

COMPENSATION
TO LIQUOR MEN

FROM A

PROHIBITIONIST'S STANDPOINT

BY MACK CLOIE

PRICE, FIFTEEN CENTS

Pam
HV
5091
Ca
1738

COMPENSATION TO LIQUOR MEN

FROM A PROHIBITIONIST'S STANDPOINT

BY

MACK CLOIE

GODERICH, ONTARIO

THE SIGNAL BOOK AND JOB PRINTING HOUSE

1905

Entered according to Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand nine hundred and five, by VANATTER & ROBERTSON, Goderich, Ont., at the Department of Agriculture,
Ottawa.

COMPENSATION
TO
LIQUOR MEN.
FROM
A PROHIBITIONIST'S STANDPOINT.

FOREWORD.

The booklet which I here offer to readers interested in the temperance question in our country is really a chapter omitted from my temperance story, "The Old Orchard," but revised and enlarged. I make no pretence at originality, but have gleaned from every reliable source of information which I could reach ; and wherever possible I acknowledge the author. The subject of compensation to liquor men is now being more liberally and fairly considered than was once the case, and it is in the hope of assisting in a proper inquiry into the matter that I have written. Prohibitionists have nothing to fear in looking at the temperance question from all sides, and honestly considering any phase of it. So of compensation.

AN EX-HOTELKEEPER.

While conversing one day recently in my study with my friend Mr. Samuel Grigg (ex-hotel-

keeper of London, Ont., and at one time President of the Victuallers' Association, but now a christian evangelist), the conversation accidentally turned upon the matter of giving compensation to liquor men in case a prohibitory law should be placed upon the statute books of our Province. Mr. Grigg most vigorously opposed compensation, almost to the point of denunciation. I was in no way surprised, for I have listened to similar denunciation for the past twenty years, without being able to gain much information from it on the prohibition question. I listened to my friend's views, and then proceeded to give him my own on the subject. Before the conversation terminated I had made a convert, and Mr. Grigg urged me to set forth my views on the subject in some printed form. Probably no man in Ontario has more accurate knowledge of the inner workings of the liquor trade than Mr. Grigg, since he began his career in it when twelve years of age and continued at the business for thirty-two years. His agreement, or disagreement with my views, therefore, ought to count for something.

WISE OR UNWISE ?

It is not personal considerations that might cause me to look upon the liquor traffic as an enemy, and the men engaged in it as deserving of no clemency from my pen. But considerations enter that modify views I might otherwise hold. Personal considerations must not be

allowed to monopolize our vision, but we must take the larger view of the welfare of the whole people of the Province, or of the Dominion. From that standpoint let us look at the question. Would it be a wise and good thing, i. e., a thing in the interest of the people of Canada, to give compensation to liquor men as herein proposed, if by so doing we could get rid of the destructive and deadly liquor traffic? Is there a probability that it would help to solve the present lock-down in prohibitory legislation? If so, would it be wise or unwise for the temperance forces to yield this point, and give consent to compensation?

LITTLE DISCUSSION.

Probably a large majority of the temperance people of Canada do not favor compensation; indeed, I am not aware that the matter has been seriously considered in any temperance agitation we have ever had, although this fact does not prove that it would be an unwise or unrighteous thing to do. Progressive ideas are often held for a long time in the background. It is very probable that a large majority of the electorate have never studied the question, and, therefore, are scarcely in a position to form an intelligent opinion on the matter. I have not met with any book, pamphlet or discourse that has attempted an extended discussion. The press has not, until quite recently, given it very much discussion. But brief allusions to compensation, found here and there recently, have

convinced me that a sentiment in favor of it on some equitable plan is growing, and is bound to increase. The question appears to me to be one of the most important considerations of the temperance problem. For these reasons I attempt to bring it before the reading public, both temperance people and liquor men; and, whatever may be the opinions held concerning the things I shall say, "I beseech all parties to hear me patiently."

MEAN MEN IN BOTH PARTIES.

That a person takes some risk in writing anything that has the least appearance of favoring the liquor man is quite certain. During temperance campaigns we have more than once seen liquor men so hard driven for arguments with which to buttress up their trade, that they have issued flaring posters which were nothing more than falsehoods in figures. Much of the personal opprobrium heaped on them and the relentless condemnation of the traffic, has been called forth by their own deceitful methods, and false presentations of statistics, which in the end have not been to the advantage of the trade. The temperance people have simply refuted error with truth, to the confusion of the liquor men and the breeding of much ill-will and mutual reproach. Now, should anyone misuse any statement which I may make here, I cannot be responsible for it. I claim the right to be judged by

the truth, and by my motives, which are sincere.

On the other hand, let it be said frankly that there are mean and selfish temperance men who are no credit to the ranks, but a positive hinderance to temperance reform,—men who are small, stingy, penurious and beggarly, and who will often do a small thing to save their own pockets, at the expense of the liquor man. Of this mean class are they who will drive through the country on business, making use of hotel pumps to water their horses, or hotel sheds to feed "their own oats," and who never give a nickel to the proprietors for the conveniences. You may see such temperance men carrying a bundle of hay in the waggon box to the market town and feeding their horses in the church sheds (to the building of which they never contributed), instead of stabling their horses at the hotel premises, and using and paying for that part of the business which we think is legitimate and necessary. These are they who TALK MUCH and "VOTE STRAIGHT" for temperance, but when asked to contribute anything to the temperance campaign fund they refuse. Too mean to pay their way, they are the "dead beats" of the temperance ranks, and little wonder that liquor men despise them. Out with such sponges! Stinginess has been, all along, a hinderance to temperance reform; while prodigal liberality has been the secret power of liquor men. With no foothold in

right they thus hold their place against the opposition of those who have.

