten drops in a little water and it brought on severe vomiting and headache and loss of power in the limbs.

27638. As regards this potato spirit, is it made from potatoes?—The Germans produce it almost exclusively.

27639. What name does it go by over there?—I cannot remember the German name; in English it is potato spirit, strictly speaking it is amyl alcohol.

27640. It has been stated by one witness that so-called brandy is shipped from Europe to Canada and sold at \$1.40 a case, or about 70 cents a gallon; the cost perhaps being about 30 cents a gallon. Can you speak as to that compound?—No, I never came upon a sample of as low a grade as that. Such brandy is made from white whisky and flavoured with cognac essence, and it is made by the compounders.

27641. That, I suppose, is not of the same character as other brandy?—No.

27642. Would it be possible for a person dealing on ordinary business lines to sell brandy at such prices as \$1.40 per dozen bottles?—They could not sell poor brandy for that price.

27643. Not if it was poor brandy?—Certainly not.

27644. In giving that opinion you take into account that there are boxes, straw, capsules, and labels to be provided, besides the spirit?—Yes. There is very little brandy however, that does come here.

27645. You have spoken of amyl alcohol, do you know anything about other liquors that are used?—Yes. The substances used by compounders are not, however, usually injurious.

27646. Do you know bead oil?—Yes. Half a tea spoonful to the bottle, well shaken up, will give it an oily appearance. There is nothing harmful in that, however.

27647. A man goes to an establishment to buy a bottle of brandy, and he is given a bottle containing white whisky, a little cognac essence, bead oil and water. Surely that is not brandy?—No.

27648. The question is whether some system should not be adopted so as to compel compounders and others to label the compounds and state distinctly what they are?—I think the trade mark law would do that. I know that respectable houses, when they find that their brands and liquors are being counterfeited, institute prosecutions.

27649. May not compounders and dealers put such compounds into old kegs and brand them anything they please?—Yes, or put the name of a bogus firm on the kegs so as to avoid prosecution.

27650. It has been stated before the Commission that some compounds sent over from Europe are made by houses that are engaged in legal trade and that they put on those goods the assumed name of firms, while they put their own name on the more expensive goods?—I think that is hardly likely, for good houses are too careful of their names.

27651. You think they would not use their own name for inferior goods?—Those inferior goods are sent out under some other name. I think they are not shipped by good houses.

27652. Do you recommend an inspection of liquors in order to detect adulteration?—The present system of detecting adulteration is very faulty in one respect—that there is no clause in the law by which you can compel witnesses to attend.

27653. It has also been stated that in the law there is no standard of strength?—We usually take the standard of the British Pharmacopœia.

27654. Would it be advantageous to the consumer if the inspections were more thoroughly carried out?—Certainly, the purer the liquor the better.

27655. Do you know anything as to the illicit sale of liquor in Montreal?—I do not think there is much.

27656. Do you believe that it is a mistake to say the number of illicit places runs from 2,000 to 4,000?—Yes. I would say the number was between 200 and 400, and those are in the very lowest parts of the city.

27657. I understand that a detective who had visited the city, discovered, I think, after going over the city, about 800 such places, and he reported the number to those who employed him?—It was Mr. Beard, who was here from New York. He was a professional whisky informer, and he was paid to get the number.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27658. Who employed him?—He was employed by the Citizens' League, I understand.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27659. Have you any knowledge of the system adopted in any other country for the treatment of persistent drunkards? It has been suggested that it might be advisable

JAMES CROSSLEY.

to confine them permanently or temporarily in some institution, instead of permitting them to go to the saloons and get drunk, then being arrested and sent to jail, and in a few days afterwards going over the round again?—Such a system would involve great expense, and we have already sufficiently heavy taxation.

27660. I understand that the Province of Quebec receives \$600,000 annually or more from the license fees?—Yes, and our taxes are growing every day.

27661. What can you suggest in regard to this matter, remembering that these people are being supported by the public already?—You can support them more cheaply in jail than anywhere else.

27662. But of course you are doing nothing there to cure them?—My own impression is that you cannot cure such men.

27663. Do you think they cannot be cured by medical treatment?—I am not a believer in it.

27664. You have spoken of having visited France?—Yes.

27665. Have you noticed the use of light wines by the people there?—Yes. No doubt they are temperate people, and you very rarely see a drunken man; although lately a great change has occurred, and they are taking more to hard liquors.

27666. Then the system has been suggested of discouraging the use of heavy liquors and encouraging the use of light wines alone. In your opinion would such a system be beneficial?—I do not think we will ever take to light wines. They are not suited to our climate.

27667. Why are they not suited to our climate?—They are too thin and sour for Canada. We want something to brace us.

27668. Do you mean that they are too thin and light for the tastes of the people?—Yes. Our people like beer, that stands by you.

27669. You spoke of having been at or lived at Woodstock, Ontario?—Yes.

27670. What law was in force when you lived there?—The Scott Act was in force.

27671. How did you find it work?—I considered it worked very well: drinking places were open all day till three o'clock in the morning, and all day Sunday.

27672. Were the places closed or open?—They were open, you could walk right in without the least trouble.

27673. Was there much drunkenness there?—The farmers got drunk on market days.

27674. Do you know the character of the liquor sold?—I never went into the farmers' houses. At that time there were over two hundred places on the main street in Woodstock where liquor was sold. My brother told me that; he is accountant in the Bank of Commerce there.

27675. What was your own observation?—There were a number of bars. I would not go into the farmers' houses, but always went into one or the other of the two hotels.

27676. Was the liquor pure?—Yes.

27677. Is the town under a license law now?—Yes.

27678. Were any persons committed to jail?—No. They were fined two or three times a year, which acted as a license fee.

27679. Did you visit any other county besides Oxford and the county town of Oxford?—Yes.

27680. Have you ever lived in a place where prohibition was in force?—I was six years in Portland.

27681. What was the result of your experience there?—The Maine law is hard on strangers, but for those who live there it is not difficult to get liquor.

27682. Is it good or bad liquor?—It depends on what you want. Some of it is good and some of it is bad.

27683. Is the price pretty high?—The charge is 15 cents a drink.

27684. Have you been in Boston?—Yes. That is under a license law.

27685. What is the quality of liquor and what is the price there?—The price varies in different towns, of course. At Worcester the price is 10 cents a drink.

27686. What is the law in Worcester?—One year it is under license and the next year it is under prohibition. It is under prohibition this year, next year it will be under license.

27687. How does that system work?—The people in the town are very evenly divided. The local questions in the town cause the pendulum to swing one way or the other.

27688. Have you any suggestions to make in regard to the adoption of any different methods with respect to dealing with the liquor traffic?—No. I am quite satisfied with the present system in Montreal, which I think is about as good as we can possibly have.

27689. But I understood you to say that you would add a number of restrictions?—I would close up some of the saloons, I would lower the number.

27690. I understand you would make the law more thorough as regards the selection of men to whom licenses should be granted?—Yes.

27691. Would you also raise the license fee?—That is a very high one already, I think.

27692. Another suggestion made by Mr. Cullen was to separate liquor from billiard and pool rooms?—I do not think that would have any good effect, because men playing, if they wanted a drink, would go to the nearest saloon and get it.

27693. Would not that cause them some trouble?—Yes, but they would take a little trouble to get it.

27694. Did you hear the evidence of Mr. Moore in regard to the system in force in his theatre?—I know his theatre.

27695. Do you know the system in vogue? He has license, I understand, to retail beer and wine, and allows them to be drunk on the premises. He has tables arranged in an apartment, and there people can obtain refreshments. No person, however, can go there unless he goes to the theatre, in this way only people can be served who go to the theatre.

27695a. How do you think that system works?—It seems to work very well. If you see a man drunk there, he is usually a man who has come in drunk. If such a man is there, they usually put him out at once. Mr. Moore keeps a very good and orderly theatre. I have never seen any disturbances or trouble there. Some men go there because they like to smoke and drink light beer and have some entertainment.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27696. Do I understand that you favour the sale of beer in the parks on Sunday?—Yes, lager beer and Weiss beer.

27697. Is not Weiss beer different from lager beer?—It has less body.

27698. I think it contains from two and one-half to three per cent of alcohol?—Yes, that is only one and one-half per cent less than ginger ale, which contains four per cent.

27699. What kind of ginger ale do you mean?—Ordinary ginger ale. The manufacturers are obliged to put in that quantity of alcohol in order to prevent it turning sour. You have to choose between alcohol and salicylic acid.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27700. What is the percentage in lager?—There are many kinds of lager, the strength runs up until, in German beers, like Brunswick, it is like that of ordinary ale.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27701. Take the ordinary Canadian lager, and what is its alcoholic strength?—It contains between five and six per cent.

27702. And how much does ginger beer contain?—Four per cent.

27703. Did you ever hear of a man getting intoxicated on ginger beer?—No.

27704. Have you heard of people getting intoxicated on lager beer?—I have never seen a man intoxicated on lager.

27705. Nor Weiss beer?—No.

27706. In your opinion a man could not get intoxicated on Weiss beer, unless his stomach was in an abnormal condition?—He will not get intoxicated on it.

27707. What kind of a theatre is that to which you made reference: is it an ordinary theatre, or is it a musical performance?—It is a popular theatre, a cheap theatre, something like Koster & Bialls in New York.

JAMES CROSSLEY.

27708. Is the theatre to which reference has been made a respectable class theatre?—I think so. It is a fair class theatre—it is quite as good as the Theatre Royal. The Theatre Royal gets the same class, working people.

27709. You are, of course, acquainted with printers. Do you consider they are a drinking class?—No, of course there are drinking men among them.

27710. Is the large proportion of the men drinking men?—No, about the same proportion as in other trades.

27711. Does their drinking habit affect them injuriously?—It sometimes keeps them away from their work.

27712. To any extent?—No. We very rarely have a man off; but every now and then a good man will go off. A case I may refer to is the case of a foreman of a city journal.

27713. Does his drinking interfere with the carrying on of his business?—Certainly.

27714. Have you found this to be true of the average printer who drinks, that he loses time and his absence interferes with the work of the establishment?—No, because printers are different from any other class—they can put on subs. No printer need work more than he likes, because there are always a number of subs hanging around the office, and when a man wants a night off he puts a sub on.

27715. What class of men are the subs?—They are often as good as the men at the cases. The difference is that one man has the case, and the other has not.

27716. Are any number of the subs waiting for vacancies to occur?—Yes; they will come to the office and get their names placed on the sub list.

27717. It is stated that printers who work on morning newspapers and have a lot of type setting to do, are more liable to resort to stimulants than other printers. Have you observed that?—They may resort to stimulants more, but there is less drunkenness. No doubt the fact that the men work late promotes drinking. The stimulants they take have the effect of building up the tissues, for as a rule, they drink beer.

27718. You think that beer builds up the tissues?—Beer undoubtedly does.

27719. Then beer is not an injurious liquor?—No, I look upon it as a healthy liquor.

27720. We have had it in evidence, from a man who pretends to know, that beer is really more brutal than whisky, and his belief is that it is the worse of the two?—I do not think so. The effects of intoxicants are almost entirely due to the temperament of the man, some will be peaceful and others quarrelsome, others stupefied. You cannot tell what will be the effect of alcohol on men, for its effect depends entirely on the temperament of the man.

27721. Then you think it is not a matter of drink but a matter of the man?—Yes, in my opinion.

27722. Have you observed the effect of the liquor sold in the Lyceum Theatre?—I have not taken any particular notice, except the fact that there have been fewer women there since.

27723. Is that the consequence of drink?—Undoubtedly.

27724. Why is it that women do not care to go where drinking is going on?—I cannot tell you. There is a kind of prejudice among Canadian women that does not exist among English women in that respect. There ladies of very good class go into public houses and places of that kind, but that is not the case here.

27725. Would it be an improvement to have that state of things existing in Canada?—I think so, because the presence of women has a certain effect in refining men. I think it is better that men should not be altogether alone.

27726. Do you think that as regards saloons of such character and the people who drink there, there is need of extra refining influences?—A man always needs refinement. He is always apt to get cross.

27727. Would you favour a prohibitory law?—No; because I consider it utterly impossible.

27728. You mean impracticable, I suppose?—Yes.

27729. As to the principle involved in a prohibitory law: do you object to that?—I do, because I think it is a dangerous principle to admit in any law. If you allow prohibitionists to stop the sale of liquor, what is to prevent the prohibitionists stopping the sale of meat, or even going so far as to stop the sale of other articles.



27730. Do you think these cases are analogous?—Yes.

27731. Do you think there would be danger in adopting such a principle?—I think it would be laying down a very dangerous principle.

27732. Then you would not favour prohibition in principle?—Certainly not.

27733. Do you think it would be interfering with the individual?—Yes, it would be interfering with human liberty.

27734. I think you have said you believe in a license law?—Certainly.

27735. As it exists now?—Yes.

27736. And you have expressed yourself as desiring that the number of licensed places should be decreased?—Yes, largely so.

27737. And you have expressed yourself in favour of imposing higher license fees?—No, the fee is sufficiently high now.

27738. But you would limit the number of places licensed?—Yes, in some districts there are far too many.

27739. Why are there far too many?—Because when there are so many in one district—and in some districts in the east end saloons are very close to each other—they must of course live, and as they can only do the trade of the district, they must lower the quality of the liquor sold. They are required to sell a glass of any liquor for five cents, and if their volume of trade is small, and it necessarily must be when it is so divided up, they must resort to some species of adulteration.

27740. Do you think it would be fair to a man now having a license to change the law by which he might be prevented from obtaining license?—I am a believer in the survival of the fittest.

27741. Would that be interfering with the rights of the citizen?—A license law of any kind is an interference.

27742. Does a license law embody the principle of prohibition?—No; it embodies the principle of temperance, not that of prohibition.

27743. For instance, it is provided that after 12 o'clock at night on Saturday and all day on Sunday a licensee shall close his saloon. Is that not interfering with his rights? Is not that the principle of prohibition?—No, because the same law provides that the tradesmen shall not open their shops on the Lord's day.

27744. At all events, that is prohibition within a certain limit?—Yes.

27745. Is that not interfering with his rights?—It is in the interest of the public, it is in the general interest and welfare of the public.

27746. Do you think that a prohibitory law would not be in the interest of the public at large?—I do not.

27747. Do you think the drink trade has any relation to the drink habit as they prevail?—I do not think so.

27748. In providing facilities for drinking, do you think that parks encourage the drinking habit?—No, a man who wants a drink will get it any way.

27749. Why does the law order saloons to be closed at 12 o'clock?—It is with the same object. If a man has the stuff in his house as a good many men have, he will never go to a saloon, and yet he will probably drink more liquor than many a man who goes there. The difference is that one man drinks at home and the other in the saloon.

27750. Then you think the liquor traffic is not injurious in the main to the community?—No, not when it is properly regulated.

27751. Is it properly regulated?—Nothing is perfect in this world.

27752. Is it fairly well regulated?—It is fairly well regulated in Montreal. The Montreal system is better than any other system I have seen.

27753. We have had it in evidence that a large number of licensees violate the provisions of the law, and that a large number of the people disregard the license law and sell illicitly day and night. We also have had it in evidence from men in position who are supposed to know, that they do not think there is a saloon in Montreal at which a man cannot get admittance on Sunday and get a drink?—I am afraid that gentleman was saying a little more than was true. I know a number of places, I could name forty or fifty within my own knowledge where you cannot get in after hours or on Sunday.

JAMES CROSSLEY.

27754. How many of these places that are licensed in Montreal would refuse admission to an old timer on the Sabbath or after 12 o'clock?—I cannot tell you.

27755. Do you think there are forty?—Yes, I think so.

27756. Is that a large percentage of the law keepers?—I think there are more than that number. There are a great number of saloon-keepers who keep Sunday as a holiday and go away.

27757. How many are there of the first class licensees?—There are only five saloons in this town into which I think of going to take a drink. The others I judge from the outside appearance.

27758. You have spoken about an inebriate asylum, and in answer to Judge McDonald, you have stated that it would be well to provide a place for such individuals where they could be kept until they were cured. At whose expense would such a place be supported?—I do not think it is fair to support those men at all.

27759. Then you would let them look out for themselves?—Yes.

27760. Would it not be well to stop making that kind of man?—Between you and me he is not nearly as bad as the quinine or chloral fiend.

27761. Are there as many of them as of rum fiends?—There are more of them.

27762. Do you think it would be well to prohibit the sale of chloral and quinine?—It is a very difficult matter to regulate. It is required for medicinal purposes if for no other.

27763. Then you think it is not safe to tamper with the chloral or quinine trade?—Certainly not.

27764. Do you think the authorities would be justified in placing as much protection about men in view of that danger as possible, even to prohibit the sale?—If you want to get a full account call H. R. Gray, acting president of the Montreal Chemists' Society. He knows more about that subject than any other man.

27765. You have said that there are more chloral and quinine fiends than intemperate men. I should like to ask if you think it would be wise to protect those people against their habits, to protect them against being controlled by their habits?—In that case the habit generally originates from the person having lived in a malaria district, where quinine has been absolutely required, or in the tropics where people get accustomed to take it. The people then use it to excess, and an intoxication of quinine far exceeds that of any alcoholic drink.

27766. Would it not be well to take precautions against that evil?—I know a man who worked in the *Herald* office and had become addicted to this habit, and he said that when he saw quinine he could not answer for himself.

27767. Should he not have the protection of the State?—You cannot protect him.

27768. Not by keeping quinine out of his way?—When the craze came on him he would have to take it.

27769. But would that have happened if he could not have got it?—You cannot stop the selling of quinine any more than you can that of alcohol. A man would simply go from one druggist to another and get minute doses at each store, thus obtaining a large quantity without arousing suspicion.

27770. Then, you do not believe in prohibition at all?—No.

27771. Not in prohibiting any of these things?—No, I believe in their regulation as much as possible.

27772. From your observation of the license law in Montreal and the license law in other places, do you believe such laws regulate the liquor trade?—Yes, undoubtedly.

27773. What is your idea of regulation?—My idea of regulation is the prevention of the liquor being sold in any places except those where it is licensed to be sold by law. There are infractions of the license law just as there are infractions of the law against stealing, and, of course, there always will be people who are breaking every law. But still I think it is the best method we can obtain.

27774. Is it a fact that there are not more illicit places in Montreal simply because everybody who asks for a license gets it?—No. Of course, every applicant has to obtain twenty-five signatures to his application.

27775. Is that difficult?—In some districts it is impossible.

27775a. Do you mean in the residential districts it is impossible?—Yes, such, for instance, as on St. Catherine Street.

27776. We have had the opinion expressed that all liquor stores should be established in residential parts of the city and kept out of the business and manufacturing districts?—I do not think so. That would encourage drinking at night.

27777. Is the business man better for drinking?—Yes.

27778. Is the merchant better?—Yes; I have drank for forty years, and it has never done me any harm.

27779. You have expressed your opinion as to the operation of the Scott Act in Woodstock, and you stated that bars were open day and night and on Sunday?—Yes.

27780. Is that your idea of the observance of the law?—I was at night work at the time, and, of course, I could not get a drink after twelve o'clock under the license system. I could get it, however, under the Scott Act.

27781. Do you know that Woodstock is now under a license law?—Yes, I was there a few weeks afterwards.

27782. Was there any difference as regards the town under a license system and under the Scott Act?—No, there were the same old places.

27783. You have expressed your opinion that you would close all the smaller licensed houses in the city. Why?—Because they do more harm, and in order to get trade they have to encourage men to stay there.

27784. Do you mean by that statement that they all do some harm?—Take the respectable saloon, to which I would go, which would not permit a man to get drunk there, but would put him out and refuse to give him liquor, it would not be as harmful as the small saloon.

27785. But it would sell until the customer got drunk?—There is no limit, of course. Some men would get drunk on a quantity which another man would take without showing any signs of liquor. It all depends on the temperament of the man.

27786. As a newspaper man, how long have you been in the business?—I have been 20 years in the business.

27787. As a newspaper man, going here and there among all classes of the people, observing the business affairs of the city and social condition of the lives of young men and old men, will you tell the Commission whether you have observed that the drinking habit, as it prevails, has an injurious effect upon society generally, both materially and morally?—That is a very broad question. All that I know is that there has been a marked improvement in the drinking habits of society ever since I have known it. There has been a rapid and steady improvement. Of course, that is a very broad question to answer.

27788. As a newspaper man have you observed that the drinking habit as it prevails has had an injurious effect on society materially and morally?—Personally I am in favour of a license system and of moderate drinking.

27789. From all your observations during all these years that you have been in your profession and from being in contact with all kinds of people necessarily, have you observed whether the drinking habit as it prevails has had any effect upon the social condition of society and upon the business of the community, injuriously or beneficially?—I should say neither beneficially nor injuriously.

27790. But you say there has been a great improvement in the drinking habits of the people?—Yes.

27791. They are drinking less, I suppose?—Much less.

27792. You think that is an improvement, I suppose?—It is a saving; drinking is a luxury.

27793. And this decrease is eventually a financial benefit?—To a certain extent.

27794. Then the trade is not flourishing as much as formerly?—The dealers sell more in the shape of temperance drinks; men will take lemonade, claret-punch, &c.

27795. Then the business is not flourishing as formerly if the people are drinking less?—I cannot say, but it appears that the wholesale men are not selling so much.

27796. Is this statement involved in your answer: that when the liquor trade was flourishing there was more drunkenness than there is now (which you admit is a better

state of things) and now that the liquor trade is less flourishing there is an improved condition?—I might say that there is not so much drinking this way, that there is not so much drinking of hard stuff. In old days men drank whisky all the time, but in Montreal there is now a strong reaction in favour of light and temperate drinks. Nine men out of ten take something milder than whisky.

27797. But these light drinks are not sold in the saloons?—Yes. I am speaking now of light drinks like lemonade, ginger-wine, &c.

27798. They are not to be classed with intoxicating liquors, I suppose?—People buy them at the bars.

27799. I am speaking of the sale of intoxicants?—Everything sold in a saloon comes to a certain extent within the form of an intoxicant.

27800. Milk-shake is scarcely an intoxicant, I suppose?—You do not get milk-shake in saloons; for that you go to a confectioner.

27801. You think, however, that the diminution of the drinking habit is a benefit?—Yes.

27802. If it continues to diminish, will it be a benefit to a larger degree?—I think we are good enough now.

27803. Then you would not have it diminished any more?—No, I am satisfied with the present condition of affairs.

GEORGE HAGUE, of Montreal, banker, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

27804. What position do you occupy in the business world?—I am General Manager of the Merchants Bank of Canada.

27805. I believe you were at one time General Manager of the Bank of Toronto?—I was.

27806. How long did you reside in Toronto?—About 20 years.

27807. And how long have you resided in Montreal?—About 16 years.

27808. Have you resided in any other part of Canada than Toronto and Montreal?—I have resided in Cobourg and Port Hope.

27809. Before residing at Toronto?—I was moved from Toronto to Cobourg, and I went back again. Before going to Toronto I lived in Port Hope, having lived for a short time previously in Montreal. I have lived in the four places I have named.

27810. And for the last 16 years you have resided in Montreal?—About 16 years.

27811. Will you please proceed with the statement, which I understand you have prepared.—In giving impressions respecting this intricate problem I desire to speak with certain diffidence; long observation having convinced me that it is one of the most difficult questions that can exercise the judgment of any person in this country and one on which he may find reason to change his views even more than once, as his sphere of reflection and observation are widened.

I should judge there has been a considerable change for the better in the social customs and habits of the people during the last twenty years, though in some sections and quarters the habit of drinking to excess would seem to be prevalent as ever. This is an opinion. As a matter of fact I have been at many dinners and banquets, both public and private, during the last fifteen years, at which wines were drunk, and only on one occasion have I seen thereat a person in a state of intoxication.

The influence of the church in this matter, I am bound to say, has long appeared to be far less than it might be. Of the very numerous sermons I have heard in various churches and countries for forty years back, I can hardly recall an instance in which drunkenness was especially referred to as a sin against God, which would entail the loss of the soul, which needed to be avoided, watched against, and if committed, to be repented of, like any other sin. And I have scarcely ever heard young men warned

against the temptations that beset them in this direction in their hours of leisure, in social circles, and especially when away from home. The temperance movement appears largely to have shifted its ground from the original position taken. I was well acquainted with it in England in its early days, and for many years took an active part in it. It originated with godly and Christian people, and was long kept on spiritual and moral lines. Specific efforts were made to reclaim drunkards, and I can recall instances where, to my own knowledge, this met with conspicuous success. For some time back, however, the efforts of the promoters of temperance have largely been directed to the channel of legislation, and all the machinery of politics (which is not always as pure as it might be) has been persistently employed by both men and women over wide areas of country, with a view to repression by force of law. The reclaiming of drunkards seems now to be largely left to the Salvation Army, which in its own way brings moral and spiritual forces to bear on individuals with marked success. I am inclined to think, but I will not be positive, that had temperance organizations kept to their original ground of bringing moral and spiritual forces to bear upon the question, the results would have been far greater than have been accomplished by the other method.

Experience has shown that license laws can be enforced, for public sentiment in all municipalities and countries will support them. My own impression is that licenses should be only granted on the requisition of a large number of ratepayers in a given area; that the license fees should be very much higher than they are, in fact, so high as to largely restrict the numbers; and that illicit selling in shebeens and candy shops, &c., should be rigorously put down. Public sentiment everywhere would support such measures. They are, therefore, perfectly practicable. The sale to minors becomes a difficulty when a minor approaches majority. When a young man is 20 years of age, it is very hard to say that he may not be 21; but the scandalous selling to boys, which is known sometimes in saloons, should be made a criminal offence. With regard to groceries selling liquor: there is, from what I have heard, a large amount of abuse developed in connection with it. I would apply the same rule of very high license fee and the consent of a majority of residents to them also.

With regard to the inspection, adulteration and illicit sale of liquors, I know very little personally. But there are various forms of drunkenness, and I am told that so-called bad liquor, especially of the spirituous type, is apt to develop a far more mischievous style of intoxication than the other.

With regard to putting drunkards under restraint, there are cases in which the persistent drunkard becomes as dangerous as a lunatic, and should be confined accordingly. In fact, when the habit reaches a certain stage it becomes a form of lunacy, or insanity, and might be treated in a place like Verdun hospital. But long before this stage is reached, I believe that the appliances of an inebriate asylum may be used most admirably for the reclamation of a drunkard. But in this case, I hold that a man's personal responsibility for drunkenness as a sin should be brought home to him, and be the foundation of the treatment, and that along with medical appliances the employment of moral and spiritual influences throughout should be an essential part of it. Experience has demonstrated these to be effectual.

With regard to Sohmer Park or such places: I have never been in Sohmer Park; but no one can question that recreation grounds with zoological or other exhibitions or appliances for athletic games may be very useful in a community. But all evidence would point to the conclusion that it is dangerous for intoxicating liquors to be sold in such places at all. The temptations to excessive drinking are always most prevalent in leisure hours and holiday times. It would be a very drastic measure of reform; but I believe, if men could be compelled (which they could not, and of course it would be absurd to try) to work from the hour of getting up to the hour of going to bed and never have holidays in any shape, that drunkenness would almost cease. But this remedy would be worse than the disease. I merely say this to illustrate my point, that leisure hours and times of recreation are the specific times of danger, in which young men and young women especially need to be on their guard. And here I think is where the counsel of pastors and the whole influence of the church should be brought to bear both in the way of instruction and warning. Many fall into danger, I believe, from not knowing that there is any danger to be guarded against. With regard to

GEORGE HAGUE.

doubtful liquors sold in places of recreation, such as lager beer, I think that the community should take the benefit of the doubt and err in that direction rather than the other. There is an abundance of temperance drinks that may be safely used in such places. As to Sundays, I have a high idea of the sanctity of this as a day of the Lord, in which a man, using Scriptural words, "should not find his own pleasure, nor do his own work." I would, therefore, not frequent such a place as Sohmer Park if open on Sunday; but I recognize that many people just as religious and conscientious as I suppose myself to be, have different ideas of the obligation of the day. And so the closing of such places by law becomes a question of pure expediency.

With regard to this, experience shows that Sunday, when used as a day of recreation and amusement, is just as dangerous a time as any other holiday. I well remember a statement made to me with regard to a person given to drinking habits with whom I had to do, that ordinarily during working days he could conduct himself properly, but that "Sundays and holidays were often too much for him." I firmly believe, therefore, that the religious keeping of Sunday throughout, simply as a matter of expediency, is the best rule for the community and all its members, young and old, male and female. Whatever reasons there may be for restrictions on the sale of liquors during week days, apply with greatly increased force to their sale on Sundays. The closing of saloons and hotel bars from 8 o'clock on Saturday evening till Monday morning, as is done in some places, is an admirable regulation for this very reason. This truly can be enforced with a large measure of success. With regard to the comparative danger of saloon bars and hotel bars, much depends on whether the latter are conspicuous. But generally, I think, that the temptation to incipient drinking is as great in the one as the other. A man needs to be on his guard in both, if he frequents them at all. The general use of light wines, and of undrugged beer, would undoubtedly prevent a large amount of drunkenness that prevails in the community. But foreign light wines are expensive, and some of those manufactured in Canada or the States are to some persons not wholesome from a dietetic point of view. I should be glad to see a similar state of things in Canada to that which prevails in France and Italy. Light wines in those countries are the common drink of the people. I should be glad if in Canada the consumption of spirituous liquors could be restricted to medicinal purposes and never used even in hours of recreation as a beverage. I have travelled in both France and Italy and have noticed that amongst the mass of population, and in the houses of common labourers, and I can speak by experience, light wine is used as the ordinary drink. It is a well known fact that in those countries drunkenness is not a prevailing evil as in Canada, and is almost unknown except in the large cities. In these the use of stronger liquors has begun to prevail during the last generation, with increased prevalence of drunkenness. I am not so well acquainted with Germany, but fancy that what has been said of France and Italy would apply to Germany, substituting beer for wine, excepting in the Rhine district, where the Rhine wines are the common drink of the people.

With regard to prohibition, it is, of course, understood that all license laws are to a certain extent prohibitive, and such prohibition can be enforced. But the experience of all communities in which total prohibition has been carried by the resolution of a small body of popular representatives shows that such a law will not be obeyed, except by those who abstain on principle, and would abstain no matter what the law was, and further, that the general enforcement of the law by fines, penalties, etc., is practically impossible. Experience seems to lead up to a conclusion something like this: That no prohibitory law will be obeyed or can be enforced in any given community, unless a very large majority of that community (almost the whole in fact) have agreed on other grounds to give up the use of intoxicating drinks. But then it is evident that in such a community no prohibitory law would be needed at all.

As a conclusion of the whole matter, I am driven to the conviction, as I said at the beginning, that it is a great pity and a diversion of energy into an illusory channel for temperance organizations and religious bodies to abandon the use of moral and spiritual forces which naturally belong to them and to descend into the troubled arena of political strife merely to secure the placing of resolutions and laws upon statute-books. I give this opinion with a certain diffidence, but it is founded on experience and observation. I have long thought it to be deplorable that ministers of religion should in so many

instances have ceased to testify against drunkenness as a sin, and should have so generally concentrated blame upon the material by which the sin is committed, as if not the sinner but mere material substances called wine or whisky, or alcohol, had a moral quality and could be arraigned for a moral offence. This unfortunate diversion of blame from the man to the liquor has, I venture to think, done untold mischief. There is all the more reason for the church and philanthropists to testify and warn against drunkenness from the fact that in so much of popular literature a glamour and a charm are thrown around it. Every reader of Dickens knows this to be the case, and even Scott is not free from the same remark. These are only samples of a great stream of literary influence that is constantly operating to make drunkenness appear only as a form of good humour and good fellowship of which nobody need be particularly ashamed, and the drunkard himself not a sinner against God and in danger of eternal perdition, but a jolly good fellow, whom everybody likes.

WILLIAM C. MUNDERLOH, general merchant and shipping agent, Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

27812. Do you hold any official position?—I am Consul for the German Empire.

27813. How long have you resided in Montreal?—35 years.

27814. Are you a native of Germany?—Yes, I was born in Augsburg.

27815. Did you come from Germany to Canada?—Yes, I came from Bremen.

27816. Then your life has been spent in Canada and Germany?—I am more of a Canadian now, because I am a subject of Her Majesty the Queen, although I am Consul for the German Empire.

27817. How long have you been Consul in Montreal?—Since Germany existed, 1871.

27818. With what shipping line are you connected?—With the Hansa line, with the Hamburg-American line—that is the Hansa branch line.

27819. Have you had any experience in the working of the liquor law in Montreal?—None whatever.

27820. Have you any knowledge as to the working of the parks here, such as Sohmer Park?—I am sorry to say I have not. I should like to go there, but I have not time; my time is too much occupied with other matters.

27821. Do you know if parks, similar to Sohmer Park, exist in Germany?—Yes, many of them.

27822. How do they work there?—Very well. All large cities like Bremen, Hamburg and Nuremberg have such parks, and they cannot do well without them.

27823. Are you aware whether such parks in Europe are authorized to sell liquor of any kind?—Not to my knowledge, but I have no doubt there is the sale of wine and beer.

27824. But not sale of heavier drinks, I suppose?—Not to my knowledge. I do not think they are prohibited; the people would not drink them.

27825. Have you, from your own experience, arrived at any opinion as to whether it is preferable to use spirituous liquors or light wines?—I think light wines are far preferable.

27826. I suppose they are much used in Germany?—Very much so. You drink wine at the table as you do water here. You are served with a bottle of wine at the hotel, and have to pay for it whether you drink it or not.

27827. What is the effect on the people?—It cheers them.

27828. Does it promote drunkenness?—I was in Germany during the celebration of the victory, and there was no drunkenness. They close their drinking places at 10 o'clock at night. I do not know whether it is the law or not, but the people retire at 10 o'clock and they get to work early.

GEORGE HAGUE.

27829. Have you ever lived in a country where a prohibitory law was in force?— I have travelled through such a country.

27830. What country was that?—That was in Maine, some years ago. In Southern California there are some places where prohibition is in force. I stayed six months in Southern California.

27831. How did you find the law work there?—The people drank light wines; and when they could not obtain what they wanted in the town, they sent outside and got a sufficient quantity.

27832. A sufficient quantity to meet their requirements?—Yes, a quantity sufficient to last for some time.

27833. Of light wines?—Yes.

27834. Do you know anything of the spirits alleged to be made from potatoes in Germany and exported to Canada?—No.

27835. In connection with the business of the shipping line with which you are connected, do you employ many men?—Yes, in loading and discharging the vessels.

27836. How many men do you employ?—Perhaps 200 men per day.

27837. What is your experience regarding them: do you consider they are steady and sober men?—As a rule they like drink, but we prefer to have sober men and we will not employ those who drink. We do not, of course, enforce temperance, but we recommend it, and we instruct the stevedore who engages the men to furnish us with temperate men.

27838. Do you ask whether they are total abstainers?—No.

27839. But your rule is that you will not employ men who drink to excess?—Certainly.

27840. Have you been troubled with intemperate men?—In the beginning of our business we had some trouble in that regard.

27841. You have not now?—No.

27842. How about the sailors?—They get their portion every day, one glass or two glasses of wine; I cannot tell you exactly what the quantity is. They get something to drink, as a rule.

27843. Is the rule of supplying them with liquor still kept up?—Yes. They would rather drink coffee. Early in the morning they have coffee, and also once or twice during the day.

27844. From your experience in Germany, are you disposed to encourage the use of light wines and ales?—Yes, rather than the use of strong drinks.

27845. It has been stated to the Commission that light wines do not suit the palates of the people of this country?—I do not know as to that. It is so expensive at the present that it would not be generally drunk. I do not drink at all; I do not say I am a teetotaller, but I am an abstainer to a certain extent. I do not think a man can drink light wines here for pleasure; they are too expensive, the duty on them is very high.

27846. Would you favour an increased duty on the heavier liquors and a lower duty on the light wines?—Yes, that would be a move in the right direction.

27847. And so you would encourage the use of them?—Yes.

27848. Have you considered the question of prohibition; do you approve of the principle of prohibition?—The principle may be correct, but it cannot be carried out.

27849. Why not?—If you have prohibition, liquor will certainly be manufactured in secret, and it will also be adulterated. It might even be almost poisonous, for the authorities would not be able to watch the manufacture, and the evil would be far greater than if we had license.

27850. Do you think prohibition practicable, or would you prefer free and untrammelled sale under license?—I think a license law must be recommended.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27851. I think I have seen the statement within the last year or two that the use of strong liquor is increasing in Germany?—I have been so long away from the country I really cannot tell you. I should be very sorry if that was the case.

27852. I notice that the Emperor has proposed a very drastic liquor bill. Whether it has been carried or not I cannot say, but I understand from what I have read that it



was introduced because he had observed and his Cabinet had observed that there was a steadily increasing tendency towards alcoholism among the people.—That may be so. If such is the case, the German Government, which is a very paternal one and looks closely after the interests of the people, will enact such a law as you have indicated, and prevent such a condition taking place.

27853. Can you answer this question : whether the use of beer and light wines during a period of long years has eventually resulted in a strong appetite being formed for strong drink ?—Not to my knowledge.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27854. Do you know any shipping line, except the Donaldson line, where total abstinence is demanded of the men ?—No ; I do not even know that such is the case in regard to the Donaldson line.

27855. I think a witness has given testimony that the Donaldson line exact total abstinence on the part of the officers and sailors.—I do not know of any line doing so. The North German-Lloyds and Hamburg-American Lines do not prohibit the use of liquor, but of course drunkenness is not allowed.

27856. Temperance principles are inculcated among the officers and men ?—Certainly. Whenever a man gets drunk he is discharged.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27857. For captains and engineers and the like you require thoroughly temperate men, I suppose ?—Yes ; they would not be employed by the Company if they were not temperate, because they are responsible for lives and valuable property entrusted to them. So soon as they overstep the bounds of temperance, they go.

AUGUSTUS GUSTAFFSON, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

27858. You are a journalist ?—I have been connected with the *Manchester Guardian* of late, and before that I was on the *New York World*, and the *Boston Globe*, and various papers in America. I have been travelling of late.

27859. How long have you lived in New York ?—I have been a rolling stone round the world for years, but I have been only there for half a year.

27860. What is your nationality ?—I am a Swede.

27861. You have lived in Sweden ?—Yes.

27862. And Norway ?—I have been there, though I have not lived there.

27863. How far back does your knowledge of Sweden go ?—Only to 1856.

27864. Do you know Gothenburg ?—I do.

27865. Do you recollect when Gothenburg was under the old system ?—I recollect it, but I do not know anything about it personally.

27866. Do you know anything of the present condition there ?—I do.

27867. Please make a brief statement in regard to it ?—The Gothenburg system, in the first place, is a misnomer, because what is called the Gothenburg system was first adopted at Fallun many years before, and it was undoubtedly adopted with the purest motives. Men of patriotic intentions thought the license business, being in the hands of men who were conducting it for their own profit and advantage, was not in the public interest. So they decided to make an experiment and get the sanction of Government to take over a certain number of distilled liquor shops. The Gothenburg system does not apply to anything but the distilled liquor business. They bought them out, and appointed agents. These agents were paid by them, and they were so to speak trustees to the public for the good behaviour of their agents. At first, as I said, the business resulted in a remarkable reduction in drunkenness and crimes which come from drink.

WILLIAM C. MUNDERLOH.

But as the idea has prevailed for years that purity of liquor must be secured, it was natural that these companies should try to get as pure liquor as possible, and as they were corporately responsible for the purity of their liquor, they became refining companies themselves; so that at present they buy up raw liquors, and treat them in their own refineries, thereby practically establishing themselves permanently as refiners in order to justify themselves before the public. The returns of the criminal calendar are comparatively small. Now, we have this provision. In the first place, these companies are either private companies, which have got from the municipality the right of controlling the liquor business, or else it is the municipality itself, and in most cases the power is in the hands of municipal "rings," resulting in the most outrageous corruption. These municipal "rings," brandy "rings" and refining "rings" take on an average from 25 to 35 per cent for refining the people's liquors, and that is a considerable profit on all the liquors sold in a large community. In order to retain themselves in power the Municipal Government must be able to show the people that they have reduced drunkenness and drink crimes to a great extent; hence, as they are themselves the municipal power, the policeman does not dare to arrest any one who gets drunk, and the Judge does not dare to convict any man brought before him. I have walked in the streets of Gothenburg at 10 o'clock in the morning and met five men drunk, so drunk that they could hardly walk straight, holding one another by the arm, insulting decent women, and the policeman had turned his back, because he would not retain his position if he did not.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27868. Was that lately?—Two years ago, after the temperance conference at Christiania.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

27869. Does the general Government permit this?—The general Government has nothing to do with it.

27870. It is the police and Judges?—That is all.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27871. Go on.—There is another very corrupt feature of the system: that is in the allocation of the profits. The companies receive from 5 to 6 per cent each from the profits, and also profits from the food sold.

27872. Is food sold in these places?—It is compulsory that food be sold. The profits are allocated in this way; first one-third, I do not remember exactly, but I think it is one-third of the amount, goes to the national revenue. Another third I think goes to the county, and the rest to the municipality itself for municipal improvements. So that the more they drink the better parks and the better theatres and the better bathing houses can be had. But there is a vital distinction between the Gothenburg system and the Bergen system in this way: that in the Bergen system all the profits are for public purposes, in the Gothenburg system they are for charitable purposes, which include temperance societies.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27873. Does that mean that a portion is for the benefit of temperance societies?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

27874. What proportion?—The Christiania Society and the Good Templars receive their share in these profits; and if that is not the most effectual way of shutting the mouths of the temperance societies, I do not know what is.

27875. Has it had that effect?—I should say it would have that effect on those who receive that blood money.

27876. Has it had that effect on the temperance societies?—I do not know that I am qualified to answer that. There is a strong temperance movement. I have not inquired into it.

27877. Will you say that the receipt of a percentage of the profits would have any soothing influence on these temperance organizations which would reconcile them to the condition of things which exists?—It seems to be practically a conscience bribe.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27878. The license system, in the first instance was to reduce drinking and drunkenness?—Certainly.

27879. And now it is expected that the propagation work will have such an effect on the people that there will not be any need ultimately of having even the Gothenburg system?—I think so, but it seems a peculiar way to reach the end.

27880. You think it is not a proper system?—It seems as if you said gambling institutions should support the church.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27881. Do you think that the drinking of intoxicating liquor is an evil?—I do.

27882. And that the licensing is an evil?—I do.

27883. Do you think that these people think that the licensing of these places will aid temperance? Is that their motive?—I do not question their motives.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27884. Do you say that the national revenue receives one-third of the amount paid by these people?—About that.

27875. Would not the national Government, then, have something to say respecting the conduct of that business? The charge you make against the Judges and police is serious. Has the attention of the Government been called to that condition of things, as they are partners in the profits?—Yes.

27886. Has their attention been drawn to that, and have they turned a deaf ear to these appeals?—I think any municipality is left to its own volition as to what it proposes to do.

27887. I am speaking of the interest of the national Government?—The national Government has no direct interest in the control of the business, though it receives a share of the profits, but it does not decide what it is to receive.

27888. Do the Government appoint the Judges?—No.

27889. The Judges are appointed by the municipalities in Norway and Sweden?—No, they are all trained jurists. You have to pass your examinations just as at any college, and you have to serve one of the Judges until you become a Judge yourself. There are no appointments.

27890. Do you say these men are interested in not enforcing the law?—Well, I do not know what to say.

27891. Are we justified in understanding that both Judges and policemen do not perform their duties to the municipality?—You may understand that emphatically.

27892. Notwithstanding that the Judges are trained, experienced jurists?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27893. We have been told that Gothenburg is a sea-port town?—Certainly.

27894. That there is a strong temperance sentiment there?—Yes.

27895. That prior to 1866 the state of the community was perfectly dreadful ; that there were what were called beer cellars, frequented by seafaring men and others ; that it was not safe for strangers to go in amongst these people ; that the matters in that community came to such a state that a certain number of citizens banded themselves together in the interests of the community, went to the Municipal Council and said, " We will undertake that you shall not lose the license revenue you have been obtaining, but give us the control of the traffic," and they adopted this system by which they employed a certain number of persons to sell for them, and if any of those persons sold to a man who was drunk or violated other restrictions, he was dismissed at once. Moreover, the liquors were to be of a pure character ; and the result was such that when the witness visited Gothenburg in 1866, the change was marked?—I can understand that the first year.

AUGUSTUS GUSTAFFSON.

27896. And that he could sit down in these places and get his breakfast without fear?—Yes.

27897. You say that is all changed?—The statistics show that drunkenness is on the increase in both Sweden and Norway.

27898. I thought you said they were cooked?—Yes, they do not show as badly as they are.

27899. Can we have those statistics?—Yes, easily. I remember when I was at the Temperance Congress at Christiania the Minister of Instruction made a very favourable showing to the Congress of the result of the Bergen system at Christiania; but the night previous I had been to the Police Commissioners and obtained the official statistics as to drunkenness for the last 6 years, and they showed that if every man and woman and child in Christiania had been arrested once, that would cover, and only cover, the number of arrests for drunkenness.

27900. We had before us the captain of a Norwegian vessel who lives in Bergen?—That is the best place to find it out. In Norway they call them Samlags. I know of 19 places there. These Samlags in Norway only apply to spirits and not to wine or ale.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27901. Do I understand that you got information from the Police Commissioners of Christiania, and the statistics in regard of drunkenness?—Yes, the statistics are available to anybody.

27902. Are the police under a different government in Christiania from Bergen?—Yes.

27903. Are they under the same law?—No, they are not.

27904. The same influences are not at work in Christiania as in Gothenburg. You spoke of having information from the Police Commissioners in Christiania.—Yes.

27905. And the statistics showed that every man, woman or child had been arrested once, if the number of the population were taken as the basis?—Yes.

27906. You say the police are under different government in Christiania from what they are in Gothenburg?—I think in the capital the police are under the national Government. They have a Stadt Hohlde who stands at the head.

27907. But the profits of the liquors are distributed much in the same way?—No, in Bergen they are for the municipality and for State interests. In the Gothenburg system it is for the charities and institutions that receive no other public support.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27908. So the charities which are supported by the liquor trade are dependent entirely upon it?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27909. What kind of charity?—All kinds of public institutions which receive no other support.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27910. Is there any movement in Norway or Sweden for the total prohibition of drink?—Yes, very strong.

27911. Have you any statistics in regard to it?—I formed a prohibition party in Sweden. From two points of view the world is getting enlightened on this question; first, from the physiological point of view, and then from the moral point of view. The physiological aspect undoubtedly tends more and more to prove that when the so-called alcoholic effect is produced, the individual is to a degree poisoned, and that drunkenness so-called is merely the extreme outward physical manifestation of the harm done within. Any one will grant that the effects are most varied, and in many cases evanescent, yet the totality of evidence goes to prove that none can habitually indulge in liquors without affecting his mental, his physical, and his moral organization; and that is a conviction growing I think among the best people in the world to-day. Then as to morals it is not to us prohibitionists so much a question whether the public sentiment is ripe for the

question, but whether we are ripe to do our duty to the public sentiment, not so much whether the law will at once become enforced as to whether it is right, and we do not think so much as to whether the law will be passed or not as to whether I by my ballot will be absolved from further blood guiltiness in regard to the traffic. We do not want to force you or anybody in your capacity as individuals and citizens, but we say, allow us at any rate to absolve ourselves by means of our ballot from responsibility for this business any more.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27912. Is that the principle on which the prohibition party is acting in the United States now?—It ought to be.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27913. Is that the case with the prohibition party in Sweden?—It is.

27914. Have you presented candidates for election?—There are prohibition candidates in the Rigstag.

27915. How many members are there?—200 or 300, I think.

27916. Do they identify themselves with one or the other of the parties?—I have not observed it so much as to be able to say.

27917. How do you define prohibition?—I define it to mean that no liquor that is poisonous and proved to be harmful to the race shall by the State be sanctioned for sale or use.

27918. Would you prohibit the importation of liquor entirely, except for manufacturing, medicinal and sacramental purposes?—Sacramental is the last place where I would admit it.

27919. Would you prohibit it entirely except for manufacturing and medicinal purposes?—I do not believe in any liquor being used for any purpose that is not by science proven to be essential.

27920. Then you would prohibit its importation for sacramental purposes?—Why, yes.

27921. For medicinal purposes?—Unless the doctors can show good reason why they would use it.

27922. You would deprive the people of this or any other country, if you had the power, of importing liquor for their own use?—You throw a curious responsibility upon me. I would not in my own person be responsible for depriving anybody. I want my own personal example and personal action to be correct, and then I have done all I can for the welfare of others.

27923. What is the aim of the prohibition party of Sweden?—The aim of the prohibition party in Sweden is to emancipate the people of Sweden from the thralldom of drink.

27924. By what means?—Prohibition of the importation, exportation, manufacture and use of intoxicating drink.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27925. In every shape, manner and form?—We do not believe it is possible to admit it in any form without its taking its old shape.

27926. Light wines and ales and so on?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27927. And that would take away the right the people have now to import liquor for their own use?—Certainly.

27928. Do you know of any place in the world where that law exists?—No.

27929. We are told that such a law is in force in the Fiji Islands?—I do not know, I have not been there.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27930. Is there evasion of the law as to the sale of wine and beer, and in the sale of stronger alcoholic liquors?—Yes, and there is a good deal of blackmail in that way.

AUGUSTUS GUSTAFFSON.

A good many people go into places where they are only permitted to sell wine and beer, and they say, "Sell me a glass of brandy or whisky." The proprietor replies, "We have not got it." The informer says, "Yes, you have." If it is sold, and the fact is told to the police, the informer gets a certain amount for having given them notice.

27931. You have spoken of the physiological effects and the moral effects: have you thought of the financial effects?—Yes.

27932. Do you think we would be financially embarrassed if prohibition were adopted?—As the drink trade invariably degrades the mental, physical and spiritual powers of man, it also reduces his capacity for earning.

27933. Take Norway and Sweden, where the profits of the business are expended in charities or public works not otherwise provided for. If the business were stopped, how would those public works and charities be supported?—Suppose a man here in Montreal should pay \$1,000 for what he could get for \$10, it would not be considered good business; and I consider there is about the same ratio of financial loss directly to the community from the degradation and misery produced by drink on the community, and the return it gets and its application for charitable purposes.

27934. Do you believe the people of Norway and Sweden, under the present liquor system, pay more directly and indirectly for these charities and public works than if they were directly taxed?—I think there would be no need for the charities.

27935. And the public improvements?—I think they would be royal compared with what they are now.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27936. You are not able to say whether the state of affairs in Gothenburg is worse or better than it was before the city took hold of this trade?—I cannot say.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27937. They have a Government system in Switzerland?—Yes, it is a Government monopoly.

27938. How does it work?—That has only been in operation a little over a year, and it has undoubtedly done something for the Government coffers. Whether it has done much for public morality I doubt, and at any rate the Government have given the people such pure liquor that little has been brought in by smuggling.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

27939. What interest has the Government in stopping the smuggling?—A very great interest, because it has a monopoly of the whole thing.

27940. It would be to its interest to stop smuggling?—Certainly.

27941. But notwithstanding that?—Smuggling goes on to a very great extent.

27942. Might not the same reply be made as to the use of hundreds of thousands of pounds spent annually in buying tobacco, and blowing it in smoke?—Yes, I think it would be a very good thing to do away with it; but it does not enter into the prohibition programme I think.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27943. Are you promoting prohibition in New York?—Yes.

27944. If you prohibit liquor, are you afraid of smuggling there?—Undoubtedly if such a law were passed at first it would produce most tragic relations between the law abiding and law breaking elements, for customs and habits engrained in the popular life cannot be torn out without a struggle between law and order and anarchy.

27945. Norway and Sweden are now one Government. Suppose that in Sweden there were ten to one in favour of prohibition, and in Norway ten to one against it, in which country would you hope to enforce it best?—Of course in the country where the larger majority was in favour of it.

27946. How would you enforce it where the majority was against it?—It would not be possible to get a law with a minority of ten to one.

27947. You think that in no place could a law be enforced if a majority was against it?—I do not believe in local option at all.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27948. Why not?—I think it is a tissue of delusions and illusions and collusions.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27949. Sometimes people speak of taking a plebiscite?—Yes. That means the Swiss referendum, which means that the people are the ultimate arbiters of any law; that the question submitted to the people and enacted by the Legislature is by the Legislature submitted for popular decision before it becomes law. So if a plebiscite were taken, it would mean that the Dominion Parliament allowed a plebiscite on the question, "Shall liquors be used in this country or not?" and if the result was in favour of prohibition it would mean that the Legislature would in a certain time have to draw up a Bill in accordance with the popular will, and that this Bill would in another certain stipulated period be submitted for another plebiscite, whether it was in accordance with the popular will or not.

27950. If it met the people's wishes?—It would become law, because the Government would go out of power if it did not.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27951. And it could not be repealed unless by another plebiscite?—The Legislature might repeal it, but it would be responsible.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27952. Would you adopt such a law in the United States?—I think it would be a blessing in the United States.

27953. Suppose in the Eastern States there was a vote of five to one in favour of prohibition, and in the Western States a vote of five to one against it, but it was carried on the total vote, where would you expect to enforce it more easily?—I hope the United States are a law abiding people.

27954. You have spoken of the collision there would be between the law abiding people and the others. Would the law be more easily enforced in the States where the prevailing vote was in its favour?—Most probably.

27955. If in the Western States you found the vote of five to one against it, would it not mean actually the moving of an army from the East to the West to enforce it?—Yes. There is little probability of there being such a result in the States.

27956. Did you hear the paper read by Mr. Hague, the banker?—I did.

27957. His idea is that if you could get a place where there was such a prevailing influence against the traffic, you would not need prohibition, because the sentiment itself would do away with the traffic?—I believe that as long as there is the alcoholic taste in the flesh and blood of the race, and as long as the alcoholic drink is there to tempt them, they will fall by that means.

27958. Do you believe that in case such a law was passed, there would be still such a class in the community that would get liquor some way or another?—Certainly, and so every law in favour of the moral element has the immoral element in the locality to contend against.

27959. I do not know whether you said the granting of licenses to sell intoxicating liquors is a sin *per se*?—It is an absolute wrong. Sin I judge more to mean a crime from a religious point of view.

27960. Do you consider it a moral wrong to have a license law?—Emphatically.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27961. Would you prefer free rum rather than that the community should be guilty of a moral wrong?—Most decidedly.

*By Judge McDonald :*

27962. In Canada we have one locality under free rum?—I did not know that.

27963. In Prince Edward Island, in the City of Charlottetown, any one can sell intoxicating liquor, but it must be sold in one room of the house, which must have but one door, and the bar must be visible from the street, and nothing must be sold in it

except liquor, with the exception of oysters and cigars?—I do not believe in any license or sale. Evils for which I am not responsible, I feel that I cannot be charged with. If I consent to a License Act I must to my own mind have made it clear that I do no wrong, and if I do not believe in liquor at all, if I consent to license, I make a compromise with my own conscience.

27964. But if you let in free, unlimited sale?—I am not responsible for the consequences if my action is in the right direction.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27965. You prefer that there should be free rum to a license law, as far as you are concerned?—As far as my ballot is concerned.

27966. Is that the view held by prohibitionists generally?—I do not know, but I do not think it is.

27967. Why do you think local option laws are illusive and collusive and delusive? Take a small district, parish or county where there is a very strong temperance sentiment, and not the difficulties in enforcing the local option law which are found when public sentiment is more evenly divided. Does the existence of a local option law for five or ten years act as an educator?—Certainly; but let us see what the education is. I think the mere agitation for the local option Act, irrespective of its application, is an educator of public opinion to believe that no questions of right or wrong are involved in this, that this concerns merely public expediency in the various localities of the country. Therefore, I hold that the very agitation lowers public sentiment in regard to this question. As regards the passing of such an Act, I think it is dodging pure prohibition. As regards its application, there are a lot of plausible pleas by which the public view may be centered on this question, party views set aside and this question only occupy public attention; but we are not so much interested as practical politicians in a locality getting a law as in the locality being able to enforce it; and any non-political agitation and passing of an Act leads to non-political enforcement, and then, like the case of Ginx's baby, both parties kick it out.

27968. What about enforcement?—The enforcement is possible in districts where the traffic is weak. In the proportion that the traffic can tire out the public sentiment, it is powerful. The law is enforced in localities where the public sentiment is strong at the expense of the localities that cannot enforce it, and the larger the area of local option or local prohibition, the more easily it can be enforced.

27969. That is it is not practicable to enforce it in cities and towns?—Certainly not. There may be temporarily a popular sentiment, but it will be only a nine days' wonder. Then the larger the area where the local prohibition is secured, the stronger the traffic will become in the area where it could not reach. Local option serves to create high license in the big cities, and if I were a brewer, I should contribute handsomely to pass a local option law as contributing to the brewing interests.

27970. Does not the education from local option laws permeate the communities where they are in force?—It does.

27971. And does it not advance the temperance sentiment there?—I differ as to temperance sentiment being educated by means of local option. This question of license or no license has lost all moral significance, and you and I can vote up or down on it, but questions of right or wrong cannot be so treated; therefore, the education of the temperance sentiment is to treat it as a matter of local expediency, and it leads people to believe that prohibition does not prohibit.

27972. Why can it not be enforced?—Because it cannot be enforced. It has undoubtedly been enforced for years in distant rural localities, and those localities have become the strongest opponents of prohibition ever since. Look at the constitutional amendment in the different States where local prohibition has prevailed, in Texas, Tennessee and Massachusetts, in localities where they have had local option and where at the same time the overwhelming vote went against the Constitutional Amendment. You say they were educated for prohibition. They said that if these localities around them could not get prohibition by local option, they were not likely, when the whole State came under it, to obey such a law, and they would not be able to enforce it when it was a State affair.



27973. Would you favour in the temperance cause the abolition of local option?—Decidedly. It is the tree of good and evil.

27974. Would you favour taking away the right of people to vote whether in certain localities they would have prohibition or not?—Yes, it is a national question. It is a trap to have these people vote on local option, and have a national liquor traffic which can concentrate its forces and crush them out.

27975. You think the issue is the complete suppression of the liquor traffic?—No, not the traffic; but the drink, because, I hold that the mere anti-saloon agitation is strengthening the saloons daily.

27976. Would you advocate a crusade in favour of the saloons?—Not exactly.

*By Judge McDonald:*

27977. How does it help it?—Very naturally. If you and I are attacked we seek for assistance. If the saloon is attacked, it seeks for political assistance. The attack, therefore, on the saloon leads it into politics. The more severe the attack the more anxious the saloon is for protection. Now the saloon in going into politics, not only gets votes here and there by a mug of beer, and a glass of ale, and a shelter in the storm for the beggars—and they have votes—but it contributes handsomely to churches and charitable institutions, and it keeps splendid bar rooms for sporting men, and upstairs it has excellent rooms and places for balls and so on. The saloon becomes a great social institution, and to prevent public sentiment turning too severely against it, co-operates with political parties in making the business as respectable as possible. They get better men in; they make it outwardly more grand and attractive and are willing to pay more to the public treasury, so that the taxpayers' consciences are debauched.

27978. What would be the most potent way of weakening the influence of the saloon?—It is a terrible factor in politics. I have thought of various methods whereby we could weaken the influence of the saloon. One I think is, that inasmuch as this is a privileged business entirely under State control at present, it is perfectly proper and within the sphere of the State to say, Henceforth as long as you remain in this business, having found the saloon so corrupt in politics, you will not be allowed to vote or influence voters, and you will lose your license the moment you infringe upon these directions.

27979. Given the saloon and hotel bar in equal numbers, which exercises the more deleterious influence on the community?—I hold that in the degree in which the evil is made attractive it is more dangerous.

27980. Which is more attractive in appearance?—Judging from outward observation I should say the hotel, such for instance as the Hoffman bar in New York. I hold that if there was only one day on which you could suppress the liquor traffic, it should never be Sunday. I want it open on Sunday and a saloon on each side of the church, and then the church would take an interest in the matter.

27981. You think the church is not taking such interest?—I do not think the churches do. They have not waked up to their responsibility on this question.

W. W. MOORE recalled.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

27982. Is it a fact that fewer women attend the Lyceum than before you established a bar?—No.

27983. We had that evidence when you were not here?—It is not so. Mr. Crossley is a little down on me lately. There were seven or eight ladies to one gentleman this afternoon. I said that Montreal was away behind in the matter of amusements. It is thought horrible to see a woman drinking in public. They will sneak to the corner groceries, or they will send their children, and that is why I say the Sohmer Park is educating them up to something different.

AUGUSTUS GUSTAFFSON.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

27984. Then Sohmer Park is an educator?—Yes.

27985. And is making the people temperate?—Certainly. It is closing up the corner groceries and the shebeens.

27986. You think there has been an improvement since you had this license?—Most undoubtedly.

27987. Did you ever try to conduct your theatre without a license and without these pass checks?—You could not do it.

27988. Why not?—I will refer you to any theatre in the world, in the United States, or England, but try Montreal. We have four theatres here. There are two first class theatres and two cheap theatres. Take the Royal. If you stood on the corner of Côté Street any night and watched the number of people, you would see. It costs 20 cents to go in, and after the curtain goes down the theatre is more than half emptied, and that is the only theatre from which the women will go out. That is the cheap theatre. Go to the Academy, our tony theatre, the west end theatre, which is supposed to be patronized by the wealthy people, and you will see the same state of affairs, that half the people will go out and take the trouble to walk 300 yards.

27989. So it is an advantage to have the audience remain in the theatre and give them light wine and beer?—I compel them to drink my stuff or go without.

27990. Was it to promote temperance, or to conduct your theatre better, that you took the license?—It was for money undoubtedly.

27991. But I understood you had some difficulty because of people drinking too much, and now you have more control over them?—No. The idea of getting a license at all was to make more money out of it; but I have less difficulty now, because I put on my programme, “no pass checks given,” and I will not give pass checks. Sometimes some of the boys say, “Let me out, I am sick,” and occasionally I will let them go, but it is whisky they want.

27992. Does that apply to the theatres in the old country?—Every theatre in England has bars. The Alhambra has eight, and the Empire has seven bars in the building.

27993. Has the Aquarium bars?—More still, more than any of them.

27994. How is it in the United States?—Almost every theatre has a bar, and the theatre which has not a bar is gradually closed up.

27995. Do you know of any instances of people bringing strong liquors into your theatre?—They could not do it. It is impossible. I have copied my theatre from Koster & Biall's in New York. There are four proscenium boxes. There are curtains in front, but if they are kept closed I open them myself. It would be impossible to use liquor there unless it was seen from the stage, and some one would instantly tell me. The stage manager or the stage carpenter would see it. Upstairs there are seven boxes, and it might be done there, but it might as easily be done in church.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

27996. Do you think it would be likely to be done in church?—Candidly, from experience, I think more likely than in my theatre.

27997. You said, I think, something about the influence of the churches in preventing the granting of licenses. Do you think that is hurtful?—No, I do not say that. I think it is right. Of course, I do not think it is right for the church to interfere, to give one man \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year, and deprive another man of making a living.

27998. You think they should not discriminate?—No. Take the saloon, the Oxford. Another man tried to get a saloon close to that, and he was ruined. He is worse than a wandering Jew.

27999. Did the churches stand by the Oxford?—No, they always opposed it. But instead of costing him \$800, it has cost him about \$3,000.

28000. Why?—Because he has to fight.

28001. Where, in the courts?—Yes.

28002. He makes more money to recoup himself?—It is worth it. He is in a first class locality, and has the trade of two theatres, and all the west end trade.

28003. Do we understand that the majority of the patrons of theatres are drinking people, and go out between acts?—I do not know. They say they go out to see a man, but they do go out.

28004. That would be your impression; but to stop their going out you put the business in?—I told you this morning that I drink hard liquor myself. I prefer beer, but I am subject to gout, and if I drink four or five drinks a day, instead of my head swelling my feet would swell, so I drink hard liquor. Possibly I have a constitution that can stand it, but I have been in the amusement business for many years. There are some young men, especially Frenchmen, who get a few drinks and become crazy. It may be due to bad liquor, They become "full," but with the liquor I give them, they may swell a little, but it does not hurt them. I only handle 600 or 700 a day, and the Sohmer Park handle 2,000 a day, but in neither place have I ever seen any one drunk.

28005. Did you find it possible to make the Lyceum pay without the bar?—Sometimes. Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28006. Does it pay better with the bar?—Better with the bar.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28007. Does it pay of itself, or is the bar necessary to make it pay?—I have to be very careful. I hold that there should be a bar in every theatre.

28008. I do not want to press for an answer, but I wish to know whether the Lyceum of itself would pay, or whether it was necessary to introduce the use of beer and wine?—It pays better with the bar. But the very fact that any theatre will half empty itself between the acts, and we all know—prohibitionists and temperance people—that this is the fact; and further that this going out to see a man is for drink and nothing else; shows that the people want liquor. I say it is better for me and for them to get that drink in my place. The proof is that I had to keep three or four policemen, as the Theatre Royal does, and now I have only one.

28009. Do all the theatres have to keep policemen?—The Academy has three, the Theatre Royal three or four, the Lyceum had two up to last week, when I found things were going so smoothly that I could do with one.

28010. You said under the system of pass checks your ushers used to come back "set up?"—My ushers are lithographic men as well. They are in the theatre most of the time, and do not get a chance till 7. The season is during the winter, and in the evening they would frequently get a hat and coat and sneak out, and relieve one another, and so they got drunk. Now as there is no crowd going out between the acts, it is impossible for them to get out.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28011. Do you think that light wine and ale being on hand, with no trouble to get them, people will take them in preference to going a distance and having trouble to get liquor?—Certainly. The price of admission to the Sohmer Park, or the Lyceum, or the Park Royal, is so low, and a man must have something to do with his evening, that he pays 10 cents or a quarter, which is my lower price, and he can go to this place, and sit down, light his cigar, and during the evening he is intent upon watching what is going on. During the intermissions, and this week they are six or seven, he will call for a drink, but in any case the chances are that he will not take more than two or three glasses of ale or beer, and he will sit there till 11 o'clock. So he has two cigars and three or four beers and he is put out at half past eleven. The chances are he will go home; whereas if he goes to the rum shop he gets talking to others, and it is "Jack what will you have," and the custom (which is very bad one) is, "What will you have with me," and that is repeated. I go round and drink more or less, and I come on these people every day.

28012. Do you believe the treating system to be an evil?—Undoubtedly. It is the root of the drinking custom. They treat and repeat.

28013. Then they drop into other places?—Yes, very likely

WILLIAM W. MOORE.

MONTREAL, September 23rd, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day, Sir JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

WILLIAM P. BATES, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

28014. How long have you resided in Montreal ?—I was born in Montreal.

28015. Have you always lived here ?—Yes.

28016. I understand you are Steward of the General Hospital ?—Yes.

28016*a*. How long have you held that position ?—Nearly 16 years.

28017. How is the General Hospital controlled ?—By a Committee of Management and Board of Governors.

28018. Is it not conducted by the Corporation of Montreal ?—There are governors, 350 or 400, and they appoint the Committee of Management, consisting of twelve or fifteen of their own number.

28019. Is that the City Hospital ?—Yes, and it receives a small grant from the Provincial Government, I think.

28020. Was your appointment made by an Executive Committee ?—I was appointed by the Committee of Management a long time ago.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28021. How long have you been Steward ?—I have been in the Steward's department 16 years, I have been Steward 10 or 12 years.

28022. You have all sorts of cases at the hospital, I suppose ?—Yes.

28023. All manner of diseases ?—Yes.

28024. All forms of accident are taken in ?—Yes.

28025. Is there any record kept of the persons coming in ?—Yes, a record is kept of every patient who comes into the hospital.

28026. I suppose that contains the name, age, nationality, religion and disease from which the patient is suffering ?—Yes.

28027. Is there a sort of private history obtained ?—Yes, of late there has been a private history taken.

28028. Is there any record which shows what proportion of the patients who come in are addicted to the drink habit ?—There is no way of getting at that. Some of the doctors or attending physicians who have been at the hospital for years might arrive at a certain percentage, but they have no regular record, because it is impossible to obtain one. There are so many diseases directly or indirectly brought on in that way that it is almost impossible to arrive at the facts.

28029. Is there any way by which you can determine whether a man who has the drinking habit—he might not necessarily be a drunkard in the ordinary sense, but a man who habitually drinks—has the same chance of recovery in certain forms of disease as has the total abstainer ?—No, I do not think there is any record kept.

28030. From your observation, are you able to say ?—No, I cannot say. I am not brought into contact with the medical department.

28031. What are your duties ?—They mostly consist in taking charge of the stores and provisions.

28032. Then you are not at the head of the nursing department?—I have nothing to do with the medical department of the hospital, except so far as the doctors and nurses come to me for stores and provisions.

28033. Can you tell the Commission the number of persons who are admitted every year?—The numbers are contained in the annual report.

28034. Have you taken any interest in the carrying out of a license law in the city?—I did not take any notice of the matter, until I received intimation to attend here; I am a disinterested party.

28035. Can you make any suggestion to the Commission in regard to the management of the liquor trade in Montreal, as to any method of improving the law?—No.

28036. Any method that would prevent drinking?—No.

28037. Do you know Sohmer Park?—Yes.

28038. Have you ever been there?—Yes.

28039. What is your opinion of it?—I have not seen anything out of the way there. I went there like other citizens.

28040. What opinion was left on your mind as to the desirability of such a place?—In my opinion it keeps the people altogether under the view of the police authorities. The police can walk around and keep order, and there is amusement and music and nothing of any kind which is unfit for the most respectable person to see.

28041. Do you believe the effect may be to attract people who are anxious for amusement, and prevent people going to places where they would be under injurious influences?—I think it is a place of cheap amusement for the people, people who otherwise would be strolling through the streets and would probably visit worse places.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28042. Do you favour the parks being allowed to remain open on Sunday and light drinks being sold there?—I am not in favour of the sale of liquor on Sunday in Sohmer Park.

28043. Is not lager or Weiss beer sold there?—Yes.

28044. Do you favour the stoppage of the sale?—Yes, on Sunday; I do not think it is exactly proper on Sunday.

28045. You think that this park does good on week days?—Yes. I find that the use of beer and light dry wines, if used in moderation by the people, is less injurious than the use of strong drink, and that the harm done to the people is from the use of strong liquors.

28046. But do they not sell strong liquors at Sohmer Park?—I do not think so. I have been told they do not.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28047. From your experience as a citizen of Montreal and one acquainted with these places, do you believe that the tendency of parks is in the direction of promoting temperance among the people?—Certainly, it is in the direction of promoting temperance among the people. Of course, it is not directly the means of promoting temperance, but the evils become less apparent.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28048. Less evil than, what?—Going into saloons and drinking strong liquors.

28049. Do you mean that if there was not a Sohmer Park for people to visit they would go into saloons?—I think the larger number of the people who use light wines and beers would spend their money on strong drinks, obtained outside the park.

28050. Then is not that a better condition than to have those people about the streets and in the hotels, and does it not promote temperance to have places like Sohmer Park?—It only helps to reduce drinking a little.

28051. Then it does reduce the drinking of strong liquors?—I believe it does.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28052. Have you observed the license law sufficiently to be able to express an opinion as to whether it regulates the liquor traffic in Montreal or not?—I do not know anything about the license system.

WILLIAM P. BATES.

MOSES B. JEWELL, of Farnham, P.Q., trader and manufacturer, affirmed and testified as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald :*

28053. In what line of manufactures are you engaged?—We are doing a little in the way of manufacturing agricultural implements, but not largely.

28054. At what place?—At Farnham.

28055. In what County?—In the County of Brome.

28056. How many men do you employ?—On an average about four. Some parts of the year we are not running. We are at work more in the summer season.

28057. Do you do moulding?—No.

28058. How many agricultural machines do you turn out in a year?—One hundred or one hundred and fifty. We buy the castings and make the woodwork, and some of the forge work and the fittings. We do a good deal of repairing.

28059. You are a sort of machine shop for the farmers there and in other districts?—Yes.

28060. What is the population of the village?—About 300. Our shop is a little out of the village, about half a mile away.

28061. What is the population of the parish?—About 2,000.

28062. How many miles square is it?—It is nine miles by six miles.

28063. What law prevails there in regard to the sale of intoxicating liquors?—We are under the Canada Temperance Act.

28064. That Act is in force in the whole County of Brome?—Yes.

28065. How long has such been the case?—Since January, 1885.

28066. Has any attempt been made to repeal the law?—There was an incipient attempt made a few years ago. A petition was deposited with the Secretary of State, but was afterwards withdrawn. That is the only attempt that has been made.

28067. How far are you from another county?—Our village is three or four miles from Missisquoi.

28068. How far is it from the boundary of the United States?—Fifteen or sixteen miles. I may say that there has never been any license granted in the municipality.

28069. Not even under the old law?—No.

28070. Was that owing to the sentiment of the people?—Yes.

28071. Of what nationality are the people generally?—They are of a mixed nationality.

28072. Are there many French?—About one-third of the population now is French. The town was originally settled by people from the United States, but a considerable number of Scotch have established themselves there and some few English. The earlier settlers, I think, came from the United States, but more recent ones have come from abroad. Forty years ago there were quite a number of settlers from Ireland, they being the better class of emigrants from the south of Ireland.

28073. Are you a prosperous and thrifty people?—Fairly so.

28074. Is land there good?—It is fair. It is on an average with the land in the Eastern Townships, but it is not so good as some parts of Western Ontario.

28075. Is there any district in the County of Brome in the same condition as the district you mention, where there has been a license granted?—The Township of Brome has refused to grant licenses for the last thirty years. They had the Dunkin Act in force in the County from the time it was passed to the time the Scott Act took its place. Prior to that time, there were seven years during which there was in the County no prohibitory law. During that interval the Township of Brome, for a considerable part of the time, refused to grant licenses.

28076. So from 1867 to the present time, your district has been under a prohibitory law?—Yes, the entire county.

28077. And before that you had no licenses granted?—Yes, for several years. We had a prohibitory county law in 1859, for we were under the prohibitory provisions of the Municipal Act.

28078. Do you mean the County or the parish?—The County. The authorities of the county were authorized to prohibit liquor. That provision had to be re-enacted every year in order to have the effect of a prohibitory law. The County Council in March would pass a by-law to provide for licenses or would make additions to the terms, or they would perhaps decide to prohibit licenses being issued. They prohibited in 1855, prohibition was repealed in 1856 and re-enacted in 1857; so public opinion has fluctuated at different times. Then the Dunkin Act was passed in 1865, but was not submitted to the people. That was repealed the next year, 1866; and the condition remained until 1877, when it was again passed and ratified by a vote of the people. So during the period between 1866 and 1877, we were without a prohibitory law.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28079. During that period, I suppose, you had a good deal of municipal prohibition?—Yes, in East Farnham and Brome. I think some other towns granted licenses during those years.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28080. Are there any hotels in your village?—There are not any in East Farnham; there are some boarding houses.

28081. Are there not any hotels?—There is one in the village of Adamsville.

28082. How large is that village?—It is a little smaller than East Farnham.

28083. Is there any railway passing the place?—Yes, there are two railways passing there or near it.

28084. What are they?—The Canadian Pacific Railway, or the South-eastern Branch, passing half a mile to the east of Farnham village, and the Short Line to Halifax, passing near Adamsville, one mile east of Farnham.

28085. What is the nearest town of any size to your place?—Cowansville, that is within four miles.

28086. What is the population of Cowansville?—I think it must be 1,500 or 2,000.

28087. I suppose there are hotels there?—Yes. The court-house is at Sweetsburgh, five miles away.

28088. That is in the district of Bedford, I believe?—Yes. There are two hotels at Cowansville and two at Sweetsburgh. Our people who are inclined to drink can get liquor by going that distance.

28089. In what county is Cowansville?—It is four miles to Cowansville, and from there it is one mile to Sweetsburgh; both are in the County of Missisquoi.

28090. So you have distant from your village one town four miles away and one town five miles away, where there is a license law in force?—Yes.

28091. And where there are licensed hotels?—Yes.

28092. Do you believe there is any liquor sold in your own municipality?—I do not think so now. There have been times when there were some few places disposed to keep it and sell it a little clandestinely. There were efforts made to stamp those places out.

28093. With licensed places within four and five miles, would there be much inducement to run the risk of selling drink illegally?—Naturally it would make some difference.

28094. But whatever sale there may have been, you think it has been stamped out?—Yes. I think if East Farnham was as large a town as Cowansville there would no doubt be hotels there. I may say that I am in position to have considerable knowledge as regards the Scott Act all over the county, because I have been the Agent of the Alliance and have conducted prosecutions.

28095. Then you have acted as Agent for the County Alliance?—Yes.

28096. And you have also been prosecutor?—Yes, in my capacity as Secretary of the County Alliance. I have been constituted Agent for the Alliance to conduct prosecutions.

28097. In that way I suppose you have travelled through the county?—Not through the whole of it. I have travelled through it on business and have attended to the prosecutions.

MOSES B. JEWELL.

28098. Are the actions brought in your name?—Yes, and I assist in working up the cases if the people furnish me with information.

28099. What is your experience as a whole? Do you believe there are any parts of the county in which liquor is sold?—I have not much doubt but that a little is sold in most of the hotels. At least that is the reported state of things.

28100. But those hotels are not in the village?—No.

28101. Do you believe that there is a different state of things apt to exist as between the rural districts and the villages and towns where the Scott Act is in force?—In what sense?

28102. Do you believe that the Act becomes more effective in the rural districts than in the villages and towns where the people are brought closer together?—Hotels in villages are dependent on the rural districts largely for their custom.

28103. Do the people in the rural districts buy any of the liquor?—Yes. The people do their shopping in the villages, and so there is no occasion to build hotels in the rural districts. In the Township of Brome, ten miles away, there is the village of Knowlton, with 1,500 people. They have two hotels there. Then there is the village of Sutton, which is about the same size, and two hotels are there. There is Mansonville, near the province line, with two hotels.

28104. I understand you to say that none of these are licensed hotels?—No, these hotels accommodate the rural districts, and there is no occasion to have other hotels.

28105. People who wish for liquor can go to those hotels and get it, I understand?—If licenses were in force, there would be no licensed drinking places except those in the villages.

28106. In your experience of the county and the country generally, do you think the increase of railways has tended to do away with many of the old way-side inns at which travellers were formerly in the habit of stopping?—It has been the case in many places. I do not think, however, that it has reduced the practice in the large villages near us.

28107. I refer to the way-side inns where people billeted their horses. The mode of travelling has changed so much that I ask whether it would not be the means of doing away with those houses of entertainment?—We never had many of those. The hotels have been in the villages and there have been very few outside.

28108. I understand from what you say and from the position you occupy, that you are a prohibitionist in principle?—Certainly.

28109. What has been your experience of the working of a prohibitory law, as to whether it has been effectual or not?—To a large extent. I am satisfied there cannot be any question as to its greatly decreasing the sale of liquor.

28110. For what reasons?—Liquor cannot be sold openly, and you see nothing of liquor. I judge from that fact and the absence of drunkenness.

28111. Is there less drunkenness now than there was during your earlier recollection?—Yes.

28112. Has there been a change in the social habits of the people? Do you find that the general influence of temperance societies has operated in that direction?—There has been a marked influence during the last thirty years. Whether this change is altogether due to a prohibitory law might be a question, for other influences have been at work.

28113. Do you believe if those influences were put in force, the people would begin to take steps towards obtaining prohibition?—Yes.

28114. Then it was the outcome of previous work?—Many of the earlier settlers in the county were staunch temperance people, and they were the first to approach the liquor traffic in the neighbourhood and in the towns. They appear to have congregated in those neighbourhoods where no liquor was sold.

28115. Do you know if there is much smuggling of liquor from the United States?—I do not think so. On the boundary in our county there has been a good deal of illicit traffic carried on.

28116. What law prevails across the boundary line?—A prohibitory law.

28117. What State is it?—The State of Vermont.

28118. Is prohibition in force there?—The law is pretty well enforced.



28119. Does the law prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale, or only the sale of liquor?—The law authorizes the importation and sale for medicinal use, and provides agents in each village.

28120. Then it is like the Maine law?—Yes.

28121. Do you know much about the law?—It is a stronger law than the prohibitory law in Canada.

28122. How do you find the state of affairs in Vermont?—There has been a great change since the passage of the prohibitory law there in 1852. Almost every year I have been there, and sometimes three or four times a year. I think the prevailing system is a marked improvement over the other; that is the case, at all events, so far as my experience goes. I stopped at St. Albans, Burlington and Montpelier, the largest towns in the State; and I can say that I never saw any indication of liquor being sold—it was not sold so far as I saw. The general opinion is that it was kept in all the hotels. The effect of the law certainly has been to drive the trade into the small saloons, for the hotels did not keep it openly.

28123. Then liquor was driven from sight?—Yes.

28124. And what was sold was sold secretly?—Undoubtedly. The effect seemed to be much greater than it has been in our own country.

28125. To what do you attribute that?—It must be accounted for by the fact that it was the general law of the State.

28126. Not a local option law?—I was many times struck with the difference. The hotel-keepers are not ostracised there, as they are in Vermont, where they are of a low class.

28127. Do you believe that the strict enforcement of the prohibitory law has the effect of throwing the traffic into the hands of people of a low class?—It eventually has that tendency.

28128. Have you had any strangers coming into your district and carrying on the trade illicitly, and clearing out when you commenced to prosecute them?—We have had some instances of that kind. In Knowlton there are dog-holes where liquor is kept.

28129. I suppose there are similar places to those known in Montreal?—A man living alone near Knowlton, and who kept boats to let, has proved a very troublesome fellow. In fact we have another man of that class there. I think for a large village it is remarkably free from liquor, except as regards those places. Liquor appears to be sold in those places, but there are very few of them in our county.

28130. Have you any knowledge as to where hotel-keepers get their liquor?—From the wholesale dealers in Montreal. The law has never been as rigidly enforced in our county, as I suppose it has in Vermont. At first the Scott Act was so interpreted that it was difficult to do anything in the way of making seizures of liquors. It was necessary to prove a sale in order to establish that liquor was illegally kept. I think there was an amendment made to the law four years ago under which our district Magistrate, if liquor is found in houses, is obliged to convict the parties for illegally keeping it. We have not, however, done very much in that direction. Of course, if we resorted to that provision, we might enforce the law a good deal better.

28131. Which do you prefer, the Dunkin Act or the Scott Act?—The Scott Act has many advantages over the Dunkin Act.

28132. As you are a prohibitionist in principle, do you believe that a prohibitory law could be practically enforced in the county at the present time?—It would be beneficial, but I think that while it is quite likely there would be localities where it could not be enforced, it would at all events be better enforced than the license law.

28133. So you would pass such a law at the present time without waiting to take the opinion of the people?—I think I would not hesitate to pass such a law, for it would have an educational effect, which I am sure has followed the enactment of the law in Vermont. It seems to place liquor under a ban. In the villages of Vermont you find lawyers and politicians talking about the difficulty experienced in enforcing the law, but there is a different feeling there as regards the liquor traffic itself. If a hotel-keeper is suspected of keeping liquor, he is considered disreputable.

MOSES B. JEWELL.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28134. At what place is this the case?—At St. Albans, Burlington, and other places. I remember once at Burlington I inquired at the hotel in regard to the sale of liquor, and they said they did not sell any there. I asked as to whether liquor was sold in other hotels, and the reply I received was that one hotel man had to go to jail for three months some time ago for selling liquor. I mention this to show how they regard the law there.

28135. Are you able to say whether at the hotels where ordinary travellers stop they can obtain liquor?—My impression is that in many hotels they cannot get it.

28136. Are the hotel-keepers themselves favourable to the law?—Probably they are not in principle, but they would lose custom if they were suspected of keeping liquor; they would be ostracised socially.

28137. Do you believe that in the case of a man who is accustomed to get liquor, the landlord would be willing to sell him liquor?—I think in Vermont there is very little sold. If the impression once prevails that a hotel-keeper sells liquor, his reputation falls.

28138. Do you know anything of the working of the prohibitory law in Maine?—Not personally.

28139. You believe that the law in Vermont is on the same lines as the law of the State of Maine?—Yes.

28140. Do you know whether it is more efficiently enforced?—From what I have heard, I think it is quite as well enforced as is the law in the State of Maine.

28141. You mean it is as well enforced in Vermont?—Yes. I think there is liquor sold in some places; but I am speaking in regard to Vermont as a whole. The Vermont law has some provisions which the Maine law has not. When parties are prosecuted, and they have no property and the authorities cannot get the fines paid, they close up the places and turn the people out, and they are unable to open again without giving bonds to obey the law. I do not know to what extent that provision of the law is enforced, or how much use has been made of it. That was an amendment made within the last ten years. I may say that the law has been amended several times to my knowledge, and I think it has been made more rigorous.

28142. So as a prohibitionist you would favour the immediate enactment of a prohibitory law in Canada, I understand?—My opinion is that in places where public sentiment was so unwieldy as not to enforce a prohibitory law or to enforce it to a very small extent, there would be a very bad condition of affairs under the license law. I think a license law would be in such localities non-enforced.

28143. Do you think where there is a strong prohibition sentiment that a prohibitory law could be enforced?—It could be undoubtedly in many localities. I am quite sure it could be in the County of Brome.

28144. Do you believe that in places where the prohibition sentiment is strong, such a law would be needed?—I do not know how that might be.

28145. The people themselves would be a law under themselves?—There would be a tendency in that direction.

28146. With respect to the treatment of the persistent drunkard: have you any such men in your locality, men who are constantly being sent to jail for drunkenness?—I know of some in the neighbourhood, but they are not very near us.

28147. It has been suggested to the Commission that instead of sending them to jail, it would be better to send them to an inebriate asylum, where they could be treated until cured?—No doubt it would be an advantage if they were sent to an inebriate asylum. In regard to the enforcement of the law, I do not think the temperance people over the country generally are sufficiently in earnest, and so the prohibitory laws are not as well enforced as they might be. There is too much indifference.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28148. Why is that?—Too many of them are inclined to avoid the odium that might attach to them, but I do not think there would be so much odium under the general law.

28149. Do you know anything of the feeling prevailing with respect to prohibition outside your own county?—The English speaking population, I think, would vote for prohibition. They came within fifteen votes of passing the Scott Act in Missisquoi a few years ago. There was a majority in favour of the Act given in every English speaking polling division.

28150. Do you think in a French speaking county the Act could be carried? Have you any idea of the feeling prevailing among the French Canadians with respect to prohibition?—I know that among the English speaking people, it is very strong in favour of prohibition.

28151. What is the feeling among the English speaking people of Montreal?—I cannot speak of Montreal.

28152. You think prohibition could be enforced here?—I think a great many people give little attention to the matter; they are absorbed in their business and have not time to think of it.

28153. Could a prohibitory law, if passed, be enforced here?—I think it could. There would be sufficient law abiding citizens to do so. That is why the law is carried out in Brome. I remember being there when the discussion was going on with respect to a plebiscite, and many of the people who were opposed to it at first, afterwards assisted in enforcing the law. The difficulty I have found in attempting to enforce the local option law has been that a great many temperance people would urge me and others to go ahead and prosecute and expose ourselves to odium, while they were unwilling to make any personal sacrifice, and when it came to doing any disagreeable work, they held back.

28154. Then they were quite willing that you should do the work?—Yes, they were quite willing that others should do the disagreeable work.

28155. Have they no right to be called upon, or should not the municipal authorities be called upon to provide the machinery to enforce the law?—Yes, and provide officers to prosecute violators of the law.

28156. Have you Inspectors to enforce the law in Brome?—The Inspector of Provincial Revenue is supposed to enforce it, but he has never acted.

28157. Has the County Council authority to appoint officers or Inspectors?—No, any individual can prosecute. The law is now such that the fines are paid over to the County Council and are used to pay expenses.

28158. Is that the object to which fines were to be applied according to Order in Council?—Under the Order in Council there is no discretion in the matter.

28159. Does the County Council appoint any one to enforce the law?—No. The Order in Council provides that the fines shall be used for the enforcement of the Act; it gives no option in the matter.

28160. Has the question of the appointment of Inspectors to enforce the Act never been brought before the attention of the Council?—Not to my knowledge.

28161. Is that the case?—It was thought better to have the Alliance take charge, as it is difficult to get a man to enforce the law except he is under the supervision of the Alliance.

28162. Then the Alliance thought they could secure better enforcement of the law than the municipal authorities?—Not better than the municipal authorities could enforce it, but better than they were likely to enforce it.

28163. Would a similar condition of things exist under prohibition?—I think so. I think temperance people would be obliged to look after it, and it would be their duty to do so until such a condition of things was brought about as now prevails in Vermont. There the officers are accustomed to carry out this law as part of their regular duties, in the same way as they enforce other laws. The State and town officers are authorized to prosecute.

28164. You say the beneficial effect in Vermont of the prohibitory law is very noticeable?—Yes.

28165. In what way?—In regard to its educational effect on the people; that is my impression. We have not found the liquor, or at all events it has been out of sight invariably.

MOSES B. JEWELL.

28166. And there has been a remarkable improvement morally, I understand?—In St. Albans, Burlington and other places there was no evidence of liquor being drank, except in low saloons.

28167. Is it well to drive the trade from the hotels into the low saloons?—I question if that is the tendency.

28168. Is that a benefit?—I think it is a great improvement.

28169. To drive trade into disreputable hands?—I think it is always in disreputable hands.

28170. Then there is no change in that respect?—In one sense, no. If you go into a hotel in St. Albans, as I did in the year immediately preceding the enactment of prohibition, you would see public bars, and drinking going on and men more or less intoxicated. I have seen that many times in St. Albans; I have not seen anything of the kind since. I have heard a good deal about prosecutions being carried on since. There were women keeping boarding-houses near the hotels, where it was said liquor was sold. I remember hearing that the Fremont House at St. Albans did not keep liquor, but one of the employés had a little store near where he kept it. I happened to be acquainted with some of the people about this hotel, and I learned that they would not keep liquor because they were afraid of being fined, and the bad reputation it would give them.

28171. Having travelled throughout that district and country, have you had good opportunities, on account of being connected with the Alliance, of knowing what was going on?—In regard to Vermont that fact has never been known sufficiently well to make any difference. In my county I am known all over it.

28172. I suppose we can rely upon the criminal statistics of Vermont and of your county to indicate the condition of affairs?—It is difficult to obtain the criminal statistics of our county because they are mixed with those of another county. We form a part of the district of Bedford.

28173. You think the local option law has had a good effect, I understand?—Yes.

28174. It would not have such a good effect as a general prohibitory law?—I think there might be a greatly improved state of things.

28175. Do you hold the view that having obtained a local option law, the people should rest satisfied and not push forward and secure a general prohibitory law?—Some people might be satisfied with any move made, however little. I think it is fair to all interested in the matter to admit that there are disadvantages connected with it, especially when the adjacent localities grant licenses. It is, moreover, disadvantageous that the moral influence of such a law is much less than that of a general prohibitory law.

28176. Has not the local option law an educational effect, and would not that effect be apparent on the surrounding municipalities?—That is the case to a certain extent. I think, for instance, if our entire district could be isolated from the French parishes south and north of us, we might hope for nearly as good a state of things as they have in Vermont; but while it is illegal to sell in Brome, it is perfectly respectable and legal to sell in Shefford and Cowansville. There they call temperance people “cranks.”

28177. The view was presented yesterday by a witness, that if he were a brewer, he would subscribe handsomely to the carrying of such a measure as the Scott Act, as it is an illusion, collusion and delusion. Do you hold that view?—I do not; I have always been in favour of the Scott Act.

28178. Have you any amendment you could suggest to the Commission with respect to the working of that Act?—I think the adoption of the Scott Act is a good way of preparing the country for the enactment of a general prohibitory law.

28179. That was suggested to the gentleman to whom I have referred yesterday?—I think there is a good deal of talk in regard to this matter by people who have not investigated it.

28180. But this witness was a pronounced prohibitionist?—I do not think he knew much about the possibility of working a local option law.

28181. Can you suggest to the Commission any amendments to the Scott Act with a view of making it more efficient?—There might be provisions adopted to aid the authorities in enforcing the law more strictly.

28182. Have you thought of any amendments that would make the law more workable and efficient?—Many have thought—I am not quite clear myself—that a pro-

vision might be inserted in the Act, such as a provision in the prohibitory law in Vermont, compelling any of the town officers to detain an intoxicated person until he had given evidence as to where he obtained liquor. A good many have urged this amendment, but I do not feel clear that it would be any great improvement.

28183. Are there any other amendments that have occurred to you in regard to the Scott Act?—There is another matter which, however, I do not think is very important, and it is as to the advisability of making more stringent provisions as to the disposal of the fines. The County Council might be inclined to hold on to the fines and not allow them to be used for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Scott Act.

28184. Would you favour an amendment to the law, to the effect that the Governor General might defer bringing the Act into force in any given locality until after the municipality had made provision for the appointment of officers to carry out the law?—I do not see that that would be any great advantage. It would have the effect in many cases of delaying the Act from going into force.

28185. Would you favour the enactment of an amendment to take away from the people in Scott Act districts the right to bring in liquor for home consumption?—I hardly see that that would be very advantageous. There might be many such provisions that would be advantageous in some cases.

28186. Would that not bring the condition of things in a Scott Act district more nearly to the condition of things that would prevail under practical prohibition?—Possibly.

28186*a*. Would that not have a better educational influence than the present Scott Act provisions—to prevent people living in Scott Act districts bringing in liquor and using it at home?—I would favour that.

28187. Would you favour an amendment in that direction?—Not to that extent. It would be very difficult to enforce.

28188. Then, how would you hope to enforce a general prohibitory law throughout the country, if that privilege were retained?—I would not be in favour of such a provision.

28189. In a prohibitory law?—I would not undertake to prevent a man using liquor himself.

28190. How would you hope to provide for the purchase of liquors by those who are not total abstainers, in the event of a total prohibitory law being passed?—I would provide for that in the same way as other medicines are provided for. I do not see any need for alcohol, except as a medicine.

28191. So you would take away, under the general prohibitory law, a privilege which you would not take away under the Scott Act?—I do not understand your question.

28192. You are aware that at the present time you can bring in liquor for domestic use under the Scott Act?—Certainly, as people can under the Maine law.

28193. And under a general prohibitory law, you would take away that privilege?—No. I think it would be considered arbitrary to do so. I know that a great many temperance people advocate that; but I do not see any necessity of going that length. I think the traffic can be pretty well checked, and eventually entirely stamped out. You can stop the sale, although perhaps not the manufacture and importation. When you get it driven down to those saloons and public sentiment becomes aroused, there will be very little trouble then to crush the traffic.

28194. Then you would favour, in a general prohibitory law, the granting of permits to persons desiring to use liquor, permitting them to bring it in for family use?—I would not use them except for medicinal and sacramental purposes.

28195. Liquor brought in for family use might be used for medicinal or beverage purposes. Would you give that permission under a general prohibitory law?—There is no provision in the Scott Act giving that permission.

28196. But it is not illegal?—It is not forbidden. It is only the sale that is forbidden.

28197. Would you continue the privilege?—I do not see any reason not to continue it.

MOSES B. JEWELL.

28198. In those prosecutions which you have carried on, have you found that much perjury has taken place?—I have known of instances, but not very many cases. We have all sorts of witnesses, and I have found that, as a general rule, they were rather reluctant witnesses. I have known instances where the court and officers have thought that the witnesses were not telling the strict truth.

28199. Were many of those parties strangers?—Not a great many of them. My experience has been this: Out of fifty or sixty prosecutions I have instituted, I have only failed in four to secure convictions, and in two of those cases no witnesses were examined, they having run away.

28200. So you only lost four cases personally?—Yes, I have been much more successful than I ever hoped to be. I have been more successful than we were under our municipal law. We formerly sent the offenders to jail, and they sometimes got home before the bailiff.

28201. Have you jailed many under the Scott Act?—One or two only. There are a great many difficulties about the enforcement of the Scott Act, but I do not consider they are serious ones. I think the law is about as good as a local option law can be. If the temperance people would take as much interest in it as they should do, and not leave all the work to one or two people, it would be far better enforced.

28202. And in your opinion it would be productive of good results?—Yes; we would get fines enough to pay the costs in a few of the cases in which we failed to convict. One advantage of the temperance people looking after the enforcement of the law, if they do it properly, is that there is less offence caused, there is less quarrelling. They can conduct prosecutions in such a way that the motives of their action are above suspicion. I have never received a hard word from a hotel-keeper whom I have prosecuted. Those men often come to me to get leniency shown them. On two or three occasions I have had their fines suspended, and they have often pleaded guilty, and asked to have sentence suspended. There has never been an instance of a hotel-keeper who has been offended with me, or who has been inclined to be unpleasant.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

28203. Is Knowlton in the County of Brome?—Yes.

28204. How has the Act worked in Knowlton?—That is where we have had most difficulty in enforcing it, in Knowlton and Sutton.

28205. You have had cases there?—Yes, that is where most of the prosecutions have taken place.

28206. We have had it in evidence that the law was openly violated in Knowlton?—It is not true that liquor is sold openly in Knowlton. I am satisfied as to that; I have never seen it.

28207. Has there been any particular difficulty in Knowlton in the way of enforcing the Act?—No; no particular difficulty. There have been some difficulties, of course. I remember one case where a man made himself a detective and went around getting liquor. That aroused a good deal of feeling. The people thought it was not fair, for the hotel-keepers believed that the man wanted the liquor for medicinal purposes. There was an outcry raised, and some of our temperance people sympathized with the sellers.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28208. They sympathized with the hotel-keepers, I suppose?—Yes. They went so far as to send a letter to me, asking me to be liberal with them, as they were hotel-keepers and had been treated unfairly. They thought this attempt to catch the sellers was unfair.

28209. What do you think of that?—That is not a proper position to take. I would not yield to it. I dislike, however, that mode of procuring evidence, but sometimes it is necessary.

28210. You think that in Knowlton the law has been pretty well enforced?—I am sure it has been. The position is like this: I suppose the hotel-keepers supply people whom they know, and to whom they are not afraid to sell. I do not think strangers can get liquor there. I know we had a smart detective who had worked up hundreds

of cases in Montreal for the Law and Order League, and he got only one case against the hotel, and he failed to get cases against the others.

28211. As it has been so long since you have had any licenses granted in your municipality, I suppose you can scarcely compare the condition of that place under license with its condition under prohibition?—We have always had prohibition there.

28212. Are you able to compare the condition of East Farnham under prohibition with that of some of the smaller places under the license law?—Yes. I think the great prosperity of the farmers and business men in our municipality and in the adjoining municipality of Durham is apparent, and will be noticeable by any one. There are fewer people losing their farms by mortgages than formerly, and there are very few people becoming drunkards, and thus losing their property.

28213. Is there a noticeable diminution in petty crimes that are incident to the community since the enforcement of prohibition?—I can hardly say that there has been any perceptible diminution in our county, because it has been rather a quiet, law-abiding county for many years. There is a section along the frontier where there is a pretty low class. There have been a great many offences in that neighbourhood brought before the criminal courts.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28214. Is that in a Scott Act district?—Yes, right on the border. There seems to be a pretty low state of affairs on both sides of the line. Brome has been in a good state of morality.

28215. I understood you to say that the county was well settled in the first instance?—Yes. I do not remember any grave crime ever taking place there.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28216. I understood you to express the belief that it would be quite as easy to enforce a general prohibitory law as to enforce the license law?—Certainly; I think it would be easier perhaps.

28217. The license law permitting the trade is not regarded as a flagrant offence when there is no illicit selling?—No. I am quite sure that the Scott Act in Brome has been much better enforced than the license law in the adjoining counties.

28218. Do you think that the feeling in favour of a general prohibitory law grows under the enforcement of prohibition?—I think so. There is a perceptible growth going on. Most of the people would be very much disinclined to go back to the license system.

28219. Are you in a position to express an opinion as to whether there would be as strong or stronger feeling in favour of a general prohibitory law than the feeling that prevails in favour of a local option law?—I think there would be a stronger feeling. A large number of temperance people would favour a general prohibitory law and would consider it much better than a local law. Some of our temperance people are inclined to think that it is not worth while to bother themselves about the local option law, that it is not so much benefit as it should be.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28220. Do you agree with them?—No. I am strongly in favour of the Scott Act until we can get something better.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28221. You consider it a step towards general prohibition, and that it has an educational influence?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28222. Have you had a chance to judge between a license law and the unrestricted sale of liquor, so as to be able to judge which you would prefer?—As far as I have seen the working of the license law, I do not see much choice between them.

MOSES B. JEWELL.

28223. Are you opposed in principle to license?—I am. Still I am not prepared to be positive about it in regard to cities, but in regard to counties and municipalities, the license law has not been efficient. I do not think the unrestricted sale would be very much worse than when we had licenses.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28224. In Charlottetown the license law was repealed and they now have free sale of liquor?—I have thought of that matter a good deal, and quite likely in cities it might be worse to have free trade than to have the trade licensed ; but so far as the country is concerned, I do not think it would be worse.

28225. Do you think, in the event of the enactment of a general prohibitory law, brewers and distillers should be compensated by the State?—No ; I think the victims of the trade should be compensated first. If this Commission were to visit the State of Vermont and examine some witnesses there, it would be well. The condition of affairs in that State has made a deep impression on my mind, especially in regard to the influence the law appears to have had on the people.

28226. Of course the criminal statistics of Vermont would speak for themselves?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28227. You think that personal observation would be more impressive in our case as it was in your case?—Yes ; if the Commission went there and conversed with intelligent people, they would be able to learn how the law works. Of course you would not expect to find that there was no liquor sold there by any means. The interesting point is this, the influence it has had in changing the opinions of the people on this question. Those engaged in the liquor traffic appear to lose caste ; that was the case when the law came into force, and it has remained so since.

28228. You think it is a good thing that they should lose caste?—Certainly.

28229. You think it weakens their influence, socially and politically?—I think if we had a general prohibitory law, I would not have been troubled with the Knowlton letter complaining of the detective business. There were some temperance people who took sides with the hotel-keepers. If we had the Vermont law in force there, no man would have dared to raise his voice in their favour.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28230. Do I understand that people went around and made pretense that they wanted liquor for medicinal purposes in order to secure a sale?—The party swore that he did not, that he merely asked for it ; the hotel-keeper probably thought that he wanted it for medicine.

28231. Do you believe he conveyed that impression to the hotel men?—I think the hotel-keeper received that impression. The party, however, said he merely asked for the liquor. The hotel man evidently did not suspect that he was a detective.

28232. The hotel man evidently thought that the purchaser wanted it for sickness?—Yes.

28233. And it was in that view that certain men sympathized with the hotel-keeper, who was convicted?—Yes, they thought it was unfair to treat him in that way.

28234. Has the Society of Friends, as a body, taken any action in regard to the sale of liquor for beverage purposes?—Yes, they have done so from time to time at the annual meeting. We belong to the annual conference in New York State. They have published their opinions from year to year, and they have been practically a total abstinence society.

28235. What is their view in regard to the enactment of a prohibitory law?—They pronounce in favour of prohibition from time to time.

28236. Do they favour a general prohibitory law?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28237. The hotel-keeper had the impression that the man bought liquor for medicinal purposes : did he at the time say he had that impression, or was it suggested to



him afterwards?—I do not know. I think it is quite likely that the hotel-keeper had that impression at the time; still it was shown in the evidence that he had not taken the trouble to make inquiries.

28238. He was ready to sell, I suppose?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28239. Strictly speaking, that gentleman wanted the liquor for beverage purposes?—No, he bought it on purpose to prosecute the party.

28240. You do not think the intention of that party was to sell it for beverage purposes?—No. He evidently did not suspect he was selling it to a detective. He was well known as a temperance man.

28241. Was he known as a detective?—He was not a professional detective. He was a resident there. He took it into his head to make a little raid on the hotel-keepers. I think he belongs to a temperance society, the Royal Templars.

28242. Have you the old fashioned order of the Sons of Temperance in that community?—Yes, there are a few of them. There is one division in East Farnham.

28243. Have they not done great work for temperance?—They have done a great deal. Latterly they have not been so active in the work as the Alliance.

28244. New organizations, I suppose, have sprung into existence?—The Royal Templars have rather superseded the Sons of Temperance, and there is also the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

28245. Why do not the Good Templars work through the Sons of Temperance?—I do not know.

28246. Have you not found a tendency of late years to a multiplication of societies?—Yes, I think so. I do not really sympathize with that tendency; still I think on the whole all the societies are beneficial.

28247. You think their intention is good?—Yes.

28248. Do you think they would be stronger if they worked on the same lines as the Sons of Temperance?—I think it would be better. There are now the Royal Templars, the Sons of Temperance and the Good Templars, and if they were all united, they would be more efficient.

28249. Does it not discourage the Sons of Temperance, who did hard work when temperance work was much harder than it is now, to find themselves superseded to a certain extent by new organizations?—It has that tendency, of course.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

28250. They have laboured with other societies, I believe, in the temperance cause?—Undoubtedly.

28251. Are there any insurance features connected with the Royal Templars?—Yes.

28252. Has that feature a tendency to induce people to join that society?—Yes. The Sons of Temperance in the United States have insurance companies of their own.

JAMES R. DICK, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

28253. How long have you resided in Montreal?—Twenty years.

28254. I understand you are at present the officer in charge of the Boys' Home in this city?—I am Manager of the Boys' Home.

28255. What is the official title of it?—The Boys' Home of Montreal.

28256. It is situated on Mountain Street, I believe?—Yes.

28257. How long have you held your present position?—About ten years.

28258. How did it originate?—It originated at the time the *Star* and *Witness* began to issue cheap evening papers. The Home was established on the lines of Lord Shaftesbury's Home in England, to provide a home for boys selling papers. Mr. Charles Alexander offered to build a home at his own expense. For a year or more Mr. Ritchie was superintendent of it. The class of boys that were there were such as were practically uncontrollable. This was owing to the class from which the boys came; the parents in the lower class only sent their boys out to do this kind of work. The Catholic boys were wild, and the institution got into such difficulty that they had to give up that class of work. Then it changed its character to an institution open to the better class of boys, who paid so much per week for their board. This system was continued right on for twelve years, but it was then found that the boys would not go to the Home. I suppose this was because the conveniencies were not such as would induce the better class of boys to go there. Nine years past in June, when I went there, I saw that there was great room for improvement as regards providing for the comfort of the boys. At that time the boys had to eat and wash in the kitchen and almost everything was done in the basement, while they had Shaftesbury's Hall let for services and were receiving a revenue from it. The Plymouth Brethren used it on Sundays and a temperance society used it during the week; so that the boys had not the full use of the building. I got the tenants out, and had the whole place opened for the boys. Instead of having them sit down at rough tables for their meals, I had all that changed, and I treated them as if they were rational beings. After those changes had been made, we had accommodation for fifty boys. Within eight months we began to talk of enlarging the house, as it was filled. Seven years ago we built an addition to accommodate forty boys more, and that has been filled. The plan I adopted was this: The upper dormitory in the old house was used by boys of 14 years of age, who were working boys. They paid \$1.50 to \$1.75 per week, according to what they earned. Then there was the little boys' dormitory, for boys running from 12 to 14 years, who were charged from \$1 a week. If they earned \$1.50 per week they were charged \$1, and they would have half a dollar with which to buy clothes. The new building was fitted up last. In the upper dormitory we had six or seven boys in a room. Possibly some boy who started at \$1 a week afterwards increased until he paid \$2.25. We graduate the table. We feed them all about the same, only the older boys get a little extra at the table. The flat in the new building we have for a few boys who are independent; they pay \$2.75 per week for board and washing. Many of them are the same boys who began with us at the lowest rate. This affords an incentive to the boys to do well, for in that way they obtain more comforts. The institution is progressing very well, it is full and it has capacity for eighty boys. We are now building another wing, not in order to get more boys but to give more room for the boys we have. The basement is to contain large rooms: there will be workshops for evening classes and carpenters and other shops. I want to teach our boys carpentering, and it will be taught by a thoroughly practical man; in fact all the boys we now turn out are able to use carpenter's tools, so that they will ultimately be able to build houses for themselves. We shall also have a plumber's shop and smithy. We have a basement 11 feet high, and it is adapted for these purposes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28259. Then this will be in the nature of a technical school?—Yes, in the nature of a technical school. All the boys, of course, will be at work during the day, and we will hold these classes in the evening. We have on the top flat four rooms for evening

classes, where boys are taught the rudiments of education. I receive a good many boys who have not had much opportunity to go to school, as the evening classes of the city do not amount to anything. There is, however, a very good school called St. Gabriel's school.

28260. How many boys have you at present?—We have 68 in the institution.

28261. What age is the oldest?—The oldest, I think, run from 20 to 21 years.

28262. And the youngest?—About 11 years.

28263. To-day all pay something for their maintenance?—Yes.

28264. From what class do they appear to have come?—A good many are lads who have come out from the old country to better themselves. They find themselves in a city, unable perhaps to get situations; they may have had some money when they started, but it has been spent at the boarding-house and they are left destitute. When they come to me I take them in. In some cases they have no money and in some cases they have no clothes.

28265. I suppose you endeavour to find them employment?—I have always more situations than I am able to fill.

28266. Do you put many of them as apprentices to trades?—Yes.

28267. Do you get many immigrant boys?—Last year we had 45 Canadian and 59 English. The previous year we had 65 Canadian and 55 English boys.

28268. Do you draw a distinction between those born in this country and those who come from abroad?—Yes.

28269. In regard to the Canadian boys who come into your institution, do you know anything about their parentage's past record?—Yes, we always get that information from the boys.

28270. What is the general cause of their coming to you for assistance: Can you classify the causes?—There are a good many who come from the country and try to get on in the city, and they ultimately come to us. A good many also come to us through the drinking habits of their fathers. The mother has perhaps to go out working, and she has to distribute her children where she can.

28271. Is that a large portion of the cases?—No, it is not a large portion. I think it would not be over 15 per cent.

28272. Do you mean as regards the total number in the institution or as regards the number of the Canadians?—Of the Canadians.

28273. Of the Canadians who come in, you say about 15 per cent come to you for assistance owing to the intemperance of one or other of the parents?—Yes, about that number.

28274. Have you any record of the causes leading immigrant boys to come to you?—The boys come out here thinking they will better themselves. There are a good many societies in Scotland and England which send boys out here. They send them out here largely without making any preparation to receive them here, supplying them with tickets for Quebec and allowing them to beg their way here.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28275. Have representations to that effect been made to the authorities?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

28276. Have you in your reports drawn attention to that circumstance?—I do not know that I have publicly done so. There is a class who have been sent out by Dr. Barnardo to people in the country. They do very well for three or four years, and then they get tired of the country. It is not right for Mr. McQuarrie to send out boys to farmers. There are a certain percentage of them not fit for farm life. Boys who have been brought up in the cities and have been living there, of course will not stop on farms. I have represented several times to Mr. McQuarrie that he should classify his boys. I hold that city boys should not be sent to farms, and it would be better for the boys to come here for a time before going on the farm.

28277. You get a few stowaways, I suppose?—Yes, sometimes.

28278. Boys who get on ships and come across the Atlantic and find themselves here with no means of living?—Yes, we receive them sometimes. I am a good judge of

JAMES R. DICK.

a boy's character after I have had a little talk with him. I do not take half the boys that come to me. Some boys will come by one ship and go home by the next. I attended the investigation in regard to the cattle trade in order to represent to the Commission this very point, the opportunities that boys had to come out to this country for a little and go back in cattle ships. I have frequently had to take indentured boys from cattle ships in the middle of the night.

28279. You mean that the boys for whom you had obtained situations and had indentured, left the institution and endeavoured to return by those ships to England?—Yes, the boys went on board the cattle ships.

28280. Can you give the Commission any idea as to how many of the immigrants have been driven to apply to the Home on account of the intemperance of their parents?—No.

28281. You have classified your inmates as Canadians and immigrants. You have told us the percentage of Canadians whom you think have been driven to the institution through the intemperance of their parents. Have you any record of the other classes?—Nothing but statements made by boys at the time. I made no record.

28282. You have said that you had to turn away boys that came to you?—Not many.

28283. How many do you think?—Last year only three were dismissed or expelled; the year previous we expelled two.

28284. What was the cause?—We expelled them for disobedience of the rules. They would not let me rule them according to my way, they broke the rules and would not be amenable to them.

28285. My question refers to those who came to you to obtain admittance into the Home whom you were not able to take and were obliged to turn away. I understood you to say there was a large number whom you were not able to assist?—No, I took in almost every boy, with the exception of those who were only loafers. Of course, if we see that boys are only loafers, I do not take them in.

28286. Were there not a great many applicants for admission whom you could not take in?—No, I give almost every boy a trial.

28287. I understand that you are superintendent and your wife is matron of the institution?—Yes.

28288. How is the institution governed?—It is governed by a Board of Directors and a committee.

28289. By whom are they elected?—By the annual meeting.

28290. The annual meeting is attended, I suppose, simply by those who have been subscribers?—The subscribers are invited every year to attend the annual meeting; they are invited by circular.

28291. They are invited to attend whether they have subscribed little or much, I suppose?—Yes.

28292. Does the meeting elect the governing body of the institution?—Yes.

28293. Of how many persons is the governing body constituted?—Twenty-seven.

28294. I think you adopted some means of encouraging boys to save part of their earnings?—Yes. We started a bank for the boys some eight years ago, a penny savings bank for the Home alone. By and by outsiders came in, and we allowed them to come in. We had to take the bank out of the house, as we had not room for it, as the outside deposits grew so much. Last year the total amount deposited by thirty-five depositors was \$334.75, or an average per boy of \$9.56. The highest amount deposited was \$49.22.

28295. You think this is an incentive to encourage the boys to save what they can out of their earnings?—Yes. This does not, however, represent the total amount of the savings by the boys. A certain class of boys bring their money to me. If a boy is earning \$2.50 per week, he may bring it to me, and I give him ten cents, and I put the balance away, and if he wants a suit of clothes I give him an order for a suit and he buys it. But every boy is as independent as I am, and clothes himself.

28296. You act as banker, I suppose?—Yes, in regard to any of the earnings that are not deposited in the savings bank. A good many of our boys also deposit in the Post Office Savings Bank.

28297. Have you much trouble with the boys on the score of drinking?—Very little.

28298. Of course, a boy who offends in this respect will be turned out of the Home?—Yes, he will be turned out after a time.

28299. You give him a second chance, I suppose?—I hang on a long time to a boy before I let him go.

28300. Have you had cause to expel many boys on that score?—No, I generally hang on to them; I think that offence may be the last.

28301. Can you tell the Commission anything as regards the history of the boys after they have left your institution?—Yes.

28302. I suppose you try to keep track of them?—So far as I can, I do. When they leave and go outside they sometimes correspond and sometimes not.

28303. You keep an account of those who go through the institution, so that you may be able to follow them?—I have a record of every boy who came in, which shows his name, where he is from, his parents' address and there is a column for remarks. When a boy leaves us, I enter the date when he leaves, his character and other particulars.

28304. Can you tell the Commission anything with regard to the boys after they have left your institution? Do they succeed; are they temperate?—Yes, as a rule. There are very few in the city who have come to drink, very few indeed. There are lots of my boys, I could count one hundred in the city occupying good situations to-day, who are married men with families, and who got their start at the Boys' Home.

28305. Have you instances of boys saving up money to buy bicycles on which to go to and from work?—No. We are very centrally situated, so that all our boys, or at any rate our boys with few exceptions can come to dinner without a bicycle. There are two of our boys, for whom you, Mr. Chairman, gave a word of recommendation, who are now locomotive engineers on the Grand Trunk Railway, and there is another who was with me and is now employed on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

28305a. You have stated that you have not much trouble with the boys on the score of intemperance?—It is an exception. I have had some trouble owing to the nearness of so many saloons to the Home. I have found a great deal of fault with the License Commissioners granting licenses to places between St. Antoine and St. James Streets; between those two streets there are no less than six saloons. There are five licensed places next door to each other, and exactly next door to the Boys' Home on Mountain Street. There are five licensed places within a distance of one hundred and fifty feet.

28306. I suppose that is a busy part of the city and is close to the market, where the farmers come to dispose of their commodities?—Yes; but I do not think there is any necessity for establishing such a large number of saloons there.

28307. Am I not correct in my statement?—I think they are not necessary. There were Thompson's and Creenan's formerly; there were only those two until about five years ago. There is a great deal more drinking now by the butchers than there was previously.

28308. You have said that the boys after they leave your institution do not fall into trouble on account of intemperance?—Not that I know of. There are very few such cases that I am aware of.

28309. What is the total sum you collect and expend each year in connection with your institution?—I expend all the money I get in from the boys for maintenance. Last year I received \$6,580.90 from the boys alone. That was all expended for groceries, services, wages and furnishing coal and wood, gas, stationery and printing, etc.,—in fact, for the necessary running expenses of the internal management of the Home. In addition I collected last year \$905.50 for general expenses, such as paying interest account. These two sums form the total income of last year. We obtained subscriptions to the amount of \$1,170 towards the building fund of the new building that is now under construction.

28310. You say you collected from the boys about \$6,000 and that you received about \$1,000 in subscriptions towards your institution?—That is what I aimed at.

28311. The building fund, of course, is a separate matter?—Yes.

28312. Considerable amounts have been given to the building fund?—All these sums have been given by donations.

JAMES R. DICK.

28313. Is the Home self-sustaining?—The internal arrangements are all self-sustaining. The boys' contributions are not applied to pay my salary or interest account. The \$1,000 I collect goes for that, and to pay interest on the debt. I have had trouble now and again from our boys, who are minors, getting liquor for the women servants. It is a very difficult matter in Montreal to get a larder woman or cook who does not drink.

*By the Chairman :*

28314. You mean that the boys are sent to the neighbouring saloons and get liquor for servants in the house. Have you had cases of that kind?—Yes.

28315. What has been done in that regard?—When the Quebec law came into force the first case I had under it before the Magistrate was that of a boy being sent up the street for a jug of beer. I caught him. We took the case up, and it was fought out for a week or two before the License Commissioners, and the conclusion there arrived at was that we had to prove that the saloon-keeper knew the boy was under 18 years of age. This boy had come to me about two months previous, and he gave me the date of his birth, which showed that he was only 16 years of age; that was a couple of months previous to this case coming up. I swore to those facts.

28316. What was the result of the case?—The result was that the Magistrate required us to prove that the saloon-keeper knew the boy was under 18.

28317. Were you unable to do that?—I swore that according to the statement made by the boy sometime previous, he was only 16.

28318. What was the result of the trial?—We could not prove that the saloon-keeper knew that the boy was under 18 years.

28319. Have you had any other cases?—I have had cases of little boys being sent for liquor.

28320. For the servants of the house?—Yes.

28321. Have you prosecuted any other cases?—It is no use.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28322. Could you not employ servants who would not drink, thereby saving the boys from being sent for liquor?—There is no use trying to prosecute in these cases, for you cannot get any satisfaction. There is a fight for a long time and the chances are that you will lose the case after all.

28323. With respect to English lads coming out here, have you communicated or requested the management to communicate with Dr. Barnardo and other people engaged in sending out boys?—I represented the matter to Dr. Barnardo's agent here and also his agent at Toronto. But Dr. Barnardo does not send any boys here. In fact we do not receive any boys sent out from the old country.

28324. I suppose after Dr. Barnardo's boys and such have drifted into Montreal and have been here for a while, they are apt to apply to you, and you admit them?—Yes.

28325. Would it not be better if they were sent out into the country after they had been in your Home for a while?—We are not a receiving home for the old country. Only boys whom we find in Montreal in need of help are assisted.

28326. What change would you suggest as advisable to be made in regard to these boys sent out by Dr. Barnardo and others?—The boys should be given a chance to follow such trades as they wish to adopt. If a boy wants to be a carpenter we should do what we can to make him one. When boys come to me after spending four or five years in country districts and they have reached 18 years of age, it is very difficult to get situations for them to learn a trade. If I get a boy at 15, I can give him his trade before he is 20, and then he is a man. I have now five or six Scotch boys who have come in from the country. I have also taken some boys who have served their apprenticeship in the country newspaper office and who have come down here. It is pretty hard for them to get situations. One boy after serving an apprenticeship had to commence at \$2 a week.

*By the Chairman :*

28327. I understand that, in your opinion, the boys brought out are not advantageously distributed, that too many are taken into the country districts and made agricultural

labourers, and that some with advantage might be brought to the cities. Is that the opinion you desire to express?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28328. What answer has Mr. McQuarrie made to your representation?—I have reported to Mr. Burgess over and over again. I was at Brockville two weeks ago.

28329. Is there any mode of discipline in the institution, except that of expelling boys?—No. If a boy does not behave himself he must go somewhere else. We bear, however, a long time with them. I have found out occasionally that some boys must be turned out.

28330. How long have you lived in this city?—About 18 years.

28331. As to the social customs of Montreal, have you found a change in the direction of temperance?—Yes, I think temperance is on the increase.

28332. Is that the result of your observation in the city?—Yes.

28333. Has that change taken place among all classes of the people or among a certain class?—I have not noticed it in regard to the people on the streets especially.

