

PROHIBITION MANIFESTO

OFFICE OF THE DOMINION ALLIANCE,
ONTARIO BRANCH.

APRIL 1902.

To the Prohibitionists of Ontario

Dear Friends,—In view of the approaching provincial election, we appeal to you to rally for another battle against the terrible drink evil that is to-day the prolific cause of physical, social and moral degradation and ruin; and that is seeking more and more to entrench itself in the vantage ground of political methods and institutions and to control the Government, the legislature and legislation so as to thwart the efforts of earnest and philanthropic citizens for the restraint of its debauching influence and power.

A CRITICAL SITUATION.

The united and energetic liquor traffic has won a temporary victory. The reasonable requests of the Convention of February 25th last have been refused by the Government and Legislature, only four members voting for them. Our only hope for success is in such electoral action, untrammelled by partyism, as will give us representatives who will fearlessly stand for our principles, uninfluenced by any subservience to the liquor interests, or the dictation of any party machine.

Your special attention is asked to the following features of the critical situation which confronts us. The Liquor Act which has been passed by the Legislature and which is to be voted upon in December next, is such a combination of useful prohibition and unjust voting requirements, that careful discrimination is necessary in discussing it, and careful consideration in planning any action to secure its alteration or enforcement.

A GOOD LAW.

The second part of this Act is a prohibitory law of the most complete and comprehensive character that the limits of provincial jurisdiction will permit. It is not fair to compare it with the Scott Act or any other measure more local in its nature or less stringent in its provisions. It is an honest attempt to devise the most effective kind of a prohibitory law. It was the work of skilled and experienced professional men who were also earnest advocates of total prohibition, and it is probably the most thorough-going legislation of the kind in existence.

UNFAIR CONDITIONS.

The first part of the Act makes the coming into operation of the second part conditional upon its being ratified by a majority of the votes cast at a special polling to be held on December 4th next, and upon the total number of votes cast for the Act being equal to a majority of the total votes cast at the general Provincial election held in 1898. The latter condition we consider exceedingly unjust.

The liquor party may be in a minority as they were in 1894 and in 1898, they may even stay away from the polls, not troubling themselves to vote, and yet be considered as successful in the contest. Prohibition may be counted as defeated although approved by a large majority of the voting electorate. Without questioning the ability of prohibitionists to secure the required vote, we must claim that the conditions are so framed as to make it difficult for them to succeed and easy for the liquor party to win. We must protest emphatically against these conditions as discriminating against temperance voters, and being unfair class legislation in the interests of the liquor traffic.

PROHIBITION IS RIGHT.

We stand by the principle embodied in the unanimous declaration of the Convention of February 25th. We cannot consent to the injustice of legislation in accordance with the wishes of a liquor-favoring minority, and against the demand of the voting majority, that majority being on the patriotic and unselfish side. Prohibition is the right legislative method of dealing with the liquor traffic. It has been emphatically endorsed at the polls, and only men who favor it have any claim upon your support as temperance electors.

ELECTORAL ACTION.

It is therefore our plain and imperative duty to strive to elect in the approaching campaign such men as can be depended upon to carry out this principle. We must secure the nomination and election of reliable candidates who will undertake, regardless of party, to support the bringing into operation of prohibitory legislation to the limit of the ascertained jurisdiction of the provincial legislature.

The question of which nominated candidate is best entitled to the support of prohibitionists, and of whether or not it is desirable to

bring out an independent candidate, must be settled by the workers of each constituency for themselves. The first duty is the holding in every constituency of a representative conference of workers to consider these matters and to take vigorous action to give effect to the decision arrived at.

THE REFERENDUM.

While we protest against the unjust requirements of the referendum plan, we deem it our duty to stand by the cause we have always supported, and we earnestly urge our people to organize everywhere and to do their utmost to secure another prohibition victory in the referendum on December 4th next.

In union is strength. We earnestly appeal for concentration of effort on the lines of action above stated, and on the plan agreed upon in each locality to carry them out. Let your ballot in the coming contests be consecrated to the temperance cause, and your energies devoted to devising how that ballot may be made to count against the liquor traffic.

