

A WANT SUPPLIED.

WEAPONS FOR OUR VOLUNTEERS.

Just what the cause requires—Just what our workers need—Information—Logic—Fact—Appeal—Read Carefully.

We desire to again call the attention of our readers to THE TEMPERANCE HERALD, the little paper published weekly at this office, and specially prepared to meet the popular demand for cheap, fresh, pointed, pitiful temperance literature for gratuitous distribution by workers and friends.

THE TEMPERANCE HERALD is not in any sense a newspaper and does not aim at giving news. It consists of the most stirring and forcible appeals, arguments and facts selected from the CANADA CITIZEN and reproduced in a cheap and convenient form. It is a rousing practical, good campaign sheet, that must do good wherever it goes, and ought to be scattered broadcast everywhere.

To give the TEMPERANCE HERALD a wider circulation and make it still more effective we have slightly diminished its size and reduced the price of large quantities. It will hereafter be supplied on the following terms:—

500 per hundred for all orders of not less than 200 copies, 400 per hundred for orders of not less than 500 copies, 400 per hundred for orders of not less than 1,000 copies. We cannot undertake to send out single copies of the TEMPERANCE HERALD to any address, and the figures we quote will be for quantities supplied in bulk as follows:—

20 copies every week for 10 weeks	\$1.00
10 " " " " " "	\$1.00
10 " " " " " "	\$2.25
50 " " " " " "	\$4.00

In cases where 1,000 or more copies of any special issue are ordered we will send the same in parcels of not less than 100 each, for \$4 per thousand.

Special arrangements may also be made for mailing single copies from this office to any number of personal addresses (not less than 1,000) in any part of the country.

In many countries, in our Scott Act contests the prohibition vote varied just in proportion to the extent to which campaign literature was circulated in different localities. THE TEMPERANCE HERALD is one of the most powerful weapons that can be used against rum. Specimen copies furnished free. Address:—

F. S. SPENCE,
8 King Street East, Toronto.

PLEASE READ THIS!

10 CENTS ONLY 10

WE ARE THOROUGHLY convinced that it is only necessary that THE CANADA CITIZEN should be known to secure its very wide circulation. To secure this general knowledge, we offer to send it to any address ON TRIAL.

SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.

Here is a broad field of work for any one who wants to aid the great temperance reform. Take an hour to canvass your friends. Nearly every one you ask will give you ten cents as a subscription for a month and a half's trial. Let us up a club of a hundred, or fifty, or ten, or any number you like. We ought to have ten thousand trial subscribers on this short date plan.

DEAR IN MIND THE FACT

that the ten cents secures for six weeks a 40-column weekly family journal of social progress and moral reform; a paper that must do good wherever it goes; bright, fresh, pure, able, attractive, and full of information and interest for young and old.

EVERY TEMPERANCE SOCIETY

ought to send as a club. Are you not thoroughly convinced of the righteousness of the temperance cause, which you have so much at heart? Do you think it deserves and needs your assistance? How can you help it more effectively than by asking thus practically in the circulation of sound, healthy, inspiring literature?

DO YOU WISH TO CONTRIBUTE

some money to the Prohibition cause? Send us a dollar, or five, or ten, or twenty, or fifty, with a list of addresses, and we will send the papers along. Ten Dollars will supply THE CANADA CITIZEN for six weeks to a hundred names.

A HUNDRED NAMES.

We believe there are thousands of warm-hearted, willing friends of our cause, who would gladly aid in this great work. Kindly show this proposition to some of them and ask them to join you in helping us.

F. S. SPENCE,

8 King St. East, Toronto.

It is specially requested that those who send us addresses without the knowledge of the parties whose names are given, will kindly inform us to that effect. We shall then notify those parties by post card that the paper is sent them. We shall also charge, otherwise some might desire to take the paper from the post-office.

10 CENTS ONLY 10

The : Canada : Citizen

AND TEMPERANCE HERALD.

A Journal Devoted to the Promotion of Social Progress and Moral Reform.

Subscription, \$1 a year, strictly in advance.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY
THE CITIZEN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

President:
Hon. A. VIDAL, Pres. Dominion Alliance.

