

Temperance Department.

"RATIONAL TEMPERANCE."

Considerable interest has been drawn to the fact that it is proposed to establish a new "Rational Temperance Society" in Toronto, based on the idea that intemperance can be most effectually removed by pledging abstinence from distilled liquors only, and sanctioning the use of wine, beer and other malt liquors. The object will be also to encourage the enactment of a law prohibiting the sale of distilled liquors, allowing the others to be vended under legal sanction as they now are.

Everybody would rejoice if the great social scourge of intemperance could be removed or lessened by this new organization, of which Prof. Goldwin Smith is the most distinguished advocate. Temperance societies, of whatever name, are but the expression of a burning desire to rid society of the gigantic evils of strong drink.

The principal objection raised against the new organization is that it is based upon an old theory which has been tried and failed many times, viz., that alcoholic liquors are productive of intemperance only when taken in the form of distilled spirits. This idea was completely exploded by the Duke of Wellington's Beer Bill of 1832, which resulted in such an increase of drunkenness in England that Lord Brougham made prompt and earnest efforts to get it repealed.

Apart from this, however, the new movement seems to lack that appreciation of the evils it proposes to remove, and that moral enthusiasm so essential to successful reform. When the leader of a crusade stands and calmly looks on through the big end of a telescope there can be little hope that he will ever conduct his followers into the actual field of battle. Mr. Goldwin Smith says that there "has been exaggeration on the subject. Drunkenness is not the source of all crime." What would have been thought of a society for the abolition of slavery, whose chief spokesman takes for his text, "Slavery is not the source of all crime." Any one who aspires to lead in a moral crusade need not exaggerate the evils, but if he commences by minimizing them he may at once retire.

Mr. Gladstone, who speaks only as an observer, not as a temperance reformer, says that "the evils of intemperance are greater than the combined evils of war, pestilence, and famine," and our Toronto police court does not say much for Mr. Smith's idea that we are reforming so fast under a whisky and beer rule that we need not make so much haste to be sober. Last Monday 60 cases of drunkenness were dealt with in the Toronto police court, and every day the magistrates have to deal with such cases.

Still no harm can be done by reviving interest in the question raised by the Rational Liberal Temperance Union. Truth will out.

A challenge has been published by Mr. W. Burgess, of Toronto, a representative total abstinence, to the leading spirits of the new movement which, if accepted, would tend to bring about a lively discussion on all the points of difference regarding the best methods of temperance work. The following are the propositions contained in the challenge:—

1. That total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages is not a mere expedient to be advised and encouraged for particular cases, but a natural, logical and scientific practice, applicable and adapted to the whole human family.

2. That total abstinence is in harmony with the highest degree of physical health, while the use of beer and other alcoholic beverages is among the most destructive of practices against human life and health.

3. That the manufacture of intoxicating liquors, including beer and modern wines, is not "a great industry," but a destroyer of wealth and produce, and inconsistent with national progress and prosperity.

4. That the liquor dealers and manufacturers have no claim upon the public purse for compensation.

It would certainly be a matter of great interest to have these questions fairly discussed, and much more likely to bring out the facts than a mere one-sided platform.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC AND COMPENSATION.

BY W. BURGESS, TORONTO.

I do not advocate that "no proposal is either just, proper or admissible unless supported by precedent." Any number of precedents do not justify the enactment of a wrong, and any particular right is no less a right because it has never been recognized before.

In my previous article in TRUTH I simply replied to those who claim compensation to the liquor factors on the ground of precedent that there is no such thing in history. The liquor traffic, whether viewed from the standpoint of its effects upon society, or its relation to the State, has no parallel.

The liquor dealers claim a precedent in the British vote to slave owners, and thus invite a comparison between their business and the infamous traffic in human life and blood. Even Mr. Hood, whose article recently appeared in these columns, after objecting to the theory of establishing a proposal by precedent, returns to the illustration. I claim that a British vote of twenty millions was a compromise between two causes of action. Either the Government must forcibly take possession of the slaves who had been regarded as property and traded as such, or they must pay for them in order to set them free. Parliament was divided on the question, but the Government decided to buy. Mr. Hood claims that this act of setting free men hitherto regarded as property, "at the same time extinguished the right of property-owners in that kind of property for all time to come." But if he will think a little he will see that British judgment and law did not rest upon the money paid. Had the Government simply paid for the existing slaves and left the matter there, human greed and villainy would have re-enslaved the purchased negroes. Law, to be effective, must rest upon a firmer basis than a mere respite or compromise with evil-doers. The law declares that there is no such thing as "a right" to hold human beings as property, and those of the slave-owners who were not satisfied to give up all claim to slaves as property on the bare payment for existing stock, had to yield—not, however, because of the twenty million vote, but because Parliament had declared the holding of slaves to be illegal. The righteousness of this judgment was not based upon the concession made to slave-owners. It was right to enact that men and women are not property. It would have been wrong not to enact it, even if every slave-owner had been ruined by the law.

