

Coming Presicite

Several Letters For and Against Prohibition.

The Question Ably Discussed From Its Two Standpoints.

Prof. Goldwin Smith's Letter and Rev. Robert Johnson's Reply Criticized.—Mr. W. H. Orr on the Effects of Prohibition—Principal Grant's Reasons for Opposing It.

To the Editor of The Advertiser: I sincerely trust that all of those who read Prof. Goldwin Smith's article on Prohibition in your columns, did not fail to read Rev. Robert Johnson's reply, which, I think, all candid readers will admit, was most conclusive. And while we rejoice that we have so many able advocates in our Dominion, and among the most influential of our leaders, at the same time, we deplore at the same time the fact that such men as Rev. Dr. Grant and Prof. Goldwin Smith are opponents of such measures as we believe are for the amelioration of our fellow-men.

We cannot fail to observe the inconsistencies of many of these eminent opponents of prohibition. While admitting that the temperance sentiment is growing and that the restrictive measures which have been fought for and won by the prohibitionists have proved beneficial in repressing crime and drunkenness of course they do not put it just that way, but they are admitting it whether they know it or not; and yet on every opportunity presented, using both voice and pen against this same educating influence. It was just the same when the Scott act was repealed in Ontario. The article appeared in the *Daily Globe* from the pen of a certain divine, who preached in one of the large churches in the city of Toronto. He deplored the defeat of this temperance measure, saying "Drunkness and crime will now be rampant. It is indeed a very great calamity." Yet the same man, on every occasion, and where an opportunity presented itself, depicting the measure as a useless and abortive piece of machinery. In replying to my article I modestly asked, among a few other questions: "How could it be possible that the loss to any community of a license could be a calamity?" In this trenchant reply of Mr. Johnson's very significantly refers to the "facile pen and magic style" of Mr. Smith. I have often thought while reading his beautifully written thoughts on many other subjects, that the strength of his arguments lay principally in the beautiful flow of language and in the beauty of style with which those thoughts were clothed, rather than in the incisive conclusiveness of his arguments. The premises which he lays down in his article on prohibition, certainly serves as a ground for argument. "There is no touching you if you first lay down your premises, and then prove them by means of your conclusion," which, I think, he has failed to do.

I have no doubt that the liquor men must feel that their interests are considerably strengthened when they can claim as their advocates and champions two of the foremost educationists in our province. I think no better campaign literature could have been secured by the temperance people of London and elsewhere than this reply referred to, by publishing it in leaflet form, and thus getting it into homes where your valuable paper may not be a regular visitor. Having spent a short time at some of the principal summer resorts in Maine, I can corroborate what has already been stated by many prohibitionists. Hope I have not trespassed.

JENNIE BARLTROP.
Appin Parsonage

Sept. 15, 1898.

PROHIBITION ELSEWHERE

Mr. W. H. Orr on Its Effects—A Blessing in Maine—The License Law in Nova Scotia.

To the Editor of The Advertiser:

It speaks well for prohibition as the best available preventive of the giant evils of intemperance that places which have heretofore had a taste of it are the strongest advocates of it. In Nova Scotia the license law has been so stringent that for more than twenty years past no license to sell liquor by the glass has been issued in any but two counties. One of these is Halifax county, including Halifax city, with a large number of licensed and unlicensed bars. And yet in the 1894 plebiscite vote in that province, even that county gave a more than two-thirds majority for prohibition. And so did the city itself.

Here is the entire vote by counties taken March 15, 1894, in that province:

County.	Yes.	No.
Antigonish	2,625	93
Antigonish	883	948
Cape Breton	2,644	1,916
Colchester	3,063	282
Cumberland	4,596	511
Digby	1,636	27
Guysboro	1,392	382
Halifax	5,357	2,351
Hants	2,638	349
Inverness	1,973	809
King's	3,170	249
Lunenburg	2,567	912
Pictou	1,137	225
Richmond	978	436
Shefford	1,838	166
Victoria	1,165	288
Yarmouth	1,838	501
Total votes	43,756	12,235

The net majority for prohibition was 31,466, or more than two-thirds, only one county, Antigonish, giving a small majority of 65 for the license system.

In Ontario also, in the plebiscite vote of Jan. 1, 1894, the counties in which the Scott Act had been tried gave the largest majorities for national prohibition. Take Bruce, which voted the Scott Act out by only 3,692 to 5,085 in 1888, and after six years of license it

votes 6,608 to 3,100 for prohibition. And Halton, too, which in 1888 lost the Scott Act, after seven years' trial of it, by only 197 votes (2,650 to 1,853), giving a majority in 1894 of 1,270 the other way (2,163 to 893). And Middlesex, after four years of the Scott Act, voted it out as an unsatisfactory form of prohibition (with London selling in the middle of it), by a majority of 2,538; but five years later it voted by 3,793 majority (6,799 to 3,006) for national prohibition.

