

The Canadian Home Guard

SUPPLEMENT TO DAILY ADVERTISER---SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 1894.

There has been quite a loud outcry to the effect that the political parties in Iowa were bound to repeal the existing prohibition law. That remains to be seen. Governor Boies was opposed to it, but he was beaten at last election. The new governor is in its favor. The House of Representatives is largely Republican and it is said that of the 76 Republican members 53 at least are pledged prohibitionists.

It did not require magic lantern views or regalia displays, with any amount of gold lace and dyed feathers, and all that, to arouse public interest to the great question during the late campaign. The movement has been given an impetus the good results of which will, we believe, be felt for years to come. The action of the Ontario Government in thus bringing the great issue so practically before the people deserves great praise.

Now that the plebiscite campaign is over its advantages as an educator of public opinion must be freely admitted by all. During the past three months there has been more effective temperance agitation throughout Ontario than ever in twice that length of time before. More temperance literature was circulated, more public meetings were held, more practical facts presented to the people, more discussion through the ordinary newspapers, more sermons preached and more practical educative work. The good results of this work will be felt for years to come.

The grand old Rev. Dr. Guthrie was one of the ablest and clearest-headed Christian workers of his day. But this fact puzzled him. He said: "How ministers of the Gospel, how Christian elders, in the face of this vice, can go on with their indulgences is to me a mystery. I can not understand it. I do not condemn them. By their own deeds they shall stand or fall; but before them I charge drink with breaking more hearts, with destroying the ties of more families, with ruining more bodies, with sending more souls to perdition, than almost all the other vices together."

Every year the churches are getting more and more in earnest to wash its hands of all connection with the legalized drink traffic. At Cape May, New Jersey, a Baptist deacon not long ago signed a petition for a liquor license applicant. The next Sunday Rev. A. F. Greening, the pastor, called up the deacon and publicly reprimanded him. The deacon apologized and promised not to repeat the offense. The church clenched this by adopting a resolution declaring "When any member of this church hereafter signs a license application he thereby elected himself out of the fold."

Hon. Senator Scott, of Ottawa, the father of the Scott Act and an old and level-headed politician, has given an interviewer his impression of the situation, now that the plebiscite verdict has been given. He says it is now the duty of the Provincial Legislature to carry into effect the verdict of the people, so far as in its power. "It controls the saloon and shop licenses, and should, next session, enact a law prohibitory to the further issue of licenses and attach severe penalties for selling by retail. With the Dominion Parliament rests the responsibility of prohibiting the manufacture and importation."

Dr. Lavell, warden of the Kingston Penitentiary, is strong in favor of prohibition. He has had a longer and more intimate experience with a larger number of criminals than probably any other man in Ontario, or in the Dominion. Something like two-thirds of the hundreds of prisoners in the penitentiary have been men of intemperate habits. Within the last two or three weeks we have noticed that two prisoners who had served long terms fell into the temptations of the bar-rooms before they left the city on their liberation, and at once spent all the money they had and were again arrested. No doubt this state of things will go on as long as the licensed liquor system continues. It is a serious business for the Canadian taxpayers, however, as well as for all those con-

nected with the unfortunate men themselves. Since confederation the penitentiaries alone of this country have cost the taxpayers over \$6,000,000.

We hope that there will be no cessation of temperance education and organization work throughout the country, now that the plebiscite result has been obtained. The most important work is to come yet. Every local, county and provincial organization that found practical work to do during the past few months should be made permanent till prohibition is obtained. Both the Provincial Legislature and the Dominion Parliament will meet within a few weeks, and in both the Houses the question will come up in some practical shape. A Provincial election will take place within the next six months, and practical work will be needed then. Every organization should consider itself "enlisted for the whole war." Victory will come all the sooner because of earnest and persistent action now.

Another illustration of the danger there is to the whole community of allowing a single man to get drunk was furnished at Attica, near Chicago, on Monday of last week. A young man of about 18 years, named Bert Ferguson, got drunk and threw a heavy oak plank on the railway track. A heavy passenger train came thundering along and providentially the locomotive wheels so crushed the plank that the cars were not derailed. Had the train been thrown off probably a hundred persons would have been killed or maimed. The young man was arrested and can give no reason for his terrible deed except that he was drunk and wanted to see some excitement. The safety of the whole community is in jeopardy because of the existence of the legalized drink traffic. Public safety demands its prohibition.

It is greatly to be hoped that the temperance people throughout the country will not now subside into indifference and inaction after the splendid results of the late splendid plebiscite. It has been a serious misfortune that temperance work has been carried on in too fitful a manner. After the Dunkin Act and Scott Act campaigns, both of which resulted in great good, there was, each time, a very unfortunate lull in temperance work all over the country and there was a reaction in consequence. No reaction should be allowed just now. The plebiscite vote is but an important preliminary step to important legislative action that should follow. As matters now stand the next big push must be for legislation to follow as a natural result of the recent sweeping verdict of the electorate. Unless that is vigorously pressed the country will not reap the great advantages of the late splendid campaign.