28334. Have you noticed whether the influences of churches and temperance societies have had the effect of diminishing drinking? You say you believe there is an increase in temperance. Would that increase have taken place without such influences?—I do not think the churches have used the influence they might have exercised in regard to temperance.

28335. Have you noticed yourself, apart from your institution, what has been the effect of this system of the liquor traffic as regards families and business?—I have not thought much about it, as I have been so much occupied with the Boys' Home.

28336. In your observation of the license law in this city, have you noticed whether the law is observed on Sundays, whether the saloons are closed?—There are four licensed places near the Home, and if people do not go there to drink, the proprietors must have a great many relatives.

28337. Are people going in and out all the time?—There are a great many visitors. It is one of those places where they go round to the back and get in by the back fence.

28338. Have you noticed whether the establishment of parks in the city has had any effect in diminishing the Sunday trade in saloons?—I have not thought of that matter.

28339. Have you considered the question as to the desirability of separating the sale of liquor from groceries?—Yes. I believe there should be no groceries licensed.

28340. From your observation as a citizen of Montreal have you reason to suppose that there is an adulteration of liquors carried on and that vile compounds are sold in this city as liquor?—I cannot say.

28341. Not from the effects of drink you have seen on the people?—I have seen men drunk, but I cannot say that they were drunk from the effects of adulterated drink.

28342. In some cases it has been stated to the Commission that people after taking such compounds become not drunk but paralyzed?—A man can drink three or four glasses of whisky in Scotland, but if he takes two glasses here you may see the man in the gutter.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

28343. How do you account for that?—It is due to the liquor.

*By the Chairman:*

28344. Has not this climate something to do with it?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

28345. Has not the temperament of the person something to do with it?—If there is any explanation, it is as regards the liquor.

28346. May not Scotchmen be able to stand more than Canadians?—Men become paralyzed there as well as here.

28347. Then you think the effect of liquor on Scotchmen is the same as on other people, it paralyzes them?—Yes.

JAMES R. DICK.

28348. Do you know anything of the existence of illicit sale of liquor in Montreal? You have said that there are several licensed saloons in the vicinity of the Home: do you know if there is any illicit selling also in that section?—I have no doubt there is a good deal of illicit selling on Sunday.

28349. I mean by people not holding licenses, I mean illicit selling in shebeens and beaneries?—I have heard it reported that there are several such on St. Antoine Street, but I have no personal knowledge in regard to them.

28350. Have you had any experience of the laws and customs of any other country where there is prohibition?—No.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28351. Do your boys frequent pool rooms and billiard rooms?—I heard that some of my boys were going to certain places on St. Antoine Street, and I stopped it. It was a question of not going there or leaving the Home.

28352. What percentage of the boys who are with you came there on account of drunkenness on the part of their parents?—I think about 15 per cent.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28353. Do you know anything of the parentage of the boys?—I always get a report from the boy himself.

28354. Are you able to learn anything about the habits of the parents as regards drink?—About 15 per cent of the Canadian boys come to me directly through the drinking habits of their parents.

28355. But as regards other boys, about what would be the percentage?—There is another class of boys to which I have not referred. There are a good many boys who have respectable parents in the old country and who have homes there. Some of them are well educated, but they have got into circumstances here when they need a helping hand. By coming to me they find a home and employment, and if they do well, they rise in life. Many of them to-day are occupying good situations in the city as travellers and clerks and so on, and now have homes for themselves and families.

28356. Of the boys who come to you from England, such as Dr. Barnardo's boys, who come to your institution after they have been in the country for a while, what percentage would they constitute?—There are very few of Dr. Barnardo's boys with us; I have more who were brought over by Mrs. Birt. We had 59 old country boys and 45 Canadians last year, and these were counter-balanced by 65 Canadians and 55 old country boys the year before.

28357. Have you been able to ascertain whether any percentage of the old country boys are children of drinking parents and had to leave home and look after themselves on that account?—I have not; there are some undoubtedly.

28358. Can you tell the number approximately?—Last year I received 119 boys into the Home. Possibly there would be one in a dozen who had left his home because of the drinking habits of his parents in the old country; but at the same time a large number of those whom Mrs. Birt brings out and Mr. McQuarrie and Dr. Barnardo, are boys who have been taken away from drinking families.

28359. Were they boys who had nobody to care for them?—No, not all. Mr. McQuarrie's boys are collected from different families. They are waifs, or at all events some are waifs. Mrs. Birt thinks she can help widows by giving their boys a start, and she brings them out.

*By the Chairman :*

28360. Do those boys who go on the cattle ships come back sometimes?—Yes, they come back worse than they went. A boy came back the other day; this was the third time, and he declared that he never would do it again. He is doing pretty well now; he is in the Home.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28361. Do you think the drinking shops in this city are a temptation to your boys?—Yes, I am afraid of the boys all the time. Those places undoubtedly offer a tempta-



tion. If there were not so many saloons the boys would never think of going there ; at the same time I very seldom come across a case of a boy drinking who has been at the Home. So long as they are connected with our Home, they do not do it, and they know well what will happen if they do.

*By the Chairman :*

28362. What is the longest time during which one of your boys has remained with you ?—I had one last year with me who had been in the Home for ten years. The one who has been the longest there now has been there six years. A boy will serve an apprenticeship of perhaps three years with me, but an apprenticeship generally covers a term of four or five years.

JOHN R. BELL, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

28363. How long have you resided in Montreal ?—Twenty-four years.

28364. What is your business or occupation ?—I am manager of the Sailors' Institute here.

28365. Will you tell the Commission the character of that institution and its operations ?—Yes. The Montreal Sailors' Institute is an institution whose object is to promote the benefit and well-being of the seamen temporarily in the city of Montreal. In my position I am brought in contact with ship-owners, ship-masters, officers and men from the vessels visiting the port, and from my observation I have no hesitation in saying that the drink traffic is the greatest curse of the sailor's life. Our rooms are situated on the corner of Commissioners Street and Place Royale, about the centre of our harbour, and within a stone's throw there are no less than nine saloons. One only of this number makes any pretense at giving meals, the rest are simply grog shops and have no reason to exist. Around the saloons along the wharfs the lowest and most depraved human beings congregate, and many of the sailors and wharf labourers after receiving their hard earned wages are enticed into these places, and after being stupefied by the poisonous stuff, are robbed. Thousands of dollars are lost by the sailors yearly in this way. The Sunday liquor law is not enforced, indeed it seems that many of the police are in league with the liquor sellers. On Sunday, September 11th, as I was passing one of the saloons, a policeman came out with two other men, while his mate waited on the next corner. Two Sundays previous to that two policemen were allowed into the same saloon by the proprietor himself, and I waited on the opposite side and found they remained in the saloon just six minutes, and then they continued on their beat. On another Sunday not long ago, I met no less than four policemen in uniform coming out of a saloon, one of them wiping his moustache as though he had just enjoyed a drink, and this at 12.30 noon on Sunday. Speaking of the open violation of the Sunday law to a policeman one evening, he informed me that he had reported to his sergeant two places that he knew were violating the law, and had been told to never mind them, that these places being open on Sunday kept the toughs from going up town. There are more drunken men on the wharfs on Sunday than on any other day in the week. Almost all the crimes of which sailors are convicted are traceable directly to the liquor traffic, as also the accidents and accidental deaths. Therefore, believing as I do that the liquor traffic is a great evil, I am in favour of the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquor. I know such a measure could not be enforced without the approval of a good majority of the people, but I believe such a majority could be secured; and I have no doubt it would, without much trouble, be enforced as well as the present license law.

28366. You have not told the Commission how the Sailors' Home is supported and what special exertion you make to benefit the sailors ?—It is supported by voluntary

JAMES R. DICK.

contributions of the citizens of Montreal, chiefly those of shippers and merchants. The cost of running the institution is about \$2,300 a year.

28367. What accommodation have you?—We have the two upper floors of Boyer's block, at the corner of Commissioners Street and Place Royale.

28368. How many rooms have you?—Each floor is practically a series of rooms. The lower flat is occupied as a writing room and reading room, where sailors come and read their letters and the papers, and there is also an office and kitchen. We also permit visitors to come in and enjoy bagatelle and other games. We have concerts at night, which are crowded, and our writing and reading rooms are also well filled.

28369. Do you supply meals?—We have a tea and temperance meeting every Saturday night. The kitchen is used for the purpose.

28370. I suppose your rooms are open to sailors of all nationalities?—Yes.

28371. And they can visit them and read the papers and periodicals there?—Yes.

28372. But they cannot get any refreshments there of any kind except on Saturday night?—Quite so.

28373. Are you manager of the institution?—Yes.

28374. What staff have you, if any?—I have Miss Ritchie associated with me.

28375. You have no servants?—Only the caretaker of the building.

28376. What is the amount collected annually for the institution?—Subscriptions amounted last year to \$1,700, and there were collections made from ships and from concerts amounting to \$304.

28377. So the income is about \$2,000?—Then we had a concert at the Windsor, which netted us \$100, and for the Friday evening concert we charge ten cents to the citizens.

28378. Then there were voluntary contributions of about \$1,700, collections on board steamers at concerts \$300, and from your own exertions, concerts and so on \$200?—Yes.

28379. That sum is nearly all expended in paying your compensation?—Yes, and rent, water tax, gas, heating and matters of that sort.

28380. Is the average income about that sum?—Yes, about \$2,200.

28381. Then the principal part goes in wages?—\$1,200 out of \$2,200.

28382. Then during the week there are no entertainments?—We have religious services, morning and evening, on Sundays, and also on Monday and Wednesday evenings. During the week there is a concert on Friday evening and on Saturday night there is a tea temperance meeting. The institution is open from early morning to half past ten at night.

28383. What takes place at those temperance meetings?—We give the sailors a cup of tea, and have a temperance address from myself and addresses from others whom I may choose to ask.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

28384. Is there any pledge given?—Yes. The signatures to the pledge amount to 403 this year.

*By the Chairman:*

28385. Have you any record of the number of sailors who visit the institution?—Yes. We have not a record of the number of sailors alone, but of the number of visits made. I should say that about 7,000 sailors come yearly to the port, and they run in four or five times, and so the visits to the institution number about 26,000.

28386. Have you any record of the number who visit the place every day?—The average last year was 108 per day.

28387. Have you any information as to the manner in which the sailors keep the pledge after they have taken it?—Of course we find it hard to follow them up, for they are here to-day and off again to-morrow, but I believe the majority keep the pledge.

28388. Have you any statistics in that regard?—No.

28389. Then on what do you base your belief?—On those who return to us; but, of course, many of them never return.

28390. Is your pledge taken for a specified time?—No.

28391. Is it taken for life?—For life.

28392. From what you have said already, I suppose I am correct in concluding that you think there are too many saloons in this city?—Most decidedly so.

28393. Of your own knowledge, can you say there are many places where liquor is being sold without a license?—I do not know.

28394. Has any information on that point been communicated to you?—I think there are so many licensed that a man without a license would not be able to get along.

28395. Would not a man without a license be able to sell cheaper than a man with a license?—They usually sell for 5 cents a drink, and I do not think there is anything cheaper than that.

28396. Do keepers of saloons along the wharf obtain licenses in the same way as keepers of saloons or restaurants in other parts of the city?—I believe so.

28397. Then they have to get a certain number of signatures to their applications?—I have not studied the license law much, but I believe the law applies the same to those on the wharf as to applicants for licenses elsewhere.

28398. Can you tell the Commission as a fact whether the owners of vessels take any active steps to inculcate temperance among the sailors?—To my knowledge, they do to a very small extent; I think they do very little in that way.

28399. Do vessel owners as a class render very liberal support to your institution?—Yes.

28400. You have made a statement to the effect that the police are in league with the liquor sellers in some instances?—I said those instances I mentioned would make it seem to be the case.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28401. Then they knew of the violation of the law?—Yes. They appear to violate the law themselves, for although they perhaps did not purchase the drink, they appeared to have drunk it. Of course I did not see them; I do not know whether they drank or not when they went into the saloon. Of course I did not go in myself.

28402. You say the Sunday law is not enforced, that indeed some members of the police force are in league with the liquor sellers, and you went on to say that on Sunday, 11th September, on passing one of the saloons a policeman came out with two other men while his mate waited on the corner; that, two Sundays previous to that, two policemen were allowed into this same saloon by the proprietor himself, and you waited on the opposite side and found they remained in the saloon just six minutes and then continued on their beats; and further, that on Sunday not long ago you saw four policemen in uniform coming out of the saloon, one of them wiping his moustache as though he had just enjoyed a drink, and this was at 12.30 noon on Sunday?—Yes.

28403. You based, then, your statement that the police are in league with the saloon-keepers on the facts you have mentioned?—Yes.

28404. Have you as Superintendent of the Sailors' Home taken any steps to bring that state of matters before the attention of the city authorities?—I have not. I have left that matter with the Dominion Alliance.

28405. You have made no report to the Superintendent of Police about these occurrences?—No.

28406. Did you advise the Dominion Alliance that such a state of things existed there?—Mr. J. H. Carson, who is a friend of mine and whom I have known for some time, knew it; it was not necessary for me to tell him.

*By the Chairman :*

28407. Then you have made no special report to any one in connection with the matter?—No.

28408. Do you make an annual report to the subscribers who contribute to your institution?—Yes.

28409. Is it printed?—Yes, and it is sent to subscribers.

28410. Have you referred to anything of that kind in your reports; I mean any charge such as you have described to the Commission, as to the police being in league

JOHN R. BELL.

with the liquor sellers to break the law?—No. This is the first season that I have seen the law so openly violated.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28411. You say that Mr. Carson knew this : was he with you?—He did not know about the policemen coming out of the saloon. He knew about the reasons why those two saloon-keepers were not called up. There are two saloons which do not go behind the door to sell liquor, but sell quite openly on Sunday.

28412. Have you and other citizens who saw the policemen doing such acts, refrained from informing the authorities? Were you not perhaps censurable in not seeing these men prosecuted?—Perhaps I am. I do not like the idea of being an informer.

28413. Of course that would not be acting as an informer. You are a ratepayer and are supporting those policemen, and I presume you are taxed to see that they do their duty, and you have a right, as a citizen, to see that they do their duty when they are paid for doing it?—Yes.

28414. If in case of conversing with the sergeant and mentioning this matter you found that course to be insufficient, was there not an Inspector or a Chief over the sergeant?—Yes.

28414*a*. But you do not seem to have reported the matter to any of those officers?—No.

28415. Another matter of which you have spoken is as to labourers being enticed into saloons and stupefied by the drink sold there. I suppose the section of the city where your institution is placed contains about the lowest class of licensed places?—Yes, I should think so.

28416. Have you reason to believe, from your observation, that compounded and adulterated liquors are sold there?—I do not know anything whatever in regard to the purity of the liquor sold ; but I know that the sailors have come to me and told me that after drinking two glasses of lager beer, they have been so stupefied that they did not know what they were doing.

28417. Do those liquors have a paralyzing effect?—Yes.

28418. I think you stated that you had reason to believe that the sailors while under the influence of such drink, are robbed of their money?—Some of them are.

28419. Has the city taken any steps to put an end to that state of things existing in connection with the saloons?—They have made no efforts.

28420. Have you remonstrated with the authorities in any way?—Not at all.

28421. Are the licenses to those saloons continued year after year?—Yes, year after year ; and I have made reference to those places regularly in my report. These reports are printed and circulated among the subscribers.

*By the Chairman :*

28422. Have you a committee to direct the institution?—Yes.

28423. How is it elected?—It is elected by the subscribers at the annual meeting.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28424. Judging from your observation of those drinking places, do you believe that liquor is sold to minors, to young men under twenty-one years of age?—I have no knowledge of that being done. I do not remember seeing any boys coming out of such places.

28425. You have seen the effect of drinking on those sailors. Have you ever considered the treatment of the habitual and persistent drunkard? We all know that men promenade from the saloon to the court and from the court to jail, and back again. In your opinion, is it desirable to put such inebriates into an asylum with a hope of improving them, or at all events, of keeping them away from drink. Have you formed any opinion on that subject?—I believe a man who will not take the advice given to him in the Bible should be prohibited from taking liquor, and he should be placed out of the way of temptation.

28426. It has been suggested that there exist in the city private parks, one of which is Sohmer Park, that are having a beneficial effect on the citizens by affording places where they can get amusement, and thus be saved from the temptation of frequenting saloons. Have you had occasion to notice the effect of those parks?—I am not in a position to speak of Sohmer Park.

28427. Do the sailors go there?—Yes; quite a number of sailors go there in the evening.

28428. Have you had any opportunity of observing them at the park?—They are certainly better there than they would be in French Mary's, which is a notorious saloon on the wharf.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28429. Is it kept by a woman?—She has a son-in-law there.

28430. In whose name is the house licensed?—In the son's name, in the name of Murphy.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28431. Have you any personal knowledge of Sohmer Park?—None whatever.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28432. Is your institution the only one in the city providing comfort and help for the sailors?—It is the only institution specially for sailors. We have a branch at Hochelaga.

28433. Do you think your institution is sufficiently large to afford that accommodation, recreation and protection which might be given to sailors?—No.

28434. In a port of the size of Montreal?—No. We ought to have a Home in connection with the institution.

28435. Then you do not provide any lodgings for them?—No.

28436. You have no system of providing refreshments, such as tea, coffee, and so on?—No.

28437. Except on the occasions to which you have referred?—Yes.

28438. Do you think it would afford a great advantage to the seafaring population frequenting this port if there was provided a home where the sailors could get lodgings and board, and all the refreshments they required?—I do. I have been agitating that very scheme.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28439. Has it been very long agitated?—Ever since I took charge, and during the time of my grand-father before me. This is my fifth season. I may say that we have a building fund amounting to \$11,000 at present.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28440. Then you are taking steps in that direction?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

28441. Is that money to carry on operations on your present site?—Yes, but to carry them on to better advantage.

28442. Is it proposed to provide refreshment rooms?—It is proposed to use the money for the purpose of putting up a more suitable building, where we can lodge sailors and otherwise provide for them.

28443. Is it contemplated to provide a place where they would be able to get tea and coffee?—I think so.

28444. But no beverages of an intoxicating kind?—I think that is the view which the committee hold.

28445. Are there any other places on the wharf where tea and coffee, at very cheap rates, are supplied to the sailors?—There are two or three.

JOHN R. BELL.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28446. Are those places in which alcoholic drinks are also sold?—No, they are temperance places.

28447. By whom are they established and controlled?—One is kept by Miss Chillingworth, who started a coffee house and lodging house in Joe Beef's old place, and another is occupied by Mrs. Wheeler for the Women's Christian Temperance Union. There is a French woman who has a shanty on the wharf and sells tea and coffee.

28448. I suppose she does not provide anything but harmless refreshments?—Ginger ale, soda water, tea and coffee.

*By the Chairman :*

28449. As a matter of fact, do not the sailors remain on board ship when they are in harbour?—Some of them do, but a good many of them go ashore.

28450. Do you think the majority do not sleep on board the ships?—Yes.

28451. You think sleeping places should be provided on shore for the men?—They would be specially used by sailors on board vessels who have been on long voyages, and there are a number of sailors paid off here. Those form the class who are induced to frequent saloons, if they have large sums of money coming to them.

28452. Yet sailors generally sleep on board the vessel?—Yes, on all steamships and a large number of other vessels.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28453. Does the license law in this city, in your opinion, practically regulate the liquor traffic; is Sunday selling freely carried on here?—Yes.

28454. And selling after hours, and to drunken men, I suppose?—I think so. I do not see that the license law is of any avail down there.

28455. Do you mean by that phrase that it is not enforced?—It is not enforced.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28456. If the law were enforced—what then?—We would have a better state of things.

28457. You spoke about accidents. I think you said that the majority of accidents that occurred were the result of drink?—A drunken sailor will go on board and possibly fall into the hold, and sometimes he may fall into the water.

28458. Those are the kinds of accidents that take place on vessels in port. You refer to those particularly?—Yes, to accidents in port.

28459. Is there much drunkenness among the dock labourers, who are employed in discharging cargoes?—There is some difficulty with the dock labourers, who are as a class very much given to alcoholic liquors.

28460. How do you account for that: is it due to the nature of their employment?—Perhaps so; or more particularly on account of the character of the men.

28461. What kind of men are they?—I believe they have got to a very low condition. This work is such that scarcely any man will take it. They work for a little while, and then they get drunk with what they have earned.

28462. Is their work very fatiguing and exhausting?—They are employed down in the hold of the vessel and are half suffocated. Their lungs get filled with dust.

28463. Have the ship-owners made any representation to the authorities with regard to the large number of saloons along the wharf?—Not to my knowledge.

28464. The authorities must be aware, I suppose, of the existence of these run holes?—Yes.

28465. So far as the sailors are concerned, do they frequent the hotels?—Not to any extent, they go to saloons.

28466. Then you think if the saloons were ousted altogether, it would be a good thing for the sailors, I suppose?—Yes.

28467. Are you not aware that it is contrary to law to sell liquor in restaurants where meals are not supplied?—I have always been under that impression.

28468. And the authorities wink at those violations of the law apparently?—Yes.

REV. JAMES LAWSON, of Compton, P. Q., on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

28469. Do you reside in the city ?—I am Methodist Minister in Compton.

28470. Perhaps you would prefer to make a statement to the Commission ?—I think the special reason why I was asked to give evidence is because I have lived in various places as a Methodist Minister, and have been about and seen the effects of the license law and the local option law. I have lived part of my time under license and part under Scott Act and the Dunkin Act and municipal prohibitory laws, so I have had a chance to see the difference in the condition of people under those different laws. If I go back a few years, to 1875, 1876 and 1877, I then lived at Mallorytown, in Leeds County. We had the Dunkin Act in force there. Whilst I was there, an effort was made to repeal it, but the Act was sustained by a good majority. The merchants there tell me they would rather pay \$20 extra as taxes than go back to license. Business was better from the very commencement of the Act going into force.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28471. Do you know any one especially who stated that to you ?—Robert Tenant.

28472. In the West ?—I heard others speak of it. Mr. Tenant was postmaster and a very prominent man, and I lived near by, and I remember he made that statement.

28473. In what business was he engaged ?—He was merchant and postmaster. He considered the effect of the law very beneficial. I do not remember now anybody else making a statement of that kind, but there was a general feeling in favour of the Act. So far as I remember during the three years I lived there, I think it was just three years, I saw only about three drunken men, about one a year, and they came off the train. Brockville had that Act. Sometimes I saw a few drunken men, once in a while one would come off the train. So there was no drunkenness there, and no results of drunkenness that I could see. When an effort was made to repeal the Act, it was sustained by a good majority. The people in general seemed to appreciate the good effects and approve of the Act. I went from there to Avonmore.

28474. Were you at Mallorytown before the Act came into force ?—No.

28475. So you had no opportunity of contrasting the condition of things under license with the condition of things under the Dunkin Act ?—No, I did not have that opportunity.

*By the Chairman :*

28476. Was the law maintained in force in Mallorytown ?—I have not heard of its repeal yet.

JUDGE McDONALD.—The law is in this position there : The Scott Act was passed for the whole county, and when it was repealed, everything was swept away.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28477. When was it repealed ?—In 1889. The next three years I spent in Stormont County in the Township of Roxburgh, and there an attempt was made to repeal the Dunkin Act, which was sustained with an increased majority. The people were generally in favour of it.

28478. When was that ?—I was there from 1878 to 1881. I think it was in 1880. It was sustained by a good majority. There was one corner of the township where we had a majority against us. I think they were French principally. There was scarcely any drinking there. There was one man who used to get drunk occasionally. There were two or three who would chip in and send him out to the neighbouring township and get the liquor. That was where the law was not in force. We used to warn that man that he might be killed somewhere on the railway, but he said he never would ; nevertheless that was his end. He was an intelligent man, and he was the first to vote

REV. JAMES LAWSON.

for sustaining the Act, because he knew his passions were so strong he might come to such an end. After I left, the Act was superseded by the Scott Act, and when that was repealed, the whole was swept away. I think that was in 1888.

*By the Chairman :*

28479. Was it not in 1884 that it was carried? Was it not voted upon again in 1888 and repealed?—Word came to me that this man was drinking again, and he was dead on the railway with a bottle by his side.

28480. Was that after the repeal of the Scott Act?—Yes.

28481. What was his name?—Michael Dooley.

28482. Where did he live?—In Avonmore. I spent a year in Delta in Leeds County from 1883 to 1884. That was before the enactment of the Scott Act. I left before it was carried, so they were under license then. There was a considerable amount of drinking. The license law was ignored to a great extent, and a great many cases were before the court.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28483. You had no opportunity to make a comparison between the Dunkin Act, or Scott Act and the license law?—No. We began an agitation for it while I was there, but it was not until after I left in June, 1884, that it was carried. I went from there to Cobden in Renfrew County for three years. Here I had occasion to see the difference between the two. I immediately began agitating for the Scott Act, and held meetings from July, 1884, up to 7th November, when the vote was taken, and the Act was carried by a majority of 730. It came into force the next May. I remained there three years, so I was a little over two years under the Scott Act. When I went to Cobden, I found it the worst place I ever lived in. That is on the Canadian Pacific Railway, twenty miles this side of Pembroke. I think I never saw a place so cursed with drinking as that. The nights were hideous from drunken brawlers. It was dangerous to go out at night.

*By the Chairman :*

28484. What was the population?—It was a very small place. It has grown since that.

28485. How many inhabitants were there, 100?—More than that, perhaps 200 or 300 in 1884.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28486. How many hotels were there?—There were two. I do not know whether there were more or not, but there were two. There was a terrible amount of drinking, and I used to be afraid to drive in because of meeting drunken people.

28487. Were there unlicensed places?—I do not remember hearing of any, but between that and Osceola, there was a place where a man sold liquor without a license, and we locked him in jail.

*By the Chairman :*

28488–89. How was it after the Scott Act?—I heard of drinking being done and discovered that drinking was done, and I know a certain minister who tried to get the people to give effect to the Act. The people were rather afraid of dynamite and such things, and that summer many things happened in Orangeville and other places where men were dynamited and illtreated in other ways; and as the people did not seem inclined to take means to enforce the Act, that minister had to tell the people to let him know about any infringements of the law, and he would keep their names secret till doomsday, and that was done. These men were fined many times, and some were jailed, and one was driven out of the country. On 12th July, in one of these years, there were 5,000 people there, and there was a circus there at the time, and I tried to discover if there was a drunken man or any liquor on the ground, and I did not discover any sign of liquor, or the smell of it on a man's breath. The general statement was made that men went to these hotels and could not get it, the law had become so effective at that time.



*By the Chairman :*

28490. In what year was that?—The year 1886, I think.

28491. The law would have been in force about twelve months?—Yes. During those two years I saw, I think, two or three drunken men, whereas before that the thing was as I have stated. The change between license and Scott Act was as great as I could possibly expect it to be. I did not expect any more benefit to accrue to us from the enactment of the Scott Act than did take place. It was a disappointment to some who thought it would make a paradise at once. I know the Scott Act could be enforced, because I know who did enforce it, and how it was done, and it had a grand effect on the people, on individuals and on the people generally. There was a man who used to stay away from the village because he would be treated, and he was afraid of it. He was one of the foremost men to vote for the Act, because he wanted the temptation to be put away from him.

28492. The Act was carried in Renfrew in the first instance by 730 majority?—It was.

28493. There were 2,766 who voted out of 5,113. Subsequently in 1888, the by-law was repealed, and there were 4,250 persons who voted when there were 6,815 on the voters' list, and the by-law was rescinded by a majority of 910. How do you account for the great change this indicates in the sentiments of the people on the question?—That is a difficult question for anybody to answer, but especially for me, because I was not there. I left in June, 1887, a year before the repeal of the Act, and, therefore, I am not prepared to speak as if I had been there.

28494. If the effect had been what you describe, it seems extraordinary that there should have been so many people to vote for the repeal of the Act?—Before the vote was taken in the county it had been repealed in several other counties, and whereas there had been a prohibition wave sweeping over the country before, it seemed to be going back.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28495. Did that have to do with the adoption of the Act?—I think so; and as it was not as effective in some counties as people expected it to be, they voted for its repeal. Many people there thought it was not proper to be an informer. I do not think so.

*By the Chairman :*

28496. You notice these figures. In the first instance only 2,766 persons voted on the Act out of 5,113 total, and the majority was 730 in favour of the Act. When it was repealed the electors numbered 6,815 and 4,250 voted. A very much larger number voted, and the majority against the Act was 910?—There may have been more people in the county. In the first instance, perhaps, the people were not aroused to a great extent on the subject. During the three years the party opposed to the Act became very active; and there was nothing they did not do to bring about the repeal and those who had been in favour of the Act were disappointed.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28497. Where?—In the County of Renfrew. Some people are very sanguine, and think they are going to have heaven when they have the Scott Act. Perhaps the supporters of it coloured it too highly, and I heard some of our good temperance men say they would not vote for it again, and would not take any part in it. They lost faith in the Act and would not enforce it, and some private citizens had to do it.

*By the Chairman :*

28498. The figures go to substantiate what you have stated, that the temperance people themselves did not come forward in the second instance, as in 1884, for 1,740 voted for the Act and in 1888, only 1,617?—Yes, so that one party decreased and the other increased. There was that difference. It puzzled me considerably. I was out of the county, but I thought about it a good deal, and in my opinion it was because a few other

REV. JAMES LAWSON.

counties repealed the Act and they became discouraged, and this informing business was very distasteful. They lost interest in it, and would not do anything to sustain it, whereas the other party would do anything to defeat it.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28499. But if it was so well enforced at Cobden, Pembroke, and Eganville, and those results were so apparent to the electors, there must be some other explanation of the vote in favour of the repeal, because the Rev. Dr. Williams gave similar testimony to yourself as to the successful enforcement of the Act. How can you account for the vote being ten to one against it?—The only way is what I have stated. There may have been other things combining to bring about that result, but as far as my knowledge is concerned, the temperance people did not want to be called upon to enforce the Act. They would vote for it, but then they thought the framers of the Act should put it into operation.

28500. Who virtually put the Act into operation?—Private citizens principally. There was a License Inspector appointed, but he did not care much about it. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction on the part of the temperance people in regard to the License Inspector.

*By the Chairman :*

28501. It is incomprehensible, if it worked such benefits, that the temperance people and others should not have been largely in favour of it. You have described a state of things as the result of the law which is most desirable, and if the people of Renfrew voted for the repeal of the law, we should like to know what brought that about?—There are temperance people and temperance people. I think the figures will show that nearly as many voted the last time as before.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28502. That disposes of the argument that the temperance people were disgusted?—Not all, but some were. The boozers bestirred themselves, while the temperance people should have bestirred themselves and acted in the same way.

*By the Chairman :*

28503. There were very many more voters on the list, over 6,000 against 4,000 in the first instance. It is not to be supposed that all the additional voters were drinkers?—I do not suppose that, but I suppose that the opponents of the Act worked much harder than the temperance people.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28504. There was a decrease of 4 per cent in the votes in favour of the Act, while there was an increase of 150 per cent in those who voted against the Act. The figures went from 1,018 to 2,580. That is what we are trying to account for?—There are many facts I cannot account for. I have never been in a place where the Act was in existence and was repealed during my stay there, so I have nothing to say on that subject.

*By the Chairman :*

28505. Have you something further to say to us?—I lived in Danville, Richmond County, for three years. I came there from Cobden. When I got there, I found they were under the Dunkin Act. A repeal vote was brought on while I was there, and we had 510 majority in favour of sustaining the Act.

28506. That was the County of Richmond?—Yes, the people told me that was the largest majority they had had. They had first the vote to enact it and then another vote to repeal it.

28507. When was that?—29th November, 1888. From that increased majority, I gathered that the Act was growing in favour with the people. During the three years I saw very little drunkenness or drinking. I was about the streets every day and night, more or less, and I saw scarcely any liquor. As in Cobden when the Act was passed, liquor practically vanished as if there was no liquor there; so in Danville I saw no more effects of liquor than if it did not exist.

28508. You do not remember the numbers?—No. I understood from the Clerk of the Circuit Court that the cases before the Court were reduced under the Dunkin Act, very largely; that perhaps not more than one-tenth of the number they had previously under license came up.

28509. Had you occasion to visit Richmond during that time?—Yes, occasionally.

28510. That was an exception in a way, was it not?—You mean there was liquor sold there more than in other places? It seemed to be a centre for the liquor traffic in that county. The greatest difficulty we had was to sustain the Act there, it being a centre.

28511. Was there any place in the district licensed for the sale of liquor for medicinal purposes?—I am not aware. There is one drug store.

28512. The proprietor would have to obtain a license?—I do not know whether druggists have or not. I am in my third year at Compton; I have lived there over two years. There they had not the Scott Act or Dunkin Act, but a municipal prohibitory by-law.

28513. That is local option?—Yes; it is a very quiet place. You see very little of the effects of drinking; a little occasionally, but not much. Liquor can be had at Sherbrooke and many go there, but I do not think liquor has been sold there much, except last year when a man obtained a Mining Inspector's license, but it turned out that it was no good. While this thing was pending he sold liquor. During this time we did see a good deal of the effects of drink, a good many family broils, wife beating and furniture smashing and so on, to a very considerable extent for a small place.

28514. What is the population of Compton?—Not more than 400 or 500, I think.

28515. You are in the village?—Yes, and I had the opportunity to see the effect. Living there for a year under local option, and then under license for a few months, and then back to local option, I saw the difference.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28516. There was no license there?—He said he was licensed to sell.

28517. Had the municipality nothing to do with it?—The municipality had nothing to do with it. He did not get a license at all, properly speaking, but he professed to have a license, and took the opportunity of putting the sign up and selling liquor.

*By the Chairman :*

28518. The Quebec law contains certain exceptional conditions governing the issue of licenses in mining districts?—Yes.

28519. What were the special conditions which led to the issue of this license?—There are mines in Capelton, about eight miles off, and I suppose the man there, wishing to sell, could think of no other scheme to get a license and thought of this, and sold.

28520. The Capelton mines have sometimes been worked and sometimes shut up. Was there a change in the position of the mines in the two periods?—Not that I am aware of. I thought, and I think still, he took that advantage to get a license.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28521. And after a little you stopped him?—Yes, but it took some time.

*By the Chairman :*

28522. What steps were taken to stop him?—We tried to show that he had no right to sell, that nothing could override the municipal by-law, and it was so decided by Judge Rioux.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28523. Cobden is the only place where you have had the opportunity of contrasting the operation of the license law with the Scott Act?—Yes, specially.

28524. There was the License law of Ontario in force in Cobden for a time?—Yes.

28525. Your experience of the Scott Act in Ontario has been favourable?—Yes.

28526. Was the Scott Act submitted to the County of Compton?—I am not sure.

28527. Do you consider these local option laws to be educators?—I do.

REV. JAMES LAWSON.

28528. And you favour them on that ground?—Yes.

28529. We had a gentleman here yesterday, Mr. Gustaffson, who seemed to be opposed to these local option laws, and went so far as to state that if he were a brewer he would contribute to the funds to carry these local option laws, his theory being that where temperance people succeeded in carrying a local option law, they thought they had done their work. Is that your experience?—There may be a little in that, because in Cobden, in Renfrew County, there seemed to be a little of that feeling, that after the battle was won, the work was done. Still I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that such a law is beneficial in its educational influence.

28530. Do you think the Scott Act can be enforced?—I think so.

28531. And do you attribute its non-enforcement to apathy?—Yes, to a great extent.

*By the Chairman :*

28532. On the part of whom?—The people in general.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28533. In view of the results where the Act has been fairly well enforced, and in view of the efforts of the Government in Ontario to enforce the Act, can you account for its complete repeal throughout that entire Province?—I think the same I have said in regard to one place applies all over, that people supposed this Act was going to give them total prohibition. The Scott Act is, in a certain sense, but in a limited district, prohibition, and having prohibition in a small district a mile from outside counties, wines and liquors can be brought in. It does not have the effect which total or Provincial prohibition would have.

28534. How is it that in small districts such as Cobden, Pembroke, and other places in Renfrew, where it was well enforced, the people voted it down?—A great many people voted for it, in the first place, believing it was prohibition, and many others in order to show what side they were on. No one asked for the Scott Act, but the Government said : You have clamoured for prohibition, we do not believe the country is ripe for prohibition, but we will test you, and will give you a prohibitory Act which you may pass in your counties, and so we may see whether the country is ripe or not for prohibition. So it was passed as the plebiscite they are talking of might pass, but not as the end, simply as a means to the end, and with the understanding that it was simply a test of public feeling.

28535. But in nearly all the counties of Ontario, after an experience of three years' operation of the Act, it was wiped out. How do you account for that? Would the Government be justified in passing a prohibitory law in view of that action of the people in wiping out the Scott Act?—I think they would be justified in view of the fact that there was a majority of 50,000 in its favour. People do not always adopt what is good. Christianity has been in the world a good many years, but it has not yet reached every one.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28536. Do you put Christianity and prohibition on the same plane?—I do not understand that question.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28537. Do you think that some people, knowing this to be a good thing, threw it over?—Some of them did.

*By the Chairman :*

28538. I should like to have an answer to the question. With the evidence before them in reference to the Scott Act, whether the results were owing to indifference, or to a misunderstanding on the part of the advocates of prohibition, you think the Government would have been justified in passing a prohibitory Act after what took place in Ontario?—I think they would.

28539. On what grounds?—Because they had given them that before; because they voted for it as a means to an end.

28540. And voted again for its repeal?—Because they said we want prohibition, and we want it general.

28541. In what sense have they said they wanted prohibition?—By voting for the Scott Act.

28542. And by voting for the repeal of it afterwards?—They did that, of course.

28543. Surely this is the position: There was a wave, as you properly call it, in favour of prohibition which passed over the country, and the Scott Act was carried in a considerable number of counties; and then another wave passed over the country, and the Scott Act was repealed in all these places by larger majorities in very many instances than those which carried it. Would the Government, in the face of that, have been justified in proposing a prohibitory measure for the whole country? What could any one conclude was the view of the country after the second episode in regard to the Scott Act in Ontario: would they conclude that the sentiment of the country was largely in favour of prohibition?—My candid opinion is that the people are as strongly in favour of prohibition as they ever were.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

28544. Do you believe the people when they voted to repeal the Scott Act were voting against general prohibition?—No, not for a moment.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

28545. For what reason did they vote that way?—I do not think the temperance people in general voted to repeal the Scott Act, but they relaxed their efforts and stayed at home.

28546. They did not relax their efforts because there was a larger vote polled?—That proves to me that the Act was very effective.

*By the Chairman:*

28547. Would that vote be an evidence that the country wanted prohibition?—I do not think there was anything in it as to prohibition. It was all about the Scott Act.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28548. You stated that the vote was an evidence that they were in favour of it, if well enforced, because the vote had dropped off so little?—But since that those opposed to the Act have made strenuous efforts to oppose the Act, and it would seem that the temperance people did not make such efforts to sustain it.

*By the Chairman:*

28549. But could any Government take that as an evidence that the people were in favour of prohibition?—I have said that the temperance people did not vote for the Scott Act, believing it was not the thing we were after. If you meet a bear and cannot shoot him, club him.

*By Mr. Clarke:*

28550. This law was intended to be an educator?—Yes.

28551. And was repealed after three years?—That is a short time.

28552. After three years surely others than temperance people could have seen the advantages which followed in its trail, and its effect would not be confined to temperance people. Would people in Cobden who had seen the disgraceful condition of things before, and the improved condition afterwards, vote against it for pure cussedness?—I do not know.

*By the Chairman:*

28553. You have spoke of people being pledged to vote in favour of the Scott Act, in the first place, as something that the promoters of temperance wanted?—Yes.

REV. JAMES LAWSON.

28554. Was it not a retrograde step when the temperance people allowed the Scott Act to be repealed without effort?—According to my statement, it was not without effort, but the people on the other side had increased in number.

28555. But you have put it on the ground that there was apathy on the part of temperance people?—I said some of them. It had scarcely time to get into operation in three years, and besides that, it was said, “What is the use of having it here and not there. In Pontiac we have liquor sold, and they can sell barley to the people there, and do a better business there than they do here and get better prices.”

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28556. Is that so about better prices?—I do not believe it.

*By the Chairman :*

28557. You have stated two or three times that on the second occasion the temperance people were disappointed that they had not got from the Scott Act what they expected, and therefore were indifferent?—That is the cause with some. That was one reason.

28558. What are the other reasons?—If we take as the principal reason given for the Act being repealed in so many places throughout Ontario, that the people were disappointed that the Scott Act had not produced the result desired and expected, and were indifferent,—if that is a correct statement, and the temperance people advocated the Scott Act as a means to an end, as a step in the right direction, in the first instance, surely in not putting forth their energies to save it in the second instance, they were allowing a backward step to be taken?—I would be sorry to waste the time of this Commission by repeating over and over again the statements I have made.

28559. Have I correctly represented your statement?—In part. I gave in one part that the Anti-Scott Act people were roused by seeing the effects the Act produced, and did everything in their power to repeal the Act. Money was available because money was in it. They expected large returns, and the temperance people could not put money in it because it was not a money matter with them, and the temperance people did not work so hard for it as the others did. While the majority of the temperance people remained true to the Act, the others brought a large majority against the Act, and the temperance people did not keep up with them, because several who worked in the first instance did nothing in the second as they were so disheartened, and while new recruits were coming in on the other side, the others did not keep up with them. They said, “We will vote for it, and that is all; we have stood by it; we want prohibition and let them give us prohibition.”

28560. Do you think that was a wise step on the part of the temperance party?—No, I would take any means in my power.

28561. Then you think the repeal of the Scott Act was a backward step?—Yes, but I do not think the temperance people generally regarded it in that light.

28562. But how could the Government conclude in view of the facts, that the prohibition sentiment was increasing or was such as to demand a general measure for the whole country?—I suppose they thought the present law was sufficient.

28563. Would you not conclude from those facts that the Scott Act was a failure?—As a prohibitive measure it might be looked upon as a failure, but that did not prove to me that the country was opposed to prohibition. The overwhelming majority in the first place proved that they were in favour of prohibition, and now the number of names poured into the Legislature proves to me that the people are still in favour of prohibition.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28564. What proportion of the electorate have petitioned for prohibition?—I do not know.

28565. One-twentieth or one-tenth?—Where I live, I think about nine-tenths.

28566. How many names have been put to petitions?—I do not know, and besides I have not supposed in my simplicity that we are to wait until the majority of the people are in favour of it. The legislators are supposed to be intelligent and wise men,

and our Government should lead us. If everybody thought as we do, we would not want a law.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28567. Could you expect to enforce a law which the majority of the people were against?—I do not think they would be against it.

28568. But that is the way you put it?—One man counts the same as another if counting heads, but in other respects they do not count the same.

28569. You mean that judging men by influence, character, responsibility and so on, there is a vast preponderance in favour of prohibition?—Yes.

28570. But in backing the evil there is a preponderance against it?—Yes.

28571. In Renfrew, when the Act was voted upon, 1,018 people voted against it; when the vote was next taken the results had been as great as expected, and the Act had had a wonderfully beneficial effect?—Certainly.

28572. And upon one occasion 5,000 people were gathered together and no liquor was allowed, but still the other party had increased to 2,880. Can you explain that?—It has puzzled me as well as you, and you have had better opportunities than I, and I have failed to account for it satisfactorily to my own mind.

28573. There is the theory put forward that the reason why it was repealed was, that it was a complete failure?—I know that is not true.

28574. There are people who say that?—There are some things we know and some things we do not know. I am speaking from knowledge and not altogether from opinion. I know it was not a failure.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28575. It would be quite an easy matter to account for the repeal of the Act, if we take the statement of those who say the Act was a failure; but we have those, like yourself, who say it was a success. When a gentleman like you and the Rev. Dr. Williams and others speak of the beneficial results of the enforcement of the Act, we are puzzled to see why such overwhelming majorities were cast against it?—I do not wish to be personal. Most people would not like the treatment which I received, to be knocked down, jumped on, kicked in the face and so on, because I took part in temperance work, and many get discouraged.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28576. Did you get that treatment?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28577. If the sentiment of the community was in favour of the law and the enforcement of the law, would not all that be crushed out?—That helped us morally, and public opinion was strongly against the man who incited it, and he was driven out of the country.

28578. May there not have been a great number of those people who thought the Act was a failure?—There were people who were paid to vote against it.

28579. You think there were people paid to vote against it?—I do.

28580. How would track be kept of their votes?—I do not know.

28581. You say that being only three years in Renfrew, you had less time than was necessary to observe the operation of the Act. Halton was looked upon as a banner county. It was tried there for three years, and then again for three years and then repealed after having a long educational effect. To what would you attribute that?—I cannot answer that; I have not lived there.

28582. You understand our difficulties in arriving at a solution of this matter?—Certainly.

28583. I concur with you in what I think you mean as to the high character of the residents of Mallorytown and the front of Yonge; but it is a small township, is it not?—Yes.

28584. Within a mile or two there were taverns at Lynn and Unionville?—Yes.

REV. JAMES LAWSON.

28585. And in the township in front of Escott?—Yes.

28586. And near the rear township at Farmersville and Charleston also?—Yes.

28587. And is not Brockville their business town?—Yes.

28588. And were they not able to supply themselves thoroughly in their houses, or get it when they went to those villages?—There was no difficulty in getting liquor.

28589. The advantage you find is that it was not for sale publicly at their doors?—Yes; there are people who want the liquor and love it, but if it is not in the place, it has not the effect on the community.

28590. In the front of Yonge the carrying of the Scott Act absorbed the Dunkin Act, and when the Scott Act was repealed the license law came into force again. Do you recollect whether in the township of Yonge there was a majority against the Scott Act?—I was not there at the time.

28591. You know nothing of the state of things in the city of Montreal?—No, not particularly. I lived under a license law before the Scott Act in Kingston and Battersea, and other places, where I have seen frightful effects of drink which I have never seen since.

28592. It has been stated that Allumette Island was a source of weakness to Pembroke?—Yes, I believe so.

28593. Was there much improvement in Delta under the Act?—No; I moved away, but I saw there was need of improvement.

28594. Mr. Gustaffson said if he was a brewer, he would cheerfully support the passing of any local option law, and he said that it is very apt in the rural districts to lead to the abolition of licenses, but concentrates the sale of liquor in towns and villages, and in the end the result is to bring influences to crush out the local option law in the districts where it is?—Those are very strange influences. All interested in the liquor business are very much opposed to the Scott Act, so I know it is not true that they sell more liquor under the Scott Act than under the License Act, because if it were true, they would not oppose it.

28595. It is put forward that where the Scott Act is in force and steps are going to be taken to repeal it, the keepers of low shebeens, knowing that if a license law came into force, they would get no license, prefer the Scott Act and vote against its repeal. While it is in force, all who sell liquor are on the same footing?—That is a phase of the subject I am not familiar with.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28596. There is another point: that there are hundreds of people in a district or county who do not like to cast their votes in opposition to a measure which it is thought will be of substantial benefit, and they abstain from voting; that that was the case in Ontario when the Scott Act was first voted upon, and that those people after seeing the operation of the Act for three years, felt constrained to come out and vote against it?—I am scarcely prepared to answer that question.

28597. We find 1,766 votes cast in the first place, with 1,018 in favour and 748 against it, and at the next voting we find 1,774 in favour of it, and 2,580 against it. We are trying to ascertain the reason for the change?—There are very many people who would respect the Act if it were a Dominion law, whereas they do not respect it if it is a local law. They say it is all owing to the temperance fanatics, whereas if the Government enacted such a law for the whole Dominion, they would observe it.

28598. There are many objections and difficulties in the way of the Dominion Government enforcing the law?—I do not know about that at all.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28599. Do you think from your observation that the people expect too much from the Scott Act, that is, more than they expect from any other law?—I am sure they do.

28600. Have you known any liquor sellers to support and vote for the Scott Act?—I have never known one. My experience has been wholly the other way, that all those interested in the liquor business have been opposed to the Scott Act.

28601. You spoke of the treatment you had received; where was that?—At Cobden, in Renfrew County.



28602. By whom?—A liquor seller.

28603. For what?—For, as he supposed, informing on him. It was not true. He told the people he was going to kill me, and he waylaid me one night.

28604. And he did not kill you?—No; he struck me and knocked me down when I was going to buy my ticket in the railway station.

28605. Was he punished?—He was sentenced to 30 days at hard labour for assault. The County Alliance took it up on my behalf. He delivered himself up to the local Magistrate, who wished to fine him a dollar and let the matter go. I took the train, and they telegraphed that he had delivered himself up. I paid no attention to it, but the Secretary of the County Alliance took the case in hand.

*By the Chairman :*

28606. Was the man under the influence of liquor?—Not at all.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28607. Was he under the influence of the liquor trade at that time?—Yes. He was in the liquor business and kept a tavern. I do not think he was under the influence of liquor at that time more than usual. I suppose he drank every day, but I do not think he was drunk at all.

28608. Your observation of license, is what?—I have been moving about in public all my life, and I have seen the effects of drink, and I could narrate terrible circumstances of man after man frozen to death and falling off horseback and so on.

28609. What I want is to know, from observation of the operations of the license law, whether license laws in any sense restrict the trade, and if they have the effect of impressing people as to the true character of the trade?—I think license laws are a failure so far as restricting the liquor traffic is concerned. I think they do not restrict the trade to any extent.

28610. Have you observed that license laws lessen the sale of liquors in the communities where they are in operation?—No, I do not think so.

28611. Would you, then, as between license and free sale prefer license or free sale?—That is a question I have thought of considerably, and have not been able to answer satisfactorily. Whether I would be more in favour of license or free rum is a difficult question to answer, because I am not in favour of either.

28612. Could you bring yourself to answer if you had to choose between the two?—There are many good temperance men who believe that license is restrictive to a certain extent, and others would prefer license as a step in the direction of free rum. I am not sure whether they are right or not.

28613. Do you think that license in itself is a sin?—I do. Excuse me if I say a word more. I have thought about that, and did when I was here the other day, and I think to license a man to sell liquor is making a distinction perhaps from prohibiting a man from doing that thing. If the Government license one man, to sell liquor, is it not practically debarring another man from that privilege.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28614. We want to know whether you consider granting a license a sin *per se*?—I do.

28615. Then do you think it can make any difference in its sinfulness whether it is given to the few or to the many?—It is only enlarging it.

*By the Chairman :*

28616. Would there be more, or less, sale if there was free trade?—My answer was that I do not think license restricted the trade to any considerable extent.

28617. What is your answer to the question whether or not there would be more sale under perfect free trade in liquor?—Perhaps there might be.

28618. Will you tell us what you think?—I rather think there would be.

28619. Under free trade there would be a larger sale?—I would suppose so.

REV. JAMES LAWSON.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28620. Did you get a circular from the Commission?—I did.

28621. Did you answer it?—I did.

28622. Fully?—Not fully.

28623. Why not?—In the first place I was straitened for time. I am a very busy man all the time, and when I received the circular I answered immediately. I filled the sheet and thought it better to be compact. I did not suppose long answers would be desirable.

28624. Did you tell Mr. Spence you answered the questions?—I do not know.

28625. Have you any official connection with the Good Templars?—Yes.

28626. What?—Only a few hours ago I was Grand Chief Templar for the Province of Quebec for three years.

28627. Are they numerically strong?—Not in the Province of Quebec ; there are about 2,000 or 3,000.

28628. Is that organization involved in the question of prohibition?—Yes.

28629. What is the attitude?—We are prohibitionists.

28630. In favour of the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale?—Yes.

28631. And the organization is propagating its views by every means?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

28632. Do you know anything of the operation of the Scott Act in Prince Edward Island?—No.

28633. You spoke, I think, of the desirability of taking a vote of the people on this question of prohibition?—Perhaps so. I think there was some reference made to it.

28634. Do you think that desirable?—If we could get prohibition in no other way, I would have that done.

28635. I am speaking of submitting to a vote at the present moment the question whether the people would have prohibition or not?—I have been referring to that lately. I think if the question were submitted to the people in general, the majority would favour prohibition. If a plebiscite were taken over the Dominion now, I think it would carry. I am not sure it is the best thing to do now. In Manitoba there has been an overwhelming majority in favour of prohibition. There is to be a plebiscite in Ontario, I think, and there will be an overwhelming majority there, and I think in every province except this, and here I am not so sanguine.

28636. You do not mean the Commission to understand that you think it desirable that a plebiscite should be taken?—No, I do not. I was simply venturing the opinion that it would carry if it were taken.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, September 24th, 1892.

The Royal Commission met this day at 10 o'clock, SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman of the Commission, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
REV. DR. McLEOD.

MR. E. F. CLARKE.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

S. P. LEET, of Montreal, advocate, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

28637. You are a member of the legal profession, I believe?—Yes ; I am a member of the firm of Leet, Smith & Smith, advocates of this city. I have been an advocate twelve years.

28638. Are you a Queen's Counsel?—No ; I am not.

28639. I presume you have read the terms of the commission ; if not, I shall be glad to read an extract from them to you?—I think I read it at the time the Commission was appointed ; it appeared in the newspapers.

28640. Being aware of the terms of the commission, and having, as I presume you have, given some attention to this subject, you would perhaps prefer to make a statement to the Commission?—The principal point which I thought I would present, as one that might be of use to the Commission, was as to the practical working of the prohibitory clause of the license law here. It permits the majority of the electors of a polling district to object to licenses being granted in such polling district. Our firm has been engaged in nearly all of those cases in the city in which we have attempted to put in operation that section of the license law. Personally, I have conducted a large number of those cases. In order to obtain a license here, the applicant is required to get a certificate signed by twenty-five electors. That comes before what the law calls the competent authority, which, in Montreal, means two Judges of the Sessions and the Recorder. Now, a Judge of the Sessions and the Recorder constitute the competent authority. The Recorder now must be one of the two, but formerly any two of them could perform the duty. The difficulty we have experienced in making use of that provision has been very serious. Some of us who have been engaged in these cases think the Magistrates have not been impartial—I do not like to say that before the Commission ; of course, it may be due to the defective law. Certainly they have interpreted the law, so that it is very difficult to successfully oppose those applications. I can give many instances in illustration of that point. The certificate of an application has to be signed by twenty-five electors. Formerly, no affidavit was required. Laterly, an affidavit is required to be attached to the certificate by some person, stating that the names on the certificates are electors qualified to sign. The usual practice is, perhaps, for the saloon-keeper wishing to get a license to get signatures on his paper by some person taking around the petition and getting electors to sign it, and the person who takes it around appears before the Judge of the Sessions or signs an affidavit that the signatures of the parties are those of electors of the polling subdivision. There is another provision in the law requiring the signatures to a petition in opposition to be thus verified, and the Magistrates have required us to make very strict proof as to those signatures to the petition. They require us to have every name sworn to by some person who knows the party. I will now give an example as to how this practically works. This was one case. There is a man named Brehan, who is a tailor on St. Antoine Street. A canvasser for signatures to a petition against granting a license, called

S. P. LEET.

at his house four or five times and asked for Mr. Brehan. He was told that he was not in. Finally the canvasser was told that Mr. Brehan was in, and he went into the house, and in the parlour Mr. Brehan signed the petition. The Magistrate threw out that signature to the petition, because the canvasser could not swear that he knew this party to be Mr. Brehan, irrespective of what Mr. Brehan told him on the occasion when he got the signature. Consequently, we had to get some persons to swear to the names on the petition in opposition, a person who could personally swear that he knew of his own knowledge that the man was the man on the voters' list and lived within the polling division. The party must be a resident voter to be able to sign a petition in opposition. We have had difficulty even in proving that the party resided in the division. Then we are liable to be called upon to prove that he lived there at the time and had not moved since the voters' list was last made up. We who are opposed to granting licenses think the Magistrates have been unnecessarily strict in requiring us to make evidence as to the names of those parties, and that they were resident voters, because, I hold, the same evidence that was sufficient for the signatures to the application, should be sufficient as regards the signatures to the petition in opposition.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28641. Was not the rule enforced by the Magistrates in regard to the signatures to the petition in opposition the same rule which ought to have been enforced in regard to the signatures to the application? Was not the laxity on the other side; in other words, should they not have strictly followed up as regards signatures to the application, the rule they apply to the signatures to a petition in opposition, requiring proper evidence that the signatures are those of persons entitled to sign?—I think that both lists of names should be verified by affidavit, but whether the Magistrates ought to exercise the extreme strictness they exercise is somewhat doubtful.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28642. Is not the list of signatures of the twenty-five persons required to sign the application verified by affidavit?—Yes, it is now; formerly it was not. We have to bring all the witnesses before the court and have them sworn, and the licensee, through his attorney, has been permitted to cross-examine every one as rigidly as in the case of Mr. Brehan, and in that case, although the canvasser called at his house four or five times when Mr. Brehan was absent, and at length Mr. Brehan answered to his name and signed the petition, the signature was not accepted by the Magistrate, because the canvasser could not swear that he knew him personally.

*By the Chairman :*

28643. Your only recourse then was to bring Mr. Brehan himself?—Yes. We contended that the same rule should apply both ways. The rule we would like to see established is this, that the Magistrate, on receiving the list with twenty-five signatures attached, should accept that list as being *prima facie* true. If we want to attack any of the names, we should be called upon to single out a name or names. If we file a petition against the application and make affidavit thereto, the list should be accepted as *prima facie* correct. If, for instance, the other side wanted to attack Mr. Brehan's name, we would be willing, in order to meet the requirements of the Magistrates, to have some person who knows the gentleman subpoenaed before the court, but at present we do not know whether the other side intend to attack the signatures or not.

28644. What do you think would be the proper remedy for the present difficulty?—My remedy would be this: We should file our opposition on exactly the same terms as the other side file their application. If there were certain names on our petition that the other side had reason to believe were doubtful or that they wished to question, let them send us a list of those names, and then we would be prepared to go into any evidence, be it ever so strict. That would be reasonable. But the way in which we have been doing so far is this: we have not been informed that there was to be any objection, and so we have had to be ready to go through 150 or 200 names, and this has put us to a great deal of trouble. People up-town have to be subpoenaed to swear to their names, even some gentlemen that are well known.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28645. What would you think of such a system as this: That a list should be furnished, and those officers who had charge of the voters' list should be called to show that A and B had a vote, or some one who knew A and B should be called to prove his signature?—I think that would be fair.

28646. But they do not seem to go beyond that now?—They do.

28647. In what way?—They force us to go into that extreme inquiry as regards every name, whether it is objected to or not.

*By the Chairman :*

28648. Do you consider this a matter of procedure in the court rather than a matter of interpretation of the law?—It is both, because the Magistrates sitting interpret the law, and feel themselves bound to exercise this extreme rigidity with regard to establishing the genuineness of the signatures to the petition.

28649. Do you think the difficulty arises from the manner in which the law is interpreted rather than from the law itself?—Yes.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28650. Then amendments to the law would be necessary in order to give you relief, I suppose?—The difficulty is that although 48 out of 50 signatures in the polling subdivision may be established as correct, yet if the forty-ninth is not proved, the whole list may be struck off.

28651. Would it be an improvement if the party resisting the petition were compelled to pay costs if his case failed?—That would be a very important change.

*By the Chairman :*

28652. Do you think it is desirable that the majority of voters in the district should be required to assent to the granting of a petition?—I think so; certainly for the first license.

28653. Granting that the applicant for a license got in the first instance a majority of the voters in his district, would you put him to the expense and trouble of getting that majority every year?—I am regarded as a pretty strong prohibitionist, and I would like to see everything possible put in the way of granting licenses; but I must admit that in applying such a rule of law and equity it would seem perhaps to be a hardship, if there was a decided majority in favour of granting the license in the first instance, that the applicant should have to go every year and get a renewal. The law, however, should be made to bear with equal force on both sides. Supposing one year the majority of the voters were opposed to the granting of the license, that decision should stand until it was reversed; I would be willing to give my opponents the advantages that I want for myself.

28654. You would place the onus of resisting a renewal on the parties opposed to it, after the license was once granted?—I would put the onus on the opponents after the system had once gone into force; I would adopt the principle of the Scott Act and would provide that the license should remain in force until it was repealed.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28655. Supposing the licensee observed the law and there was no objection against him and no complaints made for selling after hours or any thing of that kind, do you think his license should be taken away, even if the majority of the residents were opposed to granting a license?—I think so, because the business may do a good deal of harm.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28656. Would not the probabilities be that if a majority in the first instance signed for a license, that the majority would not sign against it next year?—Of course the chances would be reduced.

S. P. LEET.

*By the Chairman :*

28657. Will you state to the Commission your experience of the working of the license law in this city?—Outside of what I have said, I know personally very little, except from public rumour and what I see in the newspapers and what I hear from being around town. I do not know any facts personally beyond what everybody knows who has endeavoured to form an opinion.

28658. I assume you are a good deal about the courts?—I am very little in the courts. The prosecutions for infringement of the license law come before the police court, and I very seldom go there.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28659. What about the grocery license and saloon license: are they advisable under the license system?—I do not think so. Our law in intent does not recognize drinking places, except as regards light beer and wines. No doubt it is a fact that at least nineteen out of every twenty saloons licensed are not required for restaurant purposes. They are actually drinking places, although the law does not recognize them as such.

28660. What about the grocery license!—It should be taken away from groceries entirely.

*By the Chairman :*

28661. From what you have said, you are in favour of reducing the number of licensed places, I believe!—I am in favour of abolishing them altogether. I would sell alcohol just as I would any other drug or medicine which may be used in its place; I would abolish all places where people might go and get a glass for beverage purposes. I would have the sale regulated as is the sale of any other article used in medicine.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28662. Would you sell liquor by the bottle, as patent medicines are sold? You would not allow liquor to be drunk on the premises, I suppose?—No. I would not allow it to be sold as patent medicines are sold, but I would permit it to be sold as it is sold in Scott Act or Dunkin Act counties.

*By the Chairman :*

28663. You are in favour of prohibition, I gather?—Yes.

28664. Do you think it would be an improvement to reduce the number of licenses granted in this city?—Yes.

28665. Would you increase the license fees?—I would not.

28666. Then you think they are high enough already?—My objection is not on that ground. My idea is this: If the municipality and the Government received no revenue from the business, that would be one of the surest ways of abolishing the traffic. I think the revenue question is the main reason of the existence of the trade. Secondly, I hold that the Government and the municipalities should not receive any revenue beyond the ordinary business tax. I think money invested in the liquor business should be taxed just the same as money in any other commercial industry.

28666a. You think we should not impose any further tax on it, and you would abolish licenses altogether?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28667. Do you think the granting of license a wrong *per se*?—I never considered that question, except in this way, that I think places where liquor may be sold for legitimate purposes should have licenses granted them,

28668. Then you think the granting of licenses to sell for beverage purposes is wrong of itself!—It seems to me in this country and in this age of the world it is. There are some things regarded wrong now that were formerly not so regarded.

28669. There are some religious bodies which deny the privilege of church membership to persons engaged in the liquor traffic, I believe?—Yes.

28670. That is a fact, is it not?—I believe it is.

28671. Do you believe that has a tendency to throw the traffic itself into hands of a worse class of persons?—I do not think so.

28672. Why not?—My experience is that I never knew a man engaged in the business who asked admission to a church. I have no doubt that such is the case.

28673. Do you not know men engaged in the traffic in this city who are members of churches?—I know of one man. He is a grocer, not a saloon-keeper, and he is a member of the Episcopalian Church. He is the only one I know of.

28674. Are there not persons engaged in the trade who are members of other church communities?—Take the Roman Catholic Church, there are a good many no doubt.

28675. Take men who are engaged in wholesale business and who are importers: do your remarks apply to them?—I am not personally aware of the fact; there are no doubt some of them, but I do not know how many.

*By the Chairman:*

28676. You have made yourself very clear in regard to one side of the license question, which is, that you think that if the municipalities and Provincial Governments obtained no revenue from the traffic, that would tend to the abolition of the traffic and that would elicit more sympathy with the efforts made against it?—I do not know that it would elicit more sympathy, but the main reason why the traffic is continued is on account of the revenue derived from it. I think if the Government and municipalities were not receiving any revenue from the business, and if the Government and municipalities were called upon to pay the expenses arising out of it, they would very soon see the balance in the ledger so much on the other side that they would be willing to have the whole trade abolished. They would not desire to maintain police and pay the expenses of the police court when they received no revenue from this traffic. I know that, in this province the Mercier Government passed an Act by which no municipality could charge more than \$50, I think, for licenses. Some of the municipalities when they saw that they would receive practically no revenue from the trade, refused to grant licenses, and claimed that they were afraid to grant them.

28677. You think, then, that the Government and the municipalities having no financial interest in the business would be disposed to put it down?—I think so.

28678. Because of the expense indirectly caused by it?—I think so.

28679. Would there not be danger of apathy on their part? Is there not at present a double incentive, the protection of the revenue and also the preservation of the peace and permanent welfare of the people?—There is no doubt to a certain extent. But the Government and the municipalities seem to like to handle a good deal of money. Why, I do not know.

28680. Take the case of the Dominion Government. Having no revenue to look after, do you think they would be particularly zealous in trying to extinguish the traffic? What interest would the Dominion have in preventing the traffic if the revenue was taken away?—The only interest they would have would be that of the general prosperity of the country.

28681. You are aware that the Dominion Government is not charged with the preservation of the peace?—Not specially charged with it. They have to pay the salaries of certain Judges and other officers, but these are comparatively small. As regards the Dominion, their principal interest would be to promote the general good of the country. The Provincial Governments, which have to pay the expense of keeping up the police and similar matters, would have a stronger incentive.

28682. Do you think the Dominion Government under a prohibitory Act would be more zealous in enforcing the law than they are now in enforcing the present liquor law?—It occurs to me that the only law which they are interested in enforcing now or attempting to enforce is the excise and customs law, which, if still existing, they would have some interest in enforcing. If not existing, they would have no interest in enforcing any law on this subject, except as regards the general good of the people.

28683. Have they not both incentives at present?—Yes, they are presumed to be actuated by some sentiment now.

S. P. LEET.

28684. But they have now the additional incentive in regard to protecting revenue, I believe?—Yes.

28685. Then do you think that the only way the license system can be improved is to abolish it altogether?—No, not the only way; that would be the best way. But besides allowing the Government to receive no revenue, I would of course restrict the hours and days of selling and limit the number of persons engaged in the trade. I would prohibit a woman attending behind a bar or in a restaurant. I would make the law more rigid in regard to sale to minors. I would put the onus of proof on the party who sold the liquor, not on the party who prosecuted. I would allow a police officer if he caught a minor in a saloon to detain him so as to get from him the name and address of the person for whom he was obtaining liquor. I would give the officers authority to have him called as a witness in the case. I would improve the methods of securing evidence, because we find difficulties occurring in connection with getting evidence in order to fully establish that the parties are violating the law.

28686. Then in that case you would still continue licenses, but you would abolish the revenue derived from them?—If they have to be continued, I would impose greater restrictions. Until such time as we can obtain prohibition, I would be in favour of obtaining any measure that would diminish the number of licenses and reduce the drinking.

28687. Then one of the steps you would take to that end would be to remove or do away with the income derived by Governments and municipalities from the license system?—I would.

28688. But you would still regulate the trade?—I would tax the trade beyond the regular taxes imposed on the same capital employed in other business.

28689. Is it not very difficult to ascertain what that capital is; would you risk all that and still abolish the license fee?—Yes, as a license fee. All businesses have to pay a business tax, which is a Government tax on the capital engaged in manufacture and other industries; I would make no difference between this business and any other business.

28690. Does not the publican at the present time pay a business tax in Montreal as well as a license tax?—I am not sure on that point.

28691. Then you would practically have free sale of liquor under regulations, according to the system you have suggested?—Yes.

28692. You would take away the revenue from municipal and Provincial Governments that they derive from licensing these places?—Yes.

28693. Would you apply that principle also to the customs and excise revenues?—That is a question I have not studied. The customs tariff differs so much on the different articles that, without studying the question more fully than I have done, I could not tell why one article is taxed more than another. So long as customs duties are imposed, I would tax very heavily liquor and such articles.

28694. And you would also continue the excise duties?—I do not say so.

28695. Then would you allow manufacturers to make as much whisky as they pleased without payment of excise duties?—If it is a legitimate industry in which people are engaged and one which should be encouraged and in which capital should be invested, I do not see why the party engaged in it should be called upon especially to pay for carrying it on.

28696. You think the measures you have indicated would be an improvement on the present system, a system of which you do not approve. But would the result not be to cheapen the article sold and thereby increase the sale of it?—Possibly it might.

28697. That would not be an advantage from your standpoint?—Not immediately. But I think the Government as soon as they observed the revenue was being affected by having to expend large sums of money as a result of the liquor traffic, they obtaining no revenue in return, would very soon put such restrictions on it that the sale would be very materially reduced, and the consumption would accordingly be very materially reduced.

28698. That would apply to the Provincial Governments and municipalities?—Perhaps.

28699. Would it apply also to the Dominion Government?—Not to so great an extent. I know a good many towns where prohibition is in force; for instance the



town where I was born, the town of Danville. That town was formerly under a license law and we had to expend \$100 or \$150 every year for town constables, for occasionally there would be drunken men who had to be arrested and put in the lock-up. There was that expense involved for the payment of the town constables. Since the Dunkin Act came into force they never have any arrests for drunkenness, and I am not aware whether there has been a town constable appointed at all or not. Although at the start it might make no great difference, I think most of the municipalities would decide that if they received no revenue from the traffic and they had to expend money to pay constables, they would abolish the traffic at once. In the great majority of the country places if there was no revenue received from the traffic by the municipalities, they would stop it.

28700. If there was no revenue derived from the traffic you think they would be more zealous in enforcing the law?—I think so.

28701. In the city of Montreal the authorities charge \$8 for issuing a certificate, and the total amount of revenue from the traffic is from \$7,000 to \$8,000 annually. Do you think that fact influences the officers in carrying out the law and the regulations connected with it?—I do not think it does much in that direction here. We have tried here several times to have a limit fixed as to the number of licenses granted. Considering the small amount received from licenses, if the Commissioners had power to limit them, they would decrease the number very materially. But the Quebec Government wants the largest amount of taxes that they can obtain for their coffers, and accordingly, they will not give us the right to limit the number of licenses, either to the Council or to the people. On the other hand, if the city of Montreal had a right to impose a tax on each licensee of from \$250 to \$1,000, they would not hesitate to give the City Council or the citizens the right to limit. I think if the people had a right to limit the number, they would reduce it very materially indeed.

28702. Then you think the present system of granting licenses does not accomplish the wish of the citizens?—I do not think so.

28703. With respect to the hours of selling and such restrictions, have you any suggestions to make to the Commission?—I would shorten the hours of selling very much.

28704. In what way?—If you have to grant licenses, I would certainly keep the licensed houses closed until after the hours at which workmen usually get to work in the morning. I would also not allow saloons to be kept open until 12 o'clock at night. As to what hours, I would suggest, I do not know that I would care to make a suggestion in that regard.

28705. We have had evidence as regards the condition of affairs at Richmond? Is there any statement that you would desire to make to the Commission in regard to the working of the law there?—In regard to Richmond County, every thing I know has already been placed before the Commission by Mr. Jones and Mr. Jewell. I do not reside there, but I have visited there two or three times a year for the last 15 years. Those gentlemen, however, know more about the state of affairs there than I do.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28706. You believe in the meantime it would be well to separate the sale of liquors from the sale of groceries?—Yes.

28707. And to abolish the name restaurant as these places are really saloons?—Yes.

28708. Did you hear the statement of the Collector of Inland Revenue, Mr. Lambe, as to the number of illicit places in Montreal?—I saw it in the newspapers.

28709. Was there any attempt made by the Law and Order League, or some other organization to ascertain the number of illicit places?—I think there was.

28710. What was the result of the investigation?—I only know the result by what was published in the newspapers. I think the only person who can speak authoritatively on that subject is Major Bond.

28711. It is claimed that the hotel bar is more injurious than the saloon, as a young man can go in to see friends or guests in the hotel, and can drink liquor there; while, if he goes into the saloon, it is known that he goes there to drink liquor. Do

S. P. LEET.

you think it would be better to abolish the hotel bar rather than the saloon bar?—It is not twice in a year that I go into a saloon, and in visiting a hotel I never go into the bar, so I cannot speak on that subject. I would not like to say one way or the other.

*By the Chairman :*

28712. You have formed no opinion?—No. I can recognize the position of a bar in a hotel much better than in a restaurant. I do not see any reason for nine-tenths of the restaurants. If liquor is to be sold at all, I can see a reason for it in a hotel.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28713. Mr. Gustaffson says a local option law is an illusion, a delusion, and a collusion, that it is most damaging to the cause of prohibition. Have you studied that question at all?—I certainly cannot agree with that statement. My experience shows it is advisable in many cases to oppose a single saloon.

28714. His advice is—in the cause of true prohibition, and in order to bring that about—to put a saloon on each side of every church, the idea being to bring the traffic so close to those who are engaged in the work of religion that their attention will be called to it more forcibly than it would be otherwise?—I do not agree with him in that at all, and a strong reason why I think that to be an error is found in the County of Richmond. At the last repeal vote there, it was only in the town of Richmond that there was a majority against the Act, and that was the only place in the county where liquor was sold. That shows to me that the demoralizing influence of the sale does not disgust people generally, that they seem to get accustomed to it ; but where the law was enforced, there was no difficulty in getting a large majority in opposition to it.

DAVID McMILLAN, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

28715. What is your present occupation?—I am Secretary and Superintendent of the Protestant House of Industry and Refuge.

28716. Where is it situated?—693 Dorchester Street.

28717. How long have you held the position?—Eighteen years, if I live till next Saturday.

28718. How is the institution governed?—By a committee of gentlemen, Governors we call them. There are 30 Governors, who form a committee of management, to manage the internal arrangements of the House and carry on its work.

28719. Is that Committee only a portion of the Governors?—Yes. There are ten elected to serve three years at a time, and they retire every three years.

28720. What entitles a person to become a Governor?—There are two qualifications. \$100 given at one time qualifies a gentleman to be an elective Governor, who may be elected for one year at a time, and a subscription of \$400 or upwards makes the subscriber a Governor for life.

28721. Do you derive any revenue except that which comes to you as voluntary subscriptions?—We get from the Quebec Government \$560 a year. They formerly gave us \$800, but they cut it down 30 per cent some years ago, and the City and District Savings Bank has given \$500 a year for about twenty years. That is the only public money we receive.

28722. And the remainder of your revenue comes from voluntary subscriptions?—Yes. The House was at first established by the Governors subscribing, and a certain amount of the money was invested in buildings and the rest in a Revenue Fund.

28723. What is your total income?—The income we can depend on is about \$7,000 a year.

28724. Do you expend all that?—More than that. We depend for the rest on subscriptions and donations.

28725. But your whole income is how much?—We have a revenue from investments of about \$5,000 per annum, and then we manufacture kindling wood from which we receive from \$1,000 to \$1,200 a year, and we send men who come in for refuge out to do small jobs through the city, and that income ranges from \$500 to \$600 a year; it has been as high as \$1,200 in the year. These are our sources of income, besides voluntary contributions.

28726. Altogether from the voluntary contributions and these sources, what is your total income?—It varies a little, from \$9,000 to \$12,000 per annum.

28727. And that is expended?—It is expended in the maintenance of the old and infirm.

28728. In the House?—In the House. We have two Houses. We have a House in the municipality of Longue Pointe, where we have from 118 to 125 or 130; and in the city we have a Refuge, where we give night lodging to people who are destitute. The money is expended in the support of those two Houses.

28729. Can you tell us the proportion of your expenditure which consists in the payment of salaries and wages?—A very small part. We do not hire servants; the inmates are supposed to make themselves useful.

28730. Can you tell us the proportion of the expenditure which goes to pay the salaries and wages of those connected with the Institution?—I think less than \$1,000.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28731. Have you a printed report?—I have.

*By the Chairman :*

28732. Will you supply us with a copy?—Yes. Last year \$888 was expended in salaries and wages. (Report filed.)

28733. How many inmates have you at Longue Pointe?—An average for the year of what we call permanent inmates of 129.

28734. Can you give us the average of the numbers you assisted in the city institution?—We can give the number of lodgings during the year. We gave 30,349 lodgings last year.

28735. That is separate nights?—Yes, of course. The same man comes back very often.

28736. Do you live on the premises?—I have always done so in winter, but I go down to the lower house in summer at night.

28737. Do you keep any register of the names and occupations and so on of those who come in?—Yes, if a man comes for refuge we take his name and age and nationality.

28738. Am I correct in concluding that your establishment is frequently found too small to meet the necessities?—Yes, in the winter it is often very much crowded.

28739. Do you make any inquiry as to the previous character of these persons?—We have no means often of finding out their past character. Many of them come from a distance, and we have to take their own statement.

28740. Can you tell us the history of each inmate at Longue Pointe? Are they there from influences beyond their own control, or through their own bad habits?—It has been found in the case of a large percentage that irregular habits have brought them there.

28741. What is the proportion of males and females?—About an equal number, perhaps, a few more men than women, and my own impression is that a large percentage of the men, probably three-fourths of them, are there from that cause.

28742. What about the more interesting sex?—I think they are pretty much in the same category.

28743. You think about three-fourths of them?—Perhaps I should not make a definite statement of three-fourths, but a large proportion.

28744. What proportion of the females do you think are brought into the institution through their own bad habits?—I do not know that I could name a definite number. In a general way I would say there is a large proportion of both sexes brought there through bad habits. I think that is about the best answer I could give.

28745. You mentioned about three-fourths of the men?—Perhaps I am putting it too high. It is difficult to say.

DAVID McMILLAN.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28746. There is a large proportion of both sexes?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

28747. Through their own bad habits, by which you mean, what?—Drink, I think, is the foundation of the whole thing. I believe if there were no drink in the city, we would not need a very large House of Refuge.

28748. You mean a permanent House?—Yes, I mean both. The numbers would be largely decreased if there was no drink.

28749. Do you go so far as to say there would then be no necessity for a place of that kind?—I would not say that. There is always sickness and infirmity and things of that kind which it is necessary to provide for, but a very large proportion of the trouble comes from drink.

28750. Of those who make use of the House in the city, I suppose they are largely transient visitors, who come and go the whole time?—Yes, largely. Many of them come from public works. They crowd into the city, and the public works and the wharfs get shut down in the fall, and the men find themselves without means and become distressed.

28751. I omitted to ask you if any of the inmates of the institution at Longue Pointe contribute through their relatives?—There are three or four who do.

28752. With regard to the transient visitors in the institution in the city, do you charge them anything?—No, we give them a night's shelter and their breakfast in the morning. For that we have them work an hour in the morning. We manufacture kindling wood, and we have circular saws worked by manual power, and they work these saws and contribute in that way.

28753. You have been in the habit of hiring men out, and they do work at shovelling snow and such like in the winter?—We collect the money and give them a third of what they earn in that way, and keep them, and give them three meals and their lodging.

28754. Have you many of that class?—Probably in the winter from 50 to 75.

28755. How long do they stay with you?—As long as we will keep them, some of them longer.

28756. How long do they stay?—In the winter they want shelter to-morrow night as they do to-night. Our habit is in the morning to turn them out at nine or half-past nine, and they are supposed to go and find employment if they can, and often they come back again, having found there is no work for them.

28757. As to the class for whom you find employment and collect certain wages, do they continue, as a rule, for some time with you?—Sometimes three or four months.

28758. They are more in the position of boarders?—That is about it. If they are civil and obliging and do their work well, we let them continue.

28759. You have said that a very large number of those who use the House in winter come from public works?—Very many.

28760. Employment is scarce at that time?—Yes.

28761. Can you give us any more definite idea of the number of those who are led to use the House of Refuge owing to distress caused by their own habits?—I could not make any definite statement. If they get large wages, they spend them improvidently, and when their work ceases, they are dependent upon public charity.

28762. How many of those come to you, do you suppose, owing to habits of intemperance?—I believe that if they were sober and industrious, we would not have any of them, or very few.

28763. Some people are sober and not industrious?—When they come into our establishment they are on their good behaviour, though some cannot behave themselves.

28764. We are anxious to know the numbers who are driven to seek refuge in your Home owing to habits of intemperance?—I cannot give you a definite number. My experience goes to show that most of these men, if they get money, will get drunk and spend it. If they earn a quarter of a dollar, they come and say, You owe me a little, and I would like to get the money. Some will say they are going away, and in

nine cases out of ten these men will go out and get drunk and come back ; and sometimes give us a great deal of trouble.

28765. You must have a class who are unfortunate, and who come to seek shelter in the House from circumstances not within their own control?—Of course there are some who are brought there from circumstances not under their own control, but the proportion is very small, according to my idea.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28766. Your institution has nothing to do with the care and maintenance of the Roman Catholic indigent poor?—No, only the Protestant.

*By the Chairman :*

28767. Can you give us any idea of the percentage out of the total number who are led to come to you through the excessive use of liquor?—I could not give you a definite number. During my experience, I have occasionally thought I have found a case where liquor had nothing to do with bringing the man to the House, but on further investigation I have come to the conclusion that very few cases come there without liquor being the cause.

28768. How about immigrants?—That is a different thing. We have sometimes had a large number.

28769. They are not necessarily drunkards?—No. Immigrants coming out in the fall, and having no work, cannot help themselves.

28770. You have religious services in the Home?—Yes.

28771. And are not efforts made to induce those who visit the institution to become temperate in their habits?—Yes, we have every winter Christian workers who hold meetings, sometimes every night in the week, and they have induced hundreds of the inmates to sign the pledge. Some may have kept it, but a large percentage have not kept it many days.

28772. To what sort of pledge do you ask them to subscribe?—A simple agreement to abstain from strong drink.

28773. For ever?—No, for three months, one month, or any time the party likes to name.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28774. I see in the report before me that the inmates are people generally of a very advanced age?—That is in the permanent Home.

28775. How do you account for it that these people are of such advanced ages? The medical report says there were 17 deaths in the year, 10 over 70 years of age, 3 over 80, and 2 at 97?—There is a large percentage who have never been drinkers.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28776. What has driven them into the Home?—If a man is old and has laid by nothing for his old age, he is not able to work at the age of 80.

28777. Is the place kept open in the summer months?—In the city, yes.

28778. How many in the summer months do you have on an average per night?—From 25 to 50, and 150 to 200 in the winter.

28779. Would that be an indication that the severity of the weather had something to do with it?—Yes.

28780. And the shutting down of work?—Yes. They have no money to pay their board.

28781. And many who earn money in the summer are thriftless and spend their money, so that they are without means to fall back on?—Yes.

28782. I have looked at your last report, and I see that in the next year there were 16 deaths, and it says that old age was the cause of most of them, some being 90 years old?—Yes. We have one person in the Home now who is 99 years old.

*By the Chairman :*

28783. Was that a total abstainer?—I think so. It is a woman.

DAVID McMILLAN.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28784. You do not supply them with liquor in the house?—Not unless the Doctor orders it.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28785. So the same remark would apply to these sixteen as to the others?—Yes.

EDWARD ARTHUR ST. GEORGE HUGHES, of Montreal, Chief of City Police, recalled.

*By the Chairman :*

28786. On page of your report there is a statement giving the numbers arrested monthly during the year 1891, and the total is 8,396. Is that the number of arrests within the city for all offences?—Yes.

28787. Following that is the statement of those tried before the Court of Queen's Bench, and the Police Magistrate's Court during the year, numbering 1,598. Is that number included in the previous number of 8,396?—Yes, that is included. Some are tried before the Police Magistrate's Court, and some before the Recorder's Court. That is the total number.

28788. You report money and goods recovered by the police amounting to \$51,088?—Yes, that is the amount of goods found on prisoners or given back to the proprietors from prisoners arrested for robbery.

28789. Stolen goods and money?—Yes, restored to the proprietors.

28790. On page 20 you give the number of licensed and temperance taverns in Montreal, and I see 38 temperance places are entered, 9 of which are in the St. Louis Ward, and 15 in the St. Mary Ward. Those are both eastern wards of the city?—Yes.

28791. On the same page you have the number of houses of ill-fame in the city entered as 118. I suppose these are known to the police?—Yes, they are known to the police to be houses of ill-fame.

28792. Have you a copy of your report for 1890?—I have not it here; but when I appeared first, I gave orders to have the total number of arrests prepared for the last 10 years. That will be ready on Monday. I think the number of arrests in 1890 was about 10,000.

28793. I think in that report you gave a statement of unlicensed places in the city?—That was a mistake by the man who made the translation. I made my report in French, and instead of temperance hotels, he put in unlicensed hotels. They are only unlicensed hotels because the phrase is taken from the French words "*hôtels non licenciés.*"

*By Judge McDonald :*

28794. Have they to get a license in this Province for temperance hotels?—Yes; they can sell ginger beer and ginger ale, and so on.

*By the Chairman :*

28795. You probably saw in the newspapers a statement made by Mr. Lambe, the Collector of Provincial Revenue, to the effect that there are certainly 2,000, probably 4,000 or more places in the city of Montreal where liquor is being sold without a license. It is a startling statement, and as you are the Chief of Police, and I believe you pride yourself on having a very efficient body of men under you, I wish to give you the opportunity to make any statement on that subject that you desire.—Of course it is a part of the duty of the municipal police to look after these places, though there is a police force appointed expressly for that purpose; but I am certainly of an opinion directly to the contrary of Mr. Lambe's statement. I do not believe there are 300 places in Montreal where liquor is sold without a license.

28796. That is your opinion?—That is my opinion, and I am ready to swear to it.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28797. How many houses are there in the city all told?—I could not say exactly, but there must be 30,000 or 40,000 at least.

28798. It would be impossible that one in six of these should be unlicensed places for selling liquor?—It is perfectly ridiculous.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28799. That would be 4,000 houses, and allowing five in a family, it would make 20,000 of the population of Montreal connected with the illicit liquor traffic. You think that is an impossibility?—It is an utter impossibility. I think Mr. Lambe must have meant 400 and not 4,000.

*By the Chairman :*

28800. In the list of prisoners tried before the Court of Queen's Bench, 1891, the number given in your report is 1,598. Are the cases of all offenders tried before the Court of Queen's Bench included in that number?—Those arrested by the municipal police.

28801. Are there others?—Of course. There are others arrested by the officials of the Magistrates' Court, and by the officials of the Court of Queen's Bench, but 90 per cent are arrested by the city police.

28802. What kind of offenders would be arrested by the High Constable or the officers of the courts?—That would be when the deposition is made before the Police Magistrate, and the warrant is granted and given to the High Constable for execution; but I do not believe there are more than 10 per cent of the whole number who have been arrested by the High Constable or his officers.

28803. Such cases would not be included by you?—Not at all. These referred to in my report are arrested by the municipal police.

28804. What would be the character of the offences dealt with by the High Constable and the officers of the courts?—The same offences, such as robbery, assault and murder.

28805. Then in these cases complaint is made to the court?—Yes. The court then issues a warrant, if the Police Magistrate, or the Court of Queen's Bench chooses, and it is served by the High Constable or his officers.

28806. Not necessarily by the police?—No. If a warrant is sent to us we execute it, but it is generally executed by the High Constable, who gets a fee for that service.

28807. You do not take cognizance of that?—No.

28808. You give it as your opinion that there are not more than 10 per cent of these cases that are so dealt with?—That is what I think.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28809. Two or three statements have been made in reference to the police. Some were made by the manager of the Sailors' Home, to the effect that policemen themselves visited saloons down about the wharfs, and an intimation was given that some of these officers had taken liquor there. Is there any regulation about that?—Yes. Last year proceedings were taken against two hotel-keepers for giving liquor to policemen, and they were fined for doing so.

28810. What about the policeman himself?—There is a rule that no policeman shall go into a saloon and drink when in uniform. He may go in, if he is called in, by the proprietor to quell a disturbance; but if he goes in in uniform to get liquor, he is dismissed.

28811. The proper way would be to give you notice of it?—Certainly. If it is reported to me, he is instantly dismissed.

28812. Another statement was, that complaint was made to the Central Police Station that there were a dozen places within a hundred yards of that station where

EDWARD ARTHUR ST. GEORGE HUGHES.

liquor was being sold on Sunday, and a request was made for two men in plain clothes to watch these places, which would be pointed out to them; but the reply was that the police had no men for that purpose?—I have ten men in plain clothes who go to saloons every Sunday, and see that the law is observed.

28813. If the officer had made such an answer as that, and it was reported to you, you would have seen that the men went?—Certainly. No such application was made to me.

28814. If such an application were made to you, you would appoint those men?—Certainly. It is exaggerated, because I know I am at my office every Sunday. I have no doubt that at the hotels liquor is got by people who are known, and it is very difficult to get at that.

28815. But the complaint is the refusal to supply the officers for that purpose?—Every week special officers are appointed for that work.

28816. So such refusal would be contrary to order?—Yes. But there are officers appointed who report three or four times every Sunday, and the Sergeant might have said, “The men are all out on some other duty now, and if you call back we will give them to you.”

*By Mr. Clarke :*

28817. The hotels along the front are not permitted to keep open on Sunday, to keep “bums” from going up into the city? The gentleman who was dissatisfied said the Sergeant stated that these places were allowed to be open in order to prevent that?—There are two or three places on Commissioners Street, the street running along the wharf, where sailors go and take their glass of beer, and two or three years ago we fined them several times for being open on Sunday. Then they took out hotel licenses. A sailor goes in there and asks for a glass of beer, and cannot get it; but if he takes a meal, he can get it. He sits at a table and takes a piece of a sandwich, or a piece of cheese, and he gets his beer, and is charged for his meal. We brought this before the Recorder. The temperance societies sued these parties, and proof was made that no liquor was sold, but that it was given in connection with the meal to the sailor; and when the Recorder rendered judgment, he thought the best thing was to leave them alone. And my present impression is that it is not a bad thing to leave these sailors on the wharf, if they do not get drunk. If they did not get liquor there, they would be hanging round the streets on Sunday. There is no one living around there, and personally I think it a good thing that these people should be allowed to give them a glass of beer and a piece of cheese or a sandwich.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28818. We have this evidence on both these subjects from gentlemen of responsibility, but what I want to get at is this: If these gentlemen will make complaints to yourself personally of failure of duty on the part of the officers, will you investigate them?—Of course. I never refuse to investigate a complaint against an officer.

28819. Then they should report to you the refusal of the officers to do these acts?—Yes.

28820. These matters were never reported to you, I understand?—They may have been reported three or four years ago, but not within a few months.

28821. You have no recollection of them?—Not of any report being made. We have no men in plain clothes at the Station.



SIR WILLIAM DAWSON, C.M.G., F.R.S., LL.D., on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

28822. You are Principal of McGill College, I believe?—Yes.

28823. During how many years have you held that position?—Since 1855.

28824. If I am not mistaken, you were on one occasion President of the British Association for the Promotion of Science?—Yes, at the Birmingham meeting in 1886. I was also President of the Association in 1884.

28825. You are a total abstainer, I believe?—Yes.

28826. And you have been so for how long?—From my childhood. My father was one of the earliest advocates of temperance in the Dominion; he was concerned in the formation of the second Temperance Society in Canada.

28827. You have, I believe, taken a great interest in temperance matters?—Yes. I have followed his teaching all my life, and I believe that it is largely owing to this that I enjoy health now at an advanced age, and am able to do so much work.

28828. You have a large number of students at McGill College. Can you give the Commission some idea of the number?—It is hardly possible to state the number for the present session, but I should say 1,000 in connection with the different faculties.

28829. Have you experienced trouble with any considerable number of students at any time on the score of intemperance?—Not with any considerable number, but with a few. I may say in regard to that matter, that most of the men who have given us trouble are men who had contracted dissipated habits before they came to us, and not men who contracted them here. On the other hand, I think I may say, what I have said on several occasions, that it is a most cruel act on the part of those who have authority to grant licenses to place saloons within a short distance of the University, as they have done. The saloons afford the means of tempting men who otherwise would be under control.

28830. With regard to the habits of students, are they more temperate now than they were a few years ago?—I think very much so.

28831. There is an improvement in regard to drinking habits?—Yes, a marked improvement.

28832. I took the liberty of sending to you an extract from the Commission setting forth the objects of our inquiry, as follows :—(1) The effects of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada; (2) The measures which have been adopted in this and other countries with a view to lessen, regulate or prohibit the traffic; (3) The results of these measures in each case; (4) The effect that an enactment of a prohibitory liquor law in Canada would have in respect of social conditions, agricultural business, industrial and commercial interests, the revenue requirements of municipalities, provinces and of the Dominion, and also as to its capability of efficient enforcement; (5) All other information bearing on the question of prohibition. The Commissioners will be glad if you will make a statement of your views on this very intricate and important subject?—I may say in regard to the first of these, that my own interest is the most important one to me in Canada. In regard to the other interests, I think there are only two that have come under my cognizance which it will be worth while saying anything about. One is that to which I have just referred, namely, the interests of students. I have always felt it my duty, as have other officers of the University, to set an example of total abstinence to students, and to do everything possible to prevent them from falling into bad habits in that respect. But we have been greatly hampered by the existence of drinking places within easy reach of the University. As regards educational interests, I take it that this University city, with 2,000 students within its limits, should be very careful in establishing drinking places within reach of or near to the educational institutions. It is a very wrong course to adopt. That is one point. The other is in regard to pauperism. I have had occasion to institute inquiries in regard to the pauperism of Montreal. I can confidently say that nearly all the want and destitution prevailing in this city is directly or indirectly attributable to the liquor traffic, and if the liquor traffic could be abolished entirely, there would be far less burdens cast on the

SIR WILLIAM DAWSON.

benevolent societies and benevolent individuals of the city. The present process is simply one of taking money out of the pockets of the benevolent people of the community and passing it, through the hands of these victims, into the pockets of the liquor sellers. That is an aspect of this question which in cities like this should never be overlooked. In work among the poor it is found that there are cases of absolute destitution arising from other causes, which need relief, but the greater part are directly or indirectly due to drink. These are only two interests with which I happen to have a personal or practical acquaintance. I do not know that it would be of any service to speak of other interests, unless there are any in regard to which the Commissioners desire to question me.

28833. We are all agreed as to the evils of intemperance. The duty of the Commissioners, I think, is mainly to find out a remedy.—Quite so.

28834. We have a licensing system at present. I do not know how far you consider it efficient or efficiently carried out. There are many questions arising out of it: Is the system an efficient and desirable one; are improvements required? If it is not efficient, what system should be substituted for it in order to render the control more efficient?—First, in regard to the licensing system. I have always said that I have considered it inefficient, at all events in this, that it has established saloons and drinking places where they are not wanted. I should be very glad, if the license system is to be continued, if a more efficient control were adopted, under which the authorities would place establishments for supplying liquor where they are wanted and remove them from localities where they are not wanted. Then in regard to the question of prohibition: county prohibition under the Scott Act and local prohibition have done good. From my own experience in Nova Scotia very great effect was produced by these measures in the country population, and I presume the effect has been somewhat similar here. Although there are many failures and breakdowns in regard to enforcing such measures, it must be borne in mind that where it is deemed desirable by a community to prohibit the sale of strong drink, it is necessary to arouse and agitate that community. It is necessary to have that agitation, and it is a good thing, whether the movement fails or succeeds. That has been generally beneficial, and in places where prohibition has been carried out, it has unquestionably done good, although it was never carried out perfectly—and I do not think it is possible to carry out such a law perfectly as it should be carried out—and in some places it has been more efficient and in other places it has been less efficient, but on the whole its effect has been good. We must bear in mind that it is the inalienable right of free men in every country, whether it is a municipality, county or parish, to pass regulations to eliminate from the community anything they find to be a nuisance and necessary to be removed. The law should provide facilities to get rid of everything that is injurious to their interests. Therefore, the local option is a principle which should be continued. It cannot be dropped without depriving the people of rights which the Government has no authority to take from them. But the question as to what facilities should be given to enable a community to promote its own welfare has to be decided from time to time. Then in regard to Dominion prohibition: I do not think there are very many who would be sufficiently bold to go in for that movement at the present moment. But it has occurred to me that there are two courses which might be taken that would very much tend to remove the evil, and that, perhaps, a majority of the people might sustain. In the old days, 60 years ago, when the temperance cause was first introduced here, a temperance man pledged himself to abstain not from all alcoholic drinks, but from distilled liquors mainly, leaving all the others out. That was the point of the pledge. It strikes me that public opinion might be worked up to such a pitch that we could come to the conclusion, which is a legitimate conclusion, chemically and physiologically, that distilled alcohol is not a substance for human beings to use, except in a modified form, and then very rarely. If they came to that conclusion, they might make it criminal, under the strongest possible penalty, either to distil or to import any such spirits. I would put men in the penitentiary for selling such spirit, and I think public opinion might be brought round to the point of prohibiting the more highly poisonous spirits, which are the distilled spirits, and the question of wine and beers might be left to the present system without any trouble. I think the Dominion of Canada might come to that conclusion, if the

question were properly brought before it, within a reasonable time. I do not say it is possible to do it now, but to bring it about within a reasonable time, and it would be a grand result if we could accomplish it. Another point is this: Inasmuch as there is evidence that pauperism and crime are largely stimulated by the drink traffic, I think it would be a very wise arrangement to register all persons in a Dominion registry who have to do with this traffic in any way, either as manufacturers or vendors; to enter the amount of capital they have invested in the business and the amount they are worth altogether, and to make chargeable distinctly on them the cost of all widows and orphans and of all legal proceedings that might arise out of intemperance. That might be combined with such local action as would, if a man went in a state of intoxication out of a drinking-house and struck some one else or killed some one, make the man who sold the drink liable also to be indicted for murder. That arrangement would be a perfectly right and proper one,—to make the whole people concerned in the traffic over a very wide area responsible for the crime. When they knew that they all would have to pay, it would be their interest to keep themselves and their friends within the limits of the law, more than is the case at the present time. If either of those methods should be employed by the Dominion—and the details could afterwards be considered—that, with the ordinary options which are allowed to Councils and electors, would be able to keep the whole traffic within check without great difficulty. But my own feeling has always been—and for that reason I have not entered into the agitation for prohibition—that it would be best to have the people convinced that it was their duty and their interest not to meddle with anything of that kind, and not to require a law to keep the trade in check. That is the higher moral view to take of it, and it is the position into which I wish to see the question brought, for under it there would be no such necessity for restrictive laws as at present exist. I believe in the moral suasion method as the real essential method; but if it is necessary to protect the interests of the public from the great evils which arise from this traffic, then there are methods which I think would remedy the more serious evils. I have thought of those two expedients mentioned, which would be within the scope of practical legislation in one shape or another, and which perhaps might not please prohibitionists or anti-prohibitionists but which perhaps both sides might agree upon as an intermediary measure. In regard to the second question covered by the Commission: I do not know if I could give any information in regard to it. In regard to the third question, “the results of these measures in each case”; I am not in a position to say anything in regard to my experience in the Province of Nova Scotia. I was Superintendent of Education for that province from 1851 to 1855, and had occasion to travel extensively over the province; and on returning there subsequently, I found a wonderful reformation had taken place in regard to the drinking customs, that whereas previously there had been a great deal of drinking and many people had gone to ruin because of it, this had been to a great extent changed. I attributed this change partly to the agitation in favour of temperance principles, and partly to the fact that they were beginning to reap the effects of the local measures of restriction.

28835. You have travelled a good deal abroad, I believe. Can you tell the Commission anything in regard to the arrangement for the regulation of the traffic in other countries?—I do not know that I would care to venture to say anything on that subject, as I have not given sufficient study to understand much about those measures. In Mohammedan countries, where it is contrary to the Koran to drink strong liquors, they are a temperate people. In our North-west, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was building, I had an illustration which struck me exceedingly forcibly. There were at that time—and I went there when the road was in process of construction through the plains and Rocky Mountains—perhaps 20,000 men employed on the road, and I neither saw drunkenness, fighting nor quarrelling there; everybody seemed in a sound mind, and I never saw so many labouring men quiet and orderly (they being moreover of all nationalities), as there were there. It struck me very much as an illustration of the power of a restrictive measure, because there were no liquors allowed except for medicinal purposes.

28836. Were they largely Italians?—I do not think there were many Italians. There were a good many Swedes, and English, and Irish, and Canadians. I do not

SIR WILLIAM DAWSON.

think Italians were so abundant then as now. It was in 1883 when I was there. The next is the fourth question, and it is in regard to the effect of the enactment of a prohibitory law in Canada. Of course, that requires a man to be a prophet to say much in regard to it ; but there are some of those questions I have thought of, and in regard to which, it appears to me, there is a good deal of fallacy current. I do not see that the prohibition of the liquor traffic would do any harm to agriculture, because the whole portion of the products of the farm, which are consumed in that manufacture at present, might be consumed in other ways, or the land might be devoted to growing other kinds of grain, which would prove equally profitable to the farmer. There is nothing injurious to agriculture about it. In regard to supposed injury to commercial and industrial interests and to the revenue, one must bear in mind that all this material which is converted into strong drink, and all the apparatus employed, and the labour utilized in doing it, is, to a large extent, loss and waste, and even something more than that, because of the manufacture tending to diminish the productive value of the community as a whole and tending to impose great burdens on the community, in the shape of pauperism and crime. That being the case, the Government receives revenue into one pocket and pays it out from the other. It would be far better for men who spend their money in strong drink, to expend it in other ways. Of course, if it was invested in property, or useful articles of any kind, it would increase the productive value and give increased revenue in that way. So I do not see any harm that will obviously arise either to the revenue or to trade from prohibition. All these measures would be beneficial, according to my view, if the people could be induced to think so. I hold that is the true view of it so far as one can apply the principles of political economy to the question. Then as to the question regarding "its capability of efficient enforcement." It is easy to make a law in Canada, but it is very hard to enforce it. That I have found to be the truth in many cases. This, therefore, is a point which must be dealt with by practical politicians. I do not pretend to know how it can be done, but it strikes me that any moderate measure that would commend itself to the majority could be enforced. In every case, you have to enforce a measure against a minority. A minority of the people in the Province of Quebec apparently believe in smuggling, and a majority of the people believe in upholding the law ; but the majority are not bound to respect the views of the minority, and if you cannot altogether repress it, you are not going to dismiss the officers and allow the minority to do what they please. If this is recognized as an evil by the majority, the minority must submit, although, perhaps, the desires of the majority interfere in some degree with the comforts of the minority. I am not aware there is anything else in the questions submitted to the Commission, which occurs to me to speak upon. I should like very much if any means could be devised by this Commission or by Parliament, to put an end to this evil in Canada. We should take the lead on this question of all the nations of the world.

28837. I gather from what you have said that you have doubts as to the efficient enforcement of a prohibitory law in the existing state of public sentiment. Am I right in that opinion?—I do not think I put it in that way. If public sentiment is of such a character as to warrant a majority of the Legislature passing such a law, one must take it for granted that the public sentiment of the majority is in favour of it. In that case I do not think anybody could object.

28838. Would you come to the conclusion, from your experience, that the sentiment of the country is so largely in favour of a prohibitory system as to ensure its success, if put into force? I understood from your opening remarks that you were more than in doubt on that subject?—I cannot speak, of course, for the public at large, but so far as I have seen any expressions of opinion, they would appear to indicate that as great evils result from intemperance, any means taken to repress it would be very desirable. The question is—what means, and to what extent? I cannot tell how the division would be, and the division to-day might be different from the division to-morrow. The information which is being collected by this Commission, distributed over this country, may have great effect on the people's minds, and next year they may have different ideas on this question from what they entertain now. But the principle that strikes me in regard to the whole question is this : If there is a decided majority of the people of the country in favour of the present system, they will retain it ; but when there is no longer a decided majority, they will be unable to do so.

28839. It would be natural to expect that if there was a decided majority, they would give expression to their views through their representatives in Parliament?—Certainly.

28840. It would not follow, if there was a general vote taken to-morrow and a preponderance shown to be in favour of prohibition, that that would ensure the passage of a prohibitory measure, because other issues would come in, and the question would have, after all, to be decided by Parliament?—No doubt. You cannot be sure regarding a popular majority continuing to be a majority; it might cease to be a majority.

28841. We know that a temperance wave passed over a very large section of Ontario, and the Scott Act was put in force in county after county for a period of three years. Subsequently there was another wave, and when a vote on the question of the continuance of the Act was taken, nearly every county repealed it, or at all events a very large majority repealed it, by larger majorities than those which had put the Act in force. What inference would you draw from that fact?—I think the inference I would draw is, that which we would all draw, namely, that public opinion is a very fickle thing, and that it changes from time to time. But then I think that every change, in a certain sense, is good. If, for instance, in a certain county there is a strong agitation regarding the Scott Act, that means that public interest is stimulated. The Act is kept in force for three years, and the people are more or less deprived of liquor. You get them in the habit of doing without it to some extent, and you make it difficult for those who wish to procure it to do so. By and by the people get tired of this contest, for various reasons, and at the next election they repeal this Act and go back to the old Act. In the meantime they have been educating themselves on this question, and after the law has been repealed, there must be a large residuum of temperance work remaining among these people. Many of the contests have been carried by outside money and the money of publicans. The victors will then exercise their power in such a way that public sentiment will rise against them again. The next time a more severe defeat is encountered. That is the way the struggle goes on in popular constituencies. Every constituency in a province, county or locality should have the power of putting itself through that kind of experience.

28842. They practically have it at this moment, except in some of the cities. But looking at it simply from the general standpoint, would not the second event to which you have referred indicate a reaction?—Certainly. But it may only be a temporary one.

28843. We have it in evidence that temperance people often become discouraged and do not enforce the Scott Act after it has been adopted, but drop local prohibition in order to go for the larger measure of complete prohibition?—That is very likely. When there are two measures, one will be abandoned for the other sometimes. Another point that occurs to me as one which practical politicians and business men should look at, is this: If you have a business in this country which can be utterly annihilated by the vote of the people, say next year, it is a very unsafe business. Such a business affords a very poor investment for capital and it falls into the hands of a low class of people, and the more trade comes to be in the hands of such people, the better it is for the community. The greatest harm is done because respectable people carry on distilleries and wholesale establishments, and the less reputable people, who do most of the mischief, can work under their wings. I think even making the business uncertain by local option is in itself a great reform.

28844. Then you look upon the Scott Act and local option as means which the advocates of temperance would do well to follow and act upon?—Certainly, to continue and to act upon whenever the community seems to favour it. But where the community does not favour it, if you make a good fight for it and preach temperance you, at all events, do some good, even if you do not carry the Scott Act. I like it from that point of view, because I look upon the question from the moral standpoint more than from the legislative one. We are at this moment all over the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec and also in the Lower Provinces teaching total abstinence in the schools. Some may think we are not justified in doing that when there are people who consider it a heterodox doctrine. It comes in connection with hygiene and physiology which are taught there, and all the books sanctioned in the schools take very strong views as to the poisonous nature of alcohol and draw the conclusion that it should not be used by human beings at all. We are training

SIR WILLIAM DAWSON.

up a generation of young people in that way, though they may relapse by and by. If, however, the advancement continues, I would not be surprised, if I should live as long as ten or fifteen years, to see a very great majority holding those views.

28845. Voting in favour of prohibiting the traffic altogether?—Yes; at all events, the traffic in what may be called alcohol. I do not go to the full length of some of our prohibitionists, because there are good reasons to believe it is more difficult to stop the use and circulation of the weaker alcoholic drinks than the stronger ones, and they are less injurious also. The alcoholic drinks made by what is called natural fermentation of the grain and sugar and other articles are not so poisonous as a whole, because they are not so concentrated, as those obtained by the process of distillation. It strikes me that if, as I have said before, the Government were to look after this matter at all, they might make war in the first instance against distilled liquor. They might find it very difficult to do, but there would be a strong public opinion in favour of that course more than the other.

28846. From what you have said, I conclude that you, Sir William, like a great many other witnesses, think that when public sentiment is sufficiently educated in favour of the suppression of the traffic, prohibition will not be necessary?—Certainly. If the whole people were to come to admit that the use of alcoholic drinks is a crime, just as they admit now that stealing is a crime, it would not be very difficult to suppress it, but it might still be necessary to have some prohibitive regulation.

28847. And you would still have prohibition?—At present everybody holds that it is not right to steal, but still the community have to keep some police to prevent certain people from stealing, because there are a few people who will do it. So if there was a prohibitory law and it came to be like the laws which fall into desuetude because everybody keeps them, there might still be some necessity for it at particular places and under particular circumstances, but not much.

28848. Do you think it would be in the interests of temperance that a prohibitory law should be passed, and public sentiment being found to be against it, it subsequently be repealed: do you think that state of things would be conducive to the promotion of temperance?—Not so much in the interests of temperance as if the law were maintained, but still somewhat in the interests of temperance.

28849. Suppose a prohibitory law were passed and it proved to be in advance of public opinion, and the result was the repeal of the Act: would that be conducive to the interests of temperance?—What time would you give it before the repeal was carried?

28850. About twelve months?—The next session of the Legislature?

28851. Yes, or as soon as public opinion could be fully expressed. We have the case of New Brunswick, about which you may know something?—Yes.

28852. Would it really be in the interests of the temperance cause to have a law passed before the people were ready for it?—I do not think it would be very strongly in the interest of the temperance cause, but I think to some extent it would be so, on the principle I have mentioned. For instance, free trade and protection or other subjects that affect the people come to be agitated violently in a community. During one session of the Legislature there is a certain view taken on the question and a certain Act passed, and this is followed by a revulsion of public feeling, as is seen in the United States. In regard to the temperance question, such an agitation tends to discourage people from investing their money in the liquor business and tends to break down the credit of the trade, if it does nothing more. If the temperance people, after the Act has been repealed, chose to rest content and declared that they would let the trade go on, the dealers would feel themselves safe; but if the temperance people declared that they would fight the question out in Parliament and in the next election, the dealers would feel themselves unsafe and the trade would be more or less crippled. I look upon everything that cripples the trade and educates public opinion as a good thing.

28853. Do you not think that if we had a prohibitory law passed during next session of Parliament and put in force, and if it was discovered to be opposed to public sentiment, and in the following session, or perhaps two years afterwards, it was repealed, that it would be very demoralizing to the temperance cause?—I do not think so. They would fight it over another time.

28854. In the case of New Brunswick, the Government brought in a measure and had it passed through the Legislature, which measure was practically the Maine liquor law?—Yes.

28855. Very strong representations were made to the Lieutenant-Governor in opposition to the Act, and he called upon his Ministers to take some steps in the matter. They practically said that it was not the Governor's business, that they were responsible to the people. Finally, the Governor determined there should be an appeal to the people; the Ministers would not agree to this, and they went out of office; another set of Ministers were called in; the Legislature was dissolved and at the following election all the advocates of the Maine liquor law, with, I think, two exceptions, were defeated, and for many years afterwards there was no legislation in New Brunswick of any consequence on the liquor question, and the province went back to the original license law?—That I know.

28856. I believe Sir Leonard Tilley, who was Prime Minister at the time and voluntarily gave evidence before this Commission, stated that he did not consider that that was a very successful step; in fact, I think he went further and said he thought it somewhat of a mistake in the interests of temperance?—It was unquestionably premature; but it probably could be renewed. However, in regard to prohibition I wish the Commissioners to bear in mind that I have never taken any part in an agitation for prohibition. I have always tried to support temperance on moral grounds, and I have felt that that was the business of the educationist, and I have had nothing to do practically with the question of local compulsion. I repeat that I have never taken any part in these agitations; at the same time I have watched them, and what I have said conveys my impression as to their victories or defeats. Their victories sometimes are more fatal to them than their defeats, because the temperance people may ride roughshod over every one who opposes them. When they meet with defeat, they fight out the battle again on other lines.

28857. We understand you to advocate moral suasion?—Altogether. Whenever I have the opportunity I speak of abstinence as a moral principle. I have not taken any part whatever in the prohibition movement, but I have watched it, with a good deal of interest, as anybody might. It is a most interesting conflict.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28858. You have spoken of the early days of Nova Scotia?—Yes.

28859. Was there not a very noble work done by the old Sons of Temperance?—Yes, a very great work has been done by the temperance societies. That was what laid the foundation for local prohibition. In the old days, when I travelled a good deal in Nova Scotia and visited nearly all the schools, there were very many places where rum shops were established in settlements and proved their ruin, where people could always be found hanging round the doors and where the farms were allowed to go to waste. I visited those places years afterwards, when everything bore a very different aspect. There were temperance societies and temperance halls and all the stimulation of temperance work, and the whole aspect was improved.

28860. Was there not a large quantity of rum, Jamaica spirits, used in those old days?—Yes; West Indian rum was the special drink.

28861. Is that not liquor of the strongest description?—I do not know it from personal experience, but I believe it is so represented. It is said, however, to be diluted with a good deal of water by some of the dealers.

28862. Subsequently those counties in which that condition of things existed adopted local option?—Yes. But the first movement was a temperance movement, the agitation among the people in favour of temperance principles.

28863. Therefore, it was the temperance sentiment which had educated the people and led to the adoption of those measures?—Certainly.

28864. They were not adopted first and temperance followed afterwards?—Certainly not. I hold that the people must be educated up to the question first.

28865. Do you know the provisions of the Maine law? We had evidence from a Judge in the State of Maine that while the sale of liquor and the keeping of it for sale

SIR WILLIAM DAWSON.

in the State was forbidden, any person who pleases may get it from Montreal, Boston or elsewhere and use it for beverage purposes in his own house?—I suppose so, but he cannot dispose of it to his neighbour.

28866. So it is not an actual prohibitory law, because liquor is allowed to be brought in by any one for his private use?—Yes. It is impossible to prevent that. I believe it is not desirable. People may say that it is necessary to life and health.

28867. Sir Leonard Tilley took this position, as I understood him: that so far as national prohibition for the whole Dominion was concerned the strength of the chain is its weakest link, and that as Quebec and British Columbia are not in the same line of advance on the question as the other provinces, he feels the whole Dominion is not educated up to the point which would make prohibition a success, if it were carried now. It would make it difficult of enactment and enforcement?—Quite so.

28868. He then put forward this proposition, that the great object should be not only to win the fort, but having won it, to keep it?—Decidedly. The question needs a good deal of agitation everywhere. Among the French Canadians the Chiniquy temperance movement made a wonderful reformation. To a certain extent its effect has continued, but it had been broken down a great deal. If another man like Father Chiniquy could be got to go around the French Canadian parishes, the French Canadians would become the strongest temperance men in the Dominion very soon.

28869. His work, I suppose, was very similar to that of Father Mathew in Ireland?—Yes. He inaugurated the work of signing the pledge among these people, and he gave such strong pictures of the evil effects of liquor that they came forward in wonderful style. Now they are circulating in the French Canadian as well as in the English schools temperance literature for the training of the children; to what extent it will be operative, I do not know.

28870. Are you acquainted with the provisions of the Church of England Temperance Society with its double pledge—total abstinence and a pledge that the party will not treat?—That is the old-fashioned temperance which used to be in vogue in old times, before the total abstinence movement came into existence.

28871. And some of the societies have a triple pledge: total abstinence, not to treat, only to drink at meals, the intention being that some will take one and some another, and in the hope that the man who takes the third pledge will eventually be educated to take the first pledge?—I do not know of that matter; I have not had any experience in regard to it.

28872. Speaking of the education of popular opinion, an important question has been incidentally referred to by the Chairman. Suppose a plebiscite on the subject of prohibition is taken in the country, and prohibition is carried. Perhaps it is carried by a large majority in the Maritime Provinces, while an adverse vote is given in Quebec, but taking the provinces as a whole, there is a majority for it. Members are elected to Parliament, and it is expected that they are going to vote for prohibition. But other questions come up not connected with it but with other matters, and perhaps it becomes apparent that the adoption of a prohibitory measure involves a change of Government, and a member in favour of prohibition may think a change of Government a greater evil than to leave the liquor traffic as it is. Is that not a matter that would have to be taken into consideration?—No doubt. So soon as you introduce total abstinence into popular elections you have to mix it up with all these political considerations, or it would go to the wall.

28873. The Commission were told by witnesses from the State of Maine, that in the State they have ran a prohibitionist candidate for President of the United States, and they have done so at the last two elections, apparently without any hope of success, but, as they said, as a means of educating public opinion; and instead of merging their forces into those of one of the political parties, they consider it better to stand by their principles, even if they are defeated. Have you considered that question?—My feeling would be not to go in for such action at all, but to keep the temperance movement on common ground and not mix it up with political issues. I do not see that it is an advantage at all to adopt such measures as you have mentioned. Until you have got the support of both sides in politics, especially in view of the differences which exist, you are not likely to be successful; there must be a majority on a question of this sort.



28874. You have spoken of a great change which has taken place among the students in regard to drinking habits?—There has been quite a change.

28875. Have you not also found a change in the social customs of the people?—Yes.

28876. A great change for the better?—Very much so.

28877. Have you not noticed in travelling on steamboats, for example, that men who ordered liquor were the exception?—Yes, there is much less drinking than in olden times. The custom of treating in my young days was carried to so great an extent that you could hardly conclude any business or bargain without treating the people concerned. That practice seems to be pretty well abolished.

28878. Taking the question of intemperance as regards persistent drunkards: it has been suggested that instead of such persons being sent for short terms to jail, as is the present practice, it would be better to place them under restraint in inebriate asylums?—Certainly, there is no doubt of it, because there you could exercise some influence over them that might reform them. But that is an expensive and troublesome proceeding, I suppose.

28879. Have you considered the question of the establishment in the city of places of amusement for the people as a means of keeping them from the saloons?—I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of that proposal. I believe it is very much easier to keep up a positive reform than a negative one. You drive out one kind of evil spirit and twenty others will come in its place. Thus you require to substitute something to take its place. Accordingly, I attach great value to education in those matters, education which brings in the principle of temperance in connection with hygiene and all the requisites of human health for body and mind as a means of education, and in this way people connect temperance with all those other beneficial influences. They go to popular amusements with their families and enjoy them, and they utilize free libraries and the like. Everything of that sort which promotes the cultivation of the intellect and provides rational amusement promotes the temperance movement.

*By the Chairman:*

28880. Do you include under this head improvement in the dwellings of the working classes?—Of course I do, because I sympathize very much with working people who have to come home to uncomfortable dwellings, when they have been working in the wet and cold. Such people, it seems to me, may be regarded as being to a certain extent justified in taking strong drink, and undoubtedly in this way they may learn the habit. There is no question as regards the desirability of having the working classes lodged in comfortable dwellings. But it acts and reacts. The man is in the habit of going to a public house and getting a glass of liquor because he is placed in an uncomfortable dwelling or poorly fed and clad, and undoubtedly in this way the drinking habit is increased. On the other hand, the man who will drop drinking may soon be in comfortable circumstances and be able to dispense with liquor, especially in this country. There is great reason to sympathize with the very poor who are sufferers from the inclemency of the weather, but their condition would be improved in a better way by weaning them from their habit of depending on strong drink. Much might also be done by a better training of girls in cooking and domestic management.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28881. That view was presented to the Commission by the Honourable Mr. Joly, who urged the use of light wines by the people. He spoke of his own experience in France as a boy, when he was accustomed, with the other members of the family, to use wine. He further spoke about men going to their comfortless homes?—The working classes cannot obtain better abodes by taking heavy or light wines, but by abandoning such habits as prevent them having comfortable dwellings. A great deal has been said about this matter of wine drinking, but practically and from a physiological point of view, I doubt whether the people of Canada will ever come to drink much light wine or liquor of that sort. The climatic and other conditions are such as to tend to induce men to drink other liquors, if they drink at all.

SIR WILLIAM DAWSON.

*By the Chairman :*

28882. You no doubt are aware that the consumption of beer has largely increased?—Yes, I can understand that; and, moreover, there is a class of people coming in from the continent that drink light beers.

28883. And the consumption of the heavier liquors has decreased?—That is a good sign, and I should think beer would be better suited to this country than strong drink, but tea and coffee still better. There is another physiological point about it, for a great deal of the injury done by strong drink in this country arises from the fact that the people from the old country when they come here indulge more freely in it, and this climate being so much dryer and more exhilarating, a much less quantity does harm here than in the old country and in moist climates. There is a great deal of misconception in regard to these matters. Many Irish and Scotch immigrants get into trouble from this cause, because they do not consider the great change of climate and other conditions here.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28884. In speaking of parks, I may point out to you that there is Sohmer Park in this city and it has a license?—I do not believe in places of that kind.

28885. To such a place, then, you would not give a license?—No.

28886. Do you believe such places afford suitable amusement to the people?—We have St. Helen's Island, which is a beautiful place, and the Mountain Park, and although attempts have been made to introduce drinking into these resorts, they have not been successful. Those the people have already, but I believe that in great cities, parks or places for national amusement or instruction or anything of that kind are in the interest of temperance, because they induce people to spend their evenings in a different way from frequenting the saloons. Moreover, it must be remembered that a man who has a miserable home does not care to stay there in the evening. He will go away after his work is done to some place where there is light and warmth; but if you could induce him to stay at home and make the home comfortable he would remain there with his wife and become a different man altogether. So everything you can do to furnish rational recreation for the people is in the interests of the general welfare of the community. The difficulty is to provide these, especially in winter; but a small fraction of the money wasted in strong drink would do it.