In the State of Maine prohibition of the mere sale has been tried longer than anywhere else, and no one now thinks of such a thing as trying to have it repealed. After a trial of 40 years it was voted into the constitution by more than the requisite two-thirds majority. It has proved an unspeakable blessing in the removal of the legalized temptation throughout nine-tenths of the state.

But in Maine, in Nova Scotia, in Iowa, in Kansas and in the Dakotas the prohibition is only partial at its best. The manufacture and importation of liquor is not prohibited, as is proposed to be done in Canada. With the selling, the making, the bringing in and the carrying it through the country all closed, and suitable government depots opened for legitimate supply, we may expect much better results in Canada than have yet been accomplished elsewhere.

We hear prohibition spoken of by its enemies as having been a failure wherever tried. What they mean is that it has failed to wipe out the entire traffic, root and branch. But nobody ever claimed that such a thing would be attained. It has not been attained in the laws against murder, theft, arson, burglary, bigamy, gambling, and other evils, or any other evil thing, though tried in this country for a hundred years or more. All that prohibitionists claim is that it is the best way to treat the evil, and indeed the only proper attitude to observe toward it, whether successful or not. We should not impute our hands in our brother's blood. It is as wrong for a nation as for an individual voter to go contrary to the warning, "Woe unto him that putteth the bottle to his neighbor's mouth."

We have prohibition now in Ontario of 599 persons out of each 600 population in the rough. It is only a short step to take to drop the other man also, so that all may be treated alike. And this, too, has been already done in many municipalities under local option, or because there is no demand for liquor over large areas. And those are the places where the most pronounced majorities will be given for prohibition of the entire traffic throughout our fair Dominion. WM. H. ORR, Toronto.

PRINCIPAL GRANT'S LETTERS

Two of His Noted Epistles on Prohibition—Does Not Think It Practicable and States His Reasons.

By request we publish two of Principal Grant's letters on Prohibition, which appeared in the *Toronto Globe*. The first is as follows:

The Government of Canada has promised that the prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicants shall be ascertained by means of a plebiscite. Parliament will probably be asked at its next session to provide means for taking the vote. If a majority vote yes, the government will be under a moral obligation to introduce the necessary legislation to give effect to the vote; even though the popular will shall have been ascertained in an extraordinary way, the government, by constitutional duty, incurs the responsibility of accepting the verdict and giving it the force of law.

And yet it has not been stated officially whether the question shall simply be, "Are you in favor of prohibition?" or whether we shall also be asked as to our willingness to bear our share of the direct taxation which the change may involve.

Whether it has been stated as yet whether a majority of those actually voting, or a majority of the whole electorate, shall be considered by the government to be an adequate expression of the popular will. But once the principle of the plebiscite has been accepted, both of these points are of minor importance, though they may lead to a little either of them.

The matter of transcendent importance is that the government has promised, in accordance with the programme adopted at the Liberal convention of 1897, to submit to direct vote a question involving, not only great commercial, manufacturing and industrial interests, but also popular habits and tastes and public moralities. The premier must have thought well before giving the promise. He must have come to the conclusion that there was something longer with of question which had agitated the public for many years, and had been staved off by glittering unrealities. He must have decided that he and his straight-forwardly with it and to throw upon the whole people the responsibility of giving a decision was wiser, and certainly more moral than to try and humbug sinners with a number of elaborate subtleties or vague promises.

TIME TO CONSIDER OUR DUTY.

Unquestionably he has taken a great risk, but if he is doing so, springs from trust in the good sense of the people, as we have a right to suppose, and a confidence in the wisdom of the continent to try it, especially with a question which has been agitating the public for many years, and has been staved off by glittering unrealities. He must have decided that he and his straight-forwardly with it and to throw upon the whole people the responsibility of giving a decision was wiser, and certainly more moral than to try and humbug sinners with a number of elaborate subtleties or vague promises.

And yet, judging by the results of votes which have been taken in Manitoba, Ontario and the Maritime Provinces, the people seem ready to try the experiment. True, a number of electors are not favorable to prohibition, but who dislike the liquor traffic and sympathize with the moral fervor of many who are fighting against it, declined to go to the polls. But this class may take the same attitude when a Dominion prohibitory law is proposed.

Though a sane, we are a young people, and therefore not disinclined to try big experiments. We feel, with ill-founded confidence, that should it fail it will be quite easy for us to go

back to the former state of things, just as in 1884 the Scott act, carried in nearly the whole of Ontario, was in a few years replaced by majorities larger than those by which it had been carried.

