

his own use, he has to give it away, for the Templars out there are so rigid that it is scarcely safe for a man to have a bottle in his house. You can't kill it or stop it unless you stop the manufacture and importation of it.

Mr. Tompkins—Mr. Dibble has given us an interesting speech, and it has amused us. My friend Mr. Blanchard wants a license from the necessity of the case. Now, he owns an excellent farm in Richmond, and selling liquor is not a necessity. If he furnishes victuals or accommodation to travellers, he should be paid, and those who go to a public house can be made pay just as well if it is not licensed as if it is.

I am opposed to this system, because I am sure it will do nothing to bring men and ladies get out of the habit of hanging round taverns and learn to indulge in drinking and other evil habits, and the result is that they become drunkards.

He then brought up a tavern and there he got the taste for rum, and though he indulged still he had seen and learned the evils of it. In his Parish the leading men wanted that no license be granted. They say, if it were granted, it would be a license to their heads, and we would rather make up to the County the sum paid for licenses than have the license money go into the Treasury.

Leighton—I have a large petition from the Richmond County people, who are in favor of the people believe in the majority ruling, not only members of Temperance societies but others, men of large property, owning five or six hundred acres of land, worth \$50,000, are of this mind.

Mr. Richardson—The license is secured, if any one should have a license he should, but the people are opposed to any one being licensed in Richmond.

when a Councillor, I protested against licensees in my Parish. A man, a competent blacksmith, came with just such a story as that stated in Mr. Blanchard's behalf—in self defence. He said that he had been a licensee in Richmond is now with in the sentiment; it was then against me—I advised him against taking a license, but he took one, and it ruined him completely in credit and purse. He said that he had been a licensee in Richmond, and his business was much reduced, although now he is a Temperance man and doing well. I for one never will assume the responsibility of a man's wrong doing, simply because he will do wrong without me. I wish to see the law enforced, and to do law. Let him bear the responsibility of the wrong himself. I wish now and everlastingly to record my vote against the sale and use of intoxicating liquors. Mr. Dobbins said that he must assume the responsibility of the rum so that they may recover the price of the liquors furnished to travellers, while with a license they cannot legally recover the price of that very rum. There never was a greater mistake than to suppose that the liquor was

one that might surprise us if found existing among the savage and uncivilized.

Mr. Ketchum—If it were possible to keep liquor out of the County would do so, but that is not in his power. The greater part of the County and not in another.— It was stated last year, that if we refused to grant licenses the Town Council would refuse. This has not been done, and in Wisconsin licenses have been granted, and I cannot see why the other Parishes should be treated differently. I have a petition which I wish to lay before the board.—

Mr. Ketchum read a petition from H. T. Schuchman, for a warrant to arrest.

Mr. Drier—Considerable responsibility rests on us in this matter. I have watched the effects of not granting licenses and have failed to see any benefit. Liquor is sold or hailed in the County than formerly. There are some of them, who said liquor should not be sold, lived right where it was sold and drank, and would not take the responsibility of trying to keep it out. I think we must take ourselves to be the first to cry shame upon

any who became informers. When the corporation of the Town of Woodstock grants licenses or refusing to grant them would do more harm than good. The corporation of Woodstock licenses better not be granted, but in the case mentioned- by Mr. Stickney, would not the same result have followed if no license had been granted.

Mr. Stickney-If liquor selling is evil, why favor it? Laws are enacted against murder and stealing and other crimes, and still those crimes are perpetrated. Why enact or continue laws to prevent them?

Mr. Stickney-If we have been rather disposed to take a silent vote on this question, but now the discussion has been provoked by the opposition. I was of the opinion that not as intelligent man in the assembly would vote against the proposed liquor selling. Take the press, bring here and spread out those papers that defend the traffic, consider their character, and I ask the gentlemen wish to be reckoned with in the future. I have no doubt that the Church that defend rum, if they can be

found, and what they are; only representatives of certain classes, "known," as Paddy said of the Jacksons, as "the voice of the people." The "voice of the people" or Presbyterians, are they? Which of these churches in this County would employ a minister if he was known to advocate the sale or use of intoxicating drinks? If such churches were to be taken into consideration, broomstick him away. I am glad to work with the noble men whose aim is to make the world and society better by repressing what has long been its great evil, rather than to defend the run traffic. It is true, in this matter, there is a conflict of opinion between the people and government, but at the same time it is true that the people are the source of the evil, and that the government ought to be removed. Carleton, boasting of its intelligence, may be outwitted by other Carletons with less intelligence; we must labor on, and we must support the cause of the reformed. I would support the cause of the reformed, thankful to have the occasional right measure to control somewhat the evil

within the County. The sentiment of these resolutions bodies is against licensing; they say that the people of this County are not prepared to pocket the amount of the price of blood, the license money now received. We may not yet be able to prevent the manufacture and importation; our friends may in this point Mr. Walcott, but we are determined to prevent them from having power to withhold licenses here let us do so, and not be responsible for the evil— Let us wash our hands in innocence. Are we innocent while we license that which Mr. Walcott, we know to be a curse to the community? Not long since I read of a young man being killed on a rail track, drunk. If we had licensed the sale of that liquor which caused this tragedy, would we not be morally responsible for the death of that young man? Mr. Walcott, I am not in this County, and to believe and know that I am living among a flourishing people who are not willing to sacrifice their principles of virtue for a few hundred dollars Mr. Walcott, of the advocates of receiving which makes me shudder.

Mr. Dibble: It is very strange if people are

to suppose that there are no penalties. What is the use of talking about this being the worst of all crimes (the worst of all humanly), the terrible consequence of the fall of man—this iniquity of drinking a glass of rum? I was once a strong Temperance man myself, but being that is not the sum total of my character, I am not bound to be guilty of mean crimes, are they not worse than taking a glass of rum? I like to see consistency and reason used. I was not one who will better man when a teetotaler, a non-drinker, and a non-smoker. I will take occasionally a glass of liquor. When we overreach or take from our neighbor what is his legal right, we take the position of highway robbers. As long as liquor is an article of commerce, it will be sold. If it comes here those who want it will get it by the front door or back door. Such action as that proposed leads to lying and perjury, for get a man on the witness stand under oath and tell him to tell the truth and he will tell the truth.

I don't like, as an accountable being, to

have any money to me what I must eat or what drink.

Mr. HARRIS.—It has been asked why there are no petitions here. Now, so far as our Parish is concerned, Mr. Gibson and myself, it was well known when we were elected would vote against granting licenses, and we have been so ever since. So it is with all other representatives. I fail to see the logic of Mr. Dibble, who asked if the withholding of license had stopped the sale of wine, and then asked of an individual that he should give us every cent in his house owing to the public feeling of the community round him. The argument about the Town Council unable to nothing, for two sessions, can make no sense at all.

The W. C. T. U. have read a petition, signed by some 500, from Richmond, praying that no licenses be granted.

Mr. Harding asked how that petition came before the board.

Mr. Warden said a Councillor for Richmond had handed it to him to read.

Mr. Hovey—I just say, as did Mr. Taylor, that two wrongs do not make one right. The action of the Town Council has been referred to, but has the action or failure of that body