

WAR NOTES.

THE PREMIER'S PROMISE.

(Keep this carefully. You will be told that the premier did not commit himself to anything.)

THE PLEBISCITE PROMISED.

The premier, replying to the deputation of Prohibitionists who waited upon the government at Ottawa on Sept. 3, said:—"The plebiscite is part of the Liberal programme adopted at the convention of 1893. Our policy has been before the people, who have pronounced upon it. It now becomes our duty to carry out our programme, and I say frankly it is our intention to do so. (Cheers.) As to the time when it should be done, my answer is this:—"It is the intention of the Liberal party to carry out the letter every article of its programme within the very shortest possible limit. There is no intention to delay. On the contrary, speaking even politically, it is perhaps the best policy of all to deal with the question within the shortest time. It is not our intention this session, but I have every hope that next session, and not later, we shall introduce the legislation we have promised. (Loud cheers.) This is a question in which women are, perhaps more than the men, interested. Mrs. Alexander has not the right of suffrage, but all will admit that she could not influence the government of this country more if she had a vote than she can do simply speaking. (Cheers.)"

This declaration gains precise meaning from the statements made in the speeches to which it was a reply. The understood policy of the government had been asserted to be the taking of a plebiscite at the earliest possible time and the carrying out of the mandate which the people might give with the least possible delay.

PERSONAL LIBERTY

What Hill, Blackstone
 Abbott had to Say About It

Is it the custom of our country that every man shall do as he pleases? That is the principle that ruled to a greater or less extent in barbaric times. Have we reached the plane of a loftier line of conduct? Is Canada capable of taking the higher ground? Says John Stuart Mill: "My liberty ends when it begins to involve the possibility of ruin to my neighbor." Blackstone says: "No man has a right to use his property in such a manner as shall injure the life or property of another, and the consent of the party injured is no mitigation of the offence." Says Lyman Abbott: "Liberty is not the right of every man to do what seemeth to him good. Liberty involves the right of every man to find out for himself what are the divine laws, and to obey those laws as they are revealed and disclosed to him, provided that obedience to his own understanding of them does not bring him into conflict with the rights of his neighbor."

CAN'T FACE ITS OWN WORK.

A drunkard man or woman should be tolerated in society or in the streets no more than he or she is in a decent drinking place. —Wine and Spirit Gazette.

There you have it again! The worst possible indictment of the liquor business is the attitude toward it of those who are in it. The drunkard is a product of the business, and yet no 'decent drinking place' will tolerate its own business products around! The saloon is ashamed of its own work, and showers contempt and contumely upon its own products.

What other business does this? What other manufacturer refuses to tolerate the finished products of his factory in his place of business? What other trade sends out circulars promising that their goods shall have 'no marks or brands of any kind' on them? What other business considers it necessary to screen its customers from the public eye and to provide ways in which they may sneak in and sneak out? The business carries its own condemnation in its

face. Conscious shame is depicted all over it. Legality can't take the hang-dog look away from it. It holds exhibitions—announced one in this city last week—but keeps the ground glass windows up to hide its real products. It boasts that it is one of the leading industries, that it is as legal as any business, that it pays millions into the public revenue, that it is respectable and necessary; but its side-doors, its screens, its back-alley exits, its circular promising 'no marks or brands of any kind,' all give the lie to its boasts and prove its professions to be mere bravado. No act of the legislature can take the shame out of its face or put self-respect into its sneaking, furtive countenance. It is ashamed of itself, ashamed of its products, ashamed of its customers, and hates nothing on earth so much as to have an honest man, whom it will denounce as a 'spy,' come into its place of business to look upon the work it carries on behind its outward glitter and splendor. It is a conscious sneak and a self-confessed criminal, despite the credentials of a 'good moral character' which the excise commissioners have given it. It should—and, by God's grace and the ballots of American patriots, it shall—get off the face of the earth. —'The Voice.'

FATHER MATHEW AND PROHIBITION.

Father Mathew, who for many years labored for temperance both in Ireland and America, and who administered the pledge



FATHER MATHEW.

of total abstinence to millions of people, after more than twenty years' experience, wrote the following letter to an old friend in America:

My Dear Friend,—The question of prohib-

iting the use of ardent spirits and other intoxicating drinks which are found in our unhappy country is new to me. The principle of prohibition seems to me the only safe and certain remedy for the evils of intemperance. This opinion has been strengthened and confirmed by the hard labor of more than twenty years in the temperance cause. I rejoice in the welcome intelligence of the formation of a Maine Law Alliance, which I trust will be the means under God of destroying the fruitful source of crime and pauperism. Allow me to thank you for your earnest, active and indefatigable labors in this past movement. Yours very truly,

THEOBALD MATHEW.

MORALS IN POLITICS.

HONEST OLD HORACE GREELEY AND HIS IRRESISTIBLE LOGIC.

Its (the liquor traffic's) organs tell us that temperance is a moral question, but they would fain conceal the fact that it has vast political bearings as well. Politics, in the higher and truer sense of the term, is the science of legislation, of government, and of public well-being.

And who will say that the prevalence of temperate or intemperate, virtuous or vicious habits and usages is not vitally associated with these? Who shall say that the great first cause of idleness, unthrift, pauperism, crime, and the heavy burdens and taxes by those imposed on the community is not properly a subject of political discussion and action?

But, in fact, our opponents take ground refuted by all the past legislation of our States and cities—by all their own past action. Long before total abstinence had been prescribed as a rule of life, and when alcoholic beverages were in all but universal use, our States and cities elapsed the law which was never till now seriously discussed of regulating, controlling and restricting liquor traffic. They decided that they were not fit to be governed by such laws

and should not be allowed to sell the beverages; wherein we heartily agree with them. We do not vary the principle; we only extend its application, proposing to apply the restriction to good as well as bad men. They have established that bad men are unfit for the business; we further insist that the business does not fit for good men.—Horace Greeley.

FROM OUR WAR CORRESPONDENTS.

Under this heading we purpose giving each week as the campaign proceeds interesting items of news from all parts of the country. Prohibition workers everywhere are invited to send in items for this column.

PROVINCIAL PLEBISCITES.

Manitoba, 1892.	For Prohibition, Against - - -	19,637 7,115
	Majority	12,522
Ontario, 1893.	For Prohibition, Against - - -	192,489 110,720
	Majority	81,769
Prince Edward Island, 1893.	For Prohibition, Against - - -	10,616 3,390
	Majority	7,226
Nova Scotia, 1894.	For Prohibition, Against - - -	43,756 12,355
	Majority	31,401