Is this the reason why the great organs of public opinion have as yet said little or nothing on the subject? Or is it because party interests or their own inclination would suffer if they took a decided stand against prohibition? If the former be the reason they have not considered how much more is involved in Dominion than in local legislation. The latter, only those who are willing to themselves to risk something have the right to blame them. Clergymen in active work are not free to take any side but one on this question, and, therefore, the religious press is legitimate. There is hardly one who has not in his congregation parishioners who have suffered, directly or indirectly, because of drunkenness, and the average politician has also good reason for keeping silence. He well knows how intensely some of his friends and some of his foes feel on the subject. It is not for him to give offense to the one class and aid and comfort to the other.

But there are men in Canada—employers of labor, mechanics trusted by their fellows, educational authorities, students of history and sociology, literary men and others—competent and also free to speak out on this great public, non-party and moral question. With submission it seems to me that it is their duty to do so now, and as no man has a right to ask others whether he himself is willing to give or do according to the measure of his ability, I propose to offer a contribution to the discussion.

After long and earnest consideration I have come to the conclusion that a Dominion prohibitory law would be hurtful to the cause of temperance and most hurtful to general public morality. Believing this, it is surely my duty to go to the polls and to vote "no" to the question, "Are you in favor of prohibition?"

G. M. GRANT.

THE SECOND LETTER

Dealing With the Experiment of Prohibition and Its Results—Also With the Failure of the Scott Act in Ontario.

The people of Canada, as compared with all other Christian nations, are singularly abstemious. In making comparisons, I must confine myself to Christendom, for Mahomet and Gaudama, the Buddha and the Jesuists, have prohibited the use of intoxicating liquors. Every good Mahomedan and Buddhist is therefore a pledged abstainer; but, though we are sometimes promised the millennium under a regime of prohibition, no millennium has come yet in Turkey or Armenia, nor where Buddhism has been supreme for more than a thousand years.

The sobriety of the people of Canada is admitted. Mr. Spence recently stated that the consumption of alcoholic liquors per head in the United States averages 17 gallons a year, and in Canada 4½ gallons. What makes the difference of things the more remarkable is that, as a rule, northern people drink more than those to the south of them, and also that the United States has been a land of hope and happy conditions of the two countries were reversed, I would be ashamed to go to Canada regarding drunkenness, and on their duty in the matter of temperance. I might be offered a good fee per night for my services, but shame itself would make me confine my attention to my own country. Even if it were not evident to a self-respecting man that each people can best paddle its own canoe in its own waters.

CANADA IS TEMPERATE.

What has led to our comparatively happy condition of things? A great cause of our comparative religious sentiment of the people, which responds to every sane appeal with regard to admitted evils, an improved public opinion regarding drunkenness, and the use of wine or spirits; better food, lodging, and clothing for the masses; more refined amusements for all; better cooking; better sanitation, these and other causes, when combined with the earnest efforts of temperance reformers to bring about the happy result. We have been winning in the fight for temperance for 50 years, and the social customs were 50, or even 10 or 20 years, ago. The victory is not yet completely won, but why in the name of common sense should we then throw the well-tried sword which have served us so well for the rusty razor of prohibition and constant political fighting to secure new amendments to meet ever new evasions of coercive law?

We have already had trials, in different provinces, of county prohibition, and the results, from a temperance point of view, are a much better record than what prohibition can and cannot do than any of the provinces, and, it besides, is the place to which prohibitionists point with greatest confidence. During the early years of the century, Maine was, perhaps, the most drunken state in the Union. A recoil, essentially religious in its origin, began in 1826, which reached its climax in 1841, when the temperance cause became a popular enthusiasm all over the state. As early as 1831 the official year-book of the state said that "the quantity of alcohol consumed in Maine had been reduced two-thirds within three years." The idea of prohibition never entered the minds of those early reformers. The Washingtonian movement, whose achievements in suppressing intemperance were enthusiastically celebrated in popular songs, reached Maine in 1840, but neither did it dream of prohibition. As one of the leaders of the movement, Dr. Charles C. F. Smith, writes: "We are firm believers in the efficacy and power of moral suasion; they hold that doctrine to be unsound which includes the principle of coercion, and therefore they cannot go hand in hand with those who cry out, 'Give us the strong arm of the law.' Human nature, however, is impatient, and success is apt to make it impatient. It loves short cuts.

MAINE ENACTED A PROHIBITORY LAW IN 1846. What has been the result? In the half-century that has since elapsed 50 amendments have been called for to

...BEGINNING THURSDAY...