On one occasion when driving on the London Road, I stopped at a hotel. I saw a number of men at the bar drinking when I stepped in to give the hotelkeeper something for the use of his pump. Evidently it was a new thing there, for those toppers were so surprised or shocked to see me offering money for such a reason, that they followed me outside and gazed at me as curiously as if I had been a foreigner. On another occasion when I had done the same at another hotel, the proprietor said, "Thank you, sir. If there were more temperance men like you it would be better for this country." We mistake if we think liquor men do not appreciate honor and fair dealing in temperance men. What right have temperance people to "beat their way" on men in the liquor trade? Until temperance people make up their minds to be more generous, and to be willing to pay the price of what we are seeking, we need not hope to obtain prohibition, for, at bottom, it is a money problem and by financial means largely it must be settled. The sooner we realize this the better for our cause.

THE SITUATION TO-DAY.

Some two years ago Rev. Dr. Carman said, "Humanly speaking, prohibition is dead." They were the words of the prophet. Prohibition was never adopted as a party measure by the Conservatives in Ontario; and though the

Liberal party clung to it for a time, it was abandoned at the Liberal Convention of 1904. As a result, doubtless, to a large extent, the Liberal Government has been deposed. Now, what next? I believe prohibitionists thought they were, in all they did, pursuing the best policy. But it has failed. Why? At the above-mentioned Convention Liberal delegates arose one after another from all parts of the Province, and declared that if prohibition were adopted as the policy of the party they could not hope to be elected; and even proposals more modified than prohibition were rejected. Prohibition was dropped, and the Ross Government was dropped by the prohibitionists. But why were the Liberal party afraid to face their constituencies with a policy for prohibition such as was outlined in the "Liquor Act of 1902"? That Act, if it had become law, would have taken away from the liquor men their retail trade, and would have given them nothing for that of which they would have been deprived, and which our Provincial laws have hitherto legalized. With liquor men it meant a fight for the means of living, which it did not mean with us prohibitionists. In 1904 the Liberal party could not go to the liquor men, having the sanction of the prohibitionists, and say, "Our policy of prohibition will, if we are returned to power, take away largely your means of living, but we have the sanction of the temperance party to assure you of compensation in case we deprive you of your

business." No ; for prohibitionists in Ontario have never sanctioned compensation. Having nothing to offer the liquor men they could not afford to antagonize them (so it appears), and prohibition was discarded. Let us suppose that the Liberal party had been in a position to offer liquor men a fair and equitable compensation for the loss that Provincial prohibition would cause them. I do not feel that it requires any stretch of the imagination to believe that the result would have been very different on election day with that party pledged to prohibition. I can conceive of both political parties feeling more free to deal with the liquor trade if they were free to give compensation. Thus, I believe, by refusing to sanction some measure of compensation, we have probably stood in the way of obtaining the very reform we were zealous in seeking. Not likely that the Liberal party will again make prohibition a plank in their platform under present conditions, at least not for many years to come. The Conservatives have not committed themselves to it. Again, the attempt to organize a "third party" committed first of all to prohibition has not made encouraging progress. This is the political situation to-day as to prohibition.

A PROPOSITION.

What can we do now ? Can any suggestion be made that will commend itself as being helpful, hopeful and not wrong in principle ?

There are hundreds of more conspicuous temperance workers than myself, but I venture to speak to both liquor men and prohibitionists on this matter. I have this word to say and this suggestion to offer: I BELIEVE THE TIME HAS COME WHEN PROHIBITIONISTS SHOULD YIELD ON THIS POINT OF COMPENSATION TO LIQUOR MEN, FOR IN THIS THE KEY OF THE PRESENT DEADLOCK IS TO BE FOUND IF IT CAN BE FOUND ANYWHERE—AND I THINK IT CAN. Let us prohibitionists show to liquor men that we can be generous as well as just; that we are not contending for the abolition of their traffic in a vindictive and merciless spirit, but for the welfare of the nation, for the welfare of these very men who are engaged in the traffic, for the saving and uplifting of our fellow-citizens, and for the glory of God. If we start anew our work from these motives and at the same time be prepared to pay a share of the cost (even though we may feel we have no right to place ourselves under such an obligation, but doing it as a "gratuity," to use Dr. Chown's phrase), I for one have no fear that our aim and motives will not commend themselves to both politicians and liquor men, and will reconcile the latter especially to a new condition of things which the social life of this young and growing country now demands, besides making it vastly easier for politicians to deal with the question, if we desire to see our country rising instead of sinking.

A STORY.

If a little story would not be out of place in such a discussion, I would here introduce it for illustration, as politicians sometimes do to flavor a dry address. The story is told in these parts of the well-known lay Methodist evangelist, "Uncle Joe Little." He had tried to reconcile two brothers who had had a dispute about threshing some wheat, each claiming that it was the duty of the other to flail out the wheat. The more the good man strove to reconcile them the worse the matter grew. At length, heart-sick of the quarrel, "Uncle Joe" laid off his coat, took up the flail and threshed the wheat himself, and so buried forever the quarrel, besides shaming both parties into reconciliation. I would suggest that in the settlement of the matter of compensation to liquor men we let the spirit of "Uncle Joe" prevail, and not simply a bald, hard-headed principle of worldly wisdom—always keeping clearly in mind the fact that "Uncle Joe" had no right to thresh the wheat. And who but admires his spirit?

