

The Ontario Referendum

The Ontario Temperance Act

Question.—What is the Ontario Temperance Act?

Answer.—The Ontario Temperance Act is the name of the Prohibition Measure introduced by Premier Sir William Hearst and passed by the Ontario Legislature and which came into force on Sept. 16th, 1916.

Q.—What are its main provisions?

A.—It prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, also the keeping or having or giving of liquor except in private houses. It contains effective enforcement provisions, and provides severe penalties for law violation.

Q.—Is it a thorough-going measure?

A.—It goes practically as far in the direction of total prohibition as the constitutional powers of the Province will permit.

Q.—What does it not prohibit?

A.—It cannot and does not prohibit the manufacture, importation or inter provincial shipment of liquor. These are matters outside Provincial jurisdiction.

Q.—What about the securing of liquor for necessary purposes?

A.—Government agencies have been established and adequate provision made for the supplying of liquor for medicinal, industrial, mechanical and sacramental purposes. Only the sale for beverage purposes is prohibited.

Q.—Is it good law?

A.—The Privy Council, the highest judicial authority in the British Empire, has declared it to be so.

Q.—Wherein does its strength lie?

A.—The strength of the Ontario Temperance Act lies in the fact that, while it does all that the Province has power to do, it stops within its power. If it contained more stringent provisions than are now embodied in it there would be doubt as to its constitutionality.

Q.—How is it administered?

A.—By a board of License Commissioners, consisting of three men appointed by the Government. The Board has very wide powers and has efficiently and sympathetically administered the law.

Q.—Has it made good?

A.—Premier Hearst says: "I say, without hesitation, I do not know any one Act or measure in this province that increased the efficiency of our people, conserved our financial strength, aided thrift and generally contributed to our fighting power to a greater extent than The Ontario Temperance Act."

Hon. N. W. Rowell says: "The results have been so satisfactory that large numbers of those who were opposed to the adoption of the measure are now its warm supporters. Thousands of wives and children are better clothed, better fed and know more of the real meaning of 'home' to-day than they ever knew before. Crime has been substantially reduced; the efficiency and earning power of the worker materially increased; business has been stimulated."

Q.—Is the United States Dry?

A.—Yes. On July 1st, war-time prohibition became effective. This is a temporary measure, but on January 16th, 1920, constitutional amendment recently adopted, comes into force making permanent the prohibition of the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation and sale of intoxicating beverages of all kinds.

Q.—What would be the effect if intoxicating liquors should be sold in Ontario with the United States dry?

A.—Decidedly bad. Between the Province of Ontario alone and the United States there is an international boundary line of 1,000 miles, touching six states, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Ontario would rival Mexico as the drinking resort of the American continent, a condition which every citizen who has the honour of his country at heart should strongly deplore and vigorously oppose.

The Referendum

Question.—Why is a vote being taken now?

Answer.—The Ontario Temperance Act, as originally passed, contained a provision that on the first Monday in June, 1919, there should be submitted to a vote of the electors the question, "Are you in favor of the repeal of the Ontario Temperance Act." At the

last session of the Legislature this was amended, leaving the date for the taking of the vote to be fixed by Order-in-Council.

Q.—Why was this provision put into the law?

A.—The Ontario Temperance Act was passed during war time, to meet a national emergency. Many of Ontario's best citizens were overseas fighting for their country and could not be consulted. The Government wisely enacted the law and provided that, when the soldiers returned and conditions became normal, the people

should decide whether the law should be sustained or replaced.

Q.—Is the Government responsible for prohibition?

A.—The Government assumed full responsibility for the initial passing of the Ontario Temperance Act and was supported by the Opposition. Indeed the measure passed without a dissenting voice in the Legislature. The Government is now submitting the Act to the people. This is fair and right. The Legislature did its duty. It is now up to the people to do theirs.

The Ballot

Each Elector is urged to mark his ballot as follows:—

	Yes	No
1. Are you in favour of the repeal of The Ontario Temperance Act?		X
2. Are you in favour of the sale of light beer containing not more than two and fifty-one one-hundredths per cent. alcohol weight measure through Government agencies and amendments to The Ontario Temperance Act to permit such sale?		X
3. Are you in favour of the sale of light beer containing not more than two and fifty-one one-hundredths per cent. alcohol weight measure in standard hotels in local municipalities that by a majority vote favour such sale and amendments to The Ontario Temperance Act to permit such sale?		X
4. Are you in favour of the sale of spirituous and malt liquors through Government agencies and amendments to The Ontario Temperance Act to permit such sale?		X

How to Vote

Question.—Should a voter vote on every question?

Answer.—YES, he MUST vote on every question or his ballot will be spoiled. The Act distinctly states, section 2, sub-section 3, "Every voter shall vote on every one of the said questions, otherwise his entire ballot shall be void and shall be rejected."

Q.—What would be the effect of the various possible votings?