28887. The operation of the Scott Act is in some places fairly successful and in other places not quite so successful. The law at present provides that a majority of the votes cast being in favour of the Act shall cause the Governor in Council to declare the Act to be in force. Would it be any advantage to have the Canada Temperance Act amended so as to provide that the Act shall not be declared to be in force unless a majority of the voters on the roll cast their votes in its favour?—That is, those entitled to vote at the election of a member of Parliament.

28888. Yes?—That might make it more certain to succeed, but more difficult to obtain.

28889. Would there not be less danger of having evil effects from a law of that kind being permitted to remain on the Statute-book and persistently and flagrantly violated?—It might; but I have a feeling in regard to it of a different kind. If you are going in for an amendment of that sort, I think everybody should vote, and nobody has a better right to vote than the wives and children of drunkards; and you are aware they do not vote for members of Parliament.

28890. In Ontario there have been cases where the Scott Act was carried by a comparatively large majority, but where the total vote cast for and against the Act was a small vote; and after an experience of three years there was a much larger vote polled, with the result that the Act was repealed. If an amendment were made to the Act, that it should not be declared in force by the Governor in Council unless the majority of votes was cast in its favour, and there was reasonable assurance that it would be enforced, would not much more beneficial results follow than at present?—It would be a way to make it surer, but it would make it more difficult to carry the Act. I do not know what views the prohibitionists would take of that proposed amendment, but it is

generally held that if people will not take the trouble to vote for their rights, they deserve to suffer.

28891. You would be able to get at the public feeling to a great extent. Take the case of the County of Renfrew, where the Rev. Dr. Williams and Mr. Carson declared the Act was well enforced with satisfactory results, but which, when an opportunity was given to the people to represent their opinions, gave a vote one and a half times as large against it as the vote in its favour when the Act was adopted. If the Act was not put into force until a majority of the voters declared in its favour, would there not be a better opportunity of enforcing it, and would not the local authorities feel bound to provide machinery for its enforcement?—That would be the case, no doubt; but this is just a point on which it is difficult to get opinions, because the people have very different views in regard to the question, and because it is well known that there is more or less difficulty to get out the whole vote of the county.

28892. Is it not a fact that the vote generally has been a very light one, not nearly so large a vote as the vote for the election of a member of Parliament or a member of the Legislature?—The inference would be that the people did not care very much about it.

28893. Quite so: the majority did not represent the public feeling in the constituency?—That might be an advantage; but the prohibitionists might regard it as a retrograde step.

28894. Would you favour an amendment that would deprive the people of the right to bring in liquor for domestic use?—I do not see that would do much good. I have not taken any part in the agitation in favour of the Scott Act; but judging of the matter from the point of view of common sense, I think that taking that extreme stand would make it more difficult to enforce an Act.

28895. It is now claimed that it is class legislation, in this way: That the well-to-do man can send an order to a distant city and bring in liquor, and store it in his cellar, while those who cannot afford to import liquor are deprived from purchasing it in small quantities in taverns or elsewhere. Orthodox temperance people would not object to that. Why should not wealthy people indulge in this as in other extravagance with which the law does not interfere? The law does not prevent men from injuring themselves with poisonous drugs, but it interferes when they administer them to others. I repeat, if men are determined to injure themselves by vicious indulgences, why should not the law leave them to do so?—I understand the argument you have presented, and it is one of the difficulties in the case; but whether we would mend matters by trying to restrict men's private use of drugs, I very much doubt.

28896. It has occurred to me that these amendments which I have mentioned might be the means of ascertaining the real sentiment of the people. This matter was brought to our attention by the evidence given by a staunch supporter of the Act, who admitted that he had supplied himself with sufficient liquor in his cellar to meet the requirements of himself and his family during the whole period the Act was in operation?—Certainly it would be the more logical and legitimate way of carrying it out; at the same time, the advocates of the Act might find more difficulty in carrying its adoption, and they are always anxious to carry it and give it a chance.

28897. We have had cases brought under the notice of the Commission of the existence of the Scott Act in counties or districts where it was persistently and regularly violated, where bar-rooms were wide open, where taverns were lighted with electric light, as in Montreal. What is the moral effect on the community of having such a law on the statute-book, which is flagrantly and persistently violated?—It is very bad. There should be means of enforcing the law.

28898. The case I have in mind is Moncton. Apparently there is a large majority of the people in favour of the Scott Act. When an attempt was made to repeal it at Moncton, a large majority was given in favour of its retention, yet the bar-rooms in the hotels are wide open, no attempt is made to conceal the sale, the places are kept open during much longer hours than they are in Montreal under the license system, and there seems to be no way of accounting for the apathy of the temperance people and of a majority of the people in not seeing the Act enforced?—That is very curious. Are there no police?

SIR WILLIAM DAWSON.

28899. The Chief Constable at Moncton published a notice requesting the hotel proprietors and proprietors of bars to close on a given day, or they would be prosecuted. Should there not be some amendment made by which the Act should not be declared in force if the municipal authorities permitted the persistent violation of it? From the moral standpoint must not the community be injured?—I think so; but the proper course for the community to adopt is, to see that there are sufficient police to enforce the law; otherwise they disgrace themselves before the world.

28900. In that town the ratepayers, a majority of whom are in favour of the Scott Act, have the privilege at the town's meeting of voting the estimates for the various civic departments for the year. The responsibility seems to be taken out of the hands of the Council in Moncton, for the estimates are submitted to the town's meeting, and the appropriations for the different services are carried by show of hands. There seems to be no effort made to place a sum in the estimates to increase the police force and so have the Act observed?—That is very inconsistent, and the people who adopt a law like that should unquestionably provide the means for enforcing it.

28901. The knowledge of the existence of these different conditions has prompted me to ask you if amendments in the direction indicated are not desirable?—Is that not a very exceptional case?

28902. Would it be well that the Act should not be declared in force unless the Governor in Council had received an assurance from the local authorities that an officer has been appointed and funds provided to enforce the Act?—That would be a very good thing to do; that would give a lever which the better disposed people might use on the others who are careless, because we know how it is in the country places. They are very glad to get the adoption of the Act carried, but when it comes to levying taxes and appointing officers, they do not like it. You need to convince the people in the country that the Scott Act is the means of saving money, and that it will be cheaper in the end to have a good police force to enforce it.

*By the Chairman:*

28903. The Commissioners have had placed before them a great deal of evidence showing that these prohibitory enactments in many instances are not seriously regarded by the people and are not efficiently carried out, and it is almost impossible not to conclude that in very many instances there is indifference as to giving effect to them when passed. Would you consider it an advantage, as compared with the present state of things, to have a prohibitory law enacted for the whole Dominion, which was not enforced?—No, certainly not; that applies to any law that is not enforced.

28904. You would rather have the present system than a prohibitory law not efficiently enforced?—I should say so decidedly, because I think the public mind should be in a position to enforce it before such an Act is passed. But no Legislature should enact the farce of passing a law it does not mean to enforce.

28905. The Bishop of Nova Scotia put the matter before us in this way, and I should like to know if you concur in his opinion: He thought there were few things more demoralizing to the moral sense of the community than to have laws enacted which were not effectually carried out, and which no one considered it imperative on himself, unless he was so minded, to carry it out. What do you say on that point?—I think so too. I think it is injurious decidedly. But if the Dominion Government were to enact any kind of prohibitory legislation for the whole Dominion, either partially or entirely, it would of course provide the necessary machinery to carry out the law. It must do so. If local option is permitted, it is more difficult to exercise an influence upon a locality; although perhaps the law may be very imperfectly enforced, the agitation is the means of inculcating temperance principles. Whether the law is enforced or not enforced or is repealed, either way, the cause gains more or less.

28906. You may carry on an agitation up to a certain point and do good. When there is a decided sentiment in favour of prohibition you may be sustained in your position as regards the passage of a prohibitory enactment, whether governmental or municipal; but if by undue effort you place a law on the statute-book which is not in accordance with the sentiment of the community, and which parties tacitly agree to ignore, is not that, in your view, demoralizing to the public mind?—It is demoralizing

if that state of things is permitted ; but it strikes me that an honest and straightforward person or municipality or any other body ought to be quite sure before it enacts a law that it is carrying the public opinion with it. In the next place, it should be quite sure that while it is adopting this law, it is making provisions for its enforcement. That should be characteristic of any honest business-like body, whether a municipality or a Government. If the Dominion Government chose to pass an Act such as we are now speaking of, and left it in such a condition that no one could enforce it, the law would be a mere sham, and no one would thank them for the law.

28907. There are difficulties in the way of the Dominion Government doing anything of the kind, as it is not the duty of the Dominion Government to preserve the peace or to give effect to municipal enactments or the criminal laws. That duty devolves on other bodies. Does not the question of the introduction of alcohol into this country and the question of its manufacture in this country come under the view of the Dominion Government?—If the Dominion Government has power to enact a law that there shall be a certain duty on whisky imported into Canada and on whisky made in Canada, it has the power surely of saying that there shall not be any whisky made, or there shall be such a duty imposed that it will not be worth any one's while to make it or to import it. Surely it has, or should have, revenue officers sufficient to enable it to do this.

28908. The Dominion officials are appointed to look after the revenue, but you take away the revenue, and it is the duty of the Provincial Government to maintain peace and order. How could a general prohibitory law be effectually carried out?—A law of that kind might be carried out by the Provincial Government, in the first instance. But that is a question I have not been speaking about. I feel very strongly that local option in municipalities and parishes should be maintained, and they should be furnished with the best means to carry out the Act, if so disposed. That is the length I would go, in so far as absolute prohibition is concerned.

28909. That is a safe way of proceeding, for this reason, that they can make reasonably sure of the feeling of the people?—Yes, and if any province does that, it is reasonable to suppose it is representing the views of the people of the province, or in the case of the Dominion, that it would be representing the views of the Dominion ; but I regard it as essential that the option should be intact in every locality, and that each local body should be allowed to deal with everything in its locality.

28910. You have referred to the saving that would accrue from the diminution of crime. The revenue derived from the liquor traffic by the Dominion and Municipal Governments amounts to about \$3,000,000 a year, and the total expenditure as far as we know at the present moment on penitentiaries, jails, asylums for lunatics and so on is between two and three millions, so you see there is a large margin between the two?—Yes, there is a profit on the iniquity. I suppose the manufacturer and the vendor make their profits also.

28911. I am speaking of the income of the Government.—The Government ought to have faith that, if it sacrificed that income, it would make it up some other way.

28912. It would have to be made up in the meantime by some other imposition?—That might be for a time, but not permanently. The consumers spend a great deal more than eight millions on the alcoholic drinks. If they were prohibited, they would have all the material which is used in making those drinks to the good, and all the machinery and capital ; and the people who spend their money in that way would have money to buy silk gowns for their wives, and to add to their comforts and luxuries in other ways, and for those they would pay duty. They would not put their savings only in a stocking. They would invest them in ways that would give a revenue to the Government. I do not believe in that argument, because, if the money were invested in something useful, it must at length give more revenue to the Government.

28913. As regards the agricultural interests. There is a great consumption of agricultural products in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages, and it is not very easy to see how the agriculturist would turn his hand to the production of anything else that would give him as much revenue?—We need not be so extreme prohibitionists as to prohibit farmers from raising barley to ship to England and the United States, but allow them to do so, without questioning them as to what use they would make of it.

SIR WILLIAM DAWSON.

28914. Unfortunately, now they are shipping to both places, and they have a surplus which they do not know what to do with. If they did not raise barley, they would raise something else?—I think the only thing to be said in regard to that is, that there are some lands which are more favourable to the production of barley than to the production of wheat, but those lands are generally favourable to the production of rye and oats.

28915. There is now a large production of rye and corn for distilling purposes?—I suppose that is for the United States principally?

28916. No, I think not; but rye, corn and some other grains are produced in this country or used in connection with the distillation of spirits, and our agricultural classes are not too well off, so that to take away that market from them would be a pretty serious measure?—If limited prohibition were enacted in the first place against distilled liquor, they would still have a market for some of their products and would not lose it altogether until they had time to get accustomed to the new condition of things. I have great faith in the farmer being able to substitute one crop for another.

28917. Do you think it would be proper to leave the distillers and brewers, people who have capital invested in this trade, without any compensation if a prohibitory law were passed?—I certainly would not favour the idea of compensation; but, if a prohibitory law were passed such as I have spoken of, and such as I think Canada will pass some of these days, time should be allowed to enable these gentlemen to invest their capital in other ways. They have made a great deal of capital for a long time, and there would be so many more avenues of industry open to them if prohibition were adopted, that I do not think they would have much difficulty.

28918. A large portion of their property would not be available for anything else. You think they should not be compensated for that?—There is no question in regard to that. Alcohol is used for many purposes in the arts, and this use might be increased.

28919. That demand would be very small?—Yes, compared with the present demand, but it would increase.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, January 18th, 1893.

The Royal Commission met this day, at 11 a.m., SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. McLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

THOMAS J. WORKMAN BURGESS, M.D., Medical Superintendent of the Protestant Hospital for the Insane, at Verdun, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

28920. You are a member of the medical profession?—Yes.

28921. You are in charge of the Protestant Hospital for the Insane, at Verdun?—Yes.

28922. How long have you resided here?—About three years.

28923. And during that time you have been connected with the hospital?—Yes.

28924. That establishment has been in operation, how many years?—About two years and a half.

28925. Have you any statistics which you can present to the Commission as to the number of inmates and the classification of them?—Of the patients admitted into the hospital in 1891, drink was stated to be the cause in 7 ; in 1892 also 7 cases of the total admitted ; and since the hospital opened, two and a half years, a total of 24 cases out of 377 have been attributed to drink.

28926. Drink?—That was ascribed as the exciting cause in 24 cases out of 377, or a percentage of 6.36 per cent.

28927. Have you any statistics showing those cases which have been indirectly caused by drink?—We have no way of getting at them. It is one of the hardest things in the world we find to gather from the friends of the patient the cause. I have no doubt in my own mind that in considerably more cases than I have stated drink has had some effect ; but, of course, we have no way of getting at it from the friends of the patient.

28928. You are in the habit of classifying patients as far as you can when they come into the hospital?—Yes.

28929. And the record is made from the statement which accompanies the patient?—Yes ; of course it is modified afterwards from our own observation.

28930. Have you in your possession the reports of the institution?—I have the reports for two years. The present report has just been finished, that is the report for 1892. I now file the two annual reports of the establishment. The statistics I have given include 1892, from my own report.

28931. How many inmates are in the institution at the present time?—At the present time we have 187.

28932. You get a Government grant?—Yes.

28933. How much?—\$116 per annum for public patients.

28934. The remainder of the expense is borne by voluntary subscriptions?—Yes, by subscription.

28935. Can you tell us the age of the youngest patient in the institution?—I cannot ; the youngest patient admitted during the year 1892 was 17 years of age.

28936. And patients would run from that up to what age?—I think, if my memory serves me, that the oldest person received in 1892 was over 80 years.

THOMAS J. WORKMAN BURGESS.

28937. Did you receive one of the circulars sent out by the Commission some months ago ; and did you answer the questions respecting classification as stated in the circular?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

28938. In the case of those sent to the asylum whose friends had stated that intemperance had been the cause of their becoming insane, have you any means of verifying that statement?—We have no means whatever of verifying whether the friends had made a right statement.

28939. In all cases that are sent in, the questions are answered by friends?—Yes. A printed form of questions relating to the history of each case is sent, and that form must be filled up before the patient is admitted. We have no way of telling that the statement is true. Since the middle of July last, the statement has to be sworn to by the party filling it up. Before that time the statement was not sworn to.

28940. I suppose you have two classes of patients, those who come in through the voluntary action of friends, and those whom the authorities send in and who perhaps have no friends?—Yes.

28941. In each class of case you require the statement to be filled up?—Yes, it is supposed to be a history of the case. In this statement it is asked whether any other members of the family have been insane.

28942. In taking these cases in which intemperance has been the predisposing cause, and taking the general run of cases, how do the patients in each class stand as to the probability of their mental powers being restored?—Except in one form of mental disease, namely, general paresis, which we regard as incurable, and which is one of the few forms of mental diseases of which we can say drink is the direct cause, the chances of recovery are very fair.

28943. What would be the proportion that cases of general paresis bear to all the other alcoholic cases?—I should think that half the cases where drink is ascribed as the cause, are cases of general paresis. You cannot rely on the statistics we get ; that is to say, the friends themselves do not know the history of the patient. A case of general paresis will come in. We, as experts, know that the cause of it is alcohol, but the friends perhaps will not know the cause. A patient coming in may have been a drunkard without his friends knowing it. I have one or two cases of that kind at the present time, where intemperance is not set down as the cause, but where we feel sure it is the cause.

28944. It is quite possible, I suppose, to come to a definite conclusion in each case?—It is quite impossible. I think that the only way by which it would be possible to arrive at a conclusion, would be for experts to investigate each case ; but, of course, that cannot be done.

28945. The statement you have made is as regards intemperate people. Can you tell us what would be the proportion of all the cases that are incurable, and the proportion of the cases sent in for intemperance which are curable?—Without making a calculation, I can hardly tell you.

28946. Take the general run of cases that come in, and then take the proportion of all that are cured : what proportion of the whole would be cured, as compared with the number sent in because of drunkenness?—You mean the whole proportion of cures compared with the proportion of cures of those where intemperance is said to be the cause?

28947. Yes.—I consider that in the cases ascribed to intemperance there would be a less percentage of cures than in the other cases.

28948. Take 200 cases, of which 25 were caused by intemperance. Considering the total number of cases 200, and the proportion likely to be cured, and taking the 25 cases of intemperance, and the proportion likely to be cured, which class would show the larger proportion of cures?—I think the larger proportion would be of the cases not ascribed to drunkenness ; I think a large percentage of those would be cured.

28949. The cases not ascribed to drunkenness would be more hopeful?—Yes.

28950. Then you find there are other predisposing cases of insanity, such as religious excitement. Would you say that these were more hopeful cases than the other?—Yes.



28951. Take a certain class of cases where people through their own actions, not of intemperance, have come under your charge: are they very hopeless?—Yes.

28952. I understand you to say that unless an expert thoroughly examines into each of these cases, you cannot give any definite answer as to the predisposing cause of insanity?—We cannot. Dr. Kerlin of the Pennsylvania Asylum pushed his researches as far as he could in that direction, and he made out that intemperance was the cause of the disease in 38 per cent of the children brought under his care in the hospital, and that percentage we look on as very large. Of course, Dr. Kerlin made a business of it, and he took the greatest pains with his inquiry and wrote to people in all directions to find out the history of the children in the hospital, back as far as the grandparents.

28953. Was the report of his researches ever published?—I cannot tell you as to that. The information I gleaned from the last report published by Dr. Tuke, and he quotes Dr. Kerlin there. Dr. Kerlin has spent time and money in this investigation. He, as I told you, found 38 per cent of the young children were insane through drink; but our institution would only give the percentage 6·36. The last statistics I have from Ontario are for 1891, and there I find that drink is ascribed as the cause in only 2·37 per cent. I think, however, that is below the mark.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

28954. The percentage you mean is that in which drink is the exciting cause and not the predisposing cause?—Drink is the exciting cause in the figures quoted in the Ontario report for 1891. 927 cases were admitted into all the institutions in Ontario, and of these 2·37 per cent were ascribed to drink.

28955. From your experience as Medical Superintendent of an insane asylum, and from your reading, you being an expert, do you believe that as to the predisposing cause a larger percentage is attributable to drink than that you have stated?—I think so.

28956. That is to say that the cases in which drink is the exciting cause form only a small percentage of those cases of insanity which can fairly be attributed to drink?—I would not say a small percentage. I think the percentage in which drink is the predisposing cause is a good deal larger than in cases in which it is set down as the exciting cause. I have been 19 years connected with an asylum, and my own experience goes to show that. I have no statistics for it, because unless you have time and money, you can hardly get at them. My own experience goes to show that drink is much more apt to cause insanity in the children than in the parents, that is, that children of drunken or intemperate parents are more likely to be insane and idiotic than the children of temperate parents. I think the effect of drink is more marked in the offspring than in the parents.

28957. You draw a distinction between the ordinary drunkard and the habitual drunkard?—I do.

28958. Do you think the ordinary habitual moderate use of drink has any effect upon the children?—It is rather difficult to define what you would call ordinary habitual moderate use. There is a difference in my mind between a moderate drinker and a pretty steady tippler, although he does not get drunk. For instance, a man takes a glass of liquor going to bed. There is a marked difference between him and the man who in business hours takes half a dozen or eight drinks, although he does not get drunk.

28959. Speaking of the 24 cases out of the 377 in which drink was an exciting cause, do you mean that there were only 24 out of the 377, or that the 24 were separate cases?—24 out of the 377 cases were ascribed by the friends to drink, although we cannot say whether their statement is true or not.

28960. Of course, you accept at the outset the statement of the friends, that is as to the personal history?—Yes.

28961. Do you have reason to change that as you come in contact with the patients and come to know from your observation and treatment more about them?—Occasionally; but friends as a rule give no more information than is contained in the form of history.

28962. Is it found that friends are often delicate about stating the facts of the case?—They are.

THOMAS J. WORKMAN BURGESS.

28963. Do you find that in cases where drink is not first ascribed as the exciting cause, later on you have to assign it as such?—Later on I may so assign it to my own mind, but we cannot do so officially; we must accept the statement of the friends. The patient is entered on our books and comes in as so and so, and although I may be convinced that the statement made by the friends is wrong, I cannot change it.

28964. You have to go according to the personal history of the patient furnished by the friends, although from your observation of the patient you learn afterwards that it is an incorrect statement?—Yes, if the person comes to me affected with general paresis, I would feel satisfied in my own mind that that man was insane from the effects of what we might term wine and women. These two combined causes produce general paresis; we always attribute it to them.

28965. Judging from your large experience in the treatment of mental diseases and from your examination into cases, do you believe that total abstinence would be promotive of the mental health and strength of the community at large?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28966. Suppose that drinking were confined to moderate drinking, would you hold the same opinion?—I would. I think the world at large would be better if there were no liquor in it.

28967. I mean, used in moderation; your opinion would apply in the same way as it would in the other cases to which Dr. McLeod refers?—Yes.

28968. In case of the use of intoxicating beverages, is it better that they should be used at meals or drank by themselves?—I think they would be better used at meals. I do not profess to be a temperance man. I take a glass of ale, that is about the extent of it; but all the same I think that if I did not take that glass of ale, I would perhaps be better.

28969. You speak of the damage to the children: do you refer to the children of persons who are habitual tipplers?—Yes, those who tinkle all day, having perhaps a dozen "nips" through the day. As far as my own experience goes, I cannot put my finger on a case where the parents have been what I would call moderate drinkers and where insanity sprung up in the children.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

28970. Have you made investigation as to that?—In a round-about way, yes; in an odd case now and then in which I was interested, I would inquire as far as I could.

28971. Yet you believe that moderate drinking may be productive of insanity in offspring?—I would not say that. I say that the world would be better without drinking at all. The difficulty would be to draw the line between moderate drinking and tipping.

28972. Then the question of moderate drinking depends on the character of the man. I suppose what would be moderate in one case would not be moderate in another?—Yes, to a certain extent.

28973. That is, the extent of drinking indulged in by one man would not be excessive for him, while the same degree of drinking would not be safe for another man?—Yes; I think that one man can stand more drink than another. To give you an idea of what I mean by moderate drinking, I would say that a man who takes a glass of ale at dinner and a glass of punch at night would be a moderate drinker. I would call a man tipping who during business hours took two or three drinks, and at night time two or three drinks more.

*By Judge McDonald:*

28974. I suppose that in your reading of history, you have read of a long series of distinguished British statesmen and literary men who have been what you might call moderate drinkers and whose children afterwards inherited the genius of the fathers?—Yes; there are many such cases.

28975. Do you believe that a prohibitory law, well enforced, would improve the physical and mental health of the people?—I think, if it could be enforced, it certainly would. I think the world at large would be better off and happier if there were no liquor in it.

*By the Chairman :*

28976. From your own knowledge of public sentiment on that subject, do you consider that a prohibitory law could be enforced?—I do not.

28977. Is a medical certificate required for the admission of every patient who comes to the hospital.—Yes ; in private cases there are two certificates, and in public cases one.

28978. Do those insane patients who are committed by process of law go direct to you, or are they sent to jail first?—Sometimes direct to us and sometimes to the jail.

28979. Are such cases accompanied by medical certificate or the certificate of the presiding Judge?—By the Recorder's warrant of commitment.

28980. Can you tell us from what class of the community the largest number of the insane come?—Decidedly from the lower classes of life.

28981. From town or country?—Country, I think, as a rule, the agricultural population. I think that the lack of education, especially among the farming community, has a good deal to do with the causes of insanity. Brain, like muscle, requires a certain amount of exercise, otherwise it deteriorates, and you have insanity. The active business man will break down through overwork. His brain is worked too much. In the farming community, a great many of the people do not read at all, and the brain breaks down from lack of exercise. I think the brain is very much the same as the muscle in that way.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

28982. In speaking of the lower classes, do you mean those who have vicious habits?—No, I mean the lower classes, like the labouring classes and those who are not educated ; the agricultural labourers and people of that kind.

28983. Do you speak of the aggregate number or the percentage. The working class, of course, are a much larger number of the community. Do you think that they produce a larger percentage of the insane than the other class?—I think so ; it is in excess of the percentage among the educated class.

JOHN A. WATKINS, of the city of Montreal, excise officer, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

28984. You are connected with the Inland Revenue Department?—Yes.

28985. How long have you been so connected?—Thirteen years.

28986. It was given in evidence before the Commissioners at a previous sitting that you, with Mr. Charles Barker, made a seizure of liquor in a compounder's place here, in the city of Montreal?—Yes.

28987. Will you be good enough to tell the Commissioners the name of the person, and the information you got that led you to make the seizure?—The party's name was Joseph Poupore, and he was prosecuted. The manner in which we arrived at making the seizure at his compounding establishment was from having seized a still for manufacturing alcohol in an illicit manner, in his private house, a day or two previously. In prosecuting him for this misdeed, I learned that he was compounding, and in the fulfilment of my duty, I discovered where this establishment was, and seized it.

28988. What was he making, was it whisky?—No, I cannot say that he was making whisky, but he was making a variety of liquors, brandy, gin and cordials.

28989. He was making them from alcohol which he was distilling himself?—Yes, from alcohol that I suppose he was distilling in an illicit still.

28990. Had he no license as a compounder?—Not then. He had one previously, but he removed from the quarter for which he held the old license, and he never renewed it.

THOMAS J. WORKMAN BURGESS.

28991. Did the evidence show that he was distilling illicitly to any considerable extent?—The only evidence that was shown was as to the size of the still, which was found in his private premises. I suppose that the still there would produce about thirty or forty gallons per day.

28992. How was Poupore prosecuted?—He was prosecuted both for distilling and compounding.

28993. How did the charge for distilling go?—He was fined \$100 and one month in jail, but by paying a fine of \$20 he was exonerated from going to jail. He paid a fine of \$120 altogether. As to the compounding case, it has never been decided, through what I would call a quibble in the law. I prosecuted the man as far as I could, but the case is still before the Court.

28994. To what Court was it taken?—It was first taken to the Police Court, and there was some reason given there that on account of the information being sworn out before one Judge and tried before another, the Judge who sat on the case could not render a judgment. Then it was carried to some other Court; but the officials of the department had the case in charge, and I was simply a witness.

28995. Where was this man carrying on his distilling business?—It was on St. Charles Borromée Street, near Sherbrooke Street.

28996. And his compounding business?—He was carrying on his compounding business at 101 Commissioners St.

28997. When did you make the seizure?—If my memory serves me right, I think it was in August, 1889 or 1890.

28998. As a Revenue Officer, are you entitled to a share of the fines?—We are not entitled to it by law, but the Government often gives us a perquisite out of the fine. It is not part of our salary, and we have no legal right to it, it is merely a kind of a bonus.

28999. Did you get any bonus in this particular case?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29000. This man was a licensed compounder?—Not at the time. The reason that I seized was because he had no license. The year previous, I might explain, he had taken out a license for premises on St. Catherine Street, but he let that license run out, and removed his compounding establishment from St. Catherine Street to Commissioners Street. The law required that he should renew his license. When I went in there and asked where his license was, he pointed to the old license on the wall. On examining the license, I found that it was out of date, and I therefore took possession of his premises.

29001. In that place he was manufacturing what he was pleased to call brandy, gin and so on?—Yes.

29002. And using alcohol as the basis?—Yes.

29003. And by putting mixtures with the alcohol, he was producing liquors of different brands?—Yes.

29004. Did you find a large quantity of compounded stuff on the premises?—There was not a very large quantity, but there were vessels and barrels quite capable of producing a very large quantity.

29005. Was there some liquor already made?—There was.

29006. Was it in bottles or cases?—Some in bottles and some in large tins.

29007. Were there labels on the bottles to show what they were?—None whatever.

29008. Were you able to judge what he intended the liquors to represent?—Well, to a certain extent by taste and smell.

29009. Did you in making that seizure find on the premises any of the stuff that he mixed with the alcohol?—We found there what they call bead oil, which is a deleterious ingredient, I believe.

29010. We had it in evidence before that bead oil was glycerine?—There may be glycerine in it, but it cannot be glycerine.

29011. Is it colourless liquid?—No, it is brown. I found other substances there, and although I am not a chemist, I have a little knowledge of them. I found what I considered a very injurious ingredient, and that was essential oil of bitter almonds.

29012. Did you find any bluestone or blue vitrol?—No.

29013. Did you find any tobacco?—No.

29014. Do you remember any other drugs that you found there?—Well, I cannot remember what the drugs were. I know there were several bottles, and I produced them in court.

29015. There were several bottles containing drugs?—Yes.

29016. Was there any analysis made of these liquors?—I believe there was an analysis made in Ottawa. I know I was ordered by the Department to produce samples of the alcohol, brandy, gin and so forth, and I forwarded them to Ottawa; but what was done there, I cannot say.

29017. Was it the raw spirit?—It was the very crude spirit, unrefined alcohol.

29018. And from your knowledge of these things, would you consider the liquors found there very deleterious in the shape in which they were?—Very much so, in my opinion.

29019. Has that man taken out a license?—He has not; but he is in a Company at the present time, and he is under my control.

29020. What licensed house is he with now?—What they call the Canada Liquor Company.

29021. Are they licensed compounders?—Yes.

29022. Is he individually a compounder?—He is part of the concern, I believe.

29023. In whose name was the license taken out?—It was taken out in the name of Charles Langlois, but I will not be certain as to that.

29024. What is his position, is he manager of the Company?—I rather think he travels for the Company, and that he has an interest in it.

29025. You say that this man Poupore is in that firm?—Yes.

29026. The license is not in his name?—No.

29027. From your knowledge as an officer of the Revenue Department, have you reason to believe that there is much of that kind of business going on in the city?—I have reason to believe that there is both illicit distillation and illicit compounding.

29028. And that in compounding, deleterious substances are used?—Yes, these are my convictions, I believe that they are very deleterious substances.

29029. From your experience, do you believe that it would be in the interest of the public if a more thorough supervision was kept over these compounding places?—I certainly do.

29030. Do you believe that it would be in the interest of the public that the liquors should be analysed more frequently than they are, and a reduction made in the number of places?—I certainly do. I may say that as far as compounding is carried on in this city, we have three licensed compounders, and I am the Inspector over these three establishments; but outside of that it is within my knowledge that almost three out of every five corner groceries compound liquor and buy false labels, which I have here with me, if you would like to see them.

29031. I suppose that to give these places thorough supervision and to have frequent and thorough analysis of the liquors made, you would require a larger number of officers?—I do not think it would require a very much larger number of officers; it might require a few more.

29032. I suppose you are not able to keep track of them all?—Alone I am not. It would require a number of men who had some knowledge, and they would need to be reliable men. What I wish to call the attention of the Commissioners to in making the remark in reference to compounding, is this: that almost every grocery man compounds various liquors and puts them on the market under false names. He calls a bottle "Jamaica Rum," but to my knowledge it is nothing but common alcohol, unrectified, containing a large amount of fusel-oil, which is a deleterious substance. It is coloured up with other ingredients, and then false labels are put on the bottles; and this deleterious matter, as I call it, is put on the market as a genuine article, which I consider a great evil. (Witness here produced a large number of what he described as false labels, which were placed on bottles, and which were bought wholesale by those who wanted to use them. He produced a label "Leonard & Co." and stated there was no such firm, and this was a fictitious label. Label "Senecal, Cadieux & Co.;" this is a firm that did exist but it no longer exists, and the name has been used by some other person.)

JOHN A. WATKINS.

29033. Were these labels seized by you?—No; but I will tell you where they can be bought. George Bishop produces these labels, and sells them, and if you look at the back you will find prices marked at which they are sold.

29034. If I wished to procure some labels like those, could I buy them?—I believe you could.

29035. George Bishop & Co. do not trade in these directly, I suppose, but simply print them?—My impression is that they trade in them.

29036. Your impression is that they trade in them, and that they are not ordered from them by some particular person?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29037. Do they keep them in stock for sale?—Yes. Here you have labels describing very old brandy and very old cognac, marked “Dufort Frères,” and that is a fictitious name.

29038. Here is one with a trade mark, “C. H. Rouet of Cognac.” Do you know of any such firm?—No.

29039. Here is a label marked “Old Dunedin Scotch Malt Whisky, Angus McNeil, Dundee.” Do you mean to say that label was printed in Montreal?—I do.

29040. And these labels are sold to any person who wants them?—Yes, and put on any kind of liquor.

29041. In the use of these, there is a great fraud perpetrated upon the men who are in the legitimate business, and upon the consumers?—Yes, a very great fraud.

29042. Is there any fraud upon the Government?—I consider the legitimate manufacturer is being defrauded, the general public is being defrauded, and the Government of the country is being defrauded of their just revenue.

29043. There are certain men who are licensed compounders?—There are.

29044. Do they use labels like these?—No. The licensed compounders work according to the Revenue Act, and they use no labels but what are provided by the Department at Ottawa. It is my duty to see that they use no other labels.

*By the Chairman:*

29045. That is to say that they use materials which have already paid duty?—Yes. You will notice on the face of the legitimate labels that the word “Compound” is there, and on the fictitious labels it is not. I will explain that, if you will allow me. Up to November last the law was not fully enforced, but some agitation was got up in Montreal, and the attention of the Department was called to the fact that these compounders were using other labels and not observing the law as they should do. An investigation took place, in which I was one of the officers called upon, and it was proved that three firms were using these labels without the word “Compound.” Since last November they were forced to alter their label, and have the word “Compound” on it.

29046. Previous to that time they did not do so?—No. It is my duty now to see that in the district of Montreal all licensed compounders have the word “Compound” on whatever labels they may use.

29047. So that up to November last the licensed compounders were using these labels?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29048. Have any of the licensed compounders been detected in frauds?—Well, no. This man Poupore, of whom I have spoken, had no license at the time to do a compound business.

29049. Have you made any other seizures than the one you refer to in reference to compounding?—I have made several seizures in reference to illicit stills throughout parts of Lower Canada.

29050. But not in the city of Montreal?—My memory does not serve me on that point, but I can look up the reports.

29051. Then you evidently have not had many seizures?—I have not at present, but there have been several seizures by other officers, and by the special officer that the Government has here.

*By the Chairman :*

29052. Have you got a detective looking after these cases?—There is a man who spends his whole time looking after illicit stills. He is what is called a preventive officer. He does nothing else.

29053. From your experience, do you believe that there is a great deal of illicit distilling in Montreal?—That is my experience. Within the last twelve months there have been 13 or 14 illicit stills seized in Montreal.

29054. In what part of the city?—In various parts of the city; and as a result we condemned two men last week. One of them had been condemned to a fine of \$100 two years ago, and he was fined \$300 last week.

29055. In what district of the city were those illicit stills found?—One of them was found in the northern part of the city.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29056. Did you say that some of these bogus labels have been produced in Montreal?—A good many. I have reason to believe that there are a great many of these labels produced in Montreal, from the fact that I know a gentleman who makes a very nice living by doing nothing else than selling these bogus labels, not only throughout Montreal, but throughout the entire Dominion.

*By the Chairman :*

29057. Then he prints them here?—No, he buys and sells them.

29058. He is a sort of intermediate man in the trade?—Yes, he takes orders.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29059. Here is a label saying "Purest Canadian Rye Whisky, strength and quality guaranteed, Dominion of Canada." There is no name on the label at all?—No.

29060. In the case of distillers, such as Gooderham & Worts, Walker and Wisser, do they put their names on the bottle?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

29061. I suppose a liquor compounder can use that label (referring to a particular label) provided he puts the word "compound" on it?—Yes, according to the Act the compounder is obliged to put his name on. We have a couple of compounding houses here, and I believe the gentlemen at the head of them would not be guilty of any impropriety in their business. I believe they are gentlemen who would not sail under false colours. They put their names and addresses on everything, and were always willing to do so and to comply with the law. In so far as illicit distilling is concerned, I would like to state that I believe it is largely carried on throughout a vast extent of Lower Canada in a small way, not in an extensive way, but I believe there are a great many illicit stills.

29062. You mean that alcohol is manufactured in small quantities in a large number of places?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29063. Do you believe that adequate effort is made to prevent illicit distilling?—Yes, I do.

29064. And is it not successful?—To a certain extent it is.

29065. Would it be just as well not to continue to seize them?—I rather think not; I believe in reducing the evil wherever it exists.

29066. And you think that the attempt made to prevent illicit distillation does reduce the evil?—Yes, I believe it does to a large extent.

JOHN A. WATKINS.

JAMES PATTON, Clerk of the Committee of Management of the Montreal General Hospital, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

29067. What is your office in connection with the General Hospital?—I am clerk of the Committee of Management. My office is merely to keep the accounts; I do not come into contact with the cases at all.

29068. How long have you occupied that position?—About three years.

29069. Have you to do with the compiling of the annual report of the hospital?—Merely the monetary report.

29070. Have you got copies of the reports at the hospital?—I have.

29071. What grant does the hospital get from the Government?—It gets \$5,000 from the Quebec Government; we get nothing from the Dominion Government, except payment for sailors; and we get nothing from the city.

29072. The other portion of the income is from endowments and subscriptions?—Our endowments and allowances come to about \$16,000 a year, and we have to get the balance from subscriptions and paying patients. We have private patients to whom we charge \$2 a day, and public patients 50 cents a day. People outside the city we invariably make pay 50 cents, and people in the city of Montreal who can pay we ask them to do so. We have other fees, as we are not only a hospital but a teaching school to some extent, and the students pay for their tuition.

29073. The total expenditure of the hospital here for the year is put down at about \$50,000: is that correct?—It will be higher when we get into the new buildings; that is about the average in the past.

29074. What is the average number of patients in the institution?—164 or 165. We have what we call private wards.

29075. I see you have entered in the annual statement an item for expenditure on wines and liquors, \$543.65. Are these liquors supplied to the patients in the hospital?—Yes.

29076. On the doctor's prescription?—On the recommendation of the attending physicians and surgeons, who give their services there gratis, like Drs. Roddick, Bell and Armstrong.

29077. Do private patients who pay bring in wines and liquors to the hospital?—No.

29078. They have to get them from the hospital authorities?—Yes. If there is what appears to be an extra quantity used, we charge them for what we call extra stimulants. If champagne is used by private patients, they pay for it.

29079. A patient occupying a private ward is not allowed to bring in his own supply of liquors?—No. Of course such a patient pays for everything he gets, except medical attendance.

29080. A patient going to the hospital and taking a private room, what does he pay?—He pays nothing but \$2 a day to us; but he has to pay for the surgeon or physician attending him, and he is restricted to those attending the hospital.

29081. And does he pay for his wines and liquors?—If it is beer or cheap stimulant, we do not charge for it; but if he wants champagne or anything extra, he pays for it. I seldom have such a charge.

29082. Do you give patients supplies of liquors on their own request?—No, they have to get a medical order for it. The apothecary has charge of the wines and liquors, and he makes a return to the Governors of how much is used. The apothecary and medical superintendent keep the key of the wine store.

29083. Are the employees of the hospital allowed beer or liquor?—No.

29084. The supply is only for use of patients?—That is all.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29085. The \$2 a day paid by the private patients gives them their board, washing and lodging, but not medical attendance?—Not medical attendance, except that of the resident surgeon.



29086. If wines and ales are needed to a slight extent as stimulants, they are not charged for?—No.

29087. But if champagne and the more expensive wines are taken in any quantity, they are charged?—Yes.

29088. None of the patients are charged for medicine?—No.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29089. Have you any means of knowing whether any percentage, and if so, of what percentage of the ordinary cases in the hospital may be attributed directly or indirectly to the drink traffic?—I cannot tell. I happen occasionally to meet a case of a man of good family whose sickness is due to that cause, and that is about all I know of.

29090. Do you know whether of the cases of accidents on the streets a great number of them are attributable to drink?—I cannot say, but I should think a good many of them were.

29091. As a citizen, have you observed what effect the drink traffic has had on the business and social interests and the health and morals of the community?—I have a very strong feeling on the subject. I think it is a great evil.

29092. You think it would be well to restrict the trade?—Yes, and to prohibit it.

29093. Do you think that would benefit the morals of the community?—I think it would. I have been over this country a good deal, and I have heard that the people were hindered by prohibition, but I know that the moral tone of places has been very much benefited by it. I have been in places where they abolished the Scott Act and there was perfect pandemonium.

29094. Are you a business man?—Yes; I was a wholesale grocer and travelled a good deal.

29095. As a business man, is it your belief that restricting the drink traffic is injurious to other business interests?—I do not think so generally. I think that some men who are directly interested in the trade might lose by it.

29096. Do you think that enforced prohibition would produce good results all round?—Yes; I am quite satisfied on that point.

29097. Do you think prohibition is possible?—I think so.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29098. You are a prohibitionist in principle?—I am.

29099. What is the kind of prohibition for which you aim, the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating drinks for beverage purposes?—Yes.

29100. Do you know of any country in the world in which such a law is enforced?—Well, of course, I am somewhat familiar with it in the State of Maine.

29101. But the State of Maine law does not prevent the importation and sale of liquor for private use; and so that is not the kind of prohibition you want?—No. I travelled through New Hampshire, and we were always able to get liquor in prohibition towns by going in a certain roundabout way.

29102. Have you ever been in Manchester, N.H.?—No.

29103. You do not know that liquor is sold as freely there as in Montreal?—No.

29104. At what places were you in New Hampshire?—I cannot say; it was during the night, and I waited there for only an hour or two.

29105. You were only there during the hours you were detained by a railway accident?—Yes.

29106. Do you know of any other country where prohibition is enforced?—No, I have been in towns in Ontario though.

29107. Do you know of any country where there is total prohibition?—No.

29108. Have you any experience of total prohibition of that kind which would enable you to believe that it is possible to enforce such a law?—Perhaps I did not weigh that matter sufficiently. I am speaking of such prohibition as the Scott Act would give, if enforced.

29109. Is that kind of prohibition satisfactory to you?—Yes.

29110. You are satisfied with the Scott Act?—Yes.

JAMES PATTON.

29111. That only prevents the sale for beverage purposes. A man can import all the liquor he wants, but he cannot sell it. Is that the kind of prohibition you are aiming at?—I am satisfied with the Scott Act as far as it goes.

29112. You wish to go further?—Yes.

29113. Have you ever given any thought to the question of total prohibition?—I have given thought to it certainly, but I do not think I could argue the question satisfactorily.

29114. You know that it must carry with it the right to search the person of every traveller who comes into the country, to see if he has got liquor with him, and that it must prevent every private individual from importing every kind of intoxicating drink or manufacturing it on his own premises?—Yes.

29115. Have you merely thought of preventing the manufacture as far as brewers and distillers are concerned?—Yes.

29116. That is the only way you have looked upon it?—Yes.

29117. You have no experience, then, of total prohibition?—No.

29118. Will you tell us in what sections of the country you have found the state of pandemonium that you say exists?—In the County of Dufferin.

29119. What place in the County of Dufferin?—I should not single out a place, I suppose.

29120. I think you should. You tell us the place, and we will find it out?—Take the village of Grand Falls.

29121. How long did that pandemonium exist?—I was only there one Saturday night.

29122. Was it directly after the repeal of the Scott Act?—It was only a few weeks.

29123. What state of things did you find on that Saturday night?—The place was in a fearful state, and the profanity and the fighting of the people were awful.

29124. Did you see any liquor sold?—They were drinking it in the hotel I was stopping at.

29125. Do you know that under the law of Ontario it is illegal to keep open on Saturday night?—I know it is, after seven o'clock.

29126. Did you see any liquor sold after seven o'clock?—I did.

29127. Did you call the attention of the police to the fact?—No, there is no police there.

29128. Did you call the attention of the landlord to the fact?—No.

29129. Did you call the attention of any one to it?—I spoke to some people about it.

29130. Name another place where there was pandemonium after the repeal of the Scott Act?—Perhaps pandemonium is too strong a word for me to use.

29131. How many drunken people did you see at this place?—I did not count them, I thought there would be murder.

29132. Was there murder?—No, but one man was badly beaten.

29133. Is there any other place besides that of which you have had experience after the Scott Act was repealed?—I am satisfied that in many other places there was the same thing. I am not prepared just now to give any other.

29134. Had you any experience of Dufferin when the Scott Act was in force?—Yes.

29135. Was there a better state of things then?—Much better.

29136-37. Can you account for the repeal of the Scott Act in Dufferin?—I was there several times during the existence of the Scott Act, and I heard the objections made to it by the hotel-keepers who were constantly violating the Act.

29138. Did you call attention to that during the prohibition period?—I did not. I spoke of it in a sort of general way.

29139. Did not the people repeal the Act after three years?—I believe so.

29140. Can you account for that?—I suppose the hotel-keepers had the sympathy of the citizens.

29141. Do you mean to tell us that the citizens of an intelligent community of Western Ontario would allow their sympathies with the hotel-keepers to do away with a

public benefit and replace it by pandemonium?—I do not suppose they looked on it in that way at all. They were annoyed by the constant prosecution of these hotel-keepers.

29142. They were being constantly prosecuted?—Perhaps the word “constantly” is a strong word.

29143. They were frequently prosecuted?—I believe so.

29144. And do you know what influenced the people to repeal the Act?—No.

29145. And do you not know that after this pandemonium, they tried to re-enact it?—No.

29146. Is there any other place in Ontario that you can remember?—Guelph, in the County of Wellington.

29147. In what place in Wellington; did you see the effect of the Act?—What little I saw in Wellington was that a man had to do mean things to get liquor.

29148. Why did they do mean things?—I stated to these men that it was against the law for them to sell, and that it was against the law too for law-abiding citizens to take it.

29149. Did you see any drunkenness there?—I saw men under the influence of liquor.

29150. And the Scott Act was not enforced?—Yes.

29151. Can you account for the repeal of the Scott Act in Wellington?—I believe that it was found difficult for the farmers and people like that to get accommodation.

29152. Why?—Because there was difficulty in selling liquor at the hotels, and I understood them to say that it would not pay to keep an hotel unless they had the profits of the liquor. The consequence was there were not as many hotels, and the farmers could not get accommodation.

29153. You think the farmers repealed the Act because they could not get accommodation?—I cannot say that. My inference was, that all these things helped to strengthen the agitation for repeal.

29154. Did you learn that a great many people who had honestly voted for the Scott Act thinking it was good, when it was found out that it had not that effect, voted for its repeal and voted in favour of the regulating of the traffic by license?—Yes, that is the argument they used.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29155. Do you know if there was any peculiar thing in the way of the enforcement of the Act in Dufferin and Wellington?—The temperance people would not face the music and incur the odium of enforcing it.

29156. In cases where prosecutions were demanded, was there difficulty?—I only knew from the newspapers. I learned about the dynamiters at Orangeville and the blowing up of the Magistrate's office, and all that.

29157. Have you observed that the licensing of the trade regulates the trade or not?—No, not to any great extent. The men who will violate the prohibition law will violate the license law, if they can.

29158. You still believe, notwithstanding the failure, in some degree at least, of fully enforcing prohibition under the Scott Act, that prohibition produces good results?—That is my opinion.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29159. You stated that you thought it was possible to enforce prohibition. Do you believe that it would be more difficult to enforce total prohibition, which would render necessary the searching of every person and every house, than to enforce the Scott Act?—The only thing I know is that in the North-west the Mounted Police were required to search.

29160. With what result?—They were very often diffident. I know of one case, a village in Wellington, where the tavern-keepers were summoned for violation of the Scott Act. These men went around to the business men of the village and said: We have kept a good house, and it is necessary for your village that you have hotel accommodation here; will you sign this petition, asking the Magistrates to deal leniently

JAMES PATTON.

with us? I think, with the exception of one man, that every one of them signed it. It shows you the lack of backbone that these temperance people presented in enforcing the law.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29161. Do you know that the reason the Maine law does not prohibit importation is that there is no power in the Legislature of Maine to do that?—So I understood ; I believe it is the Federal Government that has to do with that.

29162. The Maine law goes as far as it can to prohibition?—I think, as far as the State is concerned, it prohibits.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29163. Do you know that General Neal Dow stated in evidence that if he had the power, he would not attempt to pass such a law as would prevent the bringing in of liquor?—I do not know ; I have not read the evidence.

*By the Chairman :*

29164. You have been a long time resident in Montreal?—Yes, all my life ; with the exception of some years I lived in Ontario.

29165. From your observation, is there more or less drunkenness in the city than there was ten years ago?—My impression is that it has increased. I must confess that I have not looked into the question recently, as my official duties have taken up all my time.

29166. Is it your opinion that the license law in Montreal is well enforced?—No ; I do not think it is.

29167. Do you think it would be an advantage to lessen the number of places licensed?—Yes, I think so.

29168. Would you reduce the licenses for the restaurants or for the hotels?—I think the saloons should be done away with altogether.

29169. What about corner groceries where they sell liquor?—I think they are a great evil, and a great temptation to those who go to buy groceries.

29170. You think there is no necessity for such places?—Not to sell liquor.

29171. You have been speaking of prohibition under the Scott Act. But suppose we had for the whole Dominion prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale, carried out to the extent of preventing all private individuals from importing for their own use, what would be the result?—I see the difficulty there, and I would not like to restrict that sort of liberty.

29172. Suppose you did not restrict that liberty, what would be the effect along the frontier contiguous to the United States? Might not as much liquor be imported as any one might choose to purchase?—I think the law could correct that.

29173. In what way?—For instance, smuggling is an evil, and it is carried on.

29174. But if A, B or C along the frontier can import liquor for his own use, how is excessive importation to be prevented?—I think you would have to put the man on his honour, and make him take an oath that it was for his own individual use. If men will commit crime, they are liable to punishment.

29175. And you would make it possible for every person who would take the oath to import for his own use?—I think so.

29176. Would there be any limitation to the consumption under such an arrangement?—I think so.

SAMUEL CARSLEY, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29177. You have been a resident of Montreal for a good many years?—Yes.

29178. I believe you are Chairman of the Association for Protection to Women and Children?—Yes, President of that association, the Women's and Children's Protection Society.

29179. Would you kindly, just briefly, tell us the object of the society?—It is for the object of protecting women and children from cruelty or from wrongs of any kind, if they have no other means of protecting themselves.

29180. Have you any reports of the society which you could put before the Commissioners?—Yes, I will furnish them.

29181. You keep one or two officers?—One officer, Mr. Marshall, whose duty it is to investigate all cases brought before the society and then take proceedings against the parties if it is found, after investigation, that in our opinion they are guilty of any act of cruelty.

29182. I suppose he is about in the city to look after anything in the shape of cruelty?—He stops at his office all the time, except when he has to go out for the purpose of investigating cases.

29183. Then he is not looking around like an Inspector?—No, not the same as in the case of the Society for the Protection of Animals. The cases have to be reported to us first.

29184. How many cases in a year, on an average, do you prosecute?—Last year we had 221 cases.

29185. Have you any classification of them?—442 adults and 365 children; in all 807 persons. We call children those who are below 16.

29186. Could you give us any idea of the character of the complaints laid against offending parties?—I will shortly be able to submit exact statements, but a great many cases are for cruelty on the part of husbands, neglecting to provide for their wives, leaving them without food or fuel, which cases are brought to our notice. The children, of course, suffer in consequence. Very often we have cases of drunken husbands striking their wives, and not only their wives but their children, and a great many cases of men deserting their wives. There is a great abuse in connection with the cattle trade. Men go away on the cattle ships and leave their wives and children to look after themselves. These wives and children come to us, having no means of living. There are cases of young women who very often get into other troubles, and are homeless. If a woman is in trouble, no matter how, and stands alone, it is our duty to see to her.

29187. Your efforts are made to try and get them into different homes?—That is the last resort.

29188. In the case of emigrants who come out and have no employment and are destitute, your mode of assisting them is by endeavouring to get them into some home?—We very seldom get cases of that kind. Our cases are those of women and children.

29189. Families come out having no means of support?—We, first of all, take them to the clergy of the denomination to which they belong; if Roman Catholics, we take them to the priest, who generally looks after them, and we act similarly in the case of Protestants.

29190. You hand them over to the clergy of the church to which they belong?—Yes.

29191. From the large number of cases which from your statement it is obvious you deal with in a year, have you arrived at any conclusion as to the number which result from indulgence in intoxicating liquors?—We had a meeting last night for the purpose of coming to a decision about that as nearly as possible. Our report says that considerably over 90 per cent of the cases were caused by intemperance. We put that as the minimum. You may say nearly all the cases.

29192. You have come to the conclusion that 90 per cent of the cases which the society dealt with arose from drunkenness?—Yes.

SAMUEL CARSLEY.

29193. Is that statement based on statistics for a number of years, or of one particular period?—This means a number of years, always.

29194. From your observation, living in Montreal, do you think that intemperance is increasing or decreasing?—My opinion would not be worth anything on that point, as I seldom go out, and have no idea.

29195. Do you think there are too many licensed places for selling liquor in the city?—I say—if you will allow me to read the next note we have here—after seeing the large amount of suffering and crime caused through drunken habits since being President of the Women's and Children's Protection Society—although not myself a pledged abstainer—I should certainly vote for prohibition here. I mean by that, that there are too many places licensed to sell intoxicating liquors.

29196. For what extent of prohibition would you vote?—I would vote for liquor to be sold only by druggists, under order of a doctor or some qualified person.

29197. Would you prohibit the importation by private parties for their own use?—Well, I do not like to interfere with private individuals. I am not a total abstainer myself, but I look upon it in this way: I would consider myself a poor citizen if I would not sacrifice my glass of beer for the good of the community, knowing as much as I do of the suffering caused by it.

29198. By prohibition do you mean the prohibiting of importation, manufacture and sale? Would you go to that extent?—Yes, I mean that.

29199. Then you would prohibit a citizen from importing a supply for his own use?—I would not undertake to prohibit any one, but I would recommend prohibition in the interest of the community. I would not undertake to say that I would prohibit any gentleman from doing any particular thing, but the law would.

29200. But if you passed such a law as I have referred to, a citizen importing liquor would break the law?—It would be according to the way the Legislature framed the law. Of course prohibition would mean that people could not get any liquor except for medicinal purposes.

29201. I spoke of the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale. I might have added, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes. Would you prohibit to that extent?—I would; I would prohibit myself too, because I am not a teetotaller.

29202. Necessarily, then, you would prohibit any one from importing for his own use?—I would not undertake to speak for any one.

29203. If the law was such as I have been endeavouring to describe, any one importing would break the law, except a licensed vendor for medicinal, mechanical or sacramental purposes?—I think I answered the question by stating I would vote for a prohibitory law.

29204. Such a prohibitory law as I have endeavoured to describe?—Yes.

29205. Would you make any exceptions, but those referred to, that is for sacramental, medicinal and mechanical purposes?—I would prohibit the use of intoxicating drinks in Canada except for those purposes.

29206. Do you think such a law could be efficiently enforced, in the present state of public opinion?—Yes, I think it could; I do not say whether it would.

29207. Do you think it would be?—I do not know who would have the enforcement of it, but I believe it could be enforced.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29208. Have you had any experience of the operation of a prohibitory law?—No.

29209. Do you know any country in the world in which such a law as you speak of is in force?—I know that in the State of Maine there is such a law.

29210. Under that law, citizens can bring in any quantity of liquor they like for their own consumption?—I did not know that.

29211. The law you favour is one which would prevent anybody bringing liquor into the country. It would prevent people in their own families from making compounds containing alcohol. It would prevent housewives making home-made wines containing alcohol, and it would be a law that would have to provide for the searching of private houses, for the searching of persons, for the searching of travellers

who came into the country. You would prevent the manufacture, importation and sale for beverage purposes?—Yes.

29212. Is there any country in the world in which such a law is in force?—Certainly, the State of Maine has that law.

29213. No, the State of Maine prevents the bringing in of liquor for sale, and the selling or keeping for sale, or the manufacturing. But private individuals may have all they like, if they bring it in from other places, outside of the State of Maine?—Well, I am speaking off-hand, giving opinions at first thought; but I repeat what I said before, that I would vote for prohibiting—the sale must mean the use—I mean the total prohibition of intoxicating drinks as a beverage.

29214. But you cannot suggest any way in which such a law could be enforced?—There would be no difficulty in enforcing it.

29215. But you know of no country in which there has been such a law?—I cannot say at present.

29216. With a certain amount of elasticity in the way of what is called the permit system, a law of that kind was in force in the North-west Territories. Under the permit system, by authority of the Lieutenant-Governor, liquor could be used. You have not been there?—No.

29217. You have not made a study of the subject?—I have thought it out lately.

29218. Have you made a study of the subject?—No.

29219. You merely thought it out as to the desirability, as to possibility of enforcement?—I think there would be no difficulty whatever if the authorities took the proper means.

29220. What are the means? From a gentleman of your large business experience, any suggestion would be of practical value?—It would require some little thought. I am thinking at the present moment of the means they take in the old country for protecting game—how the few protect the game from the many.

29221. But the game are protected from only a certain class of the community. In the North-west there has been a Mounted Police force of one thousand men for the purpose of stopping this liquor traffic, with a modification of the permit system. But that country has adopted the license system since the first of May; and so far as the Commission is concerned the only country put forward as having the system of which you speak—that is total prohibition—is the Fiji Islands?—I do not base my opinion on any other country at all, but on the natural experience of what I have seen.

29222. That is as to the feasibility of doing away with the traffic. Have you had any experience of the enforcement of any prohibitory law?—This is not total prohibition, but it allows liquor for certain uses.

29223. I mean total prohibition except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes. Have you lived in any country where there was such a law?—No.

29224. You have known instances, I suppose, where the Scott Act was in force?—I have known of such.

29225. You have been in those places travelling?—Not to notice particularly.

29226. Are you aware that in the Province of Ontario, where the Scott Act was in force, in almost every county, the people repealed it, in most cases on the first opportunity. To what do you attribute that?—Because it was not enforced.

29227. Why not?—It was a failure on account of not being properly done.

29228. Are you able to say whether the people there made an honest attempt to enforce it?—I think the authorities should have done so.

29229. Do you know why they did not?—I do not.

29230. Or do you know why they found it an impossibility?—I cannot think of it as an impossibility.

29231. Do you know why, after the Act had been carried by large majorities of votes, in some cases of thousands, it was repealed by large majorities at the end of three years?—I do not know the figures.

29232. How do you account for the revolution in feeling?—I come back to the old thing again, that I believe it could be prohibited, thinking of the way in which years ago they prohibited game in England against the many by making the punishment so severe; and I think it could be enforced without a doubt.

SAMUEL CARSLY.

29233. Did this thought ever suggest itself to you in connection with the game law: That the game was private property and it was, in the interest of the owner of that property to see that it was enforced, and pay people for enforcing it?—Yes, but the game was fattened by the poor people and had the privilege of roaming over the country. It was protected for the benefit of the few.

29234. Was the Government at the expense of protecting it?—I do not say at whose expense, but I simply quote that as showing that if the Government wish to enforce a law, they can do it.

29235. Do you know at whose expense the game law was enforced?—It was done by the game-keepers.

29236. By whom were they employed? The State did not employ them or pay them?—I will not say no—I do not know.

29237. Have you any doubt on the subject that the Government never paid those people for protecting private game?—There were private game-keepers, no doubt about that, but the Government may have given aid in some other way.

29238. You say you are not acquainted personally with the counties of Ontario that adopted the Scott Act.?—No.

29239. That is you have no really practical knowledge of a country which has a prohibition liquor law and enforces it?—I have never lived where such a law has been in force and have no experience.

29240. And you have no practical knowledge of the enforcement of it?—Not in enforcing this particular law.

29241. I mean a prohibitory law?—No.

29242. Therefore, your views are formed on the theory of what is right and ought to be?—I merely state that this can be enforced. Not merely because of that, but because they enforce other laws, such as the license laws and tariff laws.

29243. It is not merely on theory but on practical knowledge you speak?—Yes, on practical knowledge.

29244. Give us your practical knowledge?—I understand from you that there is no prohibitory law in any country.

29245. Yes, but not such a prohibitory law as you are favouring. There is a prohibitory law that would prevent you from buying intoxicating liquors. I am speaking of a law prohibiting the manufacture, sale and importation of liquor, except for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes?—I do not know of any, and should not base my opinion on any particular thing as to whether they could enforce the law or not, but I base it on the enforcement of other similar laws.

29246. Could such a prohibitory law be enforced in the city of Montreal? Would you consider it your duty to go out and see that it was enforced?—No, I would consider it the duty of the Government.

29247. If you saw a place where liquor was sold, would you consider it your duty to lay information?—I should not have the time.

29248. You think there would be officers whose duty it would be to attend to those things?—Yes.

29249. In the case of enacting such a law as you speak of, preventing the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating drinks for beverage purposes, the consequences would include the shutting up of breweries and distilleries. Would you think it right that the proprietors should be indemnified?—If one class of distillers are to be compensated for the losses caused by alterations of the law, then all should be. I as well as others have often had severe losses from the alteration of tariff laws, but we have never thought of asking to have this loss made good by money from the public.

29250. That is not an answer to my question. I wish to know whether you think it would be right, in the case of a law being enacted which would close up those places, that the manufacturer should be remunerated for his loss of plant and machinery?—I repeat what I have said.

29251. I must ask for a direct answer. Would you consider it a matter of justice, if such a prohibitory law as you speak of were passed, that the brewers and distillers should be remunerated for their machinery and plant rendered useless by the enforcement of this law? Brewers and distillers have been required by statutory law to put in



machinery of a certain kind, pipes, vats, &c., and from time to time Departmental regulations have been made ordering changes, with which they have had to conform. The enactment of a prohibitory liquor law would render all this plant useless. Do you think it would be just that those men should be compensated for the loss of their plant?—As a matter of fact, in altering the tariff, people have been forced out of business in dry goods. People dealing in particular classes of dry goods have had to stop business through changes in the tariff preventing the importation of such classes. And I contend that if any one class must be compensated, all must be. I have no objection to the brewers being compensated.

29252. Do you think it just that those men should be remunerated. I am not asking you about other classes, but simply inquiring with regard to the liquor traffic?—I think the brewers should be dealt with as reasonably as other people, if not more so.

29253. I must still press for an answer?—I have answered.

29254. Do you deem it just that those men should be remunerated? I am not asking about others?—We must take all into consideration.

29255. Perhaps you think that the others ought or ought not to be remunerated; but I want to know whether you think the brewers and distillers ought to be remunerated?—I think the brewers should be dealt with reasonably, but not more so than other people who suffer from alteration of the laws.

29256. I wish for a direct answer as to the brewers and distillers?—Then I must say, no; because others have suffered loss by a change in the laws and have not been remunerated.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29257. How much does your society spend a year?—About \$2,000.

29257*a*. How is that money raised, by personal subscription?—Yes.

29258. I suppose it is fair to assume that nine-tenths of that \$2,000 expenditure was made necessary by the drink traffic and drink habit?—Yes, the report says, "So that if a prohibitory law were enforced, it would prevent the expenditure of 90 per cent of these moneys."

29259. You are a business man of many years' experience and extensive business knowledge: what is your observation of the effect of the liquor traffic as it has existed during all these years?—Speaking from a business standpoint, even from that standpoint alone, I would advocate prohibition, because a lot of men, when they have earned their wages, spend it in drink, and if they could not get the liquor they would spend it in dry goods.

29260. You think that the drinking habit decreases the purchasing power of those who drink?—Yes, if the money spent in drink were expended on their families, it would necessitate less charitable work. I am speaking of the poorer classes.

29261. You think from the point of view of the business man that prohibition would be advantageous?—Certainly.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29262. Speaking of the purchasing power of money: I suppose when a man chooses to spend his money in wine parties and dinners every day, or on trotting horses, you would not wish to interfere with those people and say that they must necessarily give up those things and spend their money in buying wearing apparel and so on?—No.

29263. It is not in that light you speak of the saving, but of the saving where people waste their money in intemperance?—Of course it is the excessive use of liquor which has caused all the trouble.

29264. It is the waste of money in cases of drinking you are speaking of?—Not altogether. I contend that the poor man, one of the corporation labourers, for instance, who earns, perhaps, a dollar a day, ought to give every cent to his wife to spend, and she is entitled to it. He cannot afford to spend anything on a glass of beer in the week.

29265. You tell us that you are not a total abstainer yourself?—Yes

29266. That you take a glass of ale for dinner?—I did not say that.

SAMUEL CARSLY.

29267. You feel that no man would have a right to interfere with your glass of ale if you chose to take it?—No.

29268. If a man earning a dollar a day chose to spend his money in that way, why should the law step in?—I could afford it without loss or suffering, where the other man could not.

29269. You are assuming that this man cannot?—I am speaking of a man with a wife and children and getting a dollar a day, and only working a part of the week.

29270. Your view is to let the man who says he can afford it use it?—They never say that.

29271. Then supposing that he would not admit that he could not afford it, you are to judge what he can afford, and he is not?—I did not say that.

29272. Is not that the practical outcome?—As a matter of fact, there is no dispute about it, if that man spends his money on drink and only gets a dollar a day.

29273. We are speaking of the glass of ale every day for dinner, with the richer man it may be a glass of champagne?—It will cause no suffering.

29274. In one case you would say to the corporation labourer earning a dollar a day: You cannot afford to have that glass of ale. And to the man who is wealthy and who can afford it, you would say: We will not interfere with you?—I do not say that at all.

29275. What do you say?—I say that the poor man who cannot afford it, and who, by his indulgence, causes other people to run short of the necessaries of life, is culpable.

29276. Here are you and the man. Each of you has a vote. You say: Well, I am willing to give it up, although I can afford it; but my friend cannot; and as you cannot, I am going to vote that you shall not have it. He says: I can afford it. You say to him: You cannot; and I will vote for prohibition. Is not that practically your proposition?—No, I think not.

29277. You say to this man: I am willing to give it up for your sake, although I can afford it?—No, I never go talking to men like that at all.

29278. Perhaps not, but that is the outcome?—No.

29279. Well, if you were talking to him, what would you say?—I do not talk to those men.

29280. I see, you do not come in contact with them. Then you are going to deal with their interests without consulting their wishes or feelings?—I am not going to deal with anything.

29281. You are going to vote to put him in a position he does not want to be placed in without being consulted?—I am going to vote for the sake of his wife and children.

29282. Without asking him whether he will do without his glass of ale. Perhaps the wife takes it herself?—Unfortunately, they do.

29283. That is the kind of law you would vote for, even though it governs yourself, and you are going to leave the law of the land to carry it out?—I repeat again that, although not a total abstainer, from my experience as President of this society, having to deal with those cases, I would vote for prohibition and assist it all I could.

29284. You do that upon the view and with the expectation that prohibition would prohibit; that is, it would keep liquor away?—That my vote would keep the liquor away from the people who abuse it; I would keep it away from others also.

29285. Have you considered at all the items of how the cost of enforcing prohibition would be met, and who would supply officers to enforce it, and what provision would be made for the raising of some seven or eight million dollars revenue which the country now derives from the liquor traffic?—Prohibition would in many cases lessen the expenditure, so that less revenue would be required. I think granting licenses to do what will increase crime for the sake of raising a revenue is very much like a person resorting to bad means of obtaining money, just because he does not get enough by honourable ways.

29286. You do not mean to say that the men engaged in the distilling business are dishonourable men?—Not by any means. Prohibition would lessen the necessity for expenditure by lessening crime.

29287. The prosecution of crime is at the expense of the province?—Yes.

29288. The Dominion Government is not charged with that expense?—It is at the expense of the people.

29289. But we are speaking now of seven million dollars or eight million dollars Dominion revenue. How are you going to meet that?—The expenditure would be reduced.

29290. What expenditure would be reduced?—Criminal expenditure.

29291. They do not pay for prosecuting crime?—I am thinking of the money (it does not matter where it comes from) that is spent and which need not be expended.

29292. But the Dominion Government do not expend that money. The provinces expend it. They appoint the district attorneys and all the officers and pay them. The Dominion Government gets a revenue from customs duties on liquors, and also excise duties, amounting to seven or eight million dollars. Would you supply that sum by increasing the duties on other articles?—It is for our legislators to find that out.

29293. You leave it to them?—Yes.

29294. You know that the provinces and municipalities obtain a revenue from the liquor licenses?—Yes.

29295. That revenue being abolished, would you raise it by direct taxation?—I am in favour of direct taxation.

29296. What authority should appoint officers to enforce a prohibitory law, the Dominion, provincial or municipal?—I have not gone into that.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29297. In dealing with women, your society comes in contact with fallen women, and seeks to rescue them from their degradation?—That does not come much within our work. Our work deals with cases of cruelty, and mostly with people not of the criminal class—good people who suffer from evil.

29298. Not the wrong-doers?—No, except those who abuse their wives and children.

29299. The people you protect are those who suffer from wrong-doers?—Yes.

29300. Then your society has not much to do with fallen women who seek to lead better lives?—No.

*By the Chairman :*

29301. I think you said to Dr. McLeod with respect to the expenditure of your society, that nine-tenths of it was caused by intemperance?—Yes.

29302. Then if there was no liquor sold, there would be no necessity for your society?—I do not think there would. I think the common law would deal with the matter sufficiently.

29303. Do you think that if there was no traffic in liquor, a society such as yours would be necessary?—I believe it would, certainly.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29304. Referring to the revenue of the Dominion from the excise and customs duties: that revenue amounts to about \$6,600,000, or nearly \$7,000,000 per year. Practically if you had prohibition, that would be wiped out?—The excise would.

29305. And the duties on importations?—Yes, on intoxicating liquors.

29306. As a leading commercial man in the Dominion, I ask you from what other source you would raise that revenue?—On first thought, as I think now, income tax.

29307. Now, we come to the revenue of the provinces and municipalities, which amounts to \$1,350,000 collected from licenses. The Quebec Government gets alone between \$500,000 and \$600,000 from provincial licenses. Under a prohibitory law that source of revenue would be done away. What would be the best method of replacing it?—Income tax, decidedly.

29308. A provincial income tax?—Yes, based on the incomes of different people.

29309. The Provincial Government are charged with the administration of the criminal law; the Dominion Government looks to the enforcement of the revenue laws?—Yes.

SAMUEL CARSLEY.

*By the Chairman :*

29310. There being no revenue to collect from this traffic by the Dominion Government, they would have little interest in expending money to prevent importations of liquor?—No.

29311. Do you think the Provincial Government could stand the expense of enforcing a law against importing, smuggling, manufacturing, selling, &c.?—I do not think the Provincial Government should undertake it.

29312. Then how would you have the work done?—By the Dominion Government, just as they collect duties on merchandise.

29313. You think the law should oblige the Dominion Government to see that importation, manufacture and sale were prohibited under a prohibitory law?—I do.

29314. And carry on prosecutions for infractions of the law?—Yes. I would like to mention this, that from a business standpoint—I speak from actual experience and knowledge—all other things being equal, a total abstainer as an employee is better than a man who is not a total abstainer.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29315. You employ a very large number of men?—Yes.

29316. You give preference to total abstainers?—I never ask the question when they come in; but taken as a whole, that is in their favour.

29317. That is purely from a business point of view?—Yes.

29318. But you do not insist on their being total abstainers?—No, I never ask the question. But we are never troubled with total abstainers staying away as others do.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29319. Have you not people in your employ who are not total abstainers with whom you never have trouble by their staying away on business days through intemperance?—Not from drink.

29320. Do you mean to say that all your employees, except the teetotallers, give you trouble by staying away on business days?—Not at all.

29321. You never ask a man whether he is a total abstainer or not?—Never.

29322. Are there men in your employ whom you cannot tell whether they are total abstainers or not?—There are.

29323. If a man drinks to excess, you will not keep him at all or only for a short time?—The difficulty is sometimes we do not find it out until they have done us a great deal of harm.

29324. Then you would dismiss them?—I would caution the parties first and give them a chance. The difficulty is they keep on drinking, not sufficient to show it, and we find that they give offence to our customers.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29325. Do we understand you to say that from your own experience with a large number of employees, total abstainers are most satisfactory?—Other things being equal; we never question a man about that.

29326. Do you find the number of total abstainers amongst young men and others increasing?—I could not give an opinion on that; it is a thing we never ask about at all.

29327. Have you observed during late years whether business men pay more attention to the drinking habits of their employees than in earlier years?—I think there are more opportunities now.

29328. So that a total abstainer comes to have a commercial value in those ways?—Certainly.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29329. Is it a commercial value as against a man who never takes more than he ought to do?—We never ask such a question of any one.

29330. There may be men in your employment who are not teetotallers, and you do not know it?—Yes, but men giving voluntary statements or anybody else telling us, it

enhances him in our estimation at once ; because if he has to do certain work, such as outdoor work, as collector, or do work around the warehouse and where, there being so many men, he can be easily tempted to drink and lose his time, the fact that he is a teetotaller certainly enhances his value.

29331. There may be other men doing that same work who are not teetotallers and do not lose time?—Certainly.

29332. It is not a test of employment with you?—Not at all.

JOHN DUNLOP, Q.C., of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29333. I believe you secured the legislation incorporating the village of Côte St. Antoine?—It was first erected a village under the Municipal Code, and the municipality extended in those days out to the Blue Bonnets. Afterwards there was an Act cutting us off by Monklands, leaving a very compact suburb there, which is inhabited by English people. The municipality passed a by-law prohibiting liquor, under the old Dunkin Act, which has ever since been in force. After we got incorporated into a town, the original by-law remained. There was never any question of repealing the original by-law. Since 1872 the Dunkin Act has been in force. I have always contended that this particular by-law, having been passed under the old Act of 1864, is still in force. It has never been attacked. At the time it was passed, we left with the Collector of Inland Revenue the keeping of the by-law.

29334. You lived in the municipality for several years?—For twenty years. I now live in the city of Montreal. I have been connected with the municipality as secretary-treasurer for ten years and to-day am its solicitor.

29335. Are there any hotels or saloons within the boundaries of the municipality?—Not to my knowledge.

29336. Are there any places within it licensed to sell for medicinal purposes?—That I could not tell. There were none in my day, when I was secretary.

29337. Latterly there has been no sale there?—No, there was none in my time.

29338. There was nothing to prevent the bringing in of a supply from Montreal?—No. This is a suburb of Montreal. You cannot tell where the city stops and the municipality begins. The population of the municipality comprises principally business men, clerks and professional men.

29339. It has a separate police force?—Yes.

29340. Has there been much intemperance in the municipality to your knowledge?—No, very much the reverse.

29341. What police force have you?—I think originally we started with one man, but I fancy we have four or five now, because of late years the population has increased very much.

29342. What is the population at the present time?—About two thousand, probably more.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29343. The line between it and Montreal is imaginary?—Yes.

29344. In what direction does it lie?—South-west.

29345. Do you follow St. Catherine Street?—Yes, taking St. Catherine Street you go right into the centre. If you go by Sherbrooke you take one boundary ; if you go by Dorchester, you take pretty much the other boundary. It is a compact territory of about 1,200 acres.

29346. From your knowledge of Montreal, after you pass that line between Côte St. Antoine's corporation and the city, coming down into Montreal, and between Dorchester and Sherbrooke, would you go some distance into Montreal before you found a licensed house?—I think rather a considerable distance.

SAMUEL CARSLEY.

29347. It is a residential section?—Entirely.

29348. In Côte St. Antoine, would there be a large preponderance of sentiment against having licensed houses in that community?—I should think it would be almost unanimous. I only remember, in my experience, having to take action once against a person who attempted to sell liquor, and we had him fined. There was a very strong representation made to the Government to remit the fine, but the Government very properly insisted on its payment. The fine was \$60 or \$80, and we never had any further trouble.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29349. Is there any illicit selling of liquor within the municipality?—Not to my knowledge.

29350. Have the benefits of local prohibition during those fifteen years been quite marked?—I think it has been a very good thing for the municipality. It prevented people coming in and creating a disturbance on Sundays and holidays.

29351. Do you think that the value of property is enhanced by prohibition?—I do in this particular instance.

29352. For instance, if saloons were established in Côte St. Antoine, the value of property would depreciate?—I think the population would not increase so rapidly, and it would not have the same class of inhabitants as we have at the present.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29353. Take Côte St. Antoine as it is, with the population there : is it the sort of place an ordinary saloon-keeper would select in which to establish a saloon?—I should think not.

29354. There would not be the class of people there who would patronize a saloon?—No.

*By the Chairman :*

29355. Descending from the mountain towards the south, where is the boundary line of the municipality?—That going down to St. Antoine, the continuation of St. Antoine Street.

29356. The south side of St. Antoine Street is another municipality?—Yes, at one place St. Henri, and at another Ste. Cunégonde.

29357. Take the corner of the municipality, which borders on Montreal at the south-east, there are some saloons not very far distant?—That is a part of the municipality I am not at all familiar with.

29358. Take the corner of the municipality on the south-east, at St. Antoine Street, just beyond that in Montreal is there not a large number of saloons?—I am sure there are, but cannot particularize them.

29359. When you get into the populous part of the west end of Montreal, where there are numbers of small houses, and some tenement houses, there must be saloons close to the municipality?—I am sure there are.

29360. It would not be very difficult for a man residing in the municipality to go across the line and get his supply of liquor?—There would be no difficulty at all.

LOUIS CHEVALIER, Superintendent of Provincial Police, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

29361. You are appointed by the Provincial Government ?—Yes.

29362. How long have you been Chief ?—One year on the 13th of this month.

29363. How large a force have you under your control ?—Five men.

29364. What are the duties of the force ?—To see that the law is observed, that nobody sells without a license or on Sunday ; and if any one makes application for license, it is my duty to see that he is qualified according to law. I find out what kind of a man he is. If he is not a responsible man, I report him to the Commissioners.

29365. You have to see whether he is qualified as to character, etc. ?—Yes.

29366. Have you a regular form that you fill up ?—Yes, I will send you one.

29367. To what Commissioners do you make the report ?—To the Judges of the Police Court and the Recorder, Judges Desnoyers, Dugas and deMontigny.

29368. In the first place, when a man wishes to have a license, does he come to you first or to them ?—When a man makes application for a license, he goes to the Receiver of Revenue, and gets a two dollar stamp ; then he goes to the Greffier and gets his blank, and then the Greffier puts his stamp on his application. Then he tries to get the names required to recommend him, the names of citizens living in some of the wards. Then he brings that back to the Greffier, where he gets a blank. Then the application is posted on a board for fifteen days, so that any citizen can see it. There must be twenty-five names endorsing his application. The application shows the street, the number, etc. We do it in this way because we find sometimes that names are forged, and it was on that account we had a law passed enabling anybody to see the list.

29369. When you speak of the clerk, is that the clerk of the Commissioners ?—That is another office altogether. The clerk is appointed by the Government and paid by the Government.

29370. He is license clerk ?—Yes.

29370a. Is he in Mr. Lambe's office ?—No.

29371. If he has the twenty-five names and there are no objections, what steps do you take ?—I make a report that applicant is qualified according to law, and then I see what kind of a man he is, whether he deserves to have a license or not.

29372. And if your opinion is adverse to him ?—In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, his application is refused.

29373. If your opinion is favourable, what is done next ?—A license is granted him.

29374. If some people have seen the application posted up and object, what is done next ? Do they file their objection in writing ?—They may. They leave their objections with the clerk. Then I take note of their objections and make my report to the Commissioners, and they investigate and act accordingly. They may say that they will not give him his license this week, but wait for another week. The Commissioners have the option of giving the license or not after they look into the objections ; they may take evidence concerning the objections. We refuse licenses every week. We often refuse to consent to a transfer of license when a man sells his place.

29375. If the Commissioners decide to give a license, do you hand it to the man ?—The clerk enters it in his book and then delivers it to the applicant, who then goes to the Receiver of Revenue, Mr. Lambe, and pays his license.

29376. How much does he pay ?—According to his rent, from \$300 to \$800. I have to inspect the place, to see the number of his house, and he pays a license according to the valuation of the Corporation. The applicant has to go to the City Hall and get his certificate of the valuation of the property, and on that certificate he pays his license.

29377. The amount is paid to Mr. Lambe, then he gets his license ?—Yes, and he must hang it up in his bar-room where everybody will see it.

29378. Having got his license, is it your duty to visit his place occasionally to see whether he observes the law ?—Yes.

LOUIS CHEVALIER.

29379. And see that he does not sell on Sunday?—We are very careful about that; if we see a man giving liquor to a drunken man or to a minor, etc., we prosecute him.

29380. Is his license then taken away?—That is left to the Judge. I have seen a case where a man paid his license one week of \$800, and had great trouble to get it. The Judge told him that on his first offence, his license would be taken from him. He commenced to sell on Sunday and kept on doing it. We caught him, and the Judge took away his license and fined him \$120 besides, making altogether \$920. He appealed from the judgment to a higher court. We claimed that when his license was taken away by the Magistrate, he had no right to sell. So he took out another action. I told him he must close, and when he did not do so, I went down and took away all his liquors, and then he had to close.

29381. Is he still in the business?—He got fixed all right and paid. It cost him \$2,000 altogether.

29382. He got another license?—They gave him one for four months on the same premises. That cost him \$3,000, but he does not sell any more on Sunday.

29383. Have you endeavoured to thoroughly enforce the law?—Yes, we are sometimes up on Sunday till 11 or 12 at night.

29384. Can you tell us whether there are many unlicensed places in the city selling liquor?—I think Mr. Lambe put it pretty high. I do not know of any.

29385. If you knew of any, they would cease to exist?—Yes. There are some no doubt, but very few. The parties expose themselves to go to jail for three months, and pay \$150 fine.

29386. You do not know of any?—No.

29387. Have you any idea that there are any, although you cannot find them out?—There must be some in a city like Montreal.

29388. Can you form an opinion of about how many?—Very few.

29389. You do not think there is between three thousand and four thousand?—There are not two hundred.

29390. I saw in the newspapers the other day something about "beaneries." What are they?—That is where they have a sign out, "pork and beans for sale."

29391. Have they license?—No.

29392. Is liquor sold there?—It is claimed that it is.

29393. But you do not know?—No. But there must be very few, there may be some that sell without a license, but we cannot keep track of all these places.

29394. Do you find that when the sale stops in one place, it springs up in another?—Yes.

29395. Do you find any difficulty with respect to places selling in quantities they are not entitled to sell. Can grocers sell by the glass?—No, but they do. I think a few do, but you cannot catch them. The law is very bad. Even if we saw people drinking there, we cannot make a case, because we have to taste the liquor so as to be able to swear that they drink beer or whisky.

29396. From your experience, would it be better to separate the sale of liquor from the sale of groceries?—I am strongly in favour of that. It would save many a poor man from taking more liquor than he ought. I would be in favour of three kinds of licenses: beer and wine license, restaurant license, and hotel license.

*By the Chairman:*

29397. What is a restaurant license?—Where they give meals. We have only two kinds of licenses—restaurant and hotel. A man calls himself a restaurant-keeper and gives nothing to eat. His restaurant is only a drinking place.

29398. Are there many such places?—More than half of them. I commenced inspecting yesterday for this year. In about 120 places, I find 30 restaurants complying with the law.

29399. Have you a right to prosecute them?—No, after they get their license and act according to law, I cannot.

29400. But you say they are not acting according to law?—The time to stop them is when they are making application for license.



29401. Supposing they sell liquor without providing meals, are they not liable to be punished?—They say that they could give meals if required; they will say, go upstairs and you will get what meals you want.

29402. You do not believe they do give meals?—I am sure they do not. They have a bar and some rooms upstairs where their family live, but have no facilities for giving meals. This law was made only a few years ago, and some people have been keeping places like that for fifteen or twenty years. The Magistrate says: What shall we do with these men? They have places that cost them \$2,000 or \$3,000. They do not sell on Sunday; they do not give liquor to minors or to men the worse for liquor. What are we going to do? There were 383 restaurants that made application for licenses. Out of that number a few did not get licenses, and there might be 75 who were strictly complying with the law.

29403. You say that in the case of men who were in business before this law was passed, you or the Commissioners do not like to close them up?—Yes.

29404. Would a new man be allowed to continue unless he acted according to the law?—No, we would have to be satisfied that he had facilities for giving meals.

29405. In the case of men you would favour receiving licenses to sell beer and wines, would you exempt them from supplying meals?—Yes, their places should not be called restaurants when they do not give anything to eat. In the case of hotel-keepers, the law says that if a hotel-keeper has three bed-rooms, he should be given a hotel license. That is not enough bed-rooms, as they are required for his family.

29406. Does the city police force assist you?—Yes.

29407. Without their assistance would five men be sufficient for your duties?—I should say no.

29408. You could not cover the whole ground?—No, because we have the whole district of Montreal to attend to and all these villages around. I have under my control 1,236 men who have licenses. My six men could not do the work, except we had help from the city police force.

29409. Have the city authorities provided by regulation that the police force must give assistance when you require it?—No; but generally the sergeants of the different stations give it of their own accord.

29410. It is a matter of good-will?—Yes.

29411. Do you know anything about Sohmer Park?—Yes.

29412-13. Do your duties call you there?—Yes, I brought a case against them.

29414. For what?—For selling beer on Sunday. They call it Weiss beer, but they may call it what they like. They were fined, and had to quit selling it on Sundays.

29415. How is that place conducted now?—They do not sell on Sundays.

29416. Have they a license?—Yes, a regular license to sell any kind of liquor on week days.

29417. Is it a restaurant license?—I think it is a hotel license. They have a very large house.

29418. Have you any suggestions you could make to the Commission as to any changes in the law?—I am in favour of reducing the number of licenses. There are too many.

29419. I understand you to say you would separate grocers from liquor licenses?—Yes.

29420. Would you have three classes of licenses and a less number of licenses issued?—Yes.

29421. Is there anything else, such as increasing the number of your force, powers of visiting, or prosecuting or anything of that kind that you think desirable?—I know the Government are willing to give the revenue police larger powers. I can say this, that I have got the help I require from the Government to reduce the number of licenses and keep good order.

29422. Have you anything to do with seeing to the quality of liquor sold?—No, I wish I had.

29423. Do you believe that adulterated liquor is sold in this city?—Yes, plenty of vile compounds in those low places. There should be an Inspector.

LOUIS CHEVALIER.

29424. You think the liquors sold should be examined and severe penalties inflicted on those who adulterate them?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29425. Have many applications for transfers of license been reported against?—Yes. I find one man will buy a place from another and will say : I have bought such a place, will you recommend the transfer of the license to me? I inquire, and if I do not find him qualified, I report against him.

29426. Take these cases you have just discovered, 90 out of 120 that have not qualified : do you report against such places getting licenses next year?—There is an amendment required in the law. When a man has a kitchen and dining-room, he says : I give meals when I have a customer for them, and when I have none, I cannot give meals.

*By the Chairman :*

29427. When these 90 persons make application for a renewal of their licenses, will you tell the Commissioners you think they are not complying with the law in the matter of supplying meals?—Last year, when I took my present position, I was not very well posted. Therefore I went according to the practice of years back. This year I will be very particular. When a man is qualified for a restaurant license I will say so ; and when he is qualified to keep hotel, I will say so ; and when he is qualified for nothing but a drinking place, I will make a report to that effect.

29428. Will you report the fact that they are not complying with the law?—I will report that I visited that man's place and found he was not complying with the law. But if he has been keeping a place for ten or fifteen years and there has been nothing against him, the Commissioners may give him a license or not as they think fit.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29429. Is it possible for the Commissioners to grant a license to a man who is not complying with the law?—It is left to them. There is the law, and they have their authority under that law. A man may have been in business for years, there may have never been anything against him, and the Commissioners find it hard to refuse him a license.

29430. There are 300 of those places and only about 75 complying with the law. Would the Commissioners give licenses to the other 225, although you reported that they were not complying with the law?—I cannot say that they will all get licenses.

29431. Have the Commissioners, under the law, the authority, in face of the fact that the law has not been complied with, to issue those licenses?—No ; but in the case of men who have been in the business for some thirty or forty years and never been complained against, the Commissioners renew their licenses.

29432. Does the law say that in the case of men who have been in business a long time, they need not comply with the provisions of the law?—No, I do not say that they act up to the letter of the law.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29433. Is there not a temptation, in cases of that kind, to induce these men to pretend that they give meals?—They all do. I ask them if they give any meals and they reply, no, except when asked for them ; and in some cases they will only give two or three meals in the week. They have a stove and they have a table.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29434. If the number of licenses were reduced, would there be any hardship in throwing some men on the street?—We intend to reduce those who do not deserve to have licenses, those, for instance, who have been fined for selling on Sundays or for selling to minors. We take a note of those cases and report them to the Commissioners, and licenses will be refused to low places.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29435. You would weed them out and get rid of the bad places?—The idea of the Government is to reduce the number, and that will take probably three years. They will refuse a number every year.

*By the Chairman :*

29436. I understand you to say that you do not agree with Mr. Lambe that there are from two thousand to four thousand unlicensed places in Montreal?—I am sure there is not that number. When I said a couple of hundred, I might have made a mistake; but there are not more than three or four hundred.

29437. You have five men?—Yes, but I use specials whom hotel-keepers and shebeen-keepers do not know. I may use a couple of specials for four or five weeks and then another couple.

29438. How do you get them?—I engage them.

29439. What is the highest number you have ever engaged?—Not over two. I name the places where they shall go.

29440. You use them as detectives?—Yes, they report the cases to me.

29441. Have they any number or badge which they can show?—No, they do not make an arrest, but get the liquor and report to me. Then the Revenue collector seizes the party for selling without a license and the two men are witnesses. They get paid according to law, \$50 for each case they prove.

29442. Under what conditions do you enter a place you suspect of selling without license?—Sometimes we send some of our men in, when I think they are not known, and they try to get some liquor there.

29443. You could not enter by force and make an examination without making a complaint?—No, there must be a complaint and then a search warrant.

29444. Take these small “beaneries”: can you search them at any time, or must you lay an information first?—If we suspect a place we go to the Collector of Revenue, and he gives us a warrant to make a search, and if we find any liquor we seize it. If the party is guilty he is fined \$50, and if we can prove that he sold liquor, he is fined \$150 besides the \$50.

29445. Supposing you went into one of those “beaneries” and found liquor there, that fact alone would not enable you to get a conviction against the keeper?—No, but we could seize the liquor, and have him convicted of having liquor in his business place.

29446. Would it be advisable to amend the law so as to make the keeping of liquor in such premises an offence punishable by fine or imprisonment?—They are punished enough. In some places where we found only a few bottles of liquor, they were fined \$50.

29447. And then if you could prove that they sold the liquor, they would be fined another \$150?—Yes.

29448. You think the fines are heavy enough?—Yes; those people have to go to jail, because they cannot afford to pay.

29449. You would wipe out the grocery license altogether?—Yes, and I would give shop licenses to sell beer and wine in their stead. Beer and wines should be sold outside of groceries.

29450. Would you have separate places?—Yes; I think that is the way it is in London, England.

29451. In Toronto they have about 212 licensed places of all sorts to 182,000 people or about one to 860. In Montreal the licensed places of all sorts amount to 948 for a population of 225,000 or one in 237. Is there any reason why there should be this disproportion?—I do not see any reason why. I am satisfied there are too many licensed places in Montreal.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29452. That is the general feeling?—Yes.

LOUIS CHEVALIER.

*By the Chairman :*

29453. Can you give any information as to how the present state of things was brought about, if public sentiment was against it?—Before the new law was passed, anybody who applied for a license could get it if he had money to pay for it.

29454. For how many years did that state of things exist?—It was that way for many years. That is not the present state of things. Ever since about a year ago the Commissioners have been more particular. The temperance societies have been urging on the Government that there should be a stop put to the trade, and that the city of Montreal is over-crowded with drinking places.

29455. I understand you to say that for about 12 months the License Commissioners have been more strict?—Yes, very strict. To my knowledge temperance societies have done a great deal of good.

29456. And also, I suppose, the clergy?—Yes, they and the temperance societies.

29457. Do you think that the labouring men's organizations have had the effect of promoting temperance?—They have, I am satisfied of that. Most of the societies have.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, January 19th, 1893.

The Royal Commission met this day at 11 a.m., SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. MCLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

ROBERT CHARLES KIRKPATRICK, M.D., Medical Superintendent of the Montreal General Hospital, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29458. What is your position, Dr. Kirkpatrick, in connection with the Montreal General Hospital?—Assistant surgeon; I was four years resident at the hospital.

29459. You had to deal, in the course of your experience, with the compilation of the annual statistics of the hospital?—Yes, for three years.

29460. Have you given in these reports any information as to the percentage of patients who came to the hospital, and who were obliged to go there through intemperance?—One of the rules of the hospital, although it is not a written rule, is that no person suffering from the effects of too great indulgence in spirituous liquor is admitted; consequently the number of cases of alcoholism that are admitted is comparatively small, and a great deal smaller than the number that apply. Then there are a number of cases that are brought on through intemperance. For instance, a number of cases of accidents. There are also a number of cases, such as pneumonia, which are superinduced by intemperance. A great number of the cases of pneumonia are caused by indulgence in spirituous liquor. There are also cases where a man may get hurt through the intemperance of his fellow workmen, but not through his own.

29461. Has no classification ever been made which would show the number of cases arising out of intemperance?—Not to my knowledge; there are no statistics bearing on that.

29462. Have you formed any opinion yourself as to the number of patients who could be classified under the heads we have referred to?—I cannot give any definite information at all of the number. I merely say that it is a large number. Then, of course, there are others who come in, who have been reduced to poverty through intemperance, either through themselves or through members of their family, want of proper nourishment, proper house and so on. I think it would be impossible to get any definite statistics on the subject.

29463. Will the Commission be justified in concluding that there are no statistics giving such information in connection with the Montreal General Hospital?—Yes.

29464. Will you be good enough to tell us, Dr. Kirkpatrick, the system that is pursued with regard to the distribution of stimulants amongst the patients of the hospital?—There is a card, about six or eight inches long and three inches wide hanging up, and the patient's name and the number of the ward are written on the head of this. There is a space on the card for whatever is ordered by the attending medical man, and the rule is that this must be signed every second day by the attending physician. The liquor is ordered just as medicine, and only as medicine. It is never put on the regular diet table.

ROBERT CHARLES KIRKPATRICK.

29465. Well, there must be a large quantity used, for I see that there are \$500 or \$600 of expenditure under that head?—The wines and liquors used are expensive because they are a very good quality, and they will of course run up the expense without a corresponding increase in the quantity of stimulants.

29466. Does what you have said apply to patients occupying private rooms, and who pay so much?—The same. There are no stimulants, except what are prescribed by the attending physician or surgeon. Stimulants are not allowed to be brought in under any circumstances.

29467. In whose charge are the stimulants in the hospital?—The apothecary. He distributes them to the nurses, and the nurses distribute them to the patients. He registers the quantity used by each patient, when it is ordered. It is a record of what each patient uses. The resident staff are not allowed to procure liquor, except in cases of emergency.

29468. We were told yesterday by Mr. Patton that employees of the hospital are not permitted to have liquor, except they should happen to be sick?—There is no allowance made to them from the hospital.

29469. As a matter of fact, are they permitted to supply themselves with ale and wine?—Not with their meals.

29470. Or in the hospital?—They are not allowed to bring it in. That is the rule; but they are not all abstainers at the hospital.

29471. What is your personal observation with regard to intemperance in Montreal; has it increased or decreased, do you think?—As far as I have seen, I do not think there has been much change.

29472. Do you think there are too many places selling liquor in Montreal?—I do.

29473. Do you think it would be an advantage if the number was curtailed?—I do.

29474. Are you a total abstainer yourself?—I am.

29475. From your observation, do you think that the license law is fairly well enforced in the city?—No, I do not, as regards Sunday selling. I see a great many drunken men on Sunday, probably more on Sundays than on any other day; but it is my observation in the hospital that they seem to be able to get liquor on Sundays without difficulty.

29476. Have you given any consideration to the question of the total prohibition of the liquor traffic, that is the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale, except for medicinal, &c., purposes?—I think it would be desirable.

29477. You think the health of the community would be better if there were no liquor sold?—Yes, I do.

29478. And you think a prohibitory law of the character I have described would be desirable?—I do not know that it would be desirable to pass a law to that effect. Prohibition is a good thing.

29479. Have you formed an opinion as to whether or not prohibition could be efficiently carried out?—It could not be; I do not think it could be.

29480. I understand your view to be that, although you think prohibition is desirable, it is impracticable?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29481. Why do you think it is impracticable?—I do not think it could be enforced, and I do not think it would be.

29482. For what reason?—Principally on the ground that the people want the liquor, and they will get it; and I think sales would be winked at to a certain extent. I think it would be impossible to get from the highest to the lowest of those dealing with the law an absolutely honest enforcement in this respect.

29483. Do you think that a prohibitory law could be, in a degree, carried out?—I do not think so, judging from what I have seen in other places. For instance, in Portland, Maine, there is supposed to be prohibition; but I have seen a great many drunken men there, and I am told by ship captains that their men get all the liquor they want.

29484. Is the same true in any degree of other laws for the suppression of what is regarded as an evil thing?—I think so.

29485. Are these other laws, then, impracticable and valueless, more or less? Would it be well to abolish them altogether, because they are not enforced absolutely, or is it wise to continue them?—It is probably wise to continue them.

29486. Would the same thing apply as to the prohibition of the drink traffic, since in your belief it is desirable to prohibit it, if practicable?—That is a very difficult question to answer. Speaking of Montreal, I doubt very much if a prohibitory law would benefit the city so much as a law regulating the drink traffic.

29487. There are other evils in Montreal which are prohibited by the law. Would it not be better to regulate those evils than it would be to prohibit them? According to your view, the drink evil should be regulated?—No, I do not think these other evils come under the same category. Moderate indulgence in liquor is not a vice, whilst even moderate indulgence in these other evils is a vice. They are different. I do not think it is right to have a law regulating a vice. It is only excessive indulgence in liquor that is wrong. I am a total abstainer myself, but I believe that.

29488. Why do you believe that a prohibitory law is desirable, if practicable?—Because there are so many people who do indulge too much, and I believe that in that direction it would be a benefit.

29489. If practicable, you think that prohibition should be enacted?—I believe that it would be for the benefit of the State, if it were practicable.

29490. The license law is designed to regulate the trade. Do you believe, from your observation during all these years in Montreal, that the license law does regulate the trade here?—Not from what I have seen here. Practically any one can get a license, and I do not consider the law regulates it at all.

29491. Is the license law a failure?—I should say it was so to a great extent, as applied here.

29492. Would it be well, then, to repeal it, and to allow the trade to go on without hindrance?—I do not know whether those who have the granting of licenses have the power to regulate the number. If they have the power to regulate the number, then the license law is well enough, if they will regulate the number. If they have not the power to regulate the number, I think they should have the power. It is a question of degree.

29493. But whether they have the power or not, according to your statement made a little while ago, there is a lot of drinking done on Sunday, which is against the law, and I suppose there is probably a good deal of drinking after hours. Does that demonstrate the utter worthlessness of the license law, because there are those violations of it?—I do not think it does.

29494. Does it seem to you that the license law regulates the trade to any degree?—Yes, to a certain degree.

29495. You mean to say that but for the license law, there would be more drinking on Sunday?—Yes, I think so, because now men have got to go in by the back doors. If these places were open, it would make drinking more respectable, and more men would drink, who at present think it is not a respectable thing to slide in the back door. There are a certain number of people who will be restrained by the law. It has a restraining influence.

29496. Upon what do you base your conclusion that it has a restraining influence? Have you ever had any experience of a community in which there were no restrictions on the trade?—No.

29497. You are not able to compare places in which there is free selling and in which there are license laws?—No.

29498. Your idea of the impracticability of prohibition is based on your knowledge of Montreal?—Yes, it is largely theoretical.

*By the Chairman :*

29499. You come in contact with a large number of people who would not like to be known as breaking the law?—Yes. For instance, there are a great many young men in offices, clerks and so on, and if their employers knew that they were in the habit of frequenting taverns, particularly on Sunday, they would lose their situations; so they do not do so, or they do it quietly.

ROBERT CHARLES KIRKPATRICK.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29500. That is the effect of the unwritten law amongst the employers of labour?—To a great extent.

29501. If the thing was as respectable on Sundays as on other days, there would not be that law?—Yes.

29502. You stated a little while ago that it would be an advantage to lessen the number of licenses granted in Montreal. What would be the advantage of lessening the number?—There would be fewer places to sell liquor, and suppose the same quantity of liquor was sold, they would make more money and they could afford to sell a better article. The competition cuts down the price, and I presume it cuts down the quality. I believe that is the usual rule in trade.

29503. Do you think it is right to give a class of men a monopoly of the trade?—I do not think it would be a monopoly if there were so many licenses issued, and these were given to men of the best character and men whom the Commissioners felt were thoroughly qualified to carry on this traffic.

29504. Do you think if the number of licenses were lessened, there would be a corresponding increase in the number of places where liquor was illicitly sold?—No, if the law was properly administered, that could be cut down.

29505. Have you any reason to believe that the law would be properly administered?—I do not know.

29506. Your belief and the belief of the witnesses generally is, that the law is not properly administered?—Well, possibly if the number of licenses were curtailed and the price of the licenses raised, those who had licenses might take it into their own hands to enforce the law, because where there are illicit places selling liquor, it must take away from the profits of the legal places.

29507. It is contended by some people that a person who pays a large price for his license and keeps what is regarded as a reputable and attractive house, instead of complaining against the number of illicit places, rather encourages their existence because he gets rid of a class of people that are not desirable around a high toned saloon. Have you given any attention to that point?—No.

29508. You have stated that the victims of alcoholism pure and simple are not received at the General Hospital. Are there many such cases refused?—Yes, a good many.

29509. What is the objection of the Managers of the Hospital to receive such cases?—Well, our beds are limited, and really urgent cases have to be refused. Cases come there not through the fault of the individuals, and it is thought better that we should provide accommodation for them. There is more sympathy for those than for people who get ill through drink. Besides, cases of alcohol require more attention and assistance than others. When a man is suffering from the D. T's, he is a dangerous character, and a woman in the same condition is probably worse than a man; but at all events, they cause a great deal more trouble.

29510. Is there any register in the institution showing the cause of the sickness?—No.

29511. Do you not take the personal history of the patient who comes in?—There is a record kept of that, but there are no statistics compiled from it. We take the patient's own statement, and although we may be morally certain as to the cause, and our treatment may be for alcoholism, yet we cannot very well tell the patient that he is lying.

*By the Chairman :*

29512. You mean that the record is made up from the patient's own statement?—Yes; we take the statement of the man's previous history.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29513. And you take his account of the circumstances that may have occasioned the illness with which you have to deal?—Yes.

29514. Have you any reason to believe that any considerable proportion of the accidents and illness that come to the hospital are attributable directly or indirectly to the drink habit or the drink traffic?—I believe there are a considerable number.

29515. About what percentage would you say, giving a conservative estimate?—I cannot give a percentage.



29516. Twenty-five per cent?—I do not know.

29517. In the cases of accident and sickness with which you have to deal, have total abstainers from liquor a better chance of recovery than habitual users of liquor?—Abstainers have a better chance than those who use liquor to any considerable degree. Of course a glass of ale or so taken at meals acts as a food, and it does not upset the man at all, but alcohol tells on the man who is always tipping.

29518. The habitual user, you say, has not as good a chance of recovery as the abstainer?—No, other things being equal.

29519. In your experience in the hospital, is the use of spirituous liquors as a medicine prescribed as much as formerly?—I think not, I think it is going down.

29520. Why is that?—It is not considered so necessary now. I suppose that is the only answer I can give.

29521. Something else has been found as a substitute?—No; but formerly it was more of the routine treatment than it is now. Now liquor is not prescribed as routine at all, but as a medicine, like any other drug would be in emergency cases and cases of prostration.

29522. Just to tide the patient over?—Yes; and sometimes when the person has been habituated to it outside it must be done.

29523. Do you find many cases like that?—A good many. They sink without it.

29524. Because the habit has been so long continued?—Yes; they are not able to eat, and their strength goes down. I have seen some very striking cases of that.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29525. In speaking of keeping in force a law of this kind, I mean keeping it upon the statute-book without any enforcement, and keeping in force other laws which are, perhaps, not enforced, you draw a distinction: that this law deals with a thing which is not an evil of itself, and those other laws to which reference was made deal with things which are evils?—Yes. For instance, we have a law against murder, but that does not prevent it.

29526. You have laws against immorality and houses of ill-fame?—Yes, but those are evils in themselves.

29527. As to what is the moderate or immoderate use of liquor: Will that depend in some cases on circumstances, and a particular man's constitution and state of health?—Yes; for some men even one glass of liquor would be too much, while another man might take it as a food.

29528. I suppose you know men who, out of regard to their own safety, would never touch liquor at all?—Yes.

29529. And all these different circumstances have to be considered in speaking of the excessive use of liquor from a personal point of view?—Yes; of course, that all comes under the common saying, "What is one man's meat is another man's poison." I have had patients that I have had to tell not to take liquor at all in any form, because they are better without it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29530. Are spirituous liquors necessary food to any man?—Well, I have in my mind some men who have fallen into a condition that they sicken unless they have some stimulant.

29531. But, speaking generally, is it a food?—Do I understand that you refer to the case of a person who had never taken it?

29532. Yes. Is it a food in such cases?—That is a very doubtful question. I believe it would be better for the world and community at large, and for the average healths if everybody was an abstainer. There may be exceptions, but probably the average length of life would be considerably longer if everybody was a total abstainer.

29533. Take a man who is what you consider a moderate user of liquor, and take a total abstainer: would there be any difference in the duration of life?—In Canada I think they would be better as total abstainers, but I do not know enough of other climates to speak of it. I believe there is a deliverance from the Medical Board in

ROBERT CHARLES KIRKPATRICK.

England on this point ; but it is also stated on that point that there has not been sufficient length of time since total abstinence became as prevalent as it is now to form an opinion.

29534. Given a patient who is a moderate drinker and a patient who has been an excessive drinker : which is the more susceptible to the beneficial influence of liquor prescribed as a medicine ?—The man who takes it moderately.

29535. You mean that he will benefit by spirituous liquors prescribed as a medicine more than the other ?—His tissues will respond to the stimulants better than the man who has been over-stimulating his tissues.

29536. Which of the two is the patient who will sink unless some such stimulant is given him ?—Probably the man who has exceeded in the use. He is the worse risk of the two. He has to have a certain quantity to bring him to a normal condition.

LOUIS CHEVALIER, Chief of the Provincial Revenue Police, again appeared before the Commissioners to make a statement.

Witness read the following item, which appeared in a local newspaper :—

“ Mr. Louis Chevalier, Chief of the Provincial Revenue Police, gave evidence as to the working of the department. He stated that he practically decided as to who should get a license. If his report on the applicant was unfavourable, in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred the license was refused.”

This, he said, was not correct, and he made the following statement : When you asked me yesterday if the Commissioners would give a license if the man was not qualified, I answered that if I reported that the place was not fit for a license, and that the man applying was not a good character, in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred the Commissioners would refuse a license.

A. D. DEMARTIGNY, Manager of the Jacques Cartier Bank, Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29537. You are Manager of the Jacques Cartier Bank, Mr. DeMartigny ?—Yes.

29538. How long have you occupied that position ?—Since 1877. I was Cashier first, and was elected Managing Director three years ago.

29539. You have read the terms of the Royal Commission, appointing the Commissioners in this matter ?—Yes.

29540. What, in your opinion, is the effect of the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, on the agricultural, financial, commercial and business interests generally of the Dominion ?—It is very difficult for me to answer this question, because, supposing that absolute prohibition should take place, I believe it would do damage.

29541. I refer to the present state of matters, the liquor traffic as at present conducted ?—At present it may be demoralizing for a great many of the people, because I believe a strict temperance law should be enforced.

29542. You had notice that this question would be put to you ?—Yes.

29543. Have you anything to say as to the effect of prohibition on the financial, agricultural and commercial interests of the country ?—I do not like to express my opinion on that, because I have not made a sufficient study of it to answer. I had no time to prepare myself to answer such an important question.

29544. Would you prefer to answer it at a later period ?—I am so busy with my duties that I do not think I could give the time to consider the matter.

29545. The Commissioners are instructed to inquire into this phase of the matter, and it is rather difficult for them to come to any conclusion unless they get the opinions of gentlemen occupying such positions as you fill ?—That is quite true.

29546. From whom are they to seek information if they are not to come to the heads of financial institutions?—Merchants engaged in trade will be better able to answer that question than I am.

29547. The Commissioners are quite prepared to give you time to think over the subject, and they will take your evidence at a later period.—It will require more study than I will have time to devote to it. It is so important a question that I would not pronounce myself on it.

29548. Speaking of a prohibitory law, which would prevent the importation, manufacture and sale of all kinds of liquors, wines and beer as a beverage, and would admit of their importation only for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, what, in your opinion, would be the effect on the agricultural, financial and commercial interests generally and upon the revenue requirements of the Dominion, the Provinces and the municipalities of the enactment of a law of that character?—I think a prohibitory law would do a great damage to the country. I think a complete prohibitory law would do damage; that is my opinion.

29549. Are you prepared to state the grounds upon which you come to that conclusion?—It would affect the revenue of the Dominion to a large extent, and also the revenues of large cities and municipalities.

29550. Do you think, Mr. DeMartigny, that revenue could be raised with advantage in some other way to replace the revenue which would be lost by the enactment of a prohibitory law?—No doubt the Government might devise some other scheme of taxation, but I think that the liquor traffic should pay the highest amount of taxation, because it is a traffic that is not absolutely necessary.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod.*

29551. I think you stated that the liquor traffic should be taxed quite heavily?—Yes.

29552. Is that because of its evil effects on the country?—It is because there is a great abuse in liquor selling. There are too many of these little restaurants and liquor selling places in large towns.

29553. Did you consider that the drink traffic causes a very large expenditure to the Government and to the municipalities?—I do not think it causes such a very large expenditure. I think a severe temperance law that would stop the vice of liquor is the best law.

29554. You think the number of licensed places should be diminished?—Yes, there are altogether too many of them for the benefit of the country.

*By the Chairman.*

29555. Do you refer to the city of Montreal or the country generally?—The country generally, and particularly the city of Montreal.

29556. Do you think there is more intemperance in Montreal now than there was 10 years ago?—I think so.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29557. As a financial and a business man, do you find that the habit of drinking is injurious to the business man?—Yes, to many of them. In my duty as Managing Director of a bank, I see very often that people drink too much, and that they do not take so much care of their business as they would do if they did not drink.

GEORGE C. BISHOP, Managing Director of the Bishop Engraving Co., Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29558. Are you the Manager of the George Bishop Engraving and Printing Co., Limited?—Yes, I am Managing Director.

29559. There were certain labels brought under our notice yesterday by a witness, several of which were evidently printed in your establishment?—Yes.

29560. I want to ask you whether these are printed to order, or whether you print them and have them for sale. I will hand you three or four of them?—In reply, I beg to say that Mr. Verner, who has been with me from a boy, has charge of the lithographing department, and I would be obliged, in order to answer intelligently, to ask him how they were printed, because they might be printed for a customer or printed and sold as stock labels.

29561. Are you in the habit of printing labels of that kind and keeping them on hand for sale to any one who may apply for them?—Certainly, just the same as we print other labels, for other goods, canned goods, for example, sardines, lobsters, &c. In fact all articles put up now are labelled in some shape or other, and they are put up under several labels that are printed specially to order, and they are also printed and kept in stock.

29562. Then you would supply labels like these now before you to any one who might come in and pay the price for them?—If they were within the law, we would. There is a new law now that we have to respect. We have to put on the labels that they are compounded goods.

29563. But that does not concern you, it concerns the compounder?—It would concern us also. If a person came in and ordered these labels, in order to prevent violation of the law, we would say that we have to print these with the Government requirement upon them. We have not yet been asked to do anything of that kind; but I hear there is a law of that sort. In the meantime we have to print a general run of labels. We do not mind what they are for. If a man puts “Blacking” in a bottle and puts “High Wines” upon it and sells it for liquor, that is not our fault.

29564. Unless you are under contract to print such labels for some person, would you supply them out of your stock to any one who might come in and ask for them?—Certainly.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29565. I do not know, Mr. Bishop, whether you know the manner in which these labels came into our hands. An officer of the Inland Revenue Department put them in as labels that are used by people who take alcohol of some kind as a basis, and prepare mixtures which they are pleased to call rye whisky and Jamaica rum or brandy; that then they go to your place and buy these labels and put them on the bottles; and it was stated that the prices marked on the back of these labels are the marks of your establishment?—Perhaps so.

29566. For instance: take this label “Seven Years Old Rye Whisky.” If this is sold to any person who chooses to come in and ask for it, you quite see the use that may be made of it. They can take that label away, and of course without any knowledge on your part, put it upon something that is not rye whisky at all, and that is not seven years old; and that label would be a means of perpetrating fraud on the community?—I quite see that that might be done, but that would apply to other things as well as liquors.

29567. You have no personal knowledge of the matter at all?—Not a particle.

29568. It has just been done in the ordinary course of trade?—Yes, and for that reason I feel a little aggrieved that my name should be trotted out before the public as being connected with a bogus transaction.

*By the Chairman :*

29569. The object in bringing you here was to enable you to set yourself right, and that your own statement might be taken, and so a subpoena was issued?—I am much obliged to you.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29570. Personally you have no knowledge of these matters?—None at all.

29571. With your attention now called to this matter as Manager of the business, and seeing the use that has been made of these labels, even without a change in the law, I suppose you would not allow such a thing in the future?—I asked this morning before coming out what is the amount of this business, and I was told it was a mere bagatelle. There are labels printed for importers and people who are in trade, and who are recognized as respectable people as far as conducting their business is concerned, and I am not here now to define what trade is respectable. One man may say that the liquor business is not respectable, and another that it is. For such men as Meagher Bros., who are highly respectable people, we are doing work all the time, and their account is very valuable; these people give the order and we do the work. We might print a large order for them and would run off probably more than they would have need for, but those labels cannot be sold to the public.

29572. How do you account for the fact that these labels are sold to the public?—These are stock labels, and I have never heard any exception taken to that kind of thing. As long as I can remember, in Montreal, the grocers have been bottling liquor and have been getting their labels printed. They get their labels in this way and put them on. These labels are regularly sold by the printing trade. That idea of “Seven-years-old whisky,” or calling it a name, has no weight with the public, in my opinion.

29573. That is going to lead to another inquiry, because you are putting yourself on the defence as to the character of the label. The Revenue Inspector says that these labels are used to enable frauds to be perpetrated?—I should not think so.

29574. Can you inform us, then, how it comes that on the stock label prepared for ordinary sale “Seven-years-old rye whisky” is printed on it?—The whisky might be three or seven or ten years old for all I know, and this label would be simply put on it.

29575. It is known that there is a demand for such labels on the part of men engaged in the trade, and that they use these labels in their business, and you keep them in stock?—Just so.

29576. And these labels are prepared without regard to a particular firm, and are kept ready for those who come for them?—Yes.

29577. And without any knowledge that they will be used to perpetrate a fraud on the public?—So far as I know, these labels are only used to put on liquor that is seven years old.

*By the Chairman :*

29578. Take this particular label for old rye: who would design that?—Perhaps it would originate in this way. A man would come in and say he wanted a label for old rye, and he might bring us the design. We would make the label, and then it might work into stock.

29579. Would I be correct in assuming that your stock of labels are all suggested by customers?—Originally, very likely.

29580. Do you make any yourself?—Yes.

29581. You get out a design for old rye whisky and Jamaica rum, or any of these beverages?—We do not require to get out designs, because they are originally started on, and we run off that design.

29582. That label must have originated somewhere, because it is quite a work of art?—We may have designed it.

29583. And you sell them promiscuously?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29584. In reference to this label here, “Stewart’s Wormwood Bitters”: what authority would there be for making that label and selling it?—Some one who wanted that label ordered it originally; it may have been Mr. Stewart or some one representing him. I presume that it was ordered in that way, and that he did not object to our selling it to others, and it went into the stock list. If he did not object to it, it would go into the stock list and be kept there for a re-order.

GEORGE C. BISHOP.

*By the Chairman :*

29585. Would he be asked if you might use the label?—We would certainly never think of using the label without the authority of the person. This would go into the stock list, so that he might have it when he came to order again. It is a very unusual thing for a person outside of the party who originated the label to want to buy it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29586. It is sworn here that any one can go into your place and buy these labels?—Yes.

29587. Did McLaren & Sons, makers of Scotch whisky, order that label from you?—The parties who imported that whisky would put it up in bottles in this country, and they would require labels.

29588. What right have they to allow you to sell that label to any one outside?—If a man in Montreal who puts this stuff up is willing to do it, we cannot object.

29589. You mean to say that you do not object?—I mean to say that if the importer does not object.

29590. Do you get his permission?—We always do and must.

29591. Can you tell from your books who it was that ordered that label?—That would be difficult.

29592. Will you say, as a matter of fact under oath, that you did get that man's permission to sell these labels?—I would require to have Mr. Verner, who is in charge of the department, here in order to say positively as to a matter of that sort; but judging from the way we do business, I cannot imagine that any one can get that label out of our place.

*By the Chairman :*

29593. Can you say if that label is being sold at your place?—I cannot say that.

29594. Can you say that this is a label which is held to some one's order?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29595. Take this label: "Double Distilled Tom Gin, Bottled in Bond for Exportation." Can any Montreal man give you authority to print that label?—Certainly.

29596. Who?—The parties for whom we do the work. They make arrangements with their people in the old country to bottle this gin, and they buy the labels.

29597. Now take this label, which has printed upon it: "This label with trade mark is issued by the distiller to protect the public against spurious imitation." Can that protection be given if the label is sold from your establishment to any person who comes in and buys it?—I did not say that it was sold to any person.

29598. It has been sworn by a witness that these were sold at your establishment. Would that come within the limit of which you speak, of some men in Montreal giving you an order for such a label? It is sworn here that it has been used for spurious imitations. Do you justify such a label as that being sold by your firm to any one who chooses to ask for it? Do you believe that such a label should be set afloat?—I would not consider it right for us to set that label afloat, as you say.

29599. Then it must have been done inadvertently?—I do not say that it was done inadvertently, because I do not think it was done at all.

29600. But if done, it was done inadvertently?—Certainly.

29601. Here is another label: "Genuine Hollands, Geneva, Chas. Buger & Co., Amsterdam." I presume you have no authority from that firm to print that label?—Certainly not. The agent here, who received the liquor in bulk and bottled it, must have authority for issuing the label.

29602. Is it a fact that all these people had given permission to have these labels sold indiscriminately?—We have had permission from some parties that we did labels for. I cannot say which particular ones.

29603. Will you say that you have also, in cases where the firm's name is on the label, obtained permission from them to sell these labels indiscriminately? Do you think that men who are in business and doing a large trade and have a name would

give permission to have their labels sold here, there and everywhere?—Not indiscriminately; but you must draw the distinction that these wholesale people sell in wholesale quantities, in bulk, to different parties, and these parties are allowed to bottle, and the different people bottling in Montreal use these labels.

29604. Do you mean to say that Dow's people would be willing that you should sell their labels with the firm's name on them to any person who might use them and put any stuff in the bottle that they could call ale?—I do not think so.

29605. Did Dow & Co. give such permission?—I have not enjoyed their order; but I know there are parties here in the city who are allowed to bottle Dow's ale and use authorized Dow's labels, and for all I know they pay for that label themselves; and if they put inferior ale in the bottles, that would not be the fault of the man who printed the labels.

29606. Would Dow & Co. or any person who do business with them authorize you to sell labels to people to be used in putting up other than Dow's preparation? Would they not allow them to be only sold to those who would only put Dow's ale in the bottle?—They would only allow those whom they expect would bottle Dow's ale, but they might be deceived.

29607. Do you mean to tell me that any person here or his agent for an English house, would allow his business to be so interfered with that he would have his labels set afloat? He orders these labels and pays for them, and he is at the expense of the work. Do you mean to say that that man would authorize you to sell these labels to the general public?—I think I have made that plain already. They give permission to their own customers who are putting up the different liquors, and they are very glad I should think when the labels are printed, as it is so much more advantageous for them.

29608. Can you mention any name of a firm in the city of Montreal who has given authority for these labels to be sold indiscriminately?—I wish to be protected in what I say. I did not say that any one gave permission for their labels to be sold indiscriminately. We do not sell labels indiscriminately, and I stated that before.

