

Westmoreland, N. B.

THE REPEAL CAMPAIGN.

How the Battle Runs--The W.C.T.U. Hard at Work--Anti Lies and Scott Act Facts--Law Enforcement--Our Friends are Hopeful--Trusting God and Fighting Hard.

BEFORE another issue of the CANADA CITIZEN reaches the hands of our readers, the battle for repeal will have been fought in Westmoreland county, N.B. Westmoreland was one of the first counties in Canada to avail itself of the Scott Act, voting on September 11, 1870, and declaring in favor of prohibition by a vote of 1,082 against 299. An attempt to repeal the Act was made after it had been in operation for three years. The second vote was taken on August 14, 1884, and resulted in the polling of 1,774 votes in favor of the Scott Act and 1,701 against it, the Act being thus maintained by the comparatively small majority of 73. Since that time the work of enforcement has been going on with varying success, difficulty having been experienced as usual through legal technicalities.

In Moncton, the United Temperance Committee, and outside the town the County Alliance have been pushing enforcing work. An Act of the Provincial Legislature gives County Councils authority to appoint and pay Scott Act detectives, but does not compel them to do so. In Westmoreland the fines and costs in Scott Act cases have been handed over to the temperance organizations named, and they have been pushing energetically the law enforcement work. In the town of Moncton alone over \$1,200 has been imposed and collected in fines during the past year.

W.C.T.U. workers are unusually active. They have recently dedicated a very fine Temperance Hall in the town of Moncton. Sunday afternoon Gospel Temperance meetings are being held in this hall; and all over the county energetic campaigning is going on. The reports of workers so far is encouraging. We sincerely hope that our good friends will be successful, and that Westmoreland will not break the record of which Canadian temperance men are so proud, that the Scott Act has never been repealed.

Some idea of the desperate straits to which the Antis are driven may be gathered from the reckless falsehoods with which they are endeavoring to mislead the electors. As a fair specimen of these misstatements we clip the following from a letter published some days ago in the Moncton Daily Times:

Editor Times: Now that the majority of clergymen of the different denominations have arrayed themselves on the side of the Scott Act in opposition to a license law, a few figures taken from the inland revenue returns of the Dominion may be instructive to those who think the Scott Act is promoting the temperance cause.

Proof spirits manufactured in Dominion of Canada during 1885 3,779,322 1/2 Manufactured for year ending 1886 4,375,754 23 Excess spirits manufactured in 1886 776,404 96

Now we come to malt liquors Total of malt liquors manufactured in year ending 1885 12,071,722 Manufactured in year ending 1886 13,222,261 Excess of malt liquors in 1886 1,150,539

It has taken 776,404 06 gallons more spirits and 1,210,509 gallons more malt liquors to "lubricate" the Scott Act and make it workable in 1886 than in 1885, and yet in Ontario alone there are one million, or fully one half of the population under the Scott Act. An intelligent public may draw their own conclusion.

Our friends of course know that the amount of liquor manufactured in Canada is not the amount of liquor consumed in Canada, a good deal of our spirits being exported, and that during the past two years there has really been a remarkable falling off in the amount of liquor entered for home consumption. The clever falsifier who published the statement quoted above as evidence that more liquor was drunk in 1886 than in 1885, had actually before him, on the pages from which he took his misleading figures, the following:--

Gallons Proof spirits taken for consumption in the Dominion of Canada for the year ending 1885 4,274,722 Taken for consumption in year ending 1886 2,478,098

So that in the proof spirits manufactured in Canada and taken for home consumption there was a falling off in 1886 as compared with 1885 of 1,796,624 gallons.

It is true there was in malt liquors an increase as shown in the table we have quoted, but it must be borne in mind that it is a general argument of Anti-Scotts that the Scott Act drives out beer and replaces it with whisky. If, however, we add together the spirits and malt liquors (assuming that all the malt liquor manufactured were

consumed) we shall get the following totals:

Gallons. 1885 10,346,474 1886 15,760,359 Showing a falling off in the consumption of all kinds of drink of 586,115 gallons.

