

Alliance Manifesto.

Ontario Electors Urged to Support Candidates Who Will Support Pledges That Have Been Made Them.

Following is a copy of the manifesto prepared in reference to the impending Provincial elections by the Ontario executive of the Dominion Alliance for the prohibition of the liquor traffic. It is addressed to the electors of the Province of Ontario:

A general Provincial election is close at hand, and the executive committee of the Ontario branch of the Dominion Alliance respectfully and earnestly appeals for wise united action on the part of all who deplore the evils of intemperance, and desire to see at the earliest possible date the enactment of effective legislation to the full limit of the ascertained power of the Provincial Legislature for the suppression of the traffic through the operation of which those evils exist.

At no time in the history of our Province was there as favorable an opportunity for the working out of the principles which we have frequently affirmed, and never was there before placed on Prohibitionists a heavier responsibility in relation to the prohibition question, which is to-day the most important issue before the electorate.

In many meetings and conventions there have been made strong declarations as to the duty of temperance men to make partisanship subservient to principle, and vote, in every election, so as to make their ballots tell effectively for the promotion of this great reform. The time has come for action in harmony with these declarations.

The events which have given the prohibition movement the prominence which it occupies in the present electoral contest may be briefly summarized as follows:

The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario at its session in 1893, in response to a great many petitions, enacted a measure providing for the taking of a vote of the electorate on the question of immediate total prohibition to the full extent of the jurisdiction of the Legislative Assembly and the Dominion Parliament respectively.

The vote was taken on Jan. 1, and resulted in a majority of 81,769 in favor of prohibition. Following up this voting a great representative prohibition convention was held in Toronto on Feb. 6. This convention adopted the following resolution:

That a deputation be appointed to wait upon the Ontario Government and respectfully request them to declare in favor of the total prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquor to the full extent of the power vested in the Legislature.

The deputation was appointed, and laid the request of the convention before the Attorney-General and his Cabinet. The Attorney-General gave the deputation, in writing, the following reply:

"If the decision of the Privy Council should be that the Province has the jurisdiction to pass a prohibitory liquor law as respects the sale of intoxicating liquor, I will introduce such a bill in the following session, if I am then at the head of the Government."

"If the decision of the Privy Council is that the Province has jurisdiction to pass only a partial prohibitory liquor law, I will introduce such a prohibitory bill as the decision will warrant, unless the partial prohibitory power is so limited as to be ineffective from a temperance standpoint."

This declaration was hailed with much pleasure by the friends of the prohibition cause.

The question of jurisdiction has been submitted to the Supreme Court by the joint action of the Provincial and Dominion Governments, and in reference to it a final authoritative decision is expected. The Legislature about to be elected will therefore have to deal immediately with the question of direct prohibition legislation to the limit of its authority as demanded by the electorate.

Although the Government is thus definitely pledged to carry out, as far as its power, the demand of the people for prohibition, it is clear that their doing so must largely depend upon the co-operation of a Legislature favorable to the unconditional fulfillment of that promise, ready to carry out the expressed will of the people, and believing in the principle of prohibition.

It is therefore manifestly the duty of Prohibitionists to support in the approaching contest only such candidates as will co-operate in the carrying out of the pledge that has thus been given.

This is a matter of some importance which the attention of our friends is respectfully called. The effectiveness of prohibition will be largely dependent upon the thoroughness of its enforcement. Prohibitionists have incurred and stood by the policy of holding the Government of the Province directly responsible for the carrying out of whatever law exists in relation to the liquor traffic. Only the will of the whole people can be effective in every part of the Province. We must guard against the danger of the committing of such policy to any local authority, which (even if effective) would necessarily be most unfavorable to thorough enforcement, where thorough enforcement is most needed. It is suggested that candidates should be pledged against

the unwise proposal to take away from the Provincial Government the duty and the responsibility of carrying out the law relating to the liquor traffic.

This appeal is made in full confidence that the people of Ontario who declared themselves so strongly against the liquor traffic on Jan. 1 will wisely exercise their electoral power at the present crisis, so as to insure the triumph of the principle so overwhelmingly endorsed.