29609. You swear, then, that these labels are not sold indiscriminately?—Not indiscriminately.

29610. Do you know of any case in which parties have been refused labels by your firm?—Yes.

29611. State some?—I would have to get Mr. Verner to state that, as he knows the business. The labels you refer to now would not be sold generally. I wish to draw a distinction between the first label you showed me and the others. The first label was a stock label.

29612. Does the man who comes to buy labels produce the authority that he is allowed to buy them?—That would be done in two or three ways. We would have a written permission or perhaps a telephone permission.

29613. Have you any written permission on file?—I cannot say; I am not sure.

29614. We are told that some of these labels are so printed that they do not represent exactly the name of some well-known firm, but that there is a letter or something changed, and that these labels are in fact frequently an infringement on trade marks?—We are careful to protect ourselves against anything like that.

29615. What inquiry would you make?—We would tell the man straight that we could do nothing of that sort.

29616. What inquiry would you make?—I do not know, but we would make some inquiries. The rule would be that if we found it was a trade mark, when it was wanted, we would not supply it, because that would be forgery. But if we are deceived, we are not to blame.

29617. What information or guarantee have you of the validity of the label that you print?—The respectability of the party.

29618. Then none of these trade mark labels are sold to outside parties, except to the one who orders them, or upon his order?—Yes, that is so.

29619. Of course, you are not aware when a person comes to order a label that he has obtained permission from the firm in the old country?—We have nothing to do with that. We trust to the respectability and word of the person who gives the order.

GEORGE C. BISHOP.

29620. Unless you are satisfied of the respectability of the person who gives the order, you would not furnish him with any distinctive trade mark, label or name?—No.

29621. And when there is no name on the label, but merely a statement such as "Old Rye Whisky, Seven Years Old," these labels are merely kept in stock, without being ordered by any particular person?—Exactly. This is not a particular branch of our business.

29622. It would be in the ordinary run of lithographic business?—Oh, yes; all over the country.

29623. It is not particular to your firm at all?—Not at all. Many of these labels come from Germany. There are only a few designs amongst the labels you have that I recognize as being done in this country. Mr. Verner has charge of this department, and I really see nothing that is being done there. My chief business is General Manager of the finance department.

*By the Chairman :*

29624. Can you say that a certain number of these labels there were not printed at your establishment?—Yes, many of them were not. I might say that I would think it would be a wise thing if there were some further protection in the law to the whole-sale trade with regard to these labels.

29625. You employ a large number of men?—Yes; we have been in business since 1867 and employ a number of hands.

29626. Do you make it a rule that your employees shall be total abstainers?—I am glad you asked me that question, for it gives me an opportunity of saying that our establishment has been a sober establishment since its inception.

29627. Do you exact it as a condition that your employees shall be total abstainers?—No. We pay out \$700 every week, and we have no absentees after pay day; but we have no rules. I consider that having started the establishment on the principle of temperance and industry, there is an example from the very start.

29628. You do not enforce that rule?—By example, that is all. We are really a co-operative concern, and work for the benefit of one another.

29629. By that reply do you mean that the employees are participators in a portion of the profits?—They are, in this way, that we pay them liberally and treat them as brothers.

29630. But their remuneration is not dependent on the profits of the company?—No; we always like to recognize them at the Christmas season, and so on. But I consider that the example of temperance in all large establishments is of great importance. The new hands have seen that the old men in the establishment do not drink, and that there is no room for it. The result is that several of the men instead of spending money on liquor, buy homes. Several of them are now in their own homes, with our assistance.

29631. What do you do with the black sheep; if you have any?—We find that he reforms himself, if he wants to stay with us. When men come in and see that the other men in the establishment do not want to drink, they do not drink themselves. A man in my establishment arranges with me for a house, and I have known some of them to pay for a \$2,500 property inside of eight years.

29632. Have you had occasion to dismiss men because of intemperance?—I do not think we have had to do that in the entire twenty years.

29633. No question is asked by you as to whether the man is a total abstainer or not?—No; the establishment is run on these lines: the establishment opens at a certain hour and closes at a certain hour, and the men have to live up to it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29634. You have no rules bearing on the matter?—None whatever.

29635. You have no written rules?—No, but there is an unwritten rule.

29636. Does it seem to be a rule that is stronger than a written rule?—I think it is better.

29637. You do not keep a drinking man in your establishment?—They do not seem to want to be there.



29638. Why is that ; is it on moral principles ?—Anyway, we do not interfere at all with the liberty of the subject.

29639. Suppose you have a man in your establishment during twenty-five years who takes what is called a little ; have you found that the tendency amongst such men is to take what is more than a little ?—It has not come to my knowledge.

29640. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that all your people are total abstainers ?—I do not think so.

29641. What reason have you to believe that some of them are not total abstainers ?—I think I know of instances where at an excursion, which we usually have, some men would take a glass of ale.

29642. Are any of them habitual drinkers ?—None.

29643. Have you had to dismiss an employee for drinking ?—Inside of twenty-two years two or three men had to go for drinking.

29644. They were habitual drinkers ?—Yes.

29645. Were they habitual drinkers when they came ?—Yes, I think so.

29646. Were they excessive drinkers when they came to your establishment ?—I think so.

29647. And they did not reform ?—They were young men, who, I suppose, started out as drinkers.

29648. As a business man and without any reference to the moral side of the question, which do you think is the better ?—The sober man every time.

29649. It pays best ?—It pays everybody best.

29650. As a business man, do you think it pays you to have sober men ?—Certainly.

29651. Of course the liquor label trade is only a small portion of your business ?—Very small.

29652. Do you think that the profit of keeping in stock these labels for indiscriminate sale is quite compatible with your purpose of ruling your establishment with reference to sobriety and example, which is the great law there ?—I do not see a collision.

29653. Is that your answer ?—Perhaps it would be as well to leave it there.

JOHN REDPATH DOUGALL, proprietor of the *Montreal Daily Witness*, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29654. You are, I think, Mr. Dougall, the proprietor and principal editor of the *Montreal Daily Witness* ?—I am.

29655. If I am correctly informed, your late father established the paper ?—Yes.

29656. It has always been an advocate of temperance, I think ?—Yes.

29657. I do not know whether or not from the start the paper was an advocate of prohibition ?—It was from the first.

29658. You have necessarily given a great deal of consideration to the subject ?—I have always been an advocate of prohibition.

29659. Will you kindly tell the Commissioners the character of the prohibition which you advocate, because there are different degrees of prohibition ?—Well, I have never been a party to the drawing up of a prohibitory law, further than in a general way. A prohibitory law has been laid before Parliament, which has been drawn up by parties working with me, and it contains, as nearly as possible, what we would like to have, if we could get it.

29660. I want you to tell us more particularly the extent to which you go. Do you advocate the entire prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes ; or would you allow a citizen to import

GEORGE C. BISHOP.

for his own private use?—I do not think our law forbade a citizen to import for his private use. It was a law dealing with the traffic and not with the custom or use of the individual.

29661. I know you strenuously advocate prohibition, but I wish to know if at the present moment you advocate the entire prohibition, or would you allow an exception such as I have referred to, by which the individual could import for his own use?—Allowance is not our part of the business. We secure what prohibition we can. When we ask for amendments to the license law, for instance, they are all in the direction of prohibition. We are not responsible for those parts we do not get or even do not ask for, but what we do ask for is prohibition.

29662. What would you like to get?—We desire the total prohibition of all traffic in intoxicating drinks.

29663. Would you consider a part of the traffic, the importation for private use? I am anxious to get at your platform, if I may use the word.—I have never advocated that the importation for private use should be made illegal. I do not think it has been done anywhere, unless it was in the North-west Territories, where they were pretty stringent in tracing up liquor wherever it came at one time.

29664. Then I understand that you would be satisfied with a law prohibiting the importation for sale, the manufacture for sale and the open sale of liquor?—It would be, at all events, a very satisfactory instalment.

29665. Is that the extent of your advocacy of prohibition at the present moment?—Yes.

29666. Would you permit the individual to import?—I am not responsible for the permission. I think the question might arise afterwards whether anything more was necessary. That is what we ask for at the present moment: the total abolition of the traffic. We are dealing with the traffic and not with what people consume.

29667. You have, no doubt, given a great deal of consideration to the financial and commercial side of the question of prohibition. The Dominion gets a large revenue from customs and excise, and the provinces and the municipalities get a considerable revenue from the issue of licenses. Have you considered at all how the loss of revenue to the Dominion, which would follow the enactment of a prohibitory law, could be recouped?—I have never considered that my function, as I have not had the honour to be, nor do I expect to be, a Minister of Finance; but I have heard the expressions of various Finance Ministers on the subject, both in this country and elsewhere, and I should think their declarations would be satisfactory on that point. Sir Leonard Tilley, if I remember aright, remarked, that whatever loss should result from prohibition, he would be very glad to have an opportunity to provide for, or something to that effect. I cannot remember the exact words; but they were in effect, that he would not consider loss of revenue as any reason against prohibition. Sir A. T. Galt, long after he was Finance Minister, spoke in similar terms: that the injury to the country as a whole was so very much larger than the loss of the revenue that, looking at it from the point of view of a public financier, he had come to the conclusion to advocate prohibition. Mr. Gladstone, in presenting his Budget, perhaps the last he did present, remarked that there was a very large reduction in the amount of the revenue from intoxicating liquors, but that he regarded that as the most satisfactory feature he was presenting to the country. I am not quoting words, I am only quoting expressions as I remember them.

29668. I take it that you think it is obvious, to start with at least, there would have to be some other means of finding a revenue to replace the revenue lost to the Dominion?—I should suppose so.

29669. You think that would be the case?—I think for a time at least. I do not know how far the expenditure would be diminished by the same process.

29670. But the reduction of the expenditure would be a gradual process, it would not be immediate?—No.

29671. You would have, therefore, to raise a revenue in some other way to meet the loss which would follow a prohibitory measure; I am speaking of the Dominion?—Yes.

29672. You think that is a question which should be left to the Minister of Finance to deal with?—Especially seeing that men whose ability is unquestioned have willingly undertaken it.

29673. You have not, yourself, thought of the direction in which the Finance Minister might look to raise that revenue?—I should favour direct taxation, but that is a separate question.

29674. Now we come to the financial question for the provinces, and we will take as an example, the Province of Quebec, in which you and I live. The Province of Quebec gets about \$600,000 per year from the granting of licenses for the sale of liquor, and the loss of that revenue would be a serious matter to the province. In what way do you think that loss of revenue could or should be made up to the Treasury of the province?—I cannot undertake to formulate a system of taxation. But I would simply say, that the amount that would be saved in this city alone, if it did away with the quantity of liquor drunk in the city, would be three times the amount that the country would lose; it seems to me that would be good financing.

29675. Will you tell us how you arrive at that conclusion as to the amount?—I notice that the computation of the City Controller was placed before the Commission.

29676. Certain statements went into the papers which were not correct: you are speaking of Mr. Robb's evidence. I thought you had formed some theory of your own as to the saving in this city?—I was just quoting that as a sort of authoritative statement of the amount. I might calculate it at a higher rate; but Sir A. T. Galt's way of estimating the amount that the country lost was, that the revenue being five millions, it was fair to assume—after, I suppose, having carefully thought it out—that the amount spent upon liquor by the purchasers was at least twenty-five millions.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29677. I quite comprehend what you mean in regard to the Dominion taxation, that if that was saved, and a direct tax put upon the people for it, the money so saved would help at any rate certain persons to pay direct taxation. But taking the question that the Chairman asks in regard to the provincial revenue, what would be saved in that respect? The Government derives \$600,000 and the municipalities something beyond that. How would the Government recoup themselves that amount for their current expenditure, and what would be the means of getting that money from the people?—I do not think I am an expert person to answer a question like that. I simply say that the money got in this way is got at a very outrageous expense to the community as a whole, and that it is thoroughly iniquitous in its character. It puts the Government into the position of partnership with a traffic, which is creating a larger amount of evil of various sorts in the country than almost any other institution of our day. I think the evil results of the liquor traffic will be generally admitted both with regard to the moral and financial condition of the community and the health of the people in various ways. The traffic is iniquitous, and that the Government should share in that traffic is iniquitous also. No financial considerations should be considered for a moment in the presence of what is a positive iniquity.

*By the Chairman:*

29678. Without entering into any discussion as to your views about the morality of the liquor traffic, the Commissioners are called upon to report on the practicability of prohibition, and necessarily we have to look at all these financial questions. The possibility of carrying out prohibition is perhaps the most important phase of the inquiry the Commission have to consider. I ask you as conductor of a public journal, and one who has given attention to public affairs, if you have formed any opinion as to how the province could replace the revenue which would be lost if a prohibitory Act became law? By what process could the Provincial Government raise the revenue which would undoubtedly be necessary, at least for a time, on your own theory? Ultimately we do not know what might happen. If in June or July the revenue which the province derives from the sale of licenses, and the revenues which the municipalities derive from the same source were stopped, it is obvious that the province and the municipalities would have to raise a revenue, but from some other source, at least for a time. How do you think they could raise that revenue?—If I were to speak on the abstract principle of how revenue could be raised for the maintenance of government, I would say that so far as

JOHN REDPATH DOUGALL.

I know anything of political economy, the proper method of raising revenue is by direct taxation of the population, either in the form of a poll tax, or taxation upon their possessions. Upon that I think there is a consensus of abstract opinion; but then it would be a practical question whether such a method would be able to be carried or not. With regard to that, I am not able to say.

29679. Admitting that you are right, that ultimately the loss of revenue to the province would be made up in the saving in the administration of justice, what then?—I did not assert that; I only said that I did not know what the diminution of expenditure in that respect would be.

29680. You express the opinion, do you, that there would be a large diminution?—Yes. I do not know whether it would meet the loss of revenue or not; I am not able to judge that.

29681. Would it meet part of it, a large part of it?—I should think so.

29682. You think that ultimately a large part of the revenue lost to the province would be made up by the diminution of expenditure; but in the meantime do you think that a direct tax to replace the revenue lost to the Treasury would be the correct way?—I think that would be, in the abstract, the correct way.

29683. The best way?—Yes, the best way.

29684. You are satisfied that a tax of some kind would have to be imposed in the interim?—I do not know any way of raising money without a tax.

29685. Now, coming back to the prohibition question: do you think that in the present state of public opinion, if a prohibitory law were enacted, it would be efficiently enforced?—I think that it could be efficiently enforced.

29686. I am speaking with reference to the present state of public opinion. Do you think it would be enforced in the present state of public opinion? You are a public man, and I know pretty well your views generally on that question?—I think the efficiency of the enforcement would be progressive.

29687. But would the law be efficiently enforced to commence with?—It would be as efficiently enforced as the present laws are, and with more effect.

29688. Would you have it enforced by the Dominion Government?—A Dominion law, I think, should be enforced by the Dominion Government. The Government which enacts a law is supposed to be favourable to that law, and to feel responsible for its enforcement. If I am sufficient of a constitutionalist to judge constitutional questions, I think the Dominion Government has power to enforce such a law if it enacts it, and I think it has been a great misfortune to the Scott Act that it was not followed up by a measure for enforcing it.

29689. Of course the Dominion Government, as you know, has nothing to do with the issue of licenses or the regulation of the sale. Their duty is to look after the revenue and prevent the illicit importation and illicit manufacture of liquor. Would you go to the extent of altering the British North America Act, if it were found that the Dominion Government had not sufficient power to enforce a prohibitive law?—That brings in a serious question of antagonism between the Provinces and the Dominion. For myself, I would favour it.

29690. Would it not be very difficult to enforce a prohibitive law efficiently, if it were permissible for individuals for their own use to import liquor, looking at our long frontier with the United States?—That is a question that would be answered by the experience of many districts which have had a similar law for a long time.

29691. The State of Maine has permitted the importation for private use?—Such is not my understanding.

29692. That is undoubtedly the law in Maine. Well, we have 3,000 miles of frontier. If A, B, and C could order in liquor, would it not be a difficult operation to prevent the improper use of the privilege?—I think the experience of Maine would be a very fair one to compare our country with. It has a very unusually difficult frontier to command.

29693. It has a comparatively small population and the frontier is not so extensive as the Canadian frontier?—It is a very extended frontier—and a very unapproachable one in many cases—in proportion to its population.

29694. Do you not realize that there would be very great difficulty in preventing smuggling on a very large scale with such a prohibitory system?—I am thoroughly convinced that there would be, exactly as there is very great difficulty in preventing coal oil from being smuggled across the border, as there is such a difference in values between here and the United States.

29694*a*. Would there not, in your opinion, be a greater temptation to smuggle under such a system than there is under the present system of licenses? We know, of course, that there is a good deal of smuggling at present?—I should think the temptation would be increased by any increase of reward for it. There would be a greater demand for liquor. I do not know that the volume of illicit traffic would increase; there is an amount of illicit sale now. I am not at all sure that there would be more illicit drinking than now.

29695. I understood you to say that you thought there would be more smuggling, as there would be a greater incentive to smuggle?—Yes; because there would be a larger price to be obtained probably. I do not know to what extent the regular dealers are smugglers now.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29696. Have you any reason to believe that the regular dealers are smugglers to any extent now?—The suggestion was made in connection with recent smuggling, but I have no knowledge of it.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29697. I judge, Mr. Dougall, that what you want is something very much like the Maine law?—Very much.

29698. The Maine law does not interfere with the consumption for private individuals in their houses, and, therefore, you want something very much like that?—Yes.

29699. You have told us as to the mode by which we would meet the loss of revenue, both Dominion and Provincial. There is a term you used, “the progressive efficiency” of enforcement, that struck me, and that is with reference to the experience of the enforcement of the Scott Act in Ontario. How would you look for a progressive efficiency of enforcement with that experience? In a great majority of cases, the Act was repealed at the end of three years?—There was a revolt against it, because it was not enforced.

29700. There was not that progressive efficiency of enforcement that you would desire?—There are two or three counties in this province in which there is a prohibitory law, and in each of these counties there is one man determined that the law shall be enforced. That one man was lacking, I presume, in most of these counties in Ontario.

29701. Pardon me, I think in every county of Ontario the system was this: The Dominion Government, in the first place, passed an Order in Council placing at the disposal of the municipalities all the fines for the purpose of enforcing the Act. Then, the Ontario Government have to deal with all matters of licenses; and the law was maintained in the Scott Act counties by the same Inspectors that were maintained in license counties, and they made the County Council provide for the Inspector’s remuneration and expenses connected with the discharge of his duties. I know that was done in the Counties of Leeds and Grenville. This man sent requisitions to the County Council that so much was needed for the duties connected with the office, and the County Council made these appropriations out of Scott Act fines. That man looked after the enforcement of the Scott Act; but there was a regular Board kept up of three Commissioners?—I presume that was the regulation.

*By the Chairman :*

29702. Do you refer to a particular individual acting on his own responsibility?—I refer to the fact that in each of the counties in this province there happened to be a person willing to take all the odium for seeing that the law was enforced, if it could be enforced; and my impression is that in neither of these counties would the law be repealed.

JOHN REDPATH DOUGALL.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29703. You do not know about Ontario?—No ; but I have heard reports and frequent expressions with regard to the lack of zeal of the officers appointed by the Ontario Government.

29704. But there was machinery adopted for enforcing the law ?—Yes, I believe so.

29705. There being that machinery, how do you hope for what you call a progressive efficiency of enforcement ? These officers were charged with acting in the way you speak of, —I do not say whether they did or not, —and the people at the end of three years repealed the Act. Is it not attributable, as far as your knowledge goes, to the lack of efficient enforcement that the people repealed the Scott Act?—I believe that was the reason given in most places for many changing their views. They did so, it is stated, because the law was not efficiently enforced. Some of them came to the conclusion, I suppose, that it could not be enforced ; but, at all events, the reason I heard was, that the failure of the enforcement was the reason of the repeal ; not that the people changed their views so much, as that they became indifferent and did not go to vote. They became indifferent and did not go to vote in favour of the law.

*By the Chairman :*

29706. The lack of enforcement by the officials was to be attributed to what cause, do you think, Mr. Dougall ? Was it lack of interest on the part of the officials, or what ? One would naturally say : here are officials appointed to enforce the law, and if public sentiment is in favour of the law, the officials ought not fail in their duty ?—So far as I have observed public officials, the way a case of infringement of the law presents itself is something like this. They see some one infringe the law, and say to themselves, “ If I interfere with this person, I will make an enemy of him ; I will make an enemy of many individuals whom he can influence. He will bring their power against me again, and in many ways I shall get myself into trouble ; but if I do not proceed against him, there is no individual that will personally feel it, and my interest on the whole is not to act.” I think that this is an analysis of the efficiency of officials, which is almost universal.

29707. Would not that imply indifference on the part of the population ? If there was a strong sentiment in favour of prohibition, do you not think that officer would be called to account ?—If there was an adequately organized sentiment that would take him to task, I should think it would be so ; and there is where I feel that there has been a lack of recognition on the part of those who advocated and carried out the law, and which was necessary in following it up. They only commenced the war, instead of finishing it, when they passed the Scott Act, and they should have consolidated their organizations rather than have allowed them to drop, as in some cases I believe they have done after the excitement was over.

29708. You think they abandoned their efforts and hence did not continue their organizations ?—They thought that the public officials were going to act ; and that is one of the greatest mistakes they could make.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29709. If a prohibitory law were passed, would you make provision for enforcing the Act ?—If there was no great infringement of the law, there would be no fines to provide for the payment of these officials. If there was infringement of the law, there would be sufficient to pay them ; and I am afraid for some time to come, there would be material to pay for the expenditure of enforcing the law.

29710. In the case of the enactment of such a law as you say you want, which would prevent the manufacture of liquor for beverage purposes, would you deem it right that brewers and distillers should be remunerated for their plant and machinery rendered useless ?—I would not deem it right.

29711. Take the city of Montreal. Do you think it would be in the interests of the community to have the sale of groceries and liquors separated ?—It would.

29712. Would you make any change in the law in reference to the hours at which persons are allowed to sell liquor ? Of course I know that you would prohibit them altogether ; but suppose the system is to continue, would you have a change made in this respect ?—I am favourable to an early closing by-law.

29713. Have you reason to believe that there is any considerable sale in Montreal to minors and drunken people, contrary to the provision of the License Act?—I do not know how it is just at the present moment, but there has been free sale to minors and drunken people in some places.

29714. As a citizen, you know that there has been laxity of that kind in connection with the operation of the present license law?—Yes, it has not been enforced.

29715. In reference to the provision against Sunday selling, is it being enforced?—For a few months back, I believe it has been fairly observed, in fact I may say comparatively well observed. Previous to that, it was not observed at all. Outwardly the doors were shut, but the sale of liquor was going on in a general way in the city.

29716. You have in this city parks and places of pleasure resort, the Sohmer Park for instance. What, as a citizen, have you found to be the effect of those places, beneficial or otherwise?—I am not very closely acquainted with Sohmer Park. I never was there, and I have not met many people who went there; but it is, as I understand, a beer garden, a place where people go for pleasure and have refreshments constantly within reach. That is all I know about it. The question has been raised as to whether privileges should be given to such parks that were not given to other places where liquor was sold. I thought the proposition was simply preposterous. If there are any places where the limitations on the sale of liquors should be greater than others they should be these places where people assemble for amusement.

29717. Would you subject those places to the strongest provisions of the license law?—Certainly.

29718. You are opposed on principle to the sale of liquor in these places at all?—Certainly.

29719. Apart from that, do you believe they are a benefit to the community?—I cannot say anything very definitely on that. There are certain kinds of theatricals, which are to my mind immoral, and certain kinds of amusements, which are not desirable for a community; but whether they are such as prevail in these places, I have no knowledge, and I cannot answer the question at all. I think that lawful places of amusement are not undesirable.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29720. From your observation of Montreal, do you think that the license law as administered, partly regulates the trade in the city?—I do not think that the license law is enforced in a proper way.

29721. Are we to understand by that, that there is a great deal of illicit sale?—At times there is a great deal, and at other times, when proper energy is used and when persons are willing to sacrifice their time and money to bring pressure to bear in favour of the limitations which our license law enacts, there are fewer breaches of the law.

29722. As soon as that pressure is relieved, the breaking of the law becomes very general?—There is great difficulty in enforcing a law, unless there is that proper spirit in the officials who are loyal to their duty and who wish to enforce the law adequately. There is a difference between the pressure brought to bear from Governmental quarters at one time as compared with another time. Some Governments are more active than others, and at some periods the same Government is more active than it is at other periods.

29723. The Government action is generally understood to be the result of pressure? Speaking about prohibition and the Scott Act, did you understand that the enforcement of the Scott Act in Ontario and elsewhere is a practical illustration of what the enforcement and effect of a general prohibitory law would be?—I think that the enforcement of a general prohibitory law would be much simpler than the enforcement of any partial law; the Scott Act was a local law.

29724. So that a local option law does not illustrate perfectly a prohibitory law of a general character?—By no means.

29725. Speaking about the Scott Act and the repeal of that Act in Ontario constituencies, do you understand that the repeal of the Scott Act in these constituencies was an uprising of the people against the prohibition of the drink trade?—I did not so

JOHN REDPATH DOUGALL.

understand it. I was under the impression that many of those who declined to go out for the Scott Act law on the second occasion, did so because they thought it was a failure; but they would have readily gone to vote for prohibition at the same time. What they wanted was something that would produce the effect they desired; and people have an idea that law will produce those effects of itself, whereas it must be followed up and enforced.

29726. The question concerning the constitutional power of the Dominion has been raised; as to whether the Dominion really has the power under the British North America Act to enforce prohibition. That was incidentally referred to here. I suppose that, after all, is a mere matter of opinion, not affecting the desirability or undesirability of the drink trade?—That is a legal question, which I do not take upon myself to answer.

29727. Do you think that the enforcement of a prohibitory law might be as good, at any rate, as the enforcement of the license law? Would there be more flagrant violations of a prohibitory law than there are of the license law?—I think there would be less. I think it would be much easier to enforce a prohibitory law than any partial law; the license law is, of course, partial prohibition.

29728. Of course, in the event of the prohibition of the importation of liquor, we all understand that there would be attempts to smuggle. Do you understand, Mr. Dougall, whether it would be more difficult or less difficult to detect and prevent smuggling with a prohibitory law, than it is to prevent and detect smuggling in the case of revenue laws?—I should think it would be less difficult. On the other hand, the moment a prohibitory law is enacted, every appearance of drink anywhere, either the traffic itself or its effects, is considered as an evidence that the law is a failure; whereas, under the license law, the same appearances, though there might be equally an infringement of the law, would not proclaim it to be such. It would not be a proclamation of the failure of the license law if some one were seen drunk, whereas if some one is seen drunk after a prohibitory law, the whole county hears of it.

29729. That is to say, that a man now may have a quantity of liquor on his premises which is smuggled, but since importation is allowed, that is not noticed; whereas, under prohibition, if liquor is found, it is *prima facie* evidence that it is smuggled?—Yes, so far as smuggling is concerned.

*By the Chairman :*

29730. That would not be the case in the event of the importation for private purposes being allowed under the system which you advocate?—The importation for private purposes would complicate the thing a little.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29731. I think you are President of the Quebec Branch of the Dominion Alliance? Has the Alliance a platform, which says that it is desirable to prevent the manufacture and importation, with a qualification for private use?—That is the form of it.

29732. Is that the prohibition that we understand you favour, Mr. Dougall?—I do not differ with the platform of the Alliance in any respect that I know of. The phrase used is a general phrase with regard to the traffic in liquor. It desires the total abolition of the liquor traffic.

29733. Is this the position: that the Alliance and prohibitionists generally, whatever difference of opinion concerning details there may be, desire the prohibition of the manufacture and importation of strong drinks for beverage purposes, and that they are not going into the question of detail as to search and that kind of thing?—Their form of resolution is to develop by degrees, as time shows what can be done and what ought to be done.

29734. The statement has been made that the Maine law permits importation by private individuals for their own use. Without discussing whether that is the proper construction or not: supposing it does permit such private importation, do you know the reason for that?—I really do not know. I presume the Maine law to be the result of a good deal of experience; and judging from the long record of votes, they know what they can do and what they have a right to do. I think that the principle on which



the Maine law was formed was, that they wanted to deal with the trade in liquor, and they wanted to avoid as far as possible legislating with regard to what a person actually consumed.

29735. Is it a fact that the State of Maine as a State has no power to prevent the importation of liquors or the importation of any other things for private use?—Possibly.

*By the Chairman :*

29736. Are we to understand, Mr. Dougall, this, or not: That you believe in a prohibitory law, prohibiting the importation of all intoxicants for beverage purposes, as well as the manufacture and sale of them within our borders?—That is what I should like to have, and that is the declaration we constantly make. We advocate in a general way the total abolition of the liquor traffic. That is what I am trying to express—as to whether we would make sumptuary laws after that, I have no opinion.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29737. For instance, you and the gentlemen who act with you are continually trying to get restriction put into the license laws of this Province, and every one you get you think is a gain? Do I understand that while doing that, you take a position in favour of the total prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale?—I do.

29738. And every degree of that you accept as a step towards the end?—Certainly. I think it is fair to say, however, that I presume there are limitations to any law that may be passed. There are uses for alcohol that have to be specified, and there have to be limitations made. As to what precise limitations would be desirable, I cannot answer here at all.

JUDGE McDONALD.—As I understand your position, it is this: That the law you would at present promote would be a law that would prevent our friend Dr. McCleod from ordering from the old country a case of wine to be brought in and used in his own house.

REV. DR. MCCLEOD.—I hope you would do that, Mr. Dougall.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29739. I understand you to say, Mr. Dougall, that you do not ask at the present time for legislation that would prevent that, but that you ask for legislation that would interfere with the traffic?—I am under the impression that I answered the question, and I gave my reason for that. I said I understood that was the form of the Maine law, which was the result of experience.

*By the Chairman :*

29740. Do you think that intemperance has increased or decreased in Montreal?—My impression is that during the last few years there has been an increase. This is only an impression.

29741. Supposing it should be considered a wise thing to continue the Scott Act, could you suggest any improvements in that law which you think would be beneficial and lead to its more efficient enforcement?—There were one or two improvements which we did suggest, but I cannot recollect them now. We desired very much that there should be efficient enforcement by the Dominion Government, the Government that enacted the law. We desired that it should feel responsible for the enforcement of it. Whether that was desirable or not, time will tell.

29742. Do you think it would be an improvement to have an absolute majority of the votes in the county vote for the Act before it was enforced?—I do not think that is called for. I think it should be upon the basis of any other law: government by the majority of the persons who vote.

29743. There is the difficulty of the municipalities expending money to enforce the law, and unless you have a majority in favour of it, probably the Municipal Councils would not care to make the necessary expenditure.—I do not know that an absolute majority of the votes is the principle of the law anywhere or of usage for any purpose.

JOHN REDPATH DOUGALL.

29744. I am speaking of those who would vote for it before it was put in force, and as to the means of ensuring its enforcement.—I understand the question ; but I do not recollect any case in which such a majority is asked for any purpose, nor do I think that there is any special call for it in this case.

29745. Do you think it would be an improvement here in Montreal in connection with the licensing system if the applicants for licenses were compelled to get the signatures of a majority of voters or householders in the polling district where they are trying to establish the trade?—I consider that it would be much more righteous, if the majority system is to rule, that a person applying for a license should be required to secure that majority.

29746. That is on the petition for a license?—Yes. The present law makes it very difficult to oppose a license.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29747. Taking such a system of total prohibition as Dr. McLeod has spoken of, that is absolutely total prohibition, do you know of any country where such a system is in force?—I think it was the case in the North-west Territories.

29748. That is the only case you know of?—Yes.

29749. But there was a permit system there?—It became a system by usage. It was only intended to be very little used.

29750. You know of no country where they have total prohibition except in the case you have instanced, the North-west?—No.

F. W. THOMAS, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29751. You are General Manager of Molson's Bank?—I am.

29752. You know the general terms of the commission under which we are sitting here, and have received a copy of the two questions which we wish to put to you?—Yes.

29753. What, in your opinion, is the effect of the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, upon the agricultural, financial, industrial, commercial, and business interests generally of the Dominion?—That is a very wide question. I would prefer some special question to which I might reply. It seems to me your questions involve an essay on each subject.

29754. My question does not apply to prohibition, but to the effect of the liquor traffic as at present conducted on the interests mentioned?—I think I ought, in justice to myself and to your Commission, to give the subject consideration, which I have not been able to do. I really think that is a very grave question. I would prefer submitting my views in writing later.

THE CHAIRMAN said the Commissioners would be very glad to receive Mr. Thomas's views in writing.

W. WEIR, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29755. You are President of the Ville Marie Bank ?—Yes.

29756. What, in your opinion, is the effect of the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, upon the agricultural, financial, commercial and business interests generally of the Dominion?—I would like to remark, before answering that question, that I had prepared a brief written statement having reference more to the effect of prohibition than to the question directly put me. This question I have not answered, because I have found it somewhat wide in its scope ; but I may say generally that my opinion is, that the liquor traffic only affects general business in so far as it takes the industrial people away from other business, whether agricultural or other business, and waste of time is a loss to the whole community. I do not see that the employment of capital in the manufacture of liquor differs very much from the employment of capital in other walks of life. But there can be no question that the evil inflicted by the immoderate use of intoxicating liquors is notorious, as regards every branch of trade and commerce, in so far as the people are taken from active pursuits in those branches, and become impoverished. They are less able to provide for their families, and to that extent create less demand for articles which would make business of all kinds more active.

29757. I am referring to the liquor traffic as at present conducted. What is your opinion on the whole subject?—It is that only so far as the immoderate use of liquor is concerned, it is injurious to the general business of the country.

29758. What would be the effect on the financial, agricultural, commercial, industrial and business interests generally and upon the revenue requirements of the Dominion and provinces and municipalities, if a law were enacted prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of liquor except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes?—On that question I would submit a short letter which I have addressed to the Commission. I may save time by reading it.

MONTREAL, January 19, 1893.

Sir JOSEPH HICKSON,

Chairman, Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic.

DEAR SIR,—Having been summoned to appear before your Commission, it may save time to put in writing, as briefly as possible, my views as to the effects of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada.

I may say at the outset that the elevation of the social condition of the community, I regard as the primary consideration, and all other interests, whether affecting trade or the public revenues, as subsidiary to it.

In this view, the over-indulgence in intoxicating liquors existing in Canada as well as in most other countries is one of the greatest obstacles to the moral and material welfare of this and other communities.

Holding these views, I have constantly aided and encouraged the advocacy of abstinence from intoxicating liquors, but have hesitated either to support or oppose the movements of those who propose by prohibitive legislation to remedy the evils of intemperance.

There are certainly grave objections to restricting the liberties of the people in matters of food, drink or clothing, even should a large majority favour such enactment ; but if a prohibitory law were put in force by a large majority in Parliament and in sympathy with only a bare majority of the people, I have great fears that the result would be demoralizing in the extreme. The Dominion of Canada borders on the United States for over three thousand miles, in nearly all of which the liquor trade, with prohibition in Canada, would prove so profitable that most extensive smuggling would be carried on, particularly as the border States, with only one or two exceptions, have no such a law. The minority who broke the law in purchasing contraband liquors against an enactment which they would consider unjust, would soon come to disregard other laws, on the principle that he who breaks one commandment breaks the whole ten.

Another point of considerable importance is worthy of consideration, in view of the efforts being made to increase immigration to this country, namely, to what extent a prohibitory law throughout Canada would deter Englishmen and Germans, who love their beer, and Scotchmen and Irishmen, who like something stronger, and Frenchmen and southern Europeans, accustomed to their wine, from making their home in Canada.

It may be said that we would get a more select class of immigrants under the circumstances ; but this is a question of fact, and I am not sufficiently acquainted with statistics to express an opinion upon the matter, not knowing to what extent the feeling upon the liquor question exists in these countries.

W. WEIR.

As regards the falling off in the public revenues, I am of opinion that any falling off in the Dominion revenues would be largely made up by an increase in other importations, but it would be likely found necessary to impose a duty on tea and coffee, now admitted free. As to the decline in the provincial revenues, that would be a more serious matter; and while the Province of Ontario might not feel the effects of a prohibitory law very severely, the Treasurer of the Province of Quebec would, at the present time, be put to his wits' end to make both ends meet.

As to the question of high or low license and the number of licenses to be granted to a district, I have no experience to guide me in expressing an opinion, but would favour a law whereby a person charged with habitual drunkenness be tried by a jury and confined, if convicted, in a reformatory with a view to his reclamation.

I may add, in conclusion, that the introduction of the temperance question into political discussions and the use made of it at general and local elections is a serious obstacle to the proper expression of opinion by the public upon other questions of importance, vital at the moment, as it is sometimes used by both political parties to promote their interests.

I would favour instead a plebiscite of the whole people, from time to time, and on a three-fourths vote in favour of prohibition would approve of the trial of a prohibitory law, although still not without doubts as to its success.

I am, yours respectfully,  
W. WEIR.

I have not referred to the municipalities, because I have no knowledge at the moment of how far they would be affected.

29758a. You say in your letter, as regards the falling off in the public revenues: "I am of the opinion that any falling off in Dominion revenues would be largely made up by an increase in other importations?"—"Duties on other importations" is what I have said.

29759. A prohibitory law would sweep away both the customs duties and the excise duties?—Yes.

29760. If, under a prohibitory law, only importations for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes were permitted, the revenue would be very small indeed, so that it would take away from the Dominion treasury a revenue of nearly seven million dollars a year?—I do not think it would be so much as that. If it were enforced, I am of opinion that a great many more people would want more medicine than they do to-day.

29761. Supposing we put the loss of revenue at \$6,500,000, which is less than the revenue derived by the Dominion Government at present, that revenue would have to be made up by the imposition of other duties or taxes?—I think not. I think if the law were enforced and really obeyed by the people, the prosperity of the country would be so much greater that the revenue derived from other articles would be increased between three million and four million dollars.

29762. That would still leave a deficiency of about three millions?—I think that coffee and tea would have to pay a duty again. They do not pay anything at present. Under any law, if the druggists were permitted to sell liquor, a very large quantity would be consumed, even if the law were pretty generally obeyed.

29763. Do you think it would be advisable to permit the druggists to sell for beverage purposes?—I think they could not help themselves, if they had a doctor's order.

29764. You think it would be an advantageous system to have them do so under cover of a prescription?—I do not, but I think it would be done all the same.

29765. And there would be considerable revenue derived in that way from the importation of liquors?—And from the manufacture of it. I suppose the manufacture would be allowed as a medicine. There is no doubt prohibition would drain our local Government's revenues for a long time.

29766. If I understand your answer, you think there would still be a revenue derived from the traffic. Liquor would be sold under the guise of a prescription for invalids, and the deficiency in the revenue might be made up by levying duties on tea and coffee?—Yes. The duty was taken off sugar two or three years ago, on account of the Americans reducing the duties, and so they cannot be reimposed without leading to smuggling.

29767. Regarding the provincial revenue of the Province of Quebec, which derives about \$600,000 a year from the issuing of licenses, and some municipalities derive a revenue in addition to that, how do you think that revenue could be replaced under a prohibitory law?—I think it would be very difficult indeed.

29768. Have you arrived, in your own mind, at any way of meeting the difficulty?—I have not given it any serious attention.

29769. Do you think that if the Dominion Parliament passed such a law, destroying the revenue of the provinces from that source, it should compensate the provinces?—I would not like to say that; but I think there would be some claim on the Dominion Government.

29770. Do you think the Provincial Governments could raise the necessary revenue by imposing a direct tax on the people, either in the shape of income tax, or a poll tax, or a tax on property?—It could be by income tax, but that would be a very unpopular and heavy tax.

29771. Would it be detrimental to the industrial and manufacturing interests of the province?—Every tax on business is a burden, and business is very heavily burdened indeed. Many of our customers engaged in manufacturing complain very much of the taxes imposed. It would be very embarrassing to any Government to raise the deficit.

29772. What effect would the prohibiting of the manufacture of liquor or reducing the manufacture to a very fractional percentage of what it is now, have upon the agricultural interests? There is a large amount of farm produce used in the making of whisky and beer?—Of course, if the farmer should sell his barley and corn elsewhere at the same prices as he does to the brewers and distillers, he would not suffer very much.

29773. Are the farmers at the present time getting as good prices for their barley as formerly?—Since the McKinley Bill was introduced in the United States, shutting them out from that market, of course the price has fallen to some extent.

29774. And is there a market for it in Great Britain?—Yes.

29775. Is it a fact that the production last year was a good deal less than in previous years?—I cannot say.

29776. There are about 1,300,000 bushels used in making beer and spirits. Do you think that the loss of a market for that quantity would improve the position of the farmers?—I think if the farmers found that it was not a remunerative crop, if the prices fell, they would simply raise another crop. A field that raises good barley will raise other crops as well. What they had on hand might suffer to some extent.

29777. Is there any other crop which they could substitute for barley?—Not that I am aware of, but they must have done so largely already, because there is not half the barley raised in Canada that used to be raised, to the best of my recollection.

29778. If they had difficulties in the past in that respect, taking away this as well as the American market would increase their difficulties in the future?—To some extent, but not very seriously. The farmers could speak better than I on that point. There is not much corn grown in Lower Canada except for feeding cattle or for ensilage purposes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29779. I think I understood you to say that you regarded the capital employed in the liquor business about the same as capital employed in any other branch?—So far as itself is concerned, yes.

29780. Do you look upon the liquor business as a producer in the same sense as any other industry?—It is a producer of an article that is saleable and finds a market the same as other articles.

29781. Do you regard the capital employed in the liquor business as contributing to the general prosperity the same as capital employed in almost every other branch of business?—Not so far as a large portion of the liquor is concerned. So far as liquor is used beyond moderation, it is a waste and injurious.

29782. Have you observed whether the absorption of so much capital in the liquor business is in any degree injurious to other industries?—I think not to any extent. The trouble with us now—and the large banks will speak more fully on that point than I can—is that there is too much capital for the enterprises in the country. But in so far as the money spent on liquor shuts it out from other enterprises, it is a constant waste, and in so far as the people are impoverished by it and rendered unable to purchase articles of necessity and of luxury that would stimulate other branches of business, it is injurious.

W. WEIR.

29783. A large portion of the money spent in the purchase of liquors is so much withdrawn from the volume of wealth?—Yes, but not from the volume of actual business.

29784. Other branches of business suffer in consequence?—A good deal.

29785. Speaking about provincial revenues: there are in Montreal about 460 saloons. They would sell on an average \$20 each per day. That would be some \$2,879,000 in a year. That does not include the illicit sale. Do you think it pays the provincial authorities to authorize the expenditure of about three million dollars per annum for the sake of getting some \$500,000 or \$600,000 revenue?—I did not know that the Provincial Government could pass a prohibitory law.

29786. I think they cannot. But looking at it from the point of view of a business man, is it a business-like transaction?—You say there are three million dollars worth of liquor consumed. I do not think it can be called wasted. In that sense, we all live more extravagantly than we ought. We eat and drink more, and in many ways spend millions of dollars that we might avoid; but all this gives employment to people, and unless it leads to drunkenness and other crimes, I do not think that a little extravagance is a very bad thing. Otherwise there would be an accumulation of all kinds of products of toil and every article of luxury would accumulate to such an extent that there would be no work for anybody.

29787. We are not to understand you to the extent of saying that in order to avoid this state of things, it is right to encourage the use of intoxicating liquors?—Not to encourage the abuse.

29788. What is the difference between abuse and use?—I know that in Scotland they say that a man is not drunk even when he has to hold on to a lamp post to keep from falling, so long as he can stand. In other places, they say that a man ought to be able to walk without holding on to anything. I think that even men who may be sober often abuse liquor, as they may do other things; but I do not know that those who think well of taking a glass of ale or wine or toddy at night can be charged with indulging in the abuse of liquor, so long as it is not an injury to their health and they keep sober. But I think in the case of many poor people who have families to support, every dollar they spend on liquor is an abuse, because it is not necessary, as a rule, to their welfare and health and comfort; but when you come to people with ample means, the case is different. If any one injures his health and indulges to excess, he is committing an abuse, no matter whether he be rich or poor.

29789. As a business man, do you regard that indulgence on the part of the poor people as an abuse?—I think when the poor man spends 10 cents on liquor, it is an injury to every other business, because very often his children will have to go without clothes or shoes and schooling.

29790. You referred to the elevation of the social condition of the people. Do you believe that generally total abstinence would improve social conditions?—Yes, I signed the pledge when 14 years of age, and for 25 years never drank any, although I lived at one time in a distillery and had charge of it for nearly two years. I have always encouraged perfect abstinence from intoxicating liquors. Personally I have never been the worse of liquor.

29791. I think you expressed yourself as favouring a plebiscite?—Yes, to test public opinion.

29792. And you think that if three-fourths of the people were to favour prohibition, you would try the experiment?—I would support it, yes.

*By the Chairman:*

29793. Do you look upon the expenditure of \$3,000,000 in drink any more than a mere exchange of money from one to another?—What is collected in duties is not wasted, as a matter of course, since it contributes to the support of the Government; but a large part of the remaining portion of the \$3,000,000 ought to go to provide for the food and clothing and education of the families of mechanics and others, who probably make up one-half the amount of the \$3,000,000, and to that extent it is worse than wasted. It is misapplied.

29794. Do you consider the country any poorer or richer by the expenditure of that money?—I consider the country poorer to this extent, that instead of the children

being clothed and educated, they are naked and half starved ; I refer to the children of those whose parents indulge in intoxicating liquors to excess.

29795. Are there not, on the other hand, some made richer by it ?—Undoubtedly the manufacturers profit by it, but my belief is that the same amount of capital employed in other enterprises would be equally profitable or nearly so.

29796. Equally profitable ?—I think so.

29797. Then it would not be more profitable if employed in purchasing clothing and shoes and articles of that kind. Is that what you mean ?—No, I am speaking now of the capitalist. I think the capitalist could employ his capital elsewhere ; but when speaking of clothing, &c., that is simply a question of economics. I was asked whether the country was being impoverished, and I say that it is to the extent that families are inadequately fed and clothed.

29798. When you say it would be equally profitable, do you mean that the investment of capital in other branches of business would be equally profitable to the capitalists ?—Yes.

29799. And would be more profitable to other classes ?—It would be more profitable to the families of the poor men who spend their money on liquor.

29800. Is the community richer or poorer by the expenditure of these three million dollars ?—Poorer undoubtedly.

29801. Is it not a transfer from one to another ?—When you speak of the community you take the whole, and if you have one child well clothed, and another naked, the community is not as rich as if both were well clothed. The community would be richer if all were well clothed, and if parents did not, in some cases, drink up their income.

29802. The Province of Quebec, which gets about \$600,000 out of this traffic, would be poorer if that expenditure did not take place ?—Undoubtedly the Government would be very much embarrassed at present.

29803. And the whole community, if the sale of liquor went on without license, would be no better off ?—No, it would be worse off.

29804. You answered the question put by my colleague, Dr. McLeod, about taking the general vote, by saying that you thought if three-fourths of the voters were in favour of a prohibitory law you would have it enacted ?—I would be willing to try it ; but, as I said, I would still have some doubts of its successful enforcement. I would not pass any prohibitory law on a bare majority of either the House or the country.

29805. Would a vote taken on the question as to whether there should or should not be a prohibitory law, and answered in favour of prohibition, be decisive. Other questions which arise at the time of general elections frequently overshadow a question of this kind, and men are not returned on the question of prohibition but on some other ?—If the constitution provided that such a law would have to be enacted the moment three-fourths of the votes would be favourable to it, no other question would give the Government a reason for withdrawing from it.

29806. What do you mean by saying if the constitution provided ?—I mean a provision that if three-fourths of the votes of the people supported such a law, it would be law immediately.

29807. You would require an Act to be passed ?—I would be willing that a majority in Parliament should pass an Act of that kind, but not to enact the law itself. Let them enact a law providing that when three-fourths of the people favour prohibition it would be law, and then there would be a chance of success.

29808. You know there is a very large amount of capital invested at present in the manufacture of liquor. Do you think that if a prohibitory Act were passed, any compensation should be given to those whose business would be destroyed, and to what extent do you think compensation, if any, should be made ?—I think that any lawful enterprise destroyed by the action of the Government would be entitled to compensation ; that is those engaged in a lawful enterprise would be entitled to compensation, in the event of a prohibitory law destroying their business. I am not prepared to say to what extent, because there are many details connected with that trade question. If a law were enacted to go into effect three or four years from the time of its enactment, it would give time to enable those in possession of a stock of liquor to dispose of it, either by shipping

it to other countries, or allowing it to be consumed partly as medicine and partly for mechanical purposes, such as methylated spirits; but I certainly think that the Government should, in all fairness, be bound to give fair compensation to those whose property was destroyed by Act of Parliament.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29809. You speak of a three-fourths majority and of the sentiments of the people being evidenced by a three-fourths majority. Do you in that case mean a three-fourths majority of those entitled to vote or simply of those who chose to come to poll their votes?—I think the proper electors of the country.

29810. It is generally found there is quite a large number of the people who show no preference one way or the other, but yet they will help to swell the total electorate. Would you require three-fourths of those entitled to vote?—I think that would be the fairer way. I have not thought of it.

29811. The nearest counties in Ontario to your province are Stormont and Glengarry?—Yes.

29812. In 1885 there was a popular vote taken on the Scott Act in those counties, and they voted in favour of it 4,590, and against it 2,884, a majority of 1,705 in its favour. That Act remained in force for three years before there was an opportunity to vote again upon it. At the end of that time, a vote was taken, and there were 3,155 votes to retain the Act and 5,298 to repeal it. In other words, there was a majority against it of 2,143. I understood you to say that if such an enactment was passed, you would have it made a part of the constitution, not dependent afterwards upon a change of sentiment?—It would not do to make it everlasting.

29813. Do you know of any country in the world in which there exists complete prohibition?—I do not.

29814. Then the trial of it in Canada would be an experiment?—Yes.

29815. Would it be wise to make a law of that kind, which would be an experiment, an unchangeable one?—No, I think if we had the right to amend the constitution once, we could amend it again. But with regard to these changes, there is a vast difference between those of a country and those of a county, and I always doubted the wisdom of the Scott Act or any other local Act for this reason. If you have in one county a local prohibitory law in force, and in the adjoining county a license to sell, people wanting liquor will spend their money in the adjoining county. The consequence is that a large number of people in the prohibitory county find out that they are simply providing customers for other counties and depriving their own people of the business. That is one reason why in some counties prohibition was done away with. If I lived in any one county, I would oppose a prohibitory law in that county, if liquor was allowed to be sold in counties surrounding it, because it would be simply taking away business from my own county and transferring it to others. I have dealt with this in my letter. What would apply to a county, would apply to this Dominion and the adjoining country, with a frontier line of three thousand miles.

29816. If you had with you the feeling of the people with regard to this liquor question, would it be possible to police these three thousand miles and keep out liquor?—No, not as long as the desire for it continued. I have always said that the first step towards success in removing the abuse of liquor was to have a strong public sentiment against it. We have seven branches of our bank in different parts of the country, and I come in contact with French people more than English or Scotch or any other nation, and the French people, as a rule, are a sober people, not given to over-indulgence in drink. They all drink more or less, they take a little whisky occasionally, but they do not drink to any excess. But there are very few total abstainers among them, notwithstanding the fact that the Curés use their influence to make them such. The great bulk of them take their liquor but not to excess, and I think, particularly along the border, it would be impossible to stop them drinking.

29817. You have spoken of isolated counties having prohibition, surrounded by others which have not. Do you not know that in Ontario there are groups or blocks of counties which carried the Scott Act over a very large area?—I am not aware of that.



29818. And every county in Ontario which had the Scott Act has repealed it?— I know that a number of years ago, I had occasion to spend a good deal of time there when removing American silver. I stopped at taverns here and there, and found there was a good deal more drinking there than in Lower Canada.

29819. You are not in a position to say, from personal knowledge, why the Scott Act was repealed. You have not been in places where it was repealed?—No, but I am old enough to remember when I was a boy ten years of age, some sixty years ago, seeing men coming down from the highlands in Scotland, and selling whisky to the farmers, which they had to conceal about their persons in bladders.

M. J. A. PRENDERGAST, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

29820. You are Manager of the Bank of Hochelaga?—Yes.

29821. How long have you occupied your present position?—Six years.

29822. You understand the scope of this inquiry from the questions which have been sent to you?—I must say I have had very little time to devote to the study of the questions, although I think I understand them. I can give impressions rather than the results of actual study.

29823. What, in your opinion, is the effect of the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, on the agricultural, industrial, financial, commercial and business interests of the Dominion?—As at present conducted, I believe it is injurious to the general interests of the country.

29824. Have you thought out any change which would rid it of its objectionable features?—I would make a distinction between wines and spirits, because I do not believe that the consumption of wine is injurious to the same extent as that of spirits. I have observed that in countries where quantities of wine are taken, drunkenness is very rare.

29825. How do you classify beer, between the two?—I would put beer with wines. I would not prohibit to the same extent the traffic of wines and beer as that of spirits.

29826. I was referring to changes in the existing system. You think that wines and beer should be put on a different footing to distilled liquors?—Yes.

29827. In what sense should they be treated differently?—The duty at present on imported wine is very heavy. My humble opinion is that if the duty were lessened on light wines, that would prevent, to some extent, the great consumption of strong spirits. I may be mistaken, but that is my impression; and I have observed that in countries where wine is taken, drunkenness is not found to the extent it is in other countries.

29828. You think lighter charges should be put, in the shape of duties and excise, on beer and wine than now exist?—Yes; both in excise and duty.

29829. Is there anything else you consider objectionable in the liquor traffic as at present conducted?—Take the laws regulating the manufacture and sale of spirits. They seem to tend to place a monopoly of the trade in the hands of a few, and a monopoly I look upon as an evil. I do not mean to say that the distilling of spirits should be made general; but I take it as it is, and I think that, apart from the injury it inflicts upon the country in the abuse of strong liquor, there is another abuse from the liquor traffic as at present conducted. This last law, for instance, forbidding the putting of certain spirits on the market before they have been a certain number of years in storage, has tended to place a monopoly of the business in the hands of three or four, which is a bad thing.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29830. Do you think that the retention of liquor for two years tends to the purity of the liquor and, therefore, to the health of the people, or is it simply to the interest of the large distillers?—I should rather feel disposed to think in the latter sense.

W. WEIR.

*By the Chairman :*

29831. You think the present law has a tendency to create a monopoly?—Yes; that is one of the evils.

29832. Do you think the granting of more licenses than are actually required has a demoralizing effect on the people?—It creates more opportunities for the poor people to obtain liquor, and is consequently injurious.

29833. Have you considered how a monopoly in manufacture could be avoided?—Any prohibitory law against the manufacture of spirits would certainly have the beneficial effect of breaking up the monopolies that exist to-day.

29834. That would be clearing them away altogether?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29835. We had evidence given us, as far away as Vancouver, in British Columbia, on that very question, by officials and specialists, to the effect that the tendency of the present regulations, owing to the long time that the spirits had to be kept, requiring so much capital in the business, was practically to put distilling in the hands of a few people?—Yes.

29836. The result being the refinement of the liquor and the getting rid of the fusel-oil, thus making the liquor better. Do you mean to say that you would prefer having more people make it and place crude spirits on the market, or would you prefer leaving it in the hands of the few and having purer liquor?—I do not mean that.

*By the Chairman :*

29837. You look upon the concentration in a few hands as creating a monopoly, which is objectionable on principle?—Yes.

29838. Could you prevent that without abolishing the system altogether?—The suggestion I made just now, favouring the importation of light wines, I think, would prevent to some extent the demand for strong drinks.

29839. But you have no suggestion to make in the way of regulation or enactment that would tend to prevent the monopoly which you think an evil?—Nothing but prohibition. Prohibition would have, I think, that beneficial effect.

29840. The ostensible reason for keeping liquor a certain period was to get rid of the fusel-oil and the objectionable ingredients in it. Do you think that unnecessary or undesirable?—I do not. I would not take it upon myself to contradict the opinion of people who know more than I do on the matter. But that may be a good point in favour of those who were asking for that provision. It may have been an excellent reason for asking it. There may have been other motives, I do not know; at all events, it has had the effect of killing competition in that line, but I do not say that competition was desirable.

29841. You have no suggestion, short of the entire destruction of the manufacture, to remedy that state of things?—With the exception of importing light wines.

29842. Do you think there are too many licenses?—Yes.

29843. To what do you attribute the issuing of the excessive number of licenses existing in Montreal?—In the first place, to municipal politics, and to a great many other causes you cannot very well define, but which you know.

29844. Do you think that the necessity for the province and municipalities to raise a revenue has anything to do with it?—I believe the evil comes more from private interests. For instance, a party who wants to conciliate certain influences in the ward will encourage the issuing of licenses, because he will have an active agent in the person who sells the liquor.

29845. If I understand you rightly, it is mainly due to municipal and provincial politics?—To a certain extent, if not mainly. It is one of the causes of the evil.

29846. What, in your opinion, would be the effect on the financial, agricultural, commercial, industrial, and business interests generally and upon the revenue requirements of the Dominion, provinces, and municipalities, of the enactment of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, of all intoxicants?—In answering that question, I would

make the same distinction that I made just now. I would not include light wines and beers with strong spirits. A law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of spirits would, I believe, have a beneficial effect on all interests, particularly if light wines were imported in their stead. It would create a new industry in the country, and incite farmers and vine growers to put more of their capital and energy into this industry; and I believe the whole community would benefit by that, as well as by the increased duties and excise collected on the importation and manufacture of light wines. And I think that the decrease of the evil effects arising out of drunkenness would be felt very beneficially in every branch of the trade.

29847. Do you include beer in your answer?—I believe beer is nearer to strong drinks than light wines, but still I consider it less injurious than spirits.

29848. Would you encourage the importation of beer?—I do not think it requires to be encouraged. The local brewers can furnish all that is required.

29849. Would you prohibit it?—I would not like to venture an opinion on beer. I really have not considered that sufficiently, but I would not place it among the spirits.

29850. Would you prohibit it?—I rather think I would not, because I consider beer and wines contain nourishment, while spirits do not.

29851. What effect would the enactment of such a prohibitory law as you speak of have on the revenue of the Dominion?—I partly answered that question when I said that the development of the wine industry would enable the Dominion Government to create new sources of revenue from excise on manufactured wines and duties on imports.

29852. Would it fully replace the present revenue of \$6,500,000?—That is more than I could say. I think it eventually would. At first there would certainly be a deficit.

29853. How do you think the Government could raise the difference?—What other duties should be imposed?—One part of it would be made up to a certain extent by the increased excise and customs duties on spirituous liquors to be used for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29854. I understood you to say that you would increase the duties on beers and wines, and the greater quantity of beers and wines coming in would bring about an equilibrium?—To a certain extent.

*By the Chairman:*

29855. There would still be a deficit, at any rate for some years?—I would leave that point to be settled by political men, who have thoroughly studied the needs of the country.

29856. You have not thought of a tax which it would be advantageous to impose in order to raise the revenue required?—I have thought that a part might be levied from tea and coffee, as Mr. Weir said just now.

29857. Coming to the Provincial Governments, do you know that they raise large revenues from the issue of licenses, about \$1,300,000?—Yes.

29858. Under your suggestion, there would be a loss in the revenue now received by the Provinces from the issue of licenses, as it would be impracticable to collect the large amount from licenses for the sale of wines and beers only, which you now get from licenses for the sale of spirits as well?—There probably would be a large deficit.

29859. How do you think that deficit could be made up?—Politicians would probably object to that, but I would rather see direct taxation.

29860. Have you thought out the question of compensating those whose business would be destroyed?—I have not, but I think it would be only fair.

29861. What kind of direct taxation would you think the most desirable and likely to meet with the most general approbation?—I see nothing more equitable than income tax.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29862. Did you express your opinion as to the possibility of enforcing a prohibitory law? Do you think practically it could be enforced in such a country as Canada?—

M. J. A. PRENDERGAST.

Judging by the effect produced in the States, so far as I have heard, it is very doubtful whether prohibition would have, to any extent, the effect expected.

29863. My question was framed with the idea of total prohibition. Was it on that you spoke?—Yes.

29864. Would you hope with such a modified form of prohibition as you favour, that is the encouragement of light wines to a certain extent and of ales, to do away with spirits: would that form of prohibition commend itself more to the people and be more easily enforced?—Not only commend itself more to the people, but I thought it was the only feasible scheme.

29865. You do not consider total prohibition practicable?—I do not. I am not opposed to it on principle.

29866. But if the plan you suggested of encouraging the use of light wines could be carried out, do you think that would have the effect of greatly diminishing the call for distilled liquors?—Yes.

29867. Would you hope that, as the tastes of the people became educated more and more to use light wines, there would be still less call for distilled liquors?—I do. I have noticed that myself in France and Italy. A friend of mine to whom I was speaking this afternoon, an English Canadian, who has been in France occasionally, told me he was astonished to find that he hardly met a drunken man in France. The people there partake of their wine in moderation. I have seen the same thing in Italy and France.

29868. Did you find there that wine was used as the ordinary drink of the people at table, I mean these light wines?—Yes, and very seldom, if ever, was wine sold without bread. A traveller would go into a wine shop, and would very seldom ask for wine alone; he would usually ask for wine and bread.

HENRI BARBEAU, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

29869. You are the Manager of the City and District Savings Bank?—Yes.

29870. An institution which handles very large sums of money annually?—Yes.

29871. You received a communication from me containing certain questions to be put to you by the Commission?—Yes.

29872. There were two main questions we wish to ask; you have, I hope, considered both of them. If so, we are prepared to hear you?—I will not venture to interfere with the Government's statistics, as I doubt very much whether I could discuss figures in a way worthy of this honourable Commission. I leave that task to able economists. However, having lived among the French-Canadian farmers for years, and carried on the liquor business at first in my native village and afterwards in St. Hyacinthe, where I remained from 1858 to 1871, I can say that the liquor traffic is not so detrimental to agricultural and industrial success as some people claim. I have not seen a great abuse of strong liquor among the farmers, who require the use of it during the very cold season, as well as during the harvest time. The evil lies in the large number of taverns and saloons, where the farmers and factory people stop and consume a great deal too much intoxicant previous to their reaching home. I have not marked either a great abuse of strong drink at the homes of the farmers, as their wives and children would be a check; but in many instances, farmers, who leave their homes on business and remain all day at the village tavern, imbibe too freely and return to their homes in a state of intoxication. As an example, I would state that at Laprairie, where I pass my summers, a small and humble village, which, however, has seen brighter days, there are as many as eight taverns, where three or four would amply supply the local wants. Very often on entering such places, one can see or hear persons closeted and playing cards for money or drinks. The selling of strong drinks should never be allowed on any ferry boat, at least where meals are not served on board. My remarks may be applied

to towns and cities, and the great evil lies in the unnecessary large number of saloons and taverns. Let the proper authorities reduce the number, and charge very high licenses, and a change for the better will be the result.

29873. Your depositors in the Savings Bank are largely of the working class?—Mostly.

29874. How many have you?—Nearly 50,000 depositors.

29875. Has there been a large increase during late years?—Yes.

29876. You have been connected with the bank for a long time?—For fifteen years.

29877. There has been in that time a very large increase?—A continual increase, though we have every kind of opposition; still we increased over half a million dollars this year. We only pay three per cent.

29878. You have a custom, I believe, of distributing so much money annually to charitable institutions in the city?—Yes.

29879. How much?—\$10,800. It is the interest on \$180,000 which was left by the founders of the institution when it became chartered. The institution worked for a number of years without a charter, and then, when it was chartered, there was a surplus, which the then directors placed in municipal debentures, the interest to be distributed yearly to the poor of Montreal. The principal is invested in municipal bonds controlled by the Treasury Board at Ottawa. When one expires we submit another, which is declined or accepted, and the amount has to remain always the same. Supposing the bank should go into liquidation, this would have nothing to do with it. It is controlled by the Treasury Board, and is merely mentioned in our books as book-keeping entries.

29880. How is the amount divided among the different institutions?—Those institutions for the poor must be chartered. Every decade the distribution changes, because there are new institutions. The amount to be given to any one institution is not fixed.

29881. Is the matter not settled with regard to the number of depositors of any particular denomination?—Well, the amount is divided into classes. There is the English Protestant, the Hebrew, the Irish Catholic and the French-Canadian. It is divided according to population and number of depositors. We keep statistics of the proportions, so many French speaking and so many English speaking.

29882. And so many Roman Catholics and so many Protestants?—No, we just divide between the two nationalities.

29883. You have not said a great deal with respect to the agricultural, commercial, industrial, financial and business interests of the country. Do you think these are prejudicially affected by the liquor traffic as at present conducted?—I do not think they are.

29884. Then, coming to the second question, which refers to prohibition. Prohibition, as described in the question, would have the effect of almost wiping out the very large revenue which the Dominion at present receives from duties and excise upon wines and liquors. It would not entirely wipe out the revenue, because there would be something received from importations for medical, mechanical and sacramental purposes. The amount received is from \$6,000,000 to \$6,500,000. Do you think it would be necessary to raise that sum by taxing heavily something else?—I do not think it can be done very easily.

29885. Would it be necessary to replace that revenue?—Certainly, the country is not prepared to do without it.

29886. Have you given any consideration as to how that amount might be raised, what taxes might be imposed to replace that revenue?—I think it would be to the detriment of other trades.

29887. Coming to the provinces: they would, of course, lose a large revenue if there were no licenses issued. Do you think they could afford to lose that without imposing taxes in some other direction?—No, the Province of Quebec could not.

29888. From what other source could the provinces raise that revenue?—Direct taxation is the only thing.

29889. Do you think that would be popular in Quebec?—No.

29890. Is it practicable?—I think so. If they could know to what extent they would be taxed they would understand. A farmer whose farm is worth \$1,000 or \$2,000 ought to know to what extent he would be taxed.

HENRI BARBEAU.

29891. You are referring to a tax on property?—Yes.

29892. Do you think that the Legislature of the Province of Quebec would be willing to impose a tax upon property which would raise a revenue of \$600,000 a year to replace the revenue lost by the abolition of the liquor traffic?—They would be disposed to do it, but I do not think they could carry it out.

29893. Do you think it would be advisable to wipe out that revenue of \$600,000 from licenses and impose some other tax?—No, I do not think we are prepared for that.

29894. Do you think the population would agree to it, and support the members who would vote for a change of that kind?—They would not.

29895. What effect, do you think, a law such as is referred to in the second question on the paper sent you, would have on the agricultural, industrial, commercial, financial and business interests of the country. Would it disturb trade? Would it disturb financial operations either temporarily or permanently?—I think it would disturb them very much indeed.

29896. And affect those interests injuriously?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29897. In case of the enactment of a prohibitory law, preventing the manufacture of liquor, would you deem it right that the brewers and distillers should be remunerated for their loss of plant and machinery?—Yes, anything that would be detrimental to an existing industry legally established should not be enacted without compensation to those interested.

29898. Have you any knowledge of the Dominion, outside of the Province of Quebec?—No, not much.

29899. From your knowledge of the Province of Quebec do you believe, if a prohibitory law were passed, it could be effectively enforced, so as to prevent people getting liquor?—It could not.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29900. What classes of people, for the most part, have deposits in your bank?—I cannot say that it is the poorest class. With the Irish people it is in many instances; but the French Canadians will only open an account when they have a certain amount to begin with. They are not so disposed as the Irish people are to begin with a trifle.

29901. And after that, they add small amounts?—Yes.

29902. Have you observed whether you have many depositors who are habitual drunkards?—In some cases we have had complaints, but not in general. We have cases of people complaining and telling us: Do not pay that money to my husband or *vice versa* because of drink. Of course if he comes in possessed of his mental faculties and bank book, we cannot refuse; but those are only exceptions.

29903. Have you cases of wives, who have made deposits, cautioning you about letting their husbands get the money?—Yes.

29904. Have you any cases of husbands cautioning you against their wives drawing money?—Not many, but the wives like to hide the fact that they make deposits sometimes. They do not like the husbands to know it.

*By the Chairman:*

29905. If a wife deposits in her own name, would the money be paid to any one but herself?—In our charter it is specified that married women and minors can deposit as high as two thousand dollars without consent of their husbands or tutors, and it is therefore under their own control.

29906. You do not pay out money to the wife of the depositor without his order?—If it is not beyond the amount of \$2,000, we do not recognize the husband. A married woman has a right to deposit up to two thousand dollars without the assistance of the husband.

29907. Speaking of husbands having money deposited in the bank, you would not pay that to the wife without his order?—No, he is the head of the community.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29908. Have you observed whether the drinking habits of the people interfere with their savings?—I have not.

*By the Chairman :*

29909. I am aware that you are well acquainted with Montreal. Do you think that intemperance is on the decrease or increase in late years?—I am not very well acquainted with that. I live retired in the west end.

29910. There is a large number of people continually coming to the bank?—I do not think intemperance is increasing. Of course population has increased, and I think it is in about the same proportion.

29911. Is it your opinion that the license law is well enforced in the city?—I would like to see the number of saloons reduced and the price of licenses increased.

29912. Is there any class of licensed places which you think ought to be abolished altogether?—It could not be abolished altogether; I do not think it is practicable.

29913. The Commissioners could refuse to grant licenses to a certain number of places?—Those low saloons could be reduced and ought to be reduced.

29914. Would any harm arise if they were entirely wiped out?—I do not think that is practicable.

29915. But would you reduce the number?—Yes.

29916. You are referring to places where they simply sell liquor and do not provide meals?—Yes.

29917. What about the sale of liquor in groceries. Is it desirable that groceries should be licensed to sell liquor?—As long as it is not less than three half pints or a pint, I do not see any harm.

29918. Do you think it would be advantageous to separate the liquor business altogether from the sale of groceries?—No.

29919. Do you think it is practicable to do away with hotel bars entirely?—No.

29920. What are your grounds for entertaining the opinion that the number of saloons should be reduced?—If they were reduced, the city would be improved. When a man has not got keen opposition near by, he respects himself and only admits to his bar people in possession of their mental faculties, at all events.

29921. Montreal has about nine hundred and fifty licensed places for the sale of liquor, and its population is about two hundred and twenty-five thousand. That is one license to about two hundred and thirty of a population. Toronto has one license to about eight hundred and sixty of a population. Does any reason occur to you why Montreal should be so prodigal in the issue of licenses?—No reason. They should be reduced in number, certainly.

29922. Does any reason occur to you why that state of things comes to exist now? Have the financial interests of the province anything to do with it?—Yes, certainly. But it is more pardonable for the province than for the city of Montreal, because the city can do without it, and the province is forced to do things that would not be done if it were in better financial condition.

29923. I think that the city authorities have under the present law no control over the issuing of licenses. There are three Commissioners named in the license law, two Police Magistrates and the Recorder. They do not act under instructions of the city, nor do they owe their appointment to the city?—As Commissioners, certainly not.

29924. Therefore the city can hardly be considered censurable for the large number of licenses at present existing. Do you think it would be advantageous to give the control of the issuing of licenses entirely to the City Council?—No, I do not approve of that.

29925. Is it possible to work a reform in the matter of issuing licenses except through the Provincial Government?—If you have proper Commissioners, I would prefer it.

29926. Perhaps the Commissioners might desire a reduction of licenses, but the Quebec Government owing to its financial necessities might be unwilling to have such a reduction made?—Yes, it might.

HENRI BARBEAU.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29927. Have you noticed whether the liquor trade has not an evil effect as it exists?—There are exceptions; but generally, I do not think it has.

29928. If the liquor trade has no very marked evil effect, why would you reduce the number of places where liquor is sold?—Because it would prevent the occasion for drinking being so frequent.

29929. Do you believe that the large number of places offers inducements to people to drink?—Yes; the greater the number of saloons the greater the temptation.

29930. Then the establishment creates business for itself?—Yes.

29931. Then there is not a demand for all these places, but all these places make the demand?—They do make trade, but there is certainly not demand for them all.

*By the Chairman :*

29932. A great number of them increases the occasion for those who are disposed to abuse liquor?—Certainly.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29933. Is there not an evil of this kind connected with the great number of places in Montreal, that the *clientèle* of those places must be limited? There are only so many people to be served?—Yes.

29934. The greater the number the more inducement to those in the trade to press their wares on the people?—Exactly.

29935. And the prices being generally uniform, they are more likely to have cheap vile compounds served out?—Yes.

29936. That is an evil which results from too many saloons?—Yes.

29937. You mentioned that the increase which had taken place in your deposits was about one-half million last year?—Yes.

29938. The year before, was there also an increase?—Yes.

29939. Year by year the deposits have been growing?—Yes.

29940. And last year the amount was how much?—I think we had eight and a half millions, very nearly nine millions; being an increase of about one-half million in the last year.

29941. Those are mainly the earnings of the people?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29942. Has the increase been in proportion to the increase in population, or has your increase been out of proportion to the increase in population?—Well, the bank certainly offers inducements to the people to acquire the habit of making deposits. The bank has branches all through the city.

29943. If a man once has a deposit there, he is ambitious to keep on increasing it?—Of course.

*By the Chairman :*

29944. How many savings banks, besides your own, are there in the city?—Ours is the only one governed by a special charter. All the other banks have branches for savings.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29945. From the statistics of the other banks, have their deposits also been increasing?—Yes.



WALTER PAUL, of Montreal, grocer, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29946. How long have you been a resident of Montreal?—Over twenty-five years.

29947. And you have been connected with the grocery trade pretty nearly all the time?—All the time.

29948. And you are carrying on a very large grocery business in St. Catherine Street?—Yes.

29949. I believe you do not sell intoxicating drinks of any kind?—Not of any kind.

29950. Yours is entirely a grocery business?—Yes, conducted on temperance principles.

29951. You have for many years taken part in temperance work in the city?—About 18 years.

29952. You are a member of the Dominion Alliance?—I am one of the Executive of the Dominion Alliance. I do not attend very often, but have been a great number of years on the Executive.

29953. You are also on the Executive of the Law and Order League?—Not now. I was at one time, but have not the time to give to it.

29954. Is there any other temperance organization with which you are connected?—I am not officially connected with any, unless the organizations connected with our own congregation.

29955. That is Knox?—Yes, I was a director of the Young Men's Christian Association for 14 years, and was allowed to drop off last year.

29956. We would be pleased to hear any statement you would like to make to the Commission?—I have not any written statement to give, nor did I intend to come here at all. I have been interested, of course, in the Commission from its appointment. The reason I stayed here this afternoon was to see, in a general way, how the Commission was doing its business and the nature of the questions put. Of course, I differ from some of the gentlemen who have given evidence. If you were to ask me, as you have asked these gentlemen, my opinion as to the effect of the liquor traffic in the countries you have mentioned, I should say it has a very detrimental effect. I admit that I am classed among those you call extreme, while among temperance workers I did not consider myself an extremist at all, because there are others more extreme than I. Whilst I recognize the difficulties that surround the carrying out of a prohibitory measure, I am not prepared to say it is an impossibility. I acknowledge there are a great many difficulties in the way, but I hope that the time is not distant when the country will be educated sufficiently to cause those difficulties, in a great measure, to disappear. I take the opportunity of saying now that that is one reason why I did not join my brethren on the Alliance in condemning the appointment of this Commission, because I believe that, at any rate, it will be a means of education, going as it will, over the whole Dominion and thereby exciting interest in this question, and it will have a good effect on the country if properly carried out. By the questions and answers which this Commission brings out, the whole matter will be put in a clearer light. I believe that liquor, taking the effect on the individual, is evil; and what detrimentally affects the individual is bound to detrimentally affect the community in a proportionate measure. If it destroys the prosperity of the individual in his family affairs, and the bringing up of his family, and educating them, and all that sort of thing, it must injuriously affect the community. On the other hand, if the effect of prohibition or the effect of temperance on the individual is the contrary, should not the whole community share proportionately in this beneficial result? A law abiding and sober community must undoubtedly be a prosperous one. With regard to the question of revenue, I was able some years ago to take more active interest in attending the meetings of the Dominion Alliance; and I remember well, when in Ottawa some years ago, when Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister, his statement that the question of revenue was not such an important one as

WALTER PAUL.

the Government or the people imagined. He was then Finance Minister and ought to know. Sir Leonard said there was no use taking up time in discussing that as an objection against our dealing with such a law. Of course, no sane man would pretend that it was not a most important matter, as far as the Government was concerned, in raising revenue. We must not lose sight of that fact, but we must not lose sight of the other fact, that the passing of such a law, and its operation, would lessen the expenses of the Government; because the behaviour of the people being improved, the cost of administering the law, in criminal matters especially, would be less. We will, besides, have a sober people better able to bear taxation. Sir Joseph Hickson knows that in Montreal we have a good deal of grumbling lately on the subject of taxation on the part of merchants. If the people were in better circumstances, they would be better able to stand taxation. If a workingman earning small wages spends all he earns on his family, they will not have too much for their comfort; but if three-fourths is wasted on spirituous liquors, you can easily see that that man has nothing for the tax-gatherer.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

29957. I understand you to believe that the drinking habits of the people increase the burden of taxation on those who do not drink?—Most undoubtedly, and it is felt in the community in this way: that those who live in the cities and try to behave themselves and take an interest in their churches, have their patience and finances drawn upon to an extent they cannot bear in order to help the poor. We know that 90 per cent of the cases of poverty are practically the result of drink. That you can easily see is a burthen on the community, apart from taxation. I might mention another thing to show the good that will result to the community from prohibition. Take the thousands in a city who waste their whole substance in riotous living and never can afford to have a new article of apparel of any kind. They never buy a new pair of boots or a new suit of clothes or any thing of that kind, but wear the rags and tatters that ought to be in the paper mill. If these men could buy new things, what an amount of consumption there would be for the industries of the country. With regard to the question you put to Mr. Barbeau and the remark he made blaming Montreal for the number of licenses, Montreal is not altogether to blame for that. The Government appoint Commissioners, and there are laws regulating the granting of licenses, which those of us who have been interested in keeping them down as much as possible, endeavour to have strictly carried out. We have succeeded in the upper part of the city, because of the character of the population. I went to Quebec, when in the Law and Order League, to try and have the number of licenses reduced. We went, Roman Catholics and Protestants, and there were priests with us. We had a splendid deputation. The late Finance Minister of Quebec, Mr. Shehyn, received us. We did not see the Premier. We went to get the right to limit—we thought it only a mild request—the number of licenses in Montreal, and the Finance Minister said the Government could not grant that. He used that word, which has become proverbial, that Montreal was the milch cow of the province. Nine-tenths per cent of our supporters, he said, come from the country, and they will not allow us to reduce the number of licenses, because it is there we get our revenue.

29958. A few years ago the issuing of licenses was under the control of a committee of the City Council of Montreal?—Yes.

29959. Were the results more satisfactory then?—I did not take an interest in the matter then, as I was in those years engaged in the liquor business and was not interested, at any rate, in municipal affairs; but I learned from some of the aldermen, who were aldermen then, that the City Council petitioned the Government of Quebec to take the power of granting licenses away from it. I do not know but that it was the best thing to have Commissioners appointed by the Government, but the citizens of Montreal ought to have the power of saying how many licenses should be given. At the time you refer to, the city had the power of appointing License Commissioners, and it was a matter of municipal politics and became a perfect burden, which nobody could bear. The aldermen were better without it, because they were pestered for influence to get men licenses. We did not want to return to that state of things, but wanted the power to limit the number of licenses.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29960. Is it not a fact that they were influenced by fear of losing office?—Yes.

29961. Has this point struck you : that if the sentiment of the community, upon the whole, in those districts, was opposed to licenses or any number of licenses, they would be rather apt to yield to that bulk of sentiment than to the wishes of the few people who wanted the licenses. For instance, an alderman is elected for a certain ward where there are 300 voters. The majority do not wish to have licenses, but two or three individuals want them and have some supporters. Why should those men influence him more than the majority of the electors? If the majority of the electors are opposed to licensing, they will not allow that opposition to prevent their supporting him, because a few people who want licenses will actively oppose him?—Speaking as one who has a knowledge of running municipal elections but not in the congested parts of the city, there is a great difference between the different wards of the city. Where Sir Joseph Hickson and I live, the granting of licenses has no effect whatever on any candidate running in the upper part of St. Antoine Ward ; but if you go to the east end, where the population consists of working people, every tavern-keeper is an election agent, and they control considerably the vote. They have plenty of time to attend to it, and make it their business ; and I am not prepared to say that there are not ways and means taken, in running municipal elections, which are not legal or honest, and these are the very men to use them ; whereas the bulk of the respectable people will not bother their heads in the matter, and very often do not care much for either candidate.

*By the Chairman :*

29962. You say you would like to see the people given the power to determine how many licenses should be issued in Montreal?—Yes.

29963. How would you determine that?—On the basis of population. You have given us figures that ought to astound any right thinking man. You say we have in this city 950 licenses for the sale of liquor, or an average of one license for every 230 individuals. To make these places pay, on an average, you would have to assume that every one of these 230 people would have to drink, men, women and children, because that does not give a great many customers to each place. I do not know how many it would take to make a tavern pay, but it would not be too many to make these places pay if every man, woman and child were to drink.

*By Mr. Clarke :*

29964. If you have in the upper part of the city a population who have not these places at all, when you come to make your calculation you have to make a still less number?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

29965. And the 4,000 unlicensed places?—I am not prepared to say how many there are.

29966. How would you secure power to the people?—By amendments to our charter, and I am not sure that it is not in the amendments demanded now.

29967. It is in the hands of the Provincial Government to appoint three Commissioners whose duties are prescribed by law. How are you going to ascertain the voice of the city of Montreal as to how many licenses should be issued?—You will get that at the general elections. Get the aldermen pledged that they will support only so many taverns, say one to every thousand of population. Make that a question at the polls. In the mean time we want to get the power to do that. Let the population per license be an undecided point until the question comes before the City Council.

29968. Then you would by provincial Act confer upon the people the power to determine, by vote of the population, how many licenses should be issued in the city of Montreal?—Yes ; that does not commit me to the principle or number of licenses. I am simply dealing with the state of things as it is.

29969. Would you, in addition, confer the power of adopting local option on the cities?—I would not say local option. Our polling districts give us really that local

WALTER PAUL.

option, so far as the wards are concerned. If the majority of electors in a polling district decide, when an application is made for a license, that it should not be granted, the Commissioners dare not grant it. That is really local option on a small scale.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

29970. So that if a district decides that it does not want any licenses, it will not have any?—Most undoubtedly.

*By the Chairman :*

29971. What means have the citizens got to bring their power to bear, under the present system. An applicant gets twenty-five names to his petition. How much time has he within which to get them?—I could not say, but I know that the applicant often delays until the last moment, leaving perhaps only eight or twelve days for the opposition to work in, when he has been at work for months. This man can go to any part of the ward and get his 25 men. I think he should keep within the polling district.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29972. You are a prohibitionist in principle and practice?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

29973. Do you think that a prohibitory law would have sufficient support, in the present state of public opinion, to be efficiently carried out?—The difficulty is to get at the present state of public opinion. I would like to know myself what the present state of public opinion is. I pretty much agree with Mr. Weir's opinion that if two-thirds of the people were in favour of prohibition, there ought not to be the slightest difficulty in carrying it out.

29974. A bare majority would not be sufficient to give effect to a prohibitory law?—I do not think so, for this reason: that it has been found that the regularly appointed officers of the law do not assist in helping to carry out the enforcement of temperance or prohibitory measures, and do not give that aid which the temperance people have the right to expect, and which they give to other laws.

*By Judge McDonald :*

29975. Would you have that two-thirds majority composed of those entitled to vote or only of those who do vote?—Those who record their votes.

*By the Chairman :*

29976. To what do you attribute the failure of the Scott Act in Ontario?—I am not in a position to say. I would be inclined to think it was due largely to the fact that in other countries that Act was not adopted.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, January 20th, 1893.

The Royal Commission met this day at 10 a.m., SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.  
MR. E. F. CLARKE.

REV. DR. McLEOD.  
MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

ALFRED BRUNET, Manager of La Banque Nationale, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

29977. Mr. Brunet, you received the letter and statement sent to you on behalf of the Commissioners?—Yes, I did.

29978. In my letter to you, I told you there were two questions which the Commissioners would like to put to you. I suppose you have considered them?—Yes.

29979. Would you prefer to make a statement in answer, or would you prefer that I should put the questions to you?—I have not thought of preparing a statement.

29980. What, in your opinion, is the effect of the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, on the agricultural, financial, industrial, commercial and business interests generally of the Dominion?—My opinion is, as a whole, that it is beneficial to the agricultural, financial, industrial and commercial interests of the country.

29981. Will you state your reasons for entertaining that opinion?—The liquor traffic has counted for a pretty large item in the business of the country. I think liquor is a benefit to those who do not abuse it; that is the only reason that I have to give.

29982. What, in your opinion, would be the effect upon the financial, agricultural, commercial and business interests generally and upon the revenue requirements of the Dominion, the provinces and municipalities, of the enactment of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of all intoxicants except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes?—There is no doubt in my mind that the prohibition of the liquor manufacture and the traffic would diminish considerably the revenue of the country, and would also interfere with the trade of the country, for the same reason as I mentioned in answer to the previous question, that is, that liquor being a large item in the business of the country, it would diminish the business to a certain amount.

29983. The passing of such a law would certainly reduce the revenue of the Dominion Government largely?—Yes.

29984. Has any method occurred to you by which that reduction could be replaced by taxation upon other articles, or would it have to be by a direct tax? I am always speaking, of course, with reference to trade. I am speaking of the imposition of a tax that would not interfere prejudicially with commercial, financial or agricultural interests?—In every country they have always found a way to raise money necessary for Government purposes, whether it is on liquor or something else, so that if a law prohibiting the sale of liquor were enacted by Parliament, I suppose the Government would find some other way of raising the revenue.

29985. That would be compulsory on them?—Of course, they would be obliged to do so.

29986. But has any particular plan of raising that revenue occurred to you, which could be resorted to?—I did not look for that, for the reason that I think it is for the benefit of the country that the trade should exist, with certain restrictions. If my

ALFRED BRUNET. .

view had been for prohibition, I might have looked further and tried to find a way of replacing the revenues of the Government that would be wiped off by the enactment of a law prohibiting the sale of liquor.

29987. I appreciate your answer, Mr. Brunet; but I want to ask you one or two more questions. It has been suggested here that the loss of revenue might be made up by imposing a duty on tea and coffee. Do you think that would be a desirable tax?—It seems to me it would be a mistake in that case. I would prefer to impose it on tobacco, or other articles of that kind, but not upon tea or coffee, which I consider to be necessaries of life, almost.

29988. Now, coming to the Provincial Government. Of course, here in Quebec, we know the Government derives a large revenue from the issue of licenses; I think that the revenue is about \$600,000 a year. It has been suggested that if a prohibitory law was enacted and that revenue lost to the province, the proper way of replacing it would be by putting a direct tax on all property or income. Do you think that would be a desirable tax to impose?—All taxes are not desirable. But I think that in the present position of the Provincial Government, they will have to come to that one way or the other. Of course, if we wipe off some source of revenue, the tax will have to be larger; all taxes are unpopular, there is no doubt, but they have to be suffered as they are necessary.

29989. Do you think that the people of the province would prefer a tax of that kind to the present method of raising the revenue?—Certainly not, because I am convinced that the population of the province is not in favour of prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor, but I think the majority are in favour of a strict control of such trade and manufacture.

*By Judge McDonald:*

29990. In reference to the Provincial taxes. In case the liquor license revenue, which now amounts to \$600,000 a year, were done away with, it has been suggested, as Sir Joseph Hickson has told you, that it would have to be replaced by a direct tax upon the people, and it has further been suggested that an income tax would be the best kind of direct tax for that purpose. Have you had any experience that would enable you to say whether the income tax is a satisfactory tax?—Well, in view of the present position of our finances, I, like every other citizen, have thought of this question of raising the necessary revenue for the administration of the Government of the Province. My impression is that the income tax is a proper one, because it will be levied equally on all citizens according to their means. A direct tax on real estate will only reach a certain part of the wealth of the country.

29991. That is, as you are now situated?—As we are now situated. That is, a large amount of the wealth of the country is not in real estate; it is in incorporated companies, either commercial, industrial or financial, and capital will be out of the reach of the revenue.

29992. In the case of a corporation, such as a bank, would you impose this income tax upon their dividend, and not upon their gross revenue?—Yes.

29993. In imposing that tax upon the dividend, would not that affect the amount of dividend that would be paid the stockholders residing in other parts of the country than the Province of Quebec?—Yes; but it is only fair that it should be deducted.

29994. Is not that dividend earned, to a certain extent, in the other provinces?—There is no doubt that a part of it is earned outside the Province.

29995. Why should that part of the revenue that is earned in other Provinces and which might possibly have to pay local taxation there, be further taxed to make up the revenue lost to Quebec by the enactment of a prohibitory law?—My view of imposing a tax on the dividend would be, to impose it on the dividend paid to citizens in the Province of Quebec, because I think the citizens should be taxed for the administration of the Government of the country.

29996. If it was that portion of the dividend that was payable to the citizens in the Province of Quebec, that dividend forms part of their income, and their income would be taxed equally with the corporations. So that, if the dividend payable to the

people of Quebec were first taxed, and then if the people of Quebec, as citizens, were taxed upon their incomes, they would pay twice?—Yes; but that should not be done.

29997. Those are all difficulties in which the income tax would land people?—Yes.

29998. Let the mode of taxation be what it may, you see no other course but a direct tax, if these other means of revenue which are derived from licenses are struck off?—I do not see any other. Our direct tax in the Dominion on imported goods is already pretty high.

29999. In the case of the Dominion, you see no other mode except a direct tax or an increase of duty on imported goods?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

30000. You do not recommend the abolition of the license system in Quebec, and the adoption of a direct tax to raise the revenue which would thereby be lost to the Province?—No.

HON. EDWARD MURPHY, Senator, President of the City and District Savings Bank, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

30001. Senator Murphy, are you the President of any of the temperance organizations?—I am first lay President of the St. Patrick's Temperance Society. I have been connected with it half a century.

30002. And you have been in business in Montreal all your life?—I have been in business here for sixty years.

30003. You have seen the population grow here, and you are familiar with the place? Do you think we have more intemperance now than we had ten years ago or twenty years ago; I mean proportionately of course, because there has been a large increase in the population?—We have more intemperance, I believe, than we had fifty years ago, but I think the tipping is about the same. There has not been much change in ten years, but there certainly has been in twenty or thirty years.

30004. There is more intemperance now than there was twenty years ago?—No. I think that since the facilities offered by the number of saloons have decreased, intemperance has increased.

30005. Do you think the present license system is fairly in force in the city?—I do not know that I have any experience of the working of the law. I suppose you mean the illicit saloons.

30006. Are sales by licensed vendors within prohibited hours and sales to minors taking place in the city?—I am afraid that the license law is not well enforced. I think the facilities offered by the regular licensed establishments and the shebeen houses and these corner groceries prove a great factor in the irregularities that take place,

30007. You are speaking rather as to the inefficiency of the law?—I was speaking of the enforcement of the law as it exists.

30008. Do you think it is efficiently enforced?—I think if it were strictly enforced, there would be an improvement.

30009. Then you think it is not strictly enforced?—I fear not, from what I hear.

30010. Do you think the present system of issuing licenses is satisfactory?—As far as I know, I think it is satisfactory. My opinion is, however, that there is too much liberty given by the law; and even when the law is strictly adhered to, it is not strictly enforced by the authorities.

30011. What amendment in the law would you recommend in order to bring about a reduction in the number of places vending or dealing in liquor?—The society of which I am President adopted some years ago a series of resolutions. The first was, the separation of the liquor trade from the grocery and all other business. That was considered to be the first step. From our experience in the society and from inquiries made,

ALFRED BRUNET.

we found that a woman or child will go into one of these grocery stores for a pound of tea, and she will at the same time perhaps take a bottle of liquor. They would not do that if they had to go to a tavern. Then another recommendation was, a reduction of the number of saloon and tavern licenses. There are too many of them in the city, and the increase of them during the last twenty years has been such as to increase tipping to an enormous extent. I went into business here in the thirties, and I saw that in St. Paul, Commissioners Street, and St. Francis Xavier Street, drunkenness was very open. It was not then considered a disgrace to be seen drunk. The third resolution they adopted was the enactment of a rigid system of inspection, strictly enforced, not merely for the purpose of stamping out illicit drink, but to cover analysis from time to time of all liquor sold in licensed houses under the names of wines, spirits, brandies, &c. My experience has been a curious one in that way. I never heard of such a thing as *delirium tremens* until about the fifties, because the people then drank good, pure rum imported directly from the West Indies, or the whisky of the country, which at that time was pure and properly rectified. I know I was told by a man in this city who gave up the making of whisky some years ago, that not a gallon was let out of their distilleries then that was not rectified, and they had to give that up because they could not compete with whisky distillers that did not rectify. They very well know that when the fusel-oil is left in the spirit it tends to drive men mad. In those early days, I never heard of a man going mad from drink, and therefore I think that there is great benefit in strict analysis.

30012. Did I understand you to say that at that time there was less intemperance than there is now?—There was a great deal more open drunkenness; I have seen men lying on the streets. I think there was more drinking then by drinking men, but they were not driven to insane asylums by liquor. It did them harm, but it did not make them mad.

30013. Would I be justified in inferring from your statement that the restrictions which have been thrown around the traffic have, in your opinion, only led to an increase of secret drinking?—Well, I do not know that I should say that exactly; but I say that the influence of temperance societies and moral suasion has caused it to be so that drunkenness is more of a disgrace now than it was fifty years ago.

30014. Still you think that it is rather worse to-day than it was twenty years ago?—I think so. I hold that there should be a rigid inspection of liquor; and that is an opinion based on the experience of a man who is seventy-four years old and has had an experience of half a century in this city. A man now gets his license under a regulation of the Provincial Government and from inspectors appointed by them, while previously the granting of licenses was regulated by a committee of the Corporation, I believe. I have not seen any evidence to show that the license system was better under that state of things than it is now.

30015. Suppose it is admitted that there are too many licenses: what course do you think should be taken in order to bring about a reduction?—That is a difficult question to answer. You would want the good-will of the Government to support the temperance cause in that action. I think that the licenses should be regulated by the number of the population.

30016. In what way do you think the law should be amended to make it more effective?—That I cannot say; but I would be very glad to lend any assistance with that object in view.

30017. Do you not think it is the demand on the part of the people to drink that leads to so many licenses being granted?—It must be, because if the people did not drink, there would not be so many; and if there was a majority in a district against a license, I believe it should not be issued.

30018. You know there is a certain district where there is only one saloon, and we had it stated to us yesterday that that was in consequence of the fact that people living in that district would certainly oppose the granting of any more. In fact, Mr. Paul stated that they had in the district in which you and I live practical prohibition. If that is so, what can we say in reference to other portions of the city where we have an excess or undue number of licenses as compared with the population? Do you think the people encourage it in those other districts?—If the law were made so that it would



require a much larger number to sanction the opening of the saloon or tavern, I have no doubt that would be a great improvement. This is a sort of liquor option ; if the locality do not require the taverns, they ought to have a sufficient number of voters to stop granting them.

30019. I know that you have taken a great interest in all measures to promote temperance, Senator Murphy, but I am not sure whether you advocate the entire prohibition of the traffic?—Well, I do not.

30020. Will you kindly state to us your views on that point?—I believe that under the existing state of things it would be impossible to put such a law into operation. I have been told by parties on whom I can rely that in Maine the same opportunities for drinking are going on all the time. I believe that entire prohibition would be evil rather than good. I believe that if the distilling of liquors had never been discovered it would have been a grand thing for the world, and I would be the first to vote against their introduction ; but the trade exists to-day, and exists in such a way that I believe it is impossible to stop it.

30021. You are a member of St. Patrick's congregation?—Yes.

30022. The late Father Dowd, who was a prominent member of the clergy here, took an active part for many years in promoting temperance?—Indeed he did.

30023. I am aware that you yourself took an active part with him in promoting temperance?—Yes.

30024. I suppose that is the largest congregation of English speaking Catholics in the City of Montreal?—It is as large as all the rest put together.

*By Judge McDonald :*

30025. I had the satisfaction a short time ago of reading an admirable sermon that had been preached on temperance by Father McCallan of St. Patrick's Church?—Yes, I heard it delivered.

30026. Do you agree with the views set forth in that sermon?—I do.

30027. You agree as to the amendments required in the law which were suggested?—Yes, they are all comprised in this little memorandum. There was another plank in our platform, namely the early closing of saloons.

30028. There is one license now for every 230 people in this city. Then there is a section in the north-western part of the city where there are several thousand people without any license, and then there is another section of the city where there are an enormous number of saloons?—The saloons are congregated in a particular part of the city.

30028a. The rule is that the application for licenses may be opposed by the resident voters. Are there not some sections of the city where there are liquor establishments, and where there are no resident voters?—Yes, we have that right here in St. James Street. There are a great many in that neighbourhood.

30029. Do you think it would be a remedy if it were required that a large number of people would have to ask for the license?—That is just what I would suggest. I think that perhaps one saloon would be quite enough on St. James Street.

30030. You have stated that you consider a prohibitory law would be impracticable. Have you considered at all another feature in connection with it, and that is the revenue question. Take the revenue of the Province of Quebec, for instance. There are about \$600,000 of income derived by the Province from these license fees, and I suppose a very large part of it comes from the city of Montreal?—I should think so ; Montreal is the milch cow of the Province.

30031. Suppose that revenue were taken away from the Province by prohibition, what means would there be of raising a similar revenue?—I suppose the Treasurer of the Province, whoever he might be for the time being, would have to devise some other means.

30032. Do you know of any other way than direct taxation?—I do not know of any other way. At the same time, I am a prohibitionist, to this extent, as I hinted just now, that if we had no liquor and there were no distilleries or liquor shops, I say no matter what the liquor laws might be, I would be perfectly willing to bear my share and abolish them. And I would abolish the tobacco habit too.

HON. EDWARD MURPHY.

30033-34. Do you think the tobacco habit is on the increase?—I think it is.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30035. Your objection to prohibition is its impracticability, as you think?—I think so; the impracticability of carrying it out. I do not say now that the feeling may not be changed in that respect within the next twenty-five years; but we have an example of certain places where prohibition has been in force for many years, Maine especially, and look what its effect has been.

30036. Do you think, however, that if it were practicable, the removal of the liquor traffic is desirable?—If it could be wiped out in twenty-five years, I would give the remainder of my life, which cannot be long now, to obtain it. However, I think moral suasion is the best means, with the help of our legislators, to diminish the number of licenses. The grand thing in my opinion would be, and Father Dowd strongly recommended it, to separate the liquor business from the corner groceries. That is a very important feature.

30037. Speaking about moral suasion, and the society you have been connected with for many years, and which has doubtless done a very excellent work, do you find that the efforts of that society are interfered with and made non-effective in a considerable degree by the existence of all these saloons?—I do. I cannot name exact localities or places just at the present moment; but speaking in a general way, I believe that the facilities offered to many men who desire to keep sober are so great that they are prevented from taking the pledge. Sometimes when they keep sober a few months, they are induced to go into these places.

30038. It seems to be your belief that the large number of saloons induce customers and rather meet the demand for drink?—I believe so.

30039. Do you believe it is true in a large degree of all saloons that, instead of being necessary, they create a demand for stimulants?—They are always temptations.

30040. How many people have taken the pledge in St. Patrick's Society?—Several thousands. They amounted to thousands thirty years ago.

30041. As to the lapses: would 25 per cent of those who take the pledge lapse back to drink?—I cannot say, but if we save 75 per cent of all who take the pledge, we have done a good work. Many men take the pledge, and only a few may come back to be reinstated, because they are ashamed.

30042. Now, all those thousands have taken the pledge during these years, and similar work has been going on by other societies. Does it strike you as strange that, notwithstanding this, there has been a steady increase in the number of saloons and in the tipping habits of the people?—There has been a steady increase, as I have said, for twenty-five years; and I have noticed it more since these great facilities have been offered for drinking.

30043. It would appear that these saloons are a constant menace to people who desire to refrain from drink?—That I am quite sure of.

30044. As a business man with some fifty or sixty years' experience, have you observed what effect the liquor trade, as it has been carried on, has had upon the business interests of the city? Has it been good or bad?—I cannot give you any particular instances of that.

30045. I am speaking generally?—I know many men who have neglected their business from having indulged too much. I am impregnated with the idea that drink interferes with a man's business.

30046. It is contended by some people that this large expenditure of money in saloons by wage-earners diverts that money from the furniture dealer and the boot and shoe man. Have you ever thought of that?—Nothing, except what has incidentally come before me. I believe it to be a fact that if total prohibition were established tomorrow, there is not a man in the humbler walks of life that would not have more money to spend on his family and on the necessaries of life.

30047. Then it would have a beneficial effect on the various other branches of business?—It would no doubt act on the whole country. I consider, as I said before, that if we are to have licensed houses, they should be under supervision, and there should be a strict analysis of all liquor sold.

ARTHUR FEATHERSTON, of Montreal, merchant and manufacturer of pianos, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

30048. How long have you resided in Montreal?—Twenty-six years.

30049. Do you hold any official position in connection with societies or temperance organizations?—I am Chief Officer of the Dominion Council of Royal Templars of Temperance for Canada and Newfoundland.

30050. How long have you held that position?—About three years.

30051. What is the object of the society?—Prohibition.

30052. The promotion of prohibition?—Yes, and the reformation of drunkards. It is also a benefit society as well. It is a sick and benevolent society, and also it has an insurance.

30053. What is your method for the reformation of drunkards?—By individual effort, bringing them into our circle and using all influence possible to retain them.

30054. You have branches of your society in the different cities, towns and villages?—Yes, pretty nearly all over the Dominion.

30055. In connection with your society is there a pledge?—Certainly.

30056. What means has your society taken to bring about prohibition?—In our pledge, a copy of which I will send you, it is stated that the liquor traffic is a foe to God and man, and that it should be prohibited.

30057. Are these pledges for a limited time?—No, they are for life.

30058. In round figures, what is the strength of the organization in Canada?—Twenty-five thousand from Halifax to Vancouver and including Newfoundland.

30059. Do the Royal Templars promote their objects by the distribution of literature?—In every possible way.

30060. Is there a newspaper organ in connection with the association?—Yes, *The Templar*, published weekly and monthly.

30061. Is there any particular line adopted for the advancement of the prohibition cause?—We take every possible action.

30062. Have you any special way?—There is the distribution of literature, the holding of Gospel Temperance Meetings, and we take political action wherever it is possible to influence elections.

30063. Are there prohibition clubs connected with the society?—It is an independent scheme, although many of our leading men are connected with it.

30064. Have you had an opportunity of observing the working of the license law in this city?—I have. I have been a member of the Citizens' League and the first Law and Order League that was instituted here. I have been a member of the Executive.

30065. Then while you as a society are aiming at prohibition, you as a citizen are aiming at reforming the liquor traffic?—Our society does everything it can to hinder the liquor traffic.

30066. May I ask whether the action of the Law and Order League has done anything to hinder the traffic?—It has tended to a better observance of the law, and we believe that the observance of the law does considerable to hinder the liquor traffic.

30067. You think that the provisions of the license law, which you wish to have carried out more stringently than they are now, have the effect of hindering the traffic?—Yes, the prohibitive portion of the license law.

30068. I know you are opposed to a license law altogether. Suppose there is to be one: do you think there are too many licenses issued in this city?—Undoubtedly.

30069. Can you suggest to the Commission any amendments that would have a good effect on the license law?—Yes, I could talk all day of that scheme. There should be a regular scheme for opposition, a publication of the names of the signers to a petition, a majority of the voters in the polling district to secure a license, and in fact there is really no end to the amendments I could suggest. I may say that on this particular point of the publication of the names, we have considerable difficulty in looking into the signatures. People have falsely sworn to the signatures on these license petitions, and they are in the penitentiary to-day.

ARTHUR FEATHERSTON.

30070. As a result of your observation, is the Sunday law well observed?—No, it is not. There is somewhat of an improvement now, but still every one knows it is not observed.

30071. In your opinion, would it be well that the sale of groceries should be entirely separate from the sale of liquor?—Undoubtedly.

30072. You are in favour of the total prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating drinks for beverage purposes?—Yes.

30073. Have you made the matter a study?—I have.

30074. Do you know of any country where such a law is in force?—I know from reading, and I have spent summers in Maine also.

30075. Of course, total prohibition is not the law in Maine?—It is practically a prohibitory law there. I understand the importation for private use is part of it.

30076. Any one who wishes to have liquor may import it if it is for his private use?—Yes.

30077. That is your aim?—No; but we will take that much, if we can get it.

30078. Would you be satisfied with the Maine law?—I think it would be a great step in advance, but I am prepared to go the whole business.

30079. Do you know any country where the whole business is carried out?—In Kansas it is the law.

30080. Cannot liquor be brought into Kansas?—Not for sale.

30081. What you are aiming at is a law that would prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale for beverage purposes, and which would prevent the farmer from making liquor for his own family?—Yes.

30082. It would prevent a man bringing in for his own use supplies from any other country?—I would like to have that.

30083. Do you know of any other country where that is in force?—I cannot say that I do.

30084. Have you considered at all the question of revenue, in the event of prohibition?—Yes; but I am not the Minister of Finance. I think he is quite able to study that for himself.

30085. Would you leave that matter to the Minister of Finance?—If you want my idea about it, I am prepared to pay direct taxation. I have four branches of my business to-day in the city, and I will pay a direct tax of \$100 to \$125 on each of my establishments if we have prohibition, and I will make money out of it in the end. I could afford to do it. As a level-headed business man, I believe it would be in my interest to do it.

30086. In the case of the Province of Quebec there is something over \$600,000 of Provincial revenue which would be swept away by prohibition. How would you make up that sum?—By a direct tax. I could better afford to pay it than to see the money wasted on liquor.

30087. In the event of a total prohibitory law being enacted, would you remunerate the distillers and brewers for their plant and machinery?—I do not believe in compensation.

30088. Do you believe that the use of alcohol for mechanical, medicinal and sacramental purposes should be permitted?—Yes.

30089. Would you allow the manufacture of alcohol in the country for that purpose, or would you wish that the alcohol should be imported for that purpose?—I would leave that to the Government, as a matter of detail.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

30090. As a business man for a number of years in Montreal, have you noticed the effect that the liquor trade has had on the various business interests in the city?—The liquor trade is a great drawback to every business, or I would not be willing to be taxed to have it done away with.

30091. You have spoken about the difficulty arising from issuing too many licenses and in connection with enforcing the liquor law. Have you observed that the liquor trade is lawless in so far as it can be?—Certainly, any one who has anything to do with the enforcement of the license law will acknowledge that.

30092. The licensees do not comply with the law as it is?—No.

30093. There is difficulty in opposing licenses in certain cases?—We have to get a majority of the polling division to sign in opposition to the application. They must be resident voters or doing business within the bounds of the subdivision. They must be municipal voters.

30094. Suppose you get a majority, are there any difficulties in opposing an application for license?—Yes. We have to swear to the place in which each man lives. In opposing a license, we have to prove that he resides within the polling subdivision. The whole weight of evidence is left on the side of the opposition, and everything is taken for granted so far as the liquor applicant is concerned. Everything is supposed to be irregular or fraudulent on our side when we are opposing a license.

*By the Chairman :*

30095. You mean that your names are challenged, but the opposition is not necessarily assumed to be fraudulent on that account?—I merely assume that from the way the evidence is required from us in the court and the way it is required from the opposite side.

30096. Does the Board of Commissioners challenge the petition accompanying the application of the person wanting the license, or is that left for some one else to do?—It is left to the opponent, of course. The case comes up in court, and we are there, and the applicant's lawyer makes us prove every signature.

30097. Have you any idea what public opinion is in the Province of Quebec as to prohibition of the drink trade? Have you any means of knowing?—Yes, I think I have. I am pretty well acquainted even with the French classes of the city, having done business amongst them, and I am perfectly satisfied that a straight prohibition vote would carry.

30098. In the Province of Quebec?—Yes; I know a great many have not that idea, but I have.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30099. Then you are satisfied that a straight prohibition vote, separate from every other issue, would carry in the Province of Quebec?—Yes.

30100. You mean prohibition of the importation and manufacture of all intoxicants?—Yes, with the exceptions which have been already mentioned.

*By Judge McDonald :*

30101. Do you in your own mind include in your scheme of prohibition such details as the making of liquors by the farmers' wives, or do you mean prohibition in the broad way, the details to be adjusted afterwards?—I mean prohibition pure and simple. These are details that would be hard to deal with. My personal feeling is that alcohol is an evil in any form, and I would do away with it in any shape.

30102. When you speak about having prohibition pure and simple, do you mean that it would be carried in the Province of Quebec by a plebiscite?—Yes; but we have responsible government, and I would like to see the Federal Government deal with it. I would like it to be made a question at the general election, and to have members pledged to it. They could do it either in that way or by a plebiscite.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30103. Now, about the difficulties of enforcing prohibition. Supposing a prohibitory law were enacted, what difficulties would arise in the enforcement?—Sufficient backbone to enforce the law is all that is needed.

30104. Backbone in whom?—Of the powers that be, who have the enforcement of it in charge.

30105. Would that be contingent upon public sentiment?—Certainly; to a certain extent public sentiment carries the day. I may say that I have had considerable experience in assisting in enforcing the license law in this city, and I know what backbone can do. Personally, I would be delighted if I were in a position to have the enforcement of a prohibitory law. I have not the slightest fear that it could be done.

ARTHUR FEATHERSTON.

30106. It is stated by a good many people that there would be such wholesale smuggling and such evasion of the law, not only along the border but in the country, that practically it would be a dead letter. What do you think about the smuggling?—There is a certain amount of smuggling done through the custom-house now. There has never been a law made that has never been evaded to a certain extent. I can tell you that a prohibitory law could be better enforced, or fully as well enforced as the Customs-Act to-day.

30107. With the same staff of officers?—Even less. I know of one man who made it pretty hot for the illicit dealers in this city.

30108. Now, what about the revenues? I know you answered Judge McDonald that you would be willing, and you thought it would be good business to pay a direct tax to make up for whatever deficit there would be. Do you conceive that there would be any serious deficit in the event of prohibition, after a few years?—I think there would be for the time being; it would take some time to get it properly enforced. It would take some time for the finances to adjust themselves; but I believe that after a short time, the deficit would be smaller than many people believe.

30109. Suppose there were five million dollars to be provided for, how would that equalize in the administration of justice?—The importations would be larger; the customs receipts would pay much heavier. There would be an improvement all along the line in trade, and if we had prohibition, we would sell more pianos and better ones, and more shoes and better ones.

30110. Do you believe that the contributions to trade generally would be larger?—Certainly I do. I had experience in a small town near Montreal that has been under local option, and there is not a merchant there who will not testify to the improvement.

30111. What place is that?—Hemmingford, in Huntingdon County.

30112. I suppose there is some illicit trade there?—Just a little, but it is pretty well stamped out; the people have backbone.

30113. Do you think business is benefited by the prohibition of drink?—I do; I have heard a leading business man testify that from a public platform. I heard him testify that the improvement had been material since they did away with the drink traffic.

30114. Then it is your opinion that that condition of things would be general if a prohibitory law were put into effect?—Most decidedly.

*By Judge McDonald :*

30115. To what, as an intelligent man, do you attribute the fact that with all these great advantages there is no country in the world which has adopted a total prohibition system?—It is like slavery; it is going to take a certain amount of time to deal with. There is going to be a movement all along the line sooner or later in connection with this.

30116. You were speaking of prohibiting farmers' wives making liquor. What would you think if every farmer were allowed to make liquor on his own farm for his own family?—That is not allowed to-day.

30117. It is not allowed because of the revenue laws. Would it be prevented if you had prohibition?—I should like to see it prevented.

30118. You would also prevent individuals importing for their own use?—Yes, of course. You must understand that my idea is that alcohol is an evil, and we must have the least possible amount of it.

30119. Are any efforts being made at present to enforce the license laws in the city of Montreal?—Yes, by the Citizens' League.

30120. Mr. Lambe, the Inspector of Inland Revenue, has sworn to a very large number of illicit liquor places in the city. Is your society doing anything to prevent them?—We are working through the constituted authorities.

30121. How are you succeeding?—I think very well. We have aroused public sentiment on the question, and the officers are seeing that it is to their advantage to have the law better enforced.

30122. Are there as many of these places now as formerly?—I do not think there are.

*By the Chairman :*

30123. You have stated that in the event of prohibition being adopted, there would be a larger importation of certain articles? They would have to pay duty, or else that would not help the Dominion revenue. How would the Dominion revenue be recouped for the loss, if there was prohibition?—I have already stated, through the Customs. Boots and shoes are not very largely imported of course, but there are any amount of shoe findings that go into the making of the shoe, which are imported, and there would be a greater amount of these brought into the country. There would be more pianos sold, and a great many things have to be imported in order to make them.

30124. There are a great many articles on which the duty is low now and on which there is no duty at all. It would require a very large importation of pianos and shoe findings to make up five million dollars deficit. There would be a large revenue to find immediately, if you put a prohibitive law in force at once?—As I told you before, I am perfectly willing to stand direct taxation, and I say it would pay a man to stand direct taxation for that purpose, for I believe I would make more money in my business.

30125. Do you think it would be necessary, as some parties have suggested, to put a duty on tea and coffee?—I would make my breakfast table as free as I could make it, but there are lots of other things that could easily stand more duty. I would put a duty on all luxuries. I would classify a piano as a luxury, and I would put more duty on that as well as on cigars and other things. Take everything in the jewellery line, that is largely imported. You can put duty on that. In fact the country could well afford to have the duty raised almost along the whole line of goods generally imported that are not absolutely needed for the workingman, or that do not make living too dear, if we had prohibition.

30126. Would you increase the duty on articles already subject to duty and put a duty on articles that now come in free?—If necessary, I would. I say the country could well afford to pay that, and the people would make it up in savings, that would accrue from the abolition of the liquor traffic.

30127. There would be a loss of revenue of at least five millions at once. How would you raise that at once, if you were permitted to apply the machinery to do so?—First, by the amount that would be received from the customs by the extra importation that would come in to supply the trade of the country through the money being turned into legitimate channels, and secondly by direct taxation.

*By Judge McDonald :*

30128. Have you ever considered the difference between the moderate and immoderate use of liquor?—I hold that the moderate use of liquor is injurious; it leads to abuse.

30129. Do you hold that it is a sin to take a glass of liquor?—I hold that a man is sinning against himself if he takes liquor.

30130. Is it a sin against the moral law?—It is a sin against the law of God if he is defiling his body. I may say that the moderate drinker, to my mind, is the cause of more harm to the drinker himself and to the community at large, because the example is so bad. There is one point in connection with the Royal Templars that I think is important, and that is, as we are a total abstinence benefit society, our record is something extraordinary in our death rate. Although we have conducted it for the last eight years, since we started business in the Dominion, our average table is better than the mortuary table.

30131. Your members beat the mortuary tables?—Yes. Our members live longer than they have any business to do, and that is because of their total abstinence. Within three years we have got over \$40,000 to our balance at the bank.

30132. Is that balance for the benefit of the insured?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30133. It pays from a business point of view to be a total abstainer?—Yes; we do not have any but total abstainers in our association.

ARTHUR FEATHERSTON.

30134. Suppose a member ceases to be a total abstainer, what do you do with him in your insurance branch?—Fire him out.

30135. Is it a condition that he shall continue a total abstainer?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

30136. Do you have any occasion to expel men?—Yes, for the second offence. He forfeits with the second offence. If there is any chance of reforming him, we reform him.

30137. Does he lose his contributions when he goes out of the society?—Yes.

30138. And that goes to the benefit of those who remain?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30139. He has knowledge of that fact when he becomes a member?—Yes. There are very few that drop out. Take our record in the city, where we have a pretty large membership, and I do not think there is one in a dozen falls.

30140. The remaining members would not rejoice in the fall of the few because of the additional profits?—The remaining men do all they possibly can to get a man back again.

MR. FEATHERSTON, after the examination of Dr. F. W. Campbell, made the following statement:—We charge  $\frac{7}{20}$  (seven-twentieths) per \$1,000 per annum for insurance on our total risk, while straight life insurance companies charge about three times that. On the average of 35 years our rate is  $\frac{7}{20}$  (seven-twentieths) per \$1,000 per annum, and notwithstanding this small sum, we have rolled up a surplus of \$55,000 which we have in the Bank of Montreal.

F. WAYLAND CAMPBELL, M.D., of the city of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

30141. How long have you practised your profession in the community here?—Thirty years.

30142. Where did you take your degree?—I took my M.D. at McGill, and I am L.R.C.P. of London, England.

30143. You are Dean of the Faculty of Bishop's College?—I am.

30144. Do you hold any position in the Western Hospital?—I am attending physician of the Montreal General and Western Hospitals. I am also Medical Referee for the Dominion of Canada for the New York Life Insurance Company, and chief Medical Examiner for the whole Dominion besides.

30145. Did you get one of the circulars sent by the Commission, asking you a number of questions?—I did some months ago.

30146. And you replied to it?—Yes.

30147. Of course, you are necessarily about a good deal in the city of Montreal, and you observe what is going on. From your observation, can you say if intemperance has been increasing or decreasing in the city of Montreal of late years?—I think the use of intoxicating liquors to excess has decreased in the last twenty-five or thirty years. I think their general use has decreased.

30148. Do you consider that the license law at the present time, regulating the liquor traffic as it is supposed to do, is well enforced in the city?—I am not prepared to say. I do not know.



30149. Do you think we have got more places where liquor is sold than are desirable?—Yes, I do.

30150. Can you suggest any method for bringing about a reduction of these licensed places?—I do not know that I am competent to deal with that part of the question, as I have never given it a very great amount of thought. You asked me whether I thought there were too many such places, and it seems to me, driving through the city, that whilst we have perhaps less than some other cities we know of, yet, at the same time, a man might stand temptation three or four times, and succumb the fifth time. Take, for instance, a man going from Place d'Armes Square to Bonaventure Station, if he had only two or three places to pass on the road, he might probably pass them, but when he gets down to near the station he has another half dozen to pass, and the chances are that before he gets to the last one, he will go in and have a drink.

30151. From your experience, is there any large percentage of the cases which go into the hospital as the result of intemperance?—Yes; a large proportion.

30152. Are you prepared to name the percentage of persons who visit the hospitals for advice and assistance, who are ill, apparently, in consequence of intemperance?—I should say something in the neighbourhood of seventy per cent; but that is only an estimate.

30153. There are a number whose troubles arise directly from drink. At what would you put that percentage?—Perhaps ten to fifteen per cent.

30154. You think, directly and indirectly, about eighty-five per cent of the cases that go to the hospitals are due either directly or indirectly to the use of liquor?—I would say the abuse of liquor. I may also say that I have had nine years' experience in charge of 125 soldiers at the Military School at St. Johns, where I go several times a week, and there I believe that ninety-nine per cent of the trouble of all soldiers is due to liquor.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30155. Is there a canteen at that Military School?—There is.

30156. Have you observed the effect of that canteen?—Yes, to a certain extent.

30157. Is it good or bad?—Good. The trouble does not come from the canteen; the trouble comes from the outside. As regards this particular military school, it is badly situated. The men have nothing whatever in the shape of amusement excepting what is inside the barracks, and everything there is done that possibly could be done, but there is nothing in the town itself to attract them. The men have nothing to do, but to go outside and tumble into a saloon. If they were in a city like Montreal, where they would have concerts and amusements of various kinds, it would be different, but as regards the canteen, trouble has arisen, it is true, but the great majority is outside.

30158. Do you know whether in the canteen they sell spirituous liquors?—I would not like to answer that question positively.

*By the Chairman :*

30159. Have you given any consideration to the question of prohibition?—It has been called to my mind at times, and having been at places where prohibition was said to exist, I have necessarily had an opportunity of seeing the means that were used to evade it. In that way it has passed through my mind.

30160. Have you any objection to stating the conclusions you have come to upon the subject?—I do not think it is possible to enforce it entirely as regards individual use.

30161. Do you think it is desirable, if it were practicable, to enforce it?—No, I do not.

30162. What are your objections to it?—My objections are that if prohibition is carried out, the law should be the same for all; and while I think we all should do what we can to assist our neighbour, yet I do not think that every man is called upon to practise that amount of self denial which would seem to be absolutely necessary in the case of prohibition, while he is doing an injury to himself, in order to save his neighbour from falling into the gutter.

F. WAYLAND CAMPBELL.

30163. If I understand your answer correctly, you look upon it as an interference with personal liberty?—I look upon it that wine is not prohibited, even in a religious sense. The previous witness seems to think it is a sin to drink any kind of liquor. Of course, we have the Bible illustration of the marriage at Cana, in Galilee. At all events, I would give a person a right to drink what he pleased, so long as he did not do it to the detriment of the community, or perhaps to himself. I may say that I look upon the excessive use of liquor as a disease to be treated, just the same as any other disease.

30164. Holding that view, would you advocate the establishment of inebriate asylums to which offenders should be sent, instead of sending them to jail?—Certainly, that is the view I take.

