

REFERENDUM VS. RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

The Legislature Must Not Overturn the Constitution in Order to Let Mr. Ross Out of a Scrape--Deception and Duplicity Ahead.

Reprinted, with corrections and some slight additions, from The World of Feb. 10th, 1902.

The World desires to lay before the people of Ontario, the people of Canada, a full and frank statement concerning the prohibition muddle into which Mr. Ross has landed this province. We are less desirous of apportioning blame than we are of finding a way out of the difficulty. But we must be frank before anything else. If what we have to say on this question appears to be political or even partisan, it is not because we would have it so, but because those who are politicians have made it so.

Having said this much, let us get to the issue itself: We are up against a most serious condition of affairs: we are threatened with a constitutional revolution; still worse, this progressive province, which ought to attract the highest class of immigrants, is liable to be avoided by them, and Ontario put in a wrong position before all the world; worst of all, that personal liberty which Englishmen love above anything else is to be assailed in a mad effort to cure an evil by a process which, to our mind, will only aggravate it.

The Hon. George W. Ross, as Premier of this province, as a member of the Hardy administration and the Mowat administration, has been trifling with and has fallen a victim of emotion and of sex! We know of no other way of describing what has happened to him. A large section of the ministers of the Gospel rely almost entirely on emotion in making their arguments in favor of right conduct, and are very largely supported by women in this course. Emotional arguments and appeals to sex are powerful instruments in their way, but ultimately they must be tested by what we call the reason of men. This prohibition issue as it presents itself to-day, and in which Mr. Ross has become entangled, is an issue with the reason of men on one side as against emotional arguments supported largely by the weaker sex on the other. When Mr. Ross and his party were seeking for votes, in order to keep themselves in power, they were constantly flitting with and later on committed themselves to the party of emotion and the party of sex, and gradually they gave pledges which they are now called upon to make good, and the realization of which pledges, as a matter of fact, antagonizes the saner and severer reason of men, and especially of men in business and of men who regard personal liberty as the greatest right of our race.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, too, was guilty of trifling with the prohibition section of the community, but he did not go quite so far as Mr. Ross. He was satisfied by getting on the platform and in grandiloquent way saying that, if he came to power, he would give the people a plebiscite on prohibition; which he did--and that was the end of it for him. He washed his hands of the whole business, and from that day to this he has kept very clear of it.

Mr. Ross, however, has persistently gone after the support of the temperance men and of the temperance women, no matter the cost, and gave the bond which he is now asked to fulfil. And there is to his mind, and to his intimate supporters and organs, no way of fulfilling it (and holding office) but by deception and immoral compacts! True good sense, self-respect, would have suggested to him another course than this. He knows now that provincial prohibition is bound to be a failure. He knows he has committed himself to emotional and sex considerations where he should have been governed by reason. Knowing these things, he should resign his office rather than attempt that which in his heart he does not believe, and which not one, or at the most only one, of his colleagues believes in, and which not six followers of his believe in! This being the case, we repeat that he should resign, and if not resign, then just one other course is open to him, and that is to confess his fault and put himself in the hands of his party and ask his party and the country to forgive what he now admits to have been a mistake. But he has chosen to do neither of these things; he persists in going on with the most radical and at the same time the maddest proposition that was ever presented to the Canadian people.

This being the case, there is only one thing to do, and that is to stop him here and now in his mad career, and this can be done in only one way, and that is by the opposition in the legislature preventing him from passing his prohibitory law under the circumstances in which it is to be presented. That the opposition can do by a legitimate system of obstruction; the life of the house does not extend beyond the end of March, and if Mr. Ross should have recourse to his questionable legislation of last year and attempt to extend the life of the legislature, in order to pass a bill with a referendum clause, and for which he has no popular mandate, then the reason is all the stronger for continuing the obstruction from now till Doomsday if necessary. But we imagine it will require only a very short and vigorous policy of opposition and obstruction to bring him to his senses, and compel him to drop both prohibition and the constitutional revolution which he proposes, until he has submitted this latter to the people.