Vice-President:
ALD R. J. FLEMING.

F. S. SPENCE, Man Director and Editor.

OFFICE, 8 KING STREET E. TORONTO.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 11th, 1907.

A NEW SENATOR.

The appointment of Mr. John Macdonald, of this city, to the Dominion Senate, will be hailed with satisfaction by temperance workers all over the Dominion. Mr. Macdonald is a gentleman who stands high in the estimation of his fellow citizens and is a thoroughgoing temperance man.

Appointments of this character are what the Senate needs, and if men like Mr. Macdonald had been selected for those important positions from time to time in the years gone by, the Senate would not be lacking as it is to-day in public respect, and would not be so generally considered as an almost insuperable obstacle in the way of progressive legislation. We heartily congratulate Mr. Macdonald, we heartily congratulate the Dominion Senate, and we heartily congratulate the country.

TEMPERANCE UNION.

In a letter published in this week's CANADA CITIZEN, our good friend and successful worker, Brother Bliss, Grand Scribe of the Manitoba Grand Division, expresses his views on Temperance Union and also on the question of immediate prohibition. Bro. Bliss is not in harmony with those who are in favor of any further union and his objections would be perfectly sound if they were taken against the kind of Union he opposes and which no one proposes, namely, a union of the "S. of T., the I.O.G.T. the R. T. of T. Temperance Clubs, Blue Ribbon Societies, Father Matthew Societies, W.C.T.U.'s Church of England Temperance Societies, and other minor branches of our temperance army." These organizations could not be united, their methods and platforms, and to some extent their objects, radically differ. All that is proposed is that the organizations whose principles, methods, and objects are identical should be united.

Our brother says that "what will suit one portion of the globe will not do for another." True, but all who are familiar with the different secret temperance organizations, know that they do not differ in any feature that would make one better suited than another, to any community or locality. Blue Ribbon and kindred societies are doing grand and glorious work, they meet the views of those who object to private societies. The W.C.T.U., the O.E.T.S., and the Father Matthew society, each works on its own particular line and may be better suited to the interests of a particular locality, community or class, but there is no such reason that would make "Sons" better suited to any place than the "Good Templars" or "Good Templars" than "Royal Templars." The union suggested is only a union of bodies that are now doing the same work in the same way but at double the cost in time energy and means.

We regret also that our good brother is not at one with the vast majority of Canadian temperance workers in favor of immediate total prohibition. Everything that he says about the backward condition of certain communities,

all the arguments he urges against the North West permit system, everything stated as to one province not being as far advanced as another, constitutes a strong argument in favor of speedy national prohibition. Law against evil is most needed where the evil is most rampant and it is well that advanced communities should have the right to control the less advanced under the same government. Surely our good brother could not want to permit sheepstealing in one province because the farmers were not as well educated in honesty as those of some other part of the Dominion.

We are pleased, however, to have both sides of every important question discussed, and we cordially commend Brother Bliss' letter to the attention of all those who are interested in the important question of temperance union.

PROHIBITIONISTS AND REFORMERS.

The Prohibitionists met in Toronto a few days ago and came to the unanimous determination to start a third party. Our temperance friends must be aware that their cause has the strongest following in the ranks of the reform party, and from that party prohibition candidates will draw the greater part of their votes. By so doing their action tends to promote the success of the Conservative candidates. The Liberal victualers at the present time as well as in times past, unanimously support the nominees of the Tory clan.

The Prohibitionists and the liquor dealers men who profess to be opposed on principle to one another—in fact are thus co-operating to effect the overthrow of the party, which alone has shown any disposition effectively to promote the cause of temperance, and our temperance friends must not overlook the fact that the greatest number of temperance men are to be found in the ranks of the Reform party—the next greatest number in the Conservative ranks—and the least number in the so-called Prohibition party. Prohibitionists, put that in your pipe and smoke it. Of course Prohibition politicians may like to see their names in print as candidates for offices of greater or less consequence, but it is hard to see how rational voters can be persuaded to abandon their serious beliefs, merely to promote the ambitions of this small run of politicians. If a man wants his vote to tell in favor of temperance, he will cast his vote for Reform candidates. If he wants to throw it away to swell the vanity of some man who would rather see his name in the papers as a nominee for the House of Commons or Local Legislature than modestly and without notoriety to help a great cause, he will vote for the nominees of the Prohibitionists.—Port Hope Weekly Guide.

