

# The Advocate.

LOUIS P. KRIBBS

Editor and Proprietor

ISSUED EVERY WEEK

HEAD OFFICES

ABERDEEN CHAMBERS

Corner Adelaide and Victoria Streets,

TORONTO, CANADA

Telephone 1805.

Subs: Single

Per Year, in Advance, - - - \$2.00

Reverts to:

Card of Rates on Application.

Toronto and Montreal, Thursday, Oct. 4, 1894.

## PROHIBITION AND DRUNKENNESS.

Over 3,000 commitments to our jails in this province (Ontario) each year by drunkenness according to the Ontario prison reports.

So speaks the *Citizen* and *Home Guard*, a paper published in London in the Prohibition interests by Mr. John Cameron—a good estimable gentleman. The point is quite a proper one. Men should not drink to drunkenness. In so doing they lose their manhood, their control, their ability to do justice to themselves, their respect in the eyes of their fellow men, their position in life and their business prospects, present and future. Drunkenness is a great evil, one that we should all endeavor to minimize, because we cannot do more than minimize the faults of mankind.

The trouble is as to the method. Because it must be borne in mind that while drunkenness is an evil, the moderate and proper use of liquor is the right of every man. Because three thousand persons use liquor to excess is no reason why two millions and a half should be deprived of their rights. Because one man has no self-control it does not follow that 800 are to be ostracised. Therefore the rights of the great majority are not to be lost sight of when considering what is best for the feeble minority. Still, if Prohibition would do any good to the minority the robust majority might voluntarily deprive themselves of undoubted rights for the sake of their weaker brethren. But does Prohibition decrease drunkenness?

Take the figures given by our contemporary. They are general enough, as prohibition figures usually are. They speak of years, a number of years, with slight airiness born perhaps of lack of knowledge of the facts. They assume accuracy and wave off argument with a motion of the hand in true Prohibition style. They state a fact, but give it preposterous proportions in a manner that does not commit them to a falsehood, but yet has all the effect of the blackest lie in the calendar.

It is true there are 3,000 commitments for drunkenness per year, roughly speaking in Ontario, but it is also true that, considering population, this is about the lowest ratio of any civilized state in the world, and much lower than the two strong Prohibition provinces in Canada—

Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It is equally true that New Brunswick has the highest ratio of commitments for drunkenness of any province in Canada and New Brunswick is pointed to with pride—save the word—as “the Banner Prohibition Province” of the Dominion. And it is equally true that when Prohibition prevailed over the greater portion of Ontario drunkenness increased, and when Prohibition was abolished drunkenness decreased.

You doubt this? Then we will give you the proof. We will give the commitments for drunkenness from 1889 down, together with the number of liquor licenses granted in each year:

Year.	No. of Licenses.	Commitments.
1889-1.....	4,165	3,328
1891-2.....	4,760	3,405
1892-3.....	4,930	3,805
1893-4.....	4,940	4,650
1894-5.....	5,516	3,696
1895-6.....	3,098	3,555
1896-7.....	2,726	4,130
1897-8.....	2,290	4,551
1898-9.....	2,565	4,797
1899-0.....	4,246	4,573
1890-1.....	4,256	3,614
1891-2.....	4,189	2,736

It will be observed that from 1889 to 1889 were the Scott Act years, when three-fourths of the Province was under Prohibition; that during those years there was a great decrease in the number of licenses issued; that during those years there was a great increase in the number of commitments for drunkenness; that in 1888, when the Scott Act was in full swing, the commitments for drunkenness reached their highest point; and that upon the resumption of licenses drunkenness decreased rapidly.

The fact is Prohibition means free sale, while license means regulation. Drunkenness can be minimized under license, while under Prohibition it runs riot.

## POLITICALLY CONSIDERED.

Is New York there is a union of all parties to overthrow Tammany. Republicans, Prohibitionists, the Social Party League, County Democrats, Woman's Rights, A.P.A., Farmers' Alliance, are all combined for the demolition of the great Democratic tiger. Tammany has been corrupt to the core but nobody believes for a moment that all of this united effort, this amalgamation of demagogues and democrats, republicans and riff-raff is solely and entirely in the interests of political morality. And the chances are that Tammany will beat the field.

In Canada at the next general elections for the Dominion we are, judging by the present trend of events, liable to see a strange combination of atomic political globules thrown from a different or perhaps differently expressed cause. The Conservative party in power remain nominally intact. They stand by the old flag, the old policy and the old Sir John, and will stand by the same as long as the new Sir John keeps in the old man's tracks. We are speaking now of the old line Conservatives, the Old Guard, the cohort that fought stoutly for Confederation, drew the party lines taut immedi-

ately thereafter, buffeted desperately the waves of disaster in 1873, grimly marked time by the right in 1875, and have exultantly formed the advance line of battle ever since. They are right for the party every time.