And what is this constitutional revolution which he proposes? Simply this: that Mr. Ross, by reason of his entanglement with emotional and sex considerations, proposes to subvert the constitution. How do you make that out? In this way: that our government in this country is called responsible government, the idea being that whenever a radical change is proposed it can only take place thru a political party in office assuming the responsibility, not only for the passage of the law, but for its due enforcement, should that party and its administration be in power when the law becomes operative. We call this responsible government, and the Liberal party, of which Mr. Ross is a member, claim that they originated and vindicated this doctrine of responsible government and all that it implies. But Mr. Ross to-day is introducing a new system of government, substituting irresponsible government--by way of a referendum to the people--for responsible government. He is overturning the constitution. He proposes to subvert the constitution by offering a most radical law without himself or his party taking any responsibility whatever, without giving any guarantee to the people that the law is a good one, without showing how the law can be carried out, without any undertaking that he or his party will enforce it if they are in office; but shifting the burden of its passage and the responsibilities of its enforcement over to the people themselves. That, we say, is a most radical departure, and is a subversion of the constitution. At present the referendum is no part of our political system.

If Mr. Ross believes in prohibition, the sound constitutional way is to bring in the bill himself, supported by his party, carry it thru the legislature by that support, and use his party influence, if he is in office thereafter, to enforce the bill. And there is no other doctrine that we know of concerning government in this country but this. Mr. Ross, however, says there is another doctrine; that the people, who are irresponsible, can pass any kind of a law they like, even if the responsible government in office at the time does not believe in it, and that this same irresponsible people must be responsible for the administration of the law when it is passed!

Our contention is that before Mr. Ross can overturn the constitution of this country he must go to the people on the issue therein involved, and he must come back from the people with a mandate empowering him to alter the constitution and to legalize irresponsible government in the place of responsible government as we now have it. He must not even discuss the question of prohibition until the constitutional change proposed has been discussed and endorsed, if it can be endorsed, by the people. And until he has such mandate from the people, our whole contention is that it is the duty of the opposition, and of every man in the legislature, who is loyal to the constitution, to compel Mr. Ross to submit himself to the vote of the people on the constitutional change he proposes before he even attempts to submit a prohibitory law to the legislature.

If Mr. Ross pledged himself and his party to give a prohibitory law, they never pledged themselves, the one or the other, to overturn the constitution, to supplant responsible government by irresponsible government! Any one, any half dozen Liberals, not to say the whole Liberal party, would be justified in withdrawing their confidence from Mr. Ross for asking them to endorse a constitutional change to which neither they nor he is pledged!

If our readers have got this clear in their minds, our next contention is that even before this radical change of the constitution can be discussed by the people, Mr. Ross is bound to give the people adequate and full representation in the legislature which discusses it. The City of Toronto, as was pointed out not long ago, contains 10.4 per cent. of the population of this province, and on the Liberal doctrine of representation by population, is entitled to 10.4 per cent. of the representation in the legislature. As a matter of fact, we have only a little over 3 per cent. We have four members; we should have nine. The great new country to the north in this province is not properly represented in the legislature, and the representation all over ought to be corrected before a great question of a constitutional change is submitted to the people for consideration; and, therefore, we say that when Mr. Ross adjusts the representation of the country and gives proper representation to every section it is then his duty to go to the country on the constitutional issue of a referendum as against responsible government. Not for one moment will we listen to his pretence that the principle of referendum has been introduced into our system of government. It has not. We have adopted the principle in regard to municipalities and their money bylaws and the like, but we have never yet accepted that idea as applied to the personal liberties of the people, or for the conduct of public business where we have responsible government, and until such an idea has been fully discussed and endorsed by the people, and confirmed by the Crown, we condemn any radical departure in the principles of government, such as proposed by Mr. Ross. When and where was the referendum made a part of the British constitutional system?