On behalf of the executive committee.

United States National Wealth.

[From Youth's Companion, Boston.]

The steady progress of our country and our people in wealth, notwithstanding periods of comparative depression and of general discontent, is brought out clearly in a series of reports derived from the researches of the eleventh census, lately published by the Government.

One report presents the true value of all real and personal property in the United States, exclusive of Alaska. From this it appears that the total value in 1890 was \$65,000,000,000, against \$43,000,000,000 in 1880, an increase of nearly one-half in ten years. Were all the property evenly divided among all the people, there would have been \$1,039 worth for each one in 1890, against \$870 worth in 1880. This is an increase of a little less than one-fifth.

Put in another form, the average addition to the value of each person's property in ten years was \$169, or nearly \$17 a year. Of course we all understand that the property of the country is not distributed evenly, nor have all the people made an increase of wealth during the period of ten years. The census takes note only of aggregates and averages.

We must remember this again when we come to examine the figures which show the average and total wealth of each geographical division of the country. The census can tell us how much all the property in Michigan is worth; but it cannot tell what part of its copper mines are owned in New England, or how much of its railroad property is owned in New York.

The geographical division which possesses the greatest body of wealth, real and personal, is that officially called the North Central, which begins with Ohio and extends westward to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. This section possesses more than \$25,000,000,000 of total wealth, against \$21,000,000,000 for the North Atlantic division, usually called "the East."

In wealth per capita these two geographical divisions are nearly equal. The average for 1890 was for each not far from \$1,200.

But the richest section—supposing all the property to be owned by the people residing within it—is the western division, stretching from Wyoming to the Pacific Ocean. It possesses an average wealth of more than \$2,000 to each person. The wealth of Nevada, equally divided among all its people, would give them about \$4,000 each.

On the other hand, the two Southern divisions are the poorest of all, having property to the value of less than \$600 to a person, and a division of all the property of South Carolina among its people would not yield \$350 to each.

This represents a great change since 1860, when the Southern States averaged greater wealth per capita than those of the North and West. Then the Western States, too, averaged poorer than the East, whereas now the reverse is the case.

Another tendency with regard to property is shown in the statistics of the leading manufacturing industries just made public. As a rule, the industries show a great advance in capital employed, wages paid and value of product from 1880 to 1890; a smaller proportion of increase in the number of employees, and in a great many cases a marked decline in the number of establishments engaged.

This seems to show that while the industries have been growing greater and richer, they have been concentrating in fewer hands.

By far the greatest item in our national wealth is still, as it has always been, real estate—land and the improvements upon it. This item comprises nearly two-thirds of the whole. Of the real estate valuation, just about one-third was for farm lands, including fences and buildings, but not including live stock, farm implements and machinery.

All these items showed an increase of from one-fifth to nearly one-half in ten years; though in that time the value of farm products increased but little more than one-tenth. The farming business has expanded in a much larger measure than its profits have increased.

Money saved and pain relieved by the leading household remedy, Dr. Thomas' Electric Oil—a small quantity of which usually suffices to cure a cough, heal a sore, cut, bruise or sprain, relieve lumbago, rheumatism, neuralgia, excoriated nipples, or inflamed breast.

PERSIFLAGE OVER THE BABY.—"I'm going to call my baby Charles," said the author, "after Lamb because he is such a dear little lamb." "O, I'd call him William Dean," said the friend, "he Howells so much."

A Pain in the Back.—Can be removed by using Prof. Smith's Three Keys. Only 25 cents per bottle at all drug stores.

"Women's Rights" and the Bible.

