

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 pithy 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:—

50c per hundred for all orders of not less than 200 copies, 45c per hundred for orders of not less than 500 copies, 40c 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:—

Table with 2 columns: Quantity and Price. 20 copies every week for 10 weeks \$1.00, 10 " " " 20 " \$1.00, 50 " " " 10 " \$2.25, 100 " " " 10 " \$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 counties, 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 the drink. Specimen copies furnished free. Address: F. S. SPENCE, Cor. Richmond & Victoria Sts., Toronto.

YOU will find something to interest you on pages six and seven.

USEFUL BOOKS, FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Sent post free on receipt of price.

Alcohol and the State. A discussion of the problem of law as applied to the liquor-traffic. 12mo, 411 pp. By Robert C. Pitman, LL.D., Associate Judge of Superior Court of Massachusetts. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, \$1.50

It treats with great conciseness and marked ability of what the State does in various ways through alcohol, and, in turn, of what is the duty and proper function of the State concerning alcohol. It is of a high order of literary merit, and is a book for statesmen, legislators, and all intelligent, thoughtful temperance men and women everywhere. It shows that the liquor-traffic is the enemy of the State, and the foe of all the objects for which the State exists; and presents such strong arguments, statistics, appeals, and authorities as will add greatly to an intelligent and wise solution of the liquor problem. The economic and legislative aspects of the alcoholic discussion have never been so ably presented, and it should be in the hands of every citizen and in every library in the land.

Alcohol and Science; or, Alcohol, What It Is and What It Does. A \$500 Prize Essay. 12mo, 366 pp. By William Harvey Greaves, M.D. Paper, 50 cents; cloth \$1.50

This is a thoroughly scientific work, containing all the latest authorities, and showing what alcohol is and what it does to the human system. It treats of alcohol as food, as a poison, its effect upon disease and upon property, as well as its action upon the stomach, liver, and kidneys.

Alcohol in History. A Prize Essay. 12mo 481 pp. By Richard Eddy, D.D. \$1.50

"Alcohol in History," is a most valuable addition to temperance literature, and invaluable to students of the great question. It embraces the historical, statistical, economical, and political aspects of the reform. It contains many rare documents otherwise inaccessible except in the largest public and college libraries, and has very numerous marginal and reference notes, representing a vast amount of careful research and painstaking labor. The work has a general interest, making it one of reference.

Bound Volume of Sermons. \$1.50 Sixteen sermons delivered upon the invitation of the National Temperance Society, and published in the National Series, have all been bound in one volume, making 600 pages of the best temperance matter of the kind ever published. The sermons are by Revs. H. W. Beecher, T. Cuyler, J. W. Talmage, J. H. Broad, J. M. Hall, J. H. Newman, J. W. Moore, C. D. Fenn, J. R. Rogers, Harry, Peter Stricker, C. H. Fowler, H. C. Fisk, H. W. Warren, S. H. Tyng, and W. M. Taylor.

F. S. SPENCE,

19-21 RICHMOND ST. E., TORONTO.

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: W. H. HOWLAND, Esq., Toronto. Vice-President: ALD. E. J. FLEMING. Managing Director and Editor: F. S. SPENCE.

OFFICE: 19-21 RICHMOND ST. E., TORONTO TORONTO, FRIDAY, MAY 11th, 1888.

Our many friends in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island will very much oblige us by frequently sending us all the latest facts in reference to the progress of our cause in their respective localities. We find some difficulty in getting full details from the far east.

A SYMPOSIUM.

It is highly desirable that the Montreal Convention should be practical, that all the light available should be brought to bear on its discussions, and that every view of our position and every suggestion for further action should be thoroughly canvassed.

We respectfully invite every reader of the CANADA CITIZEN, or every friend of our cause whether a regular subscriber or not, to send on, on a post card, his or her opinion of the present situation, and ideas as to what line of action the Convention should adopt.

We shall publish the suggestions received in the CANADA CITIZEN as a symposium for the information of the delegates to Montreal.

