

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 running 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, 450 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 " " " " 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 repeal. Specimen copies furnished free. Address:—

F. S. SPENCE,

Cor. Richmond & Victoria Sts., 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 ensure 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. Get 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.

BEAR 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 aiding 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 homes.

A HUNDRED HOMES.

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,

Cor. Richmond-Victoria Sts. 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 without charge, otherwise some might decline to take the papers from the post-office.

10 CENTS ONLY 10

THE CANADA CITIZEN.

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

Managing-Director and Editor:

F. S. SPENCE.

OFFICE: 19-21 RICHMOND ST. E., TORONTO

TORONTO, FRIDAY, MARCH 9th, 1911.

THE ALLIANCE COUNCIL.

ELSEWHERE will be found a full report of the proceedings at the Dominion Alliance Convention on Tuesday last. The meeting was a good one. One of its main characteristics was a unity of purpose and harmony of sentiment that facilitated business and enabled the delegates to get through with a great deal of work in a very short space of time. The three principal matters dealt with, were legislation, law enforcement, and political action.

Mr. Jamieson's carefully prepared bill for amending the Scott Act, was considered and approved. An important suggestion made by Mr. McLaren, if carried into effect will be invaluable in Scott Act cases, in compelling witnesses who would prefer shielding the liquor-party, to give necessary evidence. A wire conclusion was arrived at in deciding that the prohibition resolution should again be introduced in the House of Commons and pressed to a vote so that the country may know just where the present members stand in relation to this important matter. We regret that the Council did not also see fit to ask some prohibition senator to have a similar resolution voted upon in the other house, so that we might know exactly where all our legislators stand.

The deliverances in favor of still vigorously pushing Scott Act campaign work, resisting repeals, and generally seeking for the enactment and enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act, are in the right direction. The Scott Act is not prohibition, but it comes pretty near it. It has done incalculable good, and will do yet more if fairly administered. The obnoxious Dominion Order in Council ought to be repealed. An honest, manly stand on the simple ground that whatever laws exist must be thoroughly enforced if taken by Dominion Government, Provincial Governments, and prohibition workers, would bring the liquor-traffic into very small dimensions in the greater part of our Dominion.

The vexed question of electoral action was again up for discussion. Clearly and unhesitatingly the Alliance Council confirmed the carefully thought out resolutions of last September's Convention, which are now the advice of the central body to our friends in every part of the Dominion. This advice is to be followed up by the sending out of a form of constitution for local organization, so that there may be at once in the hands of our friends machinery for the consolidation and effective exercise of prohibition electoral sentiment.

It was well to have the attention of provincial branches drawn to the important question of the relation to the prohibition movement of our electoral franchise qualification. This question will no doubt receive much consideration before next annual meeting of the Council, and those who then meet at Ottawa will have a good idea as to what prohibitionists need and desire.

One very encouraging feature in connection with this meeting was the satisfactory condition of the Alliance finances, due largely to the careful management of the past two years,

enabling the Executive Committee to report the Council entirely out of debt. It is to be hoped that the provincial branches will promptly respond to the call to be made upon them for financial aid, so that the Council may be in a position to do this year even more than has been accomplished in any year gone by.

THE MILLS RESOLUTION.

OUR friends have no need to be discouraged in view of the vote taken in the House of Commons on Tuesday last. The motion brought forward by Mr. Mills was put in such shape as to divide the House on party lines, and the division cannot be taken as indicating anything else than the relative strength of the political parties. That this is the case may be seen from the fact that many of those who voted with the Government against Mr. Mills, are men who are known to be thorough prohibitionists, men who have persistently supported Mr. Jamieson's Scott Act amendment bills, and men who voted last session for sustaining the Scott Act, and in favor of immediate prohibition; while some of the men who now vote for Mr. Mills resolution voted last session against the Alliance prohibition resolution introduced by Messrs. Jamieson and Fisher, among these being Mr. Mills himself. Four of these supporters of Mr. Mills resolution voted to destroy the Scott Act by inserting a beer and wine clause in it, and two of them voted for repealing the Scott Act altogether. To make this matter perfectly clear we give below the names of the members who voted in this curious fashion:

1. Conservatives voting against Mr. Mills who last year voted for total prohibition.

Baird, Bryson, Boyle, Colby, Couture, Davis, Foster, Freeman, James, J. Landry, Madill, Mills (Annapolis), Perley, (Assiniboia), Porter, Putnam, Smith, (Ontario), Weldon (Albert), White (Renfrew), Wilnot, Wilson (Lennox).