If the liquor traffic is a right no amount of compensation can justify its prohibition; if it is wrong the question of compensation ought not to be considered as a condition of its prohibition.

Compensation for rights disturbed, for wrongs inflicted, for contracts broken, by any new law is already an accepted principle of British law. If, in order to effect a public good a citizen's property must be taken, the owner must be paid. If, in order to prohibition the State "seizes" the closing of the distillery, or the brewery, or to annul existing licence contracts, it will be necessary to pay for the property and compensate the license holders.

Mr. Hood is strangely at sea when he says that "Governments in issuing licences, instead of granting a right actually take that right away." In granting a licence to sell liquor there is no question of "rights" involved. Government neither gives nor takes away, for no such thing as the right to sell liquor has existed for many generations. What does your correspondent mean by robbing "the seller of a liberty he possessed," etc. No one possesses the liberty to sell liquor. Those who do sell it do so by privilege or permit, under a rigid contract binding them as to time, place, hours of sale, and other conditions. All that the State

Act does is to stop the issue of these contracts, and as they are contracts in which limitation of time is an essential principle. If any wrong has been done it is in selling annual permits to certain men, and prohibiting other people from selling. But when the law says—you hotel-keepers, etc., must in future be placed on a level with the rest of the public, wherever is the injustice?

Mr. Hood falls into the practice of quoting precedents again when he talks of a tax upon gentlemen's carriages in England. The mistake is a common one. The carriage tax is no license to permit a man to ride. Anybody who can afford it may run a carriage in England, but he pays a tax upon it just as we pay a dog tax. There are not licenses to permit men to keep a carriage or a dog, but a tax upon the carriage or dog, which may be owned and kept by right and not by permission.

It is useless, however, to try to keep out of sight the great reason why the prohibition of the liquor traffic is in demand. There are evils which must be removed, whatever the cost to individuals or the nation, and without involving the questions of precedent and compensation.

If public safety demands it, a man's property may be justly destroyed. If, by the destruction of a house, we can prevent the ravages of fire over a town or city, universal judgment cries it right to do it. If carriage driving, or keeping dogs were a great source of social ruin and public danger, public opinion would demand their prohibition. If dogs were so inherently vicious that they were a pest and a constant danger to life, their restraints during dog-days would not satisfy the people, but the Government would put a fine upon the head of every dog, and exterminate them as they did the wolves.

The number of the slain by drink in Canada every year is variously estimated at from 5,000 to 7,000. Mr. Gladstone says of it that its evils are "greater than the combined evils of war, pestilence and famine."

Canadian citizens are beginning to realize that these evils are no occasional accident of the liquor traffic, but a certain natural consequence of its existence, as proved by history and experience. While we are pushing this traffic to its doom interested men cry—Hold! Let the country first pay us for the machinery with which we have sown broadcast the seeds of a worse evil than "was pestilence or famine;" and there are politicians and others who actually echo this cry. Out upon such trifling! While homes are destroyed and citizens are slain in thousands, men stand carelessly discussing the award to be given to those who have facilitated their ruin and grown rich upon the proceeds. As well might Parliament have held back the mounted police and volunteers, to discuss the question of compensating or rewarding Riel and his followers.

The fault is not that the country has given its ultimatum too soon to the liquor men, but too long have they been permitted to hold away, and experience proves that it is not notice they want, but toleration or permission to continue their nefarious work of ruin and social wreck. Twenty years ago the Dunkin Act was passed, and the liquor men refused to accept it as a notice to quit. Eight years ago the Scott Act was passed, and they fought it with every possible quibble and technical objection. The patience of the people is wearing out, and the tremendous majorities for the Scott Act are indications that the community is growing utterly weary of tampering with this king of all evils.