It was on a ceremony by an unscrupulous foreigner that when potatoes were first introduced into England the people declined to eat them because they were not mentioned in the Bible. A very large number of people who are fairly thoughtful, often decline to thoroughly examine a question on its own merits, or the social advantages accruing from its adoption. We cannot doubt that too many such people and to others too, the following view of the question known as "Women's Rights" (preferably Women's DUTIES) will be of interest. Our correspondent says:

In our issue of August 6, you notice the recent action of the Rev. E. Husband, vicar of St. Michael's Folkestone, who intended to withdraw from the church congress because a lady was announced to address it. Although I entirely differ from the reverend gentleman as to the validity of his reason for the proposed action, I realize that his conscientious conviction that women should not speak in public assemblies is one shared by a great many really good men and women throughout the empire, and therefore worthy of consideration and discussion. Their conviction, I believe, is founded on an interpretation once given to a very few passages of Scripture (chiefly St. Paul's fourteenth chapter first Corinthians) without due reference to their context or the circumstances under which they were written, and since his time taken for granted.

If you can afford me so much of your valuable space, I should be glad to submit to your readers what I have so far been able to gather from the Bible and the New Testament with reference to the rights, duties and position of women, and the interpretation which, in a spirit of great reverence and with an earnest desire to find the truth, I am able to put upon it.

To begin with the Old Testament. Eve was of course a helpmeet, not a slave, and in the history of creation was the culminating work, none of the lower creatures being found a helpmeet (suitable) for Adam, and dominion over them was given to Adam and Eve jointly.

In the 27th chapter of Numbers there is a very notable account of what is perhaps the earliest record we have of a "Woman's Rights Association." In relation to property the provisions of the Old Testament were more severe upon widows, who in any rate, to women's providing their own dinners. A woman, they urge, is not intended by nature to earn her own bread; but the farther question how she is to live without bread, and who is to earn it for her if she herself does not—this is left in rather vague uncertainty. Surely, if nature intended that a woman should not earn her dinner, nature should also either have decreed that she should live without it, or that someone should always stand ready to provide it for her. If this is the theory, it is evident that society is grossly one-sided. All the ordinary expenses of life are plainly assigned to men and women with severe impartiality. Women can be no more transported from place to place for nothing than if they were Coxey's industrial army; the conductor of the electric car holds out his merciless palm and no bakeshop announces over its doors, "Women half price." Their tea, their beefsteak, their potatoes, know no Salique law; women must eat, and they must therefore pay; they must pay, and therefore must commonly earn. They may be very elevated beings, full of aspiration and imagination, but "faith asks her daily bread and fancy must be fed."

Accordingly, as a matter of fact, they are permitted, all the world over, to work hard for food and shelter so long as they are willing to work at disadvantage and are not paid too well. Even where their faces are veiled they may still grind at the mill, but at low prices. The same distinction prevails in Christian lands; witness that school committee report which said, "Since this office involves neither honor nor profit we see no reason why it should not be held by a woman." It is the low places that excite no jealousy; a man is willing to be displaced by a woman when it is a question of scrubbing floors; nobody complains of it then. It is when she undertakes some higher position, at a competent salary, that she is censured. She may prove herself incompetent in a dozen directions and not bring down on her head so much censure as by succeeding in one. But it certainly is not her fault when she attempts to earn an honest living, and still less her fault when she obtains a good one.

"If a man or a woman will not work how shall he or she eat?" After all, it is the bread and shelter which are at stake. Women are not so wholly unlike men that they generally work ten hours a day for the fun of it. The inducement is that they may earn a living for themselves, and perhaps for many others.

In a town where I once inquired into the matter, with reference to the pay of teachers, it turned out that almost every woman had some one depending upon her, while some of the young men had absolutely no one to care for except themselves. Nay, I have again and again known women to work incessantly to maintain a stupid brother in college or to keep a worthless one out of jail.

In view of such facts, how idle is the complaint that every woman industriously employed takes the place of

"Women should keep silent in the churches, and if they wish to learn anything ask their husbands at home," but Christ himself sent the Holy Spirit and power upon women with the command that they should be witnesses and prophesies. This the Quakers have always fully and practically recognized.

I have often wondered at the apparent inconsistency of St. Paul's limitations about women in spite of the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy, but much light is thrown upon it when we remember his very natural dread that any practices of his Christian converts among women should appear in any way similar to those of heathen priestesses and their frenzied discourses.