—Hon. Finance Minister Foster has been giving his views of the late plebiscite vote to a newspaper interviewer this week. He seems somewhat surprised that the verdict in favor of prohibition, the cities included, should be so large and uniform. As to the revenue, he says it makes no difference to the Government whether it be raised on tea, coffee, or by a direct tax, or from liquors. This is the people's matter, and it is for them to decide. He concluded by saying: "Personally, I have no doubt, and never had any, that if the waste, expense and ruin entailed by drink were done away with, the country could well afford to pay three times the taxes in some different way." In our opinion some well-meaning temperance people have made a great mistake in driving Mr. Foster off the prohibition platform. He has been one of its ablest advocates in past days and, we believe, he is in full sympathy with it yet. Of course, he saw, when in office, difficulties in the way that he did not realize when in opposition.

Now that the electors in every Province of the Dominion, where the opportunity has been given, have declared as three to one in favor of the three-fold prohibition of the liquor traffic—the manufacture, importation and sale—it is to be hoped that no mere pottering legislation will again

satisfy the public demand. The mere restriction in sale, allowing the manufacture and importation to go on as before, will not be satisfactory or successful. Past experience has taught us that. We need effective legislation to cut off the supplies and the selling can be effectively prohibited. Any thing short of that will not succeed. The temperance people of Canada for the last quarter of a century have asked every Parliament we have had for laws prohibiting the manufacture and importation as well as the sale. Had such laws been enacted they would have been successful and satisfactory. The trouble has been that nearly all our previous legislation has been merely pottering with the selling. We do not need now merely some amendments to the license act; we need an effective blow at every department of the business.

The Plebiscite Verdict.

The Most Sweeping Verdict Ever Given by the Electorate of Ontario.

New Year's Day, 1894, will long be remembered in connection with the prohibition movement in Canada. The movement in the premier Province of Ontario passed the most important milestone that day that has ever yet been passed on the high road to victory. The temperance people all along claimed that a majority of the people desire thorough and effective prohibition as soon as it can be obtained, while many had honest doubts. But even the great body of temperance

and delay the reform which temperance men have at heart. The majorities for prohibition are very large, and will probably not fall far short of 100,000 in the aggregate. The whole Province, with the exception of a very few districts, seems to be of one mind upon the subject. Whenever the question of public sentiment is discussed, the prohibitionists can lay their hands upon an authentic and convincing piece of testimony. In no way could their cause have been so far advanced in a short time as by this demonstration of the strength of the sentiment for the abolition of the liquor traffic."

The Empire of the same day says: "Prohibition having carried throughout the Province, it is now in order for the Ontario Government to throw on the Dominion Government the onus of legislation and enforcement."

The Mail says: "A full vote on prohibition was not polled; but as far as the plebiscite went it was a declaration in favor of the destruction of the licensing system and the discontinuance of the manufacture, importation, and sale of liquors. When the vote was decided upon it was pointed out in these columns that although conceded to the prohibitionists as an answer to their appeals for legislation, it was practically a challenge to them to prove that they had a *raison d'être* in this Province. Had the decision been adverse, it would have been a serious blow to the principle in that it would have given the legislators a new argument against it. The verdict saves the friends of prohibition and holds their policy in the arena."

An attempt at compromise between right and wrong is sure to land a man in difficulties. It never does, in matters where principle is involved, to sail too close to the wind.

Motto for the Week:

Life, like war, is a series of mistakes, and he is not the best Christian nor the best general who makes the fewest false steps. He is the best who wins the most splendid victories by the retrieval of mistakes, by beginning afresh.—[F. W. Robertson,

Forward Movement.

people did not expect such a sweeping majority as the electors gave. The people of Ontario are found, generally, pretty evenly divided in nearly all elections. In no one election since Ontario has been an independent Province has the verdict been so general as on the prohibition plebiscite.

At the time of this writing returns are in from 498 municipalities, and out of all this number less than a score gave an anti-majority.

Every city in the Province, with the solitary exception of Windsor, gave a prohibition majority, and in most places every ward in the city.

Every county in the Province, as a whole, we believe, also gave a majority and in most places every township in each county.

The vote was not confined to party or creed. All seemed to unite in declaring that it is desirable to put an end to the entire drink traffic at the earliest practicable day.

The total vote in 500 places now heard from amounted to about 220,000—nearly quarter of a million in round numbers. The total anti-vote was less than 74,000, and the "Yes" vote over 146,000. The net majority is, therefore, as much as 72,000, or nearly three to one.