IS IT RIGHT?

The question of morals comes up, and I have no thought of trying to shirk it. Not a line of this is written to induce prohibitionists to compromise with wrong. In the end that would react upon those making such compromise. However, I cannot see where compensation

would be morally wrong. The public treasuries of this country, from the municipal to the Dominion treasury, have all received from liquor men in license fees and revenue customs such large sums of money that, if we were to pay them back even one-half of what they have paid in, it would be sufficient to buy out the entire properties of liquor men, and the other half might stand against the increased cost in the administration of justice occasioned by the traffic. Will any one say that it would be a wrong thing to clean out the national treasuries, and thus as far as possible atone for our own wrong-doing in accepting revenue from such a source? To make restitution is as binding upon, and as righteous for the nation as for the individual, and never shall we be able honestly to claim possession of that "righteousness that exalteth a nation" until we do make such restitution. The liquor traffic is UNCLEAN, and the treasuries of the nation that have received money from it are NOT CLEAN. "If I have taken anything from any man by false accusation I restore." The nation has been in a fellowship with those who have so taken. Now, return it to the liquor men, and leave it to them to do as they like with it. The moral question is on the side of those who would compensate. The further question of responsibility of compensating victims of the traffic will rest then upon the liquor men.

Too often this moral aspect of the question has been handled in a dogmatic, arbitrary

manner: "Never! It is not right! Not a dollar of compensation! Never!" But these dogmatic assertions have not settled anything. Rather they have elicited the same from liquor men, who asserted the counter claim of right to compensation. Dogmatism has done less for the world than calm reason and the spirit of conciliation. These have done marvels.

It is a safe principle to assert that, under representative government, a legislature, having knowledge that their constituencies consent in the matter, may appropriate public revenue in those ways that seem best to them as legislators in the exercise of their best judgment. In so doing they are RIGHT. In the case before us, if our legislators had assurance that a majority of the electorate favored compensation, as they have now distinct knowledge in Ontario that a vast majority favor Provincial prohibition, they would be RIGHT in entering upon a scheme of adjustment for such compensation. After we have looked at some other matters in this relation we may be in a better position to appreciate the moral issue.

WHERE GIVEN.

The question of compensation, both in cases of reduction of licenses and of prohibition, is not a new one. It has been contemporaneous with earnest agitation against the traffic in every country where such agitation has been to the front, and has met with varying fortunes. In South Carolina and in New Zealand it failed to

obtain. On the other hand, provision was made for it in Norway, in Victoria, in South Australia, and in Russia in the Baltic provinces and in some of the western provinces as well as in Poland. Thus it may be seen that the agitation for compensation is by no means local nor recent. The remark of Rev. Dr. Chown that "the cry for compensation is only a pitiable and childish whine, and can only be listened to on such a plea as appeals to a mother's heart when she gives her spoiled child a sugar-plum to stop its crying," can scarcely be justified in view of the fact that men have given it thoughtful attention who would not waste time on a "childish" matter. The question of compensation has been before the people of Britain since 1871, when Mr. Bruce introduced the Licensing Bill which made practical provision for compensation, not in money but in a ten years' notice. Sir William Harcourt's Liquor Traffic Bill of 1893 and the Intoxicating Liquor Traffic Bill of 1895 both similarly gave a three years' notice. The Bishop of Chester's Authorized Companies Liquor Bill made provisions for compensation in case of a surrender of a license which might have run for a period of five years. At the time of writing a new bill introduced by the Balfour Ministry is before the Imperial Parliament, providing for compensation in case of licenses' being "extinguished," the money to be provided by the trade itself. In Britain prohibition has never been seriously considered by

the nation at large, much less by Parliament. Hence more attention is given to the matter of reduction of licenses and compensation for such cases.

WHAT COMPENSATION WOULD COST US.

I am taking the ground that compensation should be paid from the public purse and not from the trade itself. To come from the trade, it must be perpetuated. We are after a form of prohibition that will leave no trade in intoxicating liquors in our country except what would be absolutely necessary for medical and scientific purposes, and this would be very small.

In every temperance campaign the liquor men have unveiled the bugbear of compensation, and have succeeded in frightening some electors favorable to prohibition into staying away from the polls or voting contra. I ask now, should the people of this country fear the cost, and what would it be? To be as brief as possible: We have learned from the reports of the Royal Commission that the direct cost of the traffic annually to consumers is about forty million dollars. The indirect cost is more than twice that amount. The annual net total loss is about one hundred and forty million dollars. For a number of years the revenue from the traffic has been somewhere around eight millions annually. It also appears that somewhere about seventy-four millions covers the entire value of breweries, distilleries, malt-

houses, real estate employed by vendors of liquors, and all other equipments for the traffic. Some who favor compensation take the ground that the manufacturer should not be compensated, as his trade for export could still go on. But, supposing the whole traffic be considered at the figures given above, if we bought out the liquor men clean and clear at their own price, in one year the nation would be money ahead in so doing to the extent of sixty-six million dollars by getting rid of the traffic, or the revenue of ten years handed back would purchase all. Again, it is certain that this seventy-four million dollar estimate is inflated and excessive, but, even taking the figures, it is also to be remembered that much of the property would not be waste. Hotels and hosteleries must remain though the bars do not. Some distilleries would remain. The real estate would still have a local value, so that the net loss would probably not be more than one-half of this sum of seventy-four millions. The amount which consumers spend in drink in one year would cover that. It is as plain as figures can make any problem where statistics are involved that the compensation of liquor men in Canada is by no means a matter to be dreaded by the electorate, and, indeed, is one of the least of the problems connected with the liquor traffic. That I may not seem to be romancing on this question, I here present the words of ex-Premier Ross on compensation, when he introduced the famous Liquor Act of 1902 :