And Mr. Whitney and his followers in the house will be equally guilty with Mr. Ross if they are party in any way, shape or form to any such subversion of the constitution, without first having been approved of by the people in a general election. Mr. Whitney and his followers, and the followers of Mr. Ross for that matter, will be justified in refusing to entertain a prohibitory law until he has submitted the constitutional issue.

Our whole contention, then, in a word, is: Do not give Mr. Ross one scrap of a prohibitory law except on the terms that he take full responsibility therefor and carry it by direct vote of the legislature--not shift the responsibility over to the people. We are still under responsible government. Mr. Ross proposes to abandon it. Do not let him abandon it until the people have had an opportunity of passing upon so radical a change.

And where is the cause of all this trouble? Simply as we said before, that Mr. Ross, having become entangled with considerations of emotion and sex, in order to save his political face, is now trying to subvert the constitution, and, what is almost as bad, is trying to carry his proposed bill by two utterly disreputable political acts. Neither he nor his party believe in prohibition, but they are trying to get out of the scrape by asking prohibitionists to vote for them because they are going to give a prohibitory law with a referendum string attached to it; and, in the second place, we make the solemn charge against them that they seek to deal with the liquor interests on the line that if they (the liquor men) leave them (the Liberals) alone, or, what is still better, help them thru the elections, the government and the government party will turn round and help them to defeat the prohibition law when it goes to the people in the shape of a referendum! We make these two charges, believing them to be true. The evidence of both is to be seen every day. Men whom we can characterize as nothing else than moral frauds, and who have been advocating prohibition for years for political purposes and saying that we must have a prohibitory law, are now going in and out among the temperance people and among the ministers of the Gospel, asking them to let Mr. Ross off with the bill that he proposes with the string to it, and even to support Mr. Ross because he is giving such a bill, while all the time they are saying that prohibition is an impossibility. They are both "jolly" the temperance party and holding out hopes to the liquor interest at the one and same time!

We give two specific instances of hundreds of them. One, namely, The Globe newspaper, which once professed to be a prohibitionist paper, which sent commissioners abroad to investigate the question, and which declared on these reports and on its own convictions, that the time had come for prohibition in Ontario, is now declaring every day that prohibition is an impossibility. And yet it is asking the prohibitionists of this province to support Mr. Ross in a measure which it says must be a failure; and once when it has gotten Mr. Ross over the election, with a majority, as it hopes, it is going to turn in all its forces and all its arguments to beat this same prohibitory law to death in the referendum. There is a second moral fraud in town connected with another paper doing the same thing. He was one of The Globe's commissioners to the States in connection with prohibition. He has been going in and out among the clergymen of this city telling them how a newspaper ought to be conducted on moral lines, and has been especially busy in steering the Methodist connection into Mr. Ross' camp. As a Grit emissary, he is trying to persuade the prohibitionists to vote for Mr. Ross, because he will give a prohibitory law; and he is now engaged in trying to induce Methodists to vote for Mr. Ross, because the latter is giving a prohibitory law, with a string attached to it; while at the same time he is also declaring, notwithstanding his record as a Globe prohibition commissioner, that a prohibitory law is impossible of enforcement! Such men and papers are moral frauds. We have no other word for them, and the prohibitionists of this province should awaken to the fact that they are being humbugged by the agents of politicians, anxious to keep themselves in power. How can a man or paper be anything but a moral fraud, when he or it asks the thousands who honestly believe in prohibition to vote for Mr. Ross, because he is giving them a prohibition measure that, in the same or in the next column, they say is impossible of enforcement, and which they are bound to turn in and beat when it comes to the people?

We have no doubt that Mr. Ross and his wicked partners are willing to give a pledge that, once they are over the election, they will let the liquor interests have the better end of the stick in taking the vote on the referendum. The Liberals are old and experienced hands at manipulating the ballot box. The public have not forgotten how they allowed the anti-prohibitionists of Quebec to vote against prohibition for weeks after the day of the plebiscite! If there is anything that is fraudulent in Ontario, it is the ballot box, unless watched. What pledges have the prohibitionists that the boxes will be watched, and the voting honestly conducted in places where they cannot watch, and where its management is placed in the hands of men of the kind we know now manage it for the Liberal party?