FOR THE BOYS.

There lies before us, fresh from the Government Distribution Office, the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Ontario Agricultural College, printed by order of the Legislative Assembly. Opening the book at page 14 we find the following startling statement by the President of the College, which we cordially commend to all the boys who read the CANADA CITIZEN.

"I am sorry to say that a number of students have still to be gassed as smokers; but it is true now, as it was three years ago, that our best students are nearly all non-smokers. The first year students of 1887 won 131 first class honors. Of these 18 were taken by smokers and 112 by non smokers. The second year students won 114-4 going to smokers and 110 to non smokers. Of the 15 first-class men in departments, 2 were smokers and 12 non smokers; and of the 20 medalists, whose names will be found in the list of associates, 3 were smokers and 17 non-smokers.

THE VOTE LAST YEAR.

Temperance workers are anxiously waiting for the result of the vote on the Jamieson Resolution. This will be the third time for a division of the House of Commons on the question of Immediate Prohibition. The first division took place on March 26th, 1884 and the vote stood 55 for PROHIBITION NOW, and 107 against. The second division took place on Monday, June 13th last, and the vote stood 74 for, and 112 against. The form of the resolution before the House was different from that on which the previous vote was taken. It read as follows:—

"That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes. That the enforcement of such prohibition, and such manufacture, importation and sale as may be allowed, shall be by the Dominion Government through specially appointed officers."

In order that our readers may be thoroughly posted on our present position, and able to see, when the vote comes on, how far we have really advanced, we give below the division list on the last vote.

I. IN FAVOR OF PROHIBITION. Conservatives.—Baird, Boyd, Bryson, Colby, Cantara, Davis, Foster, Froese, Jamieson, Leamy, Madill, Mills (Annapolis),

Moorehead, Perley (Assiniboia), Porter, Putnam, Roome, Shakespeare, Smith (Ontario), Stevenson, Taylor, Wood (Westmoreland), Weldon (Albert), White (Kenora), Willmot, Wilson (Lanark), Wright.—27.

Liberals.—Bala (Wentworth), Barron, Borden, Bourassa, Brien, Campbell (Kent), Charlton, Cimon, Claves, Cook, De St. Georges, Edgar, Edwards, Eisenhauer, Fisher, Gillmor, Hale, Holton, Jones, Kirk, Lang, Lavergne, Lovitt, Macdonald (Huron), McIntyre, McMillan (Huron), McMullen, Mallory, Mulock, Paterson (Hants), Perry, Platt, Purcell, Robertson (King, P.E.I.), Robertson (Shelburne), Scriber, Semple, Somerville, Turcot, Wadlie, Watson, Welsh, Yeo.—43.

II. AGAINST PROHIBITION.

Conservatives.—Amyot, Audet, Bain (Soulages), Baker, Bergeron, Bergin, Bowell, Brown, Burns, Cameron, Carling, Carling, Carpenter, Caron (St. Adolphe), Chisholm, Cockburn, Costigan, Coughlin, Coulombe, Curran, Daly, Daoust, Davin, Davis, Dawson, Denison, Desaulniers, Desjardins, Duchesnay, Dupont, Ferguson (Leeds), Giguault, Girouard, Gordon, Grandbois, Guilbault, Gullett, Haggart, Hall, Hesson, Hickey, Ives, Kenny, Kirkpatrick, Labelle, Langevin, Macdonald (St. John), McDowall, McCulla, McDougald (Pictou), McDougall (Cape Breton), McGreevy, McKay, McLellan, McMillan (Vaudreuil), McNeill, Mars, Masson, Montague, Montplaisir, O'Brien, Patterson (Essex), Perley (Ontario), Pope, Reid, Ripoll, Robertson (Hastings), Robillard, Ross, Scarth, Small, Sproule, Temple, Therien, Thompson, Tisdale, Tupper (Pictou), Tyrwhitt, Vanasse, Wallace, Ward, White (Cardwell), Wilson (Argenteuil), Wood (Brockville).—84.