Very few, even of the most sanguine, expected over 50,000 majority at the outside. The figures go to show that the feeling is even more general than they had imagined.

Nearly all the municipalities yet to hear from are country districts and nearly every one of these will help roll up the already large majority. All former temperance votes have indicated that outside of the towns and cities, where the liquor interests are strong, the people, as a whole, favor prohibition.

WHAT THE PAPERS SAY.

The Globe says: "As the returns of the voting on prohibition come in, there pass away the last faint traces of the notion that the plebiscite was a device intended to shelve the question

Drink, Crime, Taxation.

Last week a convict of the Kingston penitentiary, William Clifford, completed a term of three years' imprisonment and was liberated, being furnished at the same time, and at the public expense, with a new suit of clothes and some money to pay his way home. Drink had been the cause of his former downfall and the temptations of the licensed liquor shops were in his way again as soon as he got out. He gave way to them at once and the liquor men soon had his money and some of his clothing. Getting "strapped" he stole a horse and rig on the street, apparently too drunk to know what he was doing. He was arrested and locked up and arraigned before the police court and there pleaded guilty, giving drunkenness as the cause of his theft, evidently unable to tell, when he got sober, what he had done. He was at once sentenced to another term of three years in the penitentiary, though he expressed a desire to be given another chance to "lead a better life."

Dr. Laval, the warden, who has known the prisoner well for the past three years, is confident the man would not have committed the crime if the drink shops had been out of his way. He expresses a hope, in the interests of the many unfortunates sent to his care, that a thorough prohibition law will soon be enacted.

This kind of work may be fun for the liquor sellers who are mean enough to rake in their tills the money that ex-convicts are supplied with to enable them to get another start in the world, but it is serious work to the tax-payers. Every year a convict is in the penitentiary costs the heavily burdened tax-payers on an average \$230. Clifford's former incarceration represented at least \$690 and now as much more will be added as a result of his last drinking bout.

It is a well-known fact that the liquor traffic has more to do with filling up the five penitentiaries of the Dominion than any other cause—in fact than all other causes combined. The records show that clearly enough. Since confederation the tax-payers of Canada have paid out about \$6,000,000 for the maintenance of these penitentiaries alone, besides millions more for jails and other prisons. If

the licensed drink traffic continues as it has millions and millions more will be required for the same purpose. Like causes will go on producing like effects.

Even then the tax-payers have the lightest part of the great burden. Something like one-third of all the thousands of prisoners thus incarcerated and disgraced are married men. God pity the wives and children thus disgraced! Our liquor laws and liquor sellers have little pity for them. Is there any wonder that many wives and daughters give way to discouragement under such circumstances and many brothers and sons lose heart and resort to crime?

What a disgrace to Christian Canada that its law-makers enact such laws and that even some of its "Christian ministers" have the face to defend them.

When thou art at the greatest pinch, strength shall come. When the last handful of meal was being dressed, then was the Prophet sent to keep the widow's house.

Drink, Danger and Death.

The town of Chatham had a pretty good illustration one evening last week of the fact that a prohibition liquor law is necessary for the safety and protection of those who do not drink. George Monk, a quiet young man of 25 years, the son of a wealthy farmer, was crossing a bridge on one of the leading streets, where he was met by John Rowan, a somewhat dissipated railway brakeman, who was quite delirious at the time, the result of a drinking spree. The inebriated man demanded of Monk who he was coughing at, and young Monk quietly replied that he was not coughing at anybody. "You lie!" was the ruffian's response as he fired two shots of his revolver at the inoffensive passer-by, both of which produced serious and dangerous wounds. The wounded man managed to make his escape, and is now lying in a serious and critical condition, suffering great pain. If he recovers he may probably be maimed for life.

The drunken fellow threw his revolver in the river and went and told the chief of the police he had shot a man, apparently rather glorying in the act. He told a reporter shortly after that "he was out gunning and meant to get big game."

Of course, it was evident that he was drink-crazed at the time. There was no other reason why he should thus make a deadly assault on a quiet man whom he had never seen before. Such wanton acts are too common. Every year men and women who never drank and who protest against the existence of the legalized drink traffic are thus placed in jeopardy, or wounded, or killed outright by someone who simply happens to be "on a tear" or is having a "glorious good time," or the like of that.

Of course, John Rowan is now lying in jail, cared for and fed at the tax-payers' expense, while his victim is lying in a critical state in the hospital enduring great suffering, and his friends are being racked with anxiety. They all will feel thankful, however, if, after weeks of such terrible pain, such intense anxiety and great care, tireless watching and much expense, even his life can be saved.