Good Temperance People, read in another column of this paper of the ballot box frauds in London at the late mayoralty contest; recall the West Elgin frauds; recall the voting in Quebec at the prohibition plebiscite just referred to. This is what is in store for you. All the clever workers at the ballot box business from the Atlantic to the Pacific will be brought into Ontario when the prohibition referendum comes on--not by the liquor men, but by the politicians, who must get rid of prohibition by a cold throw-down, as they call it, as soon as Mr. Ross can get by the election successfully. That's where the politicians want to send you after they get your votes in the election!

And, going back for another moment to moral frauds connected with this question, can there be anything more immoral than the Rev. Mr. Macdonald, editor of The Westminster, leading Presbyterians up to vote for Ross and bogus prohibition, and the Rev. Dr. Grant of Kingston, who, for a consideration to his university, is telling Presbyterians that prohibition ought to be voted down in the referendum when it comes? Mr. Macdonald has been a Grit all his life, before he has been anything else, and Dr. Grant has been "a gentleman of adventure" ever since he came into this province from down beside the sea. He has turned up in every election, after having made a deal with any and every government that happened to be in power, irrespective of what its principles may have been. Dr. Courtice, editor of The Christian Guardian, on the contrary, we believe to be a most conscientious man; but he, and his paper also, The Christian Guardian, are being used to induce the Methodist body to vote for a prohibition stone when prohibition bread is asked for, as had been promised. So far Dr. Courtice has not seen thru the humbugging scheme that the politicians are working; so far he has not seen that the Quebec system of handling the ballot box in the plebiscite will also obtain in the Ontario referendum, once the election is over. And, speaking of prominent Methodists, we believe Senator Cox is honest in his opinion against the introduction of a prohibitory law, and so is Mr. J. W. Flavell, who, we believe, is a Conservative and an ardent friend of abstinence, but who is opposed to prohibition because it would aggravate rather than cure what he admits is a crying evil. And another very prominent Methodist, and a man known from one end of Canada to the other, Mr. Timothy Eaton, is, we believe, opposed, like Mr. Flavell, to a prohibitory law; but his name and one of his investments is being used without his knowledge, we believe, or without a due realization on his part, to the end of humbugging the Methodist body into supporting Mr. Ross over this election, and then throwing them down good and hard when the referendum takes place. The politicians have no hesitation in using any man or hurting his reputation if they can save their own political necks by the process. Even John Wesley and the mighty record of him that is present with us to-day is to be used to get Mr. Ross out of his trouble.

And, having said all this, have we nothing more to say? Yes. The World believes in temperance. It believes, above all things, in drink reform. It believes that a man is to be made temperate, or better still, an abstainer, by reason and example and not by law. And while we do not believe in a law of prohibition, we certainly do believe in a law of restriction, and the difference between the two is as wide as the difference between the poles. We are against the habit of treating. We are against an undue number of licensed houses in any municipality, we are against cheap licenses, we are against adulterated drink of any kind. We are in favor of a prohibited sale at late hours or on Saturday nights or on Sundays or holidays or election days, and we are in favor of higher licenses; in fact, we would not object to seeing them auctioned to the highest bidder. We are in favor of restriction up to the highest point where it is effective; but we are not for one moment in favor of a prohibition that means illicit sale, that means disrespect for law, that means injury to the country and to investments, and which, in this case, means a law passed by a change in the constitution not approved of by the people.

There is, consequently, only one duty for the opposition in the legislature to do at this stage, and that is to block Mr. Ross in his constitutional proposal. Make him "sit up," as the saying is; make him introduce the prohibitory law that he has promised as any other law is introduced, himself and the government taking full responsibility for it; or, if he insists on a radical change in the constitution in regard to such a law, the referendum to wit, let him first get the authority of the people for that radical change. Should he introduce so radical a departure, he is not entitled even to the estimates for the year; it is the stern and constitutional duty of the opposition, under the circumstances, to force him to appeal forthwith to the people on his conduct and on his revolutionary methods before he submits any drastic law by such methods, or before he is voted another dollar.