Liberals.—Bechard, Bernier, Cartwright (St. Richard), Casey, Casgrain, Choquette, Dessaint, Doyon, Ellis, Fiset, Gauthier, Geoffroy, Guay, Jones, Labrosse, Langlois (Montmorency), Langlois (Quebec), Laurier, Livingston, Mills (Bothwell), Mitchell, Prefontaine, Rinfret, Ste. Marie, Skinner, Trow, Weldon (St. John), Wilson (Elgin).—28.

THE NEW MINISTER.

Temperance workers in Ontario are to be congratulated on Mr. Drury's appointment to the Provincial Cabinet. A sound Prohibitionist, a thorough friend of every kind of moral reform, a man who holds his seat in the Legislature largely because of his pronounced temperance advocacy he will bring to the councils of the Ontario Government sound common sense, right principle and sterling character, that cannot fail to make themselves felt.

It is to be regretted that the Ontario Government is not united on this important question, that while it represents a community advanced and advancing in sound sentiment, the representatives are not all quite up to the mark of the constituency. We are thankful that a majority of the Cabinet is Prohibitionist, and we are thankful that the new accession will be a gain to the dominant sentiment, the sentiment of sound legislation, law enforcement, and genuine Reform.

THE PROHIBITION CONVENTION.

We desire to earnestly urge upon all our readers a careful perusal of the Convention Call, found elsewhere in this paper. Present indications are that the Convention will be a large one. The plan laid down, if carried out, will make it more thoroughly representative than any gathering of Canadian Prohibitionists has ever been.

The situation in which we find ourselves is painfully important, however much we may desire to take a favorable view of it. We cannot escape the fact that there has been, on the part of the Dominion Parliament, a serious breach of faith towards temperance workers. The Scott Act was offered and accepted as a temporary measure, with the distinct understanding that a large vote in its favor would be accepted as an evidence of the approval of Prohibition, and the Act was fought for by Prohibitionists in scores of counties on the understanding that by recording votes in its favor they were asking the Dominion Parliament for a measure of more comprehensive character. The total prohibition of the liquor traffic was the real issue that was before the electors. By a majority, so far as polled, of about 50,000 votes, the principles contended for were endorsed; and there existed then exists no reason why the votes of the people should be disregarded, and the Dominion Parliament should renege the legislation which was promised upon conditions that have been complied with.

In all probability the action of the Montreal Convention, will be largely

influenced by the action of the House of Commons on the Jamieson Prohibition resolution, now before that House. Another negative vote declaring for further disregard of overwhelming public sentiment, and continued ignoring of the most vital political issue of the day, may force the Temperance party into an attitude, and compel them to a line of policy, which will be taken by many of them with reluctance, but none the less with definiteness and determination. The principles and interests at stake are so near and dear to their promoters, and are of a character and extent so important and vast, that triding with them will not be tolerated. If politicians and parties, stand in the way of the execution of the will of the people, so that through them that will cannot find expression, then must there be such united, organized effort on the part of good citizens as will overthrow the unholy combination, by which both parties uphold, and force upon an unwilling community the ruin-working liquor traffic. Such a combination exists, and amounts to a conspiracy against the public welfare. It matters not that there be no written agreement or formulated articles, binding party men who fight over other questions, to unite against the people in reference to this. A tacit understanding, and united action to thwart the public will, and sustain a debauching institution that the public hat at the ballot boxes condemned, is virtually a conspiracy, whether or not the conspirators are willing to admit that it is such.

