

The Advocate.

LOUIS P. KRIBS

Editor and Proprietor

ISSUED EVERY WEEK

HEAD OFFICE

ASBERDEN CHAMBERS

Corner Adelaide and Victoria Streets,
TORONTO, CANADA

Subscription:

Per Year, in Advance, . . . \$4.00

Advertising:

Card of Rates on Application.

Toronto and Montreal, Thursday, March 8, 1894.

UNION IS STRENGTH.

LAST week we directed attention to the necessity of unity in the trade. This week we return to the subject, not because our words have fallen on desert grounds, but because we have since observed evidence of a divergence. Now because the Prohibition crank despises his brother of the lodge, he does not turn away from him or move his expulsion. No, they are extremists together, and, therefore, must remain in the same ranks. Not alone do they thus group themselves, but by means of fees they give up a liberal sum to a society from which they receive no financial return. They do not, perhaps, support their journals to any liberal extent, because the lights of their cause do that in divers ways for them; but it is notorious that their organizers and official lecturers have to be paid. Hotel-keepers are asked to do very little in support of their cause. Politicians tax them, but so they do everybody that they can, whether general storekeeper, lawyer, farmer or anything. But such people do not plead that as an excuse why they should not support their lodges, their institutes or unions. Neither should the hotel man. When a movement is undertaken entirely for his benefit, he should be with it first, last and all the time, providing only that it has the support and endorsement of the leaders of his cause and the majority of his brethren. In the past disunion has led to additional taxation and even to disorder. It would do the same over again.

In England it has come to pass that the trade act well together. Obnoxious laws have been threatened, but the license-holders have risen as one man and they have been modified, withdrawn or never submitted. As an instance, in 1871, a Mr. Bruce submitted a bill. The trade opposed it and it was withdrawn. In 1872 the Gladstone Government passed a bill reducing the hours of selling from 1 a.m. to 12 midnight, and making regulations regarding the opening. At the next general election the Government was defeated and a good authority says that bill conducted to the fall of the ministry. Do our friends think these results were brought about by discussions or by members of the trade buttoning up their pockets and refusing countenance to a legitimate cause, a cause the workers in which were devoted to their interests? If they do they are really mistaken.

There must be union all round or fanaticism will triumph. It remains for the trade to work as a unit, to support those who are supporting them, or ruin and enforced exile must largely follow.

THE READY QUESTIONER.

ASK the farmers where they expect to get a market for their barley and rye if Prohibition prevails and whether it will pay them to devote the ground on which they now grow these cereals to wheat at present prices. Ask them also if they expect to get better prices for their live stock or their produce. Ask them if they expect the price of property to be enhanced by driving people from their midst. Ask them if they do not think an additional staff of customs officers will be necessary to keep out smuggled goods. Ask them if they don't think illicit stills will spring up at many points. Ask them if they don't think asylums and prisons will be necessary for people made mad by cheap rot-gut on which an enormous profit will have to be made owing to the risk that will have to be run. Ask them if they have any idea how the deficit in the revenue will have to be made up. Ask them if they don't think prices will fall even lower than they are now. Ask them if they think the country will be made any richer because many millions of dollars will be driven out of business and many thousands of people banished from their homes and driven into exile. Ask them which are the greatest nations of the earth and then ask them if they become great under prohibitory laws. Ask them if Prohibition made the British people and the German people mighty. When you have propounded these queries to them and secured their answers, let us know and we will have another batch of interesting conundrums for their solution.

MR. FRASER'S RESIGNATION.

THE resignation of Hon. C. F. Fraser from the Ontario cabinet is the most important Canadian event since our last issue. The reason given, ill-health, is a sufficient, but by no means the only cause. Mr. Fraser's health, unfortunately, at any time during the past two years, would have been ample excuse for a retirement from public life, and there is no doubt that he desired to seek rest. But he is not the man, it is not in his nature, to leave the ship at the time the drums were beating to battle. He would never have resigned in the midst of a session, and in the face of an election merely to save himself a few months of fatigue.

It is an open secret that the real cause of the resignation is that Mr. Fraser disagrees with the Cabinet on their Prohibition policy. He believes that Prohibition is wrong and he believes it so strongly that he will rather retire from public life than countenance such a measure. When Sir Oliver Mowat made his response to the Prohibition delegation, Hon. Mr. Hardy was careful to say that "all members of the Cabinet present" agreed with

the Premier's declarations. Mr. Fraser was not present, and if he is present when a Prohibition bill is introduced into the House, if such a bill is ever introduced, he will oppose it.