ENGLISH COFFEE HOUSES.—It is stated that there are now in England 202 incorporated Coffee House Companies, running 545 coffee houses. Besides these 562 more are being conducted by private individuals. All, or nearly all, of these are reported to be financially successful. There does not appear to be anything like the same necessity for coffee houses in Canada, as in nearly every city and large town there is an abundance of respectable eating restaurants conducted on temperance principles. So far our Canadian coffee houses have done but little more than supply cheap food.

GOOD TEMPLARS.

MORE PROGRESS.—During the last two weeks two new Good Templar lodges have been instituted in the western part of the

city of Toronto, and another has at least been projected in another part of the city. The result indicates real earnest work on the part of some of the well known members of the Order here.

On Thursday evening, 2nd inst., Queen City Lodge was instituted by Bro. W. J. Beckett, assisted by a number of the members from the different city lodges. The leading officers are: Bro. M. Wroe, W. C. T.; Edith Mathews, W. V.; E. S. Cuttle, W. S.; W. J. Beckett, L. D. There are 42 members. The new lodge meets Thursday evenings at Crocker's Hall, No. 700 Queen St. West.

On Friday evening, 10th inst., Railway Signal Lodge was instituted in the parlor of the Y. M. C. A. rooms at the west end, by Bro. Daniel Rose, assisted by nearly a score of the leading Toronto Templars, nearly every lodge being represented. Thirty charter members are reported. The meetings will be held on Wednesday evenings at Old Fellows' Hall, Dundas St. Bro. W. R. Watson, L. D., 4 Adelaide St. W.; G. W. Whitley, W. C. T., 698 Queen St. W. Visitors will be heartily welcomed at both these new lodges.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G. C. R., St. Mary's.—Thanks. We are well supplied with music of every description.

ELIZABETH WOOLLAVER, London, Hants Co., N.S.—Send six cents in stamps for brooch.

S. R., Hamilton.—Card received. You will be in no way affected by the matter alluded to.

C. A. Logan, Chicago.—You can best get the information you desire at any respectable book-binders.

E. R., Ottawa.—A person, already a prize winner, is entitled to compete again at any time, and as all prizes are impartially awarded, his chances are as good as any one else.

"HORSESHOE."—A mascotte is a fetich, a luck bringer. A mascotte may be a son or a sixpence, a wife or a button—in fact, anything which a person has associated with his lucky turn in his affairs.

S. B., Windsor.—The British navy consists of 246 vessels, of which sixty-one are armor-plated and twenty-three are frigates and corvettes. The Russian navy consists of 373 vessels, of which 111 are armor-plated.

T. C., Colborne.—The same person may send in answers more than once and try for the middle and consolation awards, as well as for the first. Numbers have done this. If you only want one copy of TRUTH have the extra one ordered to some friend.

"MOSES."—The letters O. K. have become the abbreviation for "all correct." The adoption of the letters is said to have been the result of a high official of the government spelling the words all correct "all korrek." It is probably purely fanciful.

MERCHANT, Caledonia.—Yes: if a drummer persists in remaining in your store after you have told him to leave, you may pluck him on the neck and crop, if you are able. If, however, you are not very muscular, either select a poorly developed drummer for your first experiment or call your porter to assist you.

W. T. LUNDY, Brampton.—Thanks for your correction in re the doubling of the cent and so on, for 31 days, but if you had read TRUTH carefully you would have seen that we corrected the amount in the next number but one following that in which the calculation was given. However, we state once more that if a cent is doubled and then the two cents doubled again, and so on for a month, the result will be \$10,737,418.24. We have got twenty-four cents ourselves and in time hope to have the rest.

WALTER T. MASTIN, Dunedin.—Your poem was not considered to be entitled to the prize, and that's why it did not receive it. Though, as you say, it may have been highly recommended by ministers of the gospel, we do not consider the clergy, as a body, infallible judges of good poetry. The reason you have not received your "paltry butter-knife" (thanks) is probably because you have not sent a couple of paltry three-cent stamps to pay postage on it. We are sorry you are not going to send any old poetry, as we have only 1983 pieces on hand at present, sent in for competition.

A plump
To hunt
A frisky
And gay

Said the
the
its wing
While the
"Dear D

"Can you

But asks
no the
And each

Some
some
hand
the w
handso
old at
could
pulled

but no
be a be
the sta
then a
pieces

the cat
stood
cat spr
that s
plays

childre
ing tur
like hi
is a tai
and tai

called
pocket
up in s
sides.

—Jack
little b
The ti
legs in
and th

dog a
would
catch i
the do
opened

it, but
One
him a
Poor J
got so:

it, but
the w
would
traced
all car.
Gip
noon f