Mr. Ross, afraid of being pursued by the Preachers and the Women, would overturn the constitution, demoralize the country, wink at ballot box frauds on a stupendous scale, enlist in his service an army of moral frauds to deceive the Presbyterian and Methodist vote, divide the community into two raging camps, put the clock-back ten years--and all because of an insane desire that the Liberals should be forever in office, even if the heavens fall!

"Judge of nothing at first sight."

A shoe may look well, and fit badly--may fit well and wear badly.

The shoe with a five year record, and the Makers' price stamped on sole is a sure thing, even if bought in the dark.

"The Slater Shoe"

"Goodbye Wreck"

Montreal (89 King St. W.) Agents in every city and town
Ottawa (123 Yonge St.)
London

EXEMPTION ON MACHINERY

Toronto Manufacturers Will Present a Memorial to the Government Asking for It.

CO-OPERATION OF OTHER PLACES

In Having Power of Exemption Vested in Municipal Councils--Favor a Northern Railway.

At a meeting yesterday afternoon of the Executive Committee of the Toronto Branch of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, it was decided to prepare a memorial for presentation to the legislature, requesting the exemption from taxation on machinery, and plant. The memorial will point out the several disadvantages that manufacturers will labor under, owing to a taxation on machinery, and will urge the exemption as a protection to the manufacturer. It is gratified, there is a possibility that Ontario may lose some of its industries, and it will also result in discouraging industry building. In this connection the association will forward letters to the municipalities in the province, placing the matter in a clear light, this step being thought advisable, owing to the composition of many places outside of Toronto to the required exemption. The letter will state that the manufacturers of the required exemption, a two-thirds vote of the ratepayers to enact the legislation, as required, is an injustice to the taxpayer, but in cities it is "practically impossible" say the manufacturers, to bring out so large a percentage of the population as to ensure the necessary majority. The municipalities will be asked to vest the power of exemption as formerly in the hands of the municipal council. The Toronto Board of Trade will be asked to co-operate with the manufacturers in the forwarding of a bill for the exemption of the manufacturing and Northern Ontario Railway.

Mr. J. O. Thorn presided over the meeting.

MODERN STAGE DISCUSSED.

Minister Thinks It Pays No Attention to Ethical Influence.

The Toronto Ministerial Association yesterday listened to a paper by Rev. J. C. Speer on "The Ethical Outlook of the Modern Drama." Mr. Speer believed that theatres were run with regard only to the financial results and without the slightest thought of the ethical influence exerted. The object of the evening was to keep as near the subject of the association as possible. He attributed the immoral tone to the desire to cater to the public.

In the discussion which followed Rev. W. Pedley expressed the opinion that the paper was too severe. He confessed that he had attended theatres, yet had never seen any cause for concern. He could see no objection to attending the question of amusement on the basis of the question of morality. He believed that the feeling had gone abroad that to be religious meant to refrain from amusement.

Rev. W. H. Hincks believed that plays were not so clean as formerly, because clean plays were not popular. A communication was read from the Trades and Labor Council commenting upon the paper recently read by Rev. Mr. Pedley on "The Church in Relation to Labor." The Trades Council invited the Ministerial Association to hold a conference with them on the labor question.

A committee will enquire whether a Swedenborgian minister may be a member of the association.

The Indian and the Northwest.

A handsomely illustrated book, just issued, and containing 115 pages of interesting historical data relating to the settlement of the Northwest, with fine half-tone engravings of Black Hawk, Sitting Bull, Red Cloud and other noted chiefs; Custer's battlefield and ten colored map plates showing location of the various tribes dating back to 1800. A careful review of the book impresses one that it is a valuable contribution to the history of these early pioneers, and should be in every library. Price, 25 cents per copy. Mailed postage prepaid upon receipt of this amount by W. B. Kniskern, 22 Fifth Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

When washing greasy dishes or pots and pans, Lever's Dry Soap (a powder), will remove the grease with the greatest ease.