30165. You think that would result in great improvement?—Yes. And I think there is another way of reaching it. We are all composed of a certain amount of sentiment, and a veneration for sacred things. We have very powerful religious influences to bring a person to the right cause. I know a man that I have within the last 20 years taken in my sleigh, having picked him up in the street dead drunk, and to-day he is one of the hardest temperance workers in Montreal, and has been for years a teetotaler. I think religious influence in that case was the means of his reformation.

*By Judge McDonald :*

30166. I understand your position to be this: A is a man who drinks, and B is a man who uses it moderately, and C is a total abstainer. If C chooses to be a total abstainer for the sake of A, he may, but he should not enforce it on B if he drinks in moderation?—Not more than he should be compelled to be a Presbyterian if he is a Church of England man.

30167. In case such a law was passed, as has been asked for by some people, a law that would prohibit the manufacture of liquor, would you deem it right for the brewers and distillers to be compensated for their plant and machinery?—Yes, I do. I do not see any reason why any person who was engaged in an occupation which the country recognized as a lawful one, should be injured financially because the sentiment of the community tells him to give up that business.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30168. What effect do you think the liquor trade has had upon the community, morally, socially, physically and financially?—Bad morally I take it, as it exists in saloons and hotels everywhere. As to the physical effect, there is no deterioration in the human race within the last 50 or 100 years, so far as I can make out.

30169. Is that a direct answer to the question?—Yes and no. It is a difficult question to answer positively. I can only say that my experience of the human race during the last 40 years is that the human race is as large physically and as good mentally as it was then.

30170. Do you believe that it would have been better if the liquor trade had not been carried on as it has been?—I attend professionally teetotalers, people who drink moderately, and people who abuse it or people who are abused by it, and I am not aware that the teetotalers produce any better children than the moderate drinking people.

30171. In the case of serious sickness or accident, has the total abstainer a better chance of recovery than the habitual drinker?—No doubt about it.

30172. What is the effect of the liquor traffic as it exists and is conducted, on the social condition of the community?—The social condition to-day is better than it was 25 years ago. When you speak of the social improvement, am I to understand the effect that falls on the family from the use of liquor, or the social effect of drink in the family?

30173. I mean what is the effect of the liquor trade on the family?—Bad.

30174. Is it necessary for me to ask what is the effect on the community financially of the liquor trade as carried on?—Bad I should say. A man who spends his money in the tavern does not spend it on his family.

30175. You consider there are considerable evil effects as a result of the liquor trade as it is carried on?—No doubt of it.

30176. You think that prohibition is not a practicable measure?—I do not think so. That is only an opinion, the other is a fact.

30177. Not believing in prohibition, what would you do to lessen those evil effects of the traffic?—In the first place, I would not have any saloons pure and simple. I would have every saloon attached to an eating house. A place where liquor only is sold I would shut up; I do not think the saloon proper is necessary at all.

30178. Would you shut up the corner groceries?—By all means. That is one of the worst evils. I would prevent the retailing of liquor in corner groceries.

30179. Would you have groceries and liquors sold in the same place?—A good many people say that they would separate them entirely, but I do not see any reason why liquor should not be part of the grocery business if the grocer sold it in packages. It is the retailing in the corner grocery where the trouble comes in.

30180. Then you would license restaurants?—Yes.

30181. Would a diminution of the number of places diminish drunkenness?—I think so. There are altogether too many places. A man may pass one or two places, but he does not pass the other and takes liquor.

30182. Would it not be a good thing for that man to go without getting any drink at all?—It might, and it might not.

30183. Do you regard the saloon situated as it is a menace to the man?—I do. I think if a man wanted liquor very badly he would take it, in the first instance, where he saw a saloon; and if he actually required it and was going to the depot, perhaps he would rather lose his train and take the next one.

30184. Is it true that the saloon makes trade rather than meets the demand?—I think so.

30185. Does it make a trade that is profitable to the patrons of the saloon?—Not the saloon pure and simple.

30186. You spoke about interference with personal liberty in the matter of prohibition; do you regard the drink traffic as an interference in any degree with personal liberty? I mean the traffic as it is established, whether in saloons or groceries?—I do not think so.

30187. For instance, take the father of a family. His desire for his family is that they should be protected, and that they should be saved from liquor. A saloon is established in his vicinity. Is that an interference with his family? Is it a temptation to his boys?—I would answer, yes.

30188. And an injury to his family?—Yes, sometimes.

30189. Is the drink traffic an interference with the personal right of that man who wishes to do all he can for his family?—The establishment of a saloon in the neighbourhood of any residential place is certainly a temptation, and as the human race is susceptible to human frailties, such temptation placed in our way is all better out of the way. But this remark would apply to a great many other temptations. We are dealing with this one thing, but if the others are permitted, then you cannot very well, so far as I can see, prohibit this one.

*By Judge McDonald :*

30190. Is that any interference with personal liberty?—That is not interference with personal liberty, it is temptation.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30191. Is the establishment of the drink traffic an interference with the welfare of a community?—The fact that there are a large number of saloons increases the temptation, and with the increased temptation there is an increased amount of drink taken.

30192. And evil effects follow it?—Yes.

30193. Would it be advisable to wipe out all temptation?—If possible, but I do not think it practicable.

30194. Do you believe it is desirable, if practicable?—Yes, I do. But when I speak of prohibition, I am not going as far as my friend Mr. Featherston, who would interfere with a man if he wanted a drink. I would prohibit drink being exposed to

F. WAYLAND CAMPBELL.

public sale. Even when drink is prohibited it is quite obtainable and I do not think that prohibition is the right way to go about it at all.

30195. I think you expressed yourself in answer to a question by Sir Joseph Hickson that it would be well to establish inebriate asylums, to which men who became addicted to drink should be sent. Would you send them there at the public expense?—Yes, I would establish them just as lunatic asylums are established. There are a certain number of men who have not the means to pay, and they should be put there for the benefit of the community. If they are themselves able to pay, they should be compelled to do so. It would be a public institution under public control.

30196. And it would be a charge to the public?—Yes, when the individual is not able to pay.

30197. Do you think it is wise to legalize or protect a business that makes necessary the establishment of institutions to take care of a number of those who are the product of that business?—I have stated before that I think a prohibitory law would be good, if it could be enforced, and I think that answer practically covers your question now.

30198. That is since it cannot be enforced, there ought to be an institution for taking care of the users of liquor?—Yes. A man is financially worth so much to every Government, and the more a man can be restored to physical health and sanitary condition the better he becomes at once for the Government.

30199. As a physician, which do you consider is better, for a man to pursue a course which keeps him in health, or a course which makes him sick occasionally? Of course I know which is the best for the doctor?—That course which makes him physically sick is best for the doctor, but that course which makes him physically well is best for the man.

*By Judge McDonald :*

30200. Do I understand you to say that the evil effects of which you have spoken of one kind are attributable to the drink trade as carried on?—Yes, as carried on.

30201. And what you would do, then, would be not to prohibit it, but to regulate the trade?—I say regulate it, because it is impossible to prohibit it.

30202. Do you find, as a physician, any difference between those who use drink in what you call moderation and the total abstainer? Would you make any difference between them?—No, not particularly. I may say in that connection that I am connected with life insurance risks, and we always ask “What have your habits been, and are you now sober and temperate? Do you use intoxicating liquor as a beverage, and what average quantity per day? Are you now engaged in the retailing of alcoholic liquors, or have you ever been?” We make no difference between a total abstainer and a man who takes two or three glasses of liquor a day. We consider him as practically as good a risk, other things being equal. We do not insist upon a man being a teetotaler, and we find that our mortality is under the estimated standard, and we are able to pay a large dividend, very much larger than my friend Mr. Featherston’s company, that has accumulated so much in the bank. We do a business all over the world and our mortality is less. Strange to say people who are engaged in saloons or retail liquor are not taken in, although a large number of bar-keepers are teetotalers.

30203. Still you refuse them?—Yes; they are handling liquor all day long and you cannot tell what may happen. A man may stand temptation for fifteen years and fall in the sixteenth.

30204. In regard to intellectual status, do you find that the total abstainer has the advantage of the moderate drinker?—Taking a man who is a moderate user, that is a man who practically only takes liquor at his meals, there is no difference between them.

30205. You find that in their intellectual power there is no difference?—No difference.

30206. What is your opinion as to legislation which would discourage the use of strong liquors with the object of getting the people to substitute ale and light wines for them?—I think that would be a very beneficial thing. The trouble is always because of the use of spirits, especially the use of spirits on an empty stomach. I do not think a glass of whisky taken at lunch or dinner is harmful. Again, we must remember that

climate has a great influence upon the individual as regards drink. You can no more take whisky in this country the way you can in England, Ireland or Scotland than you can fly.

*By the Chairman :*

30207. You have had a great deal of experience in connection with insurance companies, Dr. Campbell? Has it not become a very general rule to refuse to insure the lives of liquor dealers?—The company I am connected with, the New York Life, will only accept liquor dealers and bar-keepers at all events, I do not refer to wholesale dealers, upon a fifteen or twenty years' endowment, and that is because in the fifteen years' endowment they are paying the risk in eight years.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30208. Do they discriminate against wholesale liquor dealers?—No.

*By the Chairman :*

30209. Can you say if that is the practice generally of insurance companies?—No.

30210. Do they charge them a higher rate even on the fifteen years' endowment plan?—I do not think they do.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30211. Is the objection to take bar-keepers because of the strong temptation to drink, or because of the effects of liquor, namely, that disturbances might arise in the bar-room and that a man's life is more in danger?—It arises from the fact that take them as a class, their mortality is higher than the ordinary. Very often they are constantly drinking a little, with this one and that one who goes into their place, on an empty stomach.

*By the Chairman :*

30212. The general impression is that they are not as good risks. Some companies take them at an increased rate and others will not take them at all?—Yes.

30213. Speaking of the question of the reduction in the number of licenses, am I correct in concluding that you think a much smaller number would meet the requirements of the class who take liquor in moderation and who do not desire to be without it, that a greater number of liquor places is simply a temptation to those who make an immoderate use of liquor?—That is exactly my view.

J. S. BOUSQUET, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

30214. The bank of which you are the Manager is the Banque du Peuple?—Yes.

30215. I suppose you received my letter inclosing two questions and asking you to answer them?—I got that letter.

30216. Have you given the matter consideration?—Not as much as I would like to have done, as my time was occupied otherwise, but I have given it some consideration.

30217. What, in your opinion, is the effect of the liquor traffic as at present conducted on the agricultural, financial, commercial and business interests of the Dominion?—I regret to say that I have not had time to make a study of the results either on the revenue of the different Governments and municipalities or upon the commercial, industrial and business interests. That requires studying very thoroughly, with statistics at hand, in order that one may be in a position to form a comprehensive and intelligent opinion on this question. The Commissioners who have heard the *pro* and *con* statements of the matter in every aspect by the proper persons, can form a judgment,

F. WAYLAND CAMPBELL.

recommending a measure with a view of regulating or prohibiting the traffic. I will simply content myself with giving the Commissioners my impression based upon superficial observation.

30218. I wish to remind you that we are asking about the business phase, mainly, of the traffic?—And I am just coming to that point. That liquor when indulged in to excess is an evil, nobody doubts. All classes of society suffer more or less from its disastrous effect. But the question as to the commercial effect is a problem not so easily solved as conceived. The habits of a nation are at stake in such a question, for we have amongst us very sober men who enjoy their glass of liquor three times a day and drink it because their fathers and forefathers did the same. Their drinking is the result of the habit of generations. Their fathers and grandfathers died at a very advanced age, after having lived the lives of very respectable citizens. Those having that habit comprise a great number of French Canadians. They drink three glasses of liquor a day, and would certainly not be willing to give their support to prohibition, although, as good citizens, they deplore the miseries of those given to liquor to an objectionable extent. Others enjoy a glass of ale; others who are richer enjoy a glass of champagne. Those would not be readily disposed to give up that little luxury and vote for prohibition, because their habits being formed, as moderate drinkers, they do not see any necessity for reform. Men addicted to drink to excess will certainly not vote for prohibition. Then the temperance people are the only champions who carry the standard of reform, and I believe that their number is too limited to carry out the idea of prohibition successfully. I therefore give it as my opinion, first, that my experience in business and my observations are not of such a nature as to justify me in supporting a prohibitory law. Secondly, prohibition is a dream of the future, not endorsed by the many. In my opinion, what requires to be done, and I really believe it would receive the support of many to the discontent of only a few, is to enact new laws in order to put the traffic in the hands of people of higher moral standing, by granting licenses to those men whose honesty, as law-abiding citizens, would be beyond doubt. I believe that such a law could be strictly enforced. That would be the first step in the right direction, for if results are to be obtained, they can only be obtained gradually. Habits have to be reformed through temperance societies and the pulpit. In all kinds of business a man addicted to drink carries his own punishment. Of course men addicted to drink deserve more pity than contempt, and I have often noticed that they themselves feel keenly the humiliation of their habit; and therefore it remains for all good citizens to try and help those wretched people out of their misery. For myself, I would give my support to any particular movement which would tend to relieve from the grasp of liquor its poor victims; and as a suggestion towards this end, I simply say that I think it is to be done gradually and by the amendment of our laws regarding the traffic. That is about the answer I have to give to the two questions.

30219. What effect do you consider the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, has upon the business of the country: is it injurious or beneficial?—As I have said, it carries its own punishment.

30220. To the individual: but upon the trade of the country, has it a beneficial or injurious effect?—It may not be either beneficial or injurious. My observations so far are that I do not see that the evils are of such an extent as to be injurious. Of course, they never are beneficial. The evils are not so extensive as to render it injurious to trade.

30221. You think the sale of liquor is not injurious to trade at present?—That is my opinion.

30222. What do you think the effect would be on trade and commerce of a law prohibiting the importation and manufacture of liquors, except beer and wine?—This question involves so many questions that to answer it properly and in an intelligent manner would require a study of its details, and I have not time to give it that study.

30223. Have you come to a conclusion as to what the effect would be of a prohibitory law on business, as described in the second question, that is the total suppression of the liquor traffic except so far as might be required for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes?—I have not studied the question sufficiently to answer what would be the effect on trade. There is a large capital invested in the manufacture, and there is a

large revenue collected by the Governments and municipalities. The sudden stoppage of the business would affect the revenues of the Dominion and provinces and municipalities to a great extent, and I suppose would also, to a large extent, render capital now invested in the manufacture of liquors useless. Prohibition would stamp out of the country an important industry. Capital not finding its way in that direction would find other directions; but in that question are involved so many problems that I do not feel competent to give an answer. The liquor question affects products of the soil which are bought by men in the trade, and the Government gets a large revenue from it. Of course prohibition would stamp out the amount of capital in that particular trade, and such capital would have to find other channels for investment; and so far as capital is concerned, prohibition would simply divert it into other business.

30224. Have you considered by what method the revenue lost to the Dominion could be supplied?—I have not gone into that.

30225. Have you thought at all how the Province of Quebec, which gets about \$600,000 a year from the issuing of licenses, could replace this amount in the treasury?—I have not thought that out.

*By Judge McDonald:*

30226. It has been suggested that, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, they would have to raise the amount by direct taxation, and it has been suggested that an income tax would be the proper way?—The only resort is direct taxation.

30227. One gentleman suggests an income tax, another suggests a tax on dividends of banks in connection with income, as distinguished from taxes on real estate and merchant's stock. Could you give any information as to what would be the best mode of taxation for raising the revenue?—Taxation of capital would be the most proper.

30228. In case a prohibitory law were enacted, would you deem it right that the brewers and distillers should be remunerated for their plant and machinery rendered useless by such a law?—I do not think so, if the Government wish to enforce such a law.

30229. You think that if a man has built a distillery, and the law has required him to put in certain machinery and from time to time to change that machinery and put in improved methods, and if a new law is enacted, stopping the business, he ought not to be remunerated?—I do not, any more than for tariff changes which make merchants lose money.

30230. You put them on the same footing?—Yes.

30231. In the case of tariff changes, they do not prevent a man keeping on with his business though they may affect it?—It comes practically to the same thing.

30232. You would not remunerate them?—No.

Rev. EDWARD McMANUS, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By Judge McDonald:*

30233. Do you reside in the city of Montreal?—Yes, I am missionary of the Church of England here.

30234. How long have you been such missionary?—Two years last July.

30235. What are your duties in that connection?—Visiting the poor in the city, aiding at the Out-door Board of Relief and Irish Protestant Benevolent Society, dispensing relief to the poor, visiting the jail, the House of Industry and the Refuge at Longue Pointe, and various other charitable institutions in the city.

30236. Are your labours confined to the Church of England?—Generally to the Church of England, but in the undenominational institutions they generally avail themselves of the administration of any clergyman who comes there.

30237. Are there persons of all ages in those institutions?—Yes. In some of them, for instance the Foundling Hospital, there are infants, and in the House of Industry at Longue Pointe the inmates are generally aged and infirm people.

J. S. BOUSQUET.

30238. Different ages in different institutions?—Yes; in the jail we find them of all ages, from 16 up.

30239. Do you find that what is commonly called drinking has been the means of bringing many of those people to those places?—I think it is the chief means.

30240. Take the old people at the House of Industry, could you name any percentage?—Well, I could give approximately. Of course I could not state exactly the percentage. I have been visiting the House of Refuge now going on three years, and from my knowledge of the inmates and their past and from the inquiries into their mode of life and what has brought them there, I would judge that from 60 to 75 per cent are brought there through intoxicating drink, directly or indirectly.

30241. In the case of the Foundling Hospital, is there any way of tracing out the habits of the parents?—None whatever.

30242. Are those cases of children who have been deserted?—Cases of illegitimate children from the Lying in Hospital who are taken in there, so that I cannot say that liquor was the cause, apart from the general impression I gather in my contact with the class of fallen women, that liquor has a great deal to do with their fall.

30243. At the jail, how do you find it?—I visit the Montreal jail once a week, and my visits there are still confined to those who profess to belong to the Church of England. I inquire for none others. Occasionally, though very rarely, one of another religious belief asks to see me; in that case I do what I can for the individual. I generally ask the question what brought him there. Of course, I find on the list the offences for which they are committed, and drunkenness is very largely prevalent. Then there are begging and vagrancy, larceny and other crimes. Of course when they are committed for drunkenness, there can be no doubt of the cause; but in many cases I ask them, how they came to commit the crime, and they generally say it was because they were in liquor.

30244. Have you traced out many cases?—Not many, but I have formed convictions from what I know, and I have every reason to believe that the statement made is pretty nearly correct in every case.

30245. In the discharge of your duties, do you see much improvement in the liquor business as carried on in the licensed places in the city?—Not in this way. A clergyman does not very often go into places where liquor is sold, and you would have to do that and frequent them to know this.

30246. Moving about, do you see the effects?—I see painfully the evil effects.

30247. On Sundays are those places closed?—My impression is there are a great many places where liquor can be got on Sunday.

30248. Are there many places, from your observation, where liquor is sold without license?—I cannot say personally, but I have indirect testimony to lead me to believe that there are many such places.

30249. Have you reason for believing from your own observation that there is a large sale of liquor?—Not from my own personal observation. I attend weekly at the House of Refuge to aid in the distribution of relief to the poor, and afterwards I visit so far as I can those families who have sought relief. I have now on my list three or four hundred families whom I have not been able to reach, although I have visited over 700 during the past year. On one occasion, on going into one of the houses, I met in the yard a little girl about eight or ten years old,—not more than eight years of age, judging from her size,—coming out with a bottle. I asked her where she was going, and she said she was going to get a bottle of beer for some women in the house.

30250. That sale would be made professedly for a grown up person?—Yes.

30251. You do not know about the sale to minors—if there is any sold?—That I cannot say, but my impression is that the law is frequently violated, that is the law limiting the sale to those over 21 years.

30252. Taking it all in all, do you find that a very large percentage of evil is caused by intoxicating drink?—I am thoroughly convinced of that.

30253. Have you had any experience in prohibition?—No.

30254. Have you ever lived in a prohibition town?—Never. I am very sorry to say it has not been my good fortune to live in a prohibition country. I hope it will before I die.



30255. What sort of prohibition would you advocate?—I would prohibit liquor in every shape, except for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes.

30256. Would you have a law that would prevent its use in any way for beverage purposes in the country?—Decidedly.

30257. You have not studied the economic question of revenue in connection with it?—I have not studied it, but have listened to the answers of previous witnesses, and I would say this: that while I think a prohibitory law would, in the first instance, greatly lessen the revenue, yet it would so enrich the country that the people would be better able to bear ten times the amount of taxes without suffering, and the revenue in that way would be replenished. I cannot imagine that the suppression of a traffic productive of so much misery as it is in this country, from my observation, would injuriously affect the country.

30258. Do you look upon the licensing of the traffic as an evil?—On the principle that if you could not get the whole loaf you had better take the half, if you cannot get prohibition I would be in favour of having high license and restrict the number of licenses issued.

30259. It is licensing an evil?—Yes.

30260. Then you look on the licensing of the traffic as a sin?—Perhaps not sinful, that would be putting it rather strongly.

30261. You look upon it as necessarily an evil in the present state of things?—I do not look upon the act of a man drinking wine or beer as a sin, but I think if we passed a law to prevent his getting it, you would not do him harm and would do others good.

30262. The law you would promote would prevent a man sending to England to get liquor for his own use?—That question would have to be worked out. I hardly know what answer to give to that.

30263. Perhaps the law you would favour would be something like the Maine law. Under that law liquor is not allowed to be sold or brought in for sale or exposed for sale or manufactured for sale?—I would favour all those.

30264. But if a man wishes it for his own use, he can import it for that purpose?—I would favour that.

30265. You heard the question put the other witnesses as to remunerating the brewers and distillers for loss of plant and machinery in case their business was closed?—I think they could divert their capital to other uses, and perhaps their plant also. I do not think they should be remunerated, because of all business in Canada the liquor traffic has been the most profitable. People who manufacture and sell liquor in a few years become rich. We have many brewers and distillers and manufacturers who could easily afford the small loss they would suffer if their business was shut down.

30266. You do not deal with the question of right or wrong?—They have made their profit. If a man builds a house and gets a fair profit for the outlay, even if it burns down, he is not suffering an entire loss because he has received remuneration.

*By the Chairman :*

30267. Do you know how much capital is invested in the manufacture of beer and spirits?—I do not.

30268. You have no idea?—No. I have an idea that it is very large, but beyond that I do not know.

30269. A man is doing business, and the Legislature passes laws requiring him to provide certain machinery from time to time, and he complies with each new law; then a law is passed saying that the business must be stopped and he must lose the value of these improvements, which will lie on his hands useless. In that case would you not remunerate?—I do not think you should make an exception in his case.

30270. Do you think it right he should be remunerated?—No, and for this reason: that laws may be made at any time altering the tariff and many business men have to suffer loss from its alteration, and nobody would dream for a moment of remunerating them.

REV. EDWARD McMANUS.

30271. Do you think the British Government did wrong in remunerating the owners of slaves when the Government abolished slavery?—I would not say they did wrong.

30272. Do you consider they did right?—I maintain that while we were not bound to remunerate slave owners, it might have been wise to do so. I believe that they were wise in doing it, because they avoided such a war as they had in the United States, which cost ten times more than would have been required to remunerate the slave owners.

30273. It is not, then, a question of right or wrong, but of expediency?—I do not believe it is right to remunerate the liquor men, but it might be expedient. If you did it, it might not be wrong, on the ground that it is never wrong for a man to give away his money, if he chooses to do so.

30274. You said that it was cheaper to remunerate the slave owners than to incur the expense of a war; that has nothing to do with the right or wrong?—No.

30275. That is a matter of expediency?—I do not think we are in justice bound to remunerate the brewers and distillers, but if a prohibitory law were passed, it might be expedient to do so. We would not be doing wrong in doing it, if we thought it expedient. As a matter of principle, I do not think justice requires they should be remunerated.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

30276. You do not understand that there was any remuneration to the slave proprietors?—When the British Government freed the slaves I cannot say that they remunerated the proprietors as distinguished from the owners. If they did that, they did decidedly wrong.

30277. Was the remuneration for the slaves a matter of purchase, or was the money paid as a gratuity afterwards to certain persons who had suffered and not to persons who had owned slaves?—That I cannot say. It is so long since I have read up history of that kind, that I would have to inform myself about it before I could answer.

30278. How are these institutions of which you spoke supported?—The Houses of Industry and Foundling Hospital and others are supported by the charity of the public, by means of benevolent contributions.

30279. Is there any public grant?—In some cases I think there is, but I cannot say in what cases or to what extent.

30280. Does the Province of Quebec give a grant towards one or the other?—To the Ladies' Benevolent Institution the Province gives a grant for certain children placed there; but how much, or under what conditions, I cannot say.

30281. Does the city?—It does to some institutions, but I cannot say to what extent.

30282. Are annual reports made of the expenditures of those institutions?—Yes.

30283. Are you connected at all with the society represented by Mr. Carsley, the Society for the Protection of Women and Children? If so, what is your observation of that work?—Yes. My observations are that between ninety and ninety-five per cent of the cases that come before that society are traceable, directly or indirectly, to strong drink.

30284. I think you said that on visiting the Foundling Hospital you came in contact with fallen women, more or less?—Yes.

30285. You said that drink was very largely the cause of their fall?—My impression was, from inquiry, not from personal knowledge, but on very good and sufficient data, that such was the case.

*By the Chairman:*

30286. You are necessarily a good deal around the city?—Yes.

30287. Is there more intemperance now than when you began your work in the city?—No; I do not think there is. I cannot say that I think there is not less.

30288. Do you think we have too many places where liquor is sold?—I know we have.

30289. Would you like to see the number reduced?—Certainly.

30290. Do you think there are many places where liquor is illicitly sold?—Not to my personal knowledge. I have reason to believe that there are many places where liquor is sold illicitly.

30291. And do you think it would be advantageous if the number of licensed places were largely decreased?—I do.

30292. Do you consider the present system of issuing licenses by Commissioners a good way to regulate the business?—I do not. Any man can get a license who can obtain twenty-five names to his petition for a license, although there may be 500 who would sign against it. If the evil must be licensed, certainly a majority, say two-thirds or three-fourths majority, should consent before a man could get a license.

30293. I suppose a majority of the municipal voters in any district can prevent a license being issued, if so disposed?—Yes; but the burden ought to be imposed on the man who claims the license to get the necessary majority in his favour, and not impose the duty on individuals to get a majority against him.

30294. Is it a fact that there is one district in the city where they have succeeded on that line?—I am only speaking from hearsay, but I have heard that in one district an application was made by the citizens against the granting of a license to a certain individual, and with success. Sometime later, the same man made application over again—rather he did it in another name, but it was the same individual—the thing was done surreptitiously, nobody seemed to know anything about it, and the license was granted.

30295. Are there any other cases in that district?—Not that I know of; I do not even know of that personally.

30296. Then, practically, they have got prohibition there?—I would not say that, because they did not get it. After a time, the liquor man succeeded in getting a license, but at higher rates.

30297. There is no other in the district?—Since then half a dozen have sprung up around it. I refer to the district opposite St. George's Church, near Windsor Station.

30298. I was merely referring to the matter for the purpose of inquiring if there is a strong sentiment in favour of a prohibitory law. How can you account for the issue of licenses?—The law has made it impossible for public sentiment to check that, because it requires twenty-five signers on the part of the man who wants a license but requires a majority against him, and imposes the bulk of the work on those who oppose the license.

30299. If there was a strong sentiment, could not that majority be found?—In the case of the place opposite St. George's Church, that majority was found, and a few weeks later the man made his application again, nobody knew of it, but he succeeded in getting a license.

30300. That might be a violation of the law. I am inquiring as to the general position of the question here now. We have an excessive number of licensed places, and if the sentiment against these places is so strong, does not the law permit of its being given expression and cause a large number of licenses now issued to be dropped?—Attempts have been made to prevent the granting of licenses in many cases. In some cases they have been successful, but in a great number of cases licenses were granted.

30301. Was that from the want of sufficient time to gather the force of the public sentiment?—I have not been working in that line.

30302. What time is allowed by the law for filing an opposition?—I do not know.

GEORGE HAGUE, General Manager of the Merchants' Bank of Canada, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows —

*By the Chairman :*

30303. I sent you a letter containing some figures for your information and asking you to appear before this Commission and answer the questions, which I also inclosed.

Mr. HAGUE, in reply, read the following statement :—Having already given my opinion of this question, and incidentally of prohibition, I am now asked two further questions :—

1st. What, in my opinion, is the effect of the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, upon the general business interests of the Dominion ?

2nd. What would be the effect on those interests and on the revenue requirements of the Dominion, provinces and municipalities, of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicants, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes ?

With regard to the first, it is evident that a business which is so extensively carried on in Canada, both in the way of importation, manufacture and sale, both wholesale and retail, must give rise to the employment of a large number of persons, both directly and indirectly, and also to the employment of capital in various forms. The business of importation gives rise to the employment of our ships, steamers and railways, to the building and renting of warehouses, and furnishes employment for sailors, officers, clerks and workmen of various kinds, as well as business for the heads of mercantile houses, all of which leads to the employment of capital and the diffusion of money in channels too numerous to be followed up here. With regard to the manufacture of liquors, both in distilleries, breweries and wine-making establishments, it is evident that a large amount of capital has been expended in the erection of costly buildings and valuable plant and machinery placed therein, all of which has, of course, led to a large employment of labour of all descriptions, from the highest to the lowest, and to the diffusion of large amounts of money through the country in the same channels that were before adverted to. And the actual carrying on from year to year of such manufacture gives rise to the steady employment of persons numbering, it is said, 2,700 or thereabouts, this figure representing only the actual wage-earners, many of whom, doubtless, have families. The number of actual persons deriving their support from these manufactories is, therefore, much larger than that just named.

In considering what may be called the monetary interest of the trade, the income derived by principals, and their expenditure thereof, through various channels, has to be considered as well as that of employees and workmen. When the process of sale and distribution begins, the same agencies are called for as were referred to in the case of importation, that is, employment is given to railroads, steamboats, warehouses, shops, etc., and to all their employees, and to the other interests deriving business from them.

With regard to agriculture, the trade furnishes a market to growers of corn, barley, hops and grapes. I am not, however, disposed to attach much importance to this, inasmuch as the same land which grows corn or barley can readily be turned to other uses.

But that the trade gives rise to a large amount of business and employment to a large number of persons, and that those in turn give rise to an immensely ramified line of business and employment in other lines, goes without saying.

I speak of the matter now, of course, purely on the line of the questions asked, simply as a matter of trade, exactly as if I were considering the trade in dry goods or hardware. It may be within the lines of these questions to consider the effect of the trade, so far as drunkenness is concerned, upon those employed in it. From all that has come under my observation, I should judge that the persons carrying on the trade and employed in it, whether principals, subordinates, or workingmen, are generally as sober as any other class in the community, with the exception of the lower class of saloon-keepers and bar-tenders. In fact, so far as distillers are concerned and perhaps brewers too, the necessities of the case call for a high average of sobriety in employees and workmen, and strict rules for its enforcement.

With regard to the second question, namely, the effect on business of absolute prohibition, except for certain purposes, it is not difficult to see that the effect would be to destroy the value of a large amount of what is now valuable property (namely, the buildings and plant of every brewery and distillery in the country), to throw a large number of persons out of employment altogether, and much diminish the employment of many other persons. There can be no doubt that a large amount of distress to families would follow until matters were adjusted to the new opinion. The cutting off of the income of all the persons and companies engaged in the business, and their officers and clerks, with the diminution of business of those amongst whom their incomes are spent, has also to be taken into account. So much with regard to the bearing of the abolition directly upon the parties carrying it on. So far as the Government is concerned, it is obvious that the large diminution in their revenue would require to be made up from other sources. It is difficult to see how this could be done without a very burdensome increase of taxation to all parties in the country. There is further the grave question of compensation. Without expressing any opinion of my own on the merits of this subject, I do not believe it possible that a prohibitory law could be passed by a Canadian Legislature without provision for compensation. The trade is one which, by force of circumstances, has grown up, not only under permission, but under the supervision and direction of the Government at every step. Take for example, the very burdensome requirements from distillers to keep the enormous stock of two years' consumption on hand. It could hardly be expected that properties so created should be destroyed by legislation without compensating the owners. The question of compensation would be found to have a very far reaching application, for not only would the owners of properties claim to be considered, but also the large number of persons thrown out of employment in connection with them. I give, of course, my own opinion as to what legislation is likely to be. Assuming compensation as likely, I think it probable that \$12,000,000 or \$15,000,000 at the lowest calculation, would be required for that purpose. This sum would be a permanent addition to the burdens of the country.

On the other hand, supposing a prohibitory law were carried out, and had the consummation, devoutly to be wished, of abolishing drunkenness, there would undoubtedly be an increased consumption of dutiable articles, such as dry goods, groceries, &c., as well as an increase in the business of savings banks, and, in time, of house building and other forms of desirable expenditure, all which would go to increase the revenue of the country and the value of property. I doubt much, however, taking a practical view of the question, if the increase of revenue would amount to so much as is supposed, for a large amount of what may be called occasional drunkenness might be stopped without producing any perceptible increase in the spending power on the part of those who indulge. In the cases where confirmed drunkenness leads to poverty and a miserable style of living in the house, there would be, of course, an immediate increase of spending power.

With regard to agencies for punishment of crime, such as courts, police, jails and penitentiaries, there would no doubt be a certain diminution of expense. But it is difficult to estimate how much actual saving would be effected. There must in every country be administration of justice, with its attendant expense, as there is for example in Mohammedan countries wherein intoxicating liquors are almost unknown. So far as crime is concerned, I have heard it said that professional criminals are rarely drunkards. They could not carry on their nefarious practices if they were. This large class, it is to be feared, would not be abolished or even much diminished by a prohibitory law, nor would certain other modes of wrong-doing, which bring persons within the law, and its attendant expense. The diminution, I take it, would be largely in the class of offences against the person, which arise from quarrels and brawls in drinking places. It would be interesting to see some attempt at accurate calculation, purely on a statistical and business basis, on this subject. I incline, however, to the opinion that the saving in the administration of justice would not be so considerable as is sometimes supposed. The great value from an economical and business standpoint of the repression of drunkenness would be in the increase of the spending powers of the people. This

GEORGE HAGUE.

applies also, to some small extent, to the entire stoppage of moderate drinking as well, could such a thing be brought about by law.

In dealing with the prohibition question, an exception is supposed to be made, both in importation and manufacture, in favour of intoxicants for mechanical, sacramental, and medicinal purposes. I do not see how any law could be worked which would make such a distinction, unless, indeed, the whole affair were taken in hand by the Government and worked entirely through one of its departments, *i. e.*, not only supervised as it is now, but actually worked. Even then, I do not believe the distinction could be kept up.

In these answers I have endeavoured to confine myself strictly to the matter defined in the questions submitted to me. But the many and ramified evils, moral, social and economical, arising out of drunkenness, are so great, that hardly any price can be too great for a community to pay to be free from them. But, as I said before, I have the gravest possible doubts whether this can be accomplished by general legislation, although it may be diminished and kept within bounds by judicious municipal laws. With regard to what can and what cannot be accomplished by law, we have much experience to guide us.

Drunkenness is essentially a moral evil, and only moral and spiritual forces are competent finally to eradicate it. That these are so competent, there has been abundant evidence in numerous individual cases on which they have been brought to bear.

*By Judge McDonald :*

30304. With regard to the economic question. In the case of the passing of a general prohibitory law to do away with the revenue from customs duty and excise, which the Government now receive, have you considered at all the means of making up that deficiency?—I find it difficult to understand how it could be done. Of course an income tax or some form of direct taxation could be resorted to.

30305. It was suggested by one or two gentlemen that, if necessary, an increase could be made on the taxes on tea and coffee?—That is a question for the future Finance Minister. The Government find it difficult enough to raise the revenue as it is.

30306. Take the Provincial Governments which have now the power to levy duties—the sum of \$600,000 is the amount received by the Province of Quebec from license fees—what mode would you suggest for making good that sum?—I know of no mode other than direct taxation.

30307. Have you considered the mode of direct taxation?—I have not thought about it, but I know we are struggling with a mode of direct taxation now which is exceedingly difficult and excites great remonstrance and outcry, although it was very carefully considered, to my knowledge, and suggestions received from a good many persons who were supposed to know. Yet the attempt to put it in force has excited a great deal of disturbance, difficulty and trouble.

30308. A suggestion was made to tax bank dividends?—As a banker, I should desire that bank dividends be kept to the very last, but, of course, this is a difficult matter, and I have not considered it specially at this moment.

*By the Chairman :*

30309. You have been a resident here now for a good many years?—Sixteen years.

30310. Do you think there is more intemperance in the city now than when you came?—I do not see any particular difference either in the way of increase or decrease, but I can go back to the time when I lived here 35 years ago and more, and I think there is a decided diminution in drinking since that time.

30311. We have a very large number of saloons and drinking places under the present system. Whilst Toronto has one licensed place to 860 of a population, Montreal has about one to 230. That seems an excessive number?—It is agreed by everybody that there are far too many in Montreal and the facilities for obtaining liquor are far too easy. I agree with what the last witness said on the whole subject; I think his evidence was very much to the point.

30312. Does it occur to you what steps should be taken to bring about a reduction, supposing it were thought necessary to continue the present system of licensing the

traffic?—I have thought at times that a high license would have a certain effect, and then, as suggested by the last witness, the burden should be thrown on the man who desires to have a license and profit by it, and not upon those who have other matters to attend to and to whom it is a trouble and expenditure of time and money to oppose applications for license. The burden of getting the majority should be thrown upon the applicants. Let the man who desires to do the business have the trouble of getting a majority, and there should be in my opinion a large majority. I heard some of the evidence of Dr. Campbell this morning, and I agree with him that a saloon pure and simple as a place to drink in, is on the whole a very great evil.

30313. The system, when the licenses were controlled by the city, did not produce more satisfaction than under the present system. In Toronto, licenses are issued by Commissioners appointed by the Government, but the City Council is permitted to name the number of licenses which shall be issued. Do you think that it would be proper to give that power to the Council in Montreal?—I do not want to disparage the Council of my own city, but I should favour the matter being dealt with by Government Commissioners.

30314. One of the most effective methods would be to put on the person seeking the license the responsibility of getting the majority of voters?—I would say two-thirds majority at least. I think if you can have officers of the Government dealing with this whole matter everywhere, it would produce very good results.

30315. Do you think it would be advantageous to have the issue of licenses controlled by the Dominion Government?—Well, that is a question.

30315a. That was the proposal under the McCarthy Act?—That is a question between the Dominion and the Provincial Legislatures. It is a very large question, and I am hardly competent to give an opinion upon it at a moment's notice. When I said Government, I meant in a general sense either the Provincial or Dominion Government. I am inclined very strongly to the regulation of the traffic as it is regulated in the north of Europe. In those countries, they put the whole matter into the hands of the Government, and throw the whole responsibility upon it.

MAJOR E. L. BOND, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

30316. You are engaged at present in what business?—Insurance manager.

30317. You have lived in Montreal all your life, and were born here?—Yes.

30318. I believe you are President of the Law and Order League?—The Citizens' League of Montreal is the official title.

30319. What are the objects of the League?—It was organized in 1888, for the purpose of enforcing the law prohibiting the sale of liquor to minors, enforcing the observance of the law regulating the liquor traffic and public morals, and to do that work in concert with the society now organized for the Prevention of Cruelty to Women and Children and Animals, in so far as the cruelty arises out of the liquor traffic.

30320. Have you succeeded in reducing the number of licenses?—Yes. Up to the time of the organization the licenses had greatly increased. The first year of our work licenses remained about steady; since then there has been a reduction, notwithstanding the increase of population.

30321. A reduction in the aggregate number?—Yes, a small reduction.

30322. Do you find that legislative measures are still necessary to enable you to make further reductions?—Yes. The legislation is fairly good at present, but amendments changing some little material points would certainly help it very much.

30323. Will you mention them?—I think that to require an increased number of names before granting an application, would be one of the greatest measures of help. I refer to endorsers of applications for license. And a stricter supervision of the moral

GEORGE HAGUE.

character and previous record of parties applying for license and of the suitability of their place would be desirable.

30324. What machinery would you employ to bring about that stricter examination?—At present we have got the machinery of the Revenue Police. If that organization were strengthened, it would be a very good means of attaining that end.

30325. Do you think it is inefficient from the want of a sufficient number of men?—I do not think it is inefficient, but it might be made more efficient. The present police force was reorganized within the last eight months; previous to that time it was utterly corrupt. The reorganization has been very good; and within the last six months, we have had valuable work done by the revenue police as now constituted, but it is a little weak in numbers.

30326. You think, in order to secure stricter examination into the character of the applicants, an addition should be made to the provincial police?—Yes; still the present police, if they are notified of the requirements of the Government, would be competent.

30327. I am not quite sure that I understand your last answer?—The revenue police receive definite instructions from the Government through the Collector of Provincial Revenue, as to the information wanted regarding these places. Those instructions, coming from the Government, requiring full particulars from the revenue police, the present police are quite able to carry out.

30328. Then the information is not obtained to as full an extent as it ought to be at present, owing to the police not being sufficiently instructed?—That has been the case up to the present time.

30329. Is it not so now?—It is under the direction of the Government. The Citizens' League have applied to the Government to give those instructions.

30330. To instruct the Collector to make stricter scrutiny?—Yes, of the places and character of the applicants for license.

30331. Has there been an increase or decrease in temperance in the city?—My opinion favours a decided improvement. So far as my own social life is concerned, I have been a teetotaller for twenty-two years now. I recollect the time when I was at the club dinners, I was the only one at the table who did not take wine. I find now that at almost every dinner an appreciable number do not take wine.

30332. You think there is really less intemperance than there was fifteen years ago?—Yes, I think less people drink and that less wine is drunk, proportionately.

30333. Have you studied the prohibition question?—Not in connection with the Citizens' League, as it is not a prohibition body. Anything I may say on prohibition is my own individual view, and not the views of other gentlemen connected with the League. I may say that I am very strongly in favour of total prohibition.

30334. Would you make no exception?—What I understand total prohibition to be is an Act making an exception in favour of liquor for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes.

30335. Would you not permit importations for private use?—No, my feeling is quite to that extent.

30336. Would you go beyond the Maine liquor law?—Decidedly; I think one of its weaknesses is the fact that liquor is allowed to be imported, and that makes it much more difficult to handle and control the traffic.

30337. In the present state of public opinion, do you think a prohibition law, if submitted to the people, would be adopted?—That is my opinion.

30338. Do you think that public sentiment is so decided on the subject that the people would vote for any prohibition measure?—I think so; I would like to see it tested. As a prohibitionist, I would not care to see prohibition introduced unless in a constitutional manner, with a fair majority of the people requiring it.

30339. Do you think that with such a majority, it could be efficiently carried out?—Without a doubt. I have noticed that, when the point of enforcing prohibition has come up, reference has been made to the Scott Act, and the Maine law; but so far as I have been able to study them, there is no comparison between the two. In the Scott Act and the Maine Act, you take an imaginary line around a certain district and you do not forbid liquor coming into that place, but you merely forbid the sale of it; whereas, if



you had a whole district or a whole country, such as Canada with its customs laws and regulations, forbidding the importation, manufacture or sale, that would make it contraband. Liquor going into the country would be quickly discovered; it would be easily located and confiscated. I would like to cite as an example that in England, when gas first came in, there was a great outcry that it would poison the people in the houses, but they found that when there was a leakage it was immediately discovered through the smell. I believe the same thing would apply if we had prohibition in Canada, because if liquor, to any extent, came out, it would at once make itself known through the smell or its effect on the people, and would therefore be comparatively easy to suppress.

30340. I suppose that liquor brought in for medicinal purposes would also distribute its flavour amongst the community?—Yes, but I think it could be controlled and traced. I do not think that alcohol sold under those circumstances would find its way to the detriment of the public, without the leakage being found and stopped.

30341. You are taking into consideration, I suppose, the fact that Canada borders on the United States, her long border line in many places being only an imaginary one, and has three thousand miles of frontier; and that unless we had prohibition on the other side of that line, it would be rather difficult to prevent liquor coming in?—I quite understand it would come over the border and there would be a number of breaches, but I do not believe it would penetrate far into the country.

30342. Would the breach mentioned be the rule instead of the exception, do you think?—In seaport towns possibly, but along the border line I do not believe it would go far into the interior of the country.

30343. The Commission found in Prince Edward Island that, under the system of permit or sale through licensed persons for medical purposes, etc., there was a tremendous abuse of the system, in fact that almost as much liquor as previously was being sold?—I know nothing of the mode they have of enforcing the law.

30344. I speak of Prince Edward Island because, being an island, men could not walk over the line into another country and get drunk or carry liquor into their own country very readily?—I know nothing of the mode of enforcing the law; it will all depend on that. If in Canada there was a prohibitory law and it was not enforced, undoubtedly liquor would come in; but if the Government really meant to take measures to prevent liquor coming in and really endeavoured to enforce the law, as they would any other law, I would not fear the result.

30345. Have you given any consideration to the financial side of the question, as to the replacement of the loss of revenue to the Dominion and the provinces?—Not sufficient to form any opinion on it.

*By Judge McDonald:*

30346. Do you find any other law which is considered by the people in the same light as this? Would the infringement of it affect public sentiment towards the offender in the same way as would the infringement of other laws?—I think, on the contrary, the moral feeling as regards liquor selling is more lax than in case of any other law.

30347. It seems to occupy a different position from any other law?—Very different.

30348. In the courts, when witnesses give evidence, do you find that regard for truth which is exhibited in other cases?—I have sat with the Judges on the Bench, and have been in most all the courts of Canada and the United States, and have seen the way they administer the liquor law.

30349. As the Hon. Edward Blake says, you take a man who has committed a breach of this law and he is a law breaker, yet the ordinary citizen does not interfere with him, whereas, in other cases he would seize the offender and would do what he could to bring him to justice. Is there not in that way a different sentiment?—Very greatly in the past, but I find a decided change for the better during the past eight or ten years.

30350. I do not mean to put the drinking of a glass of liquor on the same footing, but I speak of the ordinary sentiment?—I find all through that the moral sentiment in connection with the sale of liquor is different from that sentiment on any other subject.

30351. If any such enactment as this were made, you would like to have it made in a constitutional way. What is that way?—By the Dominion Parliament.

MAJOR E. L. BOND.

30352. Do you know of any way under our constitution by which questions are voted upon by the people to decide whether they should be legislated upon or not. Is not the responsibility, in our system of constitution, thrown upon the legislators in this matter?—That is what I have always thought, although my own sentiment is rather strong in favour of a plebiscite. This question has been before the people and thoroughly discussed for years, and it is difficult otherwise to obtain a decision.

30353. We found in investigating in California recently that they do not take a vote upon the question, but that action is taken by the local municipalities. The question at the polls is, whether people will elect councillors or trustees, as they call them, who are going in for prohibition; and if a prohibition Council is elected the members have power to enact a prohibitory law. Would it not be more in accord with British precedents to take that mode, than vote merely at the polls on the question as an abstract one?—I do not know that I am sufficiently posted in constitutional matters to answer that question. I have always been taught that the constitutional body we have to look to is the Dominion Parliament, and if we wanted to affect that, we had to go to the polls and make our wishes known through the polls.

30354. I do not know whether you have any experience in the matter of taking a plebiscite. Do you know whether the people go to the polls and simply vote for the law, and then that law is left to somebody else to put in force?—One of the difficulties we have met with in the enforcement of the law is that the Dominion Government makes the law and leaves the enforcement of it to the provinces, which do not make it. I should like to see the Government that makes the law enforce it.

30355. And would you have the Government provide officers?—Yes.

30356. You spoke of the difficulties of local option in small sections. Take the case of the Scott Act, where whole blocks of counties adopted it. There were counties that were surrounded by prohibition counties—of course the people had the right of bringing in, as they have in Maine, liquor for private consumption—and yet when opportunity offered, the people, after trying the Act for three years, repealed it, and repealed it not merely in the outlying counties but in the inner counties?—I have listened to a great many discussions on that subject, and I fancy they expected too much from the Scott Act. They expected it to have the same effect as total prohibition. Liquor coming in and drunken people coming in caused a reaction, and they abandoned the Act.

30357. May it not have been in this way: They voted for the Act, with the best motives, to prevent drinking, and they found the result did not follow, and so they went back to the old system?—Yes.

30358. Why is it that the officers appointed do not do their duty? Have you thought that out?—Yes.

30359. Is it because they have not public sentiment at their back?—No. I believe it is because in the past the liquor people claimed to be the controllers of public votes and opinions and the electioneering machinery; but the real difficulty has been, I think, that the officers who would have enforced the law were those not in accord with it, from the fact that they believed that the great power behind the politicians was the liquor traffic and not the temperance people.

30360. Who are responsible?—The temperance people, because they have held back and practically left politics in the hands of the liquor dealers and the politicians. In return for the support of the liquor dealers, they naturally rewarded them with situations, offices, &c.

30361. Do you hope better for the public under a prohibitory Act?—Yes, because the people are being educated up to a better knowledge.

30362. If you do not get that, can you hope for better results, or would it be the old story over again?—The history of the movement in the States and here, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is, that whenever the citizens really rise to oppose the liquor traffic they have never failed. One of the greatest instances I know of was in Chicago, where a Citizens' League system was really first formed. About twelve years ago they found the whole municipality of the city under control of the liquor people. They were told it was impossible to change the state of things, but inside of one year they completely abolished it and obtained control and swamped the liquor people.

30363. That was a matter of regulation, was it not?—It was a matter of certain power that was latent, but which they did not think they had at all before they tried it.

30364. Was it not a power of regulating the traffic?—They regulated it by regulating those who governed it.

30365. Still it was a matter of regulation?—Yes.

30366. Take the Province of Ontario and the regulation preventing the sale of liquor on election days and Sundays and so on. Is not the whole weight of public opinion in favour of that, as possibly it is with your people?—I confess that the sale of liquor on election days has found public opinion very lax here. Many are astonished to find when they go to their lunch on election day, that such a law exists, and quite a number say that they had forgotten all about the fact that liquor was not to be sold.

30367. Take your view which differs a little from that of the Rev. Mr. McManus, who would allow wines in the people's houses for their own use and consumption. You would not allow that. Would you prevent a farmer making liquor on his own farm for his own use?—Undoubtedly.

30368. Would you prevent his wife making home-made wine in which there is alcohol?—If it was intoxicating wine, I would prevent it.

30369. How would you punish them?—The liquor would be confiscated.

30370. Home brewed ales are, I suppose, sometimes potent enough to affect a person a little. If the breweries were closed, people might resort to that method. Would you prevent that?—Certainly, I understand that a prohibitory law would prohibit the manufacture, and that would extend to home manufacture.

30371. To carry that law out would require the right to search places and persons and those who came into the country?—Without a doubt.

30372. The right to search places?—Without a doubt.

30373. How are you going to provide for that?—That is a matter for which the Government is bound to provide, if the majority of the people desire such a law.

30374. You think it is the duty of the Government to provide for it and the people must bear the expense?—Yes.

30375. I think you have said that you have not considered the question of expense?—No, because I do not believe it is a very serious matter to enforce it.

30376. Do you know of any country where such a law is in force?—No.

30377. You have heard of the attempt in the North-west?—Yes, but I did not attach much importance to that.

30378. There was, of course, a permit system there; but the Government maintained a force of about 1,000 mounted policemen who were to see to the enforcement of the law, and now they have, by their own Legislature, adopted a license law. You have not studied the subject there?—Yes.

30379. Have you heard of the smuggling from Montana of liquor in spite of the mounted police?—Yes.

30380. Have you heard of their system of preventing smuggling?—I quite admit there was difficulty there with a newly populated country of enormous extent, but it was kept fairly well under control.

30381. Do you say, under your oath, it was?—It was, so far as I can ascertain from information that I received up there, until they received a sort of tacit understanding that they were not to be too strict.

30382. Do you assert that there ever was such an understanding as that?—I assert that I received information from the people there that that was the feeling. If I could have obtained anything definite, I would have been only too glad to have reported to the Government.

30383. Do you know that it necessitated not only the searching of persons and luggage and houses, but it rendered necessary the searching of packages of merchandise coming through the Territories; and in puncheons of molasses and sugar, crates of cabbage, and all manner of packages, liquor was found concealed?—Yes, I do.

30384. Do you know that, in a great many cases, packages were opened and inspected, and nothing found in them, and the goods were damaged by being opened by

men unaccustomed to packing goods and who could not repack them, and the consequence was great injury to tradesmen?—Yes.

30385. Do you know that in the North-west Territories, tin cases, looking like bibles, were found to contain liquor?—I have not heard of such.

30386. Do you know that packages would be addressed to leading persons or prominent ministers of the Gospel containing liquor and which packages never reached those ministers, but were taken off by the persons for whom they were intended, at the station?—I never heard of that.

30387. Did you learn that the police searched sleeping cars coming in from British Columbia, and that finally travellers made such strong objections that the Government had to stop it, and immediately after it was stopped the sleeping cars became a great means for bringing liquor into the Territories?—Yes.

30388. You have heard of those things?—Yes.

30389. And you have heard of private distilling going on?—Yes.

30390. And having heard of these things, you consider prohibition could be practically enforced?—Remembering the number of men who were in charge of thousands and thousands of square miles, in a comparatively new country, I would not consider that as having much weight. I think that a general prohibition law, enforced by means of fines and confiscation, could be carried out.

30391. You think that having a large extent of country and a much larger population to deal with, and therefore, possibly, a larger number to look after, would render it not more difficult but more easy?—Much more easy in the older parts.

30392. The larger the population, the more easily regulated?—The more easy to trace it and prevent it.

30393. From the information you obtained in the North-west Territories, was liquor more easily brought in after the means of communication became easier, after the C. P. R. was built, or when it had to be carried in by carts?—I do not know that I could give you any information on that point. The whole country has changed so rapidly that it is difficult to form any comparison between one period and another.

30394. What I understand is, let these difficulties be what they may, you are prepared to try prohibition and, if possible, make it a success?—Certainly.

30395. And you have every hope it will be a success?—Certainly.

30396. And to do that you are willing to risk the possibilities of revolution in business, and closing up business and interfering with the trade and tariff relations of the country. Would you risk all these, being so well convinced that the result would be good?—I have sufficient faith in the principle to take the risk.

30397. What about remunerating distillers for loss of plant and machinery?—As a matter of principle, I should say no. I believe in equity and in not shutting down these places in twenty-four hours, I believe in the event of the adoption of a prohibitory law the parties should be given, perhaps a year, to close up.

30398. Would you, in a matter which you believe is such an evil, allow the evil to last another year, simply because of a trade question?—It is a matter of simple equity between man and man. I recognize that the liquor traffic has been in vogue from time immemorial, and all my ancestors have recognized it as a legitimate trade. I recognize that we are asking for radical changes, and, as a matter of equity, I think it would not be departing from principle to be reasonable in bringing about such a change.

30399. But you are allowing all these men to sell liquor and people to drink it for a year. Would that be consistent with your position?—Quite consistent.

30400. There is another phase of the question, and that is the difficulty that would accrue from the exception for medicinal and mechanical purposes. Have you had experience in any section where there was prohibition of that kind?—Never.

30401. As to the way in which medical certificates could be obtained by the people?—I never lived in any such section.

30402. You have not studied that side of the question, to find out how people manage to evade the law and get their liquor?—I know this would be one of the sources that would likely have to be attended to, but I do not think that it would be such a serious matter that it could not be looked after.

30403. But you have nothing in the way of experience to guide you?—No personal experience whatever. I have had a good deal to do within the last twenty years, in connection with the militia, in the way of preventing liquor being brought into camp.

30404. That would be for how long a time?—During the camp, which lasted a month, and a month and a half.

30405. And in the North-west?—We did not go. We were in camp for one and a half months waiting orders, which did not come.

30406. You prevented liquor coming into the camp?—Yes.

30407. And found it an easy matter?—Comparatively.

30408. Were the men allowed to go and get it outside?—There was nothing to prevent their taking it outside.

30409. Was there a canteen?—No, it was not permitted. I have always opposed it.

30410. Liquor was prohibited?—Any liquor found in the camp was confiscated.

30411. The men could go out and get it?—There was no difficulty in their going out to get it.

30412. They cannot bring it in, but may drink it outside?—A. Yes.

30413. Did they ever do that?—Very often. About 90 or 95 per cent of all the trouble in the camp was traceable directly to liquor. About twelve or fifteen years ago the sergeant-major asked me if I would start a regimental pledge for him, that he and some others wished to sign it. I did so, and between sixty and seventy men of the regiment pledged themselves as teetotallers. The regiment was never in a better state of discipline than then, and I have on hand some reports, specially referring to the regiment and its high state of discipline.

30414. These men took the pledge?—Yes.

30415. That was done voluntarily?—Yes.

30416. Take such a state of things as you learned existed in the North-west Territories, do you not think that it was due to the fact that a large class of the population wished to get this liquor?—Undoubtedly.

30417. Is there not also a different sentiment among people about this liquor traffic than about anything else that is illegal?—I admit that the man who would not deceive or lie in connection with matters of business or anything in that line, would not hesitate to deceive or lie in connection with people handling liquor.

30418. Still, with all this, you are prepared to support a law which brings in this condition of things?—Yes, because I believe that a total prohibitory law could be enforced to such an extent that it would be satisfactory to those who are in favour of it, always supposing that it was carried constitutionally by the majority of the people. I would not believe in any catch vote or anything of that sort, because I believe it would be worse than nothing. I do not want prohibition until we have it clean, clear, straight and constitutional.

30419. With regard to the question of revenue, supposing that \$6,500,000 were taken away and lost to the Government, there must be some means of making the amount good. Have you considered the means?—I believe there would be a reduction in certain expenses,—for instance, the administration of justice.

30420. The Dominion does not bear that expense, except as regards the maintaining of the penitentiaries?—I believe the people would be in the state to accept direct taxation.

30421. Would you be willing to submit to direct taxation to get prohibition?—Yes, I have heard many people say they would be right willing to bear their share of any burden of direct taxation for the sake of having relief.

30422. You would apply the same remedy to the provincial revenue with regard to the loss of license fees?—Undoubtedly.

*By the Chairman :*

30423. You think the people of the Province of Quebec would be willing to pay direct taxation in order to get rid of the liquor traffic?—You ask me a question which affects the French people. I have found the French, as a nation, are most abstemious. I believe that, with a little education, with the aid of the Church of Rome, which is the

MAJOR E. L. BOND.

great controlling power, they would easily be brought to fall in with the idea, as they are undoubtedly a temperate race.

30424. You state that you have heard a great many people express their willingness to pay direct taxation in order to get rid of the liquor traffic. Do you think that applies to the majority of the people of the Province of Quebec?—No, I have no views on that question. My statement refers to my own social friends.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

30425. Speaking of the North-west and the means resorted to in order to evade the law, does it not strike you that the fact that these means have to be resorted to shows the success of prohibition?—I understood that when they were doing their utmost to carry out the law, so far as they could, there was a good deal of difficulty experienced in breaking the law.

30426. What method do the Citizens' League pursue in carrying out the purposes of the League?—The system we adopted was that of procuring information, lodging it with the Government, endeavouring to force the Government to enforce the law, and at the same time standing ready to take action ourselves if the Government would not.

30427. You were fairly successful in that?—Under the late Government we were singularly unsuccessful; it was an uphill fight and a most depressing one. When the present Administration came in, they adopted the plan of allowing the law to take its own course without interfering with it, and in the last six or eight months it has been singularly successful.

30428. Have you found throughout all these years that the liquor traffic, as you have to do with it in Montreal, is difficult to deal with?—Most difficult and lawless.

30429. Do you know anything else in Montreal that is quite so lawless?—There is only one other evil, and that is the social evil, which is also so closely bound up with the liquor traffic that it is almost impossible to separate them.

30430. Are the expenses of the Citizens' League heavy under the present arrangement?—No, they have been light, as the Government undertake the prosecutions and we merely furnish the evidence.

30431. What expenses have been incurred have been provided for by personal subscription?—Yes.

30432. You think there has been a marked diminution in the use of intoxicants. To what do you attribute that?—To the education in the churches on temperance, and particularly to the formation of Bands of Hope and such societies. I find there is a constant increase in the number of young men and women growing up who do not touch liquor.

30433. As a business man, what is your observation of the effect of liquor on the general business interests?—Injurious. I believe that if the liquor traffic were done away with, other business interests would be more prosperous.

30434. But you have not given that particular branch of the subject much thought?—I have heard manufacturers state positively that if their employees were teetotallers, or had not the opportunity of obtaining liquor, their business would be more prosperous.

30435. Do you think they would pay higher wages?—Yes, I have heard that statement. I have heard manufacturers state that they could afford to pay higher wages if they could rely upon the workmen being in their normal condition and work all the time they are supposed to work.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, December 4, 1893.

The Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic met here this day, SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, Chairman, presiding.

*Present :*

JUDGE McDONALD.

REV. DR. McLEOD.

MR. G. A. GIGAULT.

ALEXANDER SABISTON, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

030436. You are Managing Director of the Sabiston Lithographing and Publishing Company?—Yes.

030437. How long has the company been in existence?—The company was organized in 1889.

030438. And before that was the business carried on under any other organization?—Under my own name, by myself.

030439. How long has the establishment been in operation?—The business started in 1887.

030440. Do you print many labels for tradesmen?—Well, that is not the principal part of our business ; we print some.

030441. What is your custom in regard to these labels? Do you simply print them to order?—Yes, just to order.

030442. Do you put up any stock of labels to vend to other people?—No, we do not.

030443. Do you keep any stock of labels for sale generally?—We keep a stock of lobster labels, salmon labels and other labels of that kind, but no liquor labels.

030444. Will you describe to us how you came to lithograph these salmon and other labels in the first instance?—We do quite a business in salmon labels and fruit labels, and we are very frequently asked by our customers for labels for special packings. When they are packing a second crop of goods we have blank labels so that the names can be printed in. Sometimes a customer will ask his name to be printed on a certain number of labels.

030445. Of a certain kind which you have in stock?—Yes, that is why we keep a small stock.

030446. Take your lobster labels, are they all of the same kind?—Oh, no, each packer has his own label.

030447. You fill in the name on the label and then that becomes So and So's label?—Yes.

030448. Did you print a variety of them in the first instance?—In the first instance we fill our contracts. The contracts are made early in the year with the different packers and it occasionally happens that a packer will ask for a certain number of labels not of his regular brand but of a certain customer. Lobster packers will sell one thousand cans to a wholesale grocer and that wholesale grocer will perhaps want his name on the labels. We keep blank labels for that purpose.

030449. The alteration you make would be to insert the name of the vendor?—Yes.

030450. The label itself in substance would be the same?—Not always.

030451. In the first instance are the designs for these labels your own work or are they got up for some particular firm?—They are generally designed by ourselves for some particular firm.

ALEXANDER SABISTON.

030452. Then do you sell these labels to any other firm?—No. When we make a design for any particular firm we do not sell to any other firm.

030453. But would you sell them to any particular vendor with the sanction of the person who ordered them originally?—Yes.

030454. Have you any labels that you print from your own design and keep in stock for the purpose of sale?—Yes, we have what are called stock labels.

030455. That are sold to any one who may apply for them?—Yes.

030456. And such addition in the matter of name made to them as the purchaser may desire?—Yes.

030457. Now what description of labels do you keep in stock?—Just the labels I have referred to, lobster labels, salmon labels, fruit labels and labels for canned goods generally.

030458. Do you keep any liquor labels in stock for sale?—No.

030459. You simply print them to order?—Simply to order.

030460. Are they supplied to other persons than the person or persons who may order them?—No, not by us.

030461. Is yours the largest lithographic establishment in the city?—I think it is the largest in the Dominion.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030462. These labels that you keep in stock for canned goods are furnished to those who put the goods up?—Yes.

030463. Then do they also put on a separate label showing the name of their own particular business?—The name is printed on the label. The stock of labels we keep in this case is small, perhaps one thousand or two thousand. It does not pay to keep a special design. We keep a general label and a blank space on it for the name.

030464. Do you print the name on the label?—Yes.

030465. These labels are what would be called "Partially finished"?—Yes.

030466. Then when you get an order you complete them by adding the name?—Yes. When a man has a sufficiently large business to have a trade mark he generally orders his labels in large quantities and they are printed specially.

030467. Would any of these labels with that special trade mark on be sold to A, B or C who may ask for them?—No.

030468. You can look upon these labels as the property of the individual who orders them?—That is it.

030469. I understood you to say in answer to the Chairman, that you do not keep any labels purporting to be for different kinds of liquor, on hand for general sale?—Not at all.

030470. So far as your knowledge goes do you know of any person or any firms in the business that do issue such labels?—Not so far as my knowledge goes. I only know it from hearsay.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030471. Do you print liquor labels to order?—Yes.

030472. You simply fill the orders of the parties requiring them?—That is all.

030473. And when the order is finished you have none remaining in stock?—None at all.

030474. Of course you are not supposed to know whether they use the labels for the purpose alleged or not, that is you are not supposed to know whether the liquors contained in the bottles upon which the labels are placed are as indicated by the labels or not. That is not your business?—No. I may say that the number of liquor labels we have printed is very small. It is a very small portion of our business and the houses we print them for are houses beyond reproach.

030475. With you it is simply a matter of the honour of the house?—Quite so.

030476. It is not a matter of your own knowledge except that you suppose that the houses are reputable?—Yes.



*By Judge McDonald :*

030477. Have you ever had people coming to you wanting to buy stock labels?—Yes, frequently.

030478. And you have declined to sell them?—We have simply said we did not have them in stock.

030479. If you had them in stock, would you have sold them?—Yes, I think we would have sold them.

030480. If you had labels with names on them would you sell them?—Oh, no; when I refer to a stock label I mean a blank label without any name.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030481. That is without the name of the firm?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

030482. You would not sell a label ordered by a particular firm to anybody but that firm?—Not at all. We have been asked—not as regards whisky or liquor labels—to supply the same designs to other people and we have refused. We consider that, when a man orders a design and pays for it, it is his.

REV. JOHN KER, D.D., of Point St. Charles, Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

030483. How long have you been Rector of Grace Church?—Nearly five years.

030484. I think recently you found that your church was too small for your congregation and you had a larger one erected?—Yes, very much larger.

030485. Have you taken much interest in the question of the liquor traffic?—A great deal.

030486. Have you had much intemperance around Point St. Charles. How much comes under your notice?—Well, considering the numbers and considering the population, I think not.

030487. Have you any temperance organization specially connected with your church?—Oh, yes.

030488. Will you tell us the character of it?—It is a total abstinence society called the “The Grace Church Branch of the Church of England Temperance Society.” We differ a little from the Church of England Temperance Society in that it admits into its partnership those who are moderate drinkers and those who are teetotallers. I have not found it expedient at Point St. Charles to adopt the dual basis, so I go in straight for total abstinence.

030489. And a large number of the members of your congregation are total abstainers?—I think not; not a large number.

030490. Are there many who are members of your temperance organization?—Not many members.

030491. Do you meet with many cases of intemperance amongst the members of your church, those who are, I shall say, adherents of your church?—Well, I meet a good many cases of intemperance amongst residents of Point St. Charles. I would not call all of them even adherents of Grace Church, although a great many people come to this country and call themselves on landing Church of England people and in that way we have a considerable following of people who are at times subject to habits of intemperance, that were never actively connected with Grace Church at all.

030492. Have you many cases of distress amongst your congregation which have been brought about by intemperance on the part of the heads of the family?—I can

ALEXANDER SABISTON.

hardly answer the question put in that way. There are not very many among my own congregation although there are some, but there are several amongst the residents of Point St. Charles.

030493. Do they belong to any church as a rule?—By right I fancy that the most of them I meet ought to belong to Grace Church, at least a large number of them ought for the reason I have already stated of their English affinities.

030494. You have perhaps some knowledge of these labour organizations, some of which have a great many members I am aware around Point St. Charles. What effect do you think they are having upon the habits of the people in the matter of the use of intoxicants?—No good I think.

030495. Do they not as a rule, try to enforce the observance of temperance habits?—I cannot speak very much from my personal knowledge, I mean of the inside of these societies, for I know nothing at all of their inside work. I can only speak from what I see of the lives of the members.

030496. Take such an organization as the Knights of Labour, do you think that the influence of that organization has a tendency to promote temperance habits?—I should be afraid to answer that question lest I should do the society an injustice.

030497. Although you have only been five years in charge of Grace Church, I think you have been a long time connected directly or indirectly with Point St. Charles?—More than twenty years.

030498. Do you think there is more or less intemperance amongst the population now than there was in your early connection with the place?—I think there is less.

030499. You think that things have been improving in that respect in that populous district?—I do think so.

030500. The population of Point St. Charles is almost entirely composed of a working population?—Yes.

030501. Have you given any consideration to the question of the prohibition of the liquor traffic?—I have.

030502. Have you come to any conclusion in regard to the desirability or otherwise of a prohibitive measure?—I would be quite ready to vote for it to-morrow.

030503. Of course on the ground that you think it would be beneficial?—On the ground that it would be beneficial, especially to those who are intemperate.

030504. What do you think it would accomplish?—I think it would, in a very great degree, put temptation out of the reach of those who are constantly using liquor to excess. That is the sum total of my argument in favour of prohibition.

030505. Do you think that in such a community as Point St. Charles it could be effectually enforced?—That would be more a matter for those in authority to answer rather than myself. Those in authority who have the enforcing of the law would, I suppose, naturally take steps to enforce their own enactment, or they ought to.

030506. I ask you because you are among the people and know them well and know something of their habits and feelings?—I think it would be difficult to enforce.

030507. Have you studied the operation of the prohibitive system in any place?—A little in so far as it applies to the State of Maine during my visits from year to year. I went into the question a little, not very extensively, but in order to help me to form a judgment upon it.

030508. What conclusion have you come to as to the manner in which the prohibitory law is enforced in the State of Maine?—All that I saw was highly in its favour. I wish we could have such a system in Montreal. I mean such apparent results as I saw in Portland, Maine.

030509. Did you make any inquiry as to the condition of the community in the State of Maine with reference to the matter of temperance?—I did.

030510. I am asking this apart from the question as to what might meet the eye. Of course I know there are no open saloons with flaunting and enticing signs outside. None at all. I think it was a great gain.

030511. But could you say as to what happens below the surface?—I understand that there are volcanoes below the surface.

030512. Is there intemperance in that community to any considerable extent?—From my observation, which I said was slight, I should say hardly any.

030513. Did you whilst there at any time look over the police records?—I did not.

030514. I suppose your visits were during the summer months?—Yes.

030515. Did you ever go to Cushing's Island or any of those places?—I was at some of the islands on the Bay. I lived on one of the islands last summer, it was on Cushing's Island.

030516. Was there an hotel there?—A small hotel.

030517. Was there liquor sold there?—None at all.

030518. Did you know that there was liquor on Cushing's Island?—I did not, I never met anybody who saw liquor bought or sold there, to my knowledge.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030519. In case of the enactment of such a law as you speak of, for which you would vote, would you make an exception in favour of such liquors as are needed for medicinal, mechanical or sacramental purposes?—Decidedly.

030520. Will you state to us your position as a clergyman of the Church of England with regard to what is used in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper?—There must be wine.

030521. What do you mean by that?—By order of the Provincial Synod it must be ordinary fermented wine.

030522. In case of the enactment of such a law as you speak of prohibiting the manufacture of intoxicating liquor, would you deem it right that brewers and distillers should be remunerated for the plant and machinery rendered useless?—That is a very difficult question and one hardly knows how to answer it off hand without doing injustice in some direction. I would rather not answer.

030523. When the Commission held a sitting here last year a witness, Mr. Darlington, brought in your name, you know in what connection?—Yes, I do.

030524. Look now at the evidence he gave and state now if you wish to make any statement in regard to it?—What is the question proposed to me here?

030525. This gentleman says "The workmen feel that the churches are a religious institution without Christianity and that the clergy is simply a profession got up by them for the purpose of making money in some instances"?—I should think that gentleman must have had labour agitators in his mind when he made use of those words.

030526. There is some reference to yourself, there?—Yes, I will read what he says "The Rev. Dr. Ker acknowledged to me that christianity had been diverted from its true path and that it was used to assist capital against labour." I do not remember the conversation he refers to, but what I am quite sure I meant to convey to him was: that individual christians, employers of labour, have at times underpaid those who wrought for them—with special reference to the evidence taken before the Sweating Commission held lately in England. I have felt very strongly more than once in reading about the way christian men, employers of labour, treated other christian men and women who worked for them, that they acted scandalously and quite contrary to the way the Lord and Saviour of men wished people to do to others, especially his followers, and as they would that others should do to them. That was the full extent of my remarks to Mr. Darlington.

030527. You had in view the evidence given before the Sweating Commission given in England?—Yes.

030528. Which shows this state of things you refer to?—Yes.

030529. Is there any other statement you wish to make in reference to that?—None at all.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030530. There is a provision in the license law here to oppose the granting of licenses in certain cases. Has there been such opposition to the granting of licenses in Point St. Charles?—There has been.

030531. With what success?—With none at all.

030532. Do you know what prevented the success?—Well, it was argued out there in some cases before the Judge, and he decided against the temperance sentiment.

REV. JOHN KER, D.D.

030533. Have the conditions of the law in the matter of opposition been complied with fully?—I fancy there must have been some defects, I do not know.

030534. At any rate the opposition all failed?—Yes.

030535. I have an impression that the law is discretional to the Commissioners in a large degree, so that when the conditions of opposition are complied with the discretion of the Commissioners over-rides it all. I desire to know whether there might have been such a fact in the Point St. Charles case?—These matters have passed from my memory now and as I am on my oath I would not like to speak about that, for fear of doing an injustice to somebody.

030536. You have observed the working of the license law in a general way in Montreal, having been a resident here and a pastor of the church. Have you observed whether the prohibitive clauses of the law are all observed or observed in any given degree: take the Sunday clause of the License Act, for instance, so far as Point St. Charles is concerned?—I think the Sunday clause law, so far as I am able to form an opinion on my oath, is well observed in Point St. Charles.

030537. Are there any violations that come under your observation?—Not at present, but there were a year or two ago. I was appealed to by a woman to try and save her husband from spending his money in a certain tavern on Sundays; and I went to the tavern-keeper, who was at that time a parishioner of mine, and I represented to him that this charge was made against him, and that I did not want to do anything that was unfair to him or anybody else, but that it would help him very much, in my estimation, if he would observe the Lord's Day.

030538. You think the Sabbath has been better observed by him since then?—I think so.

030539. Were any other steps taken to change the bad state of things that existed previously, as to the Lord's Day and the sale of liquor on that day except your own personal influence?—A local society was formed for that purpose and my remonstrance came in about the same time, perhaps it might have been before or after.

030540. These things had good effect?—Yes.

030541. But for such remonstrances and such watching is there a general disposition on the part of the licensees to regard the prohibition clause of the license law?—Well, there are many tavern-keepers. Some that I know, I think, faithfully and honestly observe the law on the Lord's Day, while others, perhaps, would attach less importance to it.

030542. Have you observed the working of the license law in Montreal generally, outside of Point St. Charles, as to whether the Sunday clause and other restrictive clauses are observed?—I cannot add anything to the knowledge of the Commission on this subject. My duties are so closely confined to Point St. Charles, that I cannot say much about the city at large.

030543. My attention has just been called to the fact—I presume it is a fact—that every person that signed that opposition at Point St. Charles had an action taken against him for damages because of him signing that opposition?—Yes.

030544. Did these cases amount to anything?—I think not. I think they never came to a hearing.

030545. But at any rate it prevented the disallowance of the licenses?—I think not. I think there was another ground. I think there was a time limit that the temperance people did not observe.

030546. A technicality?—Yes.

030547. There are a great many railway employees at Point St. Charles?—Yes, a great many.

030548. You have had a good deal of experience among railway men?—Yes.

030549. Have you found that intemperance is a cause of much injury to them and interferes with their success?—Yes, it is a cause of injury in a multitude of cases.

030550. Do you know of any one thing so detrimental to success?—None at all, none fit to be named in comparison with it.

030551. Have you ever lived in a community under local prohibition?—Yes.

030552. Where?—In Brome County.

030553. What was the result of your observation there?—That it is not favourable to local option. The illicit selling was very common and disgracefully open.

030554. How did that compare with a licensed community?—There was very little to choose between them.

030555. Have you observed whether there are illicit places in Point St. Charles?—I do not know of any.

030556. I suppose there are so many licenses that there is scarcely room?—It may have that effect.

030557. In your contact with your parishioners, and you have a very large parish of labouring men chiefly, have you observed whether the drink habit and the drink traffic are responsible for any degree of the neglect of children and neglect of religion which come under your notice?—I think so.

030558. I think I understood you to say, in answer to one of the Commissioners, that you regard it a duty of the community to remove the temptation from intemperate men?—I should feel it my duty.

030559. Rather than to legalize the traffic?—Yes.

030560. Do you think it is the duty of the community to do so?—I would be glad if the community did remove it.

030561. You decidedly disapprove of the legalization of what you regard the temptation to weak and unwatchful men?—I think we ought not to approve of it.

*By the Chairman :*

030562. You understand, I presume, that in the State of Maine the individual citizen is allowed to import all the liquor he may desire for his own use?—I am aware of that.

030563. Do you think it a wise provision under certain circumstances?—I would not permit a man who was a drunkard to import at all. I would interfere with his liberty to that extent. I would not allow liquor to come into the city or district where a notorious drunkard was if I could stop it.

030564. The law provides for the interdiction of drunkards, but if we had a prohibitive measure here would you consider it desirable that that exemption should be made and that the right of an individual to import what he desires for his own use should not be taken away?—I should like it so arranged that a notoriously intemperate man should not get the means of gratifying his intemperance.

030565. I am speaking of the community generally. What about the community at large?—I think the community at large might be permitted.

030566. Have you considered the question as to whether fermented or distilled liquors are most harmful?—Yes. My experience is in Point St. Charles, that it is not whisky that does the mischief, it is beer.

030567. By beer, do you mean what is commonly called ale?—Yes.

030568. Do you find that the use of it leads to the use of other liquors?—Not necessarily; people get drunk and besotted on that most of the time.

030569. I suppose that wine is not used very much in Point St. Charles?—Not very much.

Mr. CARSON made application that Mr. Volney B. Cushing, of Bangor, Me., should be heard before the Commission.

The Commissioners having retired,

SIR JOSEPH HICKSON, on returning, stated that the Commission had met in Montreal on that occasion to hear a certain list of witnesses, some of whom they were unable to examine during the previous sittings in Montreal. He believed that the limited time at the disposal of the Commission would be occupied in taking the evidence of the witnesses subpoenaed. If at any time there should be a re-opening of the inquiry, he, for one, would be very glad to hear the evidence of Mr. Cushing.

REV. DR. McLEOD: with the dissent of one Commissioner.

JUDGE McDONALD regretted that the Commission could not alter their arrangements so as to permit the hearing of Mr. Cushing. He felt sure that the evidence of that gentleman would prove interesting, and he should like to have heard it had there been time.

REV. JOHN KER, D.D.

FREDERICK WANKLYN, of Montreal, Assistant Mechanical Superintendent of the Grand Trunk Railway, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

030570. How long have you occupied your present position?—I have been Assistant Mechanical Superintendent since February, 1882, and Works Manager since July, 1883, about twelve and eleven years respectively.

030571. How many men have you employed on the works at Point St. Charles?—On an average from about one thousand to eleven hundred.

030572. In what department?—That is in the locomotive department wholly, the department under my charge.

030573. How many men are there employed in the other departments?—In the yard shops, seven hundred and fifty; in the running shops, two hundred and fifty. The total number of men in the Point St. Charles shops would be a little short of two thousand.

030574. Have you much intemperance amongst the men?—None whatever. I can most positively say so. It is a matter of the rarest occurrence. In fact, I think I have not seen more than two men in the shops under the influence of liquor in eleven years.

030575. Have you any temperance organization in connection with the shops?—None whatever.

030576. Do your men lose much time through intemperance?—No.

030577. I am speaking of their condition when away from the works and not being able to come to work the following day?—We can notice that very easily because we pay the men on the tenth of every month, and the attendance on the eleventh is about the average attendance for the rest of the month. There is no marked change in the attendance of the men when they have money and when they have not.

030578. Is it within your knowledge that many of your men are members of temperance organizations?—No, unless you call the Odd Fellows and the Sons of England and kindred societies of that sort, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers and all sorts of secret and benefit Societies. I do not suppose these are strictly temperance societies.

030579. Are there a large number of your men members of the societies that you have mentioned?—Oh, yes, nearly all of our men belong to some union.

030580. Do many of them belong to the organization of the Knights of Labour?—I am not in a position to know, but I suspect a good many do.

030581. A large number of your locomotive men are, I suppose, members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers?—Yes, I think all of them. All the engineers and firemen belong to their own organizations and the moulders belong to the Amalgamated Union of Iron and Steel Workers. Ninety per cent of our men belong to some union or other apart from the actual labourers.

030582. Have you many accidents in the works caused through the men indulging too freely in the use of liquor?—No. We never had an accident that was attributable to intemperance.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030583. That is in the shops?—Yes.

030584. How about the road?—On the road I am not prepared to say because it is out of my sphere. There are twenty-five thousand men on the road.

*By the Chairman :*

030585. What do your men use in summer for a beverage?—We provide oatmeal and water. Their employment in many instances is of a very exhausting kind and they labour in a very high temperature. In every one of our shops the company provides oatmeal and water from about the first of June to the first of September. We have large cans and we surround them with ice and it is a man's duty to keep these cans filled with clean water and oatmeal. It is given out of the stores by requisition every day.

030586-7. That is what is used in the forge and rolling mill and foundry?—In every place there are drinking tins attached to the taps and they go there. The oatmeal and water is very largely used both in the office and in the shops.

030588. You have got a reading-room attached to the works?—Yes, sir, we have our Literary and Scientific Institute, which comprises a reading-room about fifty feet square. We have now nearly six thousand volumes, we have all the daily papers, the English and American illustrated papers, scientific newspapers of any note and chess and draught boards and models of different parts of machinery. In fact it is a regular institute for the advancement of science, about six thousand volumes now and there are books of reference as well as the ordinary circulating library which the men take home.

030589. Do you provide a room where the men get their meals?—Yes, we have a room in connection with the readin-groom, 150 feet long by 50 wide, and it is used daily as a mess-room. No man is allowed to bring a can into the works of any sort whatever. These men bring their cans to this room at twelve o'clock. Those who do not go home, go there and for the last quarter of the dinner hour they are allowed to smoke.

030590. You have a large room where they can have concerts and theatrical performances?—This mess-room is provided with a stage at one end and we have in connection with our shops clubs and theatrical institutions, and every winter we have entertainments once a week and lectures on astronomy or electricity or something like that.

030591. Do the employees contribute anything to that?—Yes, every man contributes one dollar a year to the maintenance of the library, but it is not compulsory. I suppose that seventy five or eighty per cent of our men are members. That subscription is for newspapers chiefly. The company pays the librarian's salary and provides gas and heating and a general attendance of the mess-room. The men pay one dollar a year to provide for newspaper and magazines, and the room is kept open every night in winter until half past nine.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030592. You have lived in England, Mr. Wanklyn?—Yes, I served my apprenticeship in England, I was five years among the workingmen in Lancashire.

030593. Taking the state of things in England and the state of things in Canada, in which do you find the greater amount of sobriety among the workingmen?—The Canadians are altogether different. There is a marked difference between the character of the workmen in Canada and the character of similar men in England.

030594. In favour of Canada?—Greatly in favour of Canada.

030595. Have you, since you came to Canada, made a study of the improvement going on here?—Yes, I think I have. I think our men are becoming more intelligent. We have less strikes and things like that. Our people are very orderly.

030596. Do you believe that these comforts they are provided with, have helped to bring about that state of things?—I have no doubt about it. I have no doubt whatever that the effect of having not only our own reading-room but other rooms and organizations has brought about that. They have erected recently the O'Brien Hall, with which some of our foremen are connected and they have made that into a gymnasium. Our entertainments are always crowded now, so that we have not room enough. When I first went there we had a very small reading-room, but there have been great developments in this direction during the last ten years.

030597. May we put it in this way, that men need some place of recreation and that by your providing these things the men are kept from going to undesirable places?—There is no doubt about it, that if you provide the entertainment the men will go there. I say that, judging from the attendance at lectures and concerts. They pay ten cents for admission.

030598. Have you any experience of the working of a prohibitory law?—No, except by going to Maine occasionally and in Brockville when the Scott Act was in force.

FREDERICK WANKLYN.

030599. How did you find prohibition work in Maine?—It did not make any difference as to the amount of drinking, but it made a little difference as to the quality of the liquor.

030600. Was the quality of the liquor not so good then?—They had no object in keeping the liquor up to the standard.

030601. In the case of the enactment of a prohibitory law, prohibiting the manufacture of liquor for beverage purposes, would you deem it right that brewers and distillers should be rendered compensation for their plant?—I think it rather hard to deprive a man of his means of livelihood and not compensate him. It is no fault of his that he has a brewery. He has embarked his money in it under the law the same as a man would in a ship.

030602. Have you had any opportunity of remarking the effect of Sohmer Park, St. Helen's Island and the Mountain Park?—I have never been on St. Helen's Island.

030603. As a citizen of Montreal, what is your opinion about these places?—I think that if you confine the sale of liquor to light beers they would not do very much harm. I am speaking from my experience of a large park in Manchester, the Bellevue Gardens, in the centre of a working district. All the factory operatives of that particular district go there twice a week. They have fireworks there and everything else. They sold beer and spirits, and judging from the number of men that attend the place and the liking they have in Lancashire for strong spirits, there were few disturbances.

030604. You think it well to confine the sale of lager beer to parks?—I think it should be confined to beer and light wines.

030605. Have you considered the question of the advisability of encouraging the use of light wines and beer generally, and trying to discourage the use of distilled spirits?—If you made light wines cheap enough, such as you can get in France and Italy, there would be less drinking of spirits. I lived in Italy for two years among the working people. There everybody gets wine—men women and children. They take it as we take water. No workingman or working woman ever dreams of taking food without a bottle of light wine. That is wine of the last year's vintage used this year and not kept for any length of time. It is almost impossible to get spirits in Italy, although they make a common sort of white whisky from grape stalks, but they very seldom use it.

030606. What are the habits of the people there as to sobriety?—You never see a drunken person. You might go through Milan and Turin and the surrounding towns and never see a tipsy person and yet wine is used like water. There is any amount of it used, and it is cheap.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030607. Dr. Ker was before us this morning, and he told us that the use of beer at Point St. Charles, according to his observation, was far more injurious. He thought that beer was the chief evil?—Did he say the drinking of beer?

030608. Yes. He did not mean to say that the use of whisky was better than beer, but he said that beer besotted the men and that they remained in a besotted condition?—I honestly tell you that in my eleven years experience I do not think I have seen three drunken men in our works. What they drink when they leave us, I do not know. They are not coerced, they can drink whatever they like, but they are not allowed to bring any liquor into the workshops.

030609. Is there any beer allowed in the mess-room?—We cannot look into a mess can, but if he was seen drinking beer there, we would not let him.

030610. You would not allow him?—No.

030611. What is the object of that?—It is a matter of regulation. The rule is that no liquor of any sort shall be allowed on the Grand Trunk premises, and, the mess-room being part of our premises, it would not be allowed.

030612. That is in the interest of the men, and the interest of the Company?—Yes.

030613. And that rule is rigidly enforced?—Most rigidly enforced. That is one of the reasons we do not allow a can to be brought into the works, and they were provided with the mess-room.



030614. That is Grand Trunk prohibition?—That is Grand Trunk prohibition, if you take it in that way.

030615. There are several churches at Point St. Charles, and each church has a society, and there are Good Templars and so on: Do you know whether many of your men belong to these societies?—No, I have no means of knowing that.

030616. Have you any saloons in the immediate vicinity of your works?—Yes, I think there are three or four in the immediate vicinity—within a block or two.

030617. Do you know if there has been any attempt to have them moved away?—Not on our part.

030618. You have not observed whether they are any temptation to the men when they go out from work or when they are coming in?—I have not noticed that.

030619. We learn from Dr. Ker that there have been some cases of opposition to the granting of licenses at Point St. Charles. Do you know whether the Grand Trunk men joined in this opposition?—Not to my knowledge.

030620. If they did join, it would be as individuals?—Oh, yes, as individuals, I am certain there was nothing done on the part of the Company.

*By the Chairman :*

030621. I have been informed that there is a lodge of Templars at Point St. Charles, every man of which is a Grand Trunk employee?—Very likely. You will find Masons and Odd Fellows and every order you can imagine represented among our workmen.

030622. I suppose these societies have a good effect among the members?—Certainly. I suppose so.

030623. The provisions you have made for the physical comfort of the men, seem to be very good. Do you know whether the Women's Christian Temperance Union or any other organization has established coffee-rooms in that vicinity?—Yes, there is a fine room on Wellington Street, about half a mile from the works.

030624. I suppose that co-operates with your own rooms?—It is rather too far from the works to be of much use except when the men are outside.

030625. The Grand Trunk has a set of rules as to the use of intoxicants by employees?—Under our general rules any man seen under the influence of liquor would be discharged. In all our shops we have printed rules as to how the men have to work, and their time, etc.

030626. You have rules about no cans being brought in and no beer used?—Certainly.

030627. Have you observed, during your twelve or thirteen years of connection with the works, whether there has been a decrease in the drinking habits of the men?—It is very slightly perceptible. I can say that we are absolutely free from it.

030628. And have been?—Yes, we are almost absolutely free from it.

030629. Do you believe that your rules have contributed to that end?—The mechanic is a very intelligent man; he is a man you cannot coerce; he is a man of honourable principle and is a man who has a trade. We have skilled labourers and also day labourers, and I think the skilled labourers exercise an influence over the rest. You would not find a better lot of men anywhere in the world than those in the Grand Trunk.

030630. You say that there has been no perceptible difference and you think that these men are not open to any degree of coercion, then what is the object of having rules?—The object is to prevent any beginning. The rules have been there for thirty-five years.

030631. They have been the same rules ever since you have been there?—Yes, they have never been altered. We reprint the same old rules when they get worn out.

030632. Do you think that the men would do just as well, as they do now, if there were no rules?—I do. I mean to say that if we abolish the rules, there would be no difference.

030633. There would be no change?—I do not think so, I do not think the men would bring in any liquor.

FREDERICK WANKLYN.

030634. Was there, at the outset, any necessity for that rule?—I dare say there was. When a lot of Scotch stonemasons were building the Victoria Bridge, there might have been a good deal of trouble.

030635. Are we to infer that the establishment of that rule and its being kept in force has brought about a condition of things as to render it no longer necessary?—I cannot say that the rules brought about the millenium. I think that men have improved and will improve when they have steady employment, and some of our men we have had for thirty-five years. We have cases in which the grandfather and the father and son have worked with us. These men hold their own property. They are respectable citizens. The influence that brought it about is, I think, that these men have had steady employment, and have worked hand in hand with the company and have seen the concern arise from a small beginning to its present importance, and they are loyal to the company. We spend thirty-five thousand dollars a month in wages in my department alone. These men become essentially a part of the corporation. They would not leave us if we were to work half time to-morrow. They would stay through difficulties, adverse times and good times. They are our own men and not only that but we supply many men to other places in Montreal and in the United States. If a man serves his time in the Grand Trunk Railway it is a certificate for him everywhere that he is a respectable man. We can point to our men with pride as intelligent and loyal workmen.

030636. Has the rule in connection with the drinking habit anything to do with this desirable condition of things?—The rule about the drinking habit amounts to about three lines among one hundred.

030637. Yet you rigidly enforce that rule as to the mess-room and all around the works?—Nobody is allowed to bring liquor to the works, but outside he can do anything he pleases.

030638. If he came to work drunk or incapacitated?—He would not be allowed in. Every man passes through the time lodge; and if he was under the influence of liquor, he would be quietly told to go away. He is seen by his foreman as well.

030639. Do you think that your rule about drinking is an exceptional one? Do not similar rules prevail in every large establishment?—As far as I can make out, our rule is a copy of the general shop rule in Manchester. I think the rule in Montreal in all large works is identically the same as ours.

030640. Is there any other reason for preventing the men carrying the cans into the shops outside the one you mention?—Yes; we do not want them to carry anything out in the cans. Pieces of brass and all these things could be very easily carried out of the works and that would amount to a large sum at the end of the year. If you have a thousand men carrying out a few pounds brass every day, which he could put in his dinner can it would amount to a large sum.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

030641. Last year I came into possession of a circular issued from the Superintendent's office of the Grand Trunk Railway in 1879. It is issued at the beginning of a new year and he says "Before entering on the New Year, which I trust may be a happy and prosperous one for each and all, I would ask you to make a good commencement by joining in a renewal of the declaration in favour of total abstinence." Then, in addition to that, he prints two pages of extracts with headings like this:—"Relinquishing Stimulants," "How the Money goes," "Our Wasted Resources," all of which seemed designed to impress on the men the importance of total abstinence. Do you know whether Mr. Spicer up to the time of his relinquishing the position of Superintendent kept working along the same lines of total abstinence?—All I know is that Mr. Spicer, at one time, was a very great advocate of total abstinence, but he has since altered his mind because I think he does not now object to a glass of wine.

030642. But so far as the rules you mention are concerned does he insist on that?—I really do not know, Mr. Spicer was in a different department.

030643. Do you know whether he framed a set of rules in addition to the general rules with reference to abstinence amongst the employees of the road?—I never saw them.

030644. I heard he did?—If he did so, it was a circular of his own; but it is not embodied in the company's rules.

030645. As Superintendent, I understand that he did issue certain rules of a very stringent character?—I have never seen them.

*By Judge McDonald:*

030646. Would he be permitted to make rules in addition to the general rules of the company?—I think not.

030647. Would you yourself favour prohibition?—I certainly would not. You would not make men moral by Act of Parliament. Intelligent workmen will do as they please. If they want to drink beer, they will drink beer. You cannot coerce them. You can guide them, but you cannot coerce them. I am certain if we had prohibition in our works, or around Point St. Charles, the men would get liquor.

030648. Do you believe that the amount of prohibition the Grand Trunk enforces in the rules does not prevent liquor coming into the works?—It is just the same as we do not allow smoking in the works.

030649. On the same principle?—Yes, we do not allow smoking. I would not like to have my forge men drink whisky on a hot summer's day, in a temperature of one hundred and fifty degrees.

030650. You would not want to have the men drinking beer at their lunch in the mess-room?—I do not object to a man having a glass of beer at a public house at one o'clock if he wants to. I take a glass of whisky and water at my lunch every day. I do not feel any the worse, I feel all the better for it.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

030651. You yourself would not be allowed to drink whisky and water in the works?—I certainly would not do it because our chief thing is example. If you set a bad example you cannot govern men.

030652. You believe in a degree of restriction?—We have rules about many of these things. We do not want a man to drink or smoke or swear in the workshop. The rule is just as much against smoking and swearing as it is against drinking.

030653. And you look upon smoking and swearing as liable to seriously interfere with the work of the company as drinking?—Quite as much. We do not allow a man to carry an orange lily into the works on the 12th July or to wear a shamrock in his hat on St. Patrick's day, because it simply makes a distinction.

*By the Chairman:*

030654. These are all regulations for the government of the workmen?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

030655. Do you notice whether the drink traffic, as carried on, interferes with the working people of the country. I mean outside of your own works?—I have not noticed. Of course I know a good many other works in Montreal, but it has never been brought to my attention that they have any difficulty in getting along, because of the drunkenness of the employees.

030656. The drink habit does not agree with the men?—If a man drinks too much it will interfere with him. If I might make a suggestion, I would say that if you bring about legislation to improve the quality of the liquor sold, to prevent adulteration, it would be more desirable in my opinion than prohibition. There are cases where men drink inferior stuff where if they had good whisky or good beer they would drink it and if you could ensure them that you would confer a real benefit on the working classes. The great difficulty is that bad liquors are sold to the working classes.

F. WOLVERSTAN THOMAS, Manager of the Molsons Bank, being duly sworn deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

030657. You were kind enough, Mr. Thomas, to appear before the Commissioners on a previous occasion : at that time you expressed a desire to postpone the giving of the evidence which you were asked to give before the Commission. We have assembled here to-day to close up the work of taking evidence in Montreal and I will now put the question which I put before ?—When I left here the last time, I saw that you had gone to the four quarters of the globe nearly, about this prohibition matter, and I thought really that I was going to be passed by and I did not think of the question again until Saturday. I will answer now to the best of my ability anything that you wish to ask me.

030658. What in your opinion is the effect of the liquor traffic as at present conducted upon the agricultural, financial, commercial and business interest, generally, of the Dominion ?—As I stated before that is a question so infinitely wide that I would require a good deal of time and attention so as to answer it properly.

030659. It will do if you answer it in a general way. We apply to gentlemen who have had large experience in financial matters to learn this. Your relations with industrial and agricultural interests is so intimate that we expect you will furnish us with valuable information upon the point ?—I can only say that the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, the issue of licenses being seemingly nearly indiscriminate, has more or less of a deleterious effect upon all these interests that you have mentioned.

030660. When you say “the indiscriminate manner in which licenses are granted” do you refer to any particular locality ?—I refer more particularly to the city of Montreal in which I have been a resident for a great many years. So far as the agricultural interest is concerned, I think it only applies directly to barley, the grain which is used for the manufacture of beer. I think it only refers to that specially, and in connection with that it would be impossible to shut ones eyes to the fact that the existing duties in the United States exclude Canadian barley from that market, that at present we have no established market in Europe—it has not been accepted as a substitute for the English barley yet, it is only an experiment—until we have a market in England, it seems to me that if prohibition were to set in, the farmers would be precluded from growing barley, excepting for feeding purposes, and as you are aware barley was largely grown at one time in this country. It would be a very serious matter I should think for the farmer, when you consider the price that wheat has got down to now-a-days.

030661. The business, as at present conducted, of course employs a certain amount of capital ; and no doubt your bank has some accounts with people who are conducting the liquor traffic in one way or another. You have only referred to the agricultural interest. The traffic is a medium of exchange, I suppose, between individuals and it supplies a certain business to banking institutions ?—I think if we had it diverted from the trade in liquor, the money would be better applied to other purposes.

030662. We are expected to give an answer to the question which is put to us, in the terms of the question I have put to you, what the present effect of the traffic is, the other question asks what the effect of prohibition would be on the agricultural, commercial and industrial enterprises of the country ?—With regard to that, I think, if the liquor business were closed entirely, that it would have a very baneful effect on a great many interests at present. For instance in the manufacture of spirits we know that the refuse, which would not be applicable elsewhere, is used for the feeding of cattle to a very large extent. A very considerable number of head of cattle are every year fed and realized on. There would be a loss thereon. There would be more or less of trade and commerce affected by it as a medium of exchange, to which you alluded just now. But still I come back to what my full belief is, that if the moneys now invested in the manufacture of spirits and liquors were applied in other directions to improve the system of agriculture for instance, I believe the country would be very materially benefited and yet I do not say I believe in prohibition.

030663. You are speaking of the effect of the liquor traffic as at present conducted, but let me ask you what would be the effect of prohibition. They are two separate ques-

tions?—It would necessarily drive all the brewers and distillers out of the business and the only use then for distilleries would be distilling of high wines for medicinal and scientific purposes.

030664. Do you think it is desirable to pass a measure, prohibiting the importation and manufacture of liquors for beverage purposes?—I do not.

030665. Have you any objection to state your reason for entertaining that view?—First of all, it has a bad effect on human nature that we should have laws interposed for our guidance in the way of eating or dressing or drinking; living in fact. I believe myself that human nature is better for being exposed in a measure to temptation. If you guard children and men from any temptation at all, and they have not gone through the crucible of trial, they do not rise to be such good reliable men, as if they had been exposed to a certain amount of trial. I think it is bad for them. It is debilitating.

030666. Then you think a prohibitory law, such as I have referred to, is undesirable?—I think it is very undesirable. That of course does not do away with my strongly advocating temperance. My idea is that temperance should begin in ones own home, taking the children at an early age, precept and example would be the most powerful means for preventing them becoming intemperate persons rather than delaying the matter until they get to be men and women. I do not see why well educated, sensible people, should be deprived of such liquor as they may think desirable and useful to them simply because a drunkard should be restrained. I came across a quotation the other day and I dare say some of you saw it. It says: "It seems to be that the fad of prohibition is a desire to limit the drink of the sober by the drunkenness of the drunk." I think it is a very proper quotation.

030667. You quote that as expressing your own view?—I had thought that. I say that the desire to limit the drink of the sober by the drunkenness of the drunk is a fad of the prohibitionists. I may be asked whether I think prohibition would be of service. Of course it is palpable that money saved from the purchase of liquor is applicable to other purposes. For persons with means or with reasonable salaries, of course that does not affect them, but in the case of the workman and day labourer, every ten cents that is taken away from the support of his home and family must tell against him. It is not only that which has to be considered but also the loss of time which ought to be money to him. I think, too, that drunkenness might be limited by prohibition and crime might be lessened and that the country might save in the cost of supporting criminals. I think that if it is accepted that drunkenness does increase the number of criminals there would be a diminution in the expense of the administration of justice.

030668. Are you convinced that prohibition would accomplish any one of these objects?—I do not think it would, and the reason I do not think it would, is a very strong one in my mind. That is, I believe that it is an impossible thing to accomplish. I think that people will have liquor and if not openly, then secretly, and I think adulterated liquors will be used instead of genuine and wholesome ones, because I call them wholesome when they are taken in moderation. I never went into one of those low places which they have in the State of Maine, but I am told that the liquor they sell there is enough to kill one.

030669. Then you have had no personal experience of the working of the prohibitory law in the State of Maine?—Only that I have been there. I have been at Portland and I remember that I was asked again and again to go into places where I could get such liquor as I might choose. I saw others go in, but I did not go in myself. I think that another difficulty with prohibition is that it would encourage illicit distilling and smuggling very largely and I think our proximity to the United States would make liquor easily obtainable and that it would be impossible to make prohibition effective. I really believe, that a prohibitory law would be inducing people to break the law. I do not know how prohibition would work in the country parts here, but I have an idea that in a city like Montreal a more effective means would be a higher license. I would have no bars. It may seem a trifling thing, but I think if liquor were not procurable at bars and that you had to sit at a table it would be a great improvement over the present system by which persons go in and swallow a glass of whisky at a bar. I am very

WOLVERSTAN THOMAS.

strongly of the belief that there should be an Inspector appointed to inspect all liquors at very frequent intervals. There should be in a city like Montreal enough Inspectors to be constantly going around and there should be penalties for the sale of adulterated liquors. I believe it would cure a great deal of the evil if all liquors were pure. I would also prohibit the selling of liquor to drunken men and to children under fifteen years old. Then, again, on the other hand, my opinion is that the moderate use of mild liquors and light wines is wise. I do not think that it is hurtful at all. I am not speaking from a monetary point of view now, but I mean that it is not hurtful physically to drink light wines, in moderation of course. That, I believe, should be encouraged. If places were started for the sale of light wines and beers and the license fee less than for the sale of other liquors, and the number limited, I think the city would feel the benefit of it. Then, with regard to the idea of Dr. Rainsford in New York, the more I talk with the clergy of the Church to which I belong, the more do I feel convinced that there is a good deal of judiciousness in that; and that is to have a church saloon, where they have much the same thing that I suggest, a pleasant, comfortable cheery room, always kept clean, no bad language allowed, and the sale limited to temperance drinks and mild liquors and light wines, and where a man could sit down and smoke his pipe if he liked. I believe that more good would come of something of that kind than from actual prohibition. I would limit the number of saloons in Montreal, and try a high license, and inspect all liquors. For an infraction of the law, I would fine severely at first, impose a large fine in the second case, and for the third offence take the license away entirely.

030670. I am aware, that you have taken a great interest in many of the charitable institutions of the city, and have devoted a considerable amount of time to the promotion of their interest: have you at all considered whether or not advantage would arise by establishing inebriate asylums, and instead of sending drunkards to the common jail, where they associate with criminals, that they should be sent to these asylums for medical treatment?—I should very heartily endorse anything of that sort. I think it would be found to be of great advantage in the cure of the evil.

030671. Do you think if the homes of the working classes were made a little more comfortable, if more attention were paid to instruction in domestic economy, that that would have the effect of keeping them away from the saloons and public houses?—I think that if that could be made at all effective it would be an admirable plan, but I dare say you are aware that something of that sort was tried some time ago and failed. Some ladies started a cookery school in Montreal, and they opened branches in Point St. Charles and Hochelaga. In the Point St. Charles branch very few attended the first year, and the Hochelaga branch, by the advice of Father Salmon, a good many attended and they were taught to cook and to keep a house clean and nice, but unfortunately our French fellow citizens of that class, that were met there, did not seem to appreciate it. One common excuse was that they could not find time to take lessons, although they paid nothing. They preferred to go to Sohmer Park or some place of that sort. I think if you will inquire you will ascertain that nearly all the factory girls and men are constantly at Sohmer Park. I do not mean to say that there is any actual harm in going there, but it is a waste of their time and their money to a certain extent, and it debars them from improving themselves at home or in taking instruction in domestic economy. If any one walks up Côté Street in the afternoon and sees the hundreds of people coming from the theatre you would begin to wonder where they got the money and time, and who they were.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030672. Do you not think, that places, such as parks—I will not say such a place as Sohmer Park—are necessary in a city such as Montreal, where people living in small and crowded houses would be able to go and get fresh air?—I am a strong advocate of that myself, and when I spoke of Sohmer Park I was not condemning it entirely, but I stated it was taking the people away from places where they might be better employed. I have strong feelings and opinions about public gardens and places where the people can obtain recreation and light refreshments of a nature such as you find in Germany and France and Italy. I am quite satisfied that it is advisable to

have such places for the poorer people to get fresh air, which they cannot get in their homes.

030673. Speaking of the class of young workmen and others who resort to these places, supposing that these places were not in existence in the city, would you expect that they would go in for the instruction that you speak of?—I am afraid not. It is not the park altogether that is the difficulty. I am afraid they do not appreciate the instruction. It seems to me that the tendency of workmen, especially those who get employment in factories, is that when they emerge from the factory, they spend most of the money they have in clothing themselves gaily and enjoying themselves.

030674. Do you not think it is a fact that owing to what they think a privilege, is what causes so many girls, that might perhaps be more comfortably situated in domestic service, to go into factories?—I am certain that that is the main reason, and it is the great difficulty we have to contend with.

030675. It is a false sense of liberty?—Not so much that. I think they feel the necessity in a way of being exempt from control, and when they get through their day's labour, they like to feel that the rest of the time is their own.

*By the Chairman :*

030676. The result is that their education in domestic duties is greatly neglected?—I think so. I think that is one of the great sources of bad homes and infelicity, and that neglected homes drive men to drink.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030677. Which would you prefer to have abolished, the hotel bar or the saloon bar?—I think one can hardly make a comparison. I do not know sufficient about the saloons and the hotel bars to answer.

030678. In case of the enactment of a prohibitory law preventing the manufacture of liquor for beverage purposes, would you deem it right that brewers and distillers should be remunerated for the plant and machinery rendered useless?—I do not see why at all. I have never been able to see the force of that contention. For instance, the National Policy comes into force and cotton and woollen manufactories are started everywhere. A new political party comes in power, the National Policy is done away with, and the manufacturer suffers, but there is no talk of compensating him. The brewer and distiller, when he goes into business, knows that he is likely to have the excise duty raised on him, raised, perhaps, to such an enormous extent that he cannot sell anything and would be driven out of business. It is the same way with the manufacturer of other goods.

030679. The brewer and distiller takes that risk?—Yes, and I do not see why he should be compensated.

030680. Do you know any instance where legislation prevented a business from being carried on?—I do not recollect any at present.

030681. You do know that regulation of the liquor traffic takes away the privileges that formerly were granted?—Yes.

030682. Therefore, you would put the brewer or distiller, whose business was closed up, on the same footing, as regards the loss of his plant and machinery, as you would put the manufacturer who was injuriously affected by the revenue tariff?—Quite so. I would rather have a leaning in favour of the manufacturer of the necessities of life rather than towards the manufacturer of what might be termed a luxury.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030683. Do I understand you to say that you believe that the money now employed in the drink traffic might be advantageously employed in other industries?—Quite so.

030684. You have spoken about the regulation of the traffic and expressed a preference for high license. Have you not in Montreal what is practically a high license?—I do not think so; at all events it is not high enough to limit the number.

030685. We had it in evidence here that in addition to the thousand licensed places there are two or three thousand illicit places?—I suppose there are a great number, but it would surprise me if there would be that number. I can hardly imagine that.

WOLVERSTAN THOMAS.

030686. That statement was made to me by Mr. Lambe, who occupies an official position?—He ought to know.

030687. He said he would not be surprised if there were three or four thousand illicit places in addition to the thousand licensed places?—I can hardly imagine that.

030688. Would it seem from that statement that the license system does not regulate the traffic? Do you not think that the blame ought to be attributable to insufficient surveillance?—The law may be all right, but if there are anything like two or three thousand illicit places or even five hundred, the law must be badly administered. That is what I am afraid is the case.

030689. The fault would lie with the officials?—Yes.

030690. I suppose with regard to any law a good deal depends upon the officials? There is no doubt of it.

030691. I think we have had in evidence several times that there have been attempts made to reduce the number of licenses, but these attempts have failed. To what do you attribute that?—I cannot tell, unless there is something improper.

030692. Do you understand the liquor interest to be quite strong and influential?—Yes, I do.

030693. And it, of course, would be opposed to any limitation on itself?—Yes, in a great measure. I remember that the Oxford saloon, which was supposed to be offensive, was attempted to be closed, but by some means or another they managed to get the license renewed. I am sure that the majority of the residents in that neighbourhood, who are strongly opposed to the renewal of that license, might easily be found. I think they have abandoned opposition, feeling that they are powerless to contend against it. How it has been done I do not know, but I cannot think it could be done properly.

030694. That is a case in which the saloon prevailed against the body of the people?—Yes; I would say just this about that saloon, I believe it is carried on better than it used to be. The exterior of it is certainly better.

030695. There are certain by-laws which prohibit certain things, for instance there is a prohibition of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. Is that proper?—I fancy that has not been found to be very successful. For a few weeks and months when it was first started, it was thought it was going to be a success, but the manufacture of the article did not pay, and that I presume is the reason it ceased.

030696. Would that by-law prohibiting it interfere somewhat with its profitability?—I do not think so.

030697. You think that if they found it profitable they would sell it in spite of the by-law?—I have no doubt in the world of it.

030698. I think that you said that you think that the moderate use of certain liquors is right. I would like to ask you this: as a business man and a very close observer doubtless, have you known business men, moderate drinkers, who have really gone to such excess that their business was interfered with or destroyed?—Occasionally it becomes, but of course then the use of liquor becomes immoderate. Now, take myself, I do not think it hurts me, and since I have attained the age of fifty years, I am quite sure it has benefited me to take some stimulant. I do not take spirits. I only take light wines. I take hardly anything but claret, but I feel the benefit of it so much that I am certain it keeps the doctor away from my house. Judging from myself, I think it must be beneficial to others.

030699. We have had it in the evidence from the Rev. Dr. Ker this morning that his observation of the use of beer amongst the men at Point St. Charles was that it really gets the man in a more besotted condition than whisky?—I, of course, have not the opportunity of observation in Point St. Charles; but I do not think that beer is drunk to that excess in Canada at all. I think that beer is more generally drunk in England, of which as a young man I had a good deal of knowledge. If you have been in England you will know that the amount of beer drunk there during the harvest time and other occasions is something that would be quite appalling to us. I am quite sure that in Canada there is very little drunkenness from beer, and I do not think they get in a besotted condition from it.

030700. Have you ever made an estimate of the amount of money Montreal spends in liquor?—I have not, but it must be enormous to sustain all these saloons and pay the



license fee and everything. That is why I say that it would be better if you could divert these moneys into some other channel. Although we are prospering in this country, we are not a rich country.

030701. As a banker, having to do with capital, and coming into touch with the various industries, have you observed whether there is a lack of capital for the various interests in this country, and whether or not there is a demand for still more capital?—I think there is a lack of acquired capital. There is enough borrowed money, but we have no capital ourselves. I think for the purposes of this country we have borrowed enough money from England and elsewhere to enable us to carry on business satisfactorily, and perhaps money is plentiful in some measure, but we have not yet any acquired wealth of our own.

030702. And so it would appear that the money, now invested in distilleries and breweries and the liquor business generally, would find other employment if it were out of that business?—I have no doubt of it.

030703. And profitable employment?—Yes. With regard to liquor drinking I may say that this is the rule I observe. If I know any person, merchant or otherwise, who drinks immoderately, to apply to open an account in the bank of which I have charge, if I have any say in the matter, I decline to receive that account.

030704. You think it dangerous?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

030705. Would not that depend on his financial standing?—You have always to take the financial standing into consideration, but I would avoid the man who drinks to excess. I would avoid him unless it was far beyond any question of chance or dispute.

030706. You mean you would avoid making loans to him; you would not avoid his account if he kept a good balance?—He could keep his balance all the time.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030707. His run of discount would be limited?—Yes.

030708. You think that improved home conditions would result in less drinking by workingmen. Have you observed sufficiently to be able to say as to whether the drinking habits of the working people are responsible for the less comfortable conditions of their homes? Does not the rule work both ways? I think it does. I think there would be greater sobriety if there were more comfortable homes. On the whole, although we do see so many saloons here, the evidence, of drinking in Montreal, to strangers coming here, or to persons resident here, are not numerous. I rarely meet a drunken man in the streets, and I have lived for twenty-four years in Montreal. As a general rule if you walk through the streets at any time during the day or night it is as well conducted a city as you will find anywhere. I think that they are doing now an admirable thing in giving facilities to get to the parks on Sundays. If you go to the parks on Sunday or a fine day or holiday, I think it is the greatest possible satisfaction to see the numbers of families taking out their lunches or dinners and enjoying themselves there. It is the greatest possible boon to the poor people, and the more places of that sort can be multiplied the better. I think there should be a park in every eligible part of the city.

030709. Is that a good way to spend the Sabbath?—I think that if I were a man immured in a grimy home for most of the week, I would trust to Providence to forgive me for spending the Sabbath in the mountain air.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030710. Have you any branches of your bank in the North-west?—Yes.

030711. Have you ever been there yourself?—Yes.

030712-3. There was originally a so-called prohibition system in the North-west and now there is a license law?—Yes.

030714. Have you any idea whether business out there has been affected by the change in the law one way or the other?—I think there are no more liquors sold to-day than there were two years ago, and then they were sold in a surreptitious way. I do not know how they distributed them, but I do know that they did distribute liquors of

some sort in a surreptitious way. Our manager reported that from Calgary at one time, and I know he does not consider there is more drinking now than there was then.

030715. As far as the financial status of the bank in the North-west is concerned, has it had any effect one way or another?—No.

030716. There is nothing in your bank to show it?—No.

*By the Chairman :*

030717. The Province of Quebec derives a revenue of somewhere between five and six hundred thousand dollars a year from the granting of licenses. Have you given any thought as to how that revenue could be replaced in the treasury if the license system should be abolished?—I think, if we were to have all exemptions done away with, and a tax put upon real estate, we would get that.

030718. Is that a practical measure at the present time. Is it possible to get all exemptions done away with?—I think people are gradually growing up to it. I think even our friends the French people are gradually getting to be restive.

030719. In what way do you think the Province of Quebec could raise that revenue in the meantime? It would be necessary to have something to replace it the moment the license system was done away with. You are a man largely engaged in financial transactions, and you know all about the finances of the Province?—It is true I know a little about them, but I have never been a Minister of Finance, and so I have never made any close scrutiny.

030720. You know sufficient of the finances of the Province to know that the treasury is anything but surfeited with money, and that this sum of money cannot be taken away unless other money are raised equal to the amount taken away?—Of course, it would be a serious question. I do not think it would be impossible, but I cannot tell you. Just now you see how the equalization is brought much nearer than it was a year or two ago. I think that in the absence of no more grants for railways, and the exercise of proper economy, the revenue of the Province ought to be ample to meet expenses.

030721. If additional taxation should have to be raised to meet a decrease in the revenue in the Province of Quebec, on what class of property or from what license system could the amount be obtained?—It is very hard to say, unless you have a property tax. As to an income tax, I think it would be nearly impossible. It is always considered a very inquisitorial tax, and it would be very difficult to levy.

030722. Would it mean of necessity direct taxation in some form or other?—I think it might, until we were carried over a couple of years or so. I am not at all afraid but that with economy we would overtake the expenditure in two or three years. I think the Province is not in a bad position at all.

030723. Without imposing additional taxation?—I think so, under a better administration than we have had.

030724. Am I correct in thinking that your view is that the present deficit and further reduction of five hundred thousand dollars now received from license fees could be made up without additional taxation?—We are getting into better shape now, and I think we ought to be able to save more by economy.

030725. Is there any other mode than direct taxation to which the Province could resort?—I did at one time think of suggesting to Mr. Hall, but I believe it is not available, that he should attempt to impose a tax on all tickets issued by railways and steamboats. I think he considered that would be indirect taxation, and I am quite convinced that such a tax would bring in a large revenue.

030726. What amount is collected for passenger tickets in the Province of Quebec?—I do not know.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030727. Speaking of the revenue derived by the Province of Quebec from licenses, I suppose most of it comes from the city of Montreal?—Yes, I think so. Montreal is the milch cow for the Province.

030728. Say that one thousand saloons in Montreal sell on an average \$15 of liquor a day, and suppose they only sell three hundred days in the year, they have taken \$4,-

500,000. Do you suppose that it pays Montreal to invest that amount in the drink traffic in order to give the Provincial treasury \$300,000?—No.

030729. It is not a good business, is it?—No, it is a bad business.

E. S. CLOUSTON, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

030730. You are the manager of the Bank of Montreal?—Yes.

030731. And you have held that position for how long?—About two years and a half.

030732. And how many years had you been with that institution before that?—Twenty-eight years altogether.

030733. I sent you a circular letter some time ago and intimated that we wished to put a few questions to you. We want to get information on the different phases of the inquiry we are charged to make, and perhaps I had better read the question to you to give you an opportunity to answer?—I was obliged to leave Montreal just at that time on a visit to New York, and have never given any consideration to the question. I have just had put in my hands by Mr. Monaghan, the secretary, a copy of the questions.

030734. I remember you were called to New York at that time. What, in your opinion, would be the effect on agricultural, financial, commercial and business interests generally and upon the revenue requirements of the Dominion, the Provinces and the municipalities, if a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, except for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes, were enacted?—I can only give you a very sketchy answer to this question, because I have not given it any fair consideration. I have never looked upon the question of prohibition as being a practical one. The liquor traffic, no doubt, gives employment to a large number of people, farmers and others, and assists many through a large number of channels, and is the means of a great deal of good, and financially it is productive of a large amount of the revenues both Dominion and Provincial. Possibly if you ask me some questions, I may get a better idea of what you wish.

030735. It is one of the means by which money is exchanged and disseminated throughout the country, and I suppose the Bank of Montreal has a good many accounts, directly or indirectly, with those in the liquor trade?—Yes.

030736. The passage of a prohibitory law would cut off almost wholly the revenue now collected by the Dominion Government, which is between six and seven million dollars a year, from excise and customs duties, on liquors of all kinds. There would, of course, be the remnant which might, or might not, pay duties, that is the quantity used for purposes which might be excepted. The Provincial Government, as I endeavoured to explain in the letter I sent to you, derive a large revenue from the liquor traffic. Taking the Provincial Government and the municipalities together, the amount is in the neighbourhood of from five to six hundred thousand dollars a year, and they would under the prohibition system lose that almost entirely?—Yes.

030737. Now, what would be the effect upon the finances of the Dominion and the Provinces and municipalities, if such a state of affairs was brought about by legal enactment?—It would have a very serious effect. I hardly see how they could replace it. The Finance Minister would be at his wits end for some other source of income. Besides, total prohibition means a very large expense in the way of police supervision and informers, to make the law effective.

030738. Take the Province of Quebec, which you and I are more familiar with, the loss of so much revenue would be a very serious matter?—Of course, a very serious matter.

030739. Has it occurred to you how it could be met?—The Province of Quebec has about six hundred thousand population?

WOLFERSTAN THOMAS.

030740. Yes, nearly that?—If they have difficulty now in making both ends meet, you can easily see what a serious matter it would be.

030741. In what other direction could they look to replace that?—Direct taxation is the only possible solution of it to my mind, and personal property and real estate.

030742. Do you think that such a law would affect the agricultural interests. Of course you know that a large amount of grain of one kind and another is used by brewers and distillers?—It would take away a market for a certain amount of barley, but I really do not know what the amount would be, and what effect it would have. I hardly think it would make a very serious difference to the agricultural community.

030743. Have you any knowledge of what a farmer could substitute for his barley crop if he endeavoured to produce something else?—I can hardly speak on that point. In the Province of British Columbia, I understand it has given quite an impetus there to farming. They grow large crops of barley.

030744. Could Canada expect to grow hops for exportation?—That is hardly in my province; I do not know anything, or pretend to know anything about farming.

030745. No, it is merely a question if the demand for barley was taken away, they could find a substitute. There is, of course, a large amount of property in cities occupied by those who vend these liquors: what would be the effect on it?—It would have a depressing effect on that special property.