It may be claimed, however, that the amount of spirits taken in 1885 was exceptionally large. Well, then let this be admitted, we will take the years ending '82, '83, '84, '85, add them all together and get an average, when we will find the following results: Gallons. Annual average for 4 years ending 1885 3,821,087 Year ending 1886 2,478,098

Falling off 1,342,989

Furthermore if our calculating friend had turned to page 29 of the report of the Minister of Inland Revenue for 1886 he would have found a table giving the per capita consumption of strong drink in the Dominion of Canada for the past few years as follows:

Year. Gal. Year. Gal. 1883 4.107 1885 3.874 1884 4.307 1886 3.059

It is probably as well that our opponents should do this malicious lying to give us an opportunity for repeating these facts which ought to be impressed upon our workers everywhere. The falsehood above exploded is of a piece with the other falsehoods through which the whisky party hope to win the fight in Westmoreland. We venture to predict that such contemptible tricks will not be influential with the intelligent electorate on whom an attempt is made to play them, and that the clear-headed voters of Westmoreland will declare themselves unhesitatingly and overwhelmingly against the debauching liquor traffic, and on the side of "God, and home and country."

A DRUNKARD'S WIFE.

The following vivid picture of the life of a drunkard's wife is from a letter which was read at the Fulton street daily prayer meeting in New York, on Friday January 27th. A reader of the CANADA CITIZEN was present, and made this copy for us after the close of the meeting. It is seldom that such an experience is given to the public as most women suffer in silence.

Dear Christian Friends,--I want to ask advice of some one of your number, who will have time to write to me. I have written to you before and have had blessed answers to prayer, offered in behalf of myself and family, by the members of your blessed meeting. Will you kindly let me tell you of my case? I have a husband thirty-eight years old, who has a terrible appetite for liquor. When he does not use it, he is kind, loving, smart and industrious, and in every way capable of making a pleasant home for his family. He gets to drinking all at once, and drinks until we know it is dangerous to let him have any more. So at the risk of my life, sometimes, I compel him to stay at home and get him to sleep it off and do his business, and keep him in as long as I can, sitting in the meantime to some dear Christian believer to pray for him. Almost always (about the same time my request is received) he suddenly leaves it off, and feels so sorry and ashamed, and I know it is in answer to prayer, and I thank God with all my heart. He goes a month or so, and then all at once he commences again, and I go through the same ordeal, and Oh! I am almost distracted. I have a terrible fear sometimes that my hitherto, very bright and blessed reason, will forsake me. My head has a strange dull pain, and sometimes I forget what I am doing. Oh! if you knew the blows and curses I have to take from my poor but wicked, intemperate husband, in order to withhold the money from him we need in our every day life, which he would take and squander in drink, then the despondency, when he comes to himself and finds what he has done! While writing this letter--10 p.m.--he is out in some cursed place and I have prayed and cried until I am almost discouraged. Oh, must the innocent always suffer for the crimes of others! I thought I would write to you again. Won't you pray for him? Oh! if he would only give his heart to God! Is it wrong for me to trouble you with this sorrowful request so often, and what shall I do? Sometimes, I think I will follow him out into the dens, and dare them to give him their poison. But he is a man of violent temper and he might commit a crime. Sometimes I think I will run away with my breaking heart and leave him awhile (I have no children) and see if that will not reform him. But he needs me so much! Advise me. Oh, what shall I do? God only knows how much I bear and how much I suffer!

Oh! for faith and strength to bear all my burdens.

Is Prohibition Right?

A POWERFUL ARGUMENT IN ITS FAVOR.

Analogy of Individuals and Corporate Bodies --Majority Rule--The Law for a Man and the Law for a Nation--If a Man Ought to Renounce the Drink Habit, a People Ought to Renounce the Drink Traffic.