2. Conservatives voting against Mr. Mills who last year voted against repealing the Scott Act.

Audet, Bain (Soulages), Baird, Bergeron, Bowell, Boyle, Brown, Bryson, Cameron, Carpenter, Colby, Coulombe, Daly, Davis, Darn, Dawson, Denison, Desjardine, Dupont, Ferguson, Foster, Freeman, Girouard, Godbout, Gordon, Guillet, Hall, Hesson, Jamieson, Jones, Kirkpatrick, Landry, Langevin, Sir Hector, McCulla, McDonald (Victoria), McDougald (Pictou), McKay, McLellan, McMillan (Vaudreuil), McNeill, Masson, Mills (Annapolis), Montague, O'Brien, Porter, Putnam, Reid, Ross, Royal, Scarth, Temple, Thérien, Thompson, Wallace, Weldon (Albert), White (Cardwell), White (Renfrew), Wilnot, Wilson (Argenteuil), Wilson (Lennox), Wood (Westmoreland).

3. Liberals voting for Mr. Mills' motion who last year voted against prohibition.

Bernier, Cartwright, Casey, Casgrain, Doyon, Ellis, Geoffrion, Guay, Jones, Langille (Montmorency), Laurier, Livingstone, Mills, Mitchell, Préfontaine, Rinfret, Ste. Marie, Trow, Weldon, Wilson (High).

4. Liberals voting with Mr. Mills who last year voted to destroy the Scott Act by exempting beer and wine from its operation.

Guay, Livingstone, Mitchell, Weldon (St. John).

5. Liberals voting with Mr. Mills who last year voted to repeal the Scott Act altogether.

Mitchell, Weldon (St. John).

We think these lists make it perfectly clear that in the vote of last Tuesday there was not any fair representation of the strength of either the temperance or the anti-temperance party, in the House of Commons. It must not be imagined that we are at all apologizing for the Conservative temperance men who voted against Mr. Mills resolution. We think these men would have done themselves more credit by refusing to be caught in what seemed to them to be a scheme to entrap them in voting against principles in which they believed. On the other hand it would be going farther than the facts warrant in assuming that Mr. Mills' resolution was submitted to the House with an unadulterated desire to help forward the cause he professed to champion. When we find the line of cleavage to be a 'straight party line, taking on the [Mills] resolution side of

it men who are known opponents of prohibition, known enemies of the Scott Act, and on the other side of it men who are known prohibitionists, known warm supporters of progressive temperance legislation. Outsiders who do not fully comprehend the power of partyism must simply accept this division as an evidence of two regrettable facts, namely, (1) The power of partyism and party leaders over the people's representatives, and (2) the readiness of professed friends of the temperance cause to make a great moral movement subservient to a petty and unworthy partyism.

The only encouraging feature about the whole affair is the fact that the promoters of the little scheme so well worked out, recognized that public opinion on the temperance question was so strong, as to be one of the most powerful weapons which could be turned against their political opponents.

HIGH LICENSE.

In another column will be found Mr. Houston's argument in favor of High License. It is well and forcibly put, being probably as concise and complete a statement of the case as has yet been made. It may be summed up in two sentences:—1. The liquor-traffic ought to be made to pay a large share of the expense which it entails upon the community. 2. High License would act beneficially by restricting the liquor traffic within smaller bounds than those which at present confine it.

The former of these propositions has an appearance of reasonableness, and will no doubt commend itself to that large section of the community accustomed to view every public matter from an economic standpoint, and consider primarily the dollars and cents aspect of every question presented. This view of the liquor-traffic is not, however, shared in by prohibition workers generally. One plank of the Alliance platform declares that "No consideration of private gain or public revenue can justify the upholding of a system so utterly wrong in principle, suicidal in policy and disastrous in results, as the traffic in intoxicating liquors." In the fact of the liquor traffic being a revenue-producing institution lies its strength, and it is claimed, not unreasonably, that the acceptance by the community, for any purpose, of a share of the profits of the drink traffic in consideration of permission granted for the continuance of that traffic, constitutes a partnership with the traffickers. The liquor-traffic is a bad business, degrading to those who carry it on, degrading to those who patronize it, demoralizing to the whole community, a thing that ought not to be tolerated. If it is mean and wicked for an individual to carry on the liquor business for gain, it is equally wrong for a community to permit that traffic for money. There are two distinct wrongs on the part of the community. 1. The permission to any one to sell liquor. 2. The acceptance of a license fee as the price of this permission. The use to which the money, derived from a tax on the liquor traffic, is ultimately put, has nothing to do with the real character of the traffic taxing system. When a community permits the liquor traffic, it takes upon itself the responsibility of providing for the pauperism, etc., which the traffic produces. The general funds must be levied upon to cover this expense, and the traffic is taxed for the benefit of the general funds.