A.—Question 1: If a majority of the voters vote "YES," The Ontario Temperance Act shall be repealed and the old Liquor License Act, just as it existed in 1916, will be revived as if The Ontario Temperance Act had not been passed. In explaining what a "YES" vote to Question 1 means, Premier Hearst said: "In that event there would be no necessity for further consideration of the other questions for the greater would include the less, and liquor would be sold in bars and shops as in years gone by."

If a majority vote "NO," the result will depend upon the answers given to Questions 2, 3, and 4.

Question 2: If a majority vote "YES" intoxicating beer shall be sold by sales agents established by the Board of License Commissioners of Ontario. Two evils would result: (1) The promiscuous sale of an intoxicating beverage; (2) Government ownership, and thus the partnership of every citizen in the booze business.

If a majority vote "NO" the people declare against this form of liquor selling.

Question 3: If a majority vote "YES" licenses may be issued by the Board of License Commissioners, authorizing the sale of intoxicating beer in standard hotels in any municipality wherein a majority of the voters shall have voted "YES" to this question at this election, and only in such municipalities.

If a majority vote "NO," the electors declare for keeping our standard hotels free from booze and bars, and for maintaining the improved conditions that have obtained in the hotels of Ontario under prohibition.

Question 4: If a majority vote "YES" liquor of all kinds shall be sold, by sales agencies established by the Board of License Commissioners, for consumption in homes only.

If a majority vote "NO" the electors declare against such sales, and for maintaining the purity of Ontario homes.

Question.—How should electors vote who favor retaining the Ontario Temperance Act?

Answer.—They must mark their ballot with a cross (X) in the "NO" column, opposite each and every question.

Q.—What constitutes a spoiled ballot?

A.—Any mark but a simple cross (x) in the proper compartment will spoil a ballot. To write "No" or

"Yes" or to sign a name, or make any other mark spoils the ballot and it is not counted, even though it should indicate the intention of the voter.

Q.—What constitutes a temperance victory?

A.—For the temperance forces to win, they must secure four "NO" majorities. That is a majority "NO" on every question. The Temperance forces will be defeated if there is a majority for "YES" on any one of the questions.

About Beer

Question.—What is the difference between the beer described in Questions 2 and 3 on the ballot and that allowed under The Ontario Temperance Act?

Answer.—The Ontario Temperance Act says: "Any liquor which contains more than 2.50 per cent proof spirit shall be conclusively deemed to be intoxicating." 2.51 per cent alcohol by weight is equivalent to 5.46 per cent proof spirits. If there is a "YES" majority for Question 2 or 3, then the sale of beer one hundred and eighteen per cent stronger than is now permitted, will be legalized.

Q.—What is the standard fixed by other countries?

A.—The United States Congress fixes intoxicating liquors as that containing one-half of one per cent alcohol. This also is the standard fixed by the British Government. The beer proposed, therefore, is more than five times as strong as that which is officially declared to be intoxicating in England and the United States.

Q.—Will increasing the alcoholic strength improve the quality of the beer?

A.—Absolutely no. What ever food value there may be in the malt, or tonic value in the hops, is neutralized by the alcohol. The more alcohol beer contains, therefore, the poorer it is as a food or a tonic.

Q.—Is the beer sold now any good?

A.—The brewers say it is. Here are extracts from a couple of recent advertisements:

"The one beverage that meets every requirement, at home or on motor trips, is.....Makes good friends everywhere. Keep a case or two always on hand—a few bottles on ice. It's delicious, refreshing beverage that should be kept always ready for instant use."

".....brews are all good—and always good. As satisfying, invigorating thirst-quenchers, they are incomparable. After recreation or strenuous exercise remove that languid feeling by refreshing yourself with....."

Q.—Why then this campaign for "stronger" beer?

A.—Brewers want the profits from increased consumption that will come through supplying beer that will intoxicate.

Q.—What is the actual effect of beer consumption?

A.—Here are a few authentic statements by qualified authorities:

"In appearance the beer drinkers may be the picture of health, but in reality he is most incapable of resisting disease. A slight injury, a severe cold, or shock to the body or mind will commonly provoke acute disease, ending fatally. Compared with other inebriates who use different kinds of alcohol, he is more incurable and more generally diseased. It is our observation that beer drinking in this country produces the very lowest kind of inebriety, closely allied to criminal insanity."—"Scientific American."

Dr. Bowers, in "American Magazine":

"White wine or brandy in sufficient quantities make a man crazy, beer tends to make him stupid. The actual reason for this tendency toward brutalization and sottishness is very simple; for, in addition to the small whiskey glass of pure alcohol in each pint, beer also contains a large and varying percentage of lupulin, the active principle of hops."

Dr. Bowers reaches the conclusion from scientific tests which he cites, that the nutritional value of beer is "almost as high as that of the hole in the doughnut."

Q.—Has any Prohibition State or Province voted upon the "Beer" issue?