“Then there is the larger question of compensation. It has been said that any legislation dealing with the prohibition of the liquor traffic would not be just without compensation to those whose business is affected. The bill does not deal with this phase of the question, as it would be needless to provide the machinery for such purposes until the bill had passed. Some of England's greatest statesmen, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Chamberlain, expressed their approval of the principle of compensation. My own view, as expressed on several occasions and many years ago, is, if we could be entirely relieved for all time of the evil effects of the liquor traffic, the purchase of the vested interests of those concerned would not be too big a price to pay.”

What a pity that Mr. Ross did not stay with his Bill and offer compensation to the liquor men on an equitable basis !

“THE FINANCIERS.”

It might be in order for me to insert here, a brief editorial from Rev. Dr. Courtice in “The Christian Guardian” of February 12th, 1902, in which he pointed out very clearly how closely the interests of the liquor men are associated with those of the “financiers” of the country.

“The deputation which waited on the Government last Friday against prohibition is properly described as made up of ‘Financiers.’ They are not manufacturers or producers or merchants. They are managers, directors, or

shareholders in money-lending institutions. Every one is well aware that the LEADING MEN engaged in the liquor traffic have accumulated a large share of wealth out of their specially privileged and protected monopoly, and that they become in an extensive way depositors and investors, directly and indirectly interested in large monetary institutions. On the other hand, it has also been the custom for loan companies and insurance companies and monetary institutions looking for paying investments, to loan their money on mortgages on hotel property or other property the value of which is affected by the liquor trade. It is evident from such considerations that there is a close community of interests between 'wealthy liquor dealers' and 'financiers' who have loaned money without regard to the possibility of prohibition, and whose investments are now shaken. The Christian Guardian long ago warned the Christian public that the last and strongest ditch of defence for the liquor trade would be the 'financiers' feelings.'

In view of these things those who seek for prohibition ought to be prepared to face this matter on its financial side. In its deepest depth the liquor traffic is a money problem, and the traffic can never be abolished without giving consideration to the money interests involved.

THE MONEY PROBLEM.

But where is the money to be obtained with which to give compensation? It has been

said that no political leader could get the money with which to compensate. Strange indeed, when some of them can get money for purposes of vileness and political trickery! I reply without hesitation: The nation that has profited (?) or that thinks (some persons do) it has profited, to the extent of eight million dollars per year in revenue obtained from liquor men, should now pay the bill for compensation. I have shown that the revenues of ten years from the liquor trade, if handed back to the liquor men, would buy them out, or the revenue of five years given back would meet all the direct loss on property in case we enacted a prohibitory law. The nation ought to do it; and this nation MUST do it before we can ever stand justified before the God of nations, before Whom "the nations are as the small dust of the balance." I am not here preaching, but I affirm that this nation, Canada, must consider its relationship to God in dealing with this matter. If we refuse, He will not fail to deal with us as recalcitrants.

And here I would express my opinion that it is not worth the while for prohibitionists to oppose compensation to liquor men on the ground of cost or expense. The annual income from our resources in Canada is now six hundred million dollars, and development is only at the beginning. Canadians have six hundred millions deposited in banks and loan companies. What, then, is a paltry forty or fifty million dollars to this young and growing

nation? A mere bagatelle when compared with the prospective gain in a sober population of industrious people with unlimited resources at hand. We should not hesitate to give our consent to it. Prohibitionists cannot afford to higggle and haggle over such a matter. Let the liquor men see that we can meet them on generous terms, and we shall also take out of their hands this frightful weapon with which they have succeeded in intimidating electors in the past. Prohibitionists must expect that such a sweeping social transformation of the nation's life is going to cost something IMMEDIATELY. What great reform has ever been consummated without costing the nation something? And if prohibition is going to be worth as much to our land as we teach that it shall be, then the paltry sum for compensation will be the best public investment this nation has ever made, and one that will bring back interest a thousandfold as years pass on. "He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly, and he that soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet but it tendeth to poverty." Very good proverbs for prohibitionists to hold in mind at this time.

When Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in 1904, approached the electorate with a proposal to build a new Grand Trunk Pacific Railway which his political opponent, Hon. Mr. Borden, asserted would cost from fifty to seventy millions, he told the electorate that they must expect that

the new outlet for the nation's commerce would cost them something. The electorate accepted his project and sustained him. So we must expect that prohibition will immediately cost us something; but, like the railway, in the long run it will repay many times over the loss from revenue or the expense in compensation. I am not able to understand the fatuous opposition to a small amount of compensation while at the same time prohibitionists set forth the illimitable advantages that would accrue from the suppression of the drink traffic in Canada. We ought at least to be consistent, and we shall lose nothing to our cause by being consistently rational.

THE TORONTO NEWS.