The Great Northern Railway Once More Takes the Lead.

In offering reduced rates to the Northwest, commencing March 1, and continuing daily thereafter until April 30, inclusive, cheap, one-way, second-class rates will be in effect to all points in the States of Montana, Washington, Oregon; also to Roseland, Nelson, Victoria, Vancouver, New Westminster and other points in British Columbia. Don't miss this opportunity of visiting the Golden Northwest to select a home for yourself. For rates, literature and all other particulars call on or write Charles W. Graves, district passenger agent, 6 West King Street (Room 12), Toronto, Ont.

Liquor, Tobacco and Morphine Habits.

A. McTaggart, C.M., 75 Yonge Street, Toronto.

References as to Dr. McTaggart's professional standing and personal integrity permitted by:

Rev. J. W. Ross, Premier of Ontario.
Rev. John P. D.D., Victoria College.
Rev. William C. D.D., Knox College.
Rev. Father Ryan, St. Michael's Cathedral.
St. Rev. A. Swetnam, Bishop of Toronto.

Dr. McTaggart's Vegetable Remedies for the liquor, tobacco, morphine and other drug habits are beneficial, safe, inexpensive home treatments. No hypodermic injections, no publicity, no loss of time from business, and a certainty of cure. Consultation or correspondence invited. 297

EULOGIZED JUDGE LISTER.

Action for Wrongful Dismissal in Civil Action.

In the Civil Action yesterday afternoon Chief Justice Meredith made feeling reference to the death of Mr. Justice Lister. The suddenness, said His Lordship, was more startling, because Judge Lister was in the prime of life, full of vigor, and gave promise of many years' service, the service of a useful life. Before his elevation he had devoted himself to public life. His great, good sense and his knowledge of people and of human affairs, made him a useful member of the judiciary. It will be difficult to fill his place. Those who met Judge Lister found him able and courteous. His relations with his fellow-members of the bench were of the most cordial character, and by them he will be greatly missed. "Looking at the suddenness of his death," concluded His Lordship, "we may well say, 'In the midst of life we are in death.'"

The action brought by W. R. Bird of this city against the William Green

TO ROME COMPANY OF BERLIN.

dismissed with costs. Bird was a traveler for the firm from September, 1891, to April, 20, 1900. They deal in shirts and collars. From October, 1899, he was to have a \$100 a month, and 4 per cent. on all sales over \$30,000. He claimed that he was wrongfully dismissed, and asked for \$336.50 for the alleged breach of contract. The company, in reply, said that either party had a right to terminate the agreement at a month's notice. Bird said he would leave, if they wished, and they wished. There was a cause for the dismissal if there was one.

After a consultation among the lawyers the suit of Webb v. New

TRIED ALL CATARRH REMEDIES.

Japanese Catarrh Cure the only one that cures. Mr. John Wylie, senior clerk for Mr. George Wardlaw, the Queen Street druggist, writes: "I believe I have been cured of my catarrh. I had tried every remedy without effect until I used this one, which completely cured me. Several of my customers speak highly of it. With the wonderful result that I have had, so a box of Catarrh, or postpaid from the G. & J. Company, Limited, 11 Church Street, Toronto."

York Life, an action to recover on a \$1000 policy, was sent over to the next court.

Betting Excluded.

London, Feb. 10.--Another change has taken place in the proprietorship of The Daily News of this city. George Cadbury has bought out his co-partners. A number of new departures are contemplated. A special feature will be made of social reform. Betting and turf news will be rigidly excluded from the paper, but the reporting of other sports will be continued.

Fell Down Stairs.

Cornwall, Feb. 10.--Roach Way, an old man, aged 83 years, fell down stairs on Saturday night and broke his neck. The old man was following his nephew upstairs to retire, when he suddenly fell backwards, killing himself almost instantly.

TO CURE A COLD IN ONE DAY.

Take Laxative Bromo Quinine Tablets. All druggists refund the money if it fails to cure. E. W. Grove's signature is on each box: 25 cents.