OUR DUTY TO VOTE.

Every vote is needed and every vote will tell. To the extent that our influence is felt in the approaching election we will be strong to compel respect and fair play from the next legislature. We shall need that strength to compel law-enforcement if the referendum brings us prohibition. We shall need it, even if our vote should fall short of the unreasonable referendum requirement, to secure the legislation which our certain majority will fairly demand.

IMMEDIATE ACTION.

Steps are being taken to secure the holding of a Convention for each constituency at the earliest possible date. Do not fail to attend the one called for your electoral district. It will be the starting point for both the impending campaigns, and upon its character and action will largely depend the value and effect of your own work for our cause in the near future. Urge others to attend. Go prepared to sacrifice if need be, all party prejudice and your personal convenience, in a determined, earnest effort to win the great boon of prohibition for our fair province.

Yours for God and Home and Country,

F. S. SPENCE,

Secretary.

W. A. MACKAY,

President.

PROHIBITION FOR ONTARIO. THE DIVISION LIST.

Where Members of the Ontario Legislature Stand on the
Question of a Fair Vote at a Convenient Time.

The great prohibition convention held in Toronto, on February 25th, strongly objected to certain conditions of the Referendum on the Liquor Act. One of these conditions is the requirement that, to bring the act into operation, the number of electors voting in favor of it must exceed one-half of the number of electors who voted at the general election of 1898. Another was the taking of the vote at an undesirable time.

The convention desired to have the referendum provisions so amended that the Act would be brought into force if approved by a majority of the electors voting thereon, and that the voting would be upon the same day as the municipal elections for 1903.

In accordance with the wishes of the Convention Mr. Marter moved in the Legislature to amend the referendum part of the Act so as to provide that the voting should be "on the date fixed for the holding of the municipal elections in the Province in 1903." This amendment was defeated upon the following division:

YEAS—Barr, Crawford, Marter, Tucker—4.

NAYS—Allen, Auld, Aylesworth, Barber, Beatty (Leeds), Blezard, Bowman, Breithaupt, Bridgeland, Brower, Brown, Burt, Caldwell, Carnegie, Carpenter, Carscallen, Charlton, Clarke, Colquhoun, Conmee, Dickenson, Dryden, Eilber, Farwell, Foy, Fox, Gallagher, Garrow, Gibson, Graham, Gross, Guibord, Harcourt, Hill, Hislop, Holmes, Hoyle, Jamieson, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Kribs, Latchford, Lee, Leys, Little, Loughrin, Lucas, Lumsden, Malcolm, Matheson, Miscampbell, Monteith, Morrison, Mutrie, Macdiarmid, McKay, McKee, McLaughlin, Pardee, Pattullo, Pense, Pettypiece, Powell, Preston, Pyne, Reid (Durham), Richardson, Robson, Russell, Stratton, Taylor, Thompson, Truax, Wardell, Whitney—75.

Mr. Marter then moved to amend the Act so as to provide that it would come into operation if adopted by a majority of the electors voting on the question, and this amendment was defeated on the following division:

YEAS—Barr, Crawford, Marter, Tucker—4.

NAYS—Allen, Auld, Aylesworth, Barber, Blezard, Bowman, Breithaupt, Bridgeland, Brower, Brown, Burt, Caldwell, Carnegie, Carpenter, Carscallen, Charlton, Clarke, Colquhoun, Conmee, Davis, Dickenson, Dryden, Eilber, Fallis, Farwell, Foy, Fox, Gallagher, Garrow, Gibson, Graham, Gross, Guibord, Harcourt, Hill, Hislop, Holmes, Hoyle, Jamieson, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Kribs, Latchford, Lee, Leys, Little, Loughrin, Lucas, Lumsden, Malcolm, Matheson, Miscampbell, Monteith, Morrison, Mutrie, Macdiarmid, McKay, McKee, McLaughlin, Pardee, Pattullo, Pense, Pettypiece, Powell, Preston, Pyne, Reid, (Durham), Richardson, Robson, Russell, Stratton, Taylor, Thompson, Wardell, Whitney—76.