In an excellent recent editorial in *The Toronto News* the writer draws attention to this strange opposition to compensation on the part of prohibitionists, as follows :—

“Now, assuming that we have at last come to the conclusion that the bar is a public evil, and ought to be abolished either immediately or gradually, it seems to us that we ought to begin by frankly admitting our own responsibility, sharing in the blame with those engaged in the traffic, and sharing also in the pecuniary loss that may result from abolition or restriction. We do not understand why prohibitionists consider that their cause would be weakened by recognizing the principle of compensation. On the contrary, a moral cause like this would be strengthened by willingness to make

pecuniary sacrifice. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that a hotelkeeper does receive by way of compensation a sum of money to which he may not be absolutely entitled, what harm is done to the cause of temperance? What principle is violated? Are not those prohibitionists who oppose compensation exalting a mere matter of dollars and cents to a position of undue importance? So far from weakening the cause of prohibition or advanced temperance legislation, the recognition of the principle of compensation would remove an obstacle to reform. It would lessen the opposition of those now engaged in the business. It would remove the scruples of those who do not wish to sanction an injustice, and whose moral support would certainly be valuable to the advocates of a moral reform. We do not understand why it should be so strenuously opposed by prohibitionists, unless they suppose that it is put forward merely to frighten the country with the idea that the cost of compensation would be enormous."

Since, as we have shown, the cost to the country would not be "enormous," the last sentence of the quotation contains a reason why prohibitionists should consent to it, and remove a cause of alarm from many voters.

REV. DR. CHOWN'S VIEWS.

In *The Christian Guardian* of February 22, 1905, Rev. Dr. Chown, Secretary of Temperance and Moral Reform of the Methodist Church,

has given his views on compensation.* To me, his brief article was disappointing. I imagine that most readers of *The Guardian* would not find it very edifying reading, though in this respect it is different from the "Notes" that Dr. Chown generally publishes there. I can scarcely see the "analogy" of his illustration from "A and B." I did not know before reading his article that the Province ever engaged in "selling" licenses. The license fee I have always regarded as a tax. There is not much point in what the Doctor has to say about a "change in tariff," since such a change does not abolish the manufacturer's right to go on in his business. Again, where he says, "It is on a matter of public justice that the case against compensation is the strongest," apparently he is looking at the matter only in the light of the analogy he draws. Arguments which I set forth in this paper make the case for compensation strong "as a matter of public justice." There is a queer mixing up of figures in the second last paragraph where the Doctor speaks of "the cost of a tavern license," and again of "the actual cost," which is only a portion of "the cost." The Doctor would be willing to grant compensation "as a matter of pure gratuity and expediency," but "as a right, never!" And

*In another article of May 3rd Dr. Chown again discusses the subject, and still expresses fears that compensation will block the way to prohibition. It will be seen that the opposite opinion is held here.

only "if tavernkeepers are so lost to manhood as to be willing to accept it."

I regret this last expression of feeling. If that is the spirit in which we propose to meet the liquor men on their proposals of compensation we shall find they are not "lost to manhood," and they will fling back in the face of prohibitionists all overtures about compensation made in such terms as these. On that ground as well might Dr. Chown charge Gladstone and Chamberlain, who have both given serious consideration to the question, with being "lost to manhood." My friend Mr. S. Grigg has told me that he knows of scores of men in the liquor business who long to get out of it, if any way could be found by which they would not have to sacrifice everything, and be able to go into some other line of business. I believe there are. These men are not "lost to manhood," nor are they beyond hope of being induced to accept a better way of living.

REDUCTION WITH COMPENSATION.

On the matter of reduction of licenses with compensation to those whose licenses may be cut off I have little to say, as I am here writing on behalf of the prohibition of the liquor traffic up to the full power of the Province, compensation to be given in such a case. Reduction always implies a residue, and we want no residue. Even if reduction were our policy it would be a fallacy still to suppose that it would ultimately bring prohibition. As a theory,

reduction looks plausible. Here is a forest with a thousand trees. Cut down fifty trees each year and in time the last tree will fall. So reason reductionists. But it does not work out this way in the destruction of the liquor traffic, for reduction means no more than the CONCENTRATION of the liquor traffic in fewer hands, as statistics prove. In 1875, the year before the Crooks Act was passed, there were in all 6,185 licenses in Ontario. In 1901 these were reduced to 2,957 in all. Yet in Ontario the traffic has constantly increased and that out of proportion to the population. Even with compensation attached, prohibition is not going to come by way of reduction, for a point will be reached where reduction will cease, and it is possible that with the increase of population the pendulum may again swing backward toward increase of licenses while some remain, if a Government should be in power that is in sympathy with such a move. And we know not who may yet be in power. The proposition to make the trade pay the amount of compensation in case of reduction is most vicious, as the British people will yet discover, and only amounts to about the same as to organize liquor men into a benevolent society for mutual assistance, the tendency of which would be to drift gradually toward the enriching of the residue, while the traffic continued, not decreasing but increasing. If, however, we were pursuing the policy of reduction instead of prohibition, there would be even

more reason why compensation should be given to the extent of the value of bar fixtures and the difference between the value of the property under license and what it would be worth simply as a hotel after the license has been cut off, since those whose licenses are continued have no more claim to them than those whose licenses are cut off and suffer loss, provided, of course, that each has fulfilled the requirements of the law as to providing accommodation, etc., and has observed the law. A case came under my personal notice where the best hotel in a certain town lost its license, on sectarian grounds. Yet the proprietor received no compensation. I am not, however, pleading for reduction with compensation. I think prohibitionists will be very unwise ever to substitute reduction with compensation from the trade, for prohibition. On the other hand, it would be better for men in the liquor business to accept prohibition with compensation from the nation for immediate loss, than to accept a policy of reduction with compensation. If prohibition came in force all hotels would have the same chance of patronage as hotels. If reduction be the policy, those hotels from which the licenses are cut off will stand a poor chance in competition with the hotel where a license is continued, and the reason is evident.