When St. Paul in his advice to wives reminds us how "Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord," he made no mention of the not less inspired words "and the angel of the Lord said unto Abraham, 'In all that Sarah thy wife saith unto thee, hearken unto her voice' (Gen. xxi. 2) and thou shalt call her name Sarah" (which means my lady or princess), whereas in his epistle to the Galatians iii. 28, Paul fully grants "that in Christ there is neither male nor female, neither bond nor free," and it is recorded (Acts xxi. 8-9) that "at Caesarea Paul and his company abode in the house of Philip the evangelist (one of the seven), who had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy."

It required the help of Priscilla as well as Aquila to fit Apollos for his great work of teaching when they took him and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly (Acts xviii. 26).

And one of the earliest of the fathers has left on record these remarkable words, "The kingdom of God shall not come until two shall be as one, and the man as the woman."

I will conclude with the new rendering of the 4th verse of the xviii Psalm, which in the old version ran, "The Lord gave the word, great was the company of those that published it," but the learned translators found that the original text was "The Lord giveth the word; the women that publish the tidings are a great host."

E. F. BEHRENS.

Concerning the Value of a Dinner.

Lord Byron hated, it is said, to dine with women. If they set themselves up for angels, he thought, let them live accordingly. He agreed in this respect with many less noted men, who would blush to be called poetical; but their objections would be more on the practical side. They would object, at any rate, to women's providing their own dinners. A woman, they urge, is not intended by nature to earn her own bread; but the farther question how she is to live without bread, and who is to earn it for her if she herself does not—this is left in rather vague uncertainty. Surely, if nature intended that a woman should not earn her dinner, nature should also either have decreed that she should live without it, or that someone should always stand ready to provide it for her. If this is the theory, it is evident that society is grossly one-sided. All the ordinary expenses of life are plainly assigned to men and women with severe impartiality. Women can be no more transported from place to place for nothing than if they were Coxey's industrial army; the conductor of the electric car holds out his merciless palm and no bakeshop announces over its doors, "Women half price." Their tea, their beefsteak, their potatoes, know no Salique law; women must eat, and they must therefore pay; they must pay, and therefore must commonly earn. They may be very elevated beings, full of aspiration and imagination, but "faith asks her daily bread and fancy must be fed."

Accordingly, as a matter of fact, they are permitted, all the world over, to work hard for food and shelter so long as they are willing to work at disadvantage and are not paid too well. Even where their faces are veiled they may still grind at the mill, but at low prices. The same distinction prevails in Christian lands; witness that school committee report which said, "Since this office involves neither honor nor profit we see no reason why it should not be held by a woman." It is the low places that excite no jealousy; a man is willing to be displaced by a woman when it is a question of scrubbing floors; nobody complains of it then. It is when she undertakes some higher position, at a competent salary, that she is censured. She may prove herself incompetent in a dozen directions and not bring down on her head so much censure as by succeeding in one. But it certainly is not her fault when she attempts to earn an honest living, and still less her fault when she obtains a good one.

"If a man or a woman will not work how shall he or she eat?" After all, it is the bread and shelter which are at stake. Women are not so wholly unlike men that they generally work ten hours a day for the fun of it. The inducement is that they may earn a living for themselves, and perhaps for many others.

In a town where I once inquired into the matter, with reference to the pay of teachers, it turned out that almost every woman had some one depending upon her, while some of the young men had absolutely no one to care for except themselves. Nay, I have again and again known women to work incessantly to maintain a stupid brother in college or to keep a worthless one out of jail.

In view of such facts, how idle is the complaint that every woman industriously employed takes the place of

some man! In a poor family it is the brightest and ablest who must maintain the fortunes of the household, and sex has nothing to do with it. Even on the farm the wife's butter and cheese and her summer boarders often bring larger cash returns than the husband's crops, but where a young woman is launched upon the world with only herself to support she has precisely the same number of mouths to feed as the average young man, namely, one. She no more displaces him than he displaces her. She needs her dinner and so does he. The day's earnings must supply it no matter who eats it. If she can displace him in the highest business pursuits is there any reason why she should not? The answer is that if she stays at home and earns nothing somebody will probably marry her. But if her dinner is not provided in the meantime, it is very certain that nobody will marry her, because she will starve while waiting.