Opposed to them will be their old time enemies, the honest, staunch Liberals, who have never turned face from the foe and have never asked quarter; with whom the name of George Brown is not yet a tradition and Alexander Mackenzie is still a reality; whose allegiance to Scotch rigidity is truthfully transferred to the courtly, polished, graceful, eloquent French gentleman, Hon. Wilfred Laurier; and who believe in free trade as a fiscal policy and have believed in it even when the clouds of concession to popular demand in the shape of Commercial Union, Unrestricted Reciprocity and Continental Serfdom have lowered most thickly.

Who are to be added to these? The P.P.A. declare that they will not serve under a Roman Catholic, though Sir John Thompson is head, shoulders and waist high in ability above any other member of the Commons, and the Liberal leader belongs to the same religious faith. A deal is being made between the Patrons and the Prohibitionists to unite forces in opposition. What the Patrons have to lose and gain we will deal with in another article. What the Prohibitionists have to lose and gain they may consider for themselves, though upon this point we may have something to say hereafter. The present point is that here again we have a union of opposing forces to oust a party at present in power. Not as in the other case, because of a long career of political profligacy and corruption, because no sane man now believes that the present Government is either profligate or corrupt. But because of a desire on the one hand to obtain power, on the other to carry out ideas—we may say fads—which are not usually considered within the domain of practical politics. What in the New York case may be, though we doubt it, an honest desire to purify an administration becomes in Canada to our mind an opening for the prejudiced, the Liberals, the faddist, to carry out his desires.

We commend these matters to the serious attention of members of the trade with only the caution that in the disagreement of political parties their first duty is to look out for themselves. A political triumph will be poorly compensated by a struggle for life afterwards.

## THE LIBERAL POLICY.

From the Vancouver *World* we get the full text of Hon. Mr. Laurier's declaration made in that city of the policy of the Liberal party with regard to prohibition. The Liberal leader said:

I just wish to answer a question here which has been sent to me from the Dominion Alliance with regard to the position of the Liberal party on the question of Prohibition. I have been asked to state what are the views of the party, if they have any, on Prohibition. I may tell you that this problem is one of the most important to-day that is engaging the attention of the public, and which received

the attention of the Liberals at the convention which sat last year at Ottawa. It was taken up at that convention of Liberals from all parts of the Dominion to determine the policy of the party, and one of the planks laid down was this, that as soon as the Liberals were returned to power—and I believe that day is not very far distant now—at all events their pledge was given that as soon as they were returned to power they would take the proper means to lay that question before the Canadian people. For my part I believe in a Government of the people, by the people and for the people, and I would say this, that if the party at the next election is returned to power we shall faithfully keep to the program which we then laid down, that is, to take the sense of the people by means of a plebiscite on the question. It will be submitted to the electorate whether or not the people want to have a prohibitory law, and all I can say for the future Government of the country is that the people determine upon having a prohibitory law it shall be the duty of the Liberals to see that their wishes are carried out to the fullest extent.

Mr. Laurier spoke with all the authority of leader of his party and his declaration may be taken as final. If the Liberal party are returned to power at the next general elections, a plebiscite vote will be taken and if that is favorable a Dominion prohibitory law will be enacted. That is the bald, blue-breasted fact, and the trade know exactly what they have to expect from that party.

It may be well here to recall Sir John Thompson's utterances upon this subject. When asked by a Prohibition delegation if he would have a plebiscite of the Dominion taken the Premier replied flatly that he would not. “I will not,” he said, “or a moment swerve from my sense of duty because of any vote that can be taken. I will not, because of any majority of votes, introduce into the House a measure that cannot be defended in the House and in the country and defended for all time to come.” And that is just where Sir John Thompson stands.

## THAT NINE O'CLOCK LAW.

ALD. LAMB is understood to have declared his intention of again introducing his by-law to close public houses at nine o'clock each evening. And with astute means Ald. Lamb has decided if we are correctly informed, not to bring up the matter until late in December, when the councillors being in the throes of an election, may be supposed to be more amenable to outside influences. In other words, he hopes to drive the council through self-interest to do what the wisdom and common sense of that body has hitherto refused to do. He relies upon the fear of loss of vote having effect where argument has failed. He intends to force the council into an action that the council's deliberation judgment has condemned. And he intends to do this by an appeal to mob passion and mob prejudice—a well dressed mob, perhaps, but still a mob. He is going to use that mob, influenced by the heat of a contest and by rabid appeals to their sentimental natures, their whims and their fads; he is going to use that mob to coerce aldermen into