OBJECTIONS.

We come now to consider the objections that have been raised to compensation. In order

that this booklet may give the reader as fair a view of the question as it is possible to give in limited space, and that I may not be accused of setting forth only those views of the subject that I agree with, I shall here deal with some of the strongest objections that I have met with. I give first a list of objections prepared by Rev. G. Armstrong Bennetts, Temperance Secretary of the Wesleyan English Conference. It is a good illustration of the nagging spirit (all too prominent in our own country), which might forever go on nagging and accomplish no more than to generate reciprocal nagging among liquor men. He sets forth the following:—

“JUSTICE DEMANDS THAT THE PUBLICAN SHOULD COMPENSATE THE STATE FOR THE UNSPEAKABLE DAMAGES HIS TRADE HAS INFLICTED UPON IT.

“The following are some few of the items of the bill of damages which the nation might fairly lay against the traffic :

“Item 1.—Damages for the deterioration of property in the neighborhood of the license.

“Item 2.—Compensation to employers for all that they lose on Mondays, and at other times, through the absence of tippling workmen from their work.

“Item 3.—Compensation to employers for muddle-headed work done by boozy workmen.

“Item 4.—The cost of the support of all drink-produced paupers and pauper lunatics.

"Item 5.—The cost of policemen, judges, prisons, and criminal procedure, as far as they are due to drink.

"Item 6.—Compensation to families for death and sickness of members of the family caused by drink.

"Item 7.—Damages for all drink-caused accidents, shipwrecks, and the like.

"Item 8.—Damages for all skilled workmen whose education has been costly to the community, and who have not given the number of years' service in return that might have been expected from them, in consequence of their premature death through alcohol.

"If the State allows this traffic, which has acquired such swollen wealth by means of an unearned increment, to go Scot free with what it has got, the trade ought to consider that it has been treated with merciful magnanimity."

Over against these views of Mr. Armstrong I would place another paragraph from an editorial of *The Toronto News* in which the writer replies to a criticism of his views on compensation by Mrs. McKee, of Barrie, Provincial President W. C. T. U. The lady had said :

"We are asked to pay the promoters of this scourge to let us off a little, thereby admitting this traffic in souls to be worthy the consideration of the long-suffering taxpayer."

In all fairness, I think, the editor makes his reply :—

"The language used by our correspondent

may not be too strong in view of the terrible evils of intemperance; but we think that she lays too much blame at the door of the hotel-keeper, while she minimizes the responsibility of the community. There is no better basis for a moral reform than to recognize one's own responsibility, and to err, if at all, on the side of accepting too large a share of the burden. It is impossible to deny that the community has made itself a partner in the liquor business in all its branches. We have not only legalized the business and given it the sanctions and protections of law, but we have derived a large part of our public revenues from taxes on the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors.

"On the other hand, what has the licensed vendor of liquors done to deserve condemnation or harsh treatment? He is engaged in a business which the law sanctions, under certain regulations, and which could not, therefore, be considered as criminal. His purpose in engaging in this business is neither moral nor immoral. He goes into it simply to make a living, as one might go into the business of selling groceries, real estate or stock. If his business, as our correspondent and many others think, is essentially evil, we as a community ought not to have permitted him to engage in it at all, and we certainly ought not to have accepted a share of the profits."

It is objected to compensation that a license is granted for one year only.

True. But are we going to get prohibition at the end of this year? Where is the Provincial or Federal statesman who has promised we shall? I want to know his name. Have they not all abandoned prohibition? It follows, therefore, that the Province will continue the liquor trade under conditions similar to those now obtaining. In this a strong ground of hope is offered the liquor man. The attitude of the Provincial Government in Ontario during the past five years could have no other effect upon the liquor man than to strengthen such a hope—that his license will be continued. On this ground the liquor man may well assert a claim in case of loss. If the attitude of the Government had been even threatening there would be more force in the objection. But it has not been even that.

It has been objected that the time may come when the liquor trade will be reinstated even though abolished now with compensation; and if so, then liquor men might again demand compensation. How then?

It is true, a future generation MIGHT reinstate the liquor traffic. But since the genius of the Christian nation is socially and morally progressive, it is not at all likely that such a retrograde social movement would occur any more than it is probable that the Anglo-Saxon peoples will ever again institute slavery. We do not deny that a legislative body has the constitutional power to repeal its own enactments; but legislators will scarcely go in

advance of the popular demand. If Provincial prohibition could be tried for a generation, or for a period that would test it fairly, I have no fear that the liquor traffic would ever be reinstated on a popular demand. It is largely the presence of the traffic and its immediate vitiating influence on character that is its strength. It is inconceivable that a generation who had grown up free from its contaminating influence would ever call for its restoration.

Again, it has been said, "Liquor men have pillaged other people's homes by their trade. They deserve no better than to suffer loss by having their trade prohibited."

