

# The Advocate.

LOUIS P. KRIBS

Editor and Proprietor

ISSUED EVERY WEEK

HEAD OFFICE:

ABERDEEN CHAMBERS

Corner Adelaide and Victoria Streets,

TORONTO, CANADA.

Subscription:

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

Advertising:

Cost of Rates on Application.

Toronto and Montreal, Thursday, April 19, 1894.

## ONTARIO'S LIQUOR LAW.

On another page we publish an admirable digest of Ontario's liquor license law prepared by Mr. E. Saunders, one of the counsel in the Prohibition reference now pending before the Supreme Court at Ottawa. Every license holder should read it from beginning to end carefully. He will find in it a great deal that will be new to him, and the knowledge of which may in the time to come save him from such harassing as well as from the waste of much time and the expenditure of much money. The language used by Mr. Saunders is so plain and so thoroughly to the point that the merest tyro can understand what is set forth. In publishing this matter there is one feature that we wish to direct attention to, and that is that those who do not get this paper will fail to receive the legal counsel that is absolutely necessary in the proper conducting of their business. We propose to give similar digests of the law as it stands in every province. License-holders who do not read these articles will have themselves to blame if they become involved in heavy law costs consequent upon ignorance of the law.

## PROHIBITION.

The great question before the people is not: Is Prohibition a necessity, but is it right, is it justifiable, can it be justified? To all three of the propositions we say Yes. Why? Because, first, last and the whole time, it curtails the liberty of the people. But, our opponents say, liquor is an insidious poison. Is it? Is there anything under God's Heaven that cannot be abused, that cannot be converted from a blessing into an evil? Bread cannot? And yet we have the scriptural injunction that man cannot live by bread alone. Water cannot? There have been more cases of sudden death, more cases of the foundation being laid for future disease by inhaling cold water when the drinker was heated than by any single drink of whiskey. But the drinking of whiskey leads to a perpetual thirst, and

a perpetual thirst means death is the next proposition. You read leads to the river and the river to death if you plunge in and cannot swim. But we are not going to abolish either the river or the road. Neither are we going to, nor should we, abolish what to many is a comfort, a joy and a solace, because to a very, very small per centage it brings disaster. Every now and again death results from canned meats. But canned meats are sold without restriction. Every now and then we hear of death lurking in ice-cream, but ice-cream continues to be freely sold. We say it here and defy contradiction that greater foundation for disease and death is laid in the candy shop than in the bar-room, and the candy shop without perpetual tax and worry continues to exist and to thrive. The women who deal out poison by the dose to your children would deprive you, a grown and reasonable man, of the right to drink a glass of wine or anything else for your stomach's sake. Let those people who lament the evil they think they see ponder over the evils they now ignore. The foundation of the evil, if it still there be, is in the candy, eye, even in the way-side grocery store.

Liquor used in moderation, and at the right time, is one of the greatest blessings God has given to man. Proof? Ask any doctor if he knows of a drug or herb that is of strengthening value without alcoholic properties; and then ask him what percentage of his patients in serious cases he endeavors to bring to the full possession of health without the aid of alcohol. Some doctors are arrayed against the promiscuous use of whiskey, wine or beer, but there is not one that does not find it necessary to resort to one or the other during his practice. If he didn't he would often sacrifice his patient. Whiskey is a curse to those who abuse it, so is ice-cream, so is tea, so is coffee, so is meat, so are pickles, so are oysters, so are eggs, so are sausage rolls and croast puffs, so is everything. But yet we continue to eat or drink them all. Make man perfect and the race will vanish. Give him liberty and the best will survive. Your man is the man who resists temptation, not the man who, kept in swaddling clothes all his life, never comes to realize what temptation is.

## A BISHOP AND HIS TEXT.

At a session of the New York Methodist Conference the other day, Bishop Vincent gave his interpretation of St. Paul's advice to Timothy: "Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." "It would be as absurd for me to draw from this passage," he said, "the general views of Paul as to Prohibition and the use of wine as to infer his views as to certain other things from other single sentences in his writings. But a very sensible Irishman, Father Matthew, to whom this advice of St. Paul to Timothy was quoted, when he was asked to take a drink, gave the best possible reply to it: 'Well, in the first place, my name is not Timothy; and, in