Morning, and continuing till Saturday Evening, MISS KENNEDY, the expert fitter, will give to ladies visiting our Corset Department practical illustrations of the many superior advantages of the

ARTIST'S MODEL CORSETS

These Corsets Give without uncomfortable lacing an erect and graceful figure, not obtainable in any other corset. Scientifically designed, the cut and make being perfect, and hygienically considered, the corset gives the required support without impeding the proper exercise of the muscles, allowing freedom of action in every position, with an additional elegance of form, as herewith shown:



LONG,

SHORT-BACK.

SHORT-FRONT.

(Patented in Canada and United States.)

The side forms of the Artist's Model Corsets are made of straps of the best silk elastic, which relieve all pressure on the vital and delicate organs, and clinging to the form give that comeliness of figure so much desired.

It is the only Corset that can be worn while taking exercise in physical culture and outdoor sports without injury to the health.

A cordial invitation is given to the ladies of London to visit our Corset Department—second floor—Thursday and following days, to see the beauties of Artist's Model Corsets fully demonstrated by Miss Kennedy.

SMALLMAN & INGRAM'S.

meet the evasions and the difficulties attending attempts at enforcing the law! Just as men who have drunk too much, and are thirsty, and cry, "More brandy," so the Maine prohibitionists have never ceased to cry for "more law."

Let me refer all who are interested in a study of the Maine liquor laws, and, indeed, of the whole question, to an admirable volume entitled "The Liquor Problem in Its Legislative Aspects," which gives the results of a careful, thorough and impartial investigation, under the direction of the most eminent educational and social reformers in the United States. This enables fair-minded men to form conclusions regarding the whole question, and what it cannot do.

Prohibition can abolish the manufacture on a large scale of distilled, fermented and malt liquors within the area covered by the law. Whether it is moral to abolish factories in which men have invested their property, and which have grown up under the law, without offering the slightest compensation to those whose property is destroyed by law, is another question. But no one pretends that prohibition can abolish illicit manufacture; and illicit stills always turn out the strongest and most poisonous liquors. In Maine, the "hard" liquor usually sold produces forms of intemperance, most injurious to health and life. It is difficult to obtain malt liquors on a small scale, and the "stricter" enforcement of the law, which is nothing but alcohol purchased from druggists and sold after dilution under the name of "spirit."

Prohibition can prevent the open importation of wine, beer or spirits. It cannot prevent smuggling, which, even without prohibition, flourishes at present along the Lower St. Lawrence and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I have not space to discuss the increase of the tariff or of licenses. Sir Richard Cartwright stated at the last session of parliament that the loss to the revenue from this smuggling was \$800,000 a year, and that it was demoralizing the people of whole parishes. It would be impossible, he said, to bring guilt home to the principals without the aid of informers. The government cannot afford to pay informers, but very little has been done. The long, unsettled coasts of the Gulf afford the smugglers too many hiding places. The recent increase of duties has led to an extensive illicit manufacture of alcohol in the country. What would happen under a Dominion prohibition law? Smuggling and the distilling of alcohol would be more and more in the hands of informers.

Prohibition can remove open temptation from the young and from persons disposed to alcoholic excess. It is practically helpless against "dives," "pocket-peddlers," and all the well-known variety of secret temptation which have such a fascination for the young. "Stolen waters are sweet." Still less can it subdue that desire for stimulant which is all but universal in human nature, and which, when ordinary means of gratification are denied, finds relief in opium, morphine, chloral and drugs and drinks of various kinds more pernicious to the constitution than even whiskey.

COLLUSIVE SELLING.

Prohibition can prevent the open sale of intoxicants, though, as long as druggists or other agents are allowed to sell for medicinal, mechanical or sacramental uses, or for use in the arts, it is extremely difficult to distinguish one class of buyers from another. But it can do nothing towards subduing the natural resistance of the human, and especially of the British, heart, to restrictive legislation, which is an infringement on personal liberty.

"It is only in regions where prohibition prevails that illicit selling assumes large proportions." (See the report signed by President Eliot, of Harvard, President Lord, of Columbia, and James C. Carter, of New York.) Now, while, according to the eminent authorities, "the most minute and painstaking legislation has failed to attain the object of the prohibitionists," let me quote a few sentences from their terrible arraignment of "concomitant evils" of their prohibitory legislation in Maine.

CONCOMITANT EVILS.

"The efforts to enforce it during 40 years past have had some unlooked-for effects on public respect for courts, judicial procedure, oaths and law, legislators, and public servants. The public have seen law defied, a whole generation of habitual lawbreakers schooled in evasion and shuffling, actions of policy, delays, perjuries, negligences, and other miscarriages of justice, officers of the law double-faced, insincere, corrupt, timid and crafty, and cunning, and office-holders unfaithful to pledges and to reasonable public expectation.