To this objection I reply that in dealing with this great problem personal feeling must not predominate, and the Christian spirit must not be lost sight of. The Christian spirit is one of grace, and is not shown in giving to every man just the measure he deserves, or grace disappears. The temperance movement is largely under the leadership of Christians. If we abandon the Christian spirit we shall fail of results, or the result we may obtain will fail to harmonize with our Christian political and social institutions. If prohibition is to be for the benefit of this nation, the Christian spirit should be willing to sacrifice in order to bring this reform to perfection. Therefore let the nation at large that shall share in common the benefits of the reform share also in common the cost of compensation. I do not think that the cause of righteousness will gain in driving men out of

the liquor trade with the feeling that Christians have forced legislation upon them which has deprived them of their means of living which they had been led to hope might continue indefinitely. We want these men not only out of the business they are now engaged in, but we want them to be led into a better life, a thing which occasional instances have shown me is by no means impossible. I know a case of a hotel man who recently lost his license—without compensation, of course. In the advent of prohibition there would be many such cases. As I have since looked upon his wretched appearance and that of his family, having no permanent means of support, I cannot say that their condition has been a source of satisfaction to me, even though he may have helped to bring others down by drink. Such a feeling would add no glory to the Christian spirit. "Deserves no better," is foreign to Christian phraseology, and a poor address with which to win erring men. It would be better to compensate liquor men, and let them with a good grace go out of the traffic, than to prejudice and antagonize, and so put them in such an attitude towards prohibitory law that they would probably endeavor to make good legislation ineffective.

Some have raised objection to compensation on the ground that liquor men have been a privileged class, and therefore have received sufficient in the monopoly which the law has protected for them.

To this I reply that they have been, in a sense, a privileged class, if permission to sell liquor under a license is a privilege. But the license theory is that such restriction in the sale of liquor is for the protection and accommodation of the public—not to create a privileged class; and the Government exacts as large a license fee as the trade can bear. Hence the permission is given only to about one in five hundred of the population. It is fair to judge men under a law by looking at the original purpose of that law. Now the original purpose of license law was to restrain, and if possible to diminish the evils of intemperance. That was the theory. It avails nothing to say that the Government saw in license laws a means of raising a certain amount of revenue. Professedly the license laws were for public protection. But when the evils of intemperance were so manifest, what the Government should have done for the protection of the nation was to enact prohibitory law, and close all places for drinking. We are told to-day that the license system must be continued because public sentiment is not sufficiently in favor of taking such a step, and this was doubtless the cause of license law being instituted at first, instead of immediate prohibition; and a number of drinking places were permitted to continue business. Now, if persons could not have been found who would go into the liquor business voluntarily, for the sake of the prospective gain, and take the risk of being closed out of it on popular

agitation, then on the Government's own theory it would have had to provide officials to manage these necessary licensed places for drinking. But such persons are found who go into the trade, and the attitude of the governing body towards their trade has been of such a temporizing character as to cause them to believe that their trade would continue. It is incorrect to call liquor men a privileged class, since the Government has pronounced them a necessary class. Nor should they be refused compensation when deprived of their business, on the ground of being a privileged class. Prohibitionists may look upon them as such, for we condemn the whole license system. But liquor men have to do with the Government, and are conducting a business on the Government's theory of necessity. If the time has now come when the business is no longer a necessity (and we believe so) and should be abolished, let them be compensated for losses that may be incurred in the social change, from the public purse of that body politic whose representatives up to the present time have pronounced their business a necessity, and on this ground have continued it. I have no expectation that any Provincial legislature will ever enact prohibitory legislation and carry it out successfully without granting compensation in some equitable manner to license-holders. Legislation without this will most likely meet the fate of the Manitoba Act. Therefore, again, I think prohibitionists will not gain anything in

opposing compensation. We had better reserve our fighting energies for the gaining of prohibition up to the full power of the Province.

Objection to compensation has been started by attempting to trace analogy between the action of the Government in extinguishing licenses, and its action in changing or readjusting the fiscal or tariff laws. "It has never been the policy of any Government in Canada, Conservative or Liberal, to compensate manufacturers when protective legislation was withdrawn."

But those who set forth this objection are plainly in error in finding a parallel in a prohibitory law, which shall abolish the liquor men's business altogether, and the removal of a protective tariff, which action in no way hinders the manufacturer from going on with his business, but gives freedom for competition. The removal of a customs duty does not prohibit the home manufacturer from continuing at his trade, whatever it may be. At most, it removes an obstruction from competition. The cases therefore are not parallel.

We must remember that prohibition will be an entirely new departure in legislation and therefore it may be necessary to depart from established precedents to meet the contingencies of the new social conditions. If we should create a precedent, that is not "a sin unto death." Someone had to create those that are so assiduously followed, and why should not we

also? To refuse to go where we may have no precedent would mean the cessation of progress, and the stagnation of the nation's life. Up to a certain point it may be good and safe to be guided by precedent, but a point may be reached where it might be very unsafe and unwise to refuse to go forward on new lines and without a precedent. It is wisdom then to create one.