In a recent issue of the *Damnon Church of England Temperance Journal*, is an article by Rev. Dr. Roy, LL.D., on prohibition. The learned writer demonstrates overwhelmingly that at the present time even the moderate use of intoxicating liquor is "by perpetuating the traffic inextricably linked with the ruin of individuals"--that the traffic is to day influencing legislation against that which is good and true--that it is retarding the progress of Christ's work in nearly every country under the sun." Based on these considerations he builds up in favor of total suppression of the liquor traffic from which these evils come, an argument so strong that we take much pleasure in reproducing the following paragraphs which give the main substance of the article.

"When an act results from a man's judgment and will, the antagonism to it of some of his feelings does not make it any less the act of the man. The action of a majority of his faculties is his act. In a country blessed with popular government, an act of society, recorded as a law does not cease to be the act of society because a minority of the individuals composing the society are opposed to the act. For instance, if the legislature should pass an act forbidding the common use of arsenic, and permitting the use of it only in medicine and the arts, such an act would not be less the act of society because some persons were opposed to it on the ground that the act restrained their liberty to use arsenic, in moderation, for the beautifying of their countenances. "The prohibition would be the act of society; for, without the consent of the majority, it could not exist, and, with the consent of the majority, it becomes the act of the body. Legal prohibition is the renunciation by society, through the majority of its component individuals, of any practice that has become obnoxious to it, and the recording, by legal enactment, of that renunciation. The substitution of intoxicating liquors for arsenic, in the instance used for example, in no way alters the case considered. "The right and duty of society to record and enforce this act of renunciation is now to be considered. "First, then, the moral obligations incumbent on every individual are incumbent, also, on every society of individuals. It is a mistake to say that corporations have no souls. The principles on which they are founded animate them with a common spirit; and the complete destruction of the corporation can be secured only by the overthrow of the principles that become its soul. Till this soul is destroyed, the corporation will rise again and again, in new forms, after every apparent dissolution. Societies are capable of moral acts. They can set up standards of right and wrong in conduct which may mould the welfare of ages; they can act for their own prosperity or ruin; they can affect, for weal or woe, the destinies of multitudes. These are moral acts. For these moral acts, societies are held responsible by the ALMIGHTY. History is one long record of rewards and punishments of societies for their deeds. If they learn the lessons PROVIDENCE teaches, and mould their conduct accordingly, they are preserved. If they, in blind adherence to theories and customs and traditions, reject God's lessons, of Providential facts, those dumb prophets of his which, while they are silent, cry aloud, they die. What are Babylon, Jerusalem, and ruined Rome, but monuments of God's judgment on blind, bigoted, maddened societies that would not hearken and learn? What are His prophecies against another Babylon and all those whose garments are spotted by contact with its mysteries, its deceptive miracles and its impure dalliance with political powers? They are but warnings that God holds societies still responsible for their acts and for all the consequences of their acts. Societies, therefore, have moral obligations; and these obligations differ in no way from the eternal laws of love that are imposed upon individuals. What Christ says unto one, he says unto all.

"Now, there are times when the individual and society are alike under moral obligation wholly to abstain from intoxicating beverages. Christ clearly sets forth the circumstances when this abstinence is imperative for the individual. It is not a question of liberty at all; it is a question of how we may restrain our liberties, and must do so, in order to do the most good. Without quoting the very words of CHRIST or St Paul, CHRIST'S clearest exponent amongst the Apostles--it may be said that the abandonment, even of things not evil in themselves, is imperative when the general well being is imperilled by them, when the interests of others, though they be not the majority, are endangered by them, and when every other remedy has failed. It is not then a question of "may," to a Christian but of "must." When the limbs of a man are palsied, when the brain is powerless, when the will is destroyed, when the stomach itself is insaned, it is no time for the stomach to say: "I am at liberty to drink. I will not allow limbs or brain, or will, or judgment to interfere with my liberties: I will drink if I want to do so." It has abused its liberties, it has endangered the other members of the

body, it has imperilled the whole man. The safety of the man demands the sacrifice of the will of the selfish member, and the abandonment of the gratification that has wrought the ruin. The stoppage, too, in such a case, must be prompt: life is in danger. The physician who then recommends a gradual diminution of the quantity taken must be ignored as one too ignorant of the tendencies of human nature to be a safe guide. What if there be a risk to life in the sudden stoppage? Better far to die struggling against evil, than live by continuing to plant the seeds of it in the system. Glorious was the answer of D'Arcy McGee under these very circumstances: "I have made my decision, and, with the help of God, not even to save my life will I break it."