A.—Yes. Michigan carried prohibition on November 7th, 1916, by a majority vote of 68,624. In April, 1919, the electors voted upon a beer and wine amendment. The vote was as follows:

For beer and wine...322,603
Against beer and wine 539,123
Majority to sustain prohibition and reject beer and wine.....207,520

Voters and Voters' Lists

Two things are absolutely essential for the casting of a legal vote:

1. The person must be qualified.
2. The person's name must be upon the voters' list.

Qualification is not sufficient; the name must be on the list. Having the name on the list is not sufficient; there must be qualifications.

QUALIFICATION OF VOTERS

Subject to certain minor modifications the persons entitled to be entered on the list of voters and to vote in the approaching referendum shall be every man and woman who:—

1. Is a British subject by birth or naturalization.
2. Is twenty-one years of age.
3. Has resided in Canada for twelve months and in the electoral district for three months next preceding the day fixed upon which enumeration begins in such electoral district.

WHO MAY BE ENTERED ON LISTS

1. Every person in possession of the qualifications already set out.

2. Nurses, soldiers, and sailors may vote. Every man or woman who is a British subject of whatever age and who is not entered on any other list or is not otherwise disqualified and who has served or is serving in any country in the naval or military forces of Great Britain and any of her Allies and who at the time he or she enlisted was even temporarily a resident of any municipality in Ontario.

3. A student in attendance at an institution of learning and not entered or entitled to be entered upon any other list may be entered upon the list for the polling sub-division in which he or she resides if otherwise qualified.

4. A woman who has become a British subject by marriage or by the naturalization of her parent when she was a minor and in either case has done nothing to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject, and has obtained a certificate under the signature of a judge certifying that she has personally appeared and has satisfied him that she is of the full age of twenty-one years, has resided in Canada a sufficient length of time and is possessed of all requirements as would be necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to be naturalized as a British subject, and that she has taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty.

5. Every man and every woman who is otherwise qualified and will within fifty-six days after the day upon which the enumerators shall commence to make up the list, be of the full age of twenty-one years.

Q.—If a qualified person's name is left off the list by the enumerators can it be afterwards added?

A.—Yes, full provision is made by the law for Courts of Revision. Section 38 of the Ontario Election Act, 1918, reads:

"Every list shall be subject to revision by the revising officer at the instance of any voter who complains that the names of any persons who are entitled to be entered on the list have been omitted, or that the names of persons who are not entitled to be voters have been entered on the list."

Q.—Will due notification be given?

A.—Yes. At least fifteen days' notice shall be given by public advertisement of the date of the sitting of the Revising Officers.

Voting Day

The date for the taking of the vote has not been fixed, but Premier Hearst has said: "It would seem probable that the vote might be taken in September or October, or November at the latest."

Guarding the Vote

Q.—What are the legal provisions regarding corrupt practices?

A.—All the provisions of the law applicable to the holding of an election for members of the Legislature and regarding illegal and corrupt practices and penalties and prosecutions therefor apply to the taking of this vote.

Q.—What are these provisions?

A.—Every person guilty of bribery shall incur a penalty of \$200, and shall also on conviction be imprisoned for a term of six months.

Q.—What constitutes bribery?

A.—The law is very comprehensive and amongst many provisions contains the following:

(a) The giving, lending, agreeing to give or lend, directly or indirectly, or promising any money or valuable consideration to, or for any voter to induce any voter to vote or to refrain from voting or on account of a voter having voted or refrained from voting.

(b) To give or procure, or agree to give or procure or offer or promise any office or employment to induce a voter to vote or refrain from voting.

(c) To make any gift, loan, etc., to any person in order to induce them to procure the vote of any voter, or the engaging, or endeavoring to procure, the vote of any voter in consequence of such gift, loan, etc.

(d) Every person who receives, agrees or contracts for any gift, loan, etc., for voting or agreeing to vote or for refraining or agreeing to refrain from voting.

(e) Any person who, after an election, directly or indirectly, receives any money or valuable consideration for having voted or refrained from voting, or for having induced any other person to vote or refrain from voting.

Q.—What other actions constitute corrupt practices?

A.—All the provisions of the Ontario Election Act regarding betting, hiring conveyances, furnishing transportation, undue influence to induce or compel a person to vote or refrain from voting, misrepresentation, etc., apply.

Q.—What about personation?

A.—A person who applies for a ballot paper in the name of some other person, living or dead, or a fictitious person, or who attempts to, or shall vote more than once in the same election, is guilty of personation and shall incur a penalty of \$400, and shall also on conviction be imprisoned for one year.

Q.—Can a person whose name is upon the voters' list, but who has no right to vote, cast a legal vote?

A.—The Act is very explicit. It says: "A person who votes knowing that he has no right to vote, and a person who induces or procures any other person to vote, knowing that such person has no right to vote, shall be guilty of a corrupt practice, and shall incur a penalty of \$200."