the second place, my stomach is all right.' The fact is, I think that St. Paul meant that we may use wine for the relief of physical pain, but, at the same time, the very fact that he found it necessary to give this advice shows that there was a strong temperance sentiment among the followers of Christ." Father Matthew's reply was witty, but it shirked the issue. The Bishop says his interpretation is that "we may use wine for the relief of physical pain." That is a concession with which we have no cause to grumble, but where do the "often infirmities" come in? The Bishop has no more right to say that "physical" is there referred to than "mental." Excellent scholars have declared that the phrase refers to both. Anyway, physical or mental, the text shows that people who advocate Prohibition fly in the face of the scriptures. There is no doubt there was a strong temperance sentiment among the followers of Christ. Without temperance Christianity is impossible. Still there is nothing in the text to prevent the conclusion that Timothy was reproving those who would deprive the people of their creature comforts, that, in fact, he was telling the extremists of his day of what true temperance consisted. The term "often infirmities" certainly implies something more than casual physical pain, such as an occasional discomfiture of the stomach. It must also mean weariness both of mind and body.

## MASTER WORKMAN POWDERLY.

DISCREDITED by the Knights of Labor, the order that he ruled with an iron hand for ten years, T.V. Powderly was brought here by the "Temperance people who misuse the Sabbath by holding campaign meetings in the Pavilion on that day, to address them." There is nothing strange in the fact that when one branch fails him, the professional agitator should turn to another; but temperance people should really see to it that the man they engage to talk to them is worthy the position in which he is placed. Personally, Mr. Powderly is a companionable man, but he is tarnished with antipathy to the empire to which we choose to owe allegiance. He is a leading member of the Clan-na-Gael and has been charged with advocating violent measures towards the mother country in the sacred name of liberty. His chief accuser is Le Caron, the spy, who is said to be dead. Of course Mr. Powderly denies the allegation and contemns "the allegator." That is but natural, and that Le Caron was not a man whom we could hold in high esteem is a certainty, but people who claim to hold a monopoly of respectability and morality, should at least be careful how they select their associates. Disloyalty will not gain them adherents, and the fact that Powderly was even under suspicion was sufficient reason why temperance advocates should not have invited him to address them on Sunday afternoon. But then glibness of tongue and always has been, the one great consideration in the engagement of orators for the Pavilion.

It disastrously exhibits our temperance friends that they should have to go abroad at all for talent for their Sunday entertainments, but that they should put forward men objectionable to a large section of their own people, as the ex-Master Workman of the Knights of Labor admittedly is, brings discredit upon themselves as well as upon their cause.

## ACRANK ON THE WARPATH.

As individual who signs himself Richard J. Wicksteed wrote a letter which appeared in *The Mail* of Saturday that so far as Magistrate O'Gara, of Ottawa, is concerned, seems grossly libellous. It charges the Magistrate with dismissing eleven cases of violation of the license act under instructions from Toronto, and because the defendants were co-religionists, on frivolous and trivial technicalities. The letter also states that the informers "Offered these cases to the local license inspector for prosecution. Just previous to this Mr. J. K. Stewart, provincial inspector, had come down to Ottawa with instructions from his superiors not to permit the faithful supporters to be irritated by prosecutions. He broke his oath of office but obeyed his masters—the license inspectors would not prosecute the informants laid down by their own detectives."

Mr. J. K. Stewart, provincial inspector, replied in Monday's paper, denying Mr. Wicksteed's statements in toto and referring to the informers in this wise:

Neither superior nor any other person had any communication with me upon the subject, nor was I aware that the detectives in question were then in Ottawa until after my arrival there. I then learned that they had been employed by the inspector for a certain time, that had expired, and had been paid for the work done; that after being paid they had left the city. Subsequently he found out that they waited to attend some horse-races, bet their money in a pool-room, and lost some \$60, all they had. Later they reappeared and informed him that they had obtained additional cases which they desired prosecuted to enable them to raise money to leave the city. The inspector was doubtful what to do, but did proceed in three cases. In the meantime he received apparently trustworthy information that in two instances the detectives had offered to compromise cases upon payment to them of \$10 each. His suspicions had been previously aroused by the fact that in a certain case the detectives, when called as witnesses, failed to appear, and he was compelled to ask twice for adjournments owing to their absence. He consequently hesitated to accept further cases from them. When informed of the facts I told the inspector as he had employed the men on his own responsibility, he must use his own discretion in the matter. I gave him no instruction whatever, but did advise caution lest he might be brought into discredit should the charges alleged against the detectives prove to be true. The detectives were subsequently arrested and placed in goal upon the sworn information of a prominent liquor dealer, charging them with attempting blackmail. Although not convicted, the evidence was of such a character as to convince the inspector that he would not be justified in acting upon the other informations which they had tendered him.