"That which is noble, that which is necessary, in an individual is no less noble and necessary in society; and there are times when the welfare of society demands such decisive measures for its preservation; when, with an overwhelming voice, the lovers of good things should demand the sweeping away of all that would breed a moral pestilence, or has already caused its ravages. "Such a time has now come in the history of the traffic in intoxicating liquor."

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?

An Instructive Reply to a Standing Question.

THE *Central Minnesotan* had, some weeks ago, a remarkable New Year's article--one worthy of being reproduced and read all over this continent. The article deals with facts in the history of the American nation, but every paragraph of which has equal force if considered as referring to our own Dominion. After referring to the wonderful history of the American Republic during the past 100 years the writer goes on to say:--

"WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?"

To the watchman upon the wall, at this close of the first century, we cry "Watchman, what of the night?" What is the answer? Amid the mighty changes which one hundred years have wrought in the history of men, what is the outlook for the self-government of man? Amid this dazzling civilization which has sprung forth from a single century--what of self-governed man? Amid the tremendous march of literature, science, industry, philanthropy and commerce--what of the great Experiment? Man, what is your status as a part of the history now writing?

IS IT A SUCCESS?

Are you sure that your ownership in self is a success? Are you sure that you cast off the clothes of infancy, and put on the garments of manhood, as a strong, healthy, safe and enduring commonwealth? As a "body-politic" is "esto perpetua" written on your banner? Or, do you feel that disease has crept into your system? Is corruption in your blood? Are dangers lurking in the nerves of our vast republic which may lead to paralysis and death?

Are we, as men, ready to answer this multiple question?

If you feel that we are still struggling as an experiment with disease seated in the vital organization, let us consider a moment what that disease is.

IS IT CORRUPTION IN POLITICS?

We re-creation set loose to seek for pleasure. The heavy hand of the system of higher powers, to which age leads respect, does not tend to keep up in paths of moderation and sobriety. The sanctity of a state church, which, with all its evils, imbues the mind at least with a formulative religion, never puts a safeguard around us to keep the masses from excesses.

Have we, of ourselves with freedom unrestrained by the sanctity of tradition, or the religion of custom, maintained our political purity and our personal dignity and integrity? Have these one hundred years added to our strength?

MEN.

We are talking to men. We point with sorrow to the evils which have made our ballot box the tool of the ignorant, the whip of the rich and powerful, the toy of the demagogue. In our cities the saloon and the "bar" control the ballot-box.

We point with sorrow to the fact that laws are obeyed or not as a community likes or dislikes. With regret we see the great commercial world, heedless of the woes and wrongs of suffering laborers, combine to build nighty fortunes--such as the world never saw--out of the pitances of struggling toil. With pity for the toiler we see labor pressing its pallid cheek against the prison-windows of a hopeless present looking into a hopeless future. Not prudence, not providence, not integrity, not industry, brings competence among the masses of our cities--but the fateful throw of the die in speculation. Our country people may not be aware of the large and sale condition of the caucus is a gambling den of greater infamy than ever disgraced the secret junta of the Roman Dictators!

GO!

And the reason is as clear as that sinking southern sun, marking the expiration of the one-hundredth year, shining in a cloudless sky. We may dispute and argue. We may hesitate and doubt. We may urge sophistry and casuistry. We may drag theory from the deepest caves of human philosophy. But after all has been said! After every color of reason examined in the spectra of doubt; after every palliation and excuse is offered and offered in vain--the truth remains "God reigns and we have drifted from Him."

We have neglected God in government! Standing upon the single shore of the present--and looking over an infinite sea--and fathomless--weeping tears over a deathless life which can span but a few circles

of time on this ocean--facing the inevitable in which no life can exist--we know that we are drifting from God! And the disease which corrupts our commonwealth--the poison in our social life--the danger which threatens our republic, is--irreversible!