Whatever may be said as to the wisdom of these Prohibitionists who have declared themselves in favor of the immediate formation of a new party, we think their motives are not open to question. They are earnestly desirous of pushing forward the prohibition movement and such sneers as those made in the paragraph above quoted are neither honorable nor judicious. Our friends, the politicians, will best further their party ends by striving to bring their parties as far as possible into harmony with right, progressive public sentiment; not by misrepresenting that sentiment, specially in misrepresentation so palpable as that in the extract quoted. The earnest, moral reform workers, including many Christian ministers, who have expressed themselves as believing that third party action is necessary to the success of prohibition, are too well known to be injured by unkind insinuations which everybody knows to be utterly unfounded.

Further than this, however, the persistent iteration, in many quarters, of the statement that voting for Reform candidates means voting for prohibition, is misleading. We do not care to be forced to discuss this matter, but continually we are receiving letters and reading newspaper articles making the assertion that, temperance men being largely reformers and reformers largely temperance men, the success of the Reform party would be the success of the temperance cause, and would ensure prohibition. The political character of the votes taken in the House of Commons is pointed to as evidence of this. Let us see if the position is sound.

The exact vote on Mr. Jamieson's resolution in favor of prohibition in the House of Commons was as follows:—

	Con.	Lib.	Total
For.....	27	43	70
Against.....	84	28	112
Not voting.....	20	11	31
Total.....	131	82	213

Of those who abstained from voting, one was the speaker, another, Hon. Edward Blake, represented two constituencies; of those voting against prohibition, Sir John A. Macdonald represented two constituencies. If, then, we take the votes of Sir John and Edward Blake as fairly representing their constituencies and count two for each, we shall have the whole house standing as follows:—

	Con.	Lib.	Total
For.....	27	43	70
Against.....	85	28	113
Not voting.....	20	12	32
Total.....	132	83	215

It will be noticed that the number of Liberals who abstained from voting is, relatively to the whole number in the House, in about the same proportion as the number of Conservatives who abstained from voting to the whole number of Conservatives in the House. We may, therefore, assume that in any further divisions, the non-voting proportion of members would remain about the same. How would we stand, then, if we followed the advice of the Reform journals and advocates who call upon us to vote for Liberal candidates on the ground that we would thereby be voting for prohibition? To give the Liberals a bare majority in the house would require a change of 25 votes. That would be a reduction in the Conservative vote of 19 per cent. and an increase in the Liberal vote of 30½ per cent. If we take 25 per cent. off all the numbers in the first column of the table just given, and add 30½ per cent. to all the numbers in the second column we shall get the following result:

	Con.	Lib.	Total
For.....	22	57	79
Against.....	60	36	96
Not voting.....	16	15	31
Total.....	107	108	215

This means that in a parliament with a bare majority of Liberals prohibition would still be defeated by a majority of 26.

Let us, however, suppose a still better case for the Reformers. Let us suppose that they may get to be in as strong a majority over the Conservatives as the Conservatives now are over the Liberals, that is, let us suppose that the constituencies went, in a general election, 132 Liberal and 83 Conservative; and that the new Liberal and Conservative representatives voted for and against prohibition respectively as did their predecessors. Then we would have to change the second table given above so as to reduce each section of the Conservative vote by 37 per cent. and increase each section of the Liberal vote by 59 per cent. This would give us the following result:—

	Con.	Lib.	Total
For.....	17	68	85
Against.....	53	44	97
Not voting.....	13	19	32
Total.....	83	132	215

And we would still be left on the prohibition question, beaten by a majority of eleven, notwithstanding that the Liberals were in power by a majority which very few of them expect to have for a long, long time.

