

THE CAMP FIRE

A Monthly Record and Advocate of the Temperance Reform.

VOL. V. No. 8.

TORONTO, ONT. FEBRUARY, 1899.

25 CENTS PER YEAR

Distribute Literature of the very best kind. The Camp-Fire is what you want. Read the column headed IMPORTANT on page 4.

"PROHIBITION HAS COME."

A STIRRING DEBATE.

Churchmen Very Earnest and Definite.

An important feature of the recent session of the Montreal Diocesan Synod of the Church of England was a debate upon Prohibition, which is summarized by the *Montreal Witness* as follows:

"A sudden interest, however, was felt, when the Rev. Mr. Cunningham presented the report of the Church of England Temperance Society. This made reference to the recent plebiscite, and said that the people of the country had pronounced in favor of prohibition. It but remained for the Government to carry out the will of the people and pass a prohibitory measure. It had been said that such a measure would not be effectual if passed; but this was an Anglo-Saxon country, and Anglo-Saxon people were observers of law and order; and if the Government passed a law and provided the proper machinery, and were thoroughly in earnest, the people would rally to its support, loyally obeying it. The trouble with the societies of the Church was that they were not advanced enough. Public opinion was strongly growing in favor of prohibition. He himself was a sincere advocate of prohibition. The temperance societies no longer met the sentiment which was spreading abroad. He did not know if prohibition would pass at once, but he was perfectly certain that it would come; that the Dominion would be freed from the curse of drink.

"Major Bond, in seconding the adoption of the report, briefly referred to the plebiscite campaign. One of the delightful surprises was the assistance which had been given by many of the clergy. This was a most hopeful sign. So far as this province was concerned, the plebiscite was a disappointment. The majority against it had been said to be ninety thousand. This was false. He did not believe it was more than thirty or forty thousand. He had evidence of falsification in the city of Montreal, and he had almost complete evidence as to the state of things outside the city. This might probably be submitted to Parliament, to show the real state of things in the Province of Quebec. But apart from this province, the vote was simply wonderful. The principle was affirmed in every other province of the Dominion. People turned out to vote on a question in which they had no interest other than a moral one. It was unique. Prohibition was bound to come.

"The Rev. Mr. Graham moved, and the Rev. Mr. Elliott seconded, a motion looking to the establishment of a central organization in the diocese which would be a rallying centre for the various Bands of Hope; while Dr. Norton protested against the introduction of a prohibition debate in connection with the report of the temperance societies of the Church. He had made such a protest before. He had not changed his opinion. At the same time he was a total abstainer; he neither smoked nor snuffed. Moreover, he had been a temperance worker for many years, and particularly in England. What was his experience there? In the district in which he was laboring, they had prohibitionists. The latter body never made the least headway. Why? Because, instead of trying to amend the liquor laws, to regulate the traffic, it narrowly insisted on the trade being wiped out at one sweep. Therefore, it rather desired that the liquor traffic should be made as abominable as possible. The prohibitionists accom-

plished nothing because of this narrow stand, but when the Church of England Temperance Society was started in the district, the first thing started was an agitation for the proper inspection of the liquor sold to the public, in order that it must not be poisoned by bad liquor, and the rigid improvement of the Sunday liquor law. He himself had secured the co-operation of every one of the liquor men in this work, except one—clearly showing that when the reform proposed is rational, even the liquor people will be with you. He had not the least belief that they would obtain prohibition in Canada. ("Yes, we will.") "Well," said the doctor, "by all means get it if you can. It will be a good many years before you get it. The young men of this Synod will have grey hairs before it comes to pass. But I implore you, do not waste the years in doing nothing. Do something in the meantime. Improve the laws. Get the liquor inspected. See that the public are not poisoned. Do something reasonable, and you will find the high-minded men of the liquor trade will go with you. Don't lose the precious time. That is what I ask of you."

"Dean Carmichael, speaking very slowly, said that in answer to Dr. Norton, he would congratulate the young men of the Synod upon the fact that they would never see grey hair, for prohibition had come. (Loud applause.)

Dr. Norton, shaking his head emphatically, the Dean said—"I repeat, prohibition has come."

Prohibition, the Dean said, had been passed by the country; it only remained to see that those in authority gave effect to it."

THE MORTALITY OF ABSTAINERS AND NON-ABSTAINERS.

To the Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, January 6th

SIR,—Some of your readers will be familiar with a statement that the trade organs used to trot out years ago, to the general effect that high medical authorities had declared that those who took intoxicants lived much longer than those who did not. The medical authorities quoted invariably repudiated any such absurd statement. Fallacies have a marvellous vitality, and reappear in somewhat altered disguises. This time it is an actuary who is misquoted, in order, it may be fairly supposed, that those who are addicted to pale ale, invalid port, or nourishing stout, may comfort themselves with the idea that their favorite tipples are more likely to prolong than to shorten their lives.

The *Licensing World*, November 26th, 1898, concludes its news on page 386 with the following paragraph, which I quote *in extenso*:

"Mortality of Total Abstainers. It would appear, from a paper recently read before the Actuarial Society of America by Mr. McClintock, that the deaths of abstainers are more numerous than those of non-abstainers. His inquiry extended over a large number of years and among many thousands of policyholders. We are aware that occasionally abstainers reached an advanced age, so also do licensed victuallers."

Knowing Mr. McClintock to be one of the most eminent authorities in the world, I welcomed this appeal to Caesar, but took the precaution of checking the *Licensing World* by writing Mr. McClintock to ask whether he had been correctly reported in the passage given above. He has just replied as follows:

"Actuary's Department, the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, December 23, 1898.

