

# 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, \$2.00

Directions:

Send of Rates on Application.

Toronto and Montreal, Thursday, Aug. 2, 1894.

## THE FUTURE OF PROHIBITION.

MR. J. J. McLAUREN, Q. C., has not yet explained how he came to say that he voted for Mr. Emerson Coatsworth in East Toronto when he had no vote there, but he has been talking nevertheless. It was to a Montreal *Star* reporter that he explained the other day that Prohibition would of necessity be a silent question for a couple of years. Speaking as regards this province he said that the case heard in Ottawa recently would not be given judgment upon until October, and then it would go to the Privy Council in England for final settlement. We all knew that this was the route the question had to travel, but what we did not know is that after all Messrs. McLaren & Co. do not wish to interfere with the right of importation and manufacture. Mr. McLaren is reported as saying in answer to a query as to what would be the result of the case now before the Supreme Court: "The powers of Ottawa in the matter are undisputed, but the provinces also have large powers, and I think you will find that the latter will be largely increased in the way of prohibition and restriction of the sale, but the right of importation and manufacture will not be interfered with. The most advanced Prohibitionist would not want these interfered with, but simply restricted as in the case of poisons, alcohol holds a place in medicine and art, and, therefore, is to a certain extent, a requisite of commerce."

Of course Mr. McLaren talks nonsense when he says in one breath that the right of importation and manufacture will not be interfered with, and, in the next, that all that is wanted is restriction. If restriction is not interference we would like to know what is. But we have no desire to quibble about words. Our concern is in this, that Mr. McLaren avowedly desires to transfer the sale of liquor from the present license holder to the druggist. If that is his view why doesn't he say so at once, instead of arguing for Prohibition when he wants the article with a loophole to it.

Wine, whiskey and beer are not poisons and cannot by any stretch of imagination be classed as such. Adulterated, after

the fashion adopted by illicit distillers, they are undoubtedly very harmful, but, sold pure they are generally in licensed hotels and saloons, there are many petables and edibles which to different people are far more hurtful. If not, whence comes the diseases and complaints, the dyspepsia and biliousness, which temperance people suffer from in equal measure with those they consider wine-bibbers and sinners? There is no known disease provoked by alcohol that is contagious. Can the same be said of these ailments provoked by impurities in the water? If physicians were compelled to trace the complaint of every patient to its origin and to publish the same, and every man was compelled to record his reason for taking a drink, it would be found in the one case that what are called intoxicants had far less responsibility to shoulder and that in the other they were entitled to a great deal more credit, than was generally supposed. Poor suffering humanity cannot be everlastingly running to the parson or to the doctor.

## THE WAR OF THE SEVEN BREWERIES.

For three months Berlin has been convulsed by the war of the Seven Breweries. The trouble dates from Labor Day. That end-of-the-century function was not an overpowering success in Berlin this year, and Herren Bebel and Liebknecht, leaders of the present movement, traced the cause of the fizzle to the fact that many large establishments had refused to give their workmen a holiday, or, what comes to the same thing, refused to consent to their taking one, on the 1st of May. At one large brewery the workmen, seemingly led by the coopers, who in Berlin are well paid—\$7.50 a week is good wages in Germany—and proportionately pugnacious, did not put in an appearance on Labor Day. When they did appear, they were suspended from employment for six days. The Socialists were probably no way averse from trying conclusions with the firms that had frowned on Labor Day; they retaliated by calling out all the coopers employed at this brewery. Thereupon twenty other Berlin breweries announced their intention of dismissing twenty per cent. of their workmen if the strike at the original brewery should not have terminated at a fixed date. It was not terminated at that date, and the twenty breweries punctually drove out their respective herds of seagoats. The Socialists, nothing daunted, marked six other breweries, all among the largest, and ordered a rigid boycott of the beer brewed by the seven; wholesale and retail in all the strengths and varieties of it was that beer to be boycotted; and wherever found, in beer-hall, restaurant, inns, small public houses, and grocers' shops, it was to be wholly tabooed.

Strikes have broken out at other breweries in various parts of the country; here and there a local boycott has been preached; Socialist editors have been prosecuted and imprisoned for naming the breweries to be boycotted, and urging their readers throughout the country to support the

operations of their brethren in Berlin; and all the reactionaries throughout Germany demand exceptional legislation against the boycott.