The liquor traffic is made revenue-productive by licensing it. It thereby gets a powerful grip on the community which is a partner in the proceeds of its nefarious operations. The greater the revenue the tighter the grip. We have shown the wickedness of any government accepting any liquor license fee. The extent of the partnership does not alter its character. High license is as unholy as low license, with the fact added, that it makes the liquor-traffic stronger and lessens the chances of our ultimately suppressing it altogether. This view of the case is to a certain extent accepted and commended by the better part of our communities.

Over and over again applause is elicited by the quotation of the celebrated statement of the Queen of Madagascar, "I cannot accept a revenue from that which brings only poverty and disease to my people." If foreign nations would force the liquor traffic on those whom she governed, this right minded sovereign would not accept a bribe from the nefarious system. Feeling the force of this view of the case, progressive American prohibitionists are at the present time pressing vigorously for the total repeal of the internal revenue tax upon strong drink taking the position that it is utterly wrong for the government to derive a revenue from that which curses and degrades the people. We might quote scores of our most advanced philanthropists who warmly endorse this doctrine.

Mr. Houston's second position is that high license means restriction. Of course restriction must keep pace with public sentiment, and so far in this country the public sentiment favoring liquor traffic restriction, has kept ahead of the public sentiment favoring increased liquor taxation. That is, we have always been able to restrict the liquor traffic by direct, definite legislation. And it is surely more desirable to honestly legislate for what is wanted than to legislate so as to secure the desired result through some round-about process. License fees in Ontario would have to be raised very much higher than they are at present to ensure their being any more restrictive than is the present law. Take Toronto for example. It is not by any means certain that a doubling of the present license fee would lessen the number of liquor shops. It might lessen the competition for the permitted number by excluding all competitors except those who have a good deal of ready money at their disposal. High license in Ontario to be restrictive would have to go farther than public opinion would be likely to sustain it; that means, that high license would not be restrictive.

Of course, other lines of argument which we have frequently had before our readers, go to make it clear that a high licensed traffic develops drinking habits in a community more rapidly than does a less taxed traffic, and this drinking ultimately demands and secures a larger supply of high license saloons as well as illicit liquor shops. We are dealing at present, however, with Mr. Houston's two propositions as they apply to our community as it is at present situated. We think he has failed to make a good case for high license, although he has probably made as strong a case as it is possible to make.

SIMCOE.

THE Scott Act will be voted upon in the County of Simcoe in the month of April. Already our friends are hard at work and campaigning is going vigorously on. Mr. F. W. Gray is President of the County Scott Act Association, E. B. Reid is Secretary, and E. W. King, Assistant Secretary. Rev. J. A. Trollope is acting as organizer, and all are hopeful of being able to hold their own against the liquor-traffic. Unfortunately for our cause there is at present no police magistrate for the county. Mr. Partridge as our readers know, was dismissed some time since, and his successor has not yet been appointed. This delay on the part of the government may prove a serious disaster to our cause. Already the matter has done incalculable mischief. Convictions have fallen off and prosecutions as well. No other part of the country shows, relatively to its recent work, as badly as does the county of Simcoe. The county includes three and part of two electoral districts, so that there are five inspectors at work, and the results of their work for the quarter just closed as well as that preceding it, may be seen in the following table:

	Information for quarter ending Oct. 31, 1910.	Convictions for quarter ending Oct. 31, 1910.	Information for quarter ending Jan. 31, 1911.	Convictions for quarter ending Jan. 31, 1911.
Simcoe Central	33	17	4	4
Simcoe East	31	12	10	6
Simcoe West	27	12	6	6
Cardwell	43	24	16	6
Midland	18	15	6	6

What has been said about the ab-