030746. Do you think that it would injure the value of property near these places?—It must in some quarters.

030747. Would the effect of a prohibitory law be to depreciate very largely the value of the property held by brewers and distillers?—Yes, very largely.

030748. The plant, for instance?—The plant would be perfectly useless.

030749. And the real estate?—The real estate could be used for other purposes; the buildings would suffer in value because they would have to be altered for other manufactures.

030750. Do you think that the brewers and distillers, and others who might be affected by the enactment of such a law, would be entitled to any compensation?—If it was made a law of the land that the manufacture should be stopped, I do not see that they would be entitled to any compensation, any more than any other trade. If the taxes were lowered to-morrow on any manufactures, I do not suppose the Government would allow any compensation.

030751. Is that exactly a parallel case, Mr. Clouston, to entirely prohibit a large trade, wiping it out altogether so to speak, and to reduce the duties which you might put on any other trade?—It is not exactly a parallel case, but I think the same reason would apply to it. If it is prohibited it means that it is a dangerous traffic, dangerous to the people and to the State, and anyone who may be engaged in it.

030752. In connection with that phase of it, it is a legalized traffic at the present time, but the Legislature has imposed certain conditions upon the manufacture of spirits. For instance, they have to keep a two years stock on hand and observe certain conditions under which they shall carry on their business?—Yes. I presume if a prohibitory law was enacted they would be given a certain amount of time to get rid of the stock they might have on hand. It has never occurred to me to be a practical question at all. I have never considered that prohibition could be carried out. You are asking me questions that I cannot answer at all at the present moment.

030753. Have you paid any attention to the way in which the present system is carried out in Montreal?—No, I have not paid any particular attention to it. I have always looked upon Montreal as a very well behaved place in that respect, and so far as I at present can see there is very little drunkenness in Montreal.

030754. Do you think that there is more or less in Montreal than there was ten or fifteen years ago?—It is on the decrease, very much so.

030755. From what you have stated it seems almost unnecessary, but I think I had better ask you the question: do you think the enactment of a prohibitory law desirable?—I do not.

030756. Have you any special reasons which you would like to give expression to for entertaining that view?—I do not think it is workable. I do not see how you can stop the use of liquor. Had you men all over the country to enforce a prohibitory law, I do not think you would succeed.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030757. Have you ever been in Manitoba and the North-west Territories? Your bank, I believe, has branches in Regina and Calgary?—Yes.

030758. Any other places?—Winnipeg and Calgary are the only two places.

030759. Have you been in the Territories?—Only passing through.

030760. Was it while the prohibitory law was in force?—Yes.

030761. And have you been there since the license law came in, a year ago last May?—No.

030762. Did you yourself see, while you were in the Territories, anything of the working of the liquor law?—From the small experience I had in passing through, it seemed to me to be an easy enough matter to get liquor.

030763. The liquor was easily obtained?—Yes.

030764. In what years was that?—It was in 1885 or 1886.

030765. Do the returns received from your branches show any difference?—I beg your pardon, I was wrong; I was confusing the North-west Territories with Manitoba. In going through there we really had no chance of seeing how it was working except at Calgary, and from what I could see there was no difficulty for any one to get liquor at that time.

030766. Are you prepared to say from the returns made by your Managers whether the business conditions have been altered at all by the change in the law?—No, I cannot say that we have received any report to that effect.

030767. Your objection to prohibition is that it is impracticable. Do you think it is entirely impracticable?—Yes.

03768. You object to prohibition as applied to the drink trade?—Yes, I do object to any interference with a man's wishes.

030769. Well, the chief difficulty you say is the loss of revenue?—I think that is the great difficulty.

030770. I suppose that the Finance Ministers may be regarded as exceptionally safe judges, as to the possibility of making up the revenue, men who have to deal with the matter?—They should be better judges than I, on that point.

030771. There is a report to the effect that the late Sir A. T. Galt, Sir Leonard Tilley and the present Finance Minister, have expressed themselves as quite willing to make up the revenue in the event of a law prohibiting the traffic, although I acknowledge that it would be no easy task?—I was speaking more particularly of the finances of the Province of Quebec.

030772. The finances affected in the Province of Quebec are considerable?—Yes, very.

030673. And Montreal contributes to that amount, I think?—I think we contribute to almost everything in the Province of Quebec, nearly all the revenue comes from Montreal.

030774. Well, have you considered or made any estimate of the probable amount of money that Montreal puts into the drink trade, that it expends for drink?—No, I think not.

030775. There are, in round numbers, about 1,000 licensed drink shops, hotels and restaurants in Montreal, and Mr. Lambe has told us that there are also about 3,000 illicit places. I prepared a few figures this morning showing that if these 1,000 licensed places received an average of \$15 each per day for three hundred days, they would receive in a year more than four and a half million dollars, and I asked whether it pays Montreal to invest four and a half millions in the drink traffic in order to give to the Provincial treasury \$300,000. What do you think?—I do not think that we can expect an expenditure of money in that direction, and if it is to be expended in that direction the best thing the Province can do is to take a vote on it. I am a great believer in limiting the drink shops in proportion to the population.

030776. You think there are too many?—I think so. They should be highly licensed and rigidly looked after.

030777. The license, I think, is something like \$800,000 in Montreal?—I do not know.

030778. There have been attempts made from time to time to get the number of licenses reduced, but without success?—Yes.

E. S. CLOUSTON.

030779. I think you stated that in the event of a prohibition of the trade, it would, (I do not think you used the word impede) but it would be a very serious detriment to the progress of the county?—I think so. It would take something to overcome it.

030780. Now, take the capital which is invested in the decorations and fixings of saloons, would that be a loss in the event of prohibition?—A great deal would be wasted.

030781. Well, take the plant of the brewers and distillers and let it be admitted for the purpose of the question, that a percentage of it is wasted, still there would be a large percentage of the capital which is in the business that would not be wasted?—Yes.

030782. Were that percentage deducted, would it be likely to wait investment for very long?—It would depend entirely on the individual views of the people who had the money. They might not want to put it into anything else in Canada.

*By the Chairman :*

030783. Would it not practically remain in the property itself, unless that could be sold?—The question would be whether the property could not be turned to some other purpose. Take the machinery, for instance, they would be left with that on their hands. I said a large amount would be wasted, but there would be a certain proportion come out of it. I presume the stock of liquor could be sold for something. Then it would be a question of individual views as to what he would do with the capital. He might consider it unsafe to invest in any business in Canada, after being treated in that way.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030784. Are we to understand that a large percentage of the money invested in distilleries and breweries is in plant and machinery, which cannot be used for anything else? Does this cover a large percentage of the money required to carry on this business successfully?—Well, a large percentage of the money in the business is required from the bank to cover their active interest, and a large percentage of the money might have to go into the plant.

030785. If it were taken out of the business, would it not naturally find its way into some other business?—As I said, that is a matter of individual feeling. I should think if I was a distiller and my business was taken from me and I had lost a large amount of money, that I would invest in United States bonds.

030786. You think they would not re-invest their money in anything else in Canada?—I do.

030787. For instance, you say if you were in the distilling business and that business was stopped and you suffered loss, you would invest in United States bonds or something like that?—I would.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030788. Have you noticed, whether the liquor traffic, as carried on, has had an injurious effect on the people in any degree?—I cannot say that I have.

030789. You have not observed whether the effects of the liquor traffic financially have been injurious?—I cannot say so.

030790. For instance, if people spent money in drink, is not their power to purchase other things diminished that much, or are other businesses not affected by it?—The buyer purchases the liquor, and the man who sells the liquor, purchases the other things.

030791. So that it is a mere matter of transfer?—Yes.

030792. So that if one hundred men spend their money in drink it is just as well for business as if they had it to spend in other things?—That is a very difficult question to answer.

030793. Well, have you observed whether the saloons depreciate the value of the adjoining property?—No, I have never had anything to do with real estate.

030794. Do you know whether the saloon increases the rates of insurance on adjoining property or not?—No.

*By the Chairman :*

030795. The brewers and distillers probably give a large amount of credit to their customers. Have you any knowledge of that?—No doubt some of them do.

030796. And you frequently discount customers bills at the banks?—Yes.

030797. Would the sudden stoppage of the business render a good deal of this paper valueless?—It would undoubtedly depreciate it. I do not know that the distillers and brewers discount their customers' notes; they carry on their business very much on an open account. They discount their own paper.

030798. It has been so stated, and I have been led to ask you, seeing your large experience, what was the practice?—They take promises to pay and give credit to a large extent.

030799. Where they have to borrow capital, you think they have to borrow on their own notes in the bank?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030800. Have you any rule which you apply to bank employees as to their drinking habits?—Any drunkenness on the part of our employees is very severely visited.

030801. And that is purely a business rule, I suppose?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030802. Have you any rule which requires total abstinence on the part of your employees?—No.

030803. Speaking about the breweries a little while ago suggests a question that I wish to ask you. Do you know whether the breweries or distilleries here control any number of the saloons, really control them?—I do not know of it.

030804. We found in some other places that brewing companies own a large number of the saloons in the community?—I hear it is a very common thing in England, but I do not know.

RIGHT REV. BISHOP BOND, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

030805. You are Bishop of the Diocese of Montreal, of the Church of England?—Yes.

030806. How long have you been Bishop of Montreal?—Fifteen years, in round numbers.

030807. Before that, you were Rector of a parish in Montreal?—For thirty-eight years, of St. George's.

030808. Were you in any other parish?—Not in Montreal, but at Lachine, and I was travelling missionary before that.

030809. How many years have you been in this Province altogether?—Fifty-three.

030810. Speaking of the state of things as you found it when you came to this Province, and as it is now, have you found a marked improvement in the habits of the people as to sobriety and temperance?—There in an improvement decidedly.

030811. In your experience as a pastor, did you find that any great amount of suffering and distress was caused by intemperance on the part of members of families?—Very largely.

030812. Have you yourself taken any interest in temperance work?—Very greatly.

030813. In what way, Bishop Bond?—Forming organizations and endeavouring to induce, before the time of pledge-giving, every one I came in contact with to be total abstainers.

E. S. CLOUSTON.

030814. At the time of administering the rite of confirmation, have you taken that matter up at all with the young people?—Not especially, except that when a pastor, having individual interviews with them, I would speak upon that amongst other things.

030815. Taking your experience, do you favour the taking of the pledge for a limited time or indefinitely?—I prefer it indefinitely, but if I cannot get it indefinitely, I get it as long as I can.

030816. Have you been able to say as to which is lived up to the best?—According to my views, the indefinite.

030817. We have found some clergymen who prefer the system of a limited time. Your experience is the other way?—Yes.

030818. In the part of the city in which your parish was, St. George's, were there many licensed houses?—Yes, a large number. The old St. George's church was first of all on St. Joseph street.

030819. Were those houses hotels and saloons?—There were no hotels there then.

030820. Principally saloons?—Yes; I do not remember any hotel at that time.

030821. I suppose the Windsor is in that parish now?—No.

030822. Have you parochial limits in Montreal?—Yes.

030823. Governed by streets?—No; I could not tell you in what way, very indistinct, but still well known to us.

030824. Do you favour the enactment of a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic liquors, except for sacramental, mechanical and medicinal purposes?—Decidedly.

030825. Have you had any experience of the working of such a law?—I cannot say I have had personally, but have come in contact with it in various places.

030826. In this Province?—Yes, in the Eastern Townships.

030827. What has been the result of your observations there?—I think it has always been beneficial.

030828. How have you found it, so far as the reports from your clergy are concerned?—Decidedly beneficial.

030829. Their reports are favourable?—Yes.

030830. Have you had experience in any other country than this?—I have studied to a certain extent the results in Maine.

030831. From practical observation?—No, merely from books and coming in contact with individuals.

030832. In the event of the enactment of such a law, would you favour exception for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes?—Of course, but that only. I think that is the weakness of the Maine law, that it does not limit to that.

030833. What is the weakness in the Maine law?—That they can bring in liquor, provided they do not sell it, to any amount they like.

030834. And the law you would favour would be a law to prevent any individual bringing it in for his own use?—Yes.

030835. Would you prevent an individual making wine from his own grapes and cider from his own apples, which would be of a fermented character?—I have not thought of that, but I have understood that the cider sometimes is exceedingly injurious.

030836. I speak of what would become fermented. In the case of the enactment of such a law, as you favour, would you propose that the liquor required for the excepted purposes should be made by the Government or by private enterprise?—I have never thought of it in that way, but I should suppose it would be better to put it in the hands of the Government.

030837. Have you studied at all the system now in force in Norway and Sweden?—A little, yes.

030838. By which the Government takes the entire control of the traffic, and the individual employed to sell is allowed no profit?—Yes.

030839. In case you could not get a prohibitory law such as you wish, would you prefer to the present system one that would take away from the man who sold the liquor any interest in selling it, beyond his salary. That is he would receive a salary, but get no profit from the quantity he sold?—I have thought of it once or twice in a



variety of aspects, but I do not know that I could give any decided answer to that. I do not like either the one or the other.

030840. Your wish is to get rid of alcoholic liquors altogether?—Yes.

030841. I suppose you would not be in favour of the plan put forward by the Rev. Dr. Rainsford of New York?—Not in any way.

030842. You are opposed to it in principle?—Entirely.

030843. You think it would work badly?—I do.

030844. You hope a law such as you favour could be successfully carried out?—I feel quite sure it could be.

030845. Have you thought of the machinery to be used: what officials would you have to carry out that law?—No, I have not. It would depend a great deal on the officials to carry it properly into effect.

030846. Would anything depend upon public opinion being behind the officials?—Yes, very much in the case of the enactment of such a law.

030847. Would you deem it right that the brewers and distillers should be remunerated for the plant and machinery rendered useless?—No. I think I might say it—although I do not know that it would be of any value—that some years ago a very dear friend, to whom I always went for advice in these matters, was the late Thomas White, and we discussed these subjects continually. He was of the opinion, as I was, that if we could only educate the people, we could carry the law into effect with the greatest ease.

030848. If you had the people sufficiently educated, would you need such a law?—We want the law.

030849. You would not hope in the course of time, by education, to bring the people into such a state that they would abstain from liquor without any law?—No.

030850. What is the state of things in Montreal with regard to the traffic. Is it in your opinion well conducted?—As a rule, and latterly it is, taking it in every aspect, fairly conducted. I think that since the Citizens' League has taken the matter up, there has been a very great improvement.

030850½. If the license law is to be continued, would it be better to diminish the number of licenses?—Yes, but I do not believe in license at all.

030851. Are you opposed to it as a matter of principle?—Yes.

030852. Do you think it is a wrong act to license the traffic?—Yes, I think it is wrong to license a wrong thing.

030853. Do you think it is wrong to receive a revenue from it for public purposes?—Yes, I should say so. I do not know how far back to go behind anything of that sort about revenue, but directly I should say so.

030854. We find that in Toronto, with a population of 175,000, there are about 150 licensed places, and in Montreal, with a population of perhaps of 225,000, there is something like 1,000 licensed places, besides a very large number of unlicensed places. Choosing between the two, would you prefer the Toronto system to the Montreal system, if you have to have a license law?—That is limiting the number?

030855. Yes?—Decidedly. We had a large meeting of Roman Catholics and Protestants held here with that object. The chief curé here and myself were together on the platform.

030856. I may say that in Toronto they have not the number of licenses the law allows for the population. They are allowed so many, and do not even go up to that number. From your knowledge of the city, have you reason to believe that illicit traffic prevails to any great extent?—Judging from the newspapers, I believe so, but to what extent I am not prepared to say.

030857. What is your opinion of the sale of liquor in places of amusement, such as Sohmer Park, Mountain Park, St. Helen's Island?—I do not know much about that. I should say if they were kept free from liquor that intoxicates, they might be of great use. I am not at all prepared to go in for the Sunday opening of them.

030858. You would be opposed to Sunday opening?—Yes.

030859. And on week days you would not allow intoxicating beverages to be sold there?—No.

RIGHT REV. BISHOP BOND.

030860. In case of the non-enactment of a prohibitory law, would you favour legislation to reduce the use of distilled liquors and encourage the use of lager beer and lighter drinks?—I would certainly go for the reducing of distilled liquors, but could not say that I would encourage lager beer.

030861. In other words, if you cannot get such a law as you wish, you would leave things as they are?—No; I would use every possible means to reduce the facilities for getting drunk.

030862. I understand that; but I mean in so far as the kind of drink is concerned. In some sections of the country a great deal of lager beer is consumed and very little spirits. In other sections people of different nationalities consume much spirits and but little lager beer. Have you any choice as between them?—I have not had sufficient experience to say.

030863. Is there any statement you would like to make to this Commission?—Nothing, except that if you take away the facilities for getting drink you save a great number of men. For example: I can remember a very respectable man of a very respectable family, some of whom are still living here. We took hold of him and sent him to keep school, in a country place, where he could not get any drink. He would have to go six or eight miles to get it, and we could keep him sober six months at a time. But the moment he came in contact with it again, he was gone.

030864. You yourself make frequent visits to all portions of your diocese, and I suppose are brought in contact with a great many people in that way?—Yes.

030865. Taking the large section of this Province which is comprised within your diocese, do you find there is a difference in various sections as to the sobriety of the people?—Outside of Montreal, not much. Nine-tenths of our clergy are total abstainers and they use their influence. I am obliged to speak more concerning our own people; but while I do not know that I can say there is much difference, yet when you go to places where the lumbermen congregate, for example, the Desert, where they cannot obtain liquor, when they come back they drink, because when in the woods they are not allowed to have liquor and cannot take it with them.

030866. Have you noticed whether raftsmen and men who work in the water are apt to drink more than any other men?—They are very apt to do so; but I am not sure whether that is the reason, or whether it is owing to their being deprived of liquor for a certain length of time when they are in the bush.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod:*

030867. From your observation during the many years of your pastorate, and your close contact with the people, can you recall anything that, in so large a degree, produces such misery and neglect of religion as the drinking habit?—Certainly not.

030868. What is the position of your Church, as a Church, on this question by deliverance in Synods or otherwise?—It is decidedly in favour of total abstinence.

030869. Are there any resolutions or reports adopted by your body in session?—Yes.

030870. Could you supply the Commission with them at any time?—I am sure we could.

030871. I presume your Church expresses itself with increased definiteness about this evil from year to year?—Yes, I think so. Take for example, the clergy. Every student is a total abstainer. I do not think there is one who is not. It is possible there may be, but I do not think there is.

*By Judge McDonald:*

030872. You are speaking of the Church in this diocese?—Yes.

030873. Not the Church in Canada?—No.

VERY REV. JAMES CARMICHAEL, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows :—

*By Judge McDonald :*

030874. You are a Doctor of Laws ?—Yes.
030875. And a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin ?—Not a graduate.
030876. An alumnus ?—I came out to this country in the year 1859, and I have been out here ever since.
030877. You are Rector of St. George's Church, Montreal ?—Yes.
030878. And Prolocutor of the Provincial Synod of Canada ?—Yes.
030879. And President of the Lower House of the General Synod ?—Yes.
030880. How long have you lived in Montreal ; I mean your last residence ?—I came to Montreal in 1869, and I stayed here for 10 years. I think I came back in 1883.
030881. You lived for a time in Hamilton ?—Yes.
030882. You were Rector of the Church of the Ascension there ?—Yes.
030883. Speaking as a clergyman, have you found in families a great amount of misery caused by intemperance ?—Yes, always.
030884. Have you found it the greatest cause of misery and unhappiness ?—Always.
030885. Have you, in your parish, temperance organizations ?—Yes.
030886. More than one ?—No, only one.
030887. What is the basis of it ?—The total abstinence pledge.
030888. Have you noticed, in your residence in Montreal, any improvement in the habits of the people as to sobriety and temperance ?—No, I cannot say I have in the city of Montreal.
030889. Have you in other parts of the Province ?—Yes, I have noticed it in the country but not in the city.
030890. Do you find wine is as much used at private tables as it used to be 10 or 15 years ago ?—I really could not say ; I never go out to private tables.
030891. Do you mean from your observations in the streets ?—In the streets and in the houses, the increase of the liquor traffic in the shape of taverns and saloons and drinking dens all over the city. In fact, it appears to me that the city of Montreal is almost governed by tavern-keepers.
030892. Do you think there has been an increase in the number of places in which liquor is sold ?—I think so.
030893. Have efforts been made to diminish the number ?—I think so.
030894. With what measure of success ?—I do not think any.
030895. To what do you attribute it ?—To the very bad law to start with—I mean bad for the welfare of the city, administered to the utmost extent in favour of the different saloon keepers.
030896. Administered by the officials ?—Yes.
030897. Do you know if any attempt has been made to obtain legislation from the Legislature to do away with that state of things ?—I think so. There have been meetings over and over again.
030898. No success ?—Never successful.
030899. How did you find things in Hamilton when you left there ? Did you find a change for the better as the years went on ?—I think Hamilton was just about the same average as here. That is, the city.
030900. Do you yourself favour the enactment of a prohibitory law, prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of liquor for beverage purposes ?—I have never taken any part in the public movement ; but if the question were submitted by the proper authorities to the country at large, I would vote at once for it and use all my influence in favour of it.
030901. Have you any objection to say why you have not hitherto done anything to promote it ?—For one reason, because I thought it was a good deal mixed up with the
- VERY REV. JAMES CARMICHAEL.

politics of the country and used by different parties in the country as a mere political engine to a very great extent, and I did not care to mix myself up in it very much. I noticed that at different times people were always ready to say they would go in for it and make great speeches in favour of it and all that kind of thing, but when they got into power they did nothing.

030902. In the case of the enactment of such a law, would you make exception in favour of liquor needed for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes?—I do not know exactly what you mean by mechanical.

030903. In the arts?—I suppose so.

030904. We have already had evidence of the position of the Church of England as to what is to be used in the sacrament. As you are the presiding officer of the Provincial Synod, do you know the resolution that was passed as to what must be used in the Holy Communion?—I do not know exactly to what you are referring.

030905. As to whether it is to be wine, or what is meant by wine. We find that in some religious communions they only use the unfermented juice of the grape, while the Church of England, you may remember, in the Provincial Synod some years ago, declared what was to be used at the Holy Communion—the kind of wine?—I do not see that the Church of England would be justified in making any change in the usual custom of the Church Universal.

030906. You know the declaration was that in Canada fermented wine was to be used?—Yes; it was not done at this last Synod.

030907. No, in 1886. In case of the enactment of a law prohibiting the manufacture of liquor, would you deem it right that brewers and distillers should be remunerated for plant and machinery rendered useless?—At one time, I thought so; but I have thought a good deal over it, and I do not know that I would be in favour of it now. Such gentlemen go into this business, place their money in it, with a perfect knowledge of the terrible injury that is done to the country. While they are in the business they make a good deal of money, and I do not know that I would be in favour of granting remuneration.

030908. The law requires them to keep liquor in stock two years before selling. Would you, in case of the enactment of a prohibitory law, allow them time to dispose of that, or would you remunerate them, or buy it from them?—I do not know that generally I would give any remuneration.

030909. Your position is this, I understand: You are in favour of a law to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of liquor for beverage purposes, without remuneration to the manufacturer for his plant or machinery rendered useless?—Yes.

030910. And then you would except from such legislation what is needed for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes?—Yes.

030911. Have you considered the method of enforcing such a law?—Well, I cannot say that I have thought very much of it, beyond the fact that there would be difficulties in the way.

030912. Do you believe that the license law you now have in this Province is enforced?—I think it is carried out in favour of the tavern-keepers.

030913. Do you believe that the law itself is carried out—the provisions of the law for instance as to limitation of licenses, doing away with the licenses where people do not wish for them, etc.?—I do not.

030914. To what do you attribute that failure?—I do not know. I know there are officials who have to look after that, and yet somehow or other it always goes, as far as my experience is concerned, against the wishes of the householders in the electoral district and always in favour of the liquor men.

030915. If the present law, as committed to officials, is not carried out, would you be willing to commit the enforcement of a prohibitory law to officials?—The officials of the Government?

030916. Yes.—I do not see to whom else you could give it. There is no good in giving it to the police, as far as I can see.

030917. Who has it now?—The officials of the Government, and the police to help them, I suppose.

030918. And yet the officials do not carry it out, and the police do not help them?—Well, the officials, I know, considered that with six taverns between St. Antoine Street and the corner of Osborne Street, there was a positive necessity—that was the deliverance of the gentlemen—to put another tavern opposite my church door. Where the necessity came, I do not know; I did not want it. None of my congregation wanted it, and there were six other taverns around the corner; but there was a positive necessity to have one opposite my church door, and it was put there. I might as well have taken all the money of St. George's used in fighting the license and saved myself a great deal of trouble by throwing it out at the start into the St. Lawrence, or giving it to any institution in the city.

030918½. Did you take the usual steps to oppose the granting of the license?—We took every legal step.

030919. And yet you were overruled?—The law works in this kind of a way, at least it did. I do not know if any alterations have been made. You fight a man and get an enormous majority against him, and then he sets to work and puts in a new application. Then you have to go over all that ground again and canvass the same people. You beat him again, and he puts in another application. It is only a question of wearing out. And when it comes to summer time and all the people are away, it is a very hard thing to keep a movement of that kind going. In any case if the tavern-keeper is only sufficiently decided, he can tire out any electoral district.

*By the Chairman :*

030920. He has to get a petition, has he not?—I think he requires 25 names of householders, and those 25 names can last him through all his applications for one license, whereas I, in opposing him, have to go around and get the fresh signatures of a majority of all the people in the electoral district.

030921. The man putting in an application for a license has to get 25 householders to sign his petition?—I think the number is 25.

030922. That application is dealt with, we will suppose, and is not granted owing to opposition. He cannot use that petition again, can he? He has to go around and get his 25 signatures over again, has he not?—I do not know whether he goes around or not, but he gets the same 25 signatures. They turn up just as sure as Tuesday comes after Monday.

030923. The objectors have to get a much large number of signatures, and they have further to have some one make oath that these are the signatures of the persons named?—Yes.

030924. To every one of them?—Yes, and, if I mistake not, there must be an affidavit that you made application to the individual and got his signature.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030925. What you mean is the same 25 people can be kept going?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

030926. And your 40 can be kept going if you get their signatures?—I do not know whether they sign over again.

030927. What possible plea could be put forward for the place for which application was made when there were six other places at hand?—I do not know, except the inner consciousness of the gentlemen who gave the decision.

030928. Are these places for the convenience of the travelling public bona fide hotels?—The one at the corner appears to me now to be a hotel, and the one lower down "The Lawrence," also furnishes beds, perhaps, but I think the others are ordinary saloons.

030929. Would you be willing to commit the enforcement of the prohibitory law for which you wish, to those officials?—I certainly would not, if I had my way.

030930. What mode of enforcement would you suggest?—I think with regard to licensing, that if a man is fairly beaten once in the year, he should not be allowed to apply a second time.

VERY REV. JAMES CARMICHAEL.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030931. The Commissioners have the discretion to override the majority of the residents in a community?—They claim they have.

030932. And they exercise it?—I can only tell you of this case, that after fighting a battle to prevent the taverns being opened in the enormous numbers they were on that line of street, a man put in his application to open one exactly opposite my church door. I went down myself and saw one of the Commissioners. I then sent him a written application, signed by my church wardens. He said he would look over the position of the ground himself, and the answer we received was that there was a necessity to have a tavern there.

030933. You regard that as an indication of the power of the liquor traffic in Montreal?—I do.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030934. Have you reason to believe there is much sale to minors?—None beyond what I read in the public prints.

030935. Have you considered the question of the treatment of what are called habitual drunkards. The system now seems to be send them to jail for short terms, 21 days or a month. They get out and go back again. Would it be well to continue that system, or place a permanent restraint on habitual drunkards by putting them at some industrial occupation?—I have often thought that when the Government of the country makes so much money out of the liquor traffic, it ought to provide some houses of refuge for the unfortunate creatures who are the result of the traffic. I would not have a jail or anything of that kind, but certainly some place to which you could commit for a term, say a year or may be two years, a well-known habitual drunkard, and keep him employed in making things that would be of value for the use of the Government. But it should be supported and kept by the Government. In connection with St. George's Church, when the Lord Bishop was the Rector of it, we had an institution for such unfortunate people and kept it going, I think, for three or four years, but of course the expense was enormous, and we had finally to give it up.

030936. Is there any statement you would like to make with reference to this matter further than the answers you have given?—No, I do not know of any.

*By the Chairman :*

030937. If the majority of the resident voters in a district petitioned against the granting of a license, have the Commissioners any option but to refuse it?—I think so. We have urged on them in our campaign against those taverns on Windsor Street, to use the power that the Act gave them. It is now some time ago. I knew the terms of the Act at the time, but they have really passed out of my mind. We urged the Commissioners very strongly to use the powers the Act gave them, and one of them said it was a very invidious kind of thing to do.

030938. If a petition is put in and withdrawn on account of opposition made to it, it holds good for another occasion; but if a petition is put in and passed upon by the Commissioners, the opposition to it does not hold good if the man puts in another petition. Is that your view?—No, you have to go over the same ground again.

030939. I understood you to express yourself as in favour of a prohibitory law, which would prevent the making or importing of liquors of any kind except for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes?—Yes.

030940. Do you know of any community in which such a law exists at present?—The only place I know is Maine.

030941. But the individual there can import as much as he desires for his own personal use?—I would go far beyond that.

030942. Could we gather any experience with regard to the operation of such a law anywhere?—I could not say. As a clergyman, from a lifelong contest that appears to grow deeper and graver the older I get, with the liquor traffic, I am so dispirited over it that really I do not see any compromise is going to do anything in this city at all events.

030943. Could a prohibitory law of any kind be carried out efficiently unless public sentiment were very largely in its favour?—I do not think it could, but I think that public opinion is increasing very strongly and rapidly in favour of a prohibitory law. Unless the public were at the back of the law, I do not see how you are going to enforce it.

030944. Would there not be great danger in passing a prohibitory law, before public opinion had reached a point that would lead to its efficient enforcement?—Yes, but I am not afraid of that in the case of this prohibitory law, because the law, as I understand it, would have to be passed by the Federal Government, and I do not believe that that law would ever be passed until the members of the House found that their seats were very likely to be imperilled unless it was enacted; and if it ever came to that, you would have public opinion behind your back in the carrying out of the law.

030945. Have you any knowledge of what took place in New Brunswick many years ago when a prohibitory law was passed there, and resulted in the Ministry going out of office and a fresh election being held, and I think of only two members being returned to the Assembly in favour of the law?—No, I do not know about that.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030946. Granted that a state of public sentiment such as you have spoken of exists, and that sentiment crystallised into an Act of Parliament owing to the influence that the public will had upon the legislators, and the law itself not proving a success, would the fact of such a law having been passed and, not being successful, be then a benefit or a detriment to the cause of temperance?—I suppose it would be a detriment, because any law on the Statute Book which is only there to be violated, is a great deal worse than no law at all. But then, on the other hand, I do not think you would be likely ever to get a prohibitory law passed by the Federal Government unless the opinion prevailed that it would be enforced and carried out generally by the people.

030947. Through whom, the officers?—I suppose so.

030948. You have a license law passed by the Provincial Legislature and officers to carry it out and you tell us it is not carried out?—No, I say it is carried out.

030949. Not carried out as the Legislature intended?—I never made such a statement. I said that the law is made wholly, as I read it, in favour of the tavern keeper, and that it is carried out to the strict letter and extent by the officials.

030950. You do not charge the officials with a dereliction of duty?—Except in the case I have stated to you.

030951. Is everything done, so far as you know, within the limits of the law?—Yes.

030952. So then it is not the officials who are to blame, but the law?—Except I thought that, in the case I have mentioned, they might have acted differently. I think, as far as I have seen, that the Commissioners have carried out the law as the law exists. They cannot alter the position of a tavern-keeper, who has only to get 25 names in favour of his license, while I have to get a majority of voters in the electoral district.

030953. What was the object of the official going and looking around the locality?—I do not know.

030954. Was it not with the view of seeing whether there was a necessity or not for a license?—Yes.

030955. You thought there was no necessity?—I did.

030956. He did not agree with your opinion, and his opinion prevailed?—His opinion prevailed.

THOMAS G. SHAUGHNESSY, of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman :*

030957. You are the Vice President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?—  
Yes.

030958. And its General Manager also?—Yes, performing the duties. We have no title of Manager.

030959. You have practically held that office since the railway was fairly completed?—I have had to do with the management for eight or nine years past.

030960. Have you any regulations in existence with regard to drinking amongst your men?—Nothing beyond the general rule that no man must drink to excess.

030961. Of course he would lose his situation if he appeared on duty the worse of liquor?—Under the influence of liquor.

030962. You do not make it a rule that employees should be total abstainers?—No, we have never had such a rule.

030963. Are you much troubled by men giving way to intemperance?—Not to any important extent. The cases that come under our notice are comparatively few.

030964. Can you tell us how many men are employed by the Company in the works at Montreal?—It varies from season to season. At present I should say we have 1,500 men. I am referring now more particularly to those engaged in the various yards and shops, etc.

030965. Have you much trouble amongst the mechanics and men about the shops on the score of intemperance?—No.

030966. Is there any temperance organization amongst the men not specially connected with the work?—Nothing of any official character, or that has come to our knowledge officially in any way.

030967. Are many of the men members of the labour organizations, such as the Knights of Labour?—I imagine a good many of them are.

030968. Are the locomotive men largely members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers?—Yes.

030969. Is it your opinion that these labour organizations have done anything towards inculcating temperance principles among the men?—I should say that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers has done a good deal in that direction. During the last two or three years there has been an effort on the part of the organizations of the trainmen to accomplish something in the same direction.

030970. Have you had many cases of accident arising from men over indulging in the use of intoxicants?—No, not so many as to make that a particularly prominent cause.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

030971. But some?—Yes. I have in my mind one particular case where an accident, we were satisfied from the evidence, was due to that cause, because the men in charge of the train had over indulged.

030972. How long ago was that?—Three or four months ago, within the year.

030973. Were there any exceptional circumstances connected with it?—Not that I recollect. The conductor and the driver, as I recollect, had evidently been indulging before they went out.

030974. They must have escaped the attention of the officers at the depot?—Yes.

*By the Chairman :*

030975. Could you give us any idea of the amount of revenue you derive from the transportation of liquors and grain for brewing and distilling purposes?—I could not offhand. We could arrive at it, however. I do not know but that I prepared something of that kind for the Commission at one time.

030976. Have you given any attention to the working of a prohibitive law in places in the States where it has been in operation?—Nothing specially. I had some personal



knowledge of its operation in the State of Maine during the time we were constructing a line across the State, and I must say there was nothing whatever in my experience to warrant the opinion that the law was by any means too effectively administered.

030977. Have you lived in the State of Maine?—No. During the time we were building the Short Line, I was up and down very frequently. That is the only place where a State law or a general law of any kind was in force in the territory in which we have done construction work, although in the construction of our main line north of Lake Superior and through the mountains, we had in force what is called in this country the Public Works Act, under which our officials prohibited the importation of liquor to the works.

030978. Then you had some experience of a prohibitory law, somewhat limited, in the North-west Territories?—Yes.

030979. Is there anything in regard to that which you think would be useful to the Commission?—Nothing that I think would be of special interest. I always have thought that the enforcement of the Public Works Act and the manner in which it was enforced, was productive of a great deal of good. Having a vast number of workmen of all countries in the world and all classes gathered together there, any means by which they were prevented from securing liquors, which they would probably use to excess, was productive of very great good. During all our time we had no serious riots or disturbances resulting from that cause, but of course we had a most effective organization to carry it out, all under our control. It was carried out practically by our own officers, except in the North-west Territories, where we had the co-operation of the Mounted Police. There were no means of getting liquor to the central sections of the work, except by means of the railway, so that we had everything in our own control there.

030980. Did you find that your men employed in the construction of the line did get liquor?—Frequently we found they did. They secured it by some means or other. They resorted to all sorts of expedients, such as sending cases of eggs, and when the cases were opened it was found that the contents had been sucked out of the shell and the shells filled with liquor.

030981. Did the men get any liquor with the authority of the Company?—No.

030982. Still they did get it?—Yes, liquor was taken in there.

030983. You spoke of the line north of Lake Superior which was put under the Public Works Act. Did the men there get liquor at all?—It was brought in surreptitiously. Notwithstanding our precautions, pedlars and others travelling along the line succeeded in bringing it in and selling it. They would establish their camps short distances from headquarters, out in the woods, and there would sell it to the men. As soon as our officers discovered it, the liquor was confiscated and the vendors punished.

030984. Did any come in by water?—No doubt it did, as many of the supplies came in by water for the western portion of the section.

030985. Going back to the State of Maine, please tell us your experience there in the construction of the Short Line?—The experience may not be broad enough upon which to base a general conclusion, but I found, one Sunday morning, when I arrived on the work, that a very considerable number of the men near Greenville were under the influence of liquor. I was rather surprised, and inquired how they secured their supplies. I thought it must have been brought in by some of the trains, but the man in charge of the works said: "No, there is no difficulty in getting it. They can get it here any place. They can get it quietly."

030986. Where had they got it?—In some of the little houses around there, some of the farmers or storekeepers had supplies which they sold off quietly to these men.

030987. Do you know anything of the law in the State of Kansas?—No.

030988. Iowa?—I know in a general way about the Iowa law, but never had any experience with it.

030989. Then you have not come in contact with a prohibition law in the West?—Not at all.

030990. Is it, in your opinion, desirable that the Dominion Parliament should pass a prohibitory law by which the importation and manufacture of liquor, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, should be put an end to?—Personally I have never entertained that opinion.

THOMAS G. SHAUGHNESSY.

030991. Have you any objection to telling us your grounds for thinking it is not desirable?—Briefly stated, after having thought the subject over, I should say that, in the first place, some very important industries in the country would be wiped out, that numbers of people, men who grow the grain and are engaged in the manufacture of these articles, would be deprived of a revenue; that, after all, some means would be found whereby the demand for those liquors would be satisfied; and that in the present day it is practically impossible to enforce effectively anything like a prohibitory law, that dishonestly and by illegal means people would get access to liquor. I have always been a believer in the general theory that it would be better to educate the people to use liquor intelligently rather than force them to use it surreptitiously and unlawfully, by legislation.

*By Judge McDonald :*

030992. In the case of the enactment of such a law, should brewers and distillers be remunerated for their plant and machinery rendered useless?—I think that would be fair.

030993. We have had before us two witnesses who were engaged on construction of the Canadian Pacific road, Mr. Sifton, and your general manager on the Pacific coast, Mr. Abbott. Mr. Sifton told us that in building the section he constructed, he had not the slightest difficulty, with the aid of two constables, in keeping liquor out. Mr. Abbott told us that using the utmost means in his power, constables and all, he found himself utterly unable to cope with it. Men came in with tin vessels around their bodies, containing liquor, and covered by a loose coat. Liquors came in with barrels of potatoes and coal oil cans made with a pipe, corked, which went to the bottom of the can, and the rest of the can was filled with liquor, and even dressed hogs were brought in with cans of liquor stowed away inside them. And I think the two sections were not very far from one another?—There is this little difference in the experience: Mr. Abbott's construction was in the upper Ottawa Valley, and everything going over to the west passed through his section. Everything going to the eastern portion of the Lake Superior section passed through his section first. He was nearer to civilization, and there were more means of access to his work than any other work on the line. Then, subsequently, the work Mr. Abbott had was on the Lake Superior section, after all the grading had been done, the track laid and the ballasting, &c., done. So that his experience was different from that of anybody who was engaged on the western section of the line, or the more inaccessible portions east.

030994. Was Mr. Sifton's section more inaccessible?—It was between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, but north of Lake Superior we had any number of cases that I have heard of where whisky sellers were detected and hauled up and their whisky confiscated, and they were fined. Our fines were not very light. As a rule, we imposed a fine of \$200 for selling whisky. While we had these cases, I think the matter was pretty effectively handled.

030995. I think Mr. Abbott spoke to us also of some riot that occurred with the men—I do not know whether on his section or not. Do you remember that?—No.

030996. In spite of these fines, did the liquor get in?—They got some in, but in comparatively small quantities; not so much as to do any special amount of harm.

030997. Do you know anything in connection with the enforcement of the prohibitory law in the North-west Territories, whether liquor was brought in there? Did you know that country before your railroad got there?—No.

030998. It was stated by some witnesses that after your railroad was constructed and once there was means of communication, liquor came in more freely?—It became very difficult then to rigidly enforce the Act. When our trains first commenced running through, the Mounted Police, in pursuance of the law, would go into the baggage car and open all the trunks and search them for liquor. Naturally we protested against that. The passengers protested and would not submit, and the execution of the law had to be modified to some extent. It is possible that may have led to the liquor being brought in surreptitiously, but I never heard of special complaint.

030999. We have been told that inside of casks supposed to contain molasses and sugar, liquor was concealed?—I have not the slightest doubt of it, though I have no such cases in mind.

031000. You look upon the enforcement of a prohibitory law as impracticable?—I think so.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

031001. You think that the prohibition during your construction period, notwithstanding some liquor came in illicitly, had an excellent effect?—Yes.

031002. Is liquor sold at the refreshment rooms of the Canadian Pacific Railway?—Wines and beer are sold.

031003. I had the impression there were a good many of your refreshment places where it was not sold at all?—There may be some of the small eating stands, lunch counters, where it is not sold, but at the proper places it is.

031004. It is not sold over the bars, but in bottles?—Yes, except in the hotels, as in the Vancouver hotel. I do not know of any place in our dining cars or railway eating houses where anything is sold except by the bottle, wine or beer.

031005. Speaking about the drinking habits of the men in your employ : if a trainman or any other man has the drinking habit, does it interfere with his promotion?—Not unless there is something to indicate that he is a stealthy drinker, which I consider the most dangerous description of a drinker—unless there is something to indicate that he keeps liquor at home and is liable to come on duty at any time under the influence of liquor, and might not be noticed. I would prefer that every man who has to do with the operation of the road, every man connected with the train service, was a total abstainer ; but that being impossible, we prefer to know that a man takes his drinks openly, that he goes into a billiard room to play billiards and a pool room to play pool, and that whatever he takes to drink he takes openly. We have less reason to fear him than the man who keeps liquor at home, and is what we call a secret drinker.

031006. Speaking of the trainmen, whom you prefer to be abstainers, I had a conversation with Mr. Whyte, who was the superintendent located at Winnipeg, last autumn, and as I recall his conversation, he said (and this is suggested by the remark made by another gentleman) speaking of the employment of telegraph operators, connected, I supposed, with the despatching of trains, that if he had two applications, one applicant a very ordinary kind of fellow, not at all brilliant, but a total abstainer, and the other really a brilliant man in his way, but given to drink, though never found to be drunk, he would not hesitate to give the preference to the ordinary fellow who had the abstinence habit?—If is difficult to express an opinion on a case of that kind. Each case would have to be considered by itself. No doubt any one responsible for the actions of the men would be influenced by that.

031007. I think he explained there would be a degree of uncertainty about the other man, which perhaps, at a critical time, might involve a great deal ; that without any intention of ever being incapable for work, he might, through the drinking habit, at a critical time fail in his duty?—I should say that 99 per cent of the loss resulting to railway companies and loss of life as well, comes rather from stupidity than from the use of liquor. The stupid man is a constant menace ; he is always stupid. At the same time, I have no hesitation in reiterating that I would be pleased to know that every man connected with our train service in any capacity is a total abstainer.

031008. I think this is a copy of your rules and regulations. Rule 193 says : “ In the interests of safety and efficiency, the use of intoxicants while on duty is absolutely prohibited. Any instance of intoxication on duty will not be overlooked, but will be followed by immediate dismissal. The habitual use of intoxicants will be considered a cause of dismissal, and preference given to those who abstain from their use.” That is your rule adopted on purely business principles?—Yes.

031009. I notice on page 87 that there is a paragraph on the use of liquor, saying that the continual or periodical use of liquor should be abstained from by those engaged on the road, because habitual drinking had a very bad effect on the constitution?—I recollect that clause.

THOMAS G. SHAUGHNESSY.

031010. Here is one of the company's forms: "I hereby apply for a situation, and if accepted, agree to faithfully observe all the rules and regulations, to pay all my bills promptly each month, to maintain strict integrity of character, to abstain from the use of intoxicating liquors, to avoid visiting saloons and places where liquor is sold, etc."?—I do not recollect this particular form. Each General Superintendent, to some extent, regulates these forms after his own fashion. I know of no general form of this description, although we may have one in force. Mr. Whyte is particularly strong on this question. While no doubt every General Superintendent would be glad to have his men make a promise of this kind and observe it, we have no general regulation debarring our men from the use of liquor.

GILBERT PROUT GIRDWOOD, M.D., of Montreal, on being duly sworn, deposed as follows:—

*By the Chairman:*

031011. You are a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, of England?—Yes.

031012. Do you hold any other degree?—Doctor of Medicine, of McGill University, and one of the professors of chemistry in the McGill faculty, and I am also Public Analyst for the Dominion. I am one of the examiners of the public analysts and *ipso facto* Public Analyst.

031013. Are samples of liquors sent you for examination?—Yes.

031014. By officials of the Government?—Yes, sometimes, and by others.

031015. How do such samples reach you?—Sometimes a brewer sends me samples of beer. Sometimes a purchaser will bring in some samples when there is a question as to strength between him and the Excise; and on one special occasion I had three samples of liquor sent me in bottles by the Collector of Inland Revenue at Sherbrooke. These bottles arrived at my house with a telegram to analyse them. I asked whether he wanted the analysis for advertising purposes, or what, and he wrote telling me who he was and asking me to analyse it. Mr. Morkill, Inland Revenue Officer, Sherbrooke District, was the man. Of course all matters that come into my hands in that way are private matters and this seemed to me a private one, and I wrote asking if any information I obtained in making the analysis I could make public, and he said, I might do as I pleased.

031016. How long ago was that?—I have brought the notes of the case with me and can tell you exactly. It was on December 23rd last, he asked me to make the analysis of three bottles. They were marked nos. 1, 2 and 3, "Elixir Antiperiodique," patented by Dr. Bouillon of Matane, P. Q., Patented June 1st 1892, No. 39045. No. 1 was made with brandy, no. 2 with gin, and no. 3 alcohol or whisky, what is commonly known as white whisky. Ten gallons or thereabouts were taken and 2 gallons of water with 20 ounces of syrup, and 4 ounces of phosphate of soda and 2 ounces of antipyrine were added. That constituted the mixture, and in lieu of syrup honey was recommended. No. 1 contained 38.22 per cent alcohol by weight; no. 2 33.29 per cent by weight; and no. 3 contained 50 per cent by weight. These were sold as a remedy against febrile diseases. Anybody wanting it could go and ask for "Elixir Antiperiodique," no. 1, 2, or 3, according as he wanted to get the brandy, whisky or gin. The quantity of the different materials put in the liquor would not amount to anything as a preventive or curative.

031017. For what purpose was the information required?—Mr. Morkill wrote me that he was Collector of Provincial Revenue for the District of St. Francis, that his business was to issue hotel and shop licenses for the sale of intoxicants and to stop illicit sales, and that his attention had been drawn to the sales of this elixir, and he had seized some 13 bottles on a grocer's premises at Quebec, and had taken an action against him for keeping intoxicating liquor for sale. He enclosed a copy of the patent and asked me to report, and added that if this elixir could be sold without license the revenue of the Quebec Government would suffer to a very great extent.

031018. Who was the patentee?—Dr. Bouillon, of Matane.

031019. Do you know where this is bottled?—I think a great deal of it was made in Montreal and sent down there.

031020. Do you know the name of the firm preparing it?—I cannot tell you.

031021. Do you know if a large quantity was shipped from Montreal?—I believe there was a very considerable quantity, and I was told by one of my friends who knew something about it that there was a very considerable quantity shipped. I think he said something like 10 or 12 cases a day or more.

031022. This sale to which you are referring now had no connection with sales taking place at Matane?—It was by the same man.

031023. Not in the same district?—No.

031024. Therefore the sales which have been referred to in the newspapers as taking place at Matane are apart altogether from the sales referred to by Mr. Morkill?—I imagine so.

031025. What sort of bottles were these?—The ordinary brandy bottle, light-colored French brandy bottles.

031026. Is it your opinion that much liquor is sold as patent medicines?—I do not know that there is. I do not think I ever came across any case of that kind before. In the shape of cordials there is a good deal done, I believe.

031027. Have you had any cordials sent you for analysis?—No; a good deal of wine is sold in the shape of quinine wine, wine containing a small quantity of quinine. It is a regular pharmacopœia preparation, and is sold by a number of grocers. There are a great number of men who sell their own quinine wine and label it as such.

031028. Have you had many samples of liquor sent to you from the city for analysis?—Not a great many. I have had some beer sent from Quebec, and I think from the city here, to know whether it is above three per cent or not, and I have had some spirits, which all ran about the ordinary strength of such spirits.

031029. With what object was the beer sent from Quebec?—It was sent by a brewing house to know whether it was under 3 per cent.

031030. What did you find?—It was just under.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

031031. Speaking of this liquor from Quebec that you analysed, were there any medicinal properties in the preparation?—None that would amount to anything. A little phosphate of soda and antipyrine were the two drugs.

031032. It seems strange the proprietor should require a patent?—He claimed that under the patent he could sell it as a patent medicine, which paid no license, and that any grocer could sell it without a license. Mr. Morkill seized it as an alcoholic drink, and brought it before the Judge, who decided that it was.

031033. Have you had occasion at any time to analyse the mixtures of any of the compounders of liquors here?—None.

031034. Did you hear the judgment of the Court in this case?—I saw it in the paper you have before you. The Judge declared that no one could sell it without paying license.

*By Judge McDonald :*

031035. What kind of beer was it which contained this small quantity of alcohol?—It was sold as root beer.

031036. What percentage of alcohol is there in ordinary ale?—It varies, 5 to 6, probably some stronger.

031037. Is Scotch the highest of all?—Yes.

031037½. Would that run up as high as 10 per cent?—I dare say it would.

031038. Have you any analysis of lager beer?—I do not think I ever analysed it. Some of that will run to 4 or 5 per cent.

031039. Take the wines made by the housewives from red currants, rhubarb, elder berries, using sugar, what percentage of alcohol is in them?—It is very hard to say, unless we try each one, but I have seen those wines thrown in the fire and ignite from the quantity of alcohol.

GILBERT PROUT GIRDWOOD, M.D.

031040. I have known of wine made by taking sticks of rhubarb, soaking them in hot water some days, adding brown sugar, and causing fermentation with some yeast?—Yes.

031041. In a wine of that kind, what would be the percentage of alcohol?—The yeast gets there sometime, and once it gets there it depends on the extent to which fermentation is allowed to go. If allowed to go until the whole of the sugar is converted into alcohol, you may have 20 or 25 per cent. A sweet wine is where the fermentation is stopped before the sugar is all converted; in the other case you will get a dry wine.

031042. How is it stopped?—By cooling it down. Fermentation will only take place between the temperatures of 70° and 80°.

031043. I know of instances where this wine from rhubarb was made with brown sugar and hot water and put in a cask, left for some months in a cool place and then transferred into bottles?—You will find the plants of yeast growing everywhere. You will find the spores about in the air, and if any of these settle upon the food, upon which they will grow, they will grow quickly and you will have the yeast growing and producing fermentation, and that will go on until all the sugar it requires for its growth is consumed, and then it stops. You can stop the growth by cooling.

031044. When it is stopped by the natural process it is a dry wine?—Yes, all the sugar is converted into alcohol.

031045. It is a bitter wine?—That depends on the quantity of acid in the juice to start with.

031046. What percentage of alcohol is there in a wine of that kind?—It would depend on the quantity of sugar which is used up in the process of fermentation.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

031047. Was the root beer to which you have referred sent you by the Citizens' League?—One sample was. That was the Dignum root beer.

031048. What percentage of alcohol is necessary in these beers to make them intoxicating?—It depends on the quantity you drink and your susceptibility to alcohol.

*By the Chairman :*

031049. You would have to drink a great deal of three per cent beer?—I should not like to get drunk on it. I am big enough as it is, but I would then be swelled out considerably more.

031050. Is there any statement you wish to make to this Commission?—I know with reference to what has been said regarding the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of Lake Superior, that any quantity of liquor was brought in there by men who brought it in tin jackets made to fit around their waists to meet their coats. I used to see a great number of men who got liquor; after they had had rows, they came to me to get medical assistance.

031051. Were you the surgeon on the works?—Yes.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

031052. Do you think as much was brought in, under the rule Mr. Shaughnessy referred to, as would have been if that rule had not been in operation?—No, it made it very difficult to get it in, but still they did get it. Some one would come 15 or 20 miles through the bush with it.

031053. And then get large prices for it?—Not always. I recollect hearing of one case where a man brought a quantity in thinking he would get a large price; but the men themselves, knowing the Public Works Act was in force, took it away from him, and he got nothing and had no redress.

*By Judge McDonald :*

031054. Was the liquor nothing but high wines?—Yes, and they took the river water and diluted it.

*By the Chairman :*

031055. Have you formed any opinion on the subject of prohibition?—I have thought about it a good deal, and I think legal prohibition or prohibition by the force

of law is a grand mistake. You cannot make men sober by Act of Parliament. If you get an Act of Parliament making drinking illegal, you simply make a liar and a thief of the man who has to get it in a back way, and morally you debase him lower than if he got all the drink he wanted. I had to go to Portland when my wife was sick, and I wanted to get some champagne at the hotel. I asked at the bar, which was closed; but after I had been three or four days in the house, I found out that by going up to one of the rooms, and ringing a bell, I could get all I wanted. On making enquiry I found that while you could get nothing openly in the town, all you had to do was to go around the back way, ring a bell and be looked at, and if you looked a respectable party, you were admitted. I do not like that sort of thing.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

031056. The law made it a little awkward?—So far uncomfortable that any man who had any respect for himself would not go to any of these places to get it, but would get it in some other way. It did not prevent men getting it. I have been told that the farmers there grew opium to eat, in lieu of it. I have seen poppies growing in the gardens, and was told they were used to make opium.

031057. As a physician, do you regard total abstinence as compatible with the best health?—Certainly, I do not know that it is incompatible. I think a man can be perfectly healthy without taking any alcohol. It is not necessary to life, except where a man requires stimulants.

031058. Were you here when I read some of the rules of the Canadian Pacific Railway? As a physician, do you think a man who has the drinking habit has the same chance of recovery from a serious accident as one who has not?—Do you mean who habitually gets intoxicated?

031059. No, a man who once in a while gets fuddled, but drinks habitually?—If a man takes a glass of wine or two, I do not think that hurts him. What is moderate to me might be immoderate to you. The only way you can judge is by the effect.

031060. Each man must determine for himself?—Certainly. The moment a man finds any habit, whether drinking or smoking or anything else, begins to master him, he had better stop. As soon as he finds it is necessary for him to do so, he had better give it up.

WALTER PAUL, of Montreal, recalled.

*By the Chairman :*

031061. You were before the Commission on a previous occasion. I sent you two questions which you were to consider and answer. What, in your opinion, is the effect of the liquor traffic, as at present conducted, upon the agricultural, financial, commercial and business interests generally of the Dominion? What would be the effect on the revenue requirements of the Dominion, the Provinces and municipalities, of the enactment of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, of all intoxicants?—I think the effect of the liquor traffic on all those branches of trade and commerce is injurious, because anything that is injurious to a smaller portion must in the long run be injurious to the whole.

031062. The man who keeps an establishment for the manufacture of liquor, sells a certain quantity and takes the money of the purchaser. Is an injury done to the manufacturer by that?—Commercially, perhaps there is no injury done to him there.

031063. It is the commercial and business view we are looking at?—I think that is narrowing the matter down to one individual. While it might not be injurious commercially to the men who manufacture the whisky or beer, at the same time the quantity of liquor which that man sold and got money for, might prove an injury to twenty men. One man manufactures 100 gallons of liquor and sells it and gets money for it. He indi-

GILBERT PROUT GIRDWOOD, M.D.

vidually is benefitted commercially by that, but perhaps 100 people are injured by that very transaction. The community, as a whole, are really injured.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

031064. Does the fact that these men have spent their money on whisky work an injury to other branches of business?—Certainly.

*By the Chairman :*

031065. As regards the money which the manufacturer gets from the sale of liquor, what does he do with it?—I suppose he does as other men do.

031066. Does he not purchase clothing and other articles, or does he lock the money up? Is it put into circulation in some other way?—Of course.

*By Rev. Dr. McLeod :*

031067. What does a man get who spends the money for his whisky?—He not only wastes his money but in nine cases out of ten he wastes his time and his health, and consequently is wasting his time and money which should have been devoted to buying the necessities of life. As Dr. Girdwood has said, liquor is not a necessity of life, and consequently he is wasting that money.

*By Judge McDonald :*

031068. Supposing a man buys all he needs from you and has his dollar over, and is going to choose whether he will spend it going to a theatre or a circus or in buying wine. In either of those cases there is no gain to you or any particular business in the way of furnishing necessaries, because none of these things in which he spends that dollar are necessary. Apart from the fact of the evil that might result to him from the acquiring of a taste for liquor, would there be any difference, from a mere economic point of view, as to whether he spent it at the theatre, or race-course or buying liquor?—In some of the instances you have indicated to us, I would say there would be a difference, but was there any necessity?

031069. It is not a matter for argument; but I was looking at it from your point of view. If a man spends a dollar for liquor which he should spend in getting necessaries for his family, there is no doubt an injury. But suppose instead of spending that dollar for the necessities of his family, he spends it at the theatre or the race-course, is there not a waste there also?—Certainly. If I were to choose I would say spend it on the water because a man could thereby benefit his health. But all the cases of drinking are bad. They lead to moral injury. What we contend for is, that in making people sober we are likely to make them save money, and that very dollar which a man has over is money we want him to save.

031070. Take the case of a man who sells 100 gallons to 100 men, each of whom spends a dollar on whisky, and each of whom supplies his family with all they need. They each have a dollar to spare and each of them invests it in liquor, but the man who sells the liquor puts it in a saving institution, so that, so far as the economic question is concerned, the money in each case is saved?—Yes.

031071. The money is in either case in some banking institution?—Yes, but the \$100 spread over 100 people, representing 100 families, is more likely to do greater good than in the hands of a millionaire who saves up his \$100.

031072. There is no question as to that; but is it not a fact that the \$100 is still in existence and used for some economic purpose?—It would be far better if that \$100 had never been spent in liquor.

*By the Chairman :*

031073. There are many instances of men selling an article for \$1.50 which is worth only 50 cents. The purchaser gives away his dollar there without getting its value. 100 purchasers would in such a case be \$100 short?—Yes.

*By Judge McDonald :*

031074. We all agree that if a man does an injury to himself there can be but one opinion, but it was from the point of view as to the economic question that I spoke?—



What I would like to see done in connection with the liquor traffic is this: Take, for example, the money invested in a distillery. The men who have so invested their capital have the right to do so under the law; but supposing these men, with their business capacity and money chose to take some other branch of business and invest that money in it, they could make good returns for their capital and be in a business that would not be doing so much harm. Dr. Girdwood said that whenever a man feels himself getting into the clutches of a habit, that is the time he is almost lost. It is almost beyond his power to stop it.

*By Judge McDonald :*

031075. How long have you lived in Montreal?—Nearly thirty years.

031076. Have you known many men engaged in the distilling or brewing business?—Yes.

031077. Have you known a class of men engaged in that business who have been respectable, upright, good-living men?—Decidedly, personal friends of mine. We had a case on hand once where we were all interested in trying to save a very worthy man, and I went to the President of the company and asked if he would allow this man to be sent away to an institution for a couple of months. He said he would keep his situation open and pay his salary and do anything. I asked him more. I said, "Will you go and speak to him?" He said, "No, my word will have no power, because I make the thing, and that destroys my influence with that man." On another occasion I was applied to by one of the officials concerned to ask if I could recommend a temperate young man for an office, and that was in a distillery.

031078. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that if you go to the distilleries and breweries you will find, as a general thing, that all the employees are sober men?—Yes, and worthy men; but I should like to see their capital invested in a better business.

031079. What, in your opinion, would be the effect on financial, agricultural, commercial and industrial business interests generally, and upon the revenue requirements of the Dominion and provinces and municipalities, of the enactment of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, of all intoxicants?—In line with my previous answer, I cannot see that there could be anything but a beneficial effect on all these institutions, because of the better conduct and position of the general community. The richer they would be, the more would all these various institutions be benefited. I am not speaking now of the difficulties that would have to be encountered in bringing about a change, but as an outcome of the passing of the law, I am persuaded it could not be anything but beneficial, if the law were enforced. I cannot think, as Christian men, that we can expect the blessing of God is going to attend any of these things, if either the Provincial or Ottawa Governments have to depend for revenue on what is injuring the people. On the other hand, if you have sober men attending to their home duties, you will find a different state of things altogether. All these things will be benefited. I quite agree there are difficulties in the way of enforcing such a law, and it should not be put on the statute-book until it has a good majority at its back. I am satisfied, in my mind, that the general sentiment of the Dominion—I would not say so much for the Province of Quebec—would be in favour of prohibition. But there is a difficulty in our having an immense border line. It would be far better if we got the Americans to prohibit at the same time. We would then have a kind of paradise over here very soon. In regard to the arguments often put forth that you cannot make men temperate by Act of Parliament, if you look into the constitution and the laws on our statutes, you will see that you are really making them drunkards by Act of Parliament. The fact that there is a license law and that this traffic has to be regulated shows it is a dangerous traffic, and that being the case, there is no strength in the argument that you cannot make men sober by Act of Parliament because you cannot make them drink unless by Act by Parliament.

The Commission adjourned.

MONTREAL, May 15, 1893.

LUCIEN FORGET, Clerk of the Recorder's Court, Montreal, appeared before the Chairman of the Commission this day and deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

031080. Are all cases of drunkenness, that is all the arrests by the police of drunken people, dealt with by the Recorder's Court, or are some of these cases dealt with by the Police Court?—Generally they come before the Recorder's Court.

031081. As a matter of fact, do they all come before the Recorder's Court?—Yes. A large number of persons who are arrested for being drunk, especially on Saturday night, are, however, discharged by the police and never appear before the Recorder's Court.

031082. Are there any arrests for drunkenness made in Montreal excepting those made by the police and recorded in the report of the Chief of Police?—Yes, but very few. For example, a person will come to the office and complain that another one is drunk in a street, and a case of this kind will not be dealt with by the police. There are about one hundred of such cases a year.

031083. Then there are a few cases where the people are summoned?—Yes. We send out a warrant of arrest ; but this is very seldom.

031084. Do the police serve that warrant?—No, it is done by our own men. We have three men in the court to make such arrests.

031085. How many of these arrests do you make during the year?—This year I have had very few, not more than twenty ; but last year I had about one hundred. These, I repeat, are special complaints.

031086. Do you make a return to the Government at Ottawa of the cases tried in the Recorder's Court?—Yes ; we make a report every year to Ottawa. In this report convictions only are mentioned.

031087. What cases do you include in that report?—Every criminal case.

031088. Do you include offences against the by-laws?—No.

031089. You say you do not include offences against the municipal by-laws?—No, because at Ottawa they refuse to accept them. They have to pay two cents per name, and they refuse to accept offences against by-laws because they do not want to pay for them, and the law does not require such cases to be reported. I should be very glad to make such a report because it would pay me. Last year I wrote a letter to the department stating that I had seen offences against by-laws mentioned in several reports, and asking what I should do. The reply I received was, not to include them. More than that, I may say that I do not include offences against the license law of the Province of Quebec. In my report you will not see any offences against the Provincial license law. Of course, such are criminal offences, but at Ottawa they say they do not want such cases reported.

031090. You will observe here in the Dominion report of Criminal Statistics breaches of the License Act, of the Canada Temperance Act, sales to Indians, &c.?—I am sure they have not there the number of cases tried before the Recorder's Court. The cases of selling liquor without license, tried before our Recorder's Court, are not included in the statistics there—I am sure of it. The report I have to make for the Quebec Government deals with these cases, but only with those in which the parties have been condemned. When the offenders go to jail, I do not enter the case in the report, because there is no money to be reimbursed ; I mean the semi-annual report.

031091. In the return of criminal statistics for 1891, there are 57 cases reported of infractions of the license law in the District of Montreal. Have you made a return to Ottawa of all the infractions against the license law in the city of Montreal?—No.

031092. The separate headings in the criminal statistics are : selling liquor to Indians, selling in contravention of the Canada Temperance Act, selling liquor during prohibited hours, selling liquor without a license?—I never made any returns of the latter, I have only made a return of sales to Indians.

031093. You say you have made no returns to Ottawa of breaches of the Provincial liquor law?—No, never; I never made any returns. We had before the Recorder's Court several cases of selling liquor without a license, but they were under the law of the Provincial Legislature, and the Ottawa Government refused to accept those cases in my return.

031094. Then, am I to understand that you have had no cases brought before your court of infractions of the Dominion law relating to liquor?—Not this year, I am sure.

031095. For past years?—I think during the time of my predecessor, there were two or three cases.

031096. And cases of infractions of the Provincial license law have not been returned to Ottawa?—They have not been returned.

031097. Do you think any of the 57 cases under the head of "The Liquor License Act, offences against," which are included in the return for 1891, would be cases tried before your court?—There are none from the Recorder's Court of Montreal, last year.

031098. I refer to the return for 1891?—There are no cases against the license law of the Dominion, but there are three cases of selling liquor to Indians.

031099. Where would those 57 cases come from?—They may have come from the Police Court, or from the Justices of the Peace for the district. All cases instituted by virtue of the Provincial license law are included in the report of either the Recorder's Court or the Police Court. In my report I find: Neglecting to keep closed on Sunday a house in which intoxicating liquors were sold, selling without a license, 2; bars of hotels and taverns open, sale of liquor on Sundays or after midnight on week days, 41; sale of intoxicating liquors to minors in hotels or restaurants, 2; keeping for sale in a store intoxicating liquors without a license, 14; keeping intoxicating liquors in a private house, 2; selling intoxicating liquors without license, 47; selling intoxicants to Indians, 3; allowing gambling in a hotel or restaurant, 3; selling to an intoxicated person, 2; grocer allowing intoxicating liquors sold in his store to be drunk therein, 1; tavern-keeper entertaining a policeman during the time of his being on duty, 2; these, with three other cases, bring the number up to 131. In my court I had 131 cases of this kind, and in the Police Court they had far more than double the number—three against one, at least.

031100. You refer to offences against the liquor law?—Yes, I had 131 cases.

031101. And those 131 cases have not been returned by you to Ottawa?—They are not returned to Ottawa, but they are returned to Quebec.

031102. The cases of drunkenness have been reported to Ottawa, of course?—Yes; they are included in the number 5,655 in the Recorder's report.

031103. On page 10 of the report of the Recorder's Court for 1891, the total number of complaints under statutes is put down as 7,749. Are those figures made up of the 5,655 cases reported on page 9, and all those on the page immediately preceding?—They are.

031104. The cases of drunkenness reported on page 10, are, I understand, included in the figures already mentioned, namely, 7,749?—Yes.

031105. Can you state whether any of the persons arrested for drunkenness are released without being brought before the Recorder's Court at all?—Yes; they are to a considerable extent, under the system that prevails. They are let off by the Police. When they are brought in on Saturday night, for instance, they are told on Sunday morning that they may go. The number will be about two-thirds of the number that come before the Court; this applies to Saturday rather than to any other day of the week.

031106. Will those persons be included in the report of the Chief of Police under the head of arrests?—I do not know. The report I make is, of course, only of cases coming before the Recorder's Court. In mentioning two-thirds, I gave that as my opinion, but I could not swear to it.

031107. You have in your report for 1891, 3,694 cases entered for drunkenness, alone?—Yes, for drunkenness, alone.

LUCIEN FORGET.

031108. Turning to the Chief's Report for 1891, I find : Drunk, 1,848 males, 272 females ; drunk in charge of vehicle, 135 ; drunk and disorderly, 368 males : 65 females, or a total of 2,688 ?—Yes, this difference may be explained as follows : When a policeman arrests a person on view he brings him or her to the station, where he gives the sergeant his reasons for the arrest. These explanations may be summed up in this, that he had either found the person simply drunk, or drunk and disturbing the peace, or drunk and loitering, or drunk and exposing his person, or drunk and begging, or drunk and fighting, or drunk and assaulting, or obstructing or molesting a constable, or drunk and damaging property, or drunk and committing a common assault, or drunk and refusing to pay a carter's fare, or drunk and fast driving, etc., etc. The offence or offences are entered on the list accordingly. Sometimes there are three and even more complaints against the same person. Sometimes also the prisoner is guilty of other offences than those mentioned on the police list, on account of the fact that the constables not being acquainted with the different sections of the law, though knowing their duty, may not be able to distinguish the proper offences and their number. At all events, I bring before the Court as many charges as there are mentioned on the list, sometimes more, never leaving aside that of drunkenness ; and the trial takes place upon all those charges, the same being, at the same time, entered in my book. Then my report is based upon the entries in my book, which must establish a difference between the statistics of the Police Department compiled wholly from the prisoners' list. Then another reason of the discrepancy noticeable between the item drunkenness in the two reports is this : In the Police Department they only write down one offence to each prisoner's name, always leaving out the charge of drunkenness as being the least important. For instance, for drunk and fast driving they will simply write down fast driving, and thus for every name, so that in the end their report on drunkenness must be very incomplete. I have made enquiries, and found this to be the case according to the declaration of the Secretary of the Police department. In this way it is clear that the report of the Chief of Police cannot agree with my report. I repeat that the police do not know all the law, although I may say they understand their duty. An officer arrests a man for being disorderly or for committing a breach of the peace, but when the case comes before the Court, we have to see what the evidence is and follow the case out. When a man is drunk, I always put him down as drunk, to show that drunkenness is the cause of nearly all disorder. We had a case before the Court to-day of a man who was drunk, cruelly treating his horse and resisting arrest by the constable. That appears as three cases in my book, but is one in the record of the Chief of Police, which is "ill-treating a horse." There are some cases that come before our Court which never go before the Chief Constable. They are cases of persons who get out warrants for assaults and other offences, as I have stated ; and these parties are arrested by our men and not by members of the police force.

031109. Would the records of your Court show these double cases ?—Yes.

031110. That is where a man is committed for two offences ?—I do not say committed.

031111. Convicted ?—Yes.

031112. By your statistics you show the number of offences, and not the number of offenders, I understand ?—Quite so, only the number of offences. If a prisoner comes before the Court, I ask the constable who arrested him if he was drunk. If the answer is yes, I make the charge of being drunk, in order to show that drunkenness is the cause of nearly all offences, without any prejudice to any other charge that can be laid against the prisoner.

031113. You have explained how the number of cases of drunkenness in your report happens to exceed the arrests set forth in the report of the Chief of Police for the offence for drunkenness ?—Yes.

031114. Would those cases of drunkenness which are reported separately in your statement, as a general rule, each represent one person ? You have 3,694 cases of drunkenness recorded for 1891. Can you state whether these figures represent 3,694 separate persons ?—The same persons have frequently been arrested three or four times during the year. The actual offenders would not be more than one half the cases to the best

of my opinion. I may say that sometimes men have been before the Court as often as six times in twelve months.

031115. You say that several of the offenders come before the Court several times during the year. What do you think is the highest number of offences of drunkenness which one individual commits during the year?—I know some persons who have come six times before the Court in twelve months.

031116. Have you many of such cases?—Yes, several of them. When I stated that the figures represented one half, I had not looked carefully through them. There are many habitual drunkards who appear before the Court. Very often they are convicted, but not sentenced on account of several reasons which would be very long to relate, but which I may establish if it is required. Furthermore I may add, that I am not anxious to send prisoners to jail for simple drunkenness, especially when it is the first offence. His Honour the Recorder and I have always done our best to find the heart of a prisoner, thinking it was the best manner to bring him to good, at the same time avoiding great expense to the city, Montreal last year paid \$20,000 for keeping prisoners in jail; for the reasons above mentioned we do our best to keep them out of jail. I know a man who has been arrested twelve times in two years for drunkenness; we have, however, less habitual drunkards than other cities. October, November and April seem to have been the worst months for drunkenness. In winter, those who drink remain inside their homes or in shebeens and at all events are not seen by the police and are not arrested; but when the weather is hot they go out on the street and are caught. Last autumn the arrests were very heavy, but this month there are very few cases because there is plenty of work.

031117. Then you think the number entered on your record contains a very large proportion of persons who have appeared several times before the Court?—The proportion is about one half.

031118. Do you mean that the number in the report represents not so many separate persons but one half that number?—Only one half the number of different persons.

031119. Then I understand you to say that the number entered in 1891, 3,694, does not represent more than 1,847 persons?—Yes.

031120. That being so, the other half is made up of drunkenness that occurs in Montreal during the year?—It represents all the cases that come before the Recorder's Court for drunkenness.

031121. There are no cases of drunkenness covered under another charge? Some other charge does not cover a case of drunkenness?—I do not know how to answer that question. A man is drunk and disorderly on the streets. When arrested he resists and assaults the police. These are not the same offences, and so there are two cases. The Recorder will sentence him for being drunk and also for assaulting the police; of course if while resisting the police he damages his uniform that will be a third offence of damage to property.

031122. Under any circumstances, the man being drunk he will be charged with being drunk?—Yes. That number 3,694 does not represent the number of prisoners charged before the Recorder's Court with being drunk, but represents the number of such offences.

031123. You say in respect to other cases that whenever a man has been drunk, he has been charged with drunkenness, although he may have been arrested for some other offence?—Yes.

031124. If he has committed some other offence, will he be charged with that also and punished for both that and drunkenness?—Yes, if he had committed that offence.

031125. You think there are a good many cases in which men charged with being drunk are put in the cells and kept all night and dismissed in the morning without being brought before the Recorder?—Yes, I am sure of it. The police arrest a number of men on Saturday night, keep them in the cells and afterwards release them. I approve of the policemen so doing.

031126. If a man who is intoxicated is going home quietly, is it the practice of the police to assist him home?—When a man is so drunk that he cannot walk the officer will bring him to the station and if he is known as a loafer and has created no disturbance,

LUCIEN FORGET.

he is often discharged by the sergeant of the station when he gets sober. At least I believe this is the way the police act.

031127. Have you any record of the number of convictions for drunkenness?—Yes.

031128. Can you separate those fined from those sent to prison?—Yes.

031129. Is the case of a man brought up before the Recorder, reprimanded and allowed to go, reported?—Yes, the case is reported because in this occurrence the prisoner has been found guilty.

031130. Will it appear in your returns as a case of drunkenness?—Yes, for the same reason.

031131. Even if there was no conviction?—When the prisoner is not convicted the offence is not reported. Very often the sentence is suspended, and then the case is entered as a conviction. We are obliged to do so, otherwise men discharged might take action against the city for being improperly arrested. We are obliged to find them guilty, but sentence may be suspended. When they are found guilty, I must report the case. I do not report them to the Government at Ottawa when they are discharged, only when the offenders are found guilty.

031132. Such cases would go into the Ottawa returns as convictions?—Yes although they have not been sentenced. I report every man found guilty, even though not sentenced, because the law says we must report every man convicted.

031133. In the report of the Chief of Police, there is a statement of the number of prisoners tried before the Queen's Bench sessions of the Police and Police Magistrates: would these cases be in addition to the cases tried in the Recorder's Court?—Yes. I must say I know very little about the report of the Chief of Police. As I have stated previously, he never consults me and I never consult him.

031134. And would the two statements represent all the cases of this class tried?—Yes.

031135. So we must add this number, 2,598, to the number of cases tried in the Recorder's Court?—Yes.

MONTREAL, May 20, 1893.

CHARLES R. DOUCET, Deputy Clerk of the Crown and Peace, Montreal, appeared before the Chairman of the Commission, this day, and deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

031136. Do you make up returns forwarded to Ottawa of the cases tried in the Police Court?—The returns are made up in the office of the Clerk of the Crown and Peace for the District of Montreal, by Mr. Sicotte or one of his clerks. I do not make them up personally.

031137. Have you any supervision over them?—Not directly.

031138. Do you see the returns before they are forwarded to Ottawa?—I do.

031139. Then you are able to speak as to the cases which are reported in the returns?—Certainly. When my late chief was living, I prepared the returns myself.

031140. At one time you prepared them personally?—Yes, during the lifetime of Mr. Schiller, late Clerk of the Crown and Peace.

031141. Can you say if there are any cases of drunkenness included in the returns sent to Ottawa?—Not from our court.

031142. Then cases of drunkenness are not tried before the Police Magistrate?—They are not tried before the Police Magistrate or Judge of Sessions.

031143. Do you know what the practice is with regard to dealing with cases of drunkenness?—Yes, I do.

031144. Will you kindly state it?—The cases of drunkenness are invariably brought before the Recorder, who tries them and deals with them.

031145. Can you say if it is the practice in the Police Court, that when a charge of any kind is brought against any prisoner and he pleads having been drunk, a charge of drunkenness is then preferred against him?—No.

031146. Then prisoners are only tried on charges entered in the charge sheet?—Yes; that is the case in the Police Court.

031147. All parties brought before the Police Court are dealt with simply on charges entered on the Police sheet?—Yes.

031148. Are infractions of the license liquor law dealt with in the Police Court?—Almost altogether.

031149. What offences do they include?—Sales without license, sales during forbidden hours and on Sunday, grocers selling less than the quantity allowed by law—in fact, infractions of the Quebec license law generally.

031150. Can you state how many cases of arrest made by the police are tried before the Police Magistrate?—Speaking from memory, about 1,500. A good many cases are brought directly before the Police Magistrate, which would not necessarily be brought before the Chief of Police, and, I am under the impression, are not entered in the list of arrests by the police, as they are taken directly before the Police Magistrate.

MONTREAL, June 14th, 1893.

E. A. ST. GEORGE HUGHES, Chief of Police of the City of Montreal, was further examined by the Chairman of the Commission this day, and deposed as follows :—

*By the Chairman :*

031151. Are there any arrests made for drunkenness in Montreal, excepting those which are made by the police, recorded in your annual reports, and a few cases which are brought to the Recorder's Court by the officers of that court ?—No.

031152. Are there cases where offenders are cited by summons, served by the police or otherwise, and are such included as arrests in your reports ?—Very few summonses are served by the police. Nearly all summonses issued by the Recorder's Court are served by the bailiffs of that Court, and are not included in my report ; but all the arrests made by the city police, by summons or otherwise, are included in my reports.

031153. Are any cases of drunkenness tried in any other Court, than that of the Recorder ?—No.

031154. How do you account for the difference between the arrests for drunkenness reported by you, and the number of cases tried by the Recorder as stated in the annual report of his Court, the latter being the larger number ?—The only way I can account for the difference is, that complaints are made by parties before the Recorder's Court for various offences, and that the clerks of that Court add a charge of drunkenness, and do the same in cases brought in by the city police.

031155. Is it within your knowledge that it occurs, that a prisoner will be taken to the Recorder's Court charged with some offence, and that on investigation he will be convicted of some other offence in addition, perhaps, to the one charged by the police, and recorded in your report ?—Yes, certainly.

031156. Are there any arrests made for drunkenness and the offenders discharged without coming before the Recorder ? If so, where do they appear in your report, and can you supply a statement of such cases ?—There are a certain number of persons arrested for drunkenness, who are discharged by my own orders. For instance, parties arrested on Saturday night, who are sent out on Sunday morning when they have sobered up. The number is not very large, and I do not keep any record of the cases.

031157. Are those cases included in the record of arrests in your annual report ?—Yes, they are included in the number arrested, because their cases are put on the sheet, and are regularly posted in the books.

031158. What does the item in your report, "Protection" mean ?—It means that some people who were without a home, came to the police station at night and asked for lodging, and it was given.

031159. Are they persons who have committed some offence ?—No.





## APPENDIX No. I.

*Statement submitted by J. L. Vincent, Collector of Inland Revenue, Montreal.*

Spirits, duty paid, from 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1892.		MALT USED AND BEER BREWED DURING SAME TIME.		
		—	Malt used.	Beer Brewed.
1891.	\$ cts.	1891.	Lbs.	Galls.
July.....	41,814 08	July.....	1,001,388	320,054
August.....	54,318 87	August.....		
September.....	70,999 60	September.....		
October.....	87,664 61	October.....	3,481,859	1,126,259
November.....	87,378 51	November.....		
December.....	106,235 58	December.....		
1892.		1892.		
January.....	59,345 81	January.....	3,752,559	1,226,854
February.....	75,213 54	February.....		
March.....	87,699 69	March.....		
April.....	72,597 78	April.....	2,197,028	814,996
May.....	83,065 43	May.....		
June.....	70,297 02	June.....		
906,730 52		10,432,834      3,488,182		

### STATEMENT of Malt used and Beer made.

Year ending 30th June.	Pounds of Malt used.	Gallons of Beer made.
1887.....	9,621,044	3,230,955
1888.....	9,883,051	3,291,558
1889.....	10,138,570	3,227,177
1890.....	10,991,184	3,553,474
1891.....	11,560,939	3,729,466

TRANSACTIONS in Spirits in the Division of Montreal.

Year ending 30th June.	Remaining in Warehouse.	Re-imported.	Warehoused from other Divisions.	Total.	Duty paid for Consumption.		Removed to other Divisions.	Ex-ported.	Used in Bonded Factory.	Written off by Authority.	Remaining in Warehouse.	Total.
	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	\$ cts.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.
1887	82,175.43	16.50	814,472.88	896,664.81	750,474.61	975,616.99	29,168.88	35.50	76,787.58		402,579.94	896,664.81
1888	40,257.94	5,962.12	764,889.97	811,110.03	588,987.43	765,684.56	42,668.35		86,041.28		93,412.97	811,110.03
1889	93,412.97	35.34	798,971.78	892,420.09	741,188.53	963,555.66	38,570.15	137.81	30,110.67	88.62	82,324.31	892,420.09
1890	82,324.31		818,961.69	901,286.00	815,494.03	1,060,143.96	32,459.07	41.31	27,230.49		26,060.20	901,286.00
1891	26,060.20		722,256.11	748,316.31	620,689.22	807,831.14	17,388.83	505.54	47,905.55		61,826.17	748,316.31

# INDEX AND ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE.

## QUEBEC.

ANDREWS, HON. F. W., Quebec, Judge, Superior Court of Quebec . . . . . Page **73**

From 1860 to 1880 conducted prosecutions in license cases and local prohibitory enactments (20054-57); failure of municipal by-laws—as much liquor sold illegally as if law not enacted (20055-59); even more illicit sale under prohibition than under license (20060); perjury in liquor cases (20061-64); under prohibition (20072). General prohibitory law would be neither just nor politic (20067); could not be successfully enforced (20068, 20083-85). Working of the present license law: not efficiently enforced owing to lack of special officers (20073-77, 20086-93); excess in issue of licenses in Quebec; number should be limited (20105-106); illicit selling suppressed (20107-10, 20115); municipal councils may efficiently prohibit the sale of liquor (20116-17); special officers should carry out the liquor law (20119); prosecutions by Provincial Government (20122).

BARBEAU, HENRI, Montreal, Manager of City and District Savings Bank .Page **691**

Had lived among the French Canadian farmers for years, and carried on the liquor business at first in his native village and afterwards in St. Hyacinthe, from 1858 to 1871; the liquor traffic is not so detrimental to agricultural and industrial success as some people claim; had not seen great abuse of strong liquor among the farmers; the evil lies in the large number of taverns and saloons where farmers and factory people stop; in Laprairie there are eight taverns where three or four would amply supply the local wants; sale of strong drink should never be allowed on ferry boats; let the authorities reduce the number of licenses and charge very high fees and a change for the better would result (29872). The bank has nearly 50,000 depositors, and the number has been largely increasing during late years (29873-77). The loss that would follow the enactment of general prohibition would have to be met, and this could only be done by direct taxation, which would be unpopular in Quebec (29884-91). Although such a law might be passed by the Legislature, it could not be carried out; the province was not prepared to wipe out its revenue of \$600,000 from licenses (29892-94). Financial operations would be much disturbed and trade interests injured (29895-96). In the event of prohibition, compensation should be granted to brewers and distillers (29897). If a prohibitory law were passed, it could not be effectively enforced (29899). The bank had received some notices not to pay out money to husbands because they were intemperate (29902-08). Temperance is not increasing in Montreal, but remains about stationary (29909-10). The number of licenses should be reduced, the license fee increased (29911-16); no advantage would be gained from separating the liquor sale from the sale of groceries (29917-18); the reduction of licenses might be carried out by the Commissioners themselves apart from the Provincial Government (29920-26); the greater the number of saloons the greater the temptation (29927-31); an excessive number of licensed places tends to lead to the use of adulterated liquors (29932-35).

**BATES, WILLIAM P., Montreal.....Page 563**

Is steward of the Montreal General Hospital, and has held that position for 16 years (29014-16*a*); during recent years a private history of each patient has been taken and recorded (28025-7); no means of arriving at the proportion of patients addicted to intemperance (28028-30); had visited Sohmer Park and considers it a place of cheap amusement for the people, who otherwise would be strolling through the streets and probably visiting worse places (28037-41); opposed to the sale of liquor on Sunday there (28042-51).

**BAZIN, P. J., Quebec, Merchant.....Page 103**

Member of firm of Turcotte & Co., wholesale grocers and liquor dealers. Customers for wines, ales and spirits located principally in this Province; largest quantity is Canadian product (20486-93); sales of smuggled whisky by the Government (20496, 20505, 20525-28); reduced liquor sales by dealers, due to smuggling (21513-19); drinking habits of people not declined (20506-08); wholesale dealers request Government to discontinue selling smuggled liquor and to destroy it (20514-15); sales of dealers to customers in Scott Act counties (20524); little unlicensed sale in the city (20532-36-38); law fairly well carried out (20537).

**BELANGER, REV. F. H., Curé de St. Roch de Québec.....Page 120**

Been in priesthood 16 years (20846); and as curate seven years (20847). License law is good, but defective on account of not being enforced (20847-49); violation of law attributable to laxity on the part of the officials (20850); illicit sales (20853); forty-three hotels in his parish (20854-55); Commissioners should be more strict in granting licenses (20856); liquor sold on Sunday principally by hotel keepers (20857-58); drunkenness has increased (20859); prohibitory law not desirable (20861); 100 persons selling liquor to a population of 2,000 (20862-64); not in favour of Scott Act (20865-67); favours the sale of light wines (20860-68-69).

**BELL, JOHN R., Montreal.....Page 584**

Is manager of the Sailors' Institute, Montreal (28363-64). Describes the institution and the accommodation provided for sailors: the Sunday liquor law is not enforced by saloons on the wharf; it seems as if the police were in league with the liquor sellers; witness describes cases of violation of the law on Sunday which he has observed; favours general prohibition, but such a measure could not be enforced without the approval of a large majority, but if such a majority could be secured, a prohibitory law could be enforced as well as the present license law (28355). Furnishes particulars of the finances of the institution and the entertainments provided for sailors, which include temperance addresses after which signatures to the pledge are taken (28366-91); licenses are granted to an excessive number of saloons, in some of which adulterated liquor is sold, which stupefies sailors (28392-421); many sailors visit Sohmer Park (28426-28); license law is not enforced in the city, especially as regards the Sunday trade (28453-55); many accidents occur from drinking especially on board vessels (28456-58); difficulty arises with the dock labourers, who largely drink to excess (28460-62); the low class of saloons on the wharf should be closed (28463-68).

**BELLEMARE, RAPHAEL, Inspector of Inland Revenue for the District of Montreal, Page 385**

Inspects the offices of Inland Revenue in eight revenue divisions forming Montreal District (25179-81); makes inspection four times yearly to examine the books and transactions, see that the money has been remitted to the Government and that the goods remaining in bond are there (25182-83); part of the duty of the officers is to prevent illicit distillation (25184-7); four or five

**BELLEMARE, RAPHAEL**—*Continued.*

cases discovered during the last two years, the manufacture being generally with molasses ; in 1868 the officers seized thirty illicit stills, principally in the city (25,188-90) ; the business is not carried on extensively and is not profitable. More samples of liquor should be examined and analysed, but deleterious liquors are not sold in great quantities (25194-7) ; perhaps there are 1,000 illicit places existing in Montreal ; the Chief of the Revenue Police and his force are mainly charged with the duty of preventing infringement of the revenue law (25198-201) ; drunkenness is decreasing, but existing license laws are not easy to enforce (25202-5) ; describes the business of compounders, of whom there are three in Montreal ; the officers only look after the products sent out into the country ; there is no special officer to supervise them. The Government possesses no other check on their compounds than analysis (25206-17) ; last year an illicit still was found on the premises of a licensed compounder (25218) ; compounders make no returns to the Government and simply pay their license fees (25221).

**BISHOP, GEORGE C.**, Montreal.....Page **667**

Is managing director of the George Bishop Engraving and Printing Co. Respecting certain labels submitted to the Commissioners by a previous witness, alleged to have been printed, and purchased from the Bishop Engraving and Printing Co., witness explains that the company print a general run of labels ; these labels are printed for importers and traders ; the labels sold to the public are what is known as stock labels ; a particular label might be required and a design furnished ; the company would make the label and then it might work into stock ; these are subsequently sold promiscuously ; if the party did not object the label would go into the stock list and be kept there for a re-order (29559-85). Labels for imported liquors, etc., were often ordered by agents in this country ; no doubt the company obtained permission from the agents to issue special labels ; large brewing firms in Montreal give permission to their agents or customers putting up their liquors to print and use the labels of the firm ; the company trust largely to the respectability of the person who gives the order for labels ; the label business is not a particular branch carried on by the company (29587-623). No doubt it would be desirable if further protection were given by law to the wholesale trade in regard to the use of labels (29624). The company employ a considerable number of hands who are temperate in habits ; instead of spending money on liquor, many buy homes (29630). Had found it necessary to dismiss only two or three men during 22 years (29631-50).

**BOISVERT, L. A.**, Quebec, restaurant keeper..... Page **148**

Has been keeping a restaurant for 33 years, supplies meals and does not think restaurants increase intemperance more than hotels (21324) ; law not observed (21328) ; number of licenses excessive (21331) ; police cannot enter saloon to see if law is observed (21338) ; dealers who do not respect the law should be deprived of their licenses (21336-7) ; liquor dealers do not aid the authorities to bring to punishment those who sell without license (21345) ; it is done through Liquor Dealers' Association (21346) ; drunkenness diminished (21349).

**BOND, MAJOR E. L.**, Montreal, Insurance Manager .....Page **726**

Is president of the Citizens' League of Montreal, which was organized in 1888 to enforce the laws regulating the liquor traffic and public morals, and watch cases of cruelty arising out of the traffic (30316-19). Since the organization of the Society the number of licenses has been reduced to a small extent, (30320-21). Among amendments needed to the license law are, that applicant should be required to obtain a larger number of endorsers to application,

BOND, MAJOR E. L.—*Continued.*

and a stricter supervision of the moral character and record of applicants, and suitability of houses is desirable (30322-23). The Revenue Police should be strengthened and its efficiency increased; recently it has been re-organized and valuable work has been done, but it is weak in numbers (30324-29); the Citizens' League have requested instructions to be given to the police to make stricter scrutiny in regard to character of applicants for license, and as to their places (30330). A decided improvement in the direction of temperance observable during recent years (30331-32). Strongly favours total prohibition (30333-34); would not permit importations for private use, which is an element of weakness in the Maine law (30335-36). If prohibition were submitted to public opinion it would be adopted (30337-38). No doubt it could be efficiently carried out; no comparison could be made between the Scott Act and the Maine Act; for one was local and the other general; liquor coming into the country would be quickly located and confiscated; no doubt there would be smuggling, but liquor would not penetrate far into the country (30339-42). The moral feeling in regard to liquor selling is more lax than in the case of any other law; there has been a different sentiment in that regard, but there has been a decided change for the better during the last two years (30342-50). Favours a plebiscite, as it is difficult otherwise to obtain a decision (30352). Difficulty arises from the fact that the Dominion Parliament passes laws and leaves the enforcement to the Provinces; the Dominion Government should enact a prohibitory law, and provide officers for its enforcement (30355). People expected too much from the Scott Act—they expected the same effect as would follow total prohibition; liquor came in and caused a reaction, and people abandoned the Act (30356); the officers did not discharge their duty, mainly because they were not in accord with the law and they believed that the great power behind the politicians was the liquor interest and not the temperance people (30357-60). Better results may be expected from general prohibition because the people have been educated up to a better knowledge (30361). The Citizens' League system of Chicago produced remarkable results in controlling the liquor traffic (30362); it succeeded in regulating the traffic (30363-65). Would prevent a farmer making liquor for his own use or his wife making home made wine (30367-68). The liquor should be confiscated; home brewed ales would also be prohibited, for prohibition would extend to home manufacture (30369-70). The right to search persons and places would be needed, and the Government would have to provide those powers (30373-74). Did not attach much importance to prohibition in the North-west Territories (30377). Difficulty was experienced in preventing smuggling, but the traffic was kept fairly under control (30378-80); this continued until there was a tacit understanding that the officers were not to be too strict (30381-88); heard that private distilling was carried on in the Territories (30389). A general prohibitory law enforced by means of fines and confiscation could be carried out (30390); it could be more easily enforced in the older provinces than in the Territories (30391-96). Opposed to compensating brewers and distillers in the event of the adoption of prohibition, but perhaps a year should be allowed in which to close up (30397-99). Had found it an easy matter to prevent liquor coming into camps; a canteen was not permitted and any liquor found in the camp was confiscated; of course there was no difficulty in the men getting liquor outside (30400-12). Found that 90 to 95 per cent of all trouble in camp was traceable directly to liquor; started a regimental pledge, which had been largely taken (30413-15). Adoption of prohibition would be followed by reduction in expenses of administration of justice (30419). People would then be in a condition to accept direct taxation (30420-24). The Citizens' League procures information and lodges it with the Government, endeavouring to force it to enforce the law, at the same time standing ready to take action themselves; been singularly successful under the present Government (30426-27). The liquor traffic

**BOND, MAJOR E. L.—*Concluded.***

is lawless and is intimately bound up with the social evil (30428-29). The diminished use of intoxicants was due to church work, bands of hope and temperance societies (30432); if the liquor traffic were abolished, other business interests would be more prosperous (30433-35).

**BOND, RT. REV. BISHOP, Montreal.....Page 758**

Is Bishop of the Diocese of Montreal, Church of England, and has filled the position 15 years, and was formerly rector of St. Georges (030805-09). A marked improvement in the habits of the people as to sobriety and temperance apparent (030810). Much suffering and distress caused by intemperance (030811). Has taken much interest in temperance work, in forming temperance organizations and in inducing individuals to become total abstainers (030812-13). Favours the taking of pledges for an indefinite period (030815-17). Favours the enactment of a general prohibitory law (030824). Has visited various places in eastern townships under local option, and observed beneficial effects (030825-27); received reports from the clergy stating that the results were decidedly beneficial (030828-29). The weakness of the Maine law was the provision under which an individual could import for his own use (030832-33); would not grant such an exemption under a Dominion prohibitory law (030834-36). General prohibition could be successfully enforced (030844); enforcement would depend largely upon the officials, and very much upon public opinion being behind the officials (030845-46). Compensation should not be granted to brewers and distillers in the event of the adoption of prohibition (030847). The liquor traffic is at present conducted very fairly in Montreal; since the Citizens' League has taken it up there has been a very great improvement (030850). Opposed in principle to a license law, and holds it is wrong to receive a revenue from the liquor trade for public purposes (030851-53). Favours reduction in the number of licenses (030854-56). Liquor should not be sold in public parks or resorts, and witness is opposed to the Sunday opening of places of amusement (030857-59). If the facilities for getting drink are removed, many men will be saved from temptation (030863). Nine-tenths of the clergy of the Church of England are total abstainers (030865). The position of the Church of England is decidedly in favour of total abstinence (030868). Every student is a total abstainer, in this diocese (030873).

**BOSQUET, J. S., Montreal, Manager of the Banque du Peuple..... Page 716**

All classes of society suffer from the evil effects of intemperance; but the commercial effect of interference with the liquor traffic involves the habits of a nation; French Canadians for generations have been in the habit of using liquor in moderation; they will not be willing to give their support to prohibition, although they deplore the miseries arising from intemperance; others using ale and wine will not give up that little luxury and vote for prohibition, because as moderate drinkers they do not see any necessity for reform; men addicted to drink to excess will certainly not vote for prohibition; thus the temperance people are the only champions of temperance reform, and their number is too limited to carry out prohibition successfully. Witness gives it as his opinion: 1st, That his experience in business and his observation are not of such a nature as to justify him in supporting a prohibitory law; 2nd, prohibition is a dream of the future, not endorsed by the many; what is required is to enact new laws placing the traffic in the hands of people of higher moral standing, by granting licenses to men whose honesty would be beyond doubt; reform is to be obtained gradually and by the amendment of the laws regarding the traffic (30218). The sale of liquor is not injurious to trade or traffic (30219-21). Prohibition would stamp out of the country an important industry and wipe out a large revenue obtained by the Governments



BOSQUET, J. E.—*Continued.*

of the Dominion and the Provinces (30222-25). In such an event the Province of Quebec would have to resort to direct taxation (30226-27). Compensation should not be granted to brewers and distillers any more than compensation should be made to merchants who lose money from tariff changes (30228-32).

BOUDREAU, LOUIS Z., Montreal, Printer.....Page **511**

Is President of the Trades and Labour Council, Montreal; previously represented the Typographical Union in Council (27103-11). Drunkenness in the printing trade has decreased within the last ten years (27114). Favours shorter hours giving workmen more time for recreation; opposed to Sunday work (27115-18). The liquor trade should be licensed, but not according to the Montreal system; licenses are too easily obtained, their number should be reduced and early closing hours adopted; liquor sale should be prohibited in groceries (27119-22). Opposed to general prohibitory law, which could not be enforced; license law at present cannot be enforced; prohibition would decrease the trade considerably, but many evils would arise; no doubt prohibition, if practicable, would be beneficial (27124-132). Printers on daily papers work long hours and this tends to indulgence in stimulants; excessive drinking causes a man's wage-earning power to decrease (27133-39). General tendency towards temperance (27142). Temperance legislation favoured by the Trades and Labour Council; but the members have not expressed a definite opinion on question (27143-48). Considers the use of light wines and ales would not get rid of the heavier drinks; liquors sold should be inspected (27149-52). Sale in billiard and pool rooms should be suppressed (27153). Saloons should be arranged to have only one door on the front street and the premises open; this would decrease the drinking habit (27155). License preferable to prohibition not enforced, and it could not be enforced at the present time (27161-70). Favours the Gothenburgh system (27171-74).

BROSNAN, ALFRED, Quebec, Comptroller of Provincial Revenue.....Page **90**

Held present position since 1888; in charge of the Revenue branch of the Treasury Department, which collects revenue in general and in particular that received from licenses. Statistics of licenses: decreased number in proportion to population, but increased fees (20312-17); annual revenue increased to \$600,000 (20318); liquor consumption in Scott Act counties and prohibitory parishes (20323-24); licensed vendors' powers (20325-31). Has reported irregularities to Provincial Treasurer on working of the local option law (20340); many provisions very unsatisfactory; larger sales than necessary for medical purposes; certificates granted improperly and in profusion, and forgeries common; license of vendor used as an hotel license or shop license; typical cases of sales in prohibitory parishes given in detail; certificates given by clergyman as well as physicians, very many forged. Witness has no confidence in certificate system or prohibitory by-laws and favours the issue of regular licenses in every municipality (20340); recommends large increase in fees for medicinal or vendor's license. Twenty-seven medicinal licenses issued in the Province. Majority of parishes where local prohibition is in force do not issue certificates. Prohibitory by-laws in force in 210 municipalities and the other 121 parishes refuse to issue certificates (20343-64); Chicoutimi and Brome under Scott Act and Richmond under the Dunkin Act (20370-71); favours granting facilities for the sale of wines and beer, but reducing the number of licenses (20385). Illicit sale: measures of Treasury Department (20396); present machinery not entirely satisfactory (20397-20412); suggests appointment of vendors with fixed remuneration (20413).

BROWN, WM., Quebec, Accountant, Quebec Bank.....Page **151**

Total abstainer and takes active part in temperance work. Decreased drinking due to enlightened public opinion, religious and moral influences (21385-92).

BROWN, WM.—*Continued.*

- General prohibition desirable (21397-21405-22, 2270-2, 77); capable of enforcement (21405); brewers and distillers should be compensated for capital invested (21423). No licenses granted at Lorette; prohibitory regulations well observed (21396-404, 22689-92); loss of revenue to Dominion and municipalities should be made up by direct taxation; would require additional subsidies (21424-40 21468-71, 22685-8); gradual reduction of judicial and police expenses (21444-54); causes of non-enforcement of local prohibition (21478-81).

BRUNET, ALFRED, Montreal, Manager of Banque Nationale . . . . . Page **700**

The liquor traffic is as a whole beneficial to the agricultural, financial, industrial and commercial interests of the country (29980); the trade has counted for a pretty large item in the general business; liquor is a benefit to those who do not abuse it (29981). General prohibition would considerably diminish the revenue of the country and interfere with its trade, and the liquor trade being a large item, business would be diminished to that extent (29982). If prohibition were enacted loss of revenue would result; duty on tea and coffee would be a mistake, and witness would prefer to levy higher taxation on tobacco (29987); the Provincial Government would be obliged to levy direct taxation (29988). The people of the province are, however, not in favour of prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor but of strictly controlling it (29989). An income tax would be more equitable than the tax on real estate, and the dividends of corporations should be taxed (29991-99). Did not recommend the abolition of the license system in Quebec and the adoption of a direct tax to raise revenue which would be lost to the province (30,000).

BULMER, HENRY, Montreal, Chairman of the Board of Harbour Commissioners. Page **216**

The Harbour Commissioners employ from 300 to 400 men, with whom there has been little trouble on the score of intemperance (22308); it is understood that if men persistently drink and cannot attend to work, they are discharged (22310). No changes observable in the habits of the people (22312 22358-70). The License Laws are more effective than formerly (22314); they are more stringent, a higher fee is levied; if enforced, would be as effective as any license law; the present license laws, if properly enforced, are very good laws (22315); unable to say whether they are properly enforced or not (22316). If prohibition could be enacted and enforced advantage would accrue to those who overindulge in liquor; but unless enforced it would be useless (22318-19); public opinion is not educated up to prohibition; at present it would be difficult to enforce, especially in Montreal (22320). The number of licenses issued should be reduced, and as an Alderman he had endeavoured to carry that out (22328-29); local option might be desirable in Montreal, but local prohibition could not be enforced with present public opinion (22330-31); if liquor was prevented from being sold in other than in licensed places, the city's requirements would be met (22322-4); sale of groceries and liquor should be kept separate (22339-41); compensation should be granted to brewers and distillers in the event of the enactment of a national prohibition (22342-44); licensing of houses for the sale of wine and beer only desirable (22356); difficulties connected with enforcement of the Dominion Prohibitory Law,—the revenue question (22376-81). Little drunkenness observable in European countries where light wines and beers are consumed (22383-85); in eastern countries where ladies are not allowed to drink even wines, they use narcotics with worse effects (22386-92); abstinence is a religious obligation—it is a question of morals, not a matter of statute (22389-91); liquor is used in those countries in moderation, and only by travellers (22392). Hotel rates would have to be increased if the sale of liquor were abolished (22393-7); loss to Provincial Treasurer resulting from abolition of liquor traffic (22398-400).

BULMER, HENRY—*Continued.*

Workmen sometimes discharged for intemperance, but number not very large ; out of from 300 to 400 men employed on harbour works only three discharged for intemperance (22401-8) ; no licenses issued at Côte St. Antoine and condition of district very good (22410-11, 22431-35) ; less drunkenness in European countries than in England or Canada (22414-15) ; due to larger use of light wines and beer ; their consumption does not lead to use of strong alcoholic liquors (22417). Present license law better enforced than formerly (22419-21) ; increased temperance sentiment (22423) ; the day for prohibition will come (22423) ; but unless prohibitory enactments are enforced they will be useless (22424) ; people at present not educated up to the point of enforcing prohibition ; in a few years it may be feasible (22445) ; the best measure would be high license system, with competent authority to enforce the law, to restrict the number of places in which liquor is sold and to regulate the trade ; this would be preparing the way for total prohibition (22446) ; if there is adulteration there should be rigid inspection (22448-9).

BURGESS, T. J. W., M.D., Verdun, Medical Superintendent for the Protestant Hospital for the Insane . . . . . Page **630**

Has been connected with the hospital about three years (28920-24). Statistics kept at the hospital show that drink was the exciting cause in 24 cases of insanity out of 377, or 6.36 per cent (28925-26). There is no way of ascertaining the cases in which drink had been the indirect cause (28927-29). Files reports for 1891-92 ; at present there are 187 inmates in the institution, ranging from 17 to 80 years (28930-36). The chances of recovery in mental diseases caused by intemperance, except general paresis, are very fair (28942) ; half the cases where drink is described as the cause are cases of general paresis ; the histories are unreliable and intemperance is sometimes the cause when not so stated (28943-44). Cases ascribed to drunkenness less hopeful than others (28948-49). Cases arising from religious excitement are more hopeful (28950). The percentage of the insane in Ontario institutions in which drink was the exciting cause was only in 1891, equal to 2.37 per cent (28954). The percentage is, however, a good deal larger than is represented by the cases in which it is entered as the exciting cause ; his experience was that drink was much more apt to cause insanity in the children than in the parents—children of drunken or intemperate parents (28955-58). The histories of patients as given by friends are accepted, but they are often found to be erroneous ; if a man is admitted affected with general paresis, the cause is always judged to be wine and women (28960-64). Total abstinence would be promotive of the mental health and strength of the community (28965-67). Alcoholic liquors if used at all should be used at meals (28968). Does not know a case where the parents have been moderate drinkers and where insanity sprang up in the children (28969-70). The world would be better without drinking, and it is difficult to draw the line between moderate drinking and tippling (28971-74). A general prohibitory law would improve the physical health of the people, if it could be enforced (28975). From his knowledge of public sentiment, is satisfied it could be enforced (28976). The largest number of insane cases come from the lower classes of life, especially the agricultural population ; lack of education, especially among the farming community has a good deal to do with the cause of insanity ; agricultural labourers and people of that kind produce a larger percentage of insane than any other class (28980-83).

CAHILL, JOSEPH H., Quebec, Deputy Collector Inland Revenue . . . . . Page **50**

District extends from Three Rivers to Magdalen Islands, in which twelve officers are stationed. Considerable illicit distilling, but only small quantities seized (19627-28) ; carried on by farmers ; the department must depend on its own officers to make arrests (19630-45).

CAMPBELL, F. W., M.D, Montreal . . . . . Page **711**

Has practised in Montreal 30 years, and is Dean of the Faculty of Bishop's College ; is also medical referee for the New York Life Insurance Co. (30141-46). The use of intoxicating liquors to excess, as well as their general use, has decreased in Montreal for the last 25 or 30 years (30147) ; a reduction in the number of licensed houses is desirable (30149-50) ; about 95 per cent of the cases entered at the hospitals are due directly or indirectly to the use of liquor ; at the military school at St. Johns, 99 per cent of all the soldiers' troubles are due to liquor (30151-54) ; a canteen exists at the military school, and its effect is good ; the trouble does not come from the canteen but outside—the men have nothing to do but to visit saloons (30155-158). Opposed to general prohibition of the liquor traffic ; it would be impossible to enforce such a measure, and it is not desirable if practicable (30159-61) ; the taking of wine is not sinful, it is not prohibited even in a religious sense ; the excessive use of liquor is however a disease, to be treated just the same as any other disease (30162-63). Favours the establishment of inebriate asylums for habitual drunkards (30164-65). Compensation should be granted to brewers and distillers in the event of prohibition being enacted (30167) ; the effect of the liquor trade as it exists in saloons and hotels is bad morally, but there has been no physical deterioration in the human race during the last century (30168-69) ; teetotallers do not produce any better children than the moderate drinking people (30170) ; the total abstainer has a better chance of recovery than the habitual drinker, in case of sickness or accident (30171) ; the effect on the liquor trade on the family is bad (30172-73) ; the man who spends his money in the tavern has less for his family (30174) ; prohibition, however, is not a practicable measure (30176) ; remedial measures under a license system would include abolition of saloons pure and simple ; the retailing of liquor in corner groceries should be prohibited, but there was no reason why liquor should not be sold there in packages, and licenses should be granted to restaurants and the number of licensed places should be largely reduced (30177-81) ; the saloon was undoubtedly a menace, it was a temptation to boys and an injury to families, and of course temptation had better be removed ; but if other temptations are permitted to remain, then the people cannot very well prohibit this one (30182-90) ; it would be advisable to wipe out all temptation, but it is not practicable ; opposed to liquors being exposed for public sale ; even where drink is prohibited it is quite obtainable, and prohibition is not the right method to adopt (30191-94) ; favours the establishment of inebriate asylums as a public charge (30195-99) ; favours the regulation of the trade because it is impossible to prohibit it (30201) ; has been largely connected with life insurance companies, and the companies make no difference between a total abstainer and the man who takes two or three glasses of liquor a day—one is as good a risk as the other ; people engaged in saloons and retail liquor trade are not accepted although a large number of bar keepers are teetotallers (30203, 30206-11). There is no difference mentally between a total abstainer and a moderate drinker (30204-05).

CARMICHAEL, VERY REV. JAMES, Montreal . . . . . Page **762**

Rector of St. George's Church, Montreal, and Prolocutor (030774-82). Much misery and unhappiness caused by intemperance (030883-84). A temperance organization is connected with St. George's Church, the basis of which is the total abstinence pledge (030885-87). Has observed an improvement in sobriety in the country districts, but not in Montreal (030888-89). An increase is observable in the taverns and saloons and drinking-dens all over the city (030891-92). Efforts have been made to diminish the number, but without success (030893-94). The law is bad, and it is administered in favour of saloon-keepers (030895-96). Efforts to secure amendments not proved successful (030897-98). Would vote for general prohibition, although witness has not taken part in the public movement (030900). Considered it

CARMICHAEL, VERY REV. JAMES—*Continued.*

was mixed up with politics and used by different parties as a mere political engine (030901). The Church of England requires the use of wine at the Holy Communion (030904-06). Opposed to granting compensation to brewers and distillers (030907-10). The present license law is not enforced, but is operated in favour of the tavern keepers (030912-14). The enforcement of a prohibitory law would have to be in the hands of Government officials (030915-17). Although six taverns existed near St. George's Church another one was licensed, notwithstanding the opposition of witness and his congregation (030918-28, 030949-56). The law should be amended so that if an applicant is fairly beaten once in a year he should not be allowed to make a second application (030930.) The Commissioners have the discretion to override the majority of the residents of the community (030931-33). The Government should provide houses of refuge for habitual drunkards; a similar institution was organized in connection with St. George's Church, but had to be dropped after three or four years on account of the enormous expense (030935). General prohibitory law could not be efficiently carried out unless backed by public sentiment, but public opinion is increasing very rapidly and strongly in favour of a prohibitory law (030943). Such a law would have to be carried by the Dominion Parliament, and it would not be passed unless public opinion demanded it (030944). A prohibitory law on the statute-book if violated would be worse than no law at all, but such a law would not be passed unless the opinion prevailed that it would be enforced and carried out by the people (030946-47).

CARSLEY, SAMUEL, Montreal, Merchant.....Page **644**

Is Chairman of the Association for the Protection of Women and Children(29177-83).

Last year the society prosecuted 221 cases, the greater number being cases of cruelty on the part of husbands neglecting to provide for their wives and children, drunken husbands striking their wives or deserting them (29184-87); 90 per cent of the cases dealt with by the society arose from drunkenness; this statement is based on statistics covering a number of years (29191-93). Liquor is sold in Montreal in an excessive number of licensed places (29195). Favours general prohibition and the sale of alcohol only by druggists; would vote for a general prohibitory law, although not personally a total abstainer (29196-205). Such a law could be enforced, but could not say whether it would be enforced (29206-07); no difficulty respecting enforcement would arise if the authorities adopted the proper means to carry out the law (29229); in the old country the few protect the game from the many (29220-21). The Scott Act in Ontario was repealed because the Act was not enforced and the Act was therefore a failure; the authorities should have made an honest attempt to enforce it (29222-31); was not personally acquainted with the counties of Ontario that adopted the Act; had never lived where the Act was in force and had no experience in that respect (29232-41); based his opinion respecting practicability of enforcing prohibitory law on the enforcement of similar laws by the Government (29245-47). Special officers would be required (29248). Had no objection to the brewers being compensated; they should be dealt with reasonably, but not more so than people who suffered from alterations of the tariff—brewers and distillers should not be paid compensation, because other traders have not been remunerated although injured by tariff changes (29249). From a business stand-point he would advocate prohibition, because a large proportion of the money now spent in drink would be spent in dry goods; this is specially the case with the poorer classes (29259-61); the excessive use of liquor is what causes the trouble, and an ordinary labourer has no surplus money to expend on beer (29272-80); would vote to prohibit such men obtaining liquor, for the sake of their wives and children (29281-82). Although not a total abstainer, having to deal with these cases coming before this Society, he would vote for prohibition (29283-84). The result of pro-

CARSLEY, SAMUEL—*Continued.*

hibition would be to reduce the general expenditure, so that less revenue would be required (29285-88). Expenditure for criminal purposes would be diminished and also general expenses to be borne by the Dominion and the Provinces (29289-93). If the revenue from liquor licenses was wiped out, money should be raised by direct taxation (29294-95). If the revenues from the liquor traffic were entirely wiped out, both Dominion and Provincial, the amount required might be raised by an income tax (29304-409). The enforcement of a prohibitory law should devolve on the Dominion Government and not on any Provincial Government (29311-13). Gives preference in employing men to total abstainers, but never asks whether they are teetotallers or not (29315-32).

CARSON, JOSEPH, Montreal, Secretary of the Quebec branch of the Dominion Alliance .....Page **396**

The object of the Alliance is the suppression of the liquor traffic (25371-3); the policy and plan of work is adopted at Provincial and Dominion Conventions (25374); there are county and provincial branches and a Dominion Council (25377-78). Has visited Scott Act counties, including Richmond, Drummond and Brome; the Dunkin Act is in force in Richmond, and the Scott Act in Drummond and Brome; in Richmond the Act has been very vigorously enforced and produced wonderfully good results (25379-82); the consumption of liquor has been reduced, and the sobriety of the people increased (25383-86); visited these counties in connection with the Alliance; visited Richmond with other members of the executive, and instituted search parties, but only found large quantities of liquor in one place; the case came into court and the party was condemned and the liquor destroyed (25388-91); had experience of the working of the Scott Act in Drummond; is more effective than the Dunkin Act, although the machinery is about the same (25392-396); visited Drummond on several occasions in connection with the Alliance, and travelled through different parts of the county (25399-401); Act did not work so well in Drummond as in Richmond, largely due to the number of French Canadians; good deal of liquor sold in Drummondville, where it is difficult to enforce the law (25402-4). Difficulties in enforcing Act in Drummond County; Government interfered with prosecutions and suspended the Commissions of Justices of the Peace while they had cases before them (25404); this action was taken by the Mercier Government, who did not wish their friends prosecuted, and this terminated the cases (25405-13); Act more easily enforced among the English speaking people than among the French; in that portion of the county bordering on Richmond the law is very effective; no liquor sold in Ulverton and that section (25416-17); a vote recently taken in Drummond, and a majority given adverse to the Act; serious irregularities at the election and in connection with preparation of the ballots, which matters were still before the Government (25418-21); owing to confusion in the ballots people voted differently to what they intended (25422). Visited Brome and found Scott Act fairly well enforced; general sentiment of the people favours temperance, and the results of the Act are beneficial (25423-30). Noticeable increase in temperance sentiment in Montreal, also in temperance habits (25431-2); not much decrease in quantity of liquor consumed or in drunkenness; but drinking now considered disreputable (25433-4); change largely brought about by influence of churches, temperance organizations and Women's Christian Temperance Union (25435); temperance education is supposed to be carried on in the schools, but it is practically ignored; it should be made one of the standard subjects (25436-37); apart from prohibition, we might look for great change in the public sentiment regarding the drinking of liquor (25438); in counties where the Scott Act had been adopted, temperance men were apt to consider their work done (25439); enumerates the temperance organizations in Montreal, and temperance societies in connection with the churches (25440-

CARSON, JOSEPH—*Continued.*

42); public resorts beneficial, but sale of intoxicating liquors should be prohibited (25443-7). Witness decidedly opposed to a license law, but the present law contains some very good features (25448-9); would prefer untrammelled sale to a license system; the Alliance had endeavoured in Montreal to take advantage of the provisions of the law in regard to opposing licenses; had been successful in a few cases but it was impossible to make it effective, due to the fact that the license commissioners demanded legal proof of every point made by the opposition (25452); while the applicant simply makes a declaration, the parties offering opposition are compelled to prove that the names on their petition are genuine (25453-55); perjury and forgery have been committed in connection with signatures to applications for licenses (25456). The law should be changed so as to require the applicant to have his petition signed by the majority of the electors; this petition should be required every year (25457-8); no licenses should be granted in residential portions of the city, and in the business part, one to a polling subdivision would be sufficient (25459-60); as between saloon and hotel, considers the hotel infinitely more dangerous to young men (25461-72); if licenses should be granted to hotels, liquor should be furnished at the table, and there should be no bar (25463-467); meals furnished in few restaurants (25468-9). The provision of the law respecting sale to minors is evaded; proof of sale is difficult, and the law should be amended so as to prevent sale or delivery to a minor (25470-476). Liquor law is better observed now than formerly, especially as regards Sunday sale; the new Provincial Government endeavouring to enforce the law (25477-82); the license commissioners nominally cancel licenses after a second or third conviction, but as no certificate is sent to the collector of provincial revenue, the license is not really cancelled (25483); discretionary powers should be removed from the license commissioners (25484). Sale of liquor in grocery stores is a great evil, as women get liquor there (25485-88); many illicit liquor places in Montreal, and the Citizens' League has an inspector, visiting them, with a view to their suppression (25490-91). Inspection of liquor with a view to adulteration would not make much difference in regard to liquor drinking; nothing can be worse than alcohol (25492-504); use of light wines and ales would not promote temperance, but would lead to the use of stronger liquors (25505-6). Only effective remedy is total prohibition, which could be now enforced as effectively as other laws; a struggle would ensue respecting enforcement, but many opponents would soon rally to its support owing to the benefits arising from it (26507-9); Scott Act elections expressed the opinion of the people in favour of prohibition; that Act did not accomplish all that was expected; national prohibition would be much more effective than local option or local prohibition (25510); prohibition would be carried if it were submitted to the people and it would be fairly well enforced, no doubt difficulties would arise, but the benefits would be so apparent that opponents would soon fall into line (25511-12); prohibition should be a question of legislation by Parliament, and the representatives should be compelled to take a stand on it (25513-14).

RECALLED . . . . . Page **475**

The Dominion Alliance is a non-partizan body; it is political only so far as prohibition enters into the contest (26567-71). The blunder regarding the form of ballot paper used at the Drummond County election arose in the Department of the Secretary of State at Ottawa (26572-75). In regard to the issuing of licenses in Montreal, the Alliance had been successful in preventing the issue of licenses only as regards four application during four years (26576); this was due to difficulties connected with conducting the opposition (26577); public sentiment was growing strongly against granting licenses in sections where they have not previously existed, but there is no change in sentiment in other sections (26578); this was on account of the demoralizing effect of

CARSON, JOSEPH—*Continued.*

the trade (26579-80); in certain sections people are strongly influenced by surrounding conditions and will not sign petitions opposed to licenses (26582); if licenses were to be issued they should be confined to business sections (26583); if restaurants were needed in business sections they were not in residential sections (26584). Recently convictions had been secured in regard to the sale of Weiss beer at Sohmer Park (26585); respecting sale to minors witness denied the charge that young men had disguised themselves by using false moustaches to entrap liquor sellers to sell to them (26586). Described formation of Law and Order League and its work; detectives were employed and went through the city to see if the liquor law was being violated; prosecutions followed and many fines were imposed; subsequently the license law was amended, withdrawing the right of private prosecution; since then the society has worked generally to secure enforcement of the license law (26587-92). Feeling in favour of prohibition is pretty general in the Province of Quebec, outside of Montreal and Quebec, perhaps Sherbrooke and one or two large towns; the Clergy of the Roman Catholic Church and the people are in favour of municipal prohibition; difficulties are encountered in refusing to grant licenses, and in Huntingdon action was taken to compel the Council to grant licenses (26594). In Richmond County difficulties occurred in connection with enforcement of Dunkin Act; information was laid on complaint of Inland Revenue officer and subsequently Collector made a declaration that the subject matter was within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government and discontinued the case; this was in 1886 (26595-604). The difficulty of enforcement in Drummond was due to the enforcement being placed under different authority; the prosecutions must be instituted by clergyman or priest (26605-7); the enforcement of the Dunkin Act and the Scott Act carried out by similar machinery (26615); in Drummond temperance people did not believe it was their business to enforce the law, whereas the people of Richmond took a different view and have steadily enforced the law (26617); when attempts were made to enforce the law in Drummond, outrages were committed (26618-19); in municipal elections party lines were so tightly drawn that a direct vote on prohibition was not obtainable (26620); no law could be efficiently enforced unless provision was made for its enforcement (26621-23); the prosecutor in Richmond receives no salary, but he is assisted by the W. C. T. U. (26624). At Mountain Park, Montreal, Weiss beer is sold, the privilege having been granted by the City Council (26625-29); Sohmer Park and the Island Park should be closed on Sunday, and witness would not favour facilities being given to the people to reach the Mountain Park (26630-34). The Scott Act should be enforced by Dominion Government (26635-38); witness does not approve of the proposition that before the Scott Act was declared in force, the municipalities should provide the requisite money for its enforcement (26639-43); the appointment of officers should be made by the Dominion Government (26644); prohibitionists object only to the legalized sale and manufacture and the legalized traffic; they have not attempted to interfere with a man's private right of drinking (26646); witness would not apply a prohibitory law to the private use of liquor (26647); a general prohibitory law should be most thorough and effective (26648-51). Licensees should be imprisoned for offences after the first offence; imprisonment does not take place in many cases from kindly sentiments to the victim (26652-58); feeling of sympathy generally exists towards violators of liquor laws (26659); a different state of feeling seems to prevail in connection with this trade from other businesses (26660); often men who bring in liquor and use it for their own use are very strongly in favour of the Scott Act and the Dunkin Act; their use of liquor weakens their influence on others (26661).