The Montreal convention must face these facts, they must face the fact that in the House of Commons at the present time, there are at least seventy earnest, consistent Prohibitionists who voted, and are ready to act, in accordance with their convictions of what is right, for the carrying out of the pledge given ten years ago, and in harmony with the declared desires of the people they represent. But outside these there are others who so far (while differing on other questions) have united to sink even political differences in the interests of the drink traffic. Some of them may do this in ignorance, many of them do it with deliberate intention to uphold the accursed system in the financial interests of either themselves, their party, or their personal friends. Very little in the way of legislation can be secured unless that legislation has behind it a thoroughly united, well-organized party, and parties to day are so disciplined that, as a rule, the rank and file can be rallied round any policy upon which the leaders of the parties agree. Therefore, there rests the heaviest responsibility with the leader of the Conservative party and the leader of the Reform party, who respectively refuse to allow or give to this reform the assistance of their party position and power. A little further consideration of these facts will show that the Conservative party and the Reform party, as parties, are directly hostile to Prohibition, and in joint conspiracy against it.

Now let there be no misunderstanding of our position. We do not say that one party is as bad as the other. We are not comparing position or action, we are simply calling attention to the fact that the Reform party is not a Prohibition party, and the Conservative party is not a Prohibition party, although the country wants Prohibition. There are seventy members of Parliament in favor of PROHIBITION NOW. Add to these Prohibitionist members, the power and influence of either party, and there would be a Prohibition combination that the other party could not resist. If the Reform party could give the country Prohibition, or the Conservative party could give the country Prohibition, and neither of them will do it, what are we to conclude?

This then is the situation which the Montreal meeting must face. The most important question for that convention to consider, will be, the ques-

tion of Political Action. To the discussion of it, there ought to come the unbiassed, untrammelled, prayerful brain power of everyone who is anxious for the success of the right. The whole ground must be carefully gone over. The history of our country and our reform, the position of our cause, the strength of our forces, must all be carefully considered, and then we must inquire what line of action is the wisest under the circumstances, and will be best adapted to secure the strongest and most effective support, without the sacrifice of any principle, and with as much regard as possible for everybody's wishes. For we must bear in mind, that our enemies are potential because they are united, that our friends are weak because they do not stand everywhere shoulder to shoulder, demanding to have Prohibition brought to the front, and treated with the importance it deserves. The liquor party is so united that it can prevent either party from declaring for Prohibition. Temperance sentiment—although in both the number and character of its advocates it has a support such as whisky never could get—cannot unite that support so as to compel either party to make Prohibition, what it ought to be, a dominant political issue. What our cause needs is union. Our friends must stand together without jealousy, without sectionalism, ignoring partizanship, but combining in a solid phalanx determined by God's help to win. Let us have full discussion as to the best line of action to secure this union, and then let every man stick this prediction for any other policy, and go in heart and soul with the majority. So only can we hope to win.

ANTI-NUISANCE.

A CURIOUS line of action is being worked out by some earnest American Prohibitionists. It is a line of action logical, consistent, and ought to be effective. Its promoters simply claim that the liquor-traffic is a nuisance, and as such has no right to exist, and ought to be suppressed by common law. We have argued on several occasions that the liquor-traffic is in its nature not only wrong, but from a certain stand-point actually unlawful; and laws purporting to license it are really unconstitutional and void. In a free country, under popular government, this must be absolutely true. Society is older than legislation, and government is an institution of society for the conservation and promotion of its interests. The sole power of government is delegated power, delegated by the community governed; and no Parliament, Congress, Legislature or any other law-making body, has any power beyond that conferred upon it by the original mandate of the community:—"Protect us and promote our interests." No government has any right to go beyond this instruction, and if a government, to please any section of the community, or for the sake of gain, or for the love of office, or for any reason, undertakes to permit or license anything detrimental to the public welfare, or even merely not beneficial to the public, that government in that act exceeds its authority, assumes functions it does not possess, and acts in treason to the community that constituted it. The liquor-traffic is a curse. No government has any right to license it. No legislative body has any charter giving it authority to stand in any other attitude towards this curse than that of antagonism, or has any constitutional power to license any one to carry on that traffic.

It is not likely that our courts, created by bodies that have done this wrong, and constituted of men who were parties to the wrong, would uphold this sound position. The evil taint of usurping intent is in the administration and interpretation as well as the enactment of law, and

"Wrong rules the land While waiting justice sleeps."

Our American friends, however, are on a seemingly more hopeful task. They base their contention that the