This is not the first time that the same drinking fellow has been charged with serious offenses against the persons of quiet and sober citizens. Scores of men, quiet and well behaved enough when sober, are constantly committing crimes quite as serious as that when crazed with drink. The devilish work will go right on just as long as our laws authorize and sanction liquor-selling. Men and women are every day endangered in the streets so long as drinking and drunkenness continue. That is no mere matter of opinion; it is a matter of well demonstrated fact. And yet, even ministers and other intelligent men, who ought to know better go about prating for the continued legal sanction of the business on the plea of "personal liberty!" Just as though the personal liberty of the John Rowans does not, in such cases, involve the personal danger of the George Monks and thousands of others!

How can society ever properly protect itself while the terrible business goes on?

Every man who goes into the liquor business, either as a maker or seller, well enough knows the dangers that innocent people are all the time in peril of because of the every day results. And yet some of them talk about "compensation" without a blush on their faces!

The same paper that gives the facts of the Chatham murderous outrage also reports the fact that a quiet young lady of Ingersoll was struck on the head in the streets and knocked into unconsciousness by an inebriated fellow who aimed a blow at a passing young man and missed his aim. Of course the Government wants the revenue and the makers and sellers want the profits. They are getting them, too. It may be fun to them, but it is death to the victims—both to those who drink and to those who always abstain.

Prince Edward Island's Vote.

We have already published the fact that the electorate of the entire Province of Prince Edward Island gave a large majority in favor of prohibition at the late Provincial election. The exact figures are in now, and they show that the electors, as a whole, stand about three to one in its favor. That is very much as the majority stood in Manitoba nearly two years ago, and very much as the majority in Ontario stands now.

The following are the figures of Prince Edward Island:

For prohibition.....10,616
Against prohibition..... 3,390

Majority..... 7,226

These figures are the more significant from the fact that the whole Province has tried the Scott Act for some years, and the counties are now all under the act. This would indicate that the people, as a whole, are by no means convinced that any such attempts at prohibition are failures.

In the city of Charlottetown, the only city on the island, the prohibition majority was over 600. There is a good deal of significance in these figures. Charlottetown first adopted the Scott Act in 1879 by a majority of 584, and it went into force soon after. In 1881 there was another vote, and it was sustained by the slim majority of 40. In 1887 there was another vote and the majority was reduced to 20. In 1891 there was still another vote and the act was defeated by a majority of 14. The cause of the revolution of feeling was largely because the people made the too common mistake of electing a council, the majority of whom were not in sympathy with the enforcement of the law. For the last two years the liquor selling has been open and above board, as of old, but the recent vote plainly indicates that the majority of the people, after a fair trial of both systems, are anxious for an efficient prohibition law. It is now intimated that the Scott Act will probably be re-enacted in that city unless the Dominion Government takes some immediate steps to provide a general prohibition measure.

Try and make sure that you are right, but do not be so eager to be sure that others are wrong.

Local Option in England.

The temperance people of England have long been struggling to obtain a local option law, similar to what we have had in Ontario for some time and it seems at last that their prospects of success are good. Thirteen years ago the House of Commons adopted a resolution in favor of such a law, just as the Commons of Canada adopted resolutions in favor of prohibition "whenever the country is ripe." Last year, however, the Gladstone Government brought down a local option bill, giving the electors of each parish the right to decide for no license, if a two-thirds majority so votes, and it was shelved in consequence of the long and angry struggle on the Home Rule Bill. A few days ago a large and important deputation, headed by such well-known workers as Sir Wilfred Lawson, M.P., Lady Henry Somerset and Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, waited on the Government to urge that the bill should be pressed as early as practicable. They were graciously received by the Hon. Premier Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt, a leading member of the Government.

Sir William was the first speaker and he assured the deputation that "The Government stand upon this question exactly where they did. They adhere firmly to the principles they have declared and by the measure they have proposed. They are resolved at the earliest available occasion to prosecute that measure with all the resources at their disposal to a final end, and they hope, successful issue." He went on with a lengthy speech containing strong arguments in favor of the people being empowered to vote out the license system wherever they do not want it. Among other things he said: "If there ever was a question on which the will of the people ought to be pronounced and ought to prevail, it is upon this question which so deeply affects their social, material and moral advantage." Mr. Gladstone followed in a vigorous speech giving expression to his full sympathy with the movement and closing with these words: "I heartily hope that the day is not a distant one when you will find your wishes accomplished to the enormous advantage of the people of this country."

The daisy is as perfect as the flower that blossoms only once a decade. The small life need not be less beautiful than the great.

—There is such a thing as a faulty excess of humility. If a man does not take notice of that excellency and perfection that is in himself, how can he be thankful to God who is the author of all excellency and perfection? Nay, if a man hath too mean an opinion of himself, it will render him unserviceable both to God and man.