

# The Canada Citizen

AND TEMPERANCE HERALD.

A Journal devoted to the advocacy of Prohibition, and the promotion of social progress and moral Reform.

Published Every Friday by the

**CITIZEN PUBLISHING COMPANY.**

Office, 8 King Street East, Toronto.

Subscription, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, strictly in advance.

*This number is sent to many friends whose names are not yet on our subscription list. Will they kindly aid our enterprise by forwarding their dollars and addresses? It is desirable to subscribe early, as we propose making every number well worth preserving for future reference and use.*

*Subscribers will oblige by informing us at once of any irregularities in delivery.*

*All communications should be addressed to*

**F. S. SPENCE, - - - MANAGER.**

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1883.

## "WHOLESOME BEER AND LIGHT WINES."

*The Bystander* for July discusses the liquor question. Usually this Review is not only well written, but thoughtful and good. We have become accustomed to regard it as such; and it is with surprise and regret that we find it treating so important a subject in an article sadly wanting in the evidences of close observation and careful study that generally characterize its pages. This article will be criticised by a contributor, in another column; but there are some of its mistakes to which we wish to refer more particularly here.

*The Bystander* gives five reasons for settling, if possible, the main question, but strange to say, entirely omits to mention the most important reason of all, namely, the necessity for some means of mitigating the terrible evils of intemperance. In fact, the tone of the first part of the article would lead a reader to believe that the writer considered agitation for the suppression of these evils a greater evil itself. It is a little paradoxical to assume that "perversion of ethics," "disregard of general rights and principles," and "bearing false witness," are the results of an agitation that is itself "the sign of a quickened moral sense in the community."

The point, however, which we desire particularly to notice is *The Bystander's* suggestion for the solution of the liquor question. This is.—"To encourage the production of wholesome beer, inspecting it so as to preclude the introduction of noxious drugs, admit light wines free, and restrict the manufacture and importation of ardent spirits to the quantity required for medical or scientific purposes."

The last of these proposals is good; it is a part of the prohibition for which we are working, the "one way of preventing liquor from being sold and drunk," as *The Bystander* itself admits "the only effective, straightforward policy." The other proposals are not new. Attempts to carry them out have often been made, and invariably resulted in miserable failure, and in increase of the evils that they were expected to remedy. The increased consumption of milder alcoholic drinks always paved the way for those of a stronger character, and the vast increase of beer drinking and wine drinking has not been accompanied by any diminution of whisky drinking.

Every student of English History knows that such were the consequences of the celebrated "Beer Shop Act"—a measure of the nature and with the same object as the proposal now under discussion. Concerning its results, the House of Commons' Committee reported, "The Beer Shop system has proved a failure." The Lords' Committee said, "The consumption of ardent spirits

has far from diminished \* \* \* and the comfort and morals of the poor have been seriously impaired," and the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation for the Province of Canterbury stated:—

"Of the direct causes of our national intemperance, one of the foremost and most prolific, as it appears to your Committee, is the operation of the Legislative Act which called Beer-Houses into existence \* \* This measure, though introduced for the avowed purpose of repressing intemperance, by counteracting the temptations to the excessive drinking of ardent spirits afforded in public houses, has been abundantly proved not only to have failed of its benevolent purpose, but to have served to multiply and intensify the very evils it was intended to remove. The testimony on this point, on the part of the Magistracy, the Constabulary, the Parochial Clergy, and other persons most competent to judge, is most emphatic and unanimous, and the moral failure of the Act is at this time admitted to the fullest extent by many who were favorable to it at its first introduction."

The same experiment has been made by some States of the American Union, and invariably with similar results.

We will not oppose, we will advocate, any proposed restriction or prohibition, in reference to any part of the strong drink traffic; but in the interests of morality and right, we must strenuously resist any attempt "to encourage" the manufacture or importation of any intoxicating drink, and we deeply regret that the sanction of *The Bystander's* influence and approval should have been given to a proposal condemned alike by experience and common sense.

We cannot allow to pass unchallenged, the statement, "In the wine-growing countries of Europe intemperance is rare." To show the error of it, we quote some notable testimony taken from Dr. Lee's *Alliance First Prize Essay*, and this weighty and reliable evidence upholds the position, that the milder forms of alcoholic liquor pave the way for the stronger sorts, that many people begin with wine who never would begin with brandy, and that anything that induces a more general consumption of alcohol in any quantity or form, tends thereby to deprave the habits and debauch the morals of the community.

For brevity's sake we quote facts in reference only to France and Germany. These are the countries most commonly named by the advocates of cheap wine and beer, as comparatively free from drunkenness, but we can, if need be, produce similar testimony in relation to Italy, Switzerland, Spain and other "countries of Europe."

"There is not so much riotous or dead drunkenness on the Continent as here, but there is more universal drinking, and quite as much of that drinking most to be feared, that perpetual steeping of the system in excitement, which inevitably ends in crime, by 'priming' the man for any deed. There is, however, far more even of palpable intoxication than superficial flying travellers suspect. Mr. J. Fennimore Cooper, the distinguished American author, says in his *Travels*:

"I came to Europe under the impression that there was more drunkenness among us than in any other country, England, perhaps, excepted. A residence of six months in Paris changes my views entirely. I have taken unbelievers with me into the streets, and have never failed to convince them of their mistake in the course of an hour. On one occasion a party of four went out with this object. We passed *thirteen* drunken men within the walk of an hour, many of them were so far gone as to be totally unable to walk. I once saw three men wallowing in the gutter before my window, a degree of beastly degradation that I never witnessed in any other country. In passing between Paris and London I have been more struck by drunkenness in the streets of the former than in those of the latter."

The HON. HORACE GREELY, in his editorial correspondence to the *New York Tribune*, once wrote:

"Walking out in the environs of Paris a few days since, I was somewhat surprised, knowing my American friend and companion to be a moderate drinker of wine, by his casual remark, that he regarded the wine as the great source of France. As to the temperance of wine-producing nations, and of this one in particular, a great deal has been boastfully said, which is not half consistent with the facts. It is true that the milder stimulants, like wine or beer, do not intoxicate or madden so readily as do the fiery products of distillation. But that wine will intoxicate, *does* intoxicate, that there are confirmed drunkards in Paris, and throughout France, is also notorious and undeniable. You can hardly open a French newspaper that does not contain an