Who will provide for the commissary department in the meanwhile? Are the young men of the age so uniformly self-sacrificing that they will guarantee in advance the dinners of a whole woman's college or a factoryful of young women, simply on the chance of marrying some one of them hereafter? If not, who is to give the guarantee? We cannot well set up every impecunious young woman in the public park, with the label appended: "Marry me! I am starving."

The more we think of it the more plain it becomes that except for the much-demonstrated "capitalists" and the favored pets of fortune the direct way to get a dinner is to earn it. Sex makes no difference in this respect. Napoleon said that there should be a free field for talents; and so long as the world is carried on by competition each must be left free to compete. Wherever a woman can do anything for an honest living she must find no obstruction in doing it. If the man at her elbow can do it better she will have to give way; there is no doubt about that; she has been doing it for many centuries. If he can do the work precisely as well it will be practically shared between them; if he does it less well he must stand aside. It is very important in this world, first that every piece of work should be done by the competent, not by the incompetent; and second, that those who have to live by bread should take the first available means of earning a dinner. When it comes to the point it is easier for a woman to support herself than to hunt round for a man to support her. In one of the Buddhist sacred books it is held out as one reward of a virtuous man that "he shall be reborn in heaven, and with 1,000 heavenly wives live in an unspeakably shining habitation." But very few men are willing to take the responsibility of providing for 1,000 heavenly creatures in this world. When they are to be fed the greater part of the 1,000 have to look out for their own dinners.

[T. W. H. in the Bazar.]

The Latest Musical Prodigy.

Bronislaw Huberman, who has just reached London after a triumphant flying visit to Vienna, Brussels, Berlin, and Paris, followed by a trip through Holland—in the course of which he raised enthusiasm in the proverbially phlegmatic Dutchmen—comes well heralded. Everywhere have audiences listened with delight and astonishment while this gifted boy, though scarce 10 years old, has displayed a talent such as was credited to the child Mozart. On this occasion the "infant prodigy" is a violinist. The face is the Slav face, and therefore unfathomable to the average Englishman. It is what, for want of a better expression may be called a composite face. One of London's oldest musicians, Herr Wilhelm Kuhe, proclaims Huberman to be the counterfeit presentment of the Great Russian pianist, Rubinstein, when a child. Others see in the boy's face a striking likeness to Beethoven. Dilettanti naturally seek and find in him a resemblance to some musician, but others will discover in that massive feature the front bombe of the Corsican strapping Bonaparte.

Huberman's parents say it was at the age of 5, but the boy insists that it was at the earlier age of 3, when he was taken to hear an opera in his native town of Warsaw. Whether or not it is the custom of juvenile Poland to be taken to the opera when so young, it is to be presumed that few of them on coming home whistle the opera right through, and then beg for a fiddle to play its melodies. One is told that Bronislaw did so, and that the proof of this pretty anecdote about the beginnings of the little virtuoso is the possession of the fiddle itself. The boy is more interesting, however, than this story. He is frankness and bluntness incarnate, and blurs out his tastes, his likes and dislikes, with a naivete that is refreshing in this age of self-conscious prigs, great and small. His answers are brief and to the point. To the first question put to him by an interviewer from The Pall Mall as to his favorite composers, he answered, his face lighting up with an expression that confirmed the sincerity of his utterance, "Beethoven and Mendelssohn; but I try everything." The "try" was uttered modestly and diffidently, although it was a master in miniature who spoke. "What do you like to read?" "History, true genuine history. I want to read Macaulay's 'History of England.' I have been told it would give me a good idea of the country, but unfortunately it has not been translated into German." He

said this eagerly. Just as eagerly did he express his desire to read the "Arabian Nights." He is an unaffected, unspoiled child of nature, and takes a keen interest in everything relating to his art.—[Pall Mall Budget.]