Meantime he steps down and out. The Premier loses its strongest supporter, the Ministry its ablest member, their side of the House its greatest debater, and the party feels the first blow of that disintegration which inevitably follows the incorporation of Prohibition into a political platform.

THE UNEMPLOYED AND THEIR SYMPATHIZERS.

UNFORTUNATELY there are few people who are not willing to take something for nothing. It is not strange, therefore, that a couple of Toronto papers when they announced that they were going to give away bread, mantles, shoes, gloves and hats had their premises besieged. Money is not so plentiful at the best of times that crowds could not be got together to partake of such bounty. But if the proprietors of the journals in question were sincere in their desire to help the poor and needy why didn't they turn their supplies over to the charities whose object it is to relieve people in want and who best know those who are observing of aid? Promiscuous giving by retail is a grave mistake, but when it comes to wholesale distribution without any enquiry whatever as to deserts the thing becomes next door to a crime, in fact is a crime for it makes criminals. The suffering and starving, if there are any, and we are bound to say that we saw few in the mobs that gathered that appeared in that condition, are not those who receive relief. They cannot stand the crush and rush and, therefore, are compelled to give way to the strong and dishonest, who cut and come again, until the weak are chastised. Now, in the recent distributions in this city we saw collections of tough, vigorous men boasting of the plunder they had gathered in, while piteously standing around were a handful of the weak and helpless for whom the charity was intended. Take, for instance, the giving away of hats and other garments. Not only did rough men make a harvest out of the situation, but many boys, newelays mainly, displayed four or five hats or caps that they had secured and some had even as many as half a dozen. This is the kind of proceeding that went on in the name of charity. This is the kind of thing that was worked up to prove how much destitution exists in Toronto and how hard the times are in Canada.

AGAIN THE THEATRES.

REV. W. F. WILSON, of the McCaul Street Methodist Church, who first came into public notice by a squabble with a policeman who ordered him to "move on," and has since posed as the special guardian of the public morals, has been at it again. Recently by a series of assaults he endeavored to give the lie to the excellent

people who obtained for this city the title of Toronto the Good. He painted the place as the haunt of thieves, gamblers, and ne'er do wells. He went further, charged not only the local minions of the law with not doing their duty, but the judges with wilfully misinterpreting it for the benefit of wicked people and to the disadvantage of society. Mr. Wilson temporarily made a bit of stir, but it was very temporary. He now finds it necessary to put more fuel on the fire. On Sunday night he accordingly made a fierce attack on the theatre. He first announced that he did not believe in a "stiff-jacket religion," whatever that may mean from his point of view, and then went on to slaughter not only the theatre, but all its attaches and its surroundings. His was kind enough to except William Shaice-spars from his anathemas; but he failed to point out that in the Divine William's plays were things that no modern playwright dare put into his work. He termed the performances now given as "gilded nastiness," overlooking the fact that Henry Irving and some of the greatest actors and actresses of the day have recently been here, and that nearly all plays have for their ending the defeat of vice and the triumph of virtue, and declared that the theatre stole time from the family and money from charity. This last charge is a happy one, for it proves the source from which charity principally comes—from the people whose views are not warped and narrowed. As for the charge that the theatre appropriates time that should be given to the family, the same can just as truthfully be said of church entertainments and of temperance or Dorcas meetings. Many a family has suffered neglect because one or other or both of the heads have been too much given to gatherings held nominally for other people's good, but frequently for the glorification of the leaders in them. A bishop once asked Garrick why the people were so moved by his acting when they knew it was only acting and yet were unmoved by his sermons when they taught of truth and reality. "Because," said Garrick, "we act naturally, while you preach artificially." In so far as Mr. Wilson preaches of things whereof he does not know, and has not seen, we commend to him Garrick's reply. Having digested this, we would ask for his definition of "stiff-jacket religion" and for a list of the recreations in which he would allow the inhabitants of a wicked world to indulge.

DEACON CAMERON in the *Citizen* asserts: "The fact is Mr. Meredith did not declare in favor of Prohibition last year in his speech and vote for the Marter Bill." The Deacon is badly informed. Mr. Meredith *did* declare himself in favor of Prohibition on the occasion referred to, and he did it in no uncertain tone. He did not vote for the Marter Bill. There was no vote on the Marter Bill. We very much fear that the Deacon's hesitancy in admitting Mr. Meredith, within the lodge portals is to be attributed to the fact that the leader of the Ontario Opposition is again a candidate in London.