CHATEAUVERT, VICTOR, Quebec, President of Quebec Board of Trade. . . Page **71**

Engaged in flour, grain and provision business. City is very peaceable, quiet and orderly, with reduced drunkenness (20136); not formed mature opinion on prohibition question; believes freedom the best plan; fight drunkenness by educational methods (20137-39).



CHEVALIER, LOUIS, Montreal, Superintendent of Provincial Police. . . . Page **654**

Has been in charge of the Provincial Police one year (29361-63). Duties of the force included the suppression of illicit selling and an examination of premises, &c., for purposes of qualification for license, also enquiry as to character of applicant (29364-66); reports results to License Commissioners; describes the system of making application for license; 25 names having been obtained to the applicant's petition, witness reports upon them, and if he finds the application in due form, he makes inquiries as to the applicant's character; if the report is favourable, license is granted; if adverse, in 99 cases out of a 100, the application is refused (29368-73). In the event of opposition being made to the application by citizens, witness notes their objection, reports to Commissioners, and they investigate and act accordingly; they may take evidence concerning the objection; licenses are refused every week, especially the Commissioners refuse to transfer licenses (29374). Application having been granted the party pays the license fee to Mr. Lambe, receiver of revenue (29375-77). It is the duty of witness subsequently to visit the house occasionally to see that the law is observed and that no liquor is sold on Sunday (29378-79). Witness and his officers have endeavoured to thoroughly enforce the law (29383). Mr. Lambe's estimate of the number of unlicensed places in the city was excessive—there are some, no doubt, but very few, certainly not 200 (29384-93); the great difficulty is that when sale is suppressed in one place it springs up in another (29394). Grocers are prohibited selling liquor by the glass, but they sell nevertheless; if witness saw men drinking there it would be necessary to prove that the liquor was alcoholic before he could make a case (29395). Favours three kinds of licenses: beer and wine license, restaurant license and hotel license, at present there are only two kinds, restaurant and hotel (29396-97); while inspecting premises recently found more than half the restaurants only drinking places; out of 120 restaurants only 30 were complying with the law (29398); the duty of providing meals is evaded, but the law is only a few years old and some of the proprietors have been keeping the same establishment for fifteen or twenty years (29399-405). The provincial force in Montreal consists of five men who have charge of the whole Montreal district and 1,236 licensed places (29408); assistance is furnished by the city police, but it is a matter of good-will (29409-40). Had brought a case against Sohmer Park for selling beer on Sunday, on which occasion they were fined (29411-17). Favours reduction in the number of licenses, the number at present being too many; the Government are willing to give the revenue police larger powers, but at present witness has all the help he requires (29418-21). Vile compounds of liquor are sold in low places in Montreal; efficient inspection is needed and severe penalties should be inflicted on those who adulterate (29422-24). Many applications to transfer license are reported against, and witness intends to be more particular for the future in regard to restaurants providing meals (29425-33). The Commissioners intend to reduce the number of licensees by refusing licenses to parties who sell on Sundays and to minors (29434); the idea of the Government is to reduce the number, and this will take probably three years, some being dropped each year (29435). Respecting the number of unlicensed places in Montreal, perhaps he was in error in placing it at 200, certainly there were not more than 300 or 400 (29436). In addition to his own officers, witness engages specials whom the hotel keepers and shebeen keepers do not know, these are used as detectives and are changed every few weeks (29437-45). Present punishment of beaneries seems sufficient, if a few bottles of liquor are found the parties are fined \$50, and if sale is proved the fine is \$150; the people go to jail because they cannot pay (29446-48). Witness would wipe out the grocery license and issue shop licenses to sell beer and wine, the liquor sale taking place in a separate establishment from groceries (29449-50); the general feeling in Montreal is that there are too many licensed places (29451-52); this condi-

CHEVALIER, LOUIS—*Continued.*

tion arose because until recently almost any one who applied for a license could obtain it (29453-54). During the last 12 months the License Commissioners have been very strict; temperance societies, the clergy, and workingmen's associations have all been working for the promotion of temperance (29455).

CLOUSTON, E. S., Montreal, Manager of Bank of Montreal . . . . . Page **754**

Has never looked upon the question of prohibition as being a practical one; the liquor traffic gives employment to a large number of people, farmers and others, and is productive of a large amount of revenue both Dominion and provincial (030734). In the event of prohibition the finances of the Dominion, Provinces and Municipalities would be seriously affected; the Finance Ministers would be at their wits end to find other sources of income; besides, total prohibition would involve heavy expenses for police supervision and informers to make the law effective (030737). In the Province of Quebec the only possible means of supplying the deficiency would be by direct taxation (030738-41). Prohibition would result in reducing the demand for the farmer's barley, it would depreciate the value of certain property in cities, it would depreciate the value of buildings and plant used by brewers and distillers (030742-51). Brewers and distillers would not be entitled to compensation; they might be allowed a certain amount of time in which to get rid of their stock (030752). Drunkenness is on the decrease in Montreal during recent years (030753-54). The enactment of a prohibitory law is not desirable (030755); it would not prove workable, even with a large staff such a law could not be enforced (030756). During his short experiences in the Territories, it seemed an easy matter to get liquor—this was during 1885 or 1886; there was no difficulty for any one to get liquor at Calgary (030757-65). Prohibition is entirely impracticable; witness objects to any interference with a man's wishes as regards drinking liquor (030767-68); another difficulty is in connection with the loss of revenue (030769); this difficulty will apply specially to the Province of Quebec (030770-73). The drink shops in Montreal should be regulated in proportion to the population (030775). They should be placed under high license and rigidly inspected (030676). In the event of prohibition being adopted a large percentage of the capital of brewers and distillers would be wasted; whether it would wait long for re-investment would depend on the view of the capitalists—they might not want to put it in to any other business in Canada (030729-87). Any drunkenness on the part of employees of the bank is very severely punished (030800-01); at the same time the bank has no rule regarding total abstinence on the part of employees (030802).

COSTIGAN, JAMES J., Inspector of Food for the Province of Quebec . . . Page **328**

His duties include collections of samples of food under instructions of the I. R. Dept. at Ottawa, and also the inspection of liquor (24266-7); explains method of collecting samples, one for the Department at Ottawa, one for the official analyst, and one for the vendor himself; complaints are made by persons at the Inland Revenue office, the complaints are few and far between (24275-77); no samples of liquor collected during the last twelve months; seventy-two or seventy-four samples collected during the previous twelve months (24286-8); wines and spirits were obtained in saloons of the lower grade (24289); no prosecutions entered (24291-93); adulteration of liquors is not so great as people imagine; dilution and colouring were principally practised (24294-98); large illicit sale, probably 2,000 places selling without license (24299-302); decided decrease in intemperance, largely due to temperance workers and the efforts of the clergy (24303-7); license law violated in regard to selling after hours and on Sunday (24303-9); although large number of un-

COSTIGAN, JAMES J.—*Continued.*

licensed houses, great difficulty is experienced in closing them as people will not inform and evidence cannot be secured (24310-13); obtained samples from houses where he expected to obtain samples of bad liquor and not from respectable houses; does not obtain samples from unlicensed people (24318-24); under the law the Inspector must purchase samples, and amendments to permit other officers to purchase them might prove beneficial (24325-27); more than a year has elapsed since he received instructions to collect any liquor samples (24328-9); samples are handed to Dr. Edwards for analysis and in case of prosecution witness is notified of result of analysis (24330-34); adulterations injurious to health would call for prosecutions, or even the selling of an inferior quality for a better grade; generally the adulterations are harmless and dilution is principally adopted (24335-41); a desirable amendment to the existing act would be adoption of some method for collecting samples more generally without waiting for orders (24342); no standard is at present fixed (24348); Inspector could take any portion of a man's stock; rule adopted by witness was to collect liquor samples from the shelves, bottles that had been opened (24349-58); license law would regulate the liquor traffic if it were properly enforced (24361-62); difficult to close illicit places; failure to regulate is due to laxity on the part of the officials (24363-65); selling within prohibited hours as frequent now as five years ago (24366); diminution of drunkenness due to the influence of the Church and temperance societies (24367); better enforcement of the law would reduce drunkenness (24372); visited Scott Act counties and found liquor could be procured (24382-87).

RECALLED .....Page **388**

Analyses have been made of regular distillery samples of liquors and the results published (25223-6); these were analysed by Dr. Edwards (25227); this was done for some special object connected with the department (25228); no analyses of liquors sold in saloons or restaurants have been made within the last year (25228).

COURTICE, REV. ANDREW G., Montreal.....Page **482**

Is pastor of the Dominion Square Methodist Church, held charges in Toronto and London (26665-70). Considers the license system is indefensible; financially it is not a prudent way to raise a revenue; socially it intensifies evil influences (26673-74); the drink trade is responsible for much of the vice found in England that prevails there; generally in neglected homes the liquor traffic has been the cause (26675-76); the legalization of the traffic leads to a wrong state of thought respecting it; some people become indifferent and others favourable to it (26680). Witness in London and Toronto joined in efforts to reduce the number of licenses and enforce the law (2661); endeavoured to get the London Council to reduce the number of licenses, and efforts had a beneficial effect (26682-83); a reduction in the number of licensed places diminished the volume of drinking, frequently led people to give up the drink habit and assisted in temperance education (26684). A prohibitory law was desirable and could be enforced; people more than ever see the necessity of enforcement (26686); a prohibitory law not enforced more than the license law, might still be an improvement (26687); it would have an educating effect (26688); the liquors of commerce were not God's gifts (26691); the Methodist Church is favourable to prohibition (26692-93); the effect of the traffic on the people engaged in it was injurious; it led to wrong use of life and to indolence (26695-96). Desirable amendments to the license law included, abolition of all saloons, abolition of grocery licenses, abolition of bars in restaurants or hotels, these being means towards prohibition (26697-701); applicants for liquor licenses should obtain a majority of the ratepayers of the district in support of the application (26702); a prohibitory law would not interfere with the liberty

COURTICE, REV. ANDREW G.—*Continued.*

of the subject ; to cut off the sale is not necessarily an interference with liberty ; the sale of tainted meat is prohibited, but a man can obtain it (26703-05) ; the liquor traffic is injurious to other lines of commerce and manufacture (26706-07) ; the loss of revenue that would follow prohibition could be recouped by direct taxation, and witness was prepared to bear his share (26708-09) ; the revenues after a certain upheaval had taken place would adjust themselves (26710-11).

CROSSLEY, JAMES, Montreal, Journalist.....Page **538**

Resided in Montreal 20 years ; had also resided in the United States and had travelled largely in Europe, including France, Sweden and Norway (27593-98). Present license law in Montreal did not work satisfactorily ; men of poor character easily obtained licenses, while men keeping first-class saloons encountered difficulty (27601) ; the law is fairly well observed, specially by the better class of restaurants (27602-08) ; Sohmer Park had exercised a good influence, and had reduced drunkenness in that section ; had never seen any drunkenness in any of the Parks (27609-17) ; the people go to Sohmer Park instead of to corner groceries and saloons on Sunday ; Sunday law is now better observed than formerly (27617-25). Liquor sales should be confined to saloons and kept out of groceries ; drinking in back rooms of groceries by the poorer class is a great evil (27626-27) ; high license would be followed either by the adulteration of liquor or an increase in prices (27630-32) ; very little adulteration at present, simply dilution (27633-34) ; injurious effects follow the use of vile compounds prepared from potato spirit (27634-39) ; low grades of brandy are made by compounders (27640-51) ; present law respecting adulteration is defective because witnesses cannot be compelled to attend (27652). Inspection of liquor should be thoroughly carried out (27654) ; not much illicit sale in Montreal ; number of places between 200 and 400, and these in lowest part of city (27655-58). The French are temperate and a drunken man is rarely seen in France ; lately, however, a great change has occurred and they are drinking more hard liquors (27664-65) ; light wines not adapted for use in Canada ; beer is more likely to become popular (27666-68). Had resided in Woodstock, Ontario, when the Scott Act was in force ; drinking places were open, liquor was obtained without the least trouble, farmers got drunk on market days ; over 200 places on the main street sold liquor (27669-76) ; offenders were fined two or three times a year, which acted as a license fee (27678). Woodstock now under a license law (27677) ; the Scott Act was hard on strangers but residents had no difficulty in obtaining liquor (27680-83) ; had visited Boston and Worcester ; the former was under license and the latter alternately under license and prohibition ; it is under prohibition this year (27684-87). Is satisfied with the present license system in Montreal ; at the same time the number of saloons should be reduced and more care taken as to character of licensees (27688-93) ; had visited the Lyceum Theatre where the system of supplying wine and beer worked very well ; it was a very good and orderly theatre, and had never seen disturbances or trouble there (27694-5a) ; lager beers and Weiss beers compared ; men cannot become intoxicated on them (27696-706) ; printers only drink in the same proportion as men belonging to other trades (27709-10) ; by arrangement they can put on "subs" so that a compositor can have a night off when he wishes (27709-17) ; effects of intoxicants due to the temperament of the drinker ; beer is certainly not injurious (27718-21). Introduction of liquors at the Lyceum Theatre has resulted in fewer women going there (27722-26). Opposed to a general prohibitory law, which is impracticable (27727-28) ; the principle of prohibition is a dangerous one ; if prohibitionists can stop the sale of liquor they may stop the sale of other articles ; such a law would interfere with human liberty (27729-33) ;

CROSSLEY, JAMES—*Continued.*

undoubtedly a license law is an interference ; but it embodies the principle of temperance, not that of prohibition (27741-42). Sunday closing is prohibition within a certain limit, but tradesmen are not allowed to open on the Lord's Day, and this provision is in the general interest (27743-45) ; prohibitory law would not be in the public interest (27746) ; liquor traffic is not injurious to the community when properly regulated ; it is fairly well regulated in Montreal (27750-52). Sunday law is observed by respectable licensees (27753-57) ; more quinine and chloral fiends than rum fiends ; yet the use of those drugs is not prohibited ; the intoxication of quinine far exceeds that of any alcoholic drink (27760-71) ; licensing is the best method to regulate the trade (27772-73) ; saloons should be excluded from purely residential portions of the city (27774-76). Visited Woodstock a few weeks after the Scott Act was repealed ; the same drinking places were then running (27781-82). Drinking habits of society have markedly improved of recent years (27787) ; is personally in favour of the license system and moderate drinking ; drinking is no doubt a luxury and therefore its diminution is a financial benefit ; the wholesalers are not selling so much (27788-95) ; strong reaction in favour of light and temperate drinks, something milder than whisky (27796-803).

CULLEN, ANDREW, Montreal, chief detective . . . . . Page **488**

Is chief detective of the Montreal city police : was formerly in the Irish Constabulary (26734-42). A good deal of slackness is observable in the enforcement of the liquor license laws ; these laws are enforced by two classes, officials who are paid fair salaries and informers who must be obtained in order to enforce the law (26744) ; had endeavoured to prevent certain people obtaining licenses, and yet they had secured them (26745) ; licenses have been granted to parties whom he did not deem worthy and notwithstanding his representations as a police officer ; all applications should be forwarded to the chief of police and an investigation made ; there were cases where over 40 complaints had been made against the house, and yet the applicant got his license (26746) ; no license should be granted to a single man, nor to a saloon which had private rooms frequented by men and women ; the number of saloons should be limited ; the number at present is excessive and it should be reduced ; the sale of liquor should be removed from groceries ; witness gave three instances in detail showing the evil effects of the excessive use of liquor (26747-48). The liquor trade possesses great influence and public officers do not want to incur its animosity ; when conditions were fulfilled, the License Commissioners had no discretion in granting licenses ; in some cases they were obtained by respectable men who put another man in to run the business ; if the man obtaining the license did not attend behind the bar, the license should be taken from him (26749). The license law in Montreal is in a very unsatisfactory state ; the present number of licenses should be reduced 40 per cent and groceries forbidden to sell liquor (26752) ; women bought groceries on credit and afterwards sold them for liquor (26753) ; young men were injured by rooms where so-called free pool was played ; really the players played for cigars or liquor (26754-55). The Sunday law fairly enforced, but a good deal of drunkenness going on (26756-60) ; favours high license, limiting the number of saloons and considering the character of applicants for licenses (26762-64) ; describes the temptations offered to young men in the pool room wheresmoking and drinking take place and where young men assemble at night (26765-66). Convicts arrested for serious crimes such as forgery are not drunkards generally, they must keep their heads level for their business, but they are not temperate people (26767) ; favours the establishment of public parks but opposed to the sale of liquor (26768-69) ; for Sunday selling the offender should be imprisoned for the second offence and

CULLEN, ANDREW—*Continued.*

deprived of his license and imprisoned for the third offence (26770); it would also be desirable to have the convictions endorsed on the licenses (26771). Would be glad if no liquor was manufactured in the world, but was afraid it could not be brought about; it was, therefore, useless to ask for a general prohibitory law; let there be inspection of liquor sold by respectable people in a limited number of places, a smaller number than at present, and the hours of sale shortened, no liquor sale in public parks or places of amusement or after ten o'clock at night and seven or eight o'clock on Saturday (26773-80); had not visited districts under Scott Act or Dunkin Act, but heard there was a great deal of liquor sold; that was why he dreaded prohibition; the people would obtain stimulants no matter where they got them (26781-83); if the license law were enforced the condition would be better than was possible under a prohibitory law; the law could be enforced if politicians and aldermen did not interfere (26784-85); the law should be enforced by the police department (26786-87); did not consider there were 2,000 illicit places in Montreal; an accurate report could be prepared by the police department, the city being divided into 15 divisions (26788-99); in the event of the enactment of a prohibitory law no compensation should be granted to brewers and distillers or hotel keepers (26791-93). No doubt many licensees violate the law in regard to selling after hours (26794-95); criminals and burglars are careful as to the extent to which they drink; a drunkard is despised, because he may talk too much (26798-801). License system does not really regulate the trade in Montreal, nevertheless drunkenness is greatly on the decrease; beneficial results have been brought about largely by the clergy, and the young people more strongly favour temperance (26802-03); the saloon keeper is no longer considered a leading man in politics (26805); many groceries depend largely on the sale of liquor, such sale should be abolished (26806); drink shops are a temptation to boys, especially when there are billiard rooms connected therewith (26807); if these were abolished, crime would undoubtedly be diminished, and great trouble arises from boys desiring easy lives (26808-12); the "street arabs" are frequently children of drunken parents (26813). Prohibition could be enforced if public sentiment throughout the country were favourable; public opinion in Montreal is not favourable (26814-15); the law could be enforced if there were honest men to enforce it (26816). Applicants for licenses should be compelled to obtain a majority of the householders in the division; further, no licenses should be granted within certain distance of a church or school house (26821-24); taverns should not be permitted in the vicinity of factories, for the men get drink on credit and have little to take to their families on pay day (26825); billiard and pool rooms should be altogether disconnected from saloons (26827-29). Although favouring the prohibition of the traffic, witness would not support a prohibitory law because it would prove ineffective; people would still find means to obtain liquor (26830-31); strict regulation of the traffic and efficient inspection of liquors were the next best measure to adopt (26832). Adulteration of liquors prevailed in the city (26836-7); confirmed drunkards who illtreated their wives and children should not be fined or sent to jail but whipped (26841-2); some drunkards were improved by treatment in inebriate asylums (26843-6).

CURRAN, JOHN J., Q.C., M.P., Montreal..... Page **334**

Has represented Montreal Centre since 1882, the constituency being two-thirds English speaking and one-third French; of the English speaking constituents, Irish Catholics are slightly in the majority (24388-92). Decrease of intemperance observable (24393); is a member of St. Patrick's Temperance Association, which organized the Irish Catholic Temperance Societies of all the parishes of Montreal, and adopted a programme of temperance effort (24394-5); had dis-

CURRAN, JOHN J., Q.C., M.P.—*Continued.*

cussed temperance with Father Dowd, and they agreed that prohibition would not have the effect its advocates supposed (24397). The Irish Catholic Temperance Convention adopted a programme, favouring a strict licensing system, careful analysis of liquors sold, separation of the liquor traffic from all other trades, and effective government police, to enforce the liquor laws (24398-9). Present license law fairly well enforced, but much more might be done (24400); first efforts of officers should be to exterminate unlicensed places (24401); but could not credit statement that there are three thousand or four thousand places in Montreal selling liquor illegally (24401-2); when this had been accomplished another step might be taken; if officers declared themselves powerless to enforce the present law, they could not enforce one more stringent (24402). Prohibition would have a revolutionary effect financially; it would throw back the temperance cause; many people preaching prohibition are not total abstainers themselves, and that was not honest (24403-04); religious influences have the most powerful effect in checking intemperance; the people must be educated by temperance organizations supported by the churches; until the use of wine and intoxicants is considered immoral; prohibition could not be carried; even if carried, it could never be enforced (24405); if a prohibitory law were enacted, it would be repealed after a time; prohibition would be impossible without a large majority of the people favouring it (24406-8); effect of enacting a law that is flagrantly violated was to bring law into contempt (24409-11); general prohibitory law could not be enforced even in the Maritime Provinces if ten to one voted in its favour (24412-14). Liquor selling continues under the Scott Act, and much drinking occurs in places where the Act is in force—the law is not observed (24415-18). Widespread feeling prevails that adulterated liquors are sold; there is not a proper inspection, the inspection should go on daily and many more samples should be analysed (24419-23). Public parks for the city are most beneficial, but liquor should not be sold there, or at most, lager beer (24424-6). Abstinance from intoxicating liquors would benefit the vast majority of mankind, except for medicinal purposes (24428-29); no plan of removing evils of intemperance possible by legislation; the people must be educated, which is done principally by the clergy (24430-1); adoption of prohibition would change the methods of business and would be a shock to trade (24432-34). Increased restrictions, especially regarding Sunday sale, should be adopted, the license fees increased and number of licenses limited (24435-6); public sentiment favours strict observance of the Sunday law, but the ordinary citizen would not become an informer (24437); increased restrictions on the trade due to its evil effects on the people (24438). In places where Scott Act is in force complaints of decline in business are heard, and it is more difficult to keep decent hotels (24439-41); had visited New Brunswick lately, and observed Fredericton under the Scott Act; violations of the Scott Act as seen there had injurious effects on the administration of law generally (24442-48); sumptuary laws should only be enacted when public sentiment would support the laws (24449-50). Results of license law in Montreal did not reflect credit upon its administrators; there is no reason why it should not be enforced (24451-52). Temperance education is carried on by religious and moral teaching, with the church as the chief agent (24453-4); the majority of the clergy do not advocate prohibition; less than three per cent of the population think it is contrary to good morals to use intoxicating liquor (24455); considerable proportion of the clergy advocate total abstinance as judicious measure for the individual (24456-57); a law in accordance with that teaching would not promote it unless a large majority in its favour (24458); if present laws were enforced, then the number of licenses might be reduced and fees increased (24459); earlier hours of closing licensed houses desirable, especially on Saturday night (24460-63); not much prohibition sentiment in his con-

CURRAN, JOHN J., Q.C., M.P.—*Concluded.*

stituency (24464). Had observed the working of Scott Act in Ontario, having visited Scott Act counties (24467-8); if public sentiment were educated up to it, any law could be enforced with the people behind it; if public sentiment demanded prohibition and it were enacted, its enforcement would be beneficial, if the evil did not break out in some other place (24469-71); the majority should govern, but should not tyrannize, for minorities have rights (24473-5). Present law discourages use of liquor by its restrictions upon the sale; but such a law as total prohibition could not be enforced (24477-81). Father Matthew's temperance crusade in Ireland (24485-6). At Fredericton noticed there was no difficulty in any person obtaining liquor (24487-9; a strong temperance sentiment prevails and also a strong anti-Scott Act sentiment (24490); Act not enforced because temperance men will not act as informers; the machinery would be effective if public sentiment were behind it (24491-93); personally observed men drinking intoxicants at a bar; this was in August after the visit of this Commission in 1892 (24494-7); a license law rigidly enforced preferable to Scott Act as enforced in Fredericton (24496); hotel-keepers were imprisoned, but the privileges granted them brought the law into contempt (24498-501); unable to compare Fredericton under license with the city under Scott Act (24502); Montreal under license is in better position than Fredericton under the Scott Act; in Montreal or elsewhere high license would have better effect than prohibition without enforcement (24503-6). Prohibition not practicable in the present state of society (24507); had visited Maine some years ago; saw a bar down stairs in the hotel and people literally paralysed with drink; effect of prohibition in Maine and New Brunswick was such that high license would be preferable for public morals (24508-13). In Scott Act counties there was a feeling in favour of adopting the Act, but they allowed other parties to carry it out (24514-16); violations of a law are not proof of its failure, unless it becomes generally known that the law may be disregarded (24517-21); illegal sale in Fredericton could not be possible in face of the majority of the people upholding the law (24522-5); people vote for prohibition but do not follow up their work (24526); non-enforcement of the Scott Act due to lack of public sentiment (24528-31); any organized demonstration of liquor drinking, if made at Fredericton, would be wrong (24535-7, 24552-3). Sunday sales in Montreal indicate that the officers of the law are not performing their duty; it is fairly well enforced; sales at Fredericton also indicated that officers were not performing their duty (24539-42); sale of Weiss Beer at Mount Royal Park (24550-51); prohibition could not be carried out in Fredericton (24554).

DARLINGTON, WILLIAM, Montreal, blacksmith.....Page **371**

Is employed by the Royal Electric Light Company, and has resided in Montreal almost ten years (24956-58); is chairman of the executive board and an organizer for one-half of the province of the Knights of Labour (24959-62); General Master Workman Powderly is a prohibitionist, and does not believe in liquor in any shape (24967); labour organizations have done more to reduce drunkenness than all other institutions together (24968); long hours and poverty are the great cause of drunkenness (24969); overwork drives men to drink (24969-70); quoted statistics compiled by Professor Léon Lévis showing that reduced hours have been followed by reduced consumption of alcohol among the labouring classes; also urges reading room provisions for the working classes, public parks and pleasure resorts (24971, 24984-86, 24987-94); sale of liquor should be prohibited at Sohmer Park on Sundays (24972-77). The people at large are not ready for prohibition, but witness favours the granting of an opportunity to put it to a popular vote (24978-79); party politics will not be laid aside for prohibition; prohibitionists are party poli-



DARLINGTON, WILLIAM—*Continued.*

ticians, although they may be in principle prohibitionists (24979-83). License liquor laws in Montreal are not enforced, but the number of unlicensed places has been exaggerated, not more than two or three hundred exist (24995-25001, 25024-28). Remedial measures should include reduction of hours of labour and higher wages; also provide the working classes with innocent amusement, and the liquor traffic would die of its own accord (25002); efforts of the Knights of Labour in the direction of temperance (25002-4); strength of the order in Montreal district (25005-8); separation of liquor trade from groceries desirable (25010); drunkenness decreased among the working classes (25012-15); would abolish labour in every respect on the Lord's Day, and is opposed to street cars running on Sunday (25012-20); during bad times workingmen are apt to abandon hope and take to drink (25032-33). More stringent laws should be enacted to compel sale of pure liquor; men who sold poisonous concoctions should be jailed (25034-37). Opposed to a general prohibitory law; no particular body of men should dictate what another body of men should drink (25038); people who take liquor to excess should be restrained; but not one per cent of Montreal people are drunkards (25039-40); local option *vs.* prohibition (25041-44); in the event of prohibition compensation should not be made to the trade; favours the education of the masses rather than a measure of prohibition (25045-52); consumption of spirituous liquors and beer in England (25056); an asylum for habitual drunkards desirable (25058-9); Mr. Powderly's views on prohibition; if prohibition would prohibit, he would favour it (25060-64); moderate drinkers do not depreciate in intelligence or capacity; if excessive drinkers, may lose time (25065-79). Reduction in number of saloons would diminish drinking among all classes (25083); too many saloons around workingmen's homes and on the wharfs (25084-88); present license law does not regulate the liquor trade, which interferes with the welfare of the workingman (25089); not one-fourth of the saloons are necessary, and saloons should be abolished in preference to hotels (25090-94). In regard to prohibition, as on other questions, the majority should rule, although much injustice is often done to the minority (25095-101); if prohibition were carried by a small majority it could not be efficiently enforced, because it would not be just; such a law not properly carried out would be a disgrace to the people (25102-4); by majority rule was meant that a majority would pass a measure, but it might not be a good law (25105-6); if it is right to have liquor, a man should not be taxed for selling it; if it is wrong to have liquor, it should not be allowed to be used (25107); free sale would be preferable to license providing there was proper supervision over the manufacture; pure liquor without any license, but with police supervision and provision against adulteration is better than prohibition (25108); the working classes discourage drunkenness (25116-17). Prohibition would solve itself; by reducing the hours of labour and improving the condition of the working classes they would not require drink (25118); total abstainers do not lose less time than workingmen who take liquor occasionally, and they are not better workmen as a rule (25119-20); under present circumstances liquor is a necessity (25122); workingmen frequent saloons more than hotels, and therefore greater good would be accomplished by reducing the number of saloons (25123-24); excessive drinkers are gradually weeded out, and managers of manufacturing establishments prefer men of steady habits (25126-38); not much good done in advancing temperance by the clergy in Montreal; it is more assumed than real; men join temperance societies but soon break the pledge; the working classes have not the same confidence in the clergy as previously (25139-42); the workingmen feel that the churches are a religious institution without Christianity, and that the clergy simply belong to a profession; the Knights of Labour teach more Christianity than the churches (25143-49); efforts made by the clergy in the

DARLINGTON, WILLIAM—*Concluded.*

East End in London and in Liverpool (25158); efforts of the clergy in Montreal (25159-78).

DAVID, LAURENT OLIVIER, Montreal, City Clerk . . . . . Page **162**

Has filled the office of City Clerk about three months; prior to that time was practising law in Montreal, and was formerly for several years a member of the Quebec Legislature, also a newspaper proprietor and editor (2158-66). Has devoted much attention to the question of the liquor traffic; the present license system is not the best method of regulating the traffic; but when the question arises as to what is the right remedy there is difficulty, because there are evils which you cannot destroy; the evil of drunkenness can be diminished, but not eradicated; so the only course to adopt is to find a remedy which will diminish the evil; if prohibition would destroy the evil, he would support it; but it would not produce that result; at the same time prohibitionists, acting in good faith, must be heard with consideration, for they adduce good reasons and strong arguments; the best method would be to impose very high customs duties on strong liquors, and very high excise duties on the manufacture of alcohol, so as to be prohibitive, and encourage the importation and the manufacture of light wines in Canada; in the wine producing districts of France there is almost no drunkenness, while in other parts of the country alcohol is largely used; another element in a successful system of dealing with the traffic would be the imposition of high licenses on the sale, as well as high duties on importation and manufacture; heavy fines and even imprisonment should be imposed on those who adulterate liquors or wines; a stringent inspection is essential, and heavy fines and even imprisonment should be inflicted on illicit sellers (21567); does not consider any change has occurred in the drinking habits of the people during recent years (21568-69). Buckle's statement, that in cold countries people feel the need of strong liquors and of eating meat, had great force (21570-72). When a member of the Legislature he proposed the adoption of the high license system, which led the Government to increase the license fee (21573-75); he also advocated a reduction in the number of licensed establishments, for a large number encourages drinking (21575-77). The abuse of liquors is especially dangerous among workingmen, and if the saloons were diminished the temptation to spend money that should be devoted to the family would be diminished; a further argument against prohibition beyond a desire in cold countries to obtain stimulants, is that where the system has been tried it has not succeeded, that very bad liquors have been used and that the sale of liquors and drinking were more secret; no doubt the use of alcohol has increased in France, but the explanation probably is the non-production of wines at cheap prices owing to the phylloxera (21591-92); the use of light wines does not lead to the consumption of strong liquors (21594); alcoholism is the great destroyer of human strength (21596); respecting the production of wines and increased consumption of alcohol it is important to ascertain whether the increased consumption of the latter has occurred in wine producing districts. Supposing the production of wine had decreased, no doubt it was due to the phylloxera, and that would be an argument in favour of the opinion that the use of wine prevents the excessive drinking of strong liquors (216023); the use of wine in France has prevailed for centuries, but increased drunkenness has been reported only during the last two years (21604-05); increased drunkenness might in fact have occurred because the people drink less wine (21606-8); the fact that the wine production has decreased and the article is more expensive may have led the people to stronger beverages (21614-15); while it is desirable to induce people to abstain from alcohol, this seems to be impossible, and therefore, the next best course

DAVID, LAURENT OLIVIER—*Continued.*

is to induce people to drink light wines and beers. From what he could learn, as to the experience in Maine and elsewhere, prohibition was not the best remedy possible (21623).

DAVIDSON, THOS., Quebec, merchant's clerk . . . . . Page **106**

Employed by John Ross & Co., wholesale grocers and importers. An active temperance worker, unconnected with any association. Less drinking than formerly (20544); less drunkenness among sailors and labourers on wharfs (20554); principal portion of smuggled liquor sold to licensed vendors (20567-20577); no licenses granted in St. Rémi, County of Portneuf, adjoining Quebec; system works well (20576-20586); some illicit sale, increased by strangers coming in with railway construction; local prohibition in force for twenty years; residents in municipality can visit Quebec and take liquor home (20589-20594). General prohibitory law desirable (20595); could be enforced (20596-7); people of some of the Provinces are not in favour of prohibition (20600); popular sentiment not yet preponderatingly favourable to prohibition (20602-20615); Scott Act largely adopted in Ontario, but subsequently repealed—due to non-enforcement (20602-20687-93). Maine law: commitments for drunkenness (21845-8). Brewers and distillers not entitled to compensation, but should receive five years notice of Parliament's intention to adopt general prohibition (20609-20616-20679-86); if compensation were now adopted and prohibitory law enacted, it would not be satisfactorily enforced (21696); would prefer to wipe out trade at once (21748); measures for replacing revenue lost by prohibition should be proposed by Finance Minister (20619); alleged statement by Sir A. T. Galt (20620); witness suggests reduction of tariff by 50 per cent, which could be followed by increased revenue, due to large importations (20623-20631); Canadian manufactures would necessarily be destroyed: legitimate industry should exist under 20 per cent tariff (20633-20637); such tariff would pay legitimate expenses of the government with prohibitory liquor law in existence (20638-9). Measures to prevent liquor being brought into the country under prohibition: detective force to seize and destroy liquor on coast; municipal police to seize contraband goods within municipality (20644-49); present municipal officers could attend to the work (20649-59); search of vessels for liquor to be conducted by the Dominion Government (20661-64). No additional taxes needed for enforcement (20666-20669-71); if necessary would impose an income tax (20672-75); liquor traffic an evil; licensing of it a sin (20672); Scott Act in Ontario failed because the Government were half hearted in enforcing it (20687-20693). Ross & Co. discontinued selling liquors (20700-03). Municipal prohibition: good effects (20706-08); license law violated; illicit sale (20711-12); expense of license system (20713-5); liquor traffic injurious to legitimate business (20716); failures due to intemperance (20717-20, 20784-796). Prohibitory law could be enforced in Quebec (20728); if Dominion prohibitory law impracticable enact Provincial law (20837-39).

DAWSON, SIR WILLIAM, Montreal . . . . . Page **616**

Is Principal of McGill College, and has occupied the position since 1855 (28822-23). Is a total abstainer, and has been so from childhood (28825-26); has taken a great interest in temperance matters all his life (28827). About one thousand students are in connection with the different faculties of McGill University (28828). The authorities have had little trouble with students on the score of intemperance; it is a cruel act on the part of the License Commissioners to place saloons within a short distance of the University, as they have done (28829); the habits of students have very much improved in late years, especially in regard to drinking habits (28830-31). Has always thought

DAWSON, SIR WILLIAM—*Continued.*

it to be his duty to set an example of total abstinence to children ; the License Commissioners should be very careful in establishing drinking places near educational institutions ; nearly all the want and destitution prevailing in Montreal is directly or indirectly attributable to the liquor traffic, and if it could be abolished there would be less burdens cast on benevolent societies and individuals (28832). The present licensing system is inefficient, at all events it has established saloons and drinking places where they are not wanted ; if the license system is to be continued, more efficient control must be adopted ; county prohibition under the Scottt Act and local prohibition have done good ; very great effect was produced by these measures on the country population of Nova Scotia ; the agitation aroused is beneficial whether the movement fails or succeeds ; the prohibition has unquestionably done good although it has never been carried out perfectly ; local option is a principle which should be continued ; in regard to Dominion prohibition there are few who would be sufficiently bold to go in for that movement at the present moment ; there are two courses that might be taken which would tend to remove the evil : 1st. Public opinion might come to the conclusion that distilled alcohol is not a substance for human beings to use as a beverage, and the question of the use of wines and beers might be left to the present system ; although it might not be possible to accomplish that now, it might be brought about in a reasonable period 2nd. As pauperism and crime are largely stimulated by the drink traffic, all persons connected with the traffic might be entered in a Dominion registry and made chargeable with the cost of all widows and orphans and legal proceedings that might arise out of intemperance ; if either of those methods should be employed, that with the ordinary options allowed to Councils and electors, would be able to keep the whole traffic in check without difficulty, but the moral suasion method is the really essential method ; in regard to the results of prohibition, witness, as Superintendent of Education for Nova Scotia from 1851 to 1855 had travelled extensively over the province ; on returning there subsequently found a wonderful change had taken place in regard to drinking customs ; this might be attributed to the agitation in favour of temperance principles and to the fact that the people were reaping the effects of local measures of restriction (28834). Visited the North-west during the period of construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and neither saw drunkenness nor quarrelling, which result was brought about by liquors being forbidden except for medicinal purposes (28835). Witness was there in 1883. General prohibition would not do any harm to agriculture because the land might be devoted to other crops ; in regard to supposed injury to commercial and industrial interests and to the revenue, the material and labour employed, are to a large extent lost and wasted because the manufacture tends to diminish the productive value of the community of the whole ; so it is not obvious that harm would arise either to the revenue or to trade through prohibition ; as to enforcement, it is easy to make a law in Canada but very hard to enforce it ; any moderate measure that would commend itself to the majority could be enforced (28836). Expressions of public opinion would indicate that as great evils result from intemperance any means taken to repress it would be desirable ; the question is—what means, and to what extent ? There is no certainty of a popular majority continuing to be a majority, and the repeal of the Scott Act throughout Ontario showed that changes in public opinion are very frequent from time to time (28837-42). Local option by making the liquor business uncertain is in itself a great reform (28843). Temperance is being taught in the public schools, and a generation of young people are educated to total abstinence, (28844). Public opinion would strongly support the Government making war in the first instance

DAWSON, SIR WILLIAM—*Continued.*

against distilled liquor (28845). If a prohibitory law were enacted and repealed within a short period, it would not be very strongly in the interest of the temperance cause, yet to some extent it would be so, on the principle that the people were being educated by the agitation (28848-55). The adoption of prohibition in New Brunswick many years ago was unquestionably premature; as an educationalist, he supported temperance on moral grounds and had taken no part in prohibition agitation; the victories of temperance people sometimes are more fatal than their defeat because they may ride roughshod over their opponents; when they meet with defeat, they fight out the battle on other lines; advocates moral suasion altogether and speaks of abstinence as a moral principle (28857). In Nova Scotia a great work was done by the temperance societies, which laid the foundation for local prohibition; on visiting the province during recent years had found the whole aspect of the province changed for the better (28858-61). The first movement was a temperance movement, for people must be educated on the question first, and subsequently local prohibitory measures were adopted (28862-64). The Maine law permitted private importation and use (28865); it was impossible to prevent that and it was not desirable to do so (28866). Agitation on the temperance question was needed everywhere; the Chiniquy temperance movement made a wonderful reformation among the French-Canadians, and if a suitable successor could be secured, they would become the strongest temperance men in the Dominion (28868-69). So soon as total abstinence is introduced in the popular elections, it becomes mixed up with political considerations (28872). The best course to adopt would be to keep the temperance movement on common ground and not mix it up with political issues (28873). There is much less drinking now than in olden times, and the practice of treating seems to be pretty well abolished (28875-77). The establishment of inebriate asylums for habitual drunkards would be an expensive and troublesome proceeding; witness attaches great value to education in the principle of temperance, in connection with hygiene; people will thus go to popular amusements with their families, and they will utilize free libraries, which promotes the cultivation of the intellect and provides rational amusement, and promotes temperance (28889). There is no question as to the desirability of having the working classes in large and comfortable dwellings, and much might be done by a better training of girls in cooking and domestic management (28880). It is doubtful if the Canadian people will ever drink much light wine, climatic conditions tending to induce men to drink heavier liquors (28881). No doubt the consumption of beer had largely increased, and a class of people are coming in who use it; the consumption of heavier liquors has decreased (28882-83). Does not favour such resorts as Sohmer Park, which should not be licensed (28884-85). At the same time, public parks should be provided, and rational recreation furnished in the interest of the general welfare of the community (28886). The amendment of the Scott Act so as to make it not adopted unless a majority of voters on the roll cast their votes in its favour, would simply make it more difficult to carry the Act (28887-93). An amendment so as to prevent importation of liquor for private use would be difficult to enforce (28894-96). In Scott Act counties efficient officers should be provided to enforce the law (28897-901). People are very glad to adopt the Act, but when it comes to levying taxes and appointing officers they do not like it (28902). The public mind should be in a position to enforce a general prohibitory law if enacted; but no Legislature should enact the farce of passing a law it did not mean to enforce (28903-04); if the Dominion Government enacted prohibitory legislation it would of course provide the necessary machinery to carry it out (28905). The Government should be quite sure before it enacts a law that it is carrying

DAWSON, SIR WILLIAM—*Concluded.*

public opinion with it, and further it should make provision for its enforcement (28906-07). Local option in municipalities and parishes should be maintained and they should be furnished with the best means of carrying out the Act (28908); it is essential that the option should be intact in every locality and that each local body should be allowed to deal with everything in its locality (28909). In regard to the revenue aspect, the Government should have faith that if it sacrificed the income from the liquor traffic it would make it up in some other way; if the money expended for liquor were invested in something useful, it must at length give more revenue to the Government (28911-12). As regards the farmers, they could utilize their lands for other crops (28913-16). Compensation should not be granted to distillers and brewers, but time should be given to allow the manufacturers to invest their capital in another direction; at the same time, compensation might be granted for that portion of their property which was not available for other purposes (28917-19).

DAY, REV. C. H., Quebec..... Page **168**

Pastor of Baptist Church, Quebec, twelve months previously at Yarmouth, N.S. Observed Sunday drinking (21502-09); operation of Scott Act in Yarmouth, N. S. (21512-19 22762-72); Maine law enforced at Fairfield (21520); liquor smuggling from New Brunswick into Maine (21521-2). General prohibition desirable (21527); capable of enforcement (21528-36). Beer drinking in Germany (21539-46).

DEMARTIGNY, A. D., Montreal, Manager of Jacques Cartier Bank.....Page **665**

Is manager of the Jacques Cartier Bank, and has occupied the position since 1877 (29537-38). If absolute prohibition should take place it would do damage (29540). The liquor traffic as at present conducted is demoralizing to a great many people and a strict temperance law should be enforced (29541). A complete prohibitory law would do great damage to the country (29548); it would affect the Dominion revenue to a large extent, also the revenues of large cities and municipalities (29549). No doubt the Government might devise some other scheme of taxation, but the liquor traffic should pay the highest amount of taxation, because it is not absolutely necessary (29550); there is great abuse in liquor selling and there are too many small restaurants and saloons in large towns (29552); a severe temperance law that would stop the vice of liquor would be the best law (29553); under it, the number of licensed places should be diminished; more intemperance in Montreal now than ten years ago (29556). The habit of drinking is injurious to many business men, who do not watch their business efficiently in consequence (29557.)

DEMONTIGNY, BENJAMIN A. D., Montreal, Recorder.....Page **179**

Has been Recorder of Montreal for 12 years. Cases coming before Recorder's court are mainly contraventions of city by-laws and cases of drunkenness, assault and petty misdemeanours (21805); in 1890 28,000 cases were tried, of which 18,000 were civil cases (21816-18); of the 10,000 penal cases, three-fourths were due to drunkenness or cases which originated in drunkenness (21820-23). Acts as a License Commissioner (21827); when cases of sale to minors are brought forward, sentences suspended are and efforts made to convict the parties who sold the liquor (21828-30). The license law in the city is not strictly carried out (21831); if it were, it would prove sufficient, for its penalties are very severe; certain clauses, however, are not observed (21832); has spoken to the Chief of police on the question of enforcement, and the difficulties presented were threefold: first, policemen on that duty sometimes become drunkards themselves; second, within a few days they are well known, and it

DE MONTIGNY, BENJAMIN A. D.—*Continued.*

is impossible to secure any cases; third, it lowers the force, because the officers are put down as informers (21832); violations of law include selling without license, and selling on Sunday or after hours, also selling to persons intoxicated (21833). If prohibition of liquor could be carried out, it would be the best measure to adopt; this would be the only means of effectually preventing drunkenness (21835); drinking becomes a passion and the habit a disease; accordingly habitual drunkards should be committed to reformatory institutions (21836-7, 21856); a prohibitory law could be enacted, but there was no possibility of securing its enforcement; the license law is not now completely executed (21838-9); as a license commissioner he had found that when an insufficient number of licenses were issued, there was increased sale without license, and those parties were less controllable by the law than regular licensees (21840); prohibition would decrease the open occasion for drinking, but it would increase the number of holes where liquor would be sold without license (21843). Few new licenses are granted; it is doubtful whether a larger number of saloons is any worse than a smaller number (21844); the number of licenses issued has increased with the growth of the population (21845-6). Desirable remedial measures include appointment of more efficient inspectors, and an amendment of the law providing distinctly that for the third offence the licensee should lose his license (21847); no discretion should be left to the commissioners (21848-50); bad liquors are sold in low class houses; these make persons drinking them furious—results which do not follow the use of beer, wine or good liquor (21851-3, 21864-66); present inspection is not sufficient (21854-5). The licensing of groceries to sell liquor was illegal and undesirable; proposed amendment to law separating sale of liquor from groceries was unfortunately declared unconstitutional (21858-9); illegal sale of liquor occurs in houses of prostitution, and liquor has generally brought the inmates there (21860-2). Prohibition not being possible of enforcement, other remedial measures should be adopted; religious means are the best, and education has a beneficial influence; the best way to make the people moral is by religious suasion (21874-5); the State might adopt measures to increase the use of light liquors in place of the stronger liquors (21876-7); the introduction of French or California wine and use of Upper Canada wine was desirable; it might be desirable to license the greater number of restaurants only for the sale of wine or beer (21878). The Gothenburgh system might be an improvement and have good effect (21880); it would not, however, be better than the license system, because it would be difficult to operate (21881). A decrease in the total penal cases in 1891 as compared with 1890 was due to many causes; increased vigilance by the police, increased care by commissioners in choosing licensees, work done by Temperance societies and the Alliance (21882-86). Respecting granting of licenses, it might be desirable to require the signatures of a majority of the local electors to the petition (21887-89). Many cases of liquor sales to minors have occurred; but dealers now sell to the parents who send children to get the liquor (21890); liquor sale in groceries tempts poor people to buy liquor on credit (21892); violations of prohibitory provisions of license law are much less now than formerly (21893-5); under the law restaurants are obliged to give meals, but most of them violate the law in this respect (21899); they are simply places for the sale of drink. Young men generally begin drinking in hotels or restaurants and not at home (21900); men become drunkards by degrees, and at length are unable to control themselves (21902); when they become habitual drunkards they should be incarcerated and receive medical treatment (21905). Undoubtedly prohibition would do good if it could be enforced, but that is not possible (21907-8); prohibition in part might be carried out, and it would be well if liquor was only used as a medicine. At Côte St. Antoine no licenses are issued; the people obtain

DE MONTIGNY, BENJAMIN A. D.—*Concluded.*

liquor in Montreal (21910-15). Increased penalties for drunkenness would have no effect except on beginners (21016-17); the habit of drinking has the effect of ruining the reputation and fortune of a business man (21918); the liquor trade also affects injuriously those engaged in it (21919-20); distress among the working classes in winter is largely due to drinking habits of the head of the family (21922); of offenders coming before witness comparatively few are habitual drunkards, many are moderate drinkers and few total abstainers (21923-5). Government had been asked to provide inebriate asylums and pay the cost of maintenance (21927); let the cost be paid by the liquor trade if a special tax could be levied on them, as it is really the cause (21928). The Scott Act had been repealed in some places because it could not be carried out, and it would be the same with prohibition (21930-31). Resided in Italy two years; there the people get a little gay but not tipsy (21939-40); this was due to the use of wine instead of strong drink; the liquor trade there was unrestrained, every one being able to retail liquors on paying a tax (21943); favours more liberal use of beer and wine, and the issue of what is called a half license (21946); the manufacture of wine could be favoured and importation encouraged (21949). Wine licenses had been granted, but were cancelled by the Government because abuses were committed; it would have been better to have left the law in force (21949); the more preventive measures adopted the better; statistics show that in countries where wine is absent the use of alcohol increases (21952); the best alcoholic liquor is of no merit except as a medicine (21954). If the Legislature limited the number of licenses to be issued, repeated demands could not be made on the Commissioners (21956).

DERY, E. A., Quebec, Recorder . . . . . Page **8**

Occupied present position 15 years. Jurisdiction covers city ordinances, and especially drunkenness (18760); drunkenness largely decreased (18766); due to more strict enforcement of special Act respecting Sunday closing (18780); provision for closing at stated hours (18782); severe penalties imposed in Recorder's Court (18892). During last year or two Sunday drinking increased (18841-42); due to diminished activity of police since placed under the control of Council instead of a Commission (18843-45); fees increased but number of taverns not diminished (18795); unlicensed places increased (18824-26). Five classes of licenses issued—hotel, restaurant, club, groceries and wholesale (18789-90); greater proportion of police arrests are for drunkenness (18796); large proportion of criminal offences attributable to drink (18797, 18837). General prohibitory enactment desirable (18805, 18870); not possible of enforcement absolutely; enforcement dependent on measures taken by Government (18807); would lessen drunkenness (18878); not much confidence in a prohibitory law (18871). Habitual drunkards (18808-16); few juvenile offenders (18838-39). Club licenses are given by the Provincial Government (18849); abuses under system (18851-59, 18901-06); local option in St. Laurent (18865); excellent results (18866-59); hotel versus saloon bar (18909-20).

DESCHAMPS, C. E., Quebec, Clerk in Provincial Civil Service . . . . . Page **100**

Presented return of judicial statistics and compilation respecting insane asylums of the Province from 1880 to 1891 (20419).

DESNOYERS, M. C., Montreal, Police Magistrate and Judge of Sessions . . Page **262**

Defines his jurisdiction and character of cases tried before him (23129-37); is a License Commissioner for the city and with his colleague receives applications for licenses, inquires into the conduct of the applicants and accommodation provided in their houses, and sees that the applications are endorsed by a suffi-



DESNOYERS, M. C.—*Continued.*

cient number of qualified voters (23143); if license applicant fulfils conditions the application is granted, as a general rule. Commissioners have, however, absolute power to refuse, and if majority of electors within a certain area oppose the application, the commissioners have no discretion but to reject it (23144-49); the requisition must be made yearly and the opposition to the application must be repeated annually (23150-51). Licenses granted in Montreal are twice too many; a legislative enactment should limit the number, as was done by the McCarthy Act (23154); difficulty found in weeding out improper holders of licenses is due to appeals for mercy made to commissioners and influence brought to bear by prominent citizens (23155-62). Legislature should make cancellation of license compulsory on certain conditions and leave no discretion to the commissioners (23163); such discretionary power is a great evil and it is almost impracticable to exercise it (23164). Law respecting sale to minors is pretty fairly enforced, but there are too many cases of Sunday selling, also of illicit sale (23165-71); sale of liquor in groceries should be forbidden (23172-3). Inspection of liquors should be more efficient and a staff should be appointed to attend to this work regularly (23174-5); the law not observed respecting restaurants, which are established simply for the sale of liquor and do not provide meals (23176-79). Opposed to absolute prohibition, but the sale should be regulated; a prohibitory law is impracticable, and liquor is sold at Portland and Old Orchard, Maine (23180-81); if prohibition were enacted, liquor would be sold secretly, and inspection or regulation would be impossible; if the law were not enforced, effect would be demoralizing (23182). Favours the encouragement of the use of light wines and ales (23183). Three-quarters of criminal cases are due directly or indirectly to intoxicating drink (23187-90; prohibition would not prove a remedy, for it could not be carried out. Temperance sentiment is growing through the influence of the churches (23191-93); remedial measures should include persuasion in favour of temperance, and also by keeping strong alcoholic liquors beyond the reach of the masses, and replacing them by beer and wine (23194-6); beneficial effects of parks and pleasure grounds (23197-99); inebriate asylums are necessary and should be supported by the State (23200-07, 23255-9). The license law regulates the trade although there is a considerable percentage of violations by licensees (23208-15); in the upper part of Montreal a majority of the people have petitioned against license applications, but the people seem reluctant to use that power (23216-22); efforts to diminish the number of licenses and reject new applications (23222-30); demoralizing effects of persistent and flagrant violation of the license law (23235-45); if prohibition were practicable and if all alcohol for beverage purposes were destroyed the world would be improved (23261-65); people should be encouraged to drink Canadian wines and beers instead of strong alcohol, and taxes on alcohol and fees of retailers might be increased (23266-7); licenses might also be granted to sell only wine and beer (23268-9); State control of alcohol, as in Switzerland, might prove advantageous (23267-72). Criminality not increasing in proportion to the population (23273); violations of the license law by licensees (23277); methods of watching the police force (23278-81); statement of licenses issued from 1866 to 1892 pro rata to the population (23282-3).

DICK, JAMES R., Montreal . . . . . Page **577**

Is manager of the Boys' Home, Montreal, and has occupied the position about ten years (28253-57). Describes the origin of the institution and its working (28258-68); about 15 per cent of the Canadian boys come to the home on account of the drinking habits of their parents; many boys from the old country are sent out by societies to work on farms, and these subsequently drift to the cities and enter the Boys' Home (28270-81); the boys have turned

DICK, JAMES R.—*Continued.*

out well and have generally remained temperate (28301-04) ; some trouble has arisen with the boys owing to many saloons being in the neighbourhood of the home (28305a-08). Witness gave particulars of a case brought against a saloon keeper selling liquor to a minor (28314-22) ; has observed an increase of temperance in Montreal, but the churches have not used the influence they might have exercised (27331-34) ; no grocery should be licensed to sell liquor (28339) ; considerable illicit selling on Sunday (28348) ; the drinking places offer temptations to the boys, but very few cases of drunkenness have been reported (28261).

DOBELL, RICHARD R., Quebec, Merchant.....Page **35**

Engaged in business 37 years ; employs men preparing timber, bateau work and loading ships. Many families live at St. Guillaume de Sillery ; Council refused to grant licenses (19297-303) ; several unlicensed places continue selling (19308) ; Council endeavoured to suppress them ; but when an elector was imprisoned he was released when elections occurred (19317-18) ; the difficulty of limiting the number of licenses led to refusal to grant any (19320) ; difficulty of convicting illicit sellers (19323-31, 18377-80) ; adulterated liquors sold by them (19354-56) ; liquor supplied by delivery carts from Quebec (19370-76). General prohibitory law is not desirable (19337-38 ; perjury arising from liquor cases (19342-45) ; would prefer few licensed houses well regulated (19361) ; provision for the inspection of liquors necessary (19363) ; general decrease in drinking due to religious influences, increased self respect, and enhanced comforts (19389). Local option desirable and works efficiently (19391-402).

DOUCET, CHARLES C., Montreal, Deputy Clerk of the Crown & Peace.. Page **783**

Cases of drunkenness are invariably brought before the Recorder who deals with them (031144) ; the prisoners are only tried on charges entered in the charge book (031146-47). Infractions of the liquor license law are dealt with almost entirely in the Police Court—infractions of the Quebec License Law generally (031149) ; about 1,500 cases are tried before the Police Magistrate yearly ; a good many are brought directly before the Police Magistrate, and are not entered in the lists of arrests by the police (031150).

DOUGALL, JOHN R., Montreal, proprietor of Montreal *Daily Witness*...Page **672**

The *Witness* has always been an advocate of prohibition (29654-58). Witness assisted in preparing a draft prohibitory law submitted to Parliament (29659) ; its object was entirely to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale, except for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes ; it did not prohibit the citizen importing for his private use (29660) ; endeavoured to secure amendments to the license law in the direction of prohibition (29661-63). The prohibition of importation, manufacture and sale would be a very satisfactory instalment of legislation (29664-66) ; had not considered it his function to specially consider the financial side of prohibition, as he was not Finance Minister ; the declarations of various Finance Ministers should be satisfactory on the revenue question ; witness refers to remarks by Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir A. T. Galt and Mr. Gladstone ; other means of obtaining revenue to replace the revenue lost by suppressing the liquor trade would be necessary (29668) ; gradual reduction in expenditures would occur ; but these questions should be left to the Minister of Finance of the day (29668-72). Favours direct taxation as a means of raising necessary revenue (29673) ; the saving in Montreal alone resulting from the abolition of the liquor traffic would be three times the amount the country would lose (29674-76). Revenue obtained through the liquor traffic is got at a very outrageous expense to the community as a whole, and it is thoroughly iniquitous in its character ; the

DOUGALL, JOHN R.—*Continued.*

trade is iniquitous, and that the Government should share in the traffic is iniquitous also; no financial question should be considered in the presence of a positive iniquity (29677). The proper method of raising revenue is by direct taxation of the population, either in the form of a poll tax or a taxation of their possessions; whether that method should be carried out or not witness was unable to determine (29678-84). General prohibitory law if enacted could be efficiently enforced (29685); the efficiency of the enforcement would be progressive (29686); it would be as efficiently enforced as the present laws are, and with more effect (29687); the enforcement should be carried out by the Dominion Government; it was a great misfortune to the Scott Act that it was not followed up by a measure of enforcement (29688). Would favour amendment of British North America Act if the Government had not sufficient power to enforce prohibitory law (29689); difficulty would be experienced in preventing smuggling across the border; but it was doubtful whether illicit sale would not increase (29692-94a); there would be a greater incentive to smuggling because liquor would command a higher price (29695). Witness desires a law very much resembling that of Maine, which does not interfere with the consumption by private individuals in their houses (29697-98). In Ontario there was a revolt against the Scott Act because it was not enforced (29699-702). Had heard reports regarding the lack of zeal of officers appointed by the Ontario Government (29703). No doubt there was machinery adopted to enforce the law (29704); but many Ontario people changed their views supposing the Scott Act could not be enforced; the reason he heard for the repeal of the Act was the failure of enforcement, not so much that the people changed their views, as that they became indifferent and did not vote (29703-06). Temperance people only commenced the war instead of finishing it when they passed the Scott Act, and they should have consolidated their organizations rather than have allowed them to drop after the excitement was over (29707); they thought the public officials would act, which was a great mistake (29708). Opposed to the granting of compensation to brewers and distillers (29710); sale of groceries and liquors should be kept separate (29711). There should be an early closing law as regards licensed houses (29712); the law has not been enforced as regard to sale to minors and drunken people (29713-14); for a few months back Sunday closing law has been comparatively well observed, previously it was not observed (29715). The proposition was preposterous to grant special privileges to Sohmer Park; greater limitations should be placed on the sale of liquor in places of amusement; is strongly opposed the sale of liquor in such places, or in any place of amusement (29716-19). The license law is not enforced in Montreal (29720). Much illicit sale except when energetic efforts are put forward to suppress it (29721); great difficulty is experienced in enforcing the law unless the officials are loyal to their duty and desire to enforce the law as a duty; there is also a difference in regard to pressure brought to bear from Governmental quarters during different periods (29722). The enforcement of general prohibitory law would be more simple than the Scott Act, which was a local law (29723-24). Many persons who declined to vote for the Scott Act would have readily voted for general prohibition (29725). Enforcement of general prohibition would be more easy than a partial law; the license law is partial prohibition (29727-29). Defines the platform of the Dominion Alliance; explains that their desire is to develop prohibition by degrees, as time shows what can be done and ought to be done; the Maine law was the result of much experience, the principle on which it was framed was to deal with the trade in liquor and avoid as far as possible legislating with regard to what a person actually consumed (29730-39). Increased intemperance in Montreal during the last few years (29740). Advocates of the Scott Act had desired that the Dominion Government should enforce the law and feel its responsibility for the enforcement of the law (29741). A more

**DOUGALL, JOHN R.**—*Concluded.*

righteous system in regard to granting licenses than at present prevails in Montreal would be to compel every applicant to secure the signatures of a majority of the householders or voters in the particular polling district (29745). The present law makes it difficult to oppose an application (29746). Total prohibition had prevailed in the North-west Territories where a permit system became permanent by usage (29747-50).

**DOUGLAS, REV. GEORGE, D.D., Montreal**.....Page **431**

Is Principal of the Theological College connected with the Methodist Church, Montreal, and has had wide experience as a pastor in Ontario and Quebec (25904-5). Has had no experience of the Scott Act, Dunkin Act, or any prohibitory law except from a temporary residence in Maine ; his experience entirely in favour of the Maine law ; all the liquor establishments were closed, and liquor was not obtainable unless you were in the secret ; advantage of the law is that it is an educating force ; had visited Portland and Old Orchard Beach, and had wide intercourse with the clergy and those administering the law (25907-11). Experience in Canada had been under a license law, his knowledge being that simply of a city pastor, and one engaged in moral reform (25912-13) ; effect of the liquor traffic had been most pathetic and appalling ; sons of the best families had gone down to a drunkard's grave (25914) ; granting of licenses was an evil, as was also free liquor ; incline to limitation rather than licensed condition (25916) ; number of drinking places should be limited according to territory and population ; cannot draw a line between detrimental effects of hotel bars and saloons (25917-19) ; utterly opposed to compensation to brewers and distillers in the event of the adoption of prohibition (25920) ; sale of liquors in groceries should be prohibited (25921) ; the heaviest penalty should be imposed on dealers selling to minors (25922) ; liquor no doubt was adulterated, but alcohol is the vilest of all pests (25923-24) ; that portion of the community which is under moral and church influences have renounced connections with the liquor trade ; but the balance of the people are becoming more demoralized (259260) ; opposed to the use of light wine and ale, as tending to habitual intoxication (25927) ; educational temperance work in the schools would open the way for an introduction of prohibition (25928). Emphatically in favour of prohibition, as the only alleviation of the curse of intemperance (25929) ; favours the immediate enactment of a prohibitory law which would be infinitely better executed than the license law (25931) ; if loyally enforced by the Government, it would be as thoroughly enforced as the vaccination law (25932) ; all churches favour temperance ; some, however, favour total prohibition and others temperance (25933-34) ; the Methodist Church almost to a man is in favour of prohibition (25939) ; it believes such a law to be a fundamental factor in the educational process (25936) ; the Maine law educated every family to almost total abstinence (25937) ; prohibition would lift Canada to the proudest place among the nations (25938) ; the augmentation of wealth in Maine has been remarkable (25939) ; a prohibitory law, even if violated, contained in itself educational elements, working towards its ultimate enforcement (25940). It was the duty of Parliament to pass a prohibitory law (25941) ; would favour a plebiscite (25942).

**DOW, GEN. NEAL, Maine, U. S. A.**.....Page **445**

Resides in Portland, Maine ; was twice mayor of the city and is a retired General in the United States service (26107). Describes the adoption of the Maine liquor law and measures taken for its enforcement, etc. Formerly liquor was largely consumed in Maine, due largely to the fact that the two great industries were lumber and fisheries ; the result was poverty and pauperism ; many distilleries existed in the State, seven in Portland and also two breweries ; rum from molasses was largely imported from West Indies, and potato whisky and apple jack was made in the State ; now, there is not a distillery

DOW, GEN. NEAL—*Continued.*

or brewery in Maine, nor is there any rum imported; so volume of liquor traffic is diminished; result was that Maine from being one of the poorest States is now one of the most prosperous, volume of liquor traffic is greatly reduced, savings of the people increased, industries largely multiplied and extended, abundance of capital for business and large surplus which seeks outside investments; whole State is changed; no longer are houses and churches and school houses dilapidated; there are indications of prosperity everywhere; at public dinners drink is not used; the moral effect of prohibition has been great; prohibitory law in Maine was enacted in 1851, within six months the jails in several counties were almost empty; this was during the first year of the enforcement, which was vigorously carried out; laxity of enforcement has prevailed at different times since, the quantity of liquor sold now is not one-twentieth as much as before prohibition was passed, in Portland it is not one-hundredth; whatever is sold there now is on a very small scale and on the sly; Judges are apt to be lenient in the administration of the law; so liquor traffic is not entirely excluded, but three-fourths of Maine, containing more than three-fourths of the population, have liquor traffic practically extinguished; in all rural districts, smaller towns and villages there are no grog shops and no liquor traffic; a whole generation has grown up without having seen the effect of liquors, and there are men and women who have never seen a drunken man (26111); Maine has never been careful as regards statistics of pauperism, etc. (26112). Habits of certain classes of the people in different States have changed for the better in recent years (26117). No direct trade in rum now with the West Indies (26118-19). Undesirable to punish the drunkard more than at present; is already punished by a loss of reputation, fortune, loss of family, and often by death (26121). The State warranted in interfering when the public good is endangered (26122). Favours a general prohibitory law for the United States (26123-25); no liquor manufactured in Maine, but in New Hampshire manufacture is not prohibited (26125-26); no statistics obtainable respecting poverty in Maine; prosperity and thrift prevail everywhere (26127-31). Illicit vendors are persistently and successfully prosecuted (26132); trade has been driven into the hands of disreputable people, men who are not afraid to go to jail and wear jail dress (26133); impossible to obtain statement of actual consumption of liquor in Maine, smuggled secretly into the State (26134); regards the vote on the constitutional amendment as an expression of the people's will (26137); yearly punishment of violators have been more severe (26138); this in an indication of the views of the people regarding the liquor traffic (26139); also an expression of opinion that the people were determined to punish the violators. The Legislature backed by the people enacted imprisonment for first offence of prohibitory law, which was subsequently repealed (26141). The Maine law was originally passed by a Democratic Senate, House and Governor (26153-55); subsequently the Republican party became the prohibitory party (26156); law went into operation in 1851 and was repealed in 1855 (26158); then adopted by the people by a large majority (26160); Maine temperance people are mostly Republicans and do not wish to antagonise any one, because the Democrats might then come into power (26163); politics have a great influence with men (26164-68); proposition of Democratic party was made recently to submit constitutional amendment to the people and to substitute a local option law (26169); but they have received an overwhelming defeat, although the Republican majority has diminished (26169-70); witness left the Republican party because it was impossible to accomplish the purpose of prohibitionists by its means (26171); many Democrats voted with prohibitionists at the last election (26173); difficulty experienced in obtaining officials who would faithfully discharge their duty; an attempt was made by the Democrats to eject the Sheriff of Cumber-

DOW, GEN. NEAL—*Continued.*

land county but it failed (26174); where officials are true, prohibition is well enforced (26175); officials elected to administer the law are chosen by the people (26179); general prosperous condition of the State (2618-82); deposits in savings banks are satisfactory, but not equal to Massachusetts (26185). Massachusetts had prohibition, but it was repealed; it operated admirably in the rural districts, but could not be enforced in Boston (26186-88); prohibitory law now in force in seven States, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Kansas, Iowa, North and South Dakota (26189-90); local option prevails in Georgia, North and South Carolina, Mississippi, Tennessee and Kentucky; the law works very well (26191-92). Prohibition not very well enforced in some places in Vermont; in New Hampshire the same (26193). Local option prevails in many places in Massachusetts, in Cambridge for many years it has been well enforced (26194-95). Maine Governors regularly referred to prohibition in their inaugural addresses, dwelling on its great benefit morally and materially; the Republican party in convention also always makes statements in favour of prohibition (26196-97); prohibition in Maine effectually prohibits, notwithstanding the violations of the law; the benefits derived to the State and people are so great they cannot be imagined (26201); great mischief would be caused by the adoption of local option or license (26202). National prohibition desirable; of course it will prevent the importation and transfer of liquor from State to State (26203); New Hampshire under prohibition does not prohibit the manufacture and has breweries (26204-5); measures adopted to prevent the importation of liquor into Maine (26206-09); national prohibition will be enacted when the churches take their proper position in regard to this shame and crime (26210-13); in Boston the school houses are of a high order, as throughout Massachusetts (26219-20); only the Episcopal church hangs aloof from the prohibition movement; the Church of Rome is rapidly coming around to the view (26221-23). Violations of the law are spoken of at Bangor, Waterville, Bath, Belfast and Rockland; in Bangor there are not open bars, but there is selling on the sly; no liquor is now sold at Old Orchard Beech (26224-28); liquor brought in by casks which were dropped from the cars; but a law has been passed to check that evil; cars of liquor have also been detached in the woods (26220-30); jurors in Maine always ready to convict persons engaged in the liquor trade (26231). Considered the Federal tax an advantage to Maine as the payment of the tax was *prima facie* evidence of the violation of the law (26234-43); reason of large number of United States certificates taken out was that apothecaries used liquor in their business (26244); details of punishment of offenders against the Maine law, imprisonment at hard labour, etc. (26245-47); adoption of the whipping post as used in Delaware would stop the rum trade, but public opinion in Maine is not in favour of the whipping post; witness would favour it because he was not afraid of public opinion (26248-52); submitted several amendments to the last Legislature, and one was adopted (26253). Maine law only forbids the sale and supplying it for sale (26254-59); burden of proof rests on parties to whom liquor is sent (26260); details of working of State agency and sub-agencies (26261-71); no doctor's certificate is necessary to obtain liquor at the agency (26272-85); vote on constitutional amendment in 1884, which was carried by a large majority (27286-91); no State authority can prohibit the importation of liquors, which is a national affair; if brought into the State it cannot afterwards be transported (36294); anybody can buy liquor for domestic use (26295); liquor can be purchased but not offered for sale (26296); the Maine law is against sale and keeping for sale and illegal transportation, not prohibiting the importation of liquor for beverage purposes for private use (26297); no attempt made during past 40 years to take away this privilege (26298); the people not prepared for an amendment of that kind (26299); by prohibition the people of Maine understand that drinking shops are forbid-

DOW, GEN. NEAL—*Concluded.*

den, as the sale of liquor for beverage purposes is forbidden and so on ; but there is no restriction on people purchasing liquor for beverage purposes and for domestic use (26301) ; does not favour legislation that would stop that importation, because public opinion is not prepared for it ; public opinion must always be consulted ; it would be unwise to attempt a measure very much in advance of public opinion (26302) ; prohibition advocated by witness is a prohibition of the sale and keeping for sale, not prohibition for domestic use ; there is a line to be drawn between the two (26303-05).

DUGAS, CALIXTE A., Police Magistrate, and Judge of Sessions, Montreal. Page <sup>6</sup>187

Is one of the License Commissioners for the city, by virtue of his official position ; describes the manner in which licenses are issued in Montreal ; application is made by the party, signed by 25 municipal electors of the polling district where a license is asked ; the commissioners examine into the veracity of the certificate and confirm it to the Provincial Government, by whose authority the license is issued. According to law the Recorder and two Judges of Sessions in Montreal must confirm such certificate (21625-33) ; the commissioners have full discretion to grant or reject applications, within the spirit of the law (21634-6). No discretion should be left the Commissioners, and the law should state conditions under which a license should be granted, and the Commissioners should decide only whether those conditions were carried out or not (21637). As to limitation of number, if that were the intention of Legislature, the law should be so framed as to force a limitation by itself (21638). The present system of controlling the liquor trade is unsatisfactory (21639) ; remedial measures should include removal of discretion from the Commissioners, and the securing of a better class of restaurants or hotel keepers (21640) ; this might be accompanied by high license, which, however, has not proved very successful ; number of licenses has steadily increased in Montreal, and inexperienced men have entered the business (21641) ; the number of licenses might be reduced by grading the requirements of the premises according to the locality, the licensees in all cases to supply meals and beds ; another amendment would be to give permanent licenses, subject to revocation for violations of the law (21643). No less than 90 per cent of crime is due to alcoholism, and much of the lower class of crime is due to bad liquor sold in restaurants and hotels of the lower class (21645). Does not believe in prohibition, but holds that mild beer and wine are of great benefit (21650) ; the enactment of such a law would lead people to violate it either by manufacturing liquor or buying it or getting it under false pretenses ; liquor would be smuggled from the States and there would be illicit manufacture (21652-55). The inferior quality of liquor sold in restaurants is one of the greatest cause of alcoholism and of the brutalization of those who use it (21656) ; at present there is practically no inspection of liquors, and improvements in the present system should include rigid inspection and severe punishment for all falsification (21657-8) ; penalty in France for adulteration is the closing of the establishment for about one month or complete prohibition of sale (21660). Describes the class of cases tried by him as Police Magistrate and the jurisdiction of the Court (21661-67). As License Commissioners he and his colleagues suffer and the public suffer from their exercise of discretionary power (21678) ; the law should define the action to be taken after the first and second offences (21679) ; difficulty also arises in regard to granting licenses, and the Commissioners are sometimes ashamed to see the places to which they have granted certificates ; if however, applications are refused all varieties of influence are brought to induce a reversal of the decision (21679) ; a still further remedy would be to tax alcohol so highly that the lower classes could not obtain it, and would be led to drink wine and mild beer (21685). No great change in social customs tending towards temperance is observable, and persuasion is one of the greatest

DUGAS, CALIXTE A.—*Continued.*

means to promote temperance (21686). Formerly applicants had to obtain a majority of the electors of the ward or district ; but that regulation had to be repealed (21691-3) ; the majority can always oppose applications, and in those cases they are refused (21695-7) ; if applicants were required to secure a majority, it would be impossible for hotel-keepers to get licenses (21698) ; the obtaining of certificate yearly is only a farce ; once a license is granted and the licensee observes the law, he should keep his license in perpetuity (21702) ; the number of licenses is not limited by law, and each case has to be considered separately (21704). The license law better observed this year than formerly as to sale after hours and on Sunday (21710). Alcohol is not a beverage, and efforts are being made to restrict its use because of the evil it does (21722) ; this would justify the imposition of heavy duties on it as a dangerous luxury (21722-4) ; many juvenile criminals are the children of drinking parents ; efforts should be made to prevent young people becoming part of the mob (31730-5). Club licenses are no doubt abused (21738), and lead to sale of liquor on Sundays (21739) ; liquor sales in Montreal take place in probably 200 unlicensed places (21740) ; the authorities endeavour to prevent the sale but fail in their effort. In regard to power to prohibit sale, given to Municipal Councils, evidence was contradictory (21749-50) ; in Switzerland and Russia the State had a monopoly of the manufacture and sale of alcohol, and he was favourably disposed towards such a system (21752-3). Crime in Montreal has probably decreased somewhat, and licensed shops have not increased in proportion to the population (21758-59). Had experience of the operation of the prohibitory law in the North-west Territories ; it did not prevent drinking, and people became intoxicated on drugs (21760-2). Had obtained information in regard to Maine law, which indicated a large number of arrests for drunkenness (21763) ; had visited France some years ago and found the people very sober as a rule (21764-5) ; as regards restaurants and hotel bars, witness declared himself opposed to bars altogether (21781-6). The magistrates daily deplore the lack of reformatory institutions for confirmed drunkards (21795-8).

DUNLOP, JOHN, Q.C., Montreal .... **652**

Assisted in procuring legislation incorporating the town of Côte St. Antoine ; the old municipality passed a by-law prohibiting liquor sale under the old Dunkin Act, which has ever since been in force ; after the incorporation of the town the original by-law remained—it has never been attacked (29333). Was Secretary-Treasurer for the Municipality for ten years, and is now its solicitor (29334) ; no sale of liquor in hotels or saloons within the boundaries of the Municipality (29335-37) ; liquor can be brought from Montreal, of which Côte St. Antoine is a suburb ; it is impossible to tell where the boundary line stops and the town begins (29338). Very little intemperance in the Municipality (29340). Côte St. Antoine is a residential suburb, and public feeling would be unanimous against liquor sale ; only one prosecution for selling was undertaken, a heavy fine was imposed and there was no further trouble (29349-48). No illicit sale within the municipality ; local prohibition has proved beneficial and enhanced the value of property (29349-52). In that part of the city adjoining the south-east corner of the Municipality there are many saloons, and no difficulty would be experienced in residents of the Municipality crossing the line and obtaining liquor supplies (29358-60).

EDWARDS, JOHN BAKER, Ph.D., Montreal - .....Page **294**

Is Doctor of Science and a practical chemist, also public Analyst to the Inland Revenue Department, in the Montreal district, and has held position for seventeen years (22944-8). Receives periodically from Department of Inland Revenue samples of food, drink, drugs or fertilizers with instructions to analyse them ; they are supplied by the Inspector of food, and results of analyses are



EDWARDS, JOHN BAKER—*Continued.*

reported to the department (22950-53); from 50 to 60 samples examined during last twelve months (22954, 23065-73). On receiving samples witness does not obtain name of vendor or maker, but locality in which they were taken; samples come sealed and labelled (22955-8); method in which Inspector obtains samples described (22959-60); boundaries of district under charge of witness (22961). Liquors are not largely adulterated within this district, either in district covered by witness or in districts under other analysts; drugs named in schedule and prohibited have not been detected in adulteration of liquor; adulterations discovered in wine, but not to any great extent, not in beer; adulteration is in the direction of dilution and not addition of toxic matters; but as no definite standard in regard to spirituous liquors has been fixed, these cannot be called adulterations (22962-3, 22966-7, 22968-75, 23064, 23084-88). Number of liquors examined has been exceedingly small; use of mixed liquors renders discovery of adulteration almost impossible; suggests adoption of system by which whole stock in trade would be examined, instead of one or two samples purchased by Inspector (22964, 23074-9); inspection of liquor not sufficient at the present time (22976); dilutions are, however, not injurious to health (22979); object of storing liquor and its advantages (22982-93); definition and strengths of alcohols (22994-3003, 23007-14); strength of light beers and malt liquors (23004-6); effect of the use of unrectified spirits (23015); light beers sold in parks favourable to public health (23017-19). Present license law fairly well enforced, but regulations insufficient and penalties not efficiently enforced (23022-4); number of licenses issued should be reduced, especially for saloons (23024-28); groceries selling liquor should be deprived of licenses or high fees exacted (23029-30). Visited Portland, Maine, several years ago, and found better state of conduct in the streets than in most cities of its size (22031-33). Visited Pembroke under license and later under the Scott Act and found during the latter period much more order and less noise at night, also less drunkenness and noise (23033-8, 23119-20, 23124-28); General prohibitory law would be desirable if practicable, but public opinion is not ripe for the change (23039-42, 23121-23); first step in that direction would be woman suffrage (23042-45); anarchy would follow enactment of prohibition except with a consenting majority (23044-6, 23059-63); temperance education must begin in the school (23047). Enactment of prohibitory law would be a protest in favour of morality, and in that sense would be advantageous (23048-9); its non-enforcement would result in the volume of sale being decreased, but amount of criminality increased (23050-56, 23112-18). Liquor is too cheap in Canada, and the duties or licenses on the heavier liquors might be advantageously increased (23089-91); no objection to use of light beers (23092); proportions of alcohol in so-called temperance drinks (23093). Physiological effects of the use of alcohol (23104-11).

EWING, JOHN, Melbourne, P.Q., Registrar of Richmond County. . . . . Page **505**

Is registrar of the County of Richmond; at the last agricultural show not a case of intoxication was reported; previously there had been general disorder in the town from drunkenness at similar gatherings (26978-9); hotels have proved profitable without bars (26980-82). Danville has lead in the prohibition movement in the county, and no liquor is now sold except in drug stores (26085-6). Favours adoption of a general prohibitory law which could be as well enforced as any other law (26989); it would be more easily enforced than local prohibition because of its more general character and more efficient machinery for its enforcement (26990); increased temperance among the farmers in Richmond county (26993); they have abandoned drinking habits and are becoming more prosperous under enforced prohibition (26994-5); the hotels in Richmond are prospering in consequence of increasing the price charged for meals (26996, 27002); some hotelmen have become wrecks morally and physically from

EWING, JOHN—*Continued.*

drinking (27004-11); residents could easily obtain liquor from Sherbrooke and elsewhere, and no doubt occasionally they did so (27012-16); the enactment of a wider prohibitory law was desirable, either for the province or for the Dominion (27018-21).

FEATHERSTON, ARTHUR, Montreal, Merchant.....Page **706**

Is chief officer of the Dominion Council of Royal Templars for Canada and Newfoundland, and has held the position three years (30049-50). The object of the society is the promotion of prohibition and the reformation of drunkards, it is also a sick benevolent and insurance society (30052). Method adopted for reformation of drunkards is to bring them into the organization and retain them; there is a pledge in connection with the society (30053-05); the pledge sets out that the liquor traffic is a foe to God and man and should be prohibited (30056-57). The Royal Templars endeavour to secure prohibition by the distribution of literature, holding meetings and political action (30058-62). Prohibition clubs are connected with the society, but they constitute an independent scheme (30063). Is a member of the Executive of the Citizens' League, which endeavours to secure a better observance of license law, especially the prohibitive portion of it (30064-67). Too many licenses are issued in the city (30068). Amendments to the license law should include publication of the names of the signers to petitions for licenses, and a majority of the voters in the polling district should be necessary to secure a license (30069). The Sunday law is not observed, although an improvement has taken place recently (30070). Sale of groceries should be separated from the sale of liquor (30071). Favours the entire prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes (30072). Has spent summers in Maine; the Maine law would be a great success and he would be willing to accept it for Canada as a step in advance, although the importation for private use is permitted (30073-78). In Kansas the whole liquor trade is prohibited (30079-80). Favours complete prohibition, so that a man should not be able to bring in supplies for his own use (30081-83). If increased revenue is required in the event of prohibition, favours direct taxation (30084-86). Compensation should not be paid to brewers and distillers (30087). The liquor trade is a great drawback to every business (30090). Licensees do not comply with the license law (30092). Great difficulty is experienced in opposing licenses owing to objections being raised (30093-96). Is satisfied that a straight prohibition vote would carry in the Province of Quebec (30097-101); favours the taking of a plebiscite in the province, but would prefer to see the Federal Government deal with the question and have it made an issue at the general elections (30102). All that would be necessary to enforce a prohibitory law would be backbone on the part of officials having the enforcement in charge (30105); such a law would be fully as well enforced as the Customs Act to-day with the same staff of officers (30106-07). After prohibition had been adopted some time would elapse before the finances adjusted themselves, but the deficit would be small (30108); the importations would be larger and the customs receipts heavier, and there would be a general improvement in trade (30109). Marked improvement had occurred in Hemmingford, in Huntingdon county, under local prohibition (30110-14). The liquor trade like slavery requires a certain amount of time to deal with it (30115). The Citizens' League is endeavouring to enforce the license law; it has aroused public sentiment on the question and the officers are enforcing the law more stringently (30119-22). The deficit in the Dominion revenue would be met by increased importation (30123); if receipts proved inadequate, he was willing to stand direct taxation (30124). The country could well afford to have a general advance in duties if it obtained prohibition (30126); the loss of revenue would be met first by the amount received through the customs by extra importations from the money

FEATHERSTON, ARTHUR—*Continued.*

being turned into legitimate channels, and second by direct taxation (30127). The moderate use of liquor is injurious—it leads to abuse; the taking of liquor is a sin (30128-29). The record of the Royal Templars Benefit Society is remarkable as regards death rate, this being due to total abstinence by its members (30130-40).

FORGET, LUCIEN, Montreal, Clerk of the Recorder's Court . . . . . Page **777**

Cases of drunkenness generally come before the Recorder's Court (031080); a large number of persons who are arrested on Saturday night are discharged by the police and never appear before the court (031081-125). About a hundred cases of drunkenness yearly are brought before the court, the men having been arrested by officers of the court, and these do not appear in the report of the Chief of Police (031082-85). Witness makes a return to Ottawa of cases tried in the Recorder's Court, but it includes only criminal cases, not offences against the municipal by-laws or the provincial license law (031086-93); his return includes cases of selling liquor to Indians (031098); 131 cases in 1891 against the liquor law were included in his return to Quebec, but not in the Ottawa return (031101). Witness gives explanation of the discrepancy between the number of prisoners shown in the report of the Chief of Police for 1891, and the returns prepared by witness, stating that sometimes three or even more complaints are entered against the same person while one offence is perhaps only entered in the police book; when a man is drunk witness always enters the case of drunkenness against him to show that drunkenness is the cause of nearly all disorder; his statistics show the number of offences and not the number of offenders (031102-14, 031121-24). Some offenders appear before the court for drunkenness several times yearly (031115). Witness is not anxious to send prisoners to jail for simply drunkenness, for by imposing fines a great expense is avoided to the city (031116). In many cases sentences are suspended and then the case is entered as a conviction; this is necessary, otherwise men discharged might institute actions against the city for illegal arrest (031130-32).

FOLEY, EDWARD, Quebec, Clerk Recorder's Court . . . . . Page **18**

Three-fourths of city's arrests are for drunkenness (18855-58, 18874, 18889-194); decrease in Sunday drinking due to the Ross Act (18874-92-97); provisions of Act (18876-77, 18880-86); diminished drunkenness due to religious and temperance influences (18887-89); by-law respecting houses of prostitution (18898-18903); earlier closing of licensed taverns desirable (18904-5).

FORSYTH, JOSEPH BELL, Quebec, Collector of Customs . . . . . Page **27**

Occupied present position since April, 1891; many outports under Quebec (19148). Drunkenness decreased; high license fees had not decreased number of sellers (19152-54); many places selling without license, especially in adjoining municipalities (19155-58). Considerable smuggling below Quebec (19159-60); statistics of wine and spirits entered at Quebec (19161-63); large quantities brought in from St. Pierre (19164-66); dealers object to sale of smuggled whisky (19168-83); whisky exported to St. Pierre manufactured from corn in Indiana (19179). License laws of city fairly well enforced (19185). Lives at Cap Rouge, five miles from Quebec; has been Mayor there; many taverns closed up; drunkenness decreased because men are of a superior class; also due to falling off in trade (19187-93); all taverns closed and improved condition generally (19196, 19240-61); municipal representatives would prefer to grant licenses (19201); no licenses granted in Sillery; several unlicensed places there (19198-203); difficult to prove sale (19204). General prohibitory law could not be enforced; it would certainly increase smuggling; people would insist on having liquor (19205-09, 19257-68); there would be illicit manufacture

FORSYTH, JOSEPH BELL—*Continued.*

(19267). Improvement in habits of sailors (19210-13); labour troubles in Quebec (19214-17). United States whisky shipped to St. Pierre and smuggled into Canada; mode of operation and seizures (19218-25). Change in local customs; diminished drinking (19226-27). Increased smuggling during the last two or three years (19228-29); energetic Government action (19232-35); liquor importations not all consumed in province (19270-79).

FORTIER, JOSEPH J., Quebec, Collector of Provincial Revenue . . . . . Page **41**

Collects revenue for liquor and other licenses including license for temperance hotels; explained the nature of a club license and mode in which same was obtained (19415-30); conditions of license for hotels and taverns (19436-42); inspection regulations (19444-48); little illicit sale (19455-57, 19463). Present License Act excellent (19469-72); some places would be better if under license than under prohibition (19473-4, 19482); led to increased illicit sale (19483-85). No limit to number of licenses in Quebec City or Levis (19476-77); some villages limit the number (19478-80); hotel bar *vs.* saloon bar (19493-97); condition better under license than local option (19485-90, 19516-19). Slight decrease in licensed and unlicensed places (19508); very few applications refused (19515); prohibition of liquor sale by grocers desirable (19548-49; Quebec City Council has no power to refuse licenses (19550-52); could not adopt a local option law (19562-67); method of applying for licenses and of opposing such applications (19567-70); action to suppress illicit sale (19573-77).

FRÉMONT, JOSEPH T., Quebec, Mayor . . . . . Page **66**

Third term as Mayor; elected by aldermen and councillors, City police Force was formerly under a board composed of the Mayor, Recorder and Chief of Police (19953-54); system works very badly compared with old arrangement (19957-58); number of liquor licenses in the city not limited by law (19960); but the Commissioners exercise discretion in giving licenses (19962-64); increased temperance among the people (19965-70). General prohibitory law would be unjust and could not be successfully carried out (19971, 19994, 20003-04). Scott Act has not been properly observed; moderate users deprived of liquor, while excessive drinkers obtained it; liquor thus sold illicitly is much adulterated (19972-73). Inspection of liquor desirable (19973); measures to ensure respectable licensees more desirable than high licenses, which is apt to lead to illicit selling (19974); number of licenses granted in a community should be limited (19976-80). Favours legislation to encourage the use of light wines and beer (19975). Visited Chicoutimi County under Scott Act; liquor sold openly in different places, including Roberval and Chicoutimi Town; only on leaving the town did he ascertain that the Scott Act was in force (19982-85). Non-observance of Scott Act in Prince Edward Island; visited Charlottetown when Scott Act in force, general sale at hotels (19986-92, 19998). Scott Act as class legislation (20000). Interdiction of habitual drunkards (20004); present law not satisfactory (20005-7).

FRENCH, REV. ARTHUR, Montreal . . . . . Page **463**

Resided in Montreal and has done parochial work since 1879; connected with the church of St. John the Evangelist (26365-691). Drunkenness is one of the great difficulties with which clergymen have to cope (26370); work with the individual is the best way of dealing with the evil (26372). Resided in Cornwall during two summers while the Scott Act was in force; in 1885 and also in 1888 (26373-74); the law worked very unsatisfactorily and an unsatisfactory condition of affairs prevailed (26375); had difficulty in obtaining alcohol for medicinal purposes and yet drunkenness was rampant there (26375). Spent a summer at Knowlton where the Dunkin Act was in force in 1883; drink was sold there (26377); moral effect of adopting prohibitory acts which are sub-

FRENCH, REV. ARTHUR—*Continued.*

sequently openly and flagrantly violated is bad (26377). Had resided in the parish of Wolverhampton, near Birmingham, England, where the publicans were a very respectable class, and where he did not hesitate to enter public houses (26378). Marked improvement in Montreal during recent years in the direction of temperance (26381); in connection with his church there is a branch of the Church of England Temperance Society, with a double pledge, which works well (26383-84); Church of England clergymen must use fermented wine in Holy Communion (26385-8). Had visited France and had observed that light wine was the common drink of the people (26389-91); use of beer preferable to the consumption of strong liquors. In England no harmful results appear to occur when the beer was of good quality (26392-95). Present license system very faulty; licenses issued should be regulated in proportion to population; this would be followed by a reduction in number (26396-9); greater power should be placed in the hands of the License Commissioners (26401); licenses issued should be continued if the licensee's record is good (26402); had seen boys intoxicated, who must have obtained the liquor in public houses; every such breach of the law should be prosecuted and the law strictly enforced (26403-05); in regard to Sunday sale, if a man had a right to have a barrel of beer in his house, a poor man should not be precluded from obtaining a glass during certain hours on Sunday (26406-08, 26498-99); high license would have the effect of causing licensees to suppress illicit sale; is not strongly in favour of high license unless the number of houses is strictly limited (264012); liquor sales should be separate from groceries (26414). Had visited Sohmer Park but did not see anything objectionable there; it was, however, quite possible to be the cause of much evil (26415-16); prefers a license law to free sale of liquor, even under police regulation (26418); the use of fermented wine at the Holy Communion and communicants who are subject to intemperance (26419-21, 26511-17). Scott Act in Cornwall was very unsatisfactory; in Knowlton everything was very well conducted (26423); had known Cornwall under the license law (26427); had taken duty one year in Cornwall when the Scott Act was in force. Was told that the present condition of affairs was more satisfactory; this information was gained from residents (26428-29); during the Scott Act period liquor could be obtained anywhere in Cornwall; it could be as easily obtained there as in Montreal; there was no secret about the sale (26430-39); the condition of Cornwall has decidedly improved since the Scott Act has been repealed (26440-41). Liquor selling in Portland, Maine; considers existence of a bar in Portland proof of failure to prohibit (26442-47); the drink trade generally evil in its effects; the liquor law is not an evil; the evil lies not in the legislation of the traffic but in the violation of the law (26448-51); breaches of the license Act—sale to minors, after certain hours and to intoxicated people (26451-57); the license law is good but there is an excessive number of public houses; the number should be restricted as liquor is a temptation, with a small number the law could be more effectively enforced (26458-60); many licensed houses afford excessive facilities to drink (26461); but if a man wants liquor he will get it. Alcohol is one of God's gifts and there was no valid reason why the law should withdraw it (26464); had no knowledge of the character of the liquor sold (26465-70); many publicans are good living people (26470-83); in England clergymen visit public houses in the parish, but this is not done in Canada where there is a different feeling towards the trade (26484-87); in England there is a better class of publicans than here (26487-90). If the trade was not frowned upon there would be a better class of publicans in Canada (26491); many young people are brought up to frown down on the liquor trade; the Church of England is, however, broader than any other religious body, although a section take radical ground regarding the drink trade (26492-95). Liquor sale is out of place at Sohmer Park and also in groceries; it should be sold only in proper places and under proper restrictions (26496-97,

FRENCH, REV. ARTHUR—*Concluded.*

26500-01); applications for licenses should be granted or refused largely on the applicant's character (26504); the number of licenses issued should be according to population (26505); the opinion of residents in the locality should have weight with the Commissioners in arriving at a decision (26506-10). Opposed to a general prohibitory law, for although it might be desirable if enforced, its enforcement would be impossible (26518-24); the drink trade is undoubtedly one of the serious causes of crime and poverty, but it is not the only one; there are others quite as great (26525-26); the use of drugs has even a more destroying effect than liquor (26529); it is a fallacy to suppose that the opium and drink habits are generally combined (26530-31); fallen women sometimes never touch liquor, although as a rule they are probably addicted to the drink habit (26532); it is useless to enact a law against the drink trade if it is inoperative (26534-35); alcohol is required for medicinal purposes and wine for the Holy Communion, and many people consider they can do more work by drinking beer at meals (26536-42). The remedy was not to abolish the saloons, but to educate the people to understand that it is not necessary to enter all bars that are passed in walking in the city, and that regular times for refreshments, whether meat or drink are desirable (26543); a man can use or misuse alcohol (26544); injury is done to a man engaged in the liquor trade if he is denied church membership (26545-46); it is also an error to endeavour to make the trade disreputable and keep it disreputable (26547-48); the trade should be made reputable and licenses granted only to respectable people; the number of places should be restricted and the law enforced especially as regards sale to minors, and there should be an efficient inspection of liquors sold (26551-52). Would not favour a general prohibitory law; but if such a law were adopted, compensation should be granted to brewers and distillers if the principle of compensation is recognized in regard to other industries (26553-55); at Cornwall no special difficulties existed to prevent efficient enforcement of the Scott Act (26556-57); but there was much drunkenness, and the present condition is more preferable (26556-57); cannot explain why prohibitionists consider alcohol an evil and yet useful for medicinal and sacramental purposes (26564); at Cornwall it was asserted that tavern-keepers said it paid them to pay the fines imposed during the Scott Act period (27565-6).

GIRDWOOD, GILBERT P., M.D., Montreal . . . . . Page **771**

Is Professor of Chemistry in McGill University and is public analyst for the Dominion (031011-12). Makes analyses of samples of liquor sent him by officials of the Government and others (031013-14). Had made an analysis of elixir antiperiodique patented by Dr. Bouillon of Matane, samples of which had been forwarded to him by the Collector of Provincial Revenue for the District of St. Francis, who had seized bottles of the mixture on the ground that the seller had not taken out a license for the sale of intoxicating liquors (031015-27). Had analysed samples of beer from Quebec and Montreal, which had been submitted to him in order to ascertain whether it was above three per cent strength or not (031028-30). Witness gives details of the percentage of alcohol in ales, lager, home made wines, etc, (031035-49). Was surgeon on the Canadian Pacific Railway works on the north shore of Lake Superior; any quantity of liquor was brought in contained in tin jackets fastened round men's waists; a great number of men got liquor, and after they had had rows they applied to him for medical assistance (031051-54). Prohibition by force of law would be a great mistake; such a law would simply make a liar and thief of a man who had to get liquor in by a back way, and it would morally debase him lower than if he got all the liquor he wanted; at Portland he found that the bar of the hotel was closed, but that he could obtain liquor by ringing a bell and going up to one of the rooms; in the city all you had to do was to go round the back way and if you appeared to be a respectable party you

GIRDWOOD, GILBERT P., M.D.—*Continued.*

were admitted ; the law made it so uncomfortable that any man who respected himself would not go to those places to get liquor but would get it in some other way (031056). Total abstinence is not incompatible with the best health ; if a man takes a glass or two of wine it will not hurt him ; the moment a man forms any habit, whether drinking or smoking, that appears to come to master him, he had better give it up (031059-60).

GIROUX, EDWARD, Quebec, Chairman Board of Harbour Commissioners . . Page **101**

Occupied position on Harbour Board for ten years. Little intemperance among pilots ; very few cases brought before the Board (20437-49) ; considerable smuggling (20450-20467, 20480-1). General prohibition not desirable, could not be sufficiently enforced (20453-58) ; few druggists in the city sell liquor (20462-64). Favours high license and superior class of licensees ; also punishment of drunkenness by fine and imprisonment (20471-72).

GREENSHIELDS, EDWARD B., President of the Board of Trade, Montreal.

Page **321**

Explains that he speaks only in his private capacity and not as President of the Board of Trade. Increased soberness among our population (24154-5) ; present license system fairly satisfactory, if proper attention were paid to the character of licensees (24161-64) ; an improvement would be the abolition of many places where liquor only is sold (24165) ; a large reduction might be followed by increased unlicensed sale (24166) ; difficulties surrounding suppression of illicit sale (24167-69). Total prohibition is impracticable (24170) ; drink will be sold, and it is better to have the traffic regulated so that good liquors will be sold, under proper restriction (24171) ; prohibition would be followed by increased illicit selling of spirits and wine, and of poor quality (24174). Effect of prohibition on commercial interests : it would diminish trade, and revenue loss would require to be replaced by direct taxation (24175, 24180) ; compensation should be given to trade in the event of the adoption of prohibition (24183-87, 24240-45) ; losses in business are to a small extent attributable to intemperance (24189-93) ; favours use of light wines and ale (24194-98) ; city parks and popular amusements (24199-203) ; church and temperance societies have exercised beneficial effect (24204-5) ; inspection of liquors desirable, and hotels should be retained in preference to saloons (24207-8) ; has no rule with respect to drinking habits of employees so long as they attend to business ; percentage of excessive drinkers in his employ very small ; multiplication of facilities for drinking induces to drink (24220) ; treating system among commercial travellers is being abandoned (24221-26). Proposal to have applicant for license secure a majority of voters would prove an unworkable law (24227-30) ; opposed to prohibitory law because the drinking of wine is not unlawful and the law would interfere with individual liberty (24231-36) ; if prohibition were enforced, there would be much illicit drinking and smuggling.

GUSTAFFSON, AUGUSTUS, Sweden, Journalist . . . . . Page **552**

Has resided in New York for six months ; previously resided in Sweden (27858-63) ; is acquainted with Gothenburgh and its present condition (27865-66). Describes in detail the Gothenburgh system, its operation, its results and the division of the profits accruing from the system (27867-73) ; the Christiania Society and the Good Templars share in the profits derived from the liquor traffic, and this is the most effectual way of shutting the mouths of the temperance societies—it would have that effect on those who received that blood money (27874-77) ; neither Judges nor policemen perform their duties in connection with carrying out the law (27875-92) ; gives details of increased drunkenness in Sweden and Norway (27897-909) ; a strong movement arisen in Norway and Sweden for the total prohibition of drink (27910) ; people were

**GUSTAFFSON, AUGUSTUS—Continued.**

becoming enlightened from the physiological point of view and from the moral point of view (27911); two or three hundred members who hold prohibition views in Rigstag; defines the aims of the prohibition party of Sweden (27917-36); a Government system has been in operation in Sweden for years; the people have had pure liquor and smuggling has been diminished (27937-42); the enactment of prohibition would produce tragic relations between the law-abiding and law-breaking elements (27943-46). Opposed to local option, which is a tissue of delusions, illusions and collusions (27947-48); prefers free rum to a license law (27961-66); the adoption of local option is simply dodging pure prohibition; enforcement is possible in districts where the traffic is weak, it cannot be enforced in cities and towns, temperance sentiment is not advanced by means of local option (27967-76); the more attractive the surroundings connected with the liquor sale, the more dangerous is the traffic (27977-80); the church has not awakened to its responsibility on the liquor question (27980-81).

**HAGUE, GEORGE, Montreal, Banker.....Page 547**

Is general manager of the Merchants' Bank of Canada and has resided in Montreal about 16 years (27804-10). Considerable change for the better in the social customs and habits of the people during the last 20 years, though in some sections the habit of drinking to excess would seem to be as prevalent as ever; the influence of the church has long appeared to be far less than it might be; the temperance movement appears largely to have shifted its ground; specific efforts were made to re-claim drunkards; lately, however, efforts of the promoters of temperance have been largely directed to the channel of legislation, and the machinery of politics has been persistently employed with a view to repression by force of law; had temperance workers kept to their original ground, results would have been far greater than have been accomplished; experience has shown that license laws have been enforced; licenses should, however, be only granted on the requisition of a large number of rate payers, license fees should be placed so high as to largely restrict the number; illicit selling should be rigorously suppressed; sale of liquor in groceries should be regulated; persistent drunkards should be placed in inebriate asylums; intoxicating liquors should not be sold in public or private parks; the religious keeping of Sunday throughout is the best rule for the community; saloons and hotel bars should remain closed from 8 p.m. Saturday till Monday morning; consumption of spirituous liquors should be restricted for medicinal purposes, and light wines and beers might be adopted for beverage use; license laws are to a certain extent prohibitive, and such prohibition can be enforced; but a law for total prohibition will not be generally obeyed, unless a very large majority of the community are total abstainers; under such conditions a prohibitory law is unnecessary; it was unfortunate that temperance organizations and religious bodies should have abandoned the use of moral and spiritual forces and descended into the troubled arena of political strife merely to secure the placing of resolutions and laws upon the statute-book; it was deplorable that ministers of the Gospel should in so many instances have ceased to testify against drunkenness as a sin, and should have so generally concentrated blame upon the material by which the sin is committed (27811).

**RECALLED.....Page 723**

With regard to the effect of the liquor traffic on general business interests, the trade gives rise to the employment of a large number of persons both directly and indirectly, and also to the employment of capital in various forms; in considering the monetary interest of the trade, the income derived by principals and their expenditure thereof has to be considered as well as that of the employees and workmen; with regard to agriculture, the trade



HAGUE, GEORGE—*Continued.*

furnishes to growers of corn, barley, hops and grapes; does not attach much importance to loss of barley market, following adoption of general prohibition, as the land could readily be turned to other uses; the persons carrying on the trade and employed in it are generally as sober as any other class in the community, with the exception of lower class of saloon keepers and bar tenders; the effect of general prohibition would be to destroy valuable property, to throw a large number of persons out of employment and diminish the employment for many others; much distress to families would follow until matters were adjusted to the new opinion; the loss of revenue to the Government would require to be made up from other sources; it is difficult to see how this could be done without very burdensome taxation; a Canadian Legislature would not pass a prohibitory law without compensating the trade; this question would have a very far reaching application, and twelve or fifteen millions at the lowest calculation would be required; supposing prohibition were carried out efficiently, there would be increased consumption of dutiable articles and this would increase the revenue, but not to such an extent as is generally supposed; no doubt there would be a great diminution of expenses with regard to agencies for the punishment of crime, but it is difficult to estimate; the great value of the repression of drunkenness would be the increase of the spending powers of the people; has the gravest possible doubts whether the abolition of drunkenness can be accomplished by general legislation, although it may be diminished and kept within bounds by judicious municipal laws (30303). Only mode by which the Government could recoup its revenue would be by direct taxation (30304-08). No change in drinking habits in Montreal during 16 years, but a decided decrease as compared with 35 years ago (30309-10). Every one agrees that the number of saloons in Montreal is excessive and the facilities for obtaining liquor are far too easy (30311); an improvement might be effected by high license, and the burden of getting the majority of ratepayers should be thrown upon the applicant; saloons pure and simple are a great evil (30312). Licenses should be issued by Government Commissioners rather than by the City Council; favours the placing of the liquor trade in the hands of the Government (30314-15a).

HEMMING, EDWARD JOHN, Drummondville, P.Q., Advocate. . . . . Page **405**

Occupied the position of District Magistrate of Arthabaska for five years (25515-518). Scott Act in force in the county of Drummond for six years up till quite recently, when it was repealed; previously was under license law (25519-21). Three years ago an attempt was made to repeal the Scott Act, but it did not succeed (25522). Witness always opposed to it on principle; such legislation was unconstitutional; the Government had no right to enact sumptuary laws (25523-24). Scott Act was carried largely by the exertion of the clergy of all denominations; witness disagreed with his Rector on the subject, and was the only man that voted against the Act at the poll where he registered his vote (25525). Result was that instead of four licensed hotels in Drummondville, there were between twenty and thirty shebeens; liquor could be had without difficulty, and there was more drunkenness than before the Scott Act went into force; the people became so demoralized that they looked upon law as not worth the paper on which it was written at the last election the Scott Act was voted down by fifty-one (25526-7, 67-696). The tendency of the Act was to place the sale of liquor in the hands of the lowest class (25528); liquor sale has also taken place in the county outside of Drummondville (25529). Regarding the form of ballot paper used at the late Scott Act election in Drummond, witness thinks it was very clear to any sensible man (25530-31); public sentiment is now against the Scott Act, and the clergy are opposed to it (25537); favours the use of light wines and ales, and discountenances the drinking of spirits (25538); a change has occurred with regard to the use of liquor, beer taking the place of spirits to some extent

HEMMING, EDWARD JOHN—*Continued.*

(25539). A social revolution has occurred in the township; some years ago Drummond had a bad reputation socially, but the disorderly class are disappearing; this change is due to the influence of the church, and the Scott Act in country places has a tendency to prevent people obtaining liquor (25040); the Scott Act had not materially assisted the church, for it did not raise the morality of the people (25541). Opposed to the Act on principle even supposing the results were in some respects beneficial; does not like class laws (25542); no coercive legislation can make a man morally good, although it may be desirable to remove temptation (25543); drink trade requires restriction from the weakness of human nature; only by elevating the moral tone and by education could improvement be secured; legislation would not as a rule have a good effect (25545); abuse of liquor alone is a crime, not its use (25546). Restriction in the direction of limiting the number of licenses is beneficial and perhaps necessary; but it does not follow that the trade should be prohibited, or people punished for using liquor; as between prohibition and free trade, let us have free trade (25547-8). The liquor traffic as it exists is harmful; but all Acts in the direction of prohibition have tended to demoralize the people (25549-53); people disregard the law, and the license legislation of Quebec has subverted the whole principle of criminal law (25554-5). Violations of the Scott Act were general in Drummond County, and even officers of the county were parties to its violation (25556-60). The liquor trade is not necessarily injurious to the community; alcohol is made the world over, but it should not be abused (25561-63). Witness is a temperance man, and does not keep alcohol in the house (25564); in his experience the only crimes traceable to drink were assaults, even up to murder (25565-6). Little difficulty in enforcing Scott Act in country districts, but in towns it is practically impossible (25579); Scott Act better enforced in English portion of Drummond County, because no large villages are there (25580); the reason for the change of sentiment in Drummond was due to the Act having proved an utter failure (25581-83). Acted as Magistrate from 1873 to 1878; Scott Act was not then in force in Drummond, but local municipalities had by-laws that carried out the same ideas (25584); effect of the Act at that time was to cause perjury to be plentiful (25585); Opposed to a general prohibitory law; under it not only would men sell, but illicit stills would be in operation (25591-93). License was the only effective way of dealing with the traffic; favours high license, so that dealers will be interested in suppressing illicit sales (25593-4); high license should be accompanied by a system of rigid inspection of liquors (25596-97); After the Scott Act came into force in Drummond there was not a decent hotel in town (25598-600); trade more profitable under Scott Act (25601-6); as much liquor sold in Drummond since the Scott Act as before; hotel keepers to a certain extent observed the law, but people got all the liquor they wanted (25607-11); no advantage followed from the liquor trade being disreputable during six years; it is because reputable men are not in the trade that liquors are adulterated, and served to drunken people (25612-13).

HENEKER, RICHARD W., Sherbrooke, P.Q. . . . . Page **438**

Is Chancellor of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, and Chairman of the Committee of Protestant Council of Public Instruction for the Province of Quebec; in business is Commissioner of the British American Land Co. (26025-26). Visited Gothenburg, Sweden, in 1886 and made a careful investigation into the liquor system in force; as a seaport, exporting timber, European vessels centred there and sailors were obliged to live in what were known as the cellars; liquor traffic was in full force, and the place was of evil repute; leading people formed a syndicate and acquired a monopoly of the liquor trade, no licenses being issued except through them; they regulate the trade, supply pure

HENEKER, RICHARD W.—*Continued.*

liquors, tea and coffee; visited these cellars, found meals served of good quality, everything clean and nothing to offend; the Gothenburg system rapidly spread to other cities, and affords a remedy for the evils of drunkenness (26028-36); comparison between Gothenburg and English port of similar size was unfavourable to the English system; no drunkenness prevailed in Gothenburg, while many sights offending the eye and the ear occur in English seaports (26038-39). In Canada habits of the people have improved and drunkenness has diminished; liquors are much less used socially than formerly (26041-43); travelled extensively in Europe and especially in France where wine is commonly used; during recent years use of spirits has greatly increased, especially in the north (26044-45); in Italy the ordinary wine is generally used (26046-48); strongly favours encouragement of the use of light wines and ales as a remedy for drunkenness (26049-50); the sale of spirits by groceries should be prohibited, and if necessary the saloon bar should be abolished (26051-52); use of light wines does not lead to spirit drinking (26053-55). Opposed to prohibition as a dangerous measure (26056); it would be impossible to carry out and the moral effect would be demoralizing (26057-58); had visited Lewiston, Maine, and obtained liquor there (26059-61); in the event of prohibition, brewers and distillers should be compensated (26063). Strict inspection not only of liquors but of all foods necessary to prevent adulteration (26068-69); Sherbroke under a license system; drinking prevailed; many licenses are granted to hotels, saloons and groceries (26070-73); little illicit sale, for licenses are easily obtainable (26074-75); authorities at Bishop's College and school are strict regarding the use of liquor by students (26079-80); Scott Act in force in Richmond, and offenders have been arrested and punished (26081-82). Objects to prohibition as wrong and incapable of being carried out, it would fail to prohibit; light wines too expensive to come into general use (26084-87); favours a limitation of the number of licensed houses, high license fees and punishment of drunkard and drink seller (26088-92); disastrous effects would follow violation of prohibitory law, which would at the same time not prohibit (26093-96); an evil of prohibition would be the creation of a class of informers (26097-100); limitations respecting hours of sale, &c., do not involve the principle of prohibition (26101-05); what is desirable is a license law accompanied by strict provisions regarding adulteration and regulation (26106).

HOOSLEP, FREDERICK W., Bergen, Norway.....Page **434**

Is a steamship captain, who has resided in Bergen ten years (25943-45). In Bergen the Bolag exists, which is an institution having a monopoly of the liquor traffic in the town (25946); the monopoly receives 20 per cent of the profits, and the balance goes to the State (25947); liquors are inspected by Government officers (25948); there is a Chief Inspector for every city and other municipal officers who make periodical visits (25949); mentions hours of opening and closing during the week (25950 1); during the last ten years the Bolag system has extended into all towns in Norway (25952); drunkenness much decreased during recent years, and the law working splendidly (25933-55); the common liquor used is Norwegian brandy made out of corn; upper classes use light wines, and lower classes frequently drink lager beer (25957-63); the number of places for sale is restricted according to population, and location of establishments is fixed by municipality; not more than ten places in Bergen, all controlled by the Bolag (25964-68); introduction of Bolag system advantageous to the people; formerly drunkenness prevalent, but great improvement since introduction of present system (25969-74). Prohibition question has been considered by the people of Norway, in which there are parishes and one small town Hangesund, where prohibition prevails (25975); prohibition does not work satisfactorily;

HOOSLEP, FREDERICK W.—*Continued.*

liquor is obtained by the people; the Bolag system is the only one that works satisfactorily (25976-79); importations to Hangesund in barrels (25980-83). In Sweden profit from liquor traffic goes to the Government, while in Norway it passes to the municipality; in Bergen roads and parks are constructed out of money obtained through the Bolag (25984); the monopoly enjoyed by the Bolag is confined to the strong liquors (25985-89). Is opposed to prohibition, because people will get liquor at all events (25990-91); difficult to obtain liquor in the interior of the country (25992); before the introduction of the Bolag a large number of places were selling in Bergen; liquor dealers had licenses for a life time, and municipality had to buy them out at high prices (25993-94); trifling illicit sale in private houses (2595-99); beer can only be sold in Norway under license and accompanied by food (26001-2); temperance work being vigorously prosecuted by temperance societies, the Good Templars being prominent (26003-05); in Norway every one agrees with the Bolag system as the best obtainable (26006-9); any person can obtain a wholesale license (26010-11); proposal now made to apply profits of the Bolag to the Government instead of the municipalities (26012); all regulations are strictly observed by the Bolag, and the Government officers are very efficient in preventing violations of the law (26013-20); the Bolag obtains the monopoly for a term of years, generally some number under ten (26021); strong drinks are sold only in town, and beer and light wines in country districts. The Government officers are constantly adopting measures to prevent adulteration of liquors (26022-25).

HUGHES, E. A. ST. GEORGE, Montreal, Chief of Police, . . . . . Page **236**

Held present office four and a half years (22619). The police force has a total strength of 374 men, and is under the Police Committee (22622-24); part of the duty of the force is to look after the closing of liquor places on Sunday and after hours; the number of offenders was reduced last year, attributable to the threat of the Magistrates to initial the licensees certificate in case of second offence (22625-28). Decidedly less drunkenness in the city than a few years ago; in 1866-67-68, there were more arrests than now (22629-33). License law is better observed now than formerly; the number of unlicensed places is not very large, and is decreasing (22634-36); a revenue police is appointed and paid by the Provincial Government for the purpose of looking after these houses, their efforts being supplemented by those of the municipal police; ten men are employed all the time to find out cases of illicit sale (22637-8); the provincial force numbers ten men, who are generally in plain clothes (22639-42). Drunken persons on the streets are sent home; if disorderly they are taken to police quarters (22643-4); indigent and destitute people are sent to jail, in the absence of a poorhouse (22645-9). Sale of liquor at Sohmer Park (22650-54). Intemperance would be curtailed if number of licensed places was reduced (22655); the lowest class should be wiped out, and no licenses should be issued unless the houses gave proper accommodation and provided meals (22655-9); legally licensed houses should supply meals, but they do not (22660). Had experience of prohibition in Drummond County four or five years ago, and also in Missisquoi, both during election times (22661-66); Scott Act was supposed to be in force in Drummond County in 1886, when he visited it; at that time liquor was sold. Witness was a member of a party from the city and no man was refused liquor who asked for it; this was in the hotel, not at the bar, but in a room (22667-75). Visited Missisquoi in 1878 and 1879, during election time, and had a similar experience (22676-7). Local option law for the city might be a good measure (22678-81), but impracticable (22682-94); General prohibition not desirable; enforcement would be almost impossible, even with an army of revenue officers (22695-7, 22897-906, 22939). Visited Maine two weeks ago and

HUGHES, E. A. ST. GEORGE—*Continued.*

observed that people obtained liquor in the hotels, and it was rank poison—this was at Old Orchard Beach (22697-9, 22940). No efficient inspection of liquors in Montreal, and much bad liquor sold, even by licensed vendors (22703-5). Mode of appointing municipal police (22706-12). Reduction in offences against liquor laws (22718-21). Possibility of enforcement of a prohibitory law as compared with present license law (22720-28). Adulteration of liquors (22741-45); separation of sale of liquors from sale of groceries (22746-55); Sunday closing (22756-7); sale of liquor to minors (22758); reduction in number of saloons (22759-60); hotel *vs.* restaurant (22761-6, 22879-90). Prohibitory law in the North-west—personal experience during the North-west Rebellion (22768-81, 22891-96). Illicit distilling in Quebec (22782-87); smuggling of liquor (22788-9). Desirability of local option in electoral districts in Montreal (22790-95). Very large proportion of criminal cases arise from drink habit and drink trade (22798); also a large proportion of juvenile crime (22802-8); illicit sale (22810-13); violations by licensees (22813-17). Local regulations of a prohibitory character (22818-38, 22910-23, 22941-3); prohibitory law could not be enforced in Montreal (22839-40). Liquor sale in houses of prostitution (22841-56). Liquor sale at Old Orchard Beach, Maine (22857-9). Drummond county under the Scott Act and previously (22860-72); Missisquoi under local prohibition (22876-7). Encouragement of the use of light wines and beer would promote temperance (22907-9); visited Italy and observed that little drunkenness there, although wine was generally used (22904-7); Government should encourage wine industry and manufacture of superior article; taxes might be adjusted to that end (22938-51); licenses might be granted for sale of wine, beer and cider only (22933-5). An asylum for drunkards desirable (22936).

RECALLED ..... Page **613**

Gives statistics from his report of number of arrests monthly during 1881, number tried in Court of Queen's Bench, the Police Magistrate's Court, value of money and goods recovered by the police, number of licensed and temperance taverns in Montreal and number of houses of ill-fame (28786-94); does not believe there are three hundred places in Montreal where liquor is sold without a license; the estimate made by Mr. Lambe that the number ranged from from 2,000 to 4,000 was perfectly ridiculous (28795-99). Ninety per cent of all offenders tried are arrested by the city police; not more than ten per cent are arrested by the High Constable or his officers (28800-08); respecting allegation that police visit saloons on the wharfs and take liquor there, last year proceedings were taken against two hotel keepers for giving liquor to policemen and they were fined (28809); a policeman may only enter a saloon if called to quell a disturbance; if he enters a saloon when in uniform and takes liquor he is instantly dismissed (28809-11); ten police officers in plain clothes watch the saloons on Sunday and see that the law is observed; no application for an officer to visit saloons near the central police station because they were open on Sunday, was made to witness (28812-16, 28818-21); liquor was sold with meals to sailors at restaurants on the wharfs, and witness' impression was that it was desirable to leave the sailors on the wharfs if they did not get drunk, rather than have them hanging around the streets on Sunday (28817).

RECALLED ..... Page **783**

No arrests are made for drunkenness in Montreal except by the city police and a few cases by officers of the Recorder's Court (031151); nearly all summons issued by the Recorder's Court are served by the court's bailiffs, and these are not included in the Chief's report (031152-53). The difference between the arrests for drunkenness recorded by witness and the number of cases tried

**HUGHES, E. A. ST. GEORGE—***Concluded.*

by the Recorder, as stated in the annual report of the court, is that complaints are made by parties before the Recorder's Court for various offences, and the clerk of the court adds a charge of drunkenness, and the same also in cases brought by the city police (031154); prisoners are convicted of other offences in addition to those charged by the police and recorded in the Chief's report (031155). A certain number of persons arrested for drunkenness on Saturday night are discharged on Sunday morning by order of witness; the number is not very large and no record is kept (031156); these cases are included in the number arrested because they are on the sheet (031157).

