

ESTABLISHED 1866.

THE MONETARY TIMES.

TRADE REVIEW AND INSURANCE CHRONICLE.

With which has been incorporated the
INTERCOLONIAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, of Montreal in (1869), the
TRADE REVIEW, of the same city (in 1870) and the
TORONTO JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.

ISSUED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING

SUBSCRIPTION—POST PAID:

CANADIAN AND U. S. SUBSCRIBERS,	\$2.00 Per Year.
BRITISH SUBSCRIBERS	10s. 6d. Sterling Per Year.
SINGLE COPIES	10 Cents.

Book and Job Printers

PUBLISHED BY

THE MONETARY TIMES PRINTING CO. OF CANADA, Limited

EDW. TROUT, President.

ALFRED W. LAW, Sec'y-Treas.

Office: 62 Church St., Cor. Court St.

TELEPHONES:

BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, 1392

PRINTING DEPARTMENT, 1485

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1902.

THE SITUATION.

In the opening speech delivered from the Chair of State, at the beginning of the session of the Ontario Legislature we read, among other things: "Measures will be submitted concerning the sale of intoxicating liquors, the construction of a railway from North Bay to Lake Temiskaming, increased representation for the northern districts of the province, the assessment laws, the fisheries and other corporations." The reference to intoxicating liquors must be taken in connection with the recently expressed convictions of leading prohibitionists of the necessity for guarantees to ensure the due enforcement of a prohibition law, if enacted. These gentlemen have come to realize that paper prohibition without the necessary force of public opinion would retard instead of advancing the cause of temperance. In their changed attitude the greatest obstacle to successful prohibition legislation has been removed. Enforcement is impossible without a strong backing of public opinion, a fact which the most prominent prohibitionists are now foremost in declaring. In Manitoba opinion on the question is to be ascertained by a special vote of the electors, and there is no other known way in which this knowledge can be obtained in Ontario. As Mr. Roblin has let it be known that the two provinces have decided upon a common policy, it is natural to expect that this policy will be carried out here too. The legislation for New Ontario will be the *piece de resistance* of the session, though in some respects secondary to prohibition.

Ontario Prohibitionists, in view of the decision of the Privy Council on the Manitoba Prohibition Law, and also of the approaching meeting of the Ontario Legislature, are making special efforts to get their views embodied in an Act of the Legislature. With this view they last Saturday sent a strong deputation to the Government, by whom was recited what had been asked by previous deputations, and what promises made by the Government. By these recitals it was made plain that the late Premier, Sir Oliver Mowat,

had promised legislation, if the decision of the Privy Council, which has since been given, should afford the necessary authority. At that time, Mr. Ross echoed the view of the Premier, and it was assumed, no one contradicting, that the view of Mr. Ross, who is now Premier, has undergone no change. There was not much discussion, and the Premier's reply was very short, consisting of only three sentences, and containing the usual promise of consideration. The deputation did not lay down any basis of action in the form of a necessary majority of voters to make a prohibitory law enforceable. This may possibly be done later.

Certain Prohibition journals, including the Presbyterian "Westminster," are collecting the opinions of men of mark on the question what proportion of the electors is required to be in favor of Prohibition in order to make a Prohibition law workable. Principal Caven, who has taken a pronounced part in favor of Prohibition all along, doubted the wisdom of taking less than three-fifths of the votes cast, as a guarantee of enforcement. Chancellor Wallace thought two-thirds might, or he implied, might not be sufficient, according to quality, an element which in a democracy it is impossible to analyze. Votes can be counted, but they cannot be weighed. Chancellor Burwash thought that the two-thirds should also include a clear majority of all the electors. Principal Sheraton, of Wycliffe, put the desired figure at three-fourths, and Rev. John Potts was of opinion that 60 or 70 per cent. of the votes polled should be required. Without some safe basis of this kind, there is little use in crying out for a Prohibition which could not be enforced. In 1855, Mr. Tilley introduced a prohibitive bill in the Legislature of New Brunswick, on the strength of petitions signed by three-fourths of the electors; but even then it was found necessary to repeal the Act the next session of the Legislature. The petitions were not votes, and many persons who signed them may have had no vote.

The Chinese are threatened by the United States with a measure of absolute exclusion of their race, as emigrants, to the Republic. Already a bill has been framed for this purpose. Its authors, Senators and Congressmen from the Pacific coast, have given full expression to the very American feeling that prevails there. As the United States is one of the countries that have been fighting to secure a foothold in China for their trade and their religion, this bill, on the score of the comity of nations, is harsh in the extreme, and to the Chinese themselves it must appear as at once illiberal and unjust. In British Columbia also a strong feeling against the Chinese immigrants exists; and if it were not somewhat held in check by the policy and treaties of the British Government, it would be as rampant as that expressed in the American bill. It remains to be seen whether so drastic a measure as that under consideration will become law. The danger in Canada is that the Ottawa Government is always under pressure to turn tighter the screws of modified exclusion against the Chinese, and that being human they will some day find it difficult to resist.

In Newfoundland the *modus vivendi* governing the French Shore question has expired, and so far no move for its renewal has been made. There is a strong