"The liquor traffic, being very profitable, has been able, when attacked by prohibitory legislation, to pay fines, bribes, hush-money and assessments for political purposes to large amounts. This money has tended to corrupt the lower courts, the police administration, political organizations, and even the electorate itself. . . . Frequent yielding to this temptation causes general corruption for the public service, and, of course, makes the service less desirable for upright men. . . . All legislation intended to put restrictions on the liquor traffic, except, perhaps, the simple tax, is more or less liable to these objections; but the prohibitory legislation is the worst of all in these respects, because it stimulates to the utmost the resistance of the liquor dealers and their supporters."

Who would not rather have even the drinking customs as they were 50 years ago in Ontario than such a horrible state of things? The corrupt society at large, the heads of families, the children, we are not called upon to choose between the two evils. We can continue to improve without attempting dangerous experiments on so delicate a complicated organism as modern society. GEORGE M. GRANT.

An Explanation.

The reason for the great popularity of Hood's Sarsaparilla lies in the fact that this medicine positively cures. It is America's Greatest Remedy, and the American people have an abiding confidence in its merits. Then buy and take it for simple as well as serious ailments, confident that it will do them good.

HOOD'S PILLS cure all liver ills. Mailed for 25c. by C. I. Hood & Co., Lowell, Mass.

Elephants can exert the strength of 31 horses.

This is the weather for the Fly, 1411.

MANY POISONED

One-Tenth of a Michigan Village's Population Prostrated.

Niles, Mich., Sept. 20.—Nearly one-tenth of the entire population of Plainwell, a little village in Allegan county, is ill from eating canned pressed beef at a church social.

Fifty-five persons were poisoned, 20 are dangerously ill, and four are expected to die.

The ladies of the Presbyterian Church gave a supper in the church parlors, and about 100 guests were present, all of whom had supper, and drank of canned beef. Steps are being taken to make a rigid investigation into the food, the doctors believing that either the meat was diseased, or the combination of tin and beef resulted in poisoning.

A late dispatch says: Of the 55 persons who were poisoned from eating canned pressed beef at a church social, 20 are dangerously ill and 4 are expected to die. The doctors have expressed no hope of their recovery. They are: Mrs. Ethel Clancy, Mrs. J. M. Travis, Mrs. John Bishop and L. W. Soule.

BRUTAL MURDER

In Greater New York—An Italian rangled to Death.

New York, Sept. 21.—Three men strangled Andrew Cassogue to death early yesterday morning in his bedroom in a tenement house, No. 253 North Sixth street, Williamsburg. They also attempted to strangle his wife who was sleeping by her husband's side, but she was aroused, made her escape, and gave an alarm. She found her husband dying on the floor with two men standing over him. These two and the man who had attempted to strangle her fled when she made an alarm. The woman then disarmed the man who had strangled her husband, placed under his pillow, was gone. Her husband died shortly after. Two men were found running from the scene. The Cassogues are Italians, and the stolen money represented all their savings.

MOUNT BRIDGES.

Mount Bridges, Sept. 21.—The funeral of the late Alonzo Lucas will take place this afternoon on the arrival of the train from London. Deceased was a charter member of Mount Bridges Lodge, No. 217, I. O. O. F., and will be buried under the same auspices. Deceased has a host of friends in Mount Bridges and vicinity, who extend their sincere sympathy to the family in their hour of sorrow.

The bell of the new Methodist Church arrived yesterday, and will be put in position at once. The work is progressing well and the church is expected to be dedicated on Sunday, Oct. 16th.

We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. J. D. Kellogg's Dysentery Cordial is without doubt the best medicine ever introduced for dysentery, diarrhea, cholera, and all summer complaints, sea sickness, etc. It promptly gives relief and never fails to effect a positive cure. Mothers should not be without a bottle when their children are teething.

The latest whim for the owners of dogs is to make them wear shoes in the house for the purpose of protecting the polished floors.

A Graduate of Toronto University Says:

"My children have been treated with Scott's Emulsion from their earliest years. Our physicians first recommended it, and now, whenever a child takes cold, my wife immediately resorts to this remedy, which always effects a cure."

Tea plantations in India cover 25,000 acres.

IN CUBA, PORTO RICO, AND Philippines, fevers are prevalent. Dr. SIEBERT'S ANGIOSTOMA BITTERS are preventive when taken regularly.

ABBEY'S Effervescent Salt
taken daily, brings health to the system in a pleasant, natural way.