Call it what you will: ethics; morality; philosophy; humanitarianism; anything to avoid the issue--but the terrible eye of an Almighty who has given us Life for a purpose and Time for its execution, sees us drifting from his code and from his unalterable and Christ-taught

GOOP!

This is all. Nothing can be said else. We are drifting from the throne which rises midway in an infinity--and which is known as the "God in History."

A PALACE OF SIN.

Detroit's New Den or Seduction.

THE following paragraphs are taken from the *Detroit Public Leader*, a journal which announces itself as the "organ of the wine and spirit trade." They describe a new saloon which has lately been opened in Detroit, and we would ask our readers to pause and carefully consider whether or not such a gilded palace of temptation would not be tenfold as powerful an agent of debauchery as the lowest run-hole in the city.

Our friends who want to respectableize the liquor-traffic through careful legislation, including High License, would root the traffic in such luxuriance and magnificence as are here described. Here the drink appetite would surely be fanned; and a terrible crop of ruin, vice, and crime, that would surely follow, might be harvested, in the low city slums, the brothels and illicit dives, which could be persistently raided and stirred up, but never suppressed by law so long as that law fostered and protected institutions that were really the starting point for all this disgrace and sin. Read it carefully, and understand why the liquor-traffic believes in the High License system.

"Detroit has always lacked one essential to becoming a really metropolitan city. It has got every other accessory, necessary or unnecessary, to metropolitan life, but a really first-class bar it has never had. Of course there are a dozen or so of places in Detroit where a man with the most aristocratic notions may be able to get his favorite apple in surroundings that charm even his exacting and refined soul, but the gorgeous saloons of New York or Chicago have heretofore been an unknown quantity in our social economy.

Since the opening of the new Churchill place, at 158 Woodward avenue, Detroit has been able to take her stand side by side with any other city on the continent. The interior arrangements of this magnificent saloon are gorgeous in their oriental splendor. The bar is a dream of elegance. There are cut glass of the costliest description, punch bowls of the rarest pottery, bric-a-brac of the most delicate and unique description, and mirrors that almost shame a man with their brilliant reflections. One Tom and Jerry set has a number of sketches of St. Clair Plate, the ship canal, the club house, Star Island, etc., painted on mugs and around the bowl.

The boudoir back of the bar is an aesthetic study. The walls are a marvel of decorative art, which would take a more vivid and imaginative pen than the present writer's to describe. An elaborately carved table from India is in itself worth going a long way to see. Then there are other tables and chairs from Japan, great tiger skin rugs, carpets in which the foot sinks ankle deep and a large open fireplace of beautiful construction. The light shimmers through a var-colored glass roof throwing rainbow hues all over the room and compelling the glorious picture.

No wonder Mr Churchill is proud of the place. He can well afford to be, and his pride is shared in by Detroiters generally. The cost of fitting up the place is estimated at \$65,000. Such enterprise deserves success, which we are sure will follow."

THE CHATHAM OUTRAGE.

The Prisoners on Trial--Why the Dynamiting Was Done--An Inspector Who Inspects--And he Keeps Right on.

FURTHER information from Chatham about the dynamiting of Inspector Evans goes to show that the outrage was carefully planned. A fuse had been attached to a dynamite cartridge and then hurled through the glass door into the building. The case looks very bad for the man who was tracked from the scene of the outrage to the Royal Exchange Hotel, and there found in bed with dynamite cartridges and fuse in his room. When brought up for preliminary examination before the Police Magistrate he was remanded at the request of the crown. Subsequently the examination was resumed and again adjourned.

The dynamiting of Mr. Evans' house was a cruel, heartless deed, but it will be understood when we learn that for the quarter ending January 31st, Mr. Evans had prosecuted 35 cases for Scott Act violation, and made the liquor party pay \$1,450 in fines. This is the reason they tried to blow him up.

The following convictions have lately been recorded in this town: Arthur Summers, fined \$50 and costs, and J. A. Ward, fined \$50 and costs.