**IVES, HUBERT R.,** Montreal, Manufacturer . . . . .Page **522**

An iron manufacturer in Montreal, and employs about three hundred hands. Foundry labourers furnish a larger percentage of intemperate men than other classes of workers—they are intemperate as a class (27333-36); all nationalities are represented among his workmen, and the Canadians are temperate, sober and energetic (27339-40). The present license law is a very fair one if properly carried out; there are too many places licensed, the number should be reduced and more attention paid to the character of licensees (27344-45). Higher license fee should be imposed in order to ensure respectability and standing of applicant; all liquor should be inspected and inebriate asylums should be provided for confirmed drunkards (27345-57); legitimate amusement for the people should be provided in public and private parks, but only light wines and beers should be sold there (27358-60); has travelled in Europe and observed the light wines in France, where there is very little intemperance (27362-65). General prohibition would be impracticable; opposed to it on principle, and if a prohibitory law were enacted it could not be enforced (27368-71); in the event of prohibition being adopted brewers and distillers should be compensated (27372). Remedial measures should include high license system, confining the trade to respectable people and thorough inspection of liquors sold (27373-75, 27412-17); if the present license law were properly enforced it would be satisfactory; the evil arises not from the law but from failure to execute it: this is partly due to the character of the people carrying on the trade (27376-79); increased license fees might cause more illicit sale (27386); the enforcement of the license law should be taken from the police and placed in the hands of a special force (27387-88). Evils arise from the existence of saloons in the vicinity of foundries and factories, also grocery stores where liquor is sold (27389-94); in special districts licenses should be prohibited if a large majority of the people were in favour of prohibition; but this should not be carried out as a general measure (27396-97). During his visits to Europe saw no intemperance; the universal use of wines for generations did not promote drunkenness; during recent years the use of absinthe and spirits had increased in France, which was due to wine having become more expensive (27398-409).

**JEWELL, MOSES B.,** Farnham, P.Q., trader and manufacturer . . . . .Page **565**

Resides at Farnham, in Brome county, which is under the Canada Temperance Act, and has been so since January, 1885 (28053-65); the township of Brome has refused to grant licenses for the last 30 years; Brome county has been under a prohibitory law since 1867, and even in 1859 it was under a prohibitory county law (28075-79); no liquor at present sold in the municipality; liquor can be obtained at Cowansville and Sweetsburgh, four or five miles away respectively, where licenses are issued (28080-93). Is agent of the Dominion Alliance, and conducts prosecutions against violators of the Scott Act (28095-96); is a prohibitionist in principle (28108); is satisfied that Canada Temperance Act greatly reduced the sale of liquor; liquor is not openly sold, and there is an absence of drunkenness (29109-11); great change

JEWELL, MOSES B.—*Continued.*

in the social habits of the people in the direction of temperance during the last thirty years (28112); the early settlers in the county were staunch temperance people, and they congregated where no liquor was sold (28114). Considerable illicit traffic carried on with the United States, although a prohibitory law prevails in Vermont, across the boundary line (28115-17); prohibition pretty well enforced in that State (28118); great improvement observable in the State since the adoption of the prohibitory law in 1852; no doubt liquor is sold in the hotels in large towns in the State, and another effect of the law has been to drive the trade into small saloons; hotel keepers are ostracised, and the laws have a tendency to throw the traffic into the hands of people of a low class (28122-27); illicit sale in Knowlton (28128-30). Advocates general prohibition law; such law could not be enforced in certain localities, but it would have an educational effect and place liquor under a ban (28132-33); very little liquor sold in Vermont; if a hotel keeper is known to sell liquor his reputation falls (28134-37); the Vermont law has been amended at several sessions of the Legislature and made more vigorous (28141). A general prohibitory law could be enforced in the county of Brome, where there is a strong prohibition sentiment (28142-45); the temperance people are not sufficiently in earnest, and so local prohibitory laws are not well enforced (28147-48). English speaking population of the Eastern Townships would vote largely for prohibition (28149-52); a general prohibitory law, if adopted, could be carried out in some counties (28153); the County Council of Brome failing to appoint an Inspector, the work of enforcement is done under the supervision of the Alliance (28154-62). In Vermont, the State and town officers prosecute, and the beneficial effects of prohibition are very noticeable there, especially in regard to its educational effect on the people (28163-65). The local option law in the district of Bedford has worked satisfactorily, and has produced good results (28172-74); its influence is, however, much less than that of a general prohibitory law (28175); if the English district could be isolated from the French parishes the condition would be equal to that prevailing in Vermont (28176); the adoption of the Scott Act is preparing the people for the enactment of general prohibition (28176). Favours the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic liquors, but would not undertake to suppress its private use; when the trade was driven to low saloons and public sentiment aroused, there would be little trouble in crushing the traffic (28177-97); most of the prosecutions in Brome county occurred at Knowlton and Sutton; at the former place the temperance people sympathized with the sellers, on the ground that they had been treated unfairly (28203-10); the great prosperity of farmers and business men in East Farnham and Durham is apparent; fewer people are losing their farms by mortgages and very few becoming drunkards—it is a quiet law-abiding county (28212-13). Scott Act in Brome has been much better enforced than the license law in the adjoining counties (28217); public feeling is perceptibly growing in favour of prohibition—would be disinclined to return to license system (28216-18); temperance people who will not trouble themselves about the local option law, would favour general prohibition (28219); strongly favours the Scott Act until the temperance people can obtain something better, it is a step towards prohibition and has an educational effect (28221); opposed to granting compensation to brewers and distillers, victims of the trade should be compensated (28225); the Society of Friends at their annual conference in New York State have pronounced in favour of general prohibition (28234-36); temperance societies in Farnham district are doing good work (28242-52).

JOHNSTON, FREDERICK W., Sault Ste. Marie, Judge of the District Court of Algoma . . . . . Page **412**

Resided at Sault Ste. Marie two years while the license law of Ontario was in force (25614-16); previously resided at Goderich, in Huron County, where the Scott Act worked very bad indeed; it was not enforced, and hotels sold liquor as previously (25618-19); two licensed vendors were appointed for the town (25620-21); boarded at the hotel while the Scott Act was in force; liquor was sold over the bar as formerly, and a certain number of fines were paid during each year (25622-23); no party was imprisoned for a third offence, and the Act was a perfect farce. Under a medical certificate one barrel of whisky was obtained on a single order (25626-31); men obtained orders for large quantities and took the liquor away as they wished (25632-33). Scott Act also adopted in Huron and Bruce; at the end of the term it was repealed by a much larger majority than that by which it was adopted (25634-35); more drunkenness under the Scott Act than under license; farmers bought it from hotel men and took it home (25636-37); the effect of such a law being openly violated was very injurious to the community (25638-9). Sault Ste. Marie is under license, but the law is not strictly carried out; great difficulty experienced in securing convictions (25644). Prohibition could not be carried out in Algoma; smuggling is going on all the time, as it is close to the frontier (25645-7); influence of church and temperance societies has proved very beneficial and has promoted temperance (25648-52). Favours a license law efficiently carried out: the number of licenses issued should be limited and the law enforced; there should also be inspection of liquors (25653). In Huron under the Scott Act bad liquors were sold; at Sault Ste. Marie under license good liquors are sold at the hotels, and the chances of adulteration are reduced (25654-5). In Huron no special difficulties existed in the way of the enforcement of the Scott Act; but the trade was openly carried on in Goderich at the hotels (25656-8); the Inspector appointed to suppress the sales would visit a seller, tell him that he had a warrant for him and the man handed over \$50.00 and the Inspector walked out (25659); the Act had no educational influence; there was more open drunkenness than before its adoption (25660); since its repeal everything has gone on well (25661-3). In the event of prohibition being enacted, brewers and distillers should be compensated (25664). Advocates high license and rigid inspection, and is opposed to prohibition (25665-6). Every licensed hotel continued to sell after the Scott Act came into force (25671-79); prohibition could not be enforced in Huron (25680); arrests in the county for different periods (25681). The license law regulates the trade to a certain extent, although it is violated (25685-92); if the church would devote its energies to having the license law carried out, that would be a good measure (25695-6). Sault Ste. Marie adopted a by-law last year prohibiting sale of liquor in shops; this was brought about by the influence of the churches, and the by-law was carried by a narrow majority (25697-9); restriction of the number of licenses led to licensees prosecuting illicit sellers (25700-704); result of local option at Sault Ste. Marie has been to drive trade into the hotel bars (25724-30). Prisoners generally put forward the plea of drunkenness to obtain reduction of sentences (25731-35).

JOHNSTON, PETER, Quebec . . . . . Page **143**

Now out of business, formerly bread and biscuit maker. License law poorly enforced in the city: much illicit sale reported, also selling on Sunday (21242-46); called attention of Chief Constable to Sunday selling (21247); enforcement of License Law less rigorous under Police Committee than under Commission (21247). Local prohibition law in force at Metis, illicit sales (21248-21258); in five places (21259); no vigorous efforts to suppress (21261, 21268-72, 22527-40). Drunkenness decreasing due to religious and tem-



JOHNSTON, PETER—*Continued.*

perance influences (21252-53). Favours local option (21254); general prohibition desirable (21255-67); capable of enforcement (21256, 21277-88, 494-506); more easily enforced than local prohibition (21257, 21275-6). Compensation should be granted brewers and distillers (21291); loss of revenue replaced by increased duties or direct taxation (21292-306).

JOLY, HON. H. G., de Lotbinière.....Page **87**

Puzzled to suggest a remedy for drunkenness; brought up in France where wine is part of daily food, so cannot look upon the use of wine as a sin; visited North-west Territory when under prohibitory law during railway construction period and observed abstinence and order (20287). No licenses granted in Lotbinière county and beneficial effects produced; liquor is brought in, sold illegally and obtained in market town, but drunkenness seldom seen in county; house of an illicit seller was destroyed at night and he was driven from the parish (20289). In country districts prohibition can be carried, but abolition of licenses and enforcement of prohibition in cities difficult to accomplish; the people should be educated in temperance; increased comforts could be secured and the higher pleasures of reading, study and friendly intercourse pointed out; use of light wines should be encouraged by a large reduction of duties, while placing restrictive duties on spirits (20290). If total prohibition was adopted in Canada, liquor interests would require to be compensated (20291); the revenues derived from the traffic would also require to be replaced (20292-93); witness has not considered means of replacing it as it is impracticable to suppress the traffic completely (20295); favours regulation and restriction of trade and encourages the use of light wines (20296); little intemperance in the wine countries of Europe (20304-6).

JONCAS, L. Z., M.P., Quebec.....Page **79**

Municipal prohibitory by-laws in force in all municipalities, except one, in Gaspé County. Decreased drunkenness, not due to prohibition but to improved education (20153-55, 20159); considerable illegal sale; liquor sold in ten or twenty places in each municipality (20163-64, 20216-17); prohibitory municipal by-laws are in force in some municipalities of Magdalen Islands (20166-72). Municipal authorities generally inactive regarding the suppression of illegal sale, majority favouring the granting of licenses (20175-78). Public sentiment in Gaspé and Magdalen Islands not favourable to prohibition (20179); prohibition might be advisable if capable of enforcement (20180-81); doubt capability of enforcement because public sentiment against it (20181); better results would follow imposition of heavy duties on spirits and permitting light wines to enter free (20181-2). Little smuggling in Gaspé county; smuggling vessels from French Islands pass further up the Gulf (20183-86). Diminished drinking among fishermen, due to religious influences and better education (20189-94); the clergy support prohibitory measures (20195 96, 20206-8); prohibitory laws not been of much avail—not stopped liquor sale (20216); beneficial effects not observable (20217).

JONES, WILLIAM EVANS, Richmond, P.Q., Journalist.....Page **496**

Is editor of the Richmond *Guardian*, and is a Stipendiary Justice of the Peace of the Province of Quebec (26847-50). The county of Richmond is under the Scott Act; originally it was under the Dunkin Act; the Dunkin Act was amalgamated with the Scott Act and a repealing vote took place in 1888 when the Scott Act was adopted (26851-56); the county has been under a prohibition Act since 1877 without interruption, the Dunkin Act adopted in April, 1877; three years later a vote was taken on its proposed repeal, but the movement was defeated; the opposition came solely from the town of Richmond;

JONES, WILLIAM EVANS—*Continued.*

subsequently the opponents of prohibition applied to the Local Legislature and obtained an Act incorporating Richmond as a town (26862); the Act took effect on July 1st, 1882; the Act authorized the Town Council to pass a by-law for the issue of certificates to eight persons; the temperance party raised the question of the power of the Council and of the Collector of Inland Revenue to issue licenses (26873); the provincial authorities issued licenses on the ground that a special act of incorporation annulled the Dunkin Act; the question was then taken before the courts (26864); the provision in the town Act was declared to be *ultra vires*, subsequently the town again issued certificates and applied to the Legislature for a bill to remove doubts as to their powers, which bill was passed; the courts again declared the town Act to be *ultra vires*, and the Dunkin Act then became permanently established (26865); in 1884 the council decided to grant certificates to applicants for licenses, on payment of the fees, but without any guarantee; applicants took the certificates and tendered their money to the Collector of Inland Revenue, who refused to accept it; they got out a writ of mandamus, but the proceedings did not go further (26866-7); the bars were then closed, but illicit sale commenced; a county prosecutor was appointed and prosecutions instituted, the effect being to shut up the whole business (27868-70); a continuous struggle went on from 1882 to 1888, when a repeal vote was taken and the Act sustained by a large majority (26873-5); the prosecutions had been completely successful; there is no sale of liquor in Richmond to-day (26876-85). Submits statistics of crime in the county for several years both before and after the adoption of the Dunkin Act, showing that crime had largely decreased of recent years (26889-99); no breaches of the Scott Act occur in the French part of the county, for they would not be allowed by the priests (26900); increased temperance among railway men and residents (26902-5); the Act is as easily enforced as the laws against larceny; there are more thieves than drunkards in Richmond county (26906-9). Changed conditions as regards temperance are not brought about until the machinery of the law is applied and until the women enter upon temperance work; the churches do not seem to make much impression; they would not be able to suppress the grog shops unless backed by law (26910-12); the prohibitory law is a complete success, and with the same chances it could be made a success anywhere; public sentiment is strongly in its favour, the only opposition being in Richmond town (26913-14); people in the rural districts no longer consume liquor; some few may obtain it outside the county (26915-21). Many thousands of persons would support total prohibition who are opposed to local option laws (26923); this was due to the fact that liquor could be obtained from neighbouring places (26924); enforcement of prohibition in other places was practicable because in Richmond there were more obstructive elements and more obstruction than ordinarily exist; up to 1888 the act was indifferently enforced owing to the Grand Trunk opening their bars; subsequently the Government decided that in a Scott Act county the railway could not sell liquor (26931-2); as much moral support was given to the suppression of drinking as to prevention of theft (26935-37). There was no reason why a general prohibitory law should be more difficult of enforcement than any other law (26939); notwithstanding the adverse vote in Richmond town, the law had been thoroughly enforced; this was due to the action of private individuals, the authorities having been against the temperance party (26945-8); if bar rooms were open in a town which had adopted the Act by a large majority, it was due to lack of organization among temperance people (26949). The Scott Act should be amended by abolishing the druggists license clause; higher penalties also should be imposed; cases occurred where doctors sent standing orders to druggists for liquor supplies (26952-57); the Provincial Government defeated a liquor prosecution by cancelling the commissions of the magistrates; this was in Drummondville where the liquor

JONES, WILLIAM EVANS—*Concluded.*

influence is strong (26958-61) ; the Act was not enforced there (26962) ; the election of members of parliament and municipal councillors opposed to prohibition was due to the fact that the liquor men ran the election ; the representative of Richmond in the Provincial Legislature was not a prohibitionist, but a man of abstemious habits ; prohibition men could elect their candidates, but there had been no necessity (26965-74).

JOSEPH, M., Quebec, wholesale grocer and liquor dealer . . . . . Page **127**

Customers practically confined to Province ; sales of spirits very much decreased (20929-32) ; due to enormous quantity smuggled (20933-37) ; purchasers of smuggled liquor generally licensed dealers (20938-48) ; injurious character of contraband liquor (20949-62). Changed character of sales in prohibitory districts in Province, because dealers abandon business and strangers take their places ; although the trade is less, the consumption must not necessarily be less ; illicit dealers keep small stocks (20953-59). Evidence regarding sales of smuggled liquors (20960-63) ; difficulty connected with seizure of contraband liquor (20964-67) ; smuggling was encouraged by the last increase of duties, but was previously very large (20971-72). Sales in Chicoutimi under the Scott Act (20974-78).

KER, REV. JOHN, D.D., Montreal . . . . . Page **763**

Is rector of Grace Church, Point St. Charles ; not much intemperance at the Point ; temperance society in connection with his church, somewhat on lines of Church of England temperance society, but without the double pledge (030483-93). Labour organizations had been no good in the matter of the use of intoxicants ; could only speak from what he had seen of the lives of the members (030494-95). Resided in Point St. Charles for more than 20 years ; there is less intemperance among the population now than formerly (030498-500) ; would be ready to vote for prohibition to-morrow on the ground that it would be beneficial, especially to those who are intemperate (030503-04) ; it would largely put temptation out of the reach of excessive drinkers (030504) ; prohibition would be difficult to enforce (030505-06) ; had seen the operation of the Maine law in that State and its results were in its favour (030507-12). His visit was made during the summer months and was to Portland and Cushing's Island (030513-18) ; fermented wine must be used by the clergy of the Church of England in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (030520-21) ; witness refers to evidence given by William Darlington before this Commission and makes explanations in regard to it (030522-29) : applications for licenses at Point St. Charles have been opposed, but unsuccessfully (030530-35) ; the Sunday closing laws were observed at the Point (030536-38) ; a local society endeavours to enforce them (030546) ; has had considerable experience among railway employees ; intemperance causes much injury to them and interferes largely with their success (030547-50) ; had resided in Brome county under local prohibition ; his experience was not favourable to local option, illicit selling was very common and disgracefully open (030552-53) ; very little difference between that and a licensed community (030554) ; the drink habit and drink traffic largely responsible for neglect of children and neglect of religion (030557-61) ; favours adoption of measures to prevent liquor coming into cities or districts where drunkards reside (030562-65) ; at Point St. Charles ale does more mischief than whisky (030566-69).

KIRKPATRICK, R. C., M.D., Montreal, Medical Superintendent of the Montreal General Hospital . . . . . Page **660**

Has had to deal with the compilation of the annual statistics of the hospital for three years (29459). One of the rules is that no person suffering from intemperance is admitted ; consequently, comparatively few cases of alcoholism are in

KIRKPATRICK, R. C., M.D.—*Continued.*

the hospital; a number of cases are superinduced by intemperance, and accidents may directly result from it (29460). There are no statistics available showing the number of cases arising out of intemperance—the simple statement can be made that there are a large number (29461-63). Explains the rules of the hospital regarding the distribution of stimulants among patients (29464-70). Not much change has occurred in Montreal as regards intemperance; too many places selling liquor and the number should be curtailed (29471-73). Is a total abstainer (29474). The license law is not enforced, especially as regards Sunday selling (29475). Favours the total prohibition of the liquor traffic (29476); the health of the community would be improved (29478); such a law, however, could not be enforced, and although prohibition is desirable it is impracticable (29479-80): such a law could not be enforced and it would not be enforced, because the people who want liquor would obtain it—sales would be winked at to a certain extent (29481-82); his opinion was based on what he had seen elsewhere; in Portland, under prohibition, he had seen a great many drunken men, and ship captains told him that the men got all the liquor they wanted (29483). It was very doubtful if a prohibitory law would benefit Montreal so much as a law regulating the drink traffic (29486); moderate indulgence in liquor is not a vice, it is only excessive indulgence that is wrong; that is his opinion as a total abstainer (29487). Prohibition is desirable if practicable, because there are so many people who indulge to excess; such a law would benefit the State if it were practicable (29488-89). License law does not regulate the trade and is to a great extent a failure—practically any one can get a license (29490-91); the Commissioners should have the power to regulate the number of licenses granted (29492-93). The license law to a certain extent regulates the trade, as it has a restraining influence, especially on Sunday sale (29494-96). If fewer places sold liquor the quality would no doubt be improved; this would not mean a monopoly, but a limitation of the number, with the licenses granted to men of the best character (29497-503). A reduction in the number of licenses would not necessarily involve an increase in the number of illicit places; if the law was properly administered those places also could be reduced in number (29503-7). A considerable number of the cases of accident and illness received at the hospital are attributable directly or indirectly to intemperance, but cannot give a percentage (29514-16). Abstainers have a greater chance of recovery from sickness than persons who use liquor to any considerable degree (29517-18). Use of spirituous liquors as medicines less prescribed in the hospital than formerly (29519-24). What may be considered moderate or immoderate use of liquor will depend on circumstances, constitution, state of health, &c., and some persons should never touch liquor (29525-29). No doubt some men sicken unless they have some stimulants; but probably the average length of life would be considerably longer if everybody was a total abstainer (29530-36).

LACOSTE, SIR ALEXANDER, Montreal, Chief Justice of Queen's Bench. Page **273**

Total prohibition is Utopian idea; it cannot be carried out; very heavy duties should be imposed on strong liquor, and light wines and beers admitted duty free, or very nearly so (23316-23290); has been a total abstainer for two or three years, and before that used little alcoholic liquors (23291). By increasing the price of strong liquors the labouring class would be led to take light wines or beer; has visited France on several occasions but never noticed any drunkenness there; there has been a large reduction in the production of wine, and it is alleged that more brandy and absinthe are consumed in France than elsewhere (23297). The drink traffic should be licensed, but the number of licenses issued in Montreal is excessive and should be reduced; fewer saloons are required and perhaps more restaurants or eating houses (23299); under the law there should be no saloons, meals should be supplied in all licensed

LACOSTE, SIR ALEXANDER—*Continued.*

houses, but the law is not enforced (23302); the effect on the morals of the community of having a law upon the Statute-book which is persistently and openly violated is bad (23303); considerable proportion of offences before the courts are attributable to drink (23309); the effect of having fewer drinking places would be that the authorities could control them more easily; also there would be less temptation to men disposed to drink (23312); strong alcoholic liquors might be sold in hotels only (23320); but the license and duty should be placed so high as to place them out of the reach of poor people (23321); this would be protecting them against themselves and would be justifiable (23322-3). The liquor traffic is special one and the use of liquor has a special effect, and so the trade cannot be compared with any other (23324); the liquor traffic is a loss to those who abuse drink (23326). Favours restricting the trade in strong alcoholic liquors by heavy duties and high licenses, without prohibiting them totally (23327); at the same time it would be desirable to encourage the use of light wines and beers (23329). Strongly favours the enactment of a rigid inspection law to prevent adulteration (23332); you cannot, by total prohibition, prevent a nation from using liquor; its use might be against the law but at the same time not against a man's conscience; attempts to prevent prostitution have been made and have failed; it would be more difficult to prevent the use of liquor (23333). The people require amusement and there was no objection to places like Sohmer Park selling light beer; places of amusement for the working classes such as parks are in the interest of temperance (23338-9). Had visited Maine but had no experience in the liquor law; had been told to go to a certain room if he wanted drink, but never saw any abuse (23340).

LAMBE, WILLIAM B., Collector of Provincial Revenue for the City and District of Montreal . . . . . Page **277**

Explains the extent of the district under his charge, the nature of his duties and the mode of issuing licenses (23342-48). The License Commissioners issue the certificates to the applicant, and witness issues the licenses; in addition to the license fee the licensee pays \$8 to the city, and enters into bonds with the Provincial Government (23347-51). The provincial police are under the direction of witness; the force numbers six men in Montreal district (23353-6); a certain number of the city police are also detailed to look after vendors of liquor (23357). License law is very difficult to enforce; the sufficiency of the force may be questionable, but witness does not depend so much on the force as on informers (23358-9); occasionally assistance is given by licensed dealers in suppressing illicit sale (23360); the clergy, municipal officers and families are interested in protecting themselves, and temperance people give information—the majority of the people are interested in preventing illicit sale and intemperance (23361); only a small proportion of illicit sellers are detected, about 1,000 in a year (23364). Total number of licenses in Montreal district for 1891-2 was 1,233 and three club licenses; the number has remained the same during the last three or four years (23366-68); prosecutions included sale out of hours and on Sunday, many of the cases being against certain hotels (23379-83); does not prosecute many cases in the west end of Montreal because he cannot get convictions (23384); licenses for groceries are taken out and they are run as drinking shops; is unable to prove the sale (23385); can get reliable evidence in the east end, occupied by French Canadian people who are Roman Catholics; English speaking people in the west end are inclined to testify in favour of the party prosecuted (23386, 23608-20); has been successful in nine-tenths of cases prosecuted (23387). Shebeens and beaneries number probably 2,000 or even 4,000 in Montreal, many of these shops being used for purposes of prostitution and illegal selling—this is an under estimate of the number of unlicensed places (23388-92); more cases are not prosecuted because proof cannot be made; the people are wary and avoid exposing them-

LAMBE, WILLIAM B.—*Continued.*

selves to persecution (23393); a larger force of police would not secure more convictions; the only chance of securing proof is by private detectives and informers (23394-5). Smuggling is carried on along the boundary line from St. Regis to St. Croix River; houses are built on the line through which to pass liquor from one side to the other; large seizures were made at Napierville; there is also a great deal of smuggling on the St. Lawrence (23398). Favours a general prohibitory law; it could be enforced as well as the present liquor law; its enforcement would be very difficult but enforcement of the present law is also very difficult (23399-402); a prohibitory law would be no more difficult to enforce than the licence law (23403); smuggling would increase, also illicit manufacture, but the law would be no more difficult to carry out, as it would be a straight law, whereas the present license law is a very uncertain law (23404-6); prohibition would be productive of great benefits to the State and the individual (23407-8). Smuggling on the frontier (23409-17); smuggling from St. Pierre and Miquelon (23416); a prohibitory law desirable, although apparently an impracticable theory, because it tends towards a good result (23420); a statute that cannot be enforced is undesirable, but, is an expression of public opinion (23421); would also adopt moral suasion, religious teaching, work in temperance societies and in the schools (23422); a prohibitory law would be helpful, and when the people were more educated it could be maintained (23424); it would be enforced by similar machinery to that in use for the present license law (23425-6); smuggling would certainly be increased and the boundary between Canada and United States would require to be constantly watched (23428-9); a large force of officers would be required, and the administration should be carried out by the Dominion authorities aided by the Provincial Government (23430-33, 23526-29); public sentiment would be needed to enforce the law, and without it enforcement would be very difficult (23434-5); the beneficial results would be adequate to the expense incurred, they being in the direction of reduced cost in maintenance of jails and asylums (23436-7). Excessive use of alcohol led to loss of time, waste of money, crime, sickness, partial insanity and sometimes total insanity (23438); inebriates should be sent to a special asylum (23440-41). Restaurants are compelled by law to furnish meals, but it is evaded by having a crust on the counter (23442-3); hotels should not be allowed to have bars (23444-4); *bona fide* restaurants are necessary, but simple saloons should be suppressed (23445-52). Complaints of violations of the law are made by the the Provincial Police as well as by private individuals; but although the force works night and day, it can only do a certain amount (23453-6); if cases are doubtful or there may be a question of spite between the parties, witness requires a deposit to cover costs (23457-8); penalties are enforced unless remitted by the Government, which is done frequently, no reasons being given; many cases are also suspended by the courts at the instance of the Government—sometimes this action is due to political influence (23459-72). The license law is not a success and is very difficult to enforce; to a certain extent it regulates the trade, which is far better regulated than not regulated (23473-6); the number of licenses might be diminished by largely increasing the license fee, and by Commissioners refusing to renew licenses where convictions may be obtained (23477-79); high licenses would result in a better class of licensees; there is more control over the sellers when the trade is licensed (23480-81); under the license a certain character attaches to a licensed house; this increases the facility for obtaining liquor and leads to more drinking (23482); the issuing of beer and wine licenses might be advantageous (23483). Education in the direction of prohibition is desirable, and the adoption of a prohibitory law would assist that educational work (23486-7); about one-fourth of the licensees violate the law, and enforcement of prohibition would be no more difficult than that of

LAMBE, WILLIAM B.—*Concluded.*

present license law (23489-90); license law in Montreal is very imperfectly enforced, because its enforcement is impossible (23491-2); a prohibitory law would be no better enforced because offences could not be detected (23493-4); prohibitory law would be only partially enforced (23495); in Montreal there are 935 licenses, and from 2,000 to 4,000 shebeens where liquor is sold illicitly, (23497-500); license law as well enforced as witness can enforce it; considered by some to be too strict and by others too easy (23501-4); reason for violation of license law is that drinking becomes a disease, dysomania; the habit is disadvantageous and immoral; the abuse of liquor is immoral, but not sinful (23505-7); advantages of high license fees would be limitation of licenses, improved class of licensees, increased cost of liquor and diminished profits, and dram shops would be driven out of the business (23508-12); favours higher license fees and rigid inspection of liquors, failing prohibition (23513-19). Submits statistics respecting provincial revenue from licenses (23520-21); loss of revenue would be partially recouped by reduced cost of administration of justice and maintenance of asylums (23522-25); favours abolition of groceries as places for liquor selling (23535); method of selling in shebeens (23536-40); license fees in Montreal regulated by the rental of premises (23542-23); fraudulent leases are common (23544-45). An increased force would not assist enforcement to any considerable degree, for the officers become known; increasing disposition to secure enforcement by municipal authorities and clergy, due to a growing feeling against the trade (23546-9); license law fairly well enforced in country places, much better than in Montreal; illicit selling prevails and selling on Sunday (23552-56); in some cases of conviction fines have been remitted by Provincial Government (23557-68, 23590-91, 23606-7); out of 65 municipalities in Montreal district 19 do not issue licenses—it is equal to a prohibitory law (23573-4); this action favours temperance, but the French-Canadian population are not addicted to drunkenness and are more temperate than people in any country in the world (23573-6). Submitted to the Provincial Government proposed amendments to the liquor law, but no attention had been paid to them (23581-3); complaint had been made by the Government in regard to the number of unlicensed shebeens and he had been asked to suppress them; he had replied that it was impossible, and he placed the number at 4,000 (23584-89); in view of the present public opinion prohibition could not be enforced any better than license, but it might give a better chance of enforcement (23592-3). Government had asked witness if he desired additional officers, and he had replied that he could do as much work with six men as with fifty; his district is fifty miles by thirty (23592-5); the law is as well enforced as witness can enforce it (23597); judgment is suspended by the magistrates sometimes to avoid cancellation of licenses (23600-02); they desire that they should not possess discretion (23601-4); discretionary powers to remit fines should be exercised in some cases, but not in many (23605).

LAVALLEE, JOS. T., Quebec.....Page **150**

Thirty years in hotel business (21361); Association of liquor dealers secures the punishment of violators of the liquor law (21364); drunkenness diminishing (21365-68); smuggled liquor is inferior (21371); had visited parishes where local option laws were in force (21377); and people would carry whisky with them (21378).

LAWSON, REV. JAMES, Compton, P.Q.....Page **590.**

Is Minister of the Methodist Church of Canada, and has lived under license law, Scott Act, Dunkin Act and municipal prohibitory law; resided at Mallorytown, Leeds County, in 1875-76-77 when the Dunkin Act was in force; an attempt was made to repeal it, but it was sustained by a large majority; business improved from the time the Act went into force (28470-76); the Act was

LAWSON, REV. JAMES—*Continued.*

repealed in 1889 (28477). Lived from 1878 to 1881 in the township of Roxburgh, Stormont county ; the Dunkin Act was in force there ; an attempt was made to repeal it, but it was sustained with an increased majority ; after witness left, the Act was superseded by the Scott Act, which was repealed in 1888 (28477-82). Resided in Delta, Leeds county, from 1883 to 1884 ; it was under license law, which was largely ignored ; an agitation was commenced in favour of the adoption of the Scott Act, but it was not carried when witness left ; resided in Cobden, in Renfrew county, during the three subsequent years ; commenced an agitation in favour of the adoption of the Scott Act and it was carried the following year ; before its adoption the place was cursed with drinking, the nights were hideous with drunken brawlers, it was dangerous to go out at night (28483-87). Marked improvement followed the adoption of the Scott Act : the Act, however, was not enforced (28488-92). In 1888 the Act was repealed by a larger majority than had previously adopted it ; witness could not explain the reason for the change in public opinion, as he left the year before the repeal (28493-94) ; the people lost faith in the Act and would not enforce it (28497) ; other counties repealed the Act and the people of Renfrew became discouraged, especially as the informing business was very distasteful (28498). The temperance people were willing to adopt the Act, but they thought the framers of the Act should put it into operation (28599) ; this work devolved upon private citizens principally ; a license inspector was appointed but he was unsatisfactory to the temperance people (28500) ; the opponents of the Act worked much harder than the temperance people (28501-04). Next resided in Danville, Richmond county, for three years ; it was under the Dunkin Act ; a repeal vote was taken, but the Act was sustained in 1888 (28505-06) ; very little drunkenness or drinking (28507). Visited Richmond, which seemed to be a centre for the liquor traffic in the county (28509-11). Now resides at Compton, which is under local option ; it is a very quiet place and the effects of drinking are little seen ; a license was issued at Capelton under the Quebec Mining Act, but it was afterwards rescinded (28512-22). The Scott Act in Ontario worked favourably, such laws are educators and are desirable on that ground ; the Scott Act could be enforced, and when not enforced it was due generally to apathy on the part of the people (28525-32) ; the explanation of its repeal was partially a belief entertained that the Act would give total prohibition, whereas wines and liquors could be brought in from adjoining districts—it did not have the effect that total or provincial prohibition would exercise (28533-37). Even after the repeal of the Scott Act throughout Ontario the Government would be justified in enacting general prohibition (28538) ; the people had demanded prohibition by voting for the Scott Act, and they are as strongly in favour of prohibition as ever (28539-47). As a prohibitive measure the Scott Act might be looked upon as a failure, but the overwhelming majority by which it was adopted proved that the people were in favour of prohibition (28563-69). Scott Act worked well in Renfrew, although it was subsequently repealed, temperance people became discouraged and witness was personally assaulted because he took part in temperance work (28571-77) ; people were paid to vote against the Act (28578-79) ; many temperance people who do not favour a local law will support a Dominion prohibitory Act and endeavour to enforce it (28597) ; the ill-treatment he received was at Cobden in Renfrew county, where he was assaulted by a liquor seller (28601-07). License laws are a failure so far as restricting the traffic are concerned (28609) ; they failed to lessen the sale, and it is questionable whether free rum would not work equally advantageously (28610-12) ; but under free trade there would probably be a larger sale (28616-18). Has been Grand Chief Templar for the Province of Quebec for three years ; the organization favours general prohibition (28626-31). If prohibition were submitted to the people it would be adopted ; it would be carried in every province except—probably Quebec ; witness is not sure whether it is desirable to take a plebiscite at present (28635-36).



LEET, S. P., Montreal, Advocate . . . . . Page **602**

Has been engaged in cases in which an attempt has been made to put in operation the prohibitory section of the license law ; this section permits the majority of the electors of the polling district to object to liquor licenses being granted there ; the Commissioners have so interpreted the law as to make it difficult to successfully oppose applications ; very strict proof of signatures to petitions in opposition is demanded—every man must be sworn to by some person who knows the party ; the party must be a resident voter to be able to sign a petition in opposition ; witness considers the Commissioners have been unnecessarily strict in regard to proof (28637-43) ; the remedy would be to give notice that opposition would be offered to certain names entered either on the application or on the opposing petition (28644-51) ; for the first license the majority of voters in the district should be required to assent to the application ; although a strong prohibitionist, he would place the onus on the opponents after the license had once gone into force, and if the majority of voters opposed an application, that decision should stand until it was reversed (28653-56). Liquor licenses should be removed from groceries, and all licensed places should be abolished ; alcohol should be sold simply as a medicine (28659-62). Favours prohibition, but admits that an improvement would follow a reduction in the number of licenses (28663-64) ; opposed to any increase of the license fees, because if no revenue were obtained from the business, the traffic would soon be abolished, and the Government and municipalities should not receive any revenue from it beyond the ordinary business tax (28665-66*a*). The granting of licenses to sell alcohol for beverage purposes is wrong *per se* (28667-68). Some religious bodies deny church membership to persons engaged in the traffic ; knows only one man engaged in the traffic who is a church member, he is a grocer, not a saloon keeper and is a member of the Episcopal church—no doubt there are some in the Roman Catholic (28669-75). Municipalities when they receive practically no revenue from the trade often refuse to grant licenses ; they are disposed to suppress the trade because of the expenses indirectly caused by it (28676-79). If the revenue were withdrawn the Dominion Government would be simply interested in the traffic as regards the general good of the country ; at present they are interested in enforcing the excise and customs law ; they are presumed to be actuated by a desire to promote the public good, and they have now the additional incentive of protecting the revenue (29680-84). The best measure would be to abolish the license system ; it could be improved by restricting the hours and days of selling and limiting the number of persons engaged in the trade, prohibiting women attending behind bars or in restaurants, making the law more rigid in regard to the sale to minors, placing the onus of proof on the party who sold the liquor not on the party who prosecuted, permitting police officers to detain minors and obtain the name and address of the person from whom he obtained liquor, and by improving the methods of securing evidence (28684-85). Until prohibition can be obtained, favours any measures that would diminish the number of licenses and reduce the drinking (28687). Would remove the income derived by Government and municipalities from the license system ; so would have free sale of liquor under regulation (28687-92). Liquor and similar articles should be very heavily taxed under the customs law ; if this was a legitimate industry there was no reason why manufacturers of liquor should pay excise duties (28694-85). When the Government observed the revenue was being affected they would place such restrictions on the trade that the sale would be materially reduced (28697-98). At Danville expenditures were necessary for town constable ; but since the Dunkin Act came into force there have been no arrests for drunkenness and no town constable is appointed (28699). Efforts have been made to have a limit placed as to the number of licenses granted in Montreal, but the Quebec Government would not agree to this as it wants the largest amount of taxes obtainable

LEET, S. P.—*Continued.*

(28701). The hours of sale should be very much reduced and licensed houses should be closed until after the hours at which working men go to work in the morning, they should also close earlier at night (28703-04). Does not favour the establishment of saloons as a means of forcing adoption of prohibition by the people (28713-14).

LEMOINE, JAMES M., Quebec, Inspector of Inland Revenue for Quebec District, Page **82**

Been Inspector 24 years, previously Collector of Inland Revenue for Quebec District ; staff of 14 officers ; excise warehouses at different points including Magdalen Islands (20226) ; illicit stills are few and unimportant ; great trouble arises from smuggling from St. Pierre and Magdalen (20227, 20224) ; ten or fifteen illicit stills seized during the last three years (20229-36). Statistics of whisky importations and duty payments (20242-43) ; consumption of spirits decreased, plainly due to influence of clergy and temperance societies (20245) ; consumption of beer probably reduced—only two breweries in Quebec as compared with four formerly (20247-50). License law in the city pretty efficiently enforced ; politics a large quantity in its administration (20236-58) ; increased license fees materially checked number of licensed places (20260-61) ; only two licensed houses from Quebec to Cap Chatte ; prohibition in the counties, but not enforced and spirits constantly sold in all the parishes (20261, 20270-73) ; licenses frequently refused from respect to the priests although against the opinion of the municipal council (20262) ; complaints regarding the working of the law ; sales of spirits in temperance hotels (20262) ; Prohibition not successful in Maine or Quebec municipalities or parishes (20263, 20281) ; sales in Bangor (20281-82) ; a general prohibitory law could not be enforced, for local prohibition failed and people are not favourable to proposed law (20264-67, 20280) ; impracticable until Canada acquires St. Pierre and Miquelon (20264). Enormous smuggling operations on the St. Lawrence (20268-69). Remedial measures should include very high license, which reduces number of licenses ; increased safeguards in regard to procuring licenses to ensure good order and observance of law, and efficient revenue police (20279).

MEAGHER, JOHN, Montreal, Wine Merchant and Compounder . . . . . Page **388**

Is a member of the firm of Meagher Bros., wholesale wine merchants (25230) ; the firm has been compelled to take out a compounder's license from the Federal Government during the last few years (25231). No limitation is made as to the ingredients to be used in compounding liquor (25232-4) ; manufactures ginger wine, fruit syrups, gin and other preparations ; sells only to the wholesale trade and jobbers, not to saloons or stores ; do not use poisonous drugs, and believe that reports of adulteration are very much exaggerated (25235) ; fruit essences are used for flavouring purposes (25236) ; manufactures Tom gin as in England (25237) ; bead oil is not used (25238-40). The object of compounding is to supply a demand for a cheaper article (25242-5) ; adulteration would be completely foreign to the business of a licensed compounder, and would be contrary to the law ; has no experience as to what is done by retailers, but there is not so much adulteration as the public imagine (25246-48) ; the people of Canada compare favourably with any nation as regards temperance, and highly respectable men are engaged in the wholesale trade (25249-51) ; increased sobriety in Montreal during recent years ; business in many branches of the liquor trade has decreased (25252) ; not practicable to change the tastes of the people as regards liquor (25253-6) ; had visited Sohmer Park and did not see any drunkenness (25257). Public interests would be served by samples of liquor being frequently collected and analysed (25258-9) ; sale of liquor in groceries ; respectable firms do not violate the law (25264-66). Cheap liquors imported from France, especially brandy, which is made from potato spirit (25268-74).

MEAGHER, JOHN—*Continued.*

Only about one-fourth of the firm's business is that of compounding liquors ; are also agents for large houses in Europe (25275). Consumption of liquor is steadily decreasing, and trade has been getting worse ; no enlargement during the last ten years (25278-9) ; compounded liquors are sold as such and the fact is stated on the label (25284-5) ; compounded liquors are equal in quantity to those imported (25287) ; the drink trade and the abuse of liquor (25289-96). The license system largely regulates the trade, but it might be carried out more effectively (25303). The Scott Act was put in force in Ontario as the result of public opinion ; but public opinion has changed (25304). The license law is not a perfect regulation, but it regulates the trade in some degree (25307-8) ; restrictions are necessary because people abuse liquor ; there are however, worse evils that are not restricted (25309-10). Difficulties surrounding the inspection of liquor in unlicensed places ; these are not suppressed because the parties are difficult to catch violating the law (25312-13) ; more inspection is necessary (25316). Had observed in Worcester, Mass., which was under local option, that liquor was sold there (25319-21).

MOORE, WILLIAM W., Montreal, Proprietor and Manager of the Lyceum Theatre.....Page **531**

Have resided in Montreal about 12 years. The Lyceum Theatre is a variety theatre (27483) ; the theatre has a beer and wine license (27484--87) ; it is in the centre of licensed places, being surrounded by at least ten restaurants and hotels, including the all night restaurants (27487-89) ; his patrons largely take wine and are mostly English people, although the theatre is in the French section (27490-98) ; the theatre is divided into six sections, liquor being served in two (27500). Witness was led to apply for a liquor license on account of trouble arising from granting pass checks and from men returning drunk (27501-02) ; favours the use of light wines and beer ; the effects of Sohmer Park and even the selling of wine and beer in the Lyceum Theatre has been to reduce the consumption of spirits (27516) ; Sunday sale prevalent ; liquor is sold in almost every saloon in the city (27518-21). The present license system works well, and witness found no difficulty in obtaining the necessary signatures for his application (27522-27) ; sale of liquor in groceries should be suppressed ; the corner grocery is the curse of Montreal (27530-31) ; restaurants generally are simply saloons, at least 25 restaurants in the city run all night ; favours a straight saloon (27534-36) ; the law as regards providing meals at restaurants is evaded, and they are practically saloons (27540-42 ; if liquor sale were prohibited in billiard rooms these rooms would have to close ; the public interest would be served by closing many of them, especially those frequented by boys (27543-45) ; had experience of high license and prohibition and neither could be carried out ; the result in both cases was an increase in the number of shebeens (27547-50). Special attention should be given to the character of the licensee, and the sale of adulterated liquor, which was common, should be suppressed (27551-52) ; a thorough inspection desirable (27555). Illicit sale had diminished in Montreal, especially in east end ; the statement of Mr. Lambe as to the number of illicit places is absurd ; the reduction in the number is largely due to the opening of Sohmer Park (27556-59) ; inebriate asylums should be established, especially for persistent drunkards who are married (27560-63). Opposed to prohibition as an interference with personal liberty (27564) ; if prohibition enacted, witness would leave the country (27566) ; travelled all over the world except Australasia ; experienced prohibition in Cornwall, Ontario, but got all the whisky he wanted, as it was sold openly at bars ; the Scott Act was in force, but the bars were running full blast, selling terrible stuff out of wooden pails (27567-71) ; had been up the Baltic ; in the Cattetgat, mostly brandy is drunk, even children are allowed to drink it (27576). Action of the Montreal Law and Order

MOORE, WILLIAM W.—*Continued.*

League as regards sale to minors (27577-87); every theatre should have a license for the sale of beer and wine; this would stop the drinking of such large quantities of hard liquor and thereby drunkenness would be prevented; no drunkenness had prevailed in the Lyceum Theatre for five months (27590-92); denies the statement that fewer women attend the Lyceum Theatre since the establishment of a bar (27982-83); Sohmer Park is closing up the corner groceries and the shebeens (27984-85); it is advantageous to a theatre to have a liquor license as it prevents the male portion of the audience leaving between acts, saves the trouble of pass checks and causes less disorder (27991); variety theatres in England and the United States have bars (27992-95); theatres should be provided with bars (28007-09); the permission of the sale of light liquors at Sohmer Park and at the variety theatres tends to reduce consumption of spirits and prevent other evils (28011-13).

MORIN, LOUIS, President of Chamber of Commerce, Montreal. . . . . Page **293**

Represents Messrs. Wisser, Distillers of Prescott, and has acted for 21 years as their agent in Montreal. The firm manufacture principally alcohol and rye whisky, (23620-37). Trade in liquor has increased generally during the last few years but since 1890, when extensive smuggling operations have been going on, business has decreased (23638-40); this decrease due to smuggling and increased duty (23641-45); intemperance in Montreal somewhat decreased (23646-7); licenses are too high and this leads to illicit sale (23649). The general opinion of members of the Chamber of Commerce is against prohibition (23652-2); such a law might check intemperance, but liquor would still be sold (23654-5 23903-09); present number of licenses excessive and should be reduced (23656). Illicit manufacture in the province (23657-9); witness explains the method of mixing liquors, so as to produce brandy, gin, etc., and advocates an analysis of imported cheap spirits (23660); explains the process of manufacturing so called brandy from potato alcohol and the residuum of beetroot sugar (23661-8); describes the manufacture of alcohol of different kinds and strength, and explains the process of separating the fusil-oil from the whisky (23668-89). Extensive smuggling from St. Pierre and Miquelon of whisky manufactured in Illinois, which is shipped within a short date of its manufacture to the French Islands and brought up the St. Lawrence to points in Quebec (23690-701 23910-13); the smuggling of this newly made whisky is gross injustice to Canadian distillers (23701). Inspection system inadequate; importation of adulterated liquors should be stopped and the sale of liquors under names which they have no right to bear (23702-11). While the consumption of whisky has decreased, beer and porter have been more largely used (23715); consumption of whisky or beer depends largely upon popular taste at the time (23713-17); no doubt the wealthy might be led to use wine and beer, but the example would not be followed in the country and fishing districts (23718); United States law respecting exportation of alcohol (23719-27); bead oil and its use in liquors (23729-31). Increased duties on Canadian alcohol will be followed by increased smuggling (23732); Canadian wines and their use (23733-35). Decrease of licenses in Montreal desirable; too many low groggeries and too much temptation to drink (23740-43, 23920-40); manufacture and storage of spirits as practised in Canada (23746-72); the manufacture of liquors by compounders, (23773-93); methods of adulteration (23795-814); efficient inspection desirable (23815-32). Visited Pictou, Nova Scotia, four years ago, also Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and obtained liquor at both towns (23440-8, 23852-57); advocates parks as resorts for the working classes (23851); gives details of a tour through certain Scott Act counties where he found illicit sale going on (23863 67); tampering with liquors is more in the direction of dilution than adulteration (23868-86). As President of Chamber of Commerce had discussed prohibition question with members and he gathered that the general

MORIN, LOUIS—*Continued.*

opinion was against prohibition (23886-92); adoption of use of light wines and beers would not diminish consumption of whisky, except among the wealthy classes (23897-902); in the event of prohibition everybody would be a smuggler (23903-6); it would be impossible to prohibit the sale (23907-8). importations of French brandies and wine (23914-15); hard working people in Canada would not drink wine instead of whisky (23917); domestic liquors being less adulterated should be brought into general consumption (23918-19); Importations of Scotch whiskies prices and duties (23941-52); use of wine in France and prices (23953); cheap wine might supersede use of whisky in Canada (23954-5); saloons are unnecessary in Montreal; license fees for groceries should be increased; use of alcohol should be diminished and wine and beer used (23961-72); alcoholic stimulants largely used in cold climates, and the consumption is trifling in Turkey or Asia (23973-5).

MULROONEY, GEO., Quebec, President Ship Labourers' Society . . . . . Page **141**

Society of 2,000 members; no temperance pledge, but many members are associated with temperance societies (21203-14). Excessive number of licenses allowed, but reduction useless unless illicit places suppressed (21216-18). General prohibitory law desirable (21219-25); smuggling would continue and liquor be sought (21226-28); less drinking than formerly, due to religious and moral influences (21234-5). Scott Act would work satisfactorily for workingmen (21236); increasing duties on spirits and diminishing them on wines and beers (21237-38); some saloons could be closed with advantage to the community (21240).

MUNDERLOH, WILLIAM C., Montreal, Merchant and Shipping Agent. Page **550**

Is Consul for the German Empire at Montreal, where he has resided 35 years (27812-17); parks like the Sohmer Park exist in Brehmen, Hamburg and Nurenburg and other European cities, and light liquors are sold (27820-24); in Germany wine is drank at the table as water is in Canada; was in Germany during the celebration of victory after the French war and there was no drunkenness; drinking places close at ten at night (27825-28). Had visited Maine and Southern California; in the latter the people drank light wine, and if they could not obtain it in the town they brought it in from outside (27830-33). Employs about 200 men per day loading and discharging vessels during the season; does not enforce temperance principles, but seeks to secure temperate men (27835-41); the sailors get a certain quantity of alcohol daily; they generally prefer coffee (27742-43). Favours the use of light wines in preference to spirits; they are, however, too expensive in Canada to-day, and a reduction of duty would be a step in the right direction (27844-47). The prohibitory principle may be correct, but a prohibitory law could not be carried out—a license law must be recommended (27848-50); is not aware that the German Emperor has proposed a very drastic liquor bill on account of increased use of strong liquors (27851-53); is not aware of any steamboat line that prohibits the use of liquor, but drunkenness is not allowed (27854-57).

MURPHY, HON. EDWARD, Montreal, President of the City and District Savings Bank . . . . . Page **702**

First lay President of the St. Patrick's Temperance Society, and has been connected with it half a century (30,001). Intemperance has increased during the last 20 or 30 years, but not much change has been apparent in the last ten years (30003-04). The license law is not well enforced; the facilities offered by the regular licensed establishments, the shebeens, and corner groceries, prove a great factor in the irregularities (30006). If the law was strictly enforced a great improvement would result (30008-09). Present system of issuing licenses is fairly satisfactory (30010). The St. Patrick's Society some years ago adopted a series of resolutions respecting the liquor trade; the first was the separation

MURPHY, HON. EDWARD—*Continued.*

of the liquor trade from the grocery and all other business ; another recommendation was a reduction in the number of saloon and tavern licenses ; a third was the enactment of a rigid system of inspection, to cover analysis of liquor sold in licensed houses (30011). Formerly there was more open drunkenness, there was more drinking by drinking men, but it did not drive them to insane asylums (30012). The influence of temperance societies and moral suasion had caused drunkenness to be considered more disgraceful now than it was 30 years ago (30015). A rigid inspection of liquor was desirable (30014). The number of licenses should be regulated by the population (30015). A greater number of ratepayers should be required to sanction the opening of a saloon or tavern (30018). Does not favour the entire prohibition of the traffic (30919) ; under the existing state of things it would be impossible to put such a law into operation ; in Maine the same opportunities for drinking prevail as formerly ; entire prohibition would be evil rather than good ; if distilling of liquors had never been discovered it would have been a grand thing for the world, but the trade exists in such a way that it is now impossible to stop it (30020). Had worked for many years with the late Father Dowd of St. Patrick's Church in promoting temperance (30021-24). Agreed with the views expressed by Father McCallan and the amendments required to the law suggested by him in his published address (30025-27). If the revenue from the liquor trade was taken from the province, the amount would have to be raised by direct taxation (30031-32). The objection to prohibition was its impracticability ; the public feeling might change during the next 25 years ; but we had the example of prohibition in Maine (30035). Moral suasion was the best means to adopt, and the number of licenses should be reduced and the liquor business separated from the corner groceries (30036). Saloons are always a temptation (30039). Notwithstanding the number of people who have taken temperance pledges there has been a steady increase of drinking during the last 25 years and especially since greater facilities have been offered for drinking (30040-42) ; the saloons are a constant menace to people who desire to abstain, and drinking interferes with a man's business (30044-45). If prohibition were enforced poor people would have more money to spend on the necessaries of life (30046) ; this would prove beneficial to the country ; if we are to have licensed houses, they should be under supervision and there should be a strict analysis of all liquor sold (30047).

McKAY, JOHN M., M.D., proprietor of Belmont Retreat for Inebriates, Quebec,

Page **52**

Institution been in existence thirty years ; received grant from Provincial Government for many years but recently withdrawn ; has been personally connected with it for five years ; accommodation for about one hundred inmates ; some inmates are sent by the Provincial Government, balance are private patients ; only one inmate at date of examination paid for by the Government ; had had more than twenty-five of that class (19657-59) ; of private patients, some interdict themselves and others are interdicted by their families (19662-64) ; fifty per cent of patients leave institute permanently cured (19670-73) ; out of 300 or 400 yearly 25 return, because they did not remain sufficiently long—some are admitted several times (19674-77) ; patients are generally old, excessive drinkers (19687). Drinking habits predispose to alcoholism ; inmates generally children of drinking parents (19691-92) ; mode of treatment adopted in institution (19695-19609, 19732-19744). General prohibitory law desirable (19703-4) ; would prove very difficult of enforcement in Canada (19706-14, 19765-69). Some persons admitted having suffered from adulterated liquors (19715-18) ; patients cured are not tempted by drinking facilities (19725-26) ; if they drank moderately, would not be cured (19727-30) ; Government only sends patients who are crazed through liquor (19749-57).

McKAY, JOHN, M.D.—*Continued.*

Drunkenness increasing in province, due to increasing number of hotels and saloons (19758-60, 19770-73). Favours establishment of Government inebriate asylums (19757); also inspection of liquor (19764); law for the incarceration of habitual drunkards in Government institutions necessary (19783-89). All patients at the retreat drank spirits—no beer drinkers (19791-95); abolition of use of tobacco desirable; but would not favour a prohibitory law (19797-800); total abstinence from alcohol beneficial (19802-3).

McKEEN, C. E., Quebec, shoe manufacturer. . . . . Page **130**

Formerly resided in Truro, N.S.; is a total abstainer. Considerable trouble with workmen on the score of intemperance (20970-89); some are absent on Monday, and occasionally come to work under the influence of liquor (20990-97); absence occasions loss to the firm from decreased output, and cancellation of orders not filled within time stipulated (20998-99). License law not thoroughly enforced; curtailment of license law necessary; illicit sales (21002-10). General prohibitory law desirable (21012, 21013); could be enforced (21014, 21023), but not absolutely. Majority of citizens would be sufficient to secure enforcement. Prohibition sentiment is rapidly growing; law more difficult to enforce where public opinion is opposed to it (21016-21); opposed to compensating brewers and distillers (21026-32); revenue should be raised by means other than liquor traffic—even by direct taxation (21034); increase customs duties and enforce direct taxation to replace revenue (21035-43). Action of Dominion Government to suppress smuggling (21045-49). Expenditure necessary to enforce prohibition (21052-54, 21077-83). Scott Act in Northumberland, N.B., and means of enforcement (21055-68). Loss of time by an average drinker (21084-99). Prohibition would lead to increased duties on useful articles, and decrease the expenditure for crime and poverty (21170). Scott Act in Newcastle and Moncton, N.B. (21128-46).

McMANUS, REV. EDWARD, Montreal. . . . . Page **718**

Is a missionary of the Church of England and visits various charitable institutions in the city (30233-37). Drinking is the principal cause of bringing people into the House of Industry and other charitable institutions; of those in the house of refuge, from 60 to 75 per cent were brought there through intoxicating liquors either directly or indirectly (30239-42). Of those in the jail the large proportion are there for drunkenness or offences connected therewith (30243). Favours general prohibition; its adoption would at first lessen the revenue, but subsequently the people would be able to bear ten times the taxes (30255-57). Failing to obtain prohibition, would favour high license and a restriction of the number of licenses issued (30258). Would favour a prohibitory law such as the Maine law, by which importation for private use would be permitted (30262-64). Opposed to compensation being allowed to brewers and distillers in the event of prohibition, as those capitalists could afford to bear the loss (30265-72). It might not be right to remunerate the liquor men, but it might be expedient (30273-77). Between 90 and 95 per cent of the cases that come before the society for the protection of women and children are traceable directly or indirectly to strong drink; women in the foundling hospital largely attribute their fall to the use of liquor (30284-85). Favours a reduction in the number of drinking places (30286-91); the present system of issuing licenses is unsatisfactory, and frequently, by making applications repeatedly, the applicant obtains a license although public sentiment is against the application (30292-302).

McMILLAN, DAVID, Montreal. . . . . Page **609**

Is Secretary and Superintendent of the Protestant House of Industry and Refuge, describes the institution, management, giving income and expenditure

McMILLAN, DAVID—*Continued.*

under its heads. Of the inmates perhaps three-fourths of the males are there through bad habits—a large proportion of both sexes (28715-46); drink is the cause of most of the trouble, and the numbers would be largely decreased if drinking habits were abolished (28747-49); the inmates include sick and infirm, but are largely transients who get out of employment, especially in fall and winter (28749-62); some of the inmates are emigrants who are unable to obtain employment (28768-69); efforts are made to induce the inmates to become total abstainers and sign the pledge (28770-73).

McSHANE, HON. JAMES, Mayor of Montreal . . . . . Page **195**

Occupied positions of Mayor, member of the City Council, member of the Legislature, and Minister of Public Works and Railways in the Provincial Cabinet. Intemperance has increased in Montreal during recent years; nevertheless the people are as sober and orderly as those of any other city (21968-71); crime had decreased, probably owing to working people frequenting places of resort like Sohmer Park (21972); if a law were passed to prevent adulteration of liquor, drunkenness would be diminished (21973). It was impossible to reduce the number of licenses issued, because the Government needs the money, and because the License Commissioners find it difficult to refuse applications (21974); the Commissioners simply refuse an application if a resident majority of the people in the district oppose it (21980). The License Laws have been recently fairly well enforced, and the Commissioners have taken away licenses from violators of the law (21982-84); there is sale by places without licenses; but there are similar violations of other laws, as grocers sell meat (21985-90); there is supposed to be liquor inspection, but adulterated liquor is vended even in licensed establishments (21995-97). In Portland, Maine, he had seen more drunkenness than in Montreal (21999); Montreal has not the right to vote prohibition; the only method of influencing the issue of licenses is by a majority opposing application (22000-03). Local option would not work in Montreal; if adopted, the people would still drink (22004-5); had seen in Portland large coal oil cans filled with bad whisky (22006). Doubted whether prohibition would ever be carried in Canada, and if carried, could not predict the result; the clergy were endeavouring to suppress intemperance (21012); a prohibitory law not desirable, because it would never be carried out—never been carried out anywhere (22013-14); the temperance question in party politics (22015-18); Father McCallen's address on temperance (22044-45). The Mercier Government doubled the tax on saloon-keepers, intending to reduce the number (22045); nevertheless the number increased the following year and has increased since. The number of licensed places should, however, be reduced by law (22047); the adoption of high license would bring a more respectable class into the business (22048); it might, however, lead to the sale of cheap liquor, in order to cover the increased expenses of the establishment (22049); a rigid inspection is desirable and careful inquiry into the character of licensees (22050-53). Policemen will not become informers; witness tried to get men to act as Provincial policemen and informers and could not get one old country man to accept the position (22054). As regards prohibition, the principle could not be carried in Montreal; even if carried, such a law could not be enforced (22045-6); if a prohibitory law were enacted, an immense force would be required to enforce it, and it would be difficult to prevent people getting liquor (22057-9); it is supposed that prohibition is enforced in Maine, but they could teach philosophers how to obtain liquor (22060); the same result would follow prohibition in Canada, and liquor can be obtained anywhere in Maine (22061). Is opposed to prohibition on principle (22062); officers in Montreal have been found drunk immediately after their appointment (22063-65); each province should direct the enforcement of prohibition if enacted (22066-67); it would lead to secure taxation of the people (22070); the benefits would be worth it; but such



McSHANE, HON. JAMES—*Continued.*

results are not obtained by prohibition in any country (22072-73); in the event of prohibition compensation should be granted to brewers and distillers (22074-75); under prohibition Montreal would be less orderly than at present, because if the people were deprived of their liberty they would drink more (22077-79); it would not do any good (22079). The License Commissioners have taken away twenty licenses this year (22081-82); influences brought to bear on License Commissioners (22086-89); strong feeling in favour of Sunday closing (22090-92); petition by the majority of the electors against granting licenses—the Kearney case (22095-107); in Montreal aldermen do not desire to control the awarding of licenses (22108-10); saloons in the vicinity of churches should be closed, and possibly near schools (22118-22); the volume of the retail liquor traffic and the profit derived therefrom by the city (22125-31); reduced drinking by workingmen and beneficial results from labour organization (22139-148); also due to church influences (22148-49). Closing the drinking shops would not produce abstinence; people would drink still; and prohibition law is therefore undesirable (22153); mechanics and labourers lose time by drinking (22162-64); the prohibition movement (22165-70). Most efficacious plan of promoting temperance is to create public sentiment against the drink habit and the drink trade (22171-72). Sale of liquor in Sohmer Park (22175-78); no difference in effect between restaurant bar and hotel bar (22186-89); liquor is sold in every drug store in Maine and bad liquor is sold in Portland, leading to drunkenness; in Maine they would be better with the license system (22191-93).

NORMAN, REV. R. W., Dean of Cathedral of Holy Trinity, Quebec. . . . . Page **123**

Canon adopted by Church of England in Canada regarding wine to be used at the holy communion provides that it shall always be fermented wine (20885-87); favours the use of light wines and beer (20888); curtailment of number of licenses; appointment of inspector of liquor (20888, 21918-27); induce young people to abstain (20888, 21915). Opposed to general prohibitory law; if people wish drink they will obtain it, opposition induces deception; high license would lead to improve liquor; prohibition wherever in force has failed; sales in Portland hotels (20888); education, moral suasion and good example will produce fruit (20888); injurious effects of laws passed in advance of public sentiment (20888); education should proceed among the young, training them to be total abstainers (20888); voluntary abstinence shows a higher act of self control than taking formal pledge (20888). Decline in drinking customs in England (20888); Church of England Temperance Society, its double pledge (20893): (1) total abstinence (2) non-treating (20894); persons determined to drink, would obtain liquor (20896-99); Gothenburg system apparently feasible and desirable (20916-18); saloons generally evil, also hotel bars (20919-20).

PARKER, MOSES, Montreal, Iron Manufacturer. . . . . Page **528**

Has been engaged in the iron foundry business in Montreal for thirty-nine years (27418-23). Favours prohibition, which could eventually be carried out (27424-30); compensation should not be granted to brewers and distillers (27431-32); prefers to employ total abstainers, and by selecting his men they work about full time (27434-44); drunkenness among them has decreased; due to men desiring to improve their condition and the condition of their family (27445-46). The traffic should be under more stringent regulation—no groceries should be allowed to sell, the liquor sellers should be more respectable men, high license fee should be charged, liquor should be rigidly inspected (27448-54); places of amusement are desirable for the working people, but no liquor should be sold there (27458-60); drinking men lose a certain portion of their time by reason of drink; when business becomes slack these men are discharged (27462-68); prohibition would be beneficial to working men and

PARKER, MOSES—*Continued.*

their families (27470); the present license law is not well carried out; if the Government licensed liquor sale it should provide an hospital for the care of drunkards, as drunkenness is a disease (27471-77).

PATTON, JAMES, Montreal.....Page **639**

Is Clerk of the Committee of Management of the Montreal General Hospital (29067-68); furnishes details of the number of patients and the expenditure of the hospital (2906-898). Favours the prohibition of the liquor traffic, by which the moral tone of the people would be improved (29089-95); prohibition could undoubtedly be enforced; would be satisfied with the general adoption of a measure similar to the Scott Act, which has produced good results (29096-117); a state of pandemonium existed at Grand Falls, Dufferin County, after the Scott Act had been repealed (29118-32); an excellent condition of affairs prevailed while that Act was in force, and he could not explain the reason of its repeal; prosecutions were being instituted against hotel keepers and people became annoyed (29133-45). Visited Guelph in Wellington county while the Scott Act was in force, and saw men under the influence of liquor; the Scott Act was not enforced, and it was subsequently repealed because the farmers found difficulty in obtaining suitable hotel accommodation (29146-54); the temperance people in Dufferin and Wellington county would not incur the odium of enforcing the Act (29155-56). Notwithstanding its failure in some respects the Scott Act had produced good results (29158). Drunkenness in Montreal had increased during recent years and the License Act was not well enforced (29164-66); the number of drinking places should be reduced, saloons should be abolished, the sale of liquor removed from corner groceries (29167-70). Even under prohibition importation for private use should be permitted, but the private individual importing should be compelled to take an oath that the liquor was for his own use (29271-76).

PAUL, WALTER, Montreal, Grocer.....Page **696**

Resided in Montreal over 25 years during which he had been connected with the grocery trade (29946-48). Does not sell intoxicating liquors of any kind and conducts his grocery business on temperance principles (29949). Is a member of the Executive of the Dominion Alliance and has taken part in temperance work in the city for 18 years (29951). The liquor traffic has a very detrimental effect; whilst recognizing the difficulties that would surround the carrying out of general prohibition, considered that with increased education of the people they would largely disappear; the effect of liquor on the individual is evil; if it destroys the prosperity of the individual, it must injuriously affect the community, a law abiding and sober community must undoubtedly be prosperous; with respect to the question of revenue, Sir Leonard Tilley, when Finance Minister, had declared that it was no use discussing that as an objection against prohibition; the effect of enacting prohibition would be to reduce expenses of government, and a sober people would be better able to bear taxation (29956). 90 per cent of the poverty is the result of drink, which casts a heavy burden on the community apart from taxation; if the money expended on liquor were used for buying clothing and other necessaries, the industries of the country would be stimulated; had joined a deputation to Quebec to have the number of licenses in Montreal limited, but the request was refused (29957). The City Council at one time appointed License Commissioners, but the matter became one of municipal politics and a burden on the Aldermen (29958-59); in certain sections of the city tavern keepers acted as election agents and largely controlled the vote (29960-61). The number of licenses issued should be on the basis of population (29962-65); increased power could be secured to the people by amendments to the City Charter (29966). The question as to the

PAUL, WALTER—*Continued.*

number of licenses per thousand to be granted should be submitted to the people at the polls (29967). If a majority of the electors in a polling district decide that an application should not be granted the commissioners dare not grant it—that was really local option on a small scale (29969). Witness is a prohibitionist in principle and practice (29972); the difficulty is to get at the present state of public opinion; if two-thirds of the people were in favour of prohibition there ought not to be the slightest difficulty in carrying it out (29973). A bare majority would not be sufficient, because the officers of the law do not assist in enforcing temperance or prohibitory measures and do not give that aid which the temperance people have a right to expect (29974).

RECALLED .....Page **774**

The liquor traffic on other branches of trade and commerce is injurious, because anything that is injurious to a small portion must in the long run be injurious to the whole community (031061); while the manufacture of liquor might be benefited commercially the community as a whole is really injured (031063). A man using liquor not only wastes his money but also his time and health, (031067); all drinking of liquor is bad, making people sober will make them save money (031068-74). Many men in the liquor business were undoubtedly worthy people, but their capital should be invested in a better business (031075-78). If prohibition were enacted the effect must be beneficial on the general community; no doubt there would be difficulties in enforcing a prohibitory law, and it should not be put upon the statute-book until it had a good majority at its back; the general sentiment of the Dominion (he would not say as regards the Province of Quebec) would be in favour of prohibition; a difficulty presented itself on account of the immense length of frontier, and it would be better to have the Americans enact prohibition at the same time; the fact that there is a license law and the traffic has to be regulated shows that it is a dangerous traffic, and there is no force in the argument that you cannot make them sober by Act of Parliament because you cannot make them drink unless by Act of Parliament (031079).

PETIT, H., M.P.P., Chicoutimi .....Page **49**

Member of the Legislative Assembly of Quebec (19602); population of Chicoutimi County, 15,000 (19588); Scott Act adopted in 1885 (19589) by a small vote (19590); two or three licensed places selling liquor now (19604-5); Scott Act has a bad effect (19606); little drunkenness (19610); no illegal sale (19612). If under license law, could not be worse than at present (19614-15); strangers can procure liquor at hotels (19616).

PRENDERGAST, M. J. A., Montreal, Manager of the Bank of Hochelaga..Page **688**

The liquor traffic as at present conducted is injurious to the general interests of the country (29823). Draws a distinction between wine and spirits, as the consumption of wine is not so injurious as that of spirits, and in countries where quantities of wine are taken drunkenness is very rare (29824). Beer may be classed with wine (29825-26). If duty on light wines was reduced the consumption of strong spirits would be decreased, and the same applies to beer (29827-28). The ageing law has tended to place a monopoly in the hands of three or four distillers, which is injurious (29829-31); any prohibitory law would break this monopoly (29832-34); it would also be affected to some extent by encouraging the importation of light wines (29837-42). The excessive number of licenses issued in Montreal was largely due to municipal politics (29843-45). A law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of spirits would have a beneficial effect on all interests, particularly if light wines were imported in their stead; the decrease in the evil effects arising from drunkenness would be felt very beneficially in every branch of trade (29846). Beer is

PRENDERGAST, M. J. A.—*Continued.*

nearer to strong drinks than light wines, but is less injurious than spirits (29847); would not prohibit wines and beers (29849-50). The development of the wine industry would create new sources of revenue, but at first there would be a deficit (29852); part of the deficit would be made up by increased excise and customs duties on spirituous liquors used for medicinal and mechanical purposes (29853); duties should be increased on beers and wines imported (29854). Any deficit remaining might be made up by taxes on tea and coffee (29856). The deficit that would arise to the province might be met by direct taxation, and no system is more equitable than the income tax (29859-60). Favours compensation to brewers and distillers in the event of the enactment of a prohibitory law (29860). It was very doubtful whether general prohibition would have the effect expected by its advocates (29862); the modified form of prohibition, meaning the encouragement of light wines and ales and the abolition of the use of spirits, would commend itself more to the people, and was the only feasible scheme (29864). Total prohibition was impracticable, although he was not opposed to it on principle (29865). The people of the south of Europe are remarkably temperate although their ordinary drink is light wine (29867-68).

RAE, WILLIAM, Quebec, Merchant and member of the firm of Allans, Rae & Co.

Page **59**

Resided in Quebec 31 years, during which period have been engaged in shipping.

Firm did not suffer from drunkenness among employees, great majority of whom are sober and hard working (19809); less drinking than some seven years ago; ship labourers not so well off, and so giving tendency to encourage drinking (19810-12); firm does as much trade as formerly, but divided among more steamers (19814); all labourers employed belong to Ship Labourers' Society (19817). General prohibitory law not desirable (19824); an interference with individuality (19825, 19829-30); absolutely impossible of enforcement (19826, 19910-30); a commission or committee should consider methods of restricting traffic, high license, etc., and report recommendations; would support recommendations adopted (19827, 19831, 19895-08, 19931-32). Favours inspection of liquors (19828); adulteration of liquors (19934-38); also increased duties on spirits and diminished on wines (19831); have not observed any diminution of drinking customs in society (19833); or growth of total abstinence sentiment (19834-37); use of liquor by sailors on shipboard (19838, 19844-92).

REDMOND, JOHN F., Montréal, Bookseller.....Page **507**

Resided in Montreal all his life. Has been connected with the Knights of Labour for a number of years. Drunkenness is on the increase in the city (27031); due principally to the great number of saloons (27032). The churches and temperance societies have been working successfully on temperance lines, and have done much good (27033-4). All bars should be abolished; the Government should control the traffic and establish distributing places where liquor would be sold by the measure to people who required it (27035); the licensed places under the present system should be more fairly distributed over the city; four or five places would be sufficient (27036-39); liquor should be controlled and sold by the Federal Government, by officers duly appointed, the profits going to the general Government; the liquor should be inspected and the Government guarantee its quality (27040-46). Present license law is not observed as regards Sunday sale; liquor should not be sold by grocers (27047-9); high license does not furnish a remedy for existing evils (27050); the saloons as such should be abolished (27051-52); inebriate asylums would be beneficial (27056). Sohmer Park and other resorts are a great advantage to the working classes; they drink lager there instead of spirituous liquors in

REDMOND, JOHN F.—*Continued.*

taverns (27057-61). A general prohibitory law would be impracticable in cities like Montreal; besides, it would be an infringement on the rights of the subject (27066); in the event of the adoption of prohibition due notice should be given to the distillers and brewers, and then they would not be entitled to much remuneration (27067-8). If the trade were placed under Government supervision, the liquor should not be drunk on the premises; each person should register for what he wanted for home consumption as well as for medicinal purposes (27069-71); the effects of liquor are injurious on mechanics; the drinking class are a hindrance to those who work and the labour unions (27072-73); moderate use of alcoholic liquor is not injurious (27076); workmen would be improved if the drink habit was less general; drinking places are altogether too numerous and afford a temptation (27078-82). Workingmen are generally moderate drinkers, but a very small porportion drink to excess, (27083-4). All parks should be owned by the municipality, and cars should run on Sunday to enable the people to get there (27085-88). More drunkenness prevails to-day than twenty years ago, but it may be due to the increased population; drunkenness among the working classes remains about the same (27089-90). Shorter hours would decrease drunkenness, many men drink from being exhausted while working long hours (27092). Prohibition is not practicable; it would be desirable if it could be carried out, but it could not be enforced (27094-6). Visited Cornwall while the Scott Act was in operation, and it did not appear to be well administered (27097). The system of Government supervision of liquor sale would do more than prohibition to decrease the consumption of liquor (27100); many who would like to see prohibition would not vote for it, as it would be forcing other men against their will; witness would like to see prohibition, if it could be enforced (27101-2).

REFORD, ROBERT, Montreal, Steamship Agent.....Page **460**

Connected with four lines of steamers (26306-7); has a large number of men employed in loading and unloading vessels, the work being carried out by stevedores who employ ship labourers (26308-9; the liquor laws of Montreal are very badly enforced, due largely to laxity of officials; the laws are fairly well framed but are not enforced (26311-12; this laxity is observable among the aldermen and policemen alike; even young men and boys respectably dressed, drink early in the morning (26313-14); has not observed any improvement as regards Sabbath observance (26314-15); considers Sohmer Park and such places about the worst resorts in the city, they are debasing in every way (26316-17; opposed to the running of street cars on Sunday on the ground that the working man is entitled to his day of rest (26318-21); all liquors sold in Montreal is adulterated; this remark also applies to spirits made in France (26322-23); alcoholic consumption increased in France owing to the failure of the vine (26324). Favours the prohibition of the liquor traffic and failing to obtain that would support legislation encouraging the use of light wines and beer (26325); prohibitory law would be beneficial in Canada, and would prohibit the importation for domestic use (26326-9); the greatest harm is done to the community by taverns (26330-41); favours reducing the number of drinking places and the imposition of high licenses, also the imposition of more severe penalties (26342); visited Maine some years ago and liquor could be obtained, but it was difficult (26348-51). Nearly all the accidents on the steamships are attributable to drink; on one steamship line no drink is allowed, (26352-54); this line is the Donaldson Line, and the men are better in every respect. Prohibition on steamships is profitable from a business stand point (26356-57); no man is much use when he is drinking; drinking places on the wharfs are a curse, for the men expend their money there; the drinking places on the wharfs are a disgrace to Montreal (26358-59). If prohibition prevailed

REFORD, ROBERT—*Continued.*

the Dominion and municipal revenues would be recouped for their loss by the savings effected (26360-62); everywhere the wage-earning power of men is lessened in consequence of the drink trade; accordingly the temptation should be removed from working men (26363-64).

ROBB, WILLIAM, Treasurer of the City of Montreal.....Page **346**

Has filled positions in the corporation during thirty years (24556-9). One thousand liquor licenses issued annually during past five years; gives statistics respecting licenses and population of the city during corresponding years, also in regard to the revenue obtained by the city (24560-66); submits statement of arrests and the ratio per thousand of the population (24560-71). Both provincial and city government lose large income from unlicensed places; their suppression would give large increase of revenue with the results of decreasing unlicensed places, reducing numbers of breaches of the law and contributing to payment of increased police force (24577-86); too many places already licensed (24587). Present license system unsatisfactory; license commissioners are unable to restrict the traffic owing to influence brought to bear in favor of applicants (24588-89); an absolute radical change in the whole system desirable; the number of saloons should be limited according to population, and municipality should indicate their locality, and a desirable class of licensees should be secured (24590-92). A general prohibitory law desirable; but it would not be efficiently enforced (24595-7); a license law might be framed which might have equally good results as prohibition; prohibition would not be successful; he had little faith in the virtue obtained by restriction, and considered there was a strong tendency in human nature to desire that which is prohibited (24598). Drinking habits are increasing and consumption liquor becoming greater daily, leading to more intemperance (24599-603); much of the evil arises from liquor adulteration (24604); there is no rigid inspection, which is very desirable (24605-7). Submits statements respecting licenses issued, revenue received, and population, also total arrests for the years 1890-91 (24610-23); grocer's license should be abolished and as between restaurants and hotels, restaurant license should be wiped out (24624-30). Payments by the city for prisoners, maintenance of orphans and charitable purposes (24632-44); no liquors should be sold in public parks (24645-54); licenses might be put up at auction and the highest possible prices obtained (24655); licenses might be granted and continued during good behaviour (24657-8); amount of license depends on rental; fraudulent leases are prevalent (24659-63); prefers hotel to restaurant license as lesser of two evils. Would prefer abolition of the drink traffic, but such is at present impossible (24664-70); education of the people in the direction of temperance important; but evil effects result from newspapers throwing the glamour of attraction over drinking (24671-2). License system not responsible for drunkenness, which would prevail under free sale, but might be restricted by prohibition (24672-77); reduced expenditure on liquor would improve the city's revenue and the health and morals of the people (24680-1). The revenue from the traffic, after necessary payments are made, exceeds the expenditure; it is necessary, however, to consider the people's interest financially and morally (24685-92); under prohibitory law illicit places could be suppressed; such a law would only be a comparative failure, no more so than the present license law (24694-98); the trade would also be delegalized, and in that way the people would be educated (24699-700). The liquor traffic cannot be otherwise than injurious to commercial interests (24701-2); ninety per cent of all failures, financial and physical, among young men have been caused by drink (24703-5); would favour enactment of a prohibitory law for its educational effects, and would run the risk of failure or non-failure (24709); would adopt scale of compensation to brewers and distillers and wholesale and retail sellers (23710-11). Believes, from hear-

ROBB, WILLIAM—*Continued.*

say, that liquor is sold in Maine ; if so, the prohibitory law is a partial failure (24717-19) ; desirable to throw the stigma of prohibition upon the trade, even though it might be a partial failure (24720) ; the delegalization of the trade would be beneficial and that would be the object of enacting prohibition (24720-21) ; if society frowned down drinking, free trade in liquor might be more desirable than either prohibition or license (24722-244) ; would prefer general to local prohibition (24725-26) ; prevalence of unlicensed places due to lack of administration of the law (24727-31) ; the community would take greater interest in the enforcement of prohibition than of license for there is something more to work for (24732-34) ; prohibition unless carried by large majority of the people would be difficult to enforce if not unwise to carry out (24735) ; such a radical change should only be adopted if reasonable prospect of success was made manifest (24737) ; it would be apt to result in failure unless a strong public sentiment was behind it (24738), and failure would be more disastrous than not having attempted it ; unlicensed places largely kept by men who desire an easy mode of life, and no sooner are they open than they obtain customers (24740-43). Decrease in drinking observable, especially among the better classes of citizens (24744-51) ; improvement in drinking customs due largely to influence of churches, moral and religious teaching and temperance societies (24752-54) ; notwithstanding these efforts drinking is increasing among young men and in the humbler ranks ; good influences are opposed by evil influences ; (24754). Temperance efforts in British army and navy, and experiments on soldiers and sailors as to power of endurance with and without alcoholic stimulants (24756-7). Licensed places supply the demand for liquor and unlicensed places obtain a certain trade due to selling liquor at low prices (34758-63).

RYAN, MICHAEL P., Collector of Customs, Montreal . . . . . Page **225**

Held present office ten years ; prior to that time was in business in Montreal, and represented a division of the city in Parliament for 14 or 15 years (22451-5). As Collector employs on an average about 200 persons (22456) ; very little trouble on score of intemperance (22457) ; temperance principles prevail more generally than formerly (22458) ; during his term of office only three or four individuals discharged annually for drunkenness, and fully as many for dishonesty (22459) ; increased temperance among sailors and labouring men, due to great moral agitation going on during recent years. As a temperance man, would be glad to see prohibition, but the people are not ripe for it, and he had declined to support prohibitory law on that ground (22463-64). Submits statement of imports of wines and spirits at Montreal from 1887 to 1892, showing a decrease in every instance excepting champagne (22465-480, 539-44). Present license law very good, but it could be improved by reducing number of licenses issued, as there are more than necessary (22481-3) ; no doubt there is considerable unlicensed sale, but it is diminishing (22485). Côte St. Antoine is more orderly and better organized than any portion of the city ; lives at St. Henri, where formerly there was no saloon within a mile of his house, but now there are three or four on the same street (22491-95, 22558-63) ; western section of Montreal occupies similar position to Côte St. Antoine, as owing to the temperance sentiment prevailing licenses are not granted in that section (22496). Local option prevailing in rural districts of province not applicable to the cities (22497-99) ; while people are not ready for prohibition, they would accept a more rigid license law and effectually carry it out (22500) ; efficient liquor inspection would be beneficial (22501-7) ; adulteration is practised in regard to liquors (22508, 22523-5) ; separation of sale of groceries from liquor sale desirable (22510-12) ; limitation of number of licenses issued would be beneficial (22509, 22513-15). Prohibition would not be successfully carried out (22562) ; the use of light wines and ale instead of spirits would be advisable,

RYAN, MICHAEL P.—*Continued.*

if practicable (22517-18). Believes liquor to be obtainable in Maine ; recently visited portions of New Jersey where no licenses were issued, but found liquor sold openly (22520) ; saloons are unnecessary, while the respectable hotel is useful (22527-35) ; amendments to the license law will produce better results than an attempt to enforce prohibition (22536). Liquor smuggling prevails in the lower St. Lawrence, and in the event of prohibition smuggling would occur between United States and here ; to prevent it, Canada would need an army as large as that of Russia (22537-8). More strict enforcement of the license law now than previously (22545) ; due to change in public feeling towards the liquor trade, brought about by religious and moral teaching (22546-50) ; protests against licenses are attended with great expense, which is unfairly imposed on temperance people (22551-53) ; attempts to obtain licenses on St. Catherine street (22554-7) ; applicants for licenses might be required to obtain the signatures of a majority of voters in the district (22564) ; it would be another safe-guard (22565) ; restaurant-keepers down town should be permitted to continue to sell liquor (22572) ; saloons are undesirable and unnecessary ; the respectable hotels are preferable (22574-6). Prohibition would be more difficult to enforce than the customs laws, which are constantly violated ; the staff of officials would require to be largely increased and then there would be violations (22583-8) ; as to prohibition it would be next to impossible to enforce it, and non-enforcement would have immoral and injurious effects (22592-4) ; hotel *vs.* saloon (22597-608) ; prohibition, if it could be enforced, would be a great blessing, and he would be very glad to see it (22618).

SANDILANDS, WILLIAM, Montreal, machinist.....Page **358**

Is Master Workman of the English speaking district of the Knights of Labour, Montreal (24764-70) ; large number of knights in Montreal, from the manual labour to the highest class of skilled labour (23771-74). The Constitution of the order provides that no person who sells intoxicating drink, either as manufacturer, dealer or agent, or who tends bar can be admitted to membership (24775) ; no special efforts made in the direction of temperance other than generally to elevate members as men : total abstinence is not exacted on the part of members ; but habitual overindulgence in intoxicants is followed by the member being expelled (24776-81) ; great improvement manifest in the members during recent years (24782-3) ; the constitution of the order provides that no assembly or member shall give, sell or have any intoxicating liquor at any meeting, party, ball, picnic or entertainment appertaining to the order (24785-86) ; no temperance organization is connected with the order (24787-9). Present licensing system is not satisfactory ; the authorities are too lax in issuing licenses and too many licenses are issued in the vicinity of factories (25790-91) ; liquor should not be so accessible to the general public (24792-93) ; does not believe there are from two to four thousand unlicensed drinking places, as the working classes do not use as much liquor as formerly ; they cannot afford to do so as the price of liquor has been raised. The claim that unlicensed places are patronized by the working classes is unfair and untrue (24974-6) ; less intemperance among the working classes generally as well as Knights of Labour (24798-99) ; unlicensed places would probably number 500 (24800). General prohibition of the liquor traffic would not be an improvement ; whenever too much restriction is forced on people they rebel and resort to other means to secure that of which they have been deprived (24802) ; working men desire their children to be educated to the disadvantages connected with the use and abuse of liquor (24803) ; in the event of prohibition even more liquor would be consumed by the wealthy class, and smuggling would be more difficult to suppress (24804) ; the time might come when prohibition might be accepted and carried out through educational means (24806) Liquor dealers, lawyers, capitalists and bankers are excluded



SANDILANDS, WILLIAM—*Continued.*

from membership in the Knights of Labour, exceptions, however; occasionally being made (24807-24813); payment of wages in saloons on the river front condemned by the Order (24814-24817). Liquor sold on Sunday to a great extent; at some places you could walk right in—the greatest evil in the city at present (24818-21); licensed houses should be closed on Saturday night at a fixed hour and all day Sunday; this is the desire of the workingmen, who also wish the number of licenses reduced (24821-24); liquor should never be sold in grocery stores, as no check can be kept over its sale with groceries (24825-27); retail liquor sales take place in groceries (24828-29); sale of liquor to minors should be absolutely prohibited (24830-31); strict inspection of liquor is desirable (24832); a Government analyst should examine liquors, and if mixtures are sold their composition should be stated on the bottle (24832-34); crime is connected with liquor and the appetite grows on the individual; therefore men should not be encouraged to use even light wines or other liquors (24835). Favours places of public amusement such as Sohmer Park, but sale of liquor and gambling should be strictly prohibited (24838); weiss beer made men stupid (24839-53); witness works in an establishment where the people are very temperate; skilled labourers addicted to drink prove a great detriment to the advance of the price of labour (24855-65); if temperate skilled men were sufficiently organized and educated they would regulate intemperate men out of employment (24866-70); men are largely benefited through the influence or organized labour (24871); religious influences have not been as strong as they should have been, but temperance societies are performing a necessary work—both of these influences have been for good (24877-5); general improvement in the direction of temperance among all classes in Montreal (24876-80). Saloons should not be placed within a certain distance of large factories; saloons are too numerous and too much encouraged where the working classes live (24881); saloons should be abolished when the people are educated on the temperance question (24882-87); the employees in factory where witness works include 50 per cent of women (24888-93); an average drinking man would not lose one day a month, because he could not afford to lose one day's pay (24894-900); regular use of liquor injurious to the workingman or any other man (24905); pay tickets sold for the purpose of procuring liquor (24906-10). Prohibition would not assist in the education of the people; religious and moral influences and temperance societies help all classes of the people (24912-16); the young should be protected by temptations to drink being removed from them (24917-19); witness not acquainted with the views of Grand Master Powderly, who knows full well the harmful results of the liquor trade to the workingmen; the only other interest producing equally harmful effects with the liquor trade is the combination of capital (24920-23). It is the abuse of liquor that is so harmful, and it is desirable to check the abuse (24924); bar tenders are excluded from the Knights of Labour because they are of no benefit to it or even to the human family (24925-26); lawyers are excluded by the laws, but the organization judges as to their admission; capitalists may also be allowed to join the ranks; the society desires to adjust relations between capital and labour (24927-35); increased sobriety by workingmen, which is exemplified by their gathering on labour day (24936-37); drinking workingmen are used by some employers as a barrier to the advancement of their fellow workingmen (24938-43); liquor equally sold on Sunday in hotels and saloons, and largely in groceries; the saloon might be suppressed, as neither the saloons or the hotel is beneficial (24944-48). License law is generally disregarded, nevertheless drunkenness and drinking have decreased among the working classes during the last ten years (24950-55).

SENTENNE, REV. ALFRED LEON, Montreal.....Page **485**

Is Parish Priest of Notre Dame, and has always resided in Montreal (26712-13). The liquor license law of Montreal needs to be more efficiently administered, and greater surveillance exercised by the police, without preference being shown to anyone; this applies especially to enforcement of Sunday closing law; certain hotel keepers were shown preference and were allowed to sell (26714). Too many licenses are granted in the city, especially to low canteens; the reduction which has taken place recently was satisfactory (26715). Measures should be adopted to encourage temperance by the exercise of moral influence through the educational profession and friendly and benevolent associations; good habits would thereby be inculcated among the people, and the young would be encouraged to use light drinks such as cider; production of cider should be largely increased in Canada, this education would also tend to prevent young people using tobacco; the young should be taught to avoid the taverns, and persuasion should be used, and all abuses and excesses denounced; Mutual Benefit Associations would encourage temperance habits; among the means of decreasing drunkenness was a reduction of the number of places selling, absence of taverns in the neighbourhood of factories, the closing of hotels on certain days and certain hours, early on Saturday evening and all day Sunday, and separation of liquor selling from groceries, and the establishment of a high license in order to improve the class of houses. Had visited Paris and Normandy but had seen no drunkenness (26716). Public parks desirable in the interest of the working class; but parks such as Sohmer Park run in private interests are dangerous; they will endeavour to satisfy perverted tastes; they are even more dangerous when open on Sunday, because people will neglect their religious duties; opposed to the sale of drink in parks at any time (26717-8). A general prohibitory law would be too radical a measure to be enforced effectually and would prove to be impracticable; complete prohibition was against human dignity; men should voluntarily become total abstainers; complete prohibition is a demoralizing principle; people became accustomed to violate prohibitory laws, which everywhere had proved impossible of enforcement. While drunkenness was a great scourge, moderate drinking was not a sin; abuse of liquor should be avoided, but absolute prohibition was not desirable (26719); abuse of liquor is not general in Montreal (26720); much domestic trouble undoubtedly traceable to the use of liquor (26721); liquor sellers are liable to abuse their position (26722); and the trade appears to have a hardening effect on those engaged in the business (26723). Inebriate asylums were desirable (26724-26); no doubt denying the rights of religion had in some cases the effect of throwing the traffic into the hands of evil disposed people, yet in some cases it had compelled them to abandon illegal sale (26722). Is opposed to complete prohibition, because it is impracticable; favours the imposition of heavy duties upon strong liquors, and higher license fees; also the separation of the sale of liquor from groceries, closing of all drinking places on Sunday and the discouragement of private parks, especially on the Sabbath; also the sale of liquor in private parks as being dangerous (26728-33a).

SHAUGHNESSY, THOMAS G., Montreal.....Page **767**

Is Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific Railway and has been connected with the management of the company for nine years (030-957-59). No rule prevails in the company regarding drinking except that no man must drink to excess (030960-61). There is no rule enforcing total abstinence (030962). Cases of intemperance are comparatively few; about 1500 men are employed in the yards and shops (030964). There is little trouble among the mechanical men on the score of intemperance (030965). Intemperance is not a prominent cause of accidents (030970), but remembered a particular case where the accident was due to the train hands having over-indulged (030971-74). Had personal knowledge of the operation of the Maine law during the time the

SHAUGHNESSY, THOMAS G.—*Continued.*

company was constructing a line across the State; there was nothing to warrant the opinion that the law was too effectively administered (030976). On the main line of the company, north of Lake Superior, the Public Works Act was in force, under which the railway officials prohibited the importation of liquor on the works (030977); the enforcement of that Act was productive of much good; it was carried out by the railway officers except in the North-west Territories where they had the co-operation of the Mounted Police (030979). Liquor, however, was frequently found on the works, people resorting to all sorts of expedients to bring it in (030980-82). Notwithstanding all precautions taken, peddlers and others succeeded in bringing in liquor (030984). When building the Short Line found a considerable number of men near Greenville in Maine under the influence of liquor; the men in charge of the works said there was no difficulty in getting it (030985-86). Is opposed to a general prohibitory law (030990); very important industries would be wiped out, men who grow grain for the manufacture of liquor would be deprived of a revenue, and at the present day it is practically impossible to enforce effectively anything like a prohibitory law; people would get liquor dishonestly and by illegal means; it is better to educate the people to use liquor intelligently than to force them to use it surreptitiously and unlawfully by passing special legislation (030991). Brewers and distillers should be compensated in the event of prohibition (030992). The sections of the Canadian Pacific built by Mr. Sifton and Mr. Abbott were in different parts of the country; Mr. Sifton's section was between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, while Mr. Abbott's was in the upper Ottawa Valley, and later in the Lake Superior region when the track had been laid and ballasting done (030993); whisky sellers were detected in the district between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, they were heavily fined and their whisky confiscated (030994). When the railway was built the enforcement of prohibition in the North-west Territories became more difficult; the company naturally protested against the baggage car and baggage being examined by the Mounted Police, the passengers also protested and the execution of the law had to be modified (030997-98). Prohibition during the construction period had an excellent effect (031001). Beer and wine are sold in the refreshment rooms of the Canadian Pacific (031002-04). The taking of liquor in moderation does not interfere with the promotion of employees on the railway; the most dangerous description of a drinker is the sly drinker at home would prefer all railway men to be total abstainers, but that being impossible witness prefers to know that a man takes his drink openly; the company have less reason to fear him than the man who keeps liquor at home and is what is called a secret drinker (031005). 99 per cent of the loss of life on railways and the loss resulting to railway companies arises rather from stupidity than from the use of liquor; the stupid man is a constant menace; at the same time witness would be pleased to know that every man was a total abstainer (031007). Each superintendent to some extent regulates the forms after his own fashion; Mr. White is particularly strong on total abstinence; the company, however, have no general regulations debarring the men from the use of liquor (031008-10).

THIBAudeau, Hon. JOSEPH R., Sheriff of Montreal. . . . . Page **313**

Has charge of the prison of Montreal and the women's prison (23981); the prison is maintained from payments annually from each municipality, and the city pays 15 cents daily for each prisoner (23989); particulars respecting cost of the institution (23998-100); prisoners who are paupers are committed to jail in the absence of almshouses (24003-06). Drunkenness decreasing (24009); number of licensed places should be reduced on some general plan; there are altogether too many saloons, but the hotels are not excessive (24009-18); number of illicit places less than estimated by Mr. Lambe (24021). License is

THIBAudeau, Hon. Joseph R.—*Continued.*

the most efficient system of dealing with the liquor trade (24022); places of amusement in the city should be multiplied, as they reduce drunkenness (24023-6). Prohibition impracticable, not suited to this country; it would not be enforced (24027-29); in Scott Act counties liquor freely sold; no serious attempt made to enforce it (24030-35); in Chicoutimi under Scott Act no difficulty in getting liquor; in Maine drink is obtained whenever required, especially in Portland (24036-25, 24025-52); drunkenness undoubtedly causes great misery, but prohibition would not succeed; public sentiment is not ripe for it and it could not be enforced (24057-61); number of licenses should be reduced, places of amusement increased and encouragement given to the use of light wines (24062-65); temperance encouraged by religious authorities and by united action of citizens (240066-70); sale in Chicoutimi was only to travellers, the bars being under lock and key (24071-76, 24132-39). Local option applicable to Quebec parishes, but not to Montreal or large cities (24077-79); objections to Scott Act (24080-81); prefers prohibition by conviction of the people and not by law (24082-84); light liquors might be sold at Sohmer Park and similar resorts (24085-87, 24253-5); liquor trade does not effect in any way other branches of industry (24088-94); many insolvencies directly due to intemperance (24093-98); use of light wines not inducive to use of strong alcohol (24098-101); restrictive measures work well in rural districts but not in cities (24102-5). Temperance in France (24109-10); prohibition of a mild type does good, but when it assumes the form of law it is more harmful than beneficial (24114-17); impracticable to enforce general prohibition; would not grant compensation to brewers or distillers, if such a law were adopted (24118-19); sale of liquor in groceries should be suppressed (24122-24); license fees already sufficiently high; an increase would not prove a remedy (24125); mild liquors should be sold at pleasure resorts on Sunday, as it would stop Sunday drinking in private houses (24126-29); clerical influence greater in country districts than in cities, where the people are more independent (24140-45).

THOMAS, F. WOLFERSTAN, Montreal, Manager of Molsons Bank. . . . Page **747**

The liquor traffic as at present conducted, the issue of licenses seeming to be nearly indiscriminate, has more or less a serious effect upon general business interests (030659). If prohibition were adopted the farmers would be precluded from growing barley, except for feeding purposes; this would be a serious matter, especially in view of the low price of wheat (030666). If the money could be diverted from the liquor trade, no doubt it could be better applied to other purposes (030661). If the liquor business were closed entirely, it would have a very baneful effect on very many interests; the refuse from the manufacture of spirits is used in cattle feeding and there would be a loss thereon; there would also be more or less of trade and commerce affected as a medium of exchange; if the money now invested in the trade were applied in other directions, such as the improvement of agriculture, the country would be materially benefited—yet he did not believe in prohibition (030664). Opposed to prohibition (030664); it would have a bad effect on human nature to enact laws respecting eating, drinking or dressing—it is debilitating (030665); prohibition is undesirable; temperance should begin at home with the children, who should be taught temperance (030666). The desire to limit the drink of the sober by the drunkenness of the drunk is a fad of the prohibitionists (030667); such a law is impossible of enforcement; if people will have liquor, they will get it secretly if necessary, and adulterated liquors will be used (030668). Had been at Portland, Maine, and was asked again and again to go into places and take liquor; another difficulty with prohibition is that it would encourage illicit distilling and smuggling; in Montreal high license would be more effective than prohibition, and a step in the right direction

THOMAS, F. WOLFERSTAN—*Continued.*

would be to abolish bars ; liquor should also be rigidly inspected and no sale should be permitted to drunken men or boys under fifteen years ; the moderate use of mild liquor and light wines is wise and should be encouraged ; the license fee should be less for wine than for spirit sales and the number of places should be limited : the number of saloons in Montreal should be limited, high license charged and liquors inspected, the penalties of violation of the law should be severe, and for a third offence the license should be taken away (030669). In favour of the establishment of inebriate asylums (030670). Efforts should be made to improve the homes of the working classes, and by instructing women in domestic economy (030671). Public gardens and recreation resorts are advantageous (030672) ; the tendency of working men and girls working in factories is to enjoy themselves and be exempt from control (030673-75) ; lack of education in domestic duties is one of the great sources of bad homes and infelicity, and neglected homes drive men to drink (030676). Opposed to compensating brewers and distilleries in the event of prohibition (030677-82). License in Montreal is not sufficiently high to limit the number (030684) ; the number of illicit places mentioned by Mr. Lambe is no doubt excessive (030688). Attempts made to close the Oxford (030691-94). Occasionally the use of liquor becomes injurious because it becomes immoderate ; judging by himself, witness thinks the use of light wines must be beneficial to others (030698). Beer is not drunk to excess in Canada : there is very little drunkenness from it and the people do not get into a besotted condition from its use (030699). Money at present invested in distillers and breweries could no doubt find other employment (030702). If any merchants apply to open a bank account, and are known to drink immoderately, witness declines to receive the account unless the individual is far beyond any question of risk. (030703-07). Favours the establishment of parks in every eligible part of the city, and favours the granting of facilities to reach them on Sunday ; Montreal streets are quiet and well conducted (030708-09.) Had visited the North-west (030710-11). The so-called prohibition system had been repealed in favour of the license law (030712-15). No more liquor sold to day than two years ago under prohibition (030714) ; the financial status of the bank in the North-west had not been affected in any way by the change of system (030716-17). The loss of liquor revenue to the Province of Quebec could be replaced if all exemptions were done away with and a tax upon real estate imposed (030717) ; this loss of revenue would prove a serious question ; a property tax would be necessary, an income tax would be almost impossible to collect (030721-26).

VALLÉE, ARTHUR, M.D., Quebec ..... Page 1

Is Medical Superintendent of Beauport Insane Asylum and Inspector of Belmont Retreat for Inebriates (18618) ; held position 14 years (18623) ; appointments made by Provincial Government (18621) ; asylum contains 975 inmates (18623) ; register kept of history of cases not always reliable (18625-29, 18675) ; institution belongs to private proprietors to whom the Provincial Government make a payment for each patient (18632) ; supervision is conducted by Government officials, a Medical Board of Inspectors ; the proprietors are represented by a house physician and a manager (18633-46) ; cases in which disease caused by alcohol are placed in Belmont Retreat ; only one case there for Government, all others being private cases (18652) ; very few are cured of intemperance ; due to absence of law compelling their residence in institution for certain period (18662) ; if they remain sufficiently long 50 per cent are permanently cured (18663) ; a portion of inmates of Insane Asylum are there from intemperance (18715) ; but the great majority are not drinkers (18719). Moderate use of alcohol does not lead to insanity (18718) ; it is not a predisposing cause (18719) ; definition of moderate drinking (18720-21) ; idiocy

VALLÉE, ARTHUR, M.D.—*Continued.*

often due to intemperance of parents (18723-24); complete abstinence from intoxicants not necessary (18726-27); excessive number of licensed places in Quebec; should be reduced one-half (18731-41); best results obtained by vigorous license law, faithfully enforced (18742).

VALLÉE, CHARLES A., Montreal, Governor of Montreal Jail . . . . . Page **210**

Has occupied the position of Governor during two years. Gives statistics of number of prisoners, which he reports to the Provincial Government yearly. Submits classification of the prisoners committed (22231): out of 3,364 committals, 1,064 were for drunkenness in 1891. The present license system is an efficient method of regulation, if enforced (22243); those committed for illegal selling should be sentenced to hard labour (22245); most cases of drunkenness are due to adulterated liquor (22251); drunkards should be sentenced to imprisonment for longer terms and placed under medical charge (22251-59); habitual drunkards should be sent to an inebriate asylum (22260); 80 per cent of the prisoners are in jail because of intemperance (2226); recommends for minimizing the evils of the liquor traffic, the encouragement of the sale of light beers, soda water and temperance drinks in Sohmer Park and similar resorts (22266); reduced number of committals to jail for drunkenness in 1892 as compared with 1891 (22266); Sohmer Park has had an influence in that direction (22266). Prohibition could never be carried out in this country; better results would follow use of light wine and beers with recreation in parks (22267-8); rigid inspection of liquors also desirable (22270); the city should be divided into districts and saloons established according to the population; sale of liquor should be abolished in grocery stores (22270-74); favours reducing number of licensed places, and regulating number according to population (22275); the use of Weiss beer (22276-82); does not believe in the Scott Act or prohibition (22284); sellers of liquor without license should be imprisoned with hard labour and fined; at present the penalty is nothing but a rest in prison (22289); desirable measure to lessen drunkenness would include the use of wine, beer, cider and the like, and encouragement of places of amusement for the working classes, public and popular resorts where they would spend little money, obtain cheap amusement and return home sober (22290). The jail statistics show decrease in drunkenness and also in crime (22294-95). Resided in Italy three years; Italians usually drink wine and drunkenness is rare (22296). Disapproves of wine and beer license; it is desirable to grant an open license to a reliable person, also to limit the number of licenses pro rata to the population; keep careful watch on all drink retailers, promote the use of light wines by charging the minimum of duties, and encourage popular places of recreation (22297-99).

VINCENT, JOSEPH LOUIS, Collector of Inland Revenue, Montreal . . . . Page **394**

Is in charge of the Inland Revenue district of Montreal, and his duties are to collect duties on the spirits and tobacco manufactured (25322-5). Submits statement of quantities of spirits passing through his hands for a period of years (25326); the Canadian product is principally whisky from Ontario distillers, who sell to wholesale merchants (25327-8). Resides in Longueuil, opposite Montreal, where there is a license law in force, (25329-32). Present system carried out by the department is effective (25335). Three compounders carry on business in Montreal (25338); their preparations are subject to analysis, and they are responsible for their samples (25339); no doubt compounders manufacture good liquors. The department obtains the names of the articles used, but it does not know the preparation (25342-3); more samples of liquors should be taken and analysed, and the samples should be obtained from low grade places (25342). Drunkenness has not increased in Montreal (25344-5); the introduction of light wines and beers, replacing

VINCENT, JOSEPH LOUIS—*Continued.*

stronger liquors, would be beneficial (25347). Remembers the seizure of an illicit still on a compounder's premises—he was making part of his own alcohol (25348-55). Three licenses are issued in in Longueuil, or only half the number previously granted; the reduction was made on the demand of the people (25356-368); further reduction of the number would promote illicit trade (25369-70).

VOHL, LEON P., Quebec, Chief of Police . . . . . Page **22**

Held present position 12 years. Drunkenness in city decreased (19042); due in part to religious and temperance influences (19043); penalties for drunkenness, especially on Sunday, more severe (19045); enforcement of law (19081-83); increased fees have not diminished number of licensed places (19047-8); more respectable houses (19049); not many unlicensed houses (19051-52); statistics, arrests for drunkenness (19058-62); juvenile drunkenness and crime (19065-67); proportion of offences against women and children traceable to drink (19077-80); not a great many unlicensed places in city (19093). Change in city charter placing police under City Council instead of a Commission (19100-109). Prefers hotel bars to saloon bars (19114-15); difficulties of enforcing provisions of license law (19131-35). Prohibitory law would prove still more difficult, could be enforced to a limited extent (19136-37); no interference by City Councillors with police force (19143-45).

WALBRIDGE, ALEXANDER S., Mystic, County of Missisquoi, P.Q., Implement Maker . . . . . Page **515**

Is proprietor of the Mystic Iron Works. The Council refused to grant licenses in the parish of Mystic and St Ignace de Stanbridge (27175-84). Dunkin Act formerly in force in Stanbridge, but was defeated by small majority, the French voting against it (27185-90). Township of Stanbridge was afterwards divided; parish in which witness resides has refused for the last four or five years to grant license certificates (27191-97). System works well (27198). No licensed houses existed in that part of the country for ten or even fifteen years (27199-218). Had offered a reward if any liquor could be bought in the municipality (27220). Bedford was the nearest point at which liquor could be obtained, 22 miles distant; licensed houses at Farnham, next railway station (27221-29). Drinking among moulders; endeavours to employ none but total abstainers (27230-55). Had suffered loss owing to moulders drinking (27259). Favours adoption of general prohibition, which could be enforced just as well as the law prohibiting manufacture and sale of counterfeit money (27266-67); beneficial effect of prohibition would be felt gradually (27271). In case of prohibition being adopted the people might cross the boundary into Vermont or New York States and get liquor; although there is prohibition in Vermont, liquor can be obtained (27272-75). Both the States and Canada would require to adopt prohibition in order to keep out liquor (27277). Sale of liquor should be confined to drug stores as with other medicines (27284). Free sale of liquor would undoubtedly bring about adoption of prohibition at an early day (27285-87). Local option has worked well in the district among the farmers, but in the villages there is a different class of people (27291-99); local option has worked well because the people are largely of the farming class and because the majority of them are in favour of it (27305-09). General improvement in the community under prohibition; local prohibition would be successfully worked if the people were favourable to it; Dominion prohibition could not be enforced at first, it would be a matter of time (27310-16). Under prohibition, pedlars would bring in liquor and it would be impossible to prevent smuggling over the frontier (27317-20). Favours making the purchase of liquor illegal even for private use; there might be difficulty as regards the French people (27322).

WANKLYN, FREDERICK, Montreal, Assistant Mechanical Superintendent, Grand Trunk Railway.....Page **741**

Has occupied present position since 1882 (030570). At the railway works at Point St. Charles from 1,000 to 1,100 men are employed in the locomotive department; in the yard shops 750, in the running shops 250 (030571-73). Intemperance is of the rarest occurrence (030574); the men do not lose time through intemperance (030575-77). Nearly all the men belong to labour unions, but not to temperance societies (030578-81); never had an accident in the shop that was attributable to intemperance (030582-83). The company supplies oatmeal and water in the summer as a beverage (030585-87). The company have a literary and scientific institute, also reading room and mess room (030588-91). Had resided many years in Lancashire, England (030592); there is a marked difference between the character of workmen in Canada and in England, the comparison being greatly in favour of Canada (030593-94). Our men are becoming more intelligent, and less strikes occur (030595). Beneficial effects have no doubt followed the establishment of the reading rooms and institutions, in which entertainments are frequently given (030597). Had had experience under the Maine law and the Scott Act at Brockville (030598). In Maine the law made no difference as to the amount of drinking, only as to the quality of the liquor; the sellers have no object in keeping liquor up to the standard (030599-600). Favours compensation to brewers and distillers in the event of the adoption of total prohibition (030601). Liquor sales in parks should be confined to beer and light wines (030603-04). Lived in Italy for two years among the working people, and never saw a drunken person, although wine is used like water (030605-06). During eleven years had not seen three drunken men in the Grand Trunk works; they can drink whatever they like, but are never allowed to bring liquor into the work shops (030606-14). Three or four saloons are within a block or two of the works, and no attempt had been made to remove them by the company (030616-20). Coffee rooms have been established about half a mile from the works, but are too far distant to be much use (030623-24). Grand Trunk workmen are almost absolutely free from excessive drinking habits, and there is not a better lot of men anywhere; they would work just as well without rules as with them (030625-40). Mr. Spicer was at one time a strong advocate of total abstinence, but he has since altered his mind; if he issued a circular it was of his own motion and was not embodied in the company's rules (030741-45). Opposed to prohibition—impossible to make men moral by Act of Parliament and men would get liquor (030646-54). No difficulty arises because of the drunkenness of employees at the company's works (030665). If men drink to excess, of course it interferes with efficiency; if legislation were enacted to improve the quality of the liquor sold and to prevent adulteration, it would be more desirable than prohibition—the great difficulty is that bad liquor is sold to the working classes (030656).

WATKINS, JOHN A., Montreal, Excise Officer.....Page **634**

Has been connected with Inland Revenue Department for 18 years (28984-85); assisted in making a seizure of liquor in a compounder's establishment in Montreal (28986-87); whisky was being illicitly manufactured and was being used in making brandy and gin (28988-89); the offender had previously held a compounder's license, but the period for which it was granted had expired (28990); the illicit still would produce 30 or 40 gallons per day (28990); prosecutions were instituted both for distilling and compounding, and a fine was imposed in the first case and the second is still before the court on legal technicalities; the seizure was made in August, 1889 or 1890 (28991-008); in addition to alcohol, bead oil, oil of bitter almonds, and other ingredients were found, which would render the compound deleterious, the whisky was a very crude spirit of unrefined alcohol (28009-18); both illicit distillation and illicit



WATKINS, JOHN A.—*Continued.*

compounding are carried on in Montreal, and undoubtedly very deleterious substances are used (29027-28); more strict supervision is necessary (29029); there are three licensed compounders in Montreal, and witness acts as inspector over these establishments; is aware that almost three out of every five of the corner groceries compound liquor and use false labels which they purchase (29030). Witness produced samples of labels containing fictitious names (29032); labels produced had been purchased from George Bishop & Co., and contained the names either of leading European firms or of firms that had ceased to exist (29033-39); such labels were purchased by keepers of corner groceries or by any person, and their use led to great frauds on the public (29040-42). Licensed compounders are compelled to use labels provided by the Inland Revenue Department; the word "compound" is on the face of all legitimate labels (29041-48); had made several seizures of illicit stills throughout Quebec (29049-51); the department has appointed a preventive officer to devote his whole time to discovering illicit stills (29052); during the last twelve months thirteen or fourteen illicit stills have been seized in Montreal and the parties heavily fined (29053-55); energetic measures are adopted to prevent illicit distilling (29063); they are to a certain extent not successful, but they reduce the evil to a large extent (29063-66).

WEIR, W., Montreal, President Ville Marie Bank . . . . . Page **682**

The moderate use of liquor is injurious to the general business of the country; the people are taken from active pursuits and become impoverished (29756-57); the over indulgence in intoxicating liquors is one of the greatest obstacles to the moral and material welfare of this and other communities; had constantly aided and encouraged the advocacy of abstinence, but had hesitated either to support or oppose the movement of those who proposed prohibitive legislation to remedy the evils of intemperance; there are grave objections to restricting the liberties of the people in matters of food, drink or clothing, even should a large majority favour such an enactment; if a prohibitory law were put in force by a large majority in Parliament and in sympathy with only a bare majority of the people, the result would be demoralizing in the extreme; extensive smuggling would be carried on with the border States; the minority who broke the prohibitory law would soon come to disregard other laws; a prohibitory law, moreover, would deter European emigrants, accustomed to use alcoholic liquors, from making their home in Canada; any falling off in Dominion revenues would be largely made up by an increase in other importations, but it would be necessary to impose duties on tea and coffee now admitted free; the decline in provincial revenues would be a serious matter, especially in Quebec; favours a law to have habitual drunkards tried by jury and if convicted sent to reformatories; favours the taking of a plebiscite from time to time, and on a three-fourths vote in favour of prohibition would approve of the trial of a prohibitory law, although still not without doubts as to its success (29758). If a prohibitory law were enacted and enforced, the prosperity of the country would be so much greater that the revenue derived from other articles would make up the deficiency owing to loss of revenue from the abolition of the liquor trade; tea and coffee would however have to pay duty (29761-62). No doubt prohibition would drain the Provincial Government's revenue for a long time (29765); it would be difficult for the province to make up the deficiency (29767); it could be done by an income tax, but that would be a very unpopular and heavy tax (29770-71). The farmers would be compelled to raise other crops instead of barley (29773-78). Money expended on liquor is a waste, and so far as people are impoverished by it and rendered unable to purchase articles of necessity and luxury, it is injurious (29783-84). Other branches of business suffer from it; in the case of poor people every dollar spent on liquor is an abuse, because it is not necessary to their welfare, health and comfort; but when you come

WEIR, W.—*Continued.*

to people with ample means the case is different (29786-89). The community is undoubtedly poorer by the expenditure of millions on liquor (29800). Would be willing to try a plebiscite ; but would not pass a prohibitory law by a bare majority of either the House or the country ; let Parliament enact a law providing that when three-fourths of the people favour prohibition it should become law (29804-07). Brewers and distillers should receive compensation in such an event, or they should receive notice (29808). Witness did not know of any country in the world where complete prohibition exists, and in Canada it would be an experiment (29813-14). Doubtless many people opposed the Scott Act or any local Act because liquor sales were continued in the adjoining counties (29815). A strong public sentiment is essential to the success of measures dealing with the liquor traffic ; the great bulk of the French people drink liquor but not to excess ; it would be impossible to stop them drinking, particularly along the border (29816).

WILLIAMS, REV. THOMAS G., D.D., Montreal . . . . . Page **418**

Is minister of the West End Methodist church, Montreal, and has resided in the city four years (25736-8) ; resided in the province of Ontario, at Pembroke, Brockville and Prescott, during the nine years previous to his residence in Montreal (25739-40). When in Prescott a license law was in force in the Counties of Leeds and Grenville (25741) ; subsequently the Scott Act was carried, but it did not come into effect until lately (25741-3) ; Scott Act in force during first portion of his residence in Brockville ; subsequently repealed and license law adopted (25744-5) ; afterwards came to Montreal where there is a license law in force (25746) ; when visiting Pembroke had an opportunity of comparing Scott Act there, with license law in other parts of Ontario (25747-8). In Pembroke and adjoining counties the Scott Act was very thoroughly enforced ; violations occurred in some outlying townships ; vigorous efforts were made by Inspectors to suppress illicit sale ; then Inspector was superseded ; law was not successfully enforced under the new officer ; temperance people were asked to nominate an inspector ; they did so, but the old inspector, an opponent of the Scott Act was re-instated, the state of affairs in Pembroke was represented to the Chief Inspector, but no improvement was made (25750) ; that Inspector is now in office under the license law (25751). Repeal of the Act in Renfrew was due to indifference of its supporters, their opinion that it had not been properly enforced, repeated statements as to its inefficiency and frequent violation, but principally to the gross ignorance of a large proportion of the voters (25754-5) ; the German vote was polled in favor of repeal (25756) ; a heavy vote was unpolled when the Act was adopted, but more energy was displayed by opponents of the Act on the poll for its repeal (25757*a*). The Scott Act produced beneficial results ; during three years in Pembroke saw only three drunken men ; is a very orderly town either under license or Scott Act ; liquor was not sold openly, but secretly ; at Egansville liquor was sold but not openly ; at Brudennelle public opinion was strongly in favor of the Act ; the Act was enforced in Renfrew ; it was better enforced there and in the county of Renfrew than was the License Act in any town or county in which he had resided (25751) ; remonstrated with the Chief Inspector as to dereliction in duty on the part of the inspector at Pembroke ; yet the Scott Act was better enforced than the license law, but this was done by private individuals (25763-70) ; cannot explain reason for repeal of Scott Act in other counties in Ontario (25771). Had had experience with local option in Huntingdon County, Quebec ; on a vote being taken, the Council decided not to grant licenses ; but three men sold deliberately until action was taken and their establishments closed (25772-4) ; the decision was arrived at on a very close vote, but as a result liquor sale was thoroughly suppressed (25775-9). Had watched the operation of the license law in Montreal ; con-

WILLIAMS, REV. THOMAS G.—*Continued.*

sidered licensing of the traffic as sinful, and as an error in legislation (25781-86). Total prohibition should be enacted; this was the deliverance of the General Conference of the Methodist Church held in 1890 (25787-89); improvements should be made in the license law (27790); applicants for liquor licenses should be compelled to secure a majority of the residents of the district, and these signatures should be obtained annually; no license should be granted in residential portions of the city (25791-2); difficult to determine whether the hotel bar or the saloon bar is the greater evil (25798); no sale or delivery should be made to a minor (25700-800); shameful and extensive adulterations practised (25801-3); deplorable effects on women following liquor sale in groceries (25804); liquor sale on Sunday (25805); careful inspection of liquors would be valuable and an inspecting officer should visit and seize impure liquor in hotels and saloons, (24807-8); liquor sale should be prohibited in Sohmer Park and the public parks (25809-11); light beer stimulates a taste for intoxicants; excessive and continued use of beer is more destructive than the use of whisky (25812-14). Favours the passing of a prohibitory law at the present time: it would be more efficiently enforced than the present license law, and would be a success (25818-21): the plebiscite vote in Manitoba and the public sentiment in Quebec and Ontario indicated that a prohibitory law could be enforced (25822); difficulties in regard to enforcement could be largely remedied by breaking up political combinations (25824-6); would not object to remunerate brewers and distillers if the burdens were adjusted in the proper way, (25827-8); as regards the loss of revenue, no doubt the financiers would make up the loss (25829); would not be unwilling to bear his share of taxation to remunerate brewers and distillers for loss of plant, for the sake of obtaining prohibition (25830); the Methodist Church demands total abstinence on the part of its members; had only found it necessary to take disciplinary steps in four or five cases in the use of intoxicants (25833). Improved social customs of the people due to increased enlightenment and increased stringency of the license laws, together with moral influences of the church and school (25834-36 very little temperance education in the schools of Quebec, and it should be increased (25837-8); would favour legislation to limit the liquor traffic and secure rigid inspection of liquor; high license would not diminish the sale of liquor (25839-40); the license law does not regulate the trade; would prefer license to free sale; the liquor trade is not well regulated by the license law; it does not diminish drinking (25846); the Scott Act, the Dunkin Act, and the withholding of licenses have all been superior to licensed sale; the Scott Act has been better enforced; everywhere under the license there are transgressions of the license law; the Scott Act made drinking more disreputable (25847-52); could not imagine a condition under which he would favour licenses, and could not consent to free sale (25855-68); Charlottetown under free sale. The Scott Act in Ontario was adopted as being the next step to prohibition; after a certain period the people became discouraged, and various reasons conspired to cause its repeal (25859-64); the vote on the repeal of the Scott Act was not against prohibition, but against a law which promised prohibition and proved ineffective; these men would largely vote for general prohibition, as would many opponents of the Scott Act (25866-67); Scott Act people would vote generally for prohibition (25869); would favour the exemption of wine for sacramental and medicinal and scientific purposes from the operation of a prohibitory law (25870-4); gave records of votes in Renfrew for and against the Scott Act (25875-78); after a considerable experience in Ontario the people re-introduced and re-adopted the license law. Favours opening public parks on Sunday, but not places of amusement (25880-8-91-902); is opposed to street cars running on Sunday; The Scott Act does not produce more perjury than the license law; the man who wants to cover his sin will perjure himself (25902).





Royal Com-

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