Just for Fun.

Of the 26 barons who signed the Magna Charta, 3 wrote their names and 23 made their mark. This is all changed now. Every baron can write, but only a few succeed in making their mark.

+++
The young housewife—Have you any nice chickens?

The poultryer—Yes, ma'am.
The young housewife—Well, send me a couple in time for dinner, and I want them with the croquettes left in, do you understand?

+++
"What is your line of business?" whispered the editor to a man he was about to introduce to northern capitalists.

"I haul furniture," huskily came the reply.

"Here, gentlemen," continued the editor, "is Mr. Jones, one of the moving spirits of our city."

+++
A little girl who had a fondness for long words was one day playing school with her dolls. She was speaking quite emphatically, when her mother said:

"My dear, do not speak so loud; it is better to speak gently."

"Yes, mamma, but you see I wish to make a deep indention on my scholars."

+++

JUSTICE.—The story is told that an English lady, walking down the Lung Arno, in Florence, missed her purse. The suspicious movements of a man in front made her boldly demand the property. Too amazed to refuse, the thief actually handed over the purse. Indignant at such broad-day robbery, the lady stopped an elegantly dressed gentleman, and in excited tones, began to pour out her grievance. Merely waiting to hear "That man stole my purse," the gallant Italian rushed after the thief, who promptly took to his heels. They had a good run before the thief could dodge the pursuer. The sun of a summer day did not help the polite Florentine to keep cool; so, red-faced and out of breath, he turned back to meet the English lady with profuse apologies. "Madame, I am very, very sorry, I did my best, but your purse is gone." "Oh, no!" she replied sweetly, "I have my purse. I got it back from the man." Got your purse back! Per Baccho! What did you want, then? "Why, I want justice." It was too much even for the proverbial Italian urbanity, and almost choking with sudden wrath, he gasped out, "Justice! To think I should have run myself into a perspiration for justice!"

This recalls the story told of one of Tammany city justices, who, after listening to the arguments in a civil suit, remarked profoundly, "Yes may all go away and come again this day week. And then those of ye as deserves justice will get it, and those as don't, won't."

Active Exercise.

and good food in plenty tends to make children healthy. If children suffer, however, from scrofulous, skin or scalp diseases—if their blood is impure and pimples or boils appear, they should be given the right medicine. Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery brings about the best bodily condition. It purifies the blood and renders the liver active as well as builds up health and strength. puny, pale, weak children get a lasting benefit and a "good start" from the use of the "Discovery." It puts on wholesome flesh and does not nauseate and offend the stomach like the various preparations of cod liver oil. It's guaranteed to cure you or your money is returned.

Dr. Pierce's Pellets cure constipation, headache, indigestion, dyspepsia. One a dose. Sold by all dealers.

+++
Dumskizzle—Young Timberwheel has a suit of clothes for every day in the week.

Skinglelet—I never seen him wear but one.

Dumskizzle—Yes, that's the suit.

+++
Mr. Henry Graham, Wingham, writes us: "For fifteen years I have suffered with indigestion, and during that time I could get nothing to give me relief, although I tried a great many different kinds of medicine recommended for that complaint. I now feel like a new man, and this change has been accomplished by the use of four bottles of Northrop and Lyman's Vegetable Discovery. To me it has been a valuable medicine."

+++
Visitor—Ah, Johnny, I see you have lost one of your front teeth.

Johnny—No Sir; I haven't lost it. It's upstairs on the windowsill.

+++

COLIC AND KIDNEY DIFFICULTY.—Mr. J. W. Wilder, J.P., Lafargeville, N. Y., writes: "I am subject to severe attacks of colic and kidney difficulty, and find Parmlee's Pills afford me great relief, while all other remedies have failed. They are the best medicine I have ever used." In fact so great is the power of this medicine to cleanse and purify, that diseases of almost every name and nature are driven from the body.