In Berlin the area of the struggle has widened. All the great breweries have threatened to cut off the beer supply of such proprietors as allow Socialist meetings on their premises; and all the owners of public halls have accordingly agreed to lock out the party, and the larger restaurants and public houses have taken similar action. On the other hand, the Socialists are not entirely headed-off from the wells yet. A great number of the small beer houses continue to supply them, and these in their turn are now fed as much as possible by several small breweries which have their own grievances against the boycotted seven, and are hastening to turn this rare situation to account. It is doubtful, however, whether the little blacklegs of the employers' union can keep up a supply of beer sufficient for the Socialist beer houses. In the meantime, the innkeepers and publicans who have made common cause with the great brewers are being assisted by subsidies to tide over the temporary loss of their Socialist customers.

Unaware the Socialist leaders exposed the morale of their followers to a most crucial test. The summer has been one of the hottest on record, and often must the working Berliner have found his tongue cleaving to the rod of his mouth, when he was far away from a tavern where unboycotted beer continued to flow freely. It is only one glass tossed off and who would know; and how could the great cause of Socialism be the worse, or the seven breweries the better, for the quaffing of one necessary draught of the obnoxious brew? If the Berlin Socialist be proof against such inner promptings of the natural man, it will be impossible to deny that the average Berlin Socialist has the faith which makes heroes in humble life. If Herren Bebel and Liebknecht have succeeded in preventing the self-denying ordinance from being generally broken, they have achieved a triumph worthy to be recorded with the most startling of their results at the polls.

## FOREWARNED IS FORE-ARMED.

The license inspectors and their hired men have, under orders from headquarters, inaugurated a most energetic campaign looking to securing convictions for infractions of the license law. By means of a very literal translation of the law, and owing to carelessness on the part of license holders, they have been to a large extent successful. In Toronto, we are informed, evidence to convict two-thirds of the hotel keepers has been secured. But the campaign is not confined to this city. It extends to all parts of the province.

The cause is said to be the necessity of replenishing the Provincial treasury. With that we have nothing to do, but we warn our readers who are in the business that they will need to exercise extraordinary care, for the least mistake may

bring severe punishment. In this connection we would again direct attention to our compendium of the law published in the issues of April 19th and 26th last.

## ALL ONE WAY.

The *Enquirer* says: "Forty years of Prohibition in Maine is admittedly a period which should furnish the investigator with a conviction one way or the other as to the success or failure of extreme legislation. Our own Royal Commission examined scores of witnesses on this head, who, however, were only able to offer a mass of contradictory evidence. Our contemporary would do well to read the evidence taken in Maine before rising to assert. We venture to express the belief that no newspaper in Toronto after perusal thereof, will make the statement that the evidence taken in Maine by the Royal Commission is a mass of contradictions. And we further venture to remark that this evidence proves conclusively that the Maine law has utterly failed to prohibit either drinking or drunkenness. It may be that drinking is less prevalent there now than it was forty years ago, but if so the first condition of that State must have been something awful."

## EXTRAORDINARY INSTANCES OF LONGEVITY.

A CONTEMPORARY recently quoted as a happy illustration of the benefits of total abstinence the case of a medical man at Rockland, Me., who at 99 is able to walk about and has perfect health and unimpaired eyesight. He never used liquor or tobacco in any shape. Then again he has never used tea, coffee or meat, his diet from infancy consisting of milk, chocolate, bread, fruit and vegetables. Against this we have a man at Staunton, Va., who is now 110 and has smoked, chewed, ate meat, drank whiskey and raced horses all his life. Here are two exactly opposite examples, and who can say what they prove beyond the virtue, possibly, of moderation? But what shall be said of a third instance of longevity, more extraordinary than either of the previous two? At Middleton, County Cork, Ellen Roche has just departed this life at the age of 115. Her eldest daughter is still living at the age of 85 and in robust health. Other members of the family have also been remarkable for the length of their days. They were all confirmed drinkers of whiskey and heavy smokers; and the ancient dame just deceased was in particular wont to ascribe to her habits her almost total immunity from illness.

It is on record that Lord Dufferin's paternal grandfather, who never had a day's illness, and lived till eighty-one, would occasionally bring a convivial evening with what he called "a clearer," that is, a bottle of port, and continue with four bottles of claret, afterwards retiring to bed in a state of perfect, though benevolent, sobriety.