The Imperial Parliament has not always followed precedent nor adhered strictly to the principle in legislation. The recent liquor legislation, in which provision is made for the compensation of those whose licenses shall be extinguished, is an instance of departure. At the time of the abolition of slavery in the British colonies a new problem came before the Imperial Parliament, and yet not wholly new, for the question of abolishing slavery in the colonies had then been under discussion for nearly one hundred years. Yet, when the final step in Emancipation was taken in 1833, the British Government generously appropriated twenty million pounds sterling, as compensation to the planters. The Government had paid, ten years previously, three hundred thousand pounds to Portuguese subjects from whom the privilege of the slave trade had been taken. We never hear the action of the British Government in that matter condemned, although slave-owners through more than half a century had heard deep protests against slavery, as liquor men have heard protests against their trade, and they must have been convinced that

slavery as an institution was in danger of abolition. If iniquitous results are a sufficient ground for refusing compensation in the case of the liquor traffic, no compensation should have been given to either planters or traders, since it was shown in the House of Commons that one half of those negroes stolen from Africa perished through maltreatment, disease, climatic influence and other causes, before the time of becoming able-bodied laborers, besides all the abuses that followed in servitude. The United States Government did not adopt the pacific means of compensation, but ultimately resorted to civil war. If the American Government had purchased the emancipation of slaves at one thousand dollars per capita, millions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives would have been saved to the Republic. Time and results have abundantly shown the wisdom of the British method of dealing with Emancipation; and I must say the method strongly commends itself to me as a safe and good precedent which we may follow in the settlement of the prohibition problem in Canada. There is not a perfect analogy in the two cases; but ANALOGY THERE IS, in the fact that slavery was so universally recognized and permitted in British colonies from the time of Sir John Hawkins till the opening of the nineteenth century, and also in the fact that the British Parliament undertook first to place restrictions on the slave trade, then later to abolish it with compensation. It was

the way of least resistance, and the wisdom of such a course has been demonstrated. If compensation by the state in the case of Emancipation be defended on the ground that thereby a large number of citizens were turned over to the state, and placed on an equality of citizenship, and made more capable of the duties of citizenship, the same argument holds good for compensation in the case of prohibition. The drunkard class are not able to fulfill the duties of citizenship, and are an actual loss to the state. Their families suffer and must come on charity. It is a fact that one half of those that go into Houses of Refuge and have to be maintained at the public expense are reduced to this through drink. This is a loss to the state which in the event of prohibition would largely cease, because citizenship of a higher standard would soon result. If compensation could be defended in the case of Emancipation, it may with at least equal, and I think greater reason, be defended in the case of prohibition.

A popular form of objection to compensation is set forth in the question, "Who shall compensate widows and orphans who have been robbed of husbands and fathers through the drink traffic?"

The Christian spirit does not ignore the sad and destitute condition of these families who have suffered from the ravages of drink; but it would seek to bring in, by some secure and legitimate means, a social condition that will prevent the possibility of the recurrence of these

unspeakably pitiable cases. There is only one answer to the question. They cannot be compensated for the loss. Every wrong and inequality cannot be adjusted in this life. We can only hope to set up safeguards against the repetition of these domestic disasters, and we are striving to do that. If compensation to liquor men will assist in getting rid of the worst foe of the home and of humanity, the drink traffic, it may be some compensation to its victims who yet live, and to those who have suffered loss through its destructive work, to see it abolished from the land. The same question might have been put concerning the slaves, many of whom were liberated in old age. Their emancipation was their compensation.

I have referred to this matter above, and have shown that if we, as a Province, or as a nation, give back to liquor men the money traffic has paid into our public treasuries, then it is for them to do what they like with it. As a nation we would no longer then be responsible. But I fear that, until we do the righteous thing and impose on ourselves the duty of rigorous restitution, we, as a nation, must continue to bear the responsibility in some measure for the victims of the liquor traffic. In the loss sustained by the death of a friend, as for instance in war, or in a mining or a railway accident, money given the relatives never fully compensates for the loss, though it may relieve the temporal necessities. It does not bring back the dead. There are losses that can never be

made up by any means, and so in this.

However, it ought not to be lost sight of that the drunkard is a consenting party, and shares the responsibility with the liquor man and with the nation which perpetuates the traffic. It would be an injustice to place the whole responsibility upon liquor men.

A great many of the women who have become widows of drunkards must also bear a share of the responsibility, because they consented at first to become the wives of young men whom they knew to be given to drink in some measure. Probably every pastor in charge of a congregation has knowledge of some such young women that are keeping company with young men who drink. These same young women do not receive well, a kind remonstrance and advice. Perhaps they resent it. These are the young women who will be the future widows of drunkards, and whose children will be orphans, made so by drink. The cases are rare where young men begin to drink after marriage. These young women receive as husbands what they bargain for with a full knowledge of the facts, and with eyes wide open. It may be a fact that "love is blind," but it is even more generally a fact that the young man who does not give up drink before he becomes a husband very seldom does so afterwards, and young women cannot say that they are not fully apprized of this fact. Faithful pastors are constantly emphasizing these facts. If young women would refuse to keep

the company of, or to marry young men who drink, there would soon be fewer drink tragedies in domestic life, and very few drunkards' widows and orphan children. If any young woman has a quarrel with what I have here written, I refer her to the confidence of some woman who took all the risks and married a man who drank. Ask the opinion of such a woman. The liquor man has his share of responsibility, but the woman in the exercise of a free choice has also a vast responsibility.

In conclusion I have this word to say: I do not expect that all I have written here will meet with universal approval by temperance people, nor by liquor men, if any of the latter should read it. I know the doctrine of compensation is unpopular with temperance people just as prohibition is unpopular with liquor men, and the man who writes to advocate either or both will not perhaps increase his popularity. Let it be so. I have written here, as in another book, my honest convictions on the prohibition question. What I have written here is the result of careful thought and some reading on the subject. I am willing that those who may read this should disagree with my views if they cannot accept them; and I hope they may concede to me the same honesty of motive in writing which I am willing to attribute to them in holding opposite views.

MACK CLOIE.

Ailsa Craig, Ont., March, 1905.