Would it not be possible, however, to go so far in this direction that the House of Commons might become prohibition by becoming Liberal? We think not. It is worth while, however, enquiring to what extent would it be necessary to make the Dominion House a Reform House to secure by that means a majority or a prohibition vote. If the same proportion of Liberals and Conservatives respectively still refrain from voting we would require to have so many Reformers in the House that the vote would stand thus:—

For prohibition.....	22
Against prohibition.....	91
Not voting.....	32

What per cent. of the House would have to be Reform to secure such a result? If we go back to Table 2 again, we shall find that 30½ per cent. of Conservatives voted for prohibition, 64½ per cent. voted against, 15 per cent. refrained from voting. Of the

Liberals 52 per cent. voted for prohibition, 34½ per cent. voted against, and 14½ per cent. refrained from voting. It will be seen at once that we will require to have a House in which 20½ per cent. of the Conservatives together with 52 per cent. of the Liberals will be equal to 99, and a little further calculation which need not be here detailed, will show that such a House would have to stand as follows:

	Con.	Lib.	Total
For.....	11	78	89
Against.....	44	47	91
Not voting.....	1	22	23
Total.....	56	147	203

That is, we cannot expect to get prohibition through without voting for the Reform party, unless that party becomes so strong that there will be in the House 13 Liberals to every 6 Conservatives, a condition of affairs which is not likely to be realized. Even then it will be seen that we could only get prohibition from the Liberal party by securing at least 11 Conservatives to co-operate with them. If we had to secure prohibition from the Reform prohibitionists alone, it would be necessary to have in the House a Reform vote that 72 per cent. of it would give us the number of votes necessary to secure prohibition, which number is shown by Table 2 to be 92; a little calculation shows us that 92 is 52 per cent. of 177, so that we can only hope to carry prohibition through Reform votes alone, in a house made up as follows:

Reformers.....	177
Conservatives.....	38
Total.....	215

The simple object of this calculation is to show to our prohibition friends that the doctrine that a Reform victory means a Prohibition victory, is far from sound. When we remember that a party in power is much more cautious and less progressive than a party in opposition, we make still less possible any chance of getting prohibition on the line suggested.

The lesson is that partyism must be ignored if prohibition is to be made a success. Temperance men must put principle before politics. Temperance Liberals and Temperance Conservatives must unite in voting only for the best candidate from a prohibition point of view, as only by such independent and united action can we ever hope to secure the end at which we aim.

Wise electors will not be misled by any attempts of party managers or wire-pullers to induce them to believe that in any other direction can we hope to succeed.

MINISTERS AND POLITICS.

Editor Canada Citizen:

DEAR Sir, I enclose stamps to pay for the Citizen's note to date of last issue. Please remove my name from your list. I am in hearty sympathy with you and your advocacy of the great cause in many respects but in other and very important issues I am not in harmony with the line you adopt and do not wish to aid or encourage it in any way. The national agitation of the Commission wine question in your columns is mischievous. It is calculated to stir up strife in a matter above many in which there should be peace and unity. The statements in your columns have been all or nearly all on one side and many of them manifestly made by persons who neither had the knowledge nor fairness of mind necessary to deal with a matter which is mainly a question of scholarship and interpretation.

I cannot agree with you regarding compensation. I believe that those in the traffic cannot establish a legal claim perhaps they would find it difficult except in a few cases to establish an equitable claim but there are a limited number whose moral right to compensation I cannot dispute. This issue is being urged largely on moral and religious grounds and by religious people. It is entirely contrary to the spirit of Christ to deal with men in the way you propose. As a minister of Christ I do not want to be put in the position of having those in the traffic feeling that they have suffered a wrong at my hands however much wrong they may have done to the Church and to the community. I do not wish to put into their mouths the reproach "You have freed the country from a curse but you have done it at our expense." You have been careful not to put your hands into your own pocket, or make any sacrifice yourself while you have ruled us. I have little or no contact with liquor men and depend on no way upon them. I do not see the Commission wine question has been crowded as a reason by such for leaving my church. I believe I have not one in any way connected with it in attendance on my ministry. But I will not join in any movement which I cannot defend at the bar of God as just and according to the spirit of my Master.

The Third Party movement which you advocate is in my judgment very questionable. I doubt much whether it will not re-