"Dear Sir,—Pressure of work and temporary illness are my excuse for delay in replying to your favour of November 27.

"I enclose herewith a copy of my paper of 1895, the only one on the subject from my pen, by which you will

see the exact contrary of the conclusion ascribed to me in your quotation, namely, 'That the deaths of abstainers are more numerous than those of non-abstainers.' Yours, etc.,

EMORY MCCLINTOCK, Actuary.

Edward Neild, Esq."

Of course I never supposed he had written such nonsense as had been ascribed to him, but felt it was only fair to him and the general public that he should have the opportunity of denying it. He had been good enough to mark more than a dozen paragraphs in his paper which prove the abstainer to be, on the whole, a better life than the non-abstainer, such as

Par. 2. "The abstainers show, therefore, a death loss of 78 per cent. of the maximum and the non-abstainers 96 per cent."

Par. 3. "There is a third large class of drinkers, who, while never intoxicated, nevertheless habitually take more than the daily allowance of alcohol found to be digestible by the medical authorities."

Par. 9. "The difference between those who drink beer and those who drink water is unmistakable, while the loss on beer drinkers has been almost the same as upon wine and spirit drinkers."

Par. 10. "On the whole, however, the teetotal habit, not only before but after middle age, must be counted as a favorable indication in judging of proposals for insurance from persons not known to be careful and moderate in the use of beverages."

There is not a single sentence in the whole paper that justifies the paragraph in the *Licensing World*. A very common fallacy is that drink is the supporter of old age. Mr. McClintock gives a heavy blow to this theory by the results of actual experience, showing opposite each other on pp. 8 and 9 the results as compared with expectancy on policies issued on non-abstainers and abstainers above the age of 60. Here it may be remarked that in this country the proportion of abstainers to non-abstainers is about 2 to 11, but in America the insurance on abstainers' lives amounts in dollars to 51 to 98, well over half. This probably is due to two circumstances—that abstinence is more general in the United States, and that the abstainer is more thrifty if not also more self-denying. When we come to policies issued on lives over 60, we find that on non-abstainers there was expected a loss amounting to \$16,583, but that there occurred a loss of \$31,000. On the other hand, among the abstainers, who at this advanced age were in a majority, there was expected a loss of \$19,791, but there only occurred a loss of \$4,000. Possibly the believers in intoxicants will have some new figures to confute these I have verified from an authority whom they called as a witness. Yours, etc.,

EDWARD NEILD.

Hon. Secretary, Manchester, Salford, and District Temperance Union, Eccles, January 14th, 1899.

HOW THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC ROBS LABORING MEN.

In every \$100 worth of boots and shoes you buy is \$20.71 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of furniture you buy is \$23.77 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of hardware you buy is \$24.17 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of clothing you buy is \$17.42 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of cotton goods you buy is \$16.01 of labor.

In every \$100 of men's furnishing goods you buy is \$18.34 of labor.

In every \$100 of worsted goods you buy is \$13.55 of labor.

In every \$100 of woollen goods you buy is \$12.86 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of the above goods, \$100 worth of each kind in \$800 lots, \$147.73 of human labor is employed.

In every \$800 worth of liquors you buy is \$9.84 of human labor.—Forward.

MODERATE DRINKING

We frequently hear a good deal about the desirability of having moderate drinkers and total abstainers work together in effort for the suppression of the terrible evils of intemperance. We appreciate and will cooperate with every agency and effort for the promotion of the cause we advocate, and earnestly wish every worker a hearty God-speed, but we will none the less persistently call attention to the real position of those who indulge moderately in alcoholic beverages.

Canada is cursed today with the drinking system and its inevitable results. Liquor shops, taverns and saloons are working incalculable harm in our young community and it is well to study and understand wherein lies their strength. The total abstainer is not a saloon patron; his position is a clear and emphatic protest against the whole institution. The drunkard is not the man who mainly upholds the drinking customs and the liquor traffic. The drunkard's example is not a dangerous one, comparatively speaking. The results of unbridled appetite in his case are so manifest as to have a deterrent effect on the would-be drinker. The drunkard is not a desirable saloon customer; he is generally poor, has little money to spend, is not an attraction, but rather a discredit and a disgrace to the establishment he frequents. Many saloon-keepers refuse to sell to these degraded creatures, and would rather be patronized by men of respectability, position, influence and wealth.

But how about the moderate drinkers? It is from their ranks that the drunkards almost invariably graduate. They are the parties whose example is seductive and dangerous. It is their respectability, influence and money that sustain the liquor shop, the tavern, and the saloon. The men who "can take it or leave it alone," but who do not leave it alone, are the backbone, the up-holding power, the stronghold of the whole liquor system. Without their assistance the liquor traffic would be disreputable in this generation and unknown in the next. If so-called "moderate drinking" were abolished, drunkenness would soon be a thing of the past. We ask in all fairness and reason can such people be considered as on the side of temperance, morality, and reform?

"No man can serve two masters." "He that is not with us is against us." The dividing line is definite and unmistakable. The members of our community are arrayed in opposing attitudes, on one side is the saloon system, with its awful concomitants of ruin, poverty, disease and crime; on the other side are the home, the church, the school, the philanthropic efforts of Christian workers in God's name, for the uplifting and ennobling of our common humanity. We ask each of our readers to look calmly at the situation, to consider the whole case, to see where the moderate drinker stands, and to ask and answer for himself, the question: Where ought I to stand?