

Weekly Messenger

AND TEMPERANCE WORKER.

VOL. III.

MONTREAL AND NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1884.

No. 9.

TO OUR FRIENDS.

The testing time of renewals or stoppages of subscriptions for the past year is about over, and it leaves the *Weekly Messenger* with a larger circulation. Although only two months of our third year have passed, we have the promising number of 7,400 subscribers on our books, and to provide samples we print this week between eight and nine thousand copies. We know of no reason, however, why the above number could not be doubled or even tripled this year. All that is required is the appreciative efforts of our friends. They are not asked to work for nothing, either, as a handsome picture awaits every subscriber who sends in a new subscription, and one for the recruit as well. At the exceedingly low price of fifty cents, and club price of two dollars for five, for such a full and attractive newspaper, we feel we have a powerful claim upon public patronage. Address all letters and orders to JOHN DUGGALL & SON, Montreal, Canada.

THE TIME FOR ACTION.

To have good laws a free people must show a desire for them. Especially is this in regard to such a question as the temperance reform. Upon this question the politicians for the time ruling are well aware of the strong interests that will be thrown against them if they do anything to hurt the liquor traffic. It is for all who consider that traffic only and continually an evil to show the framers of the laws what support they may expect from the people in legislating against it. Hitherto the people of Canada have enjoyed for such a purpose, in common with other free countries, the privileges of a free press, the right of assembly and organization and that of petition. By means of these agencies substantial progress has been made both in Provincial and Federal legislation. The restriction or suppression of the liquor traffic has been no more than an incidental issue in political elections, except in very isolated cases, yet the question may, oftener than it is possible to say with certainty, have been the means of making or marred the fortunes of aspirants to legislative honors. The impossibility, in the present stage of Canadian progress, of making temperance reform the main issue in any grand struggle of parties for the reins of power, is sufficient reason for the necessity of the local option measure that has been on the statute books of the Dominion for six years. By means of that measure—the Canada Temperance Act—it is possible to have the electorate of almost every constituency in Canada divided upon the question of whether or not the pernicious traffic shall continue to have legal sanction. This can be done, too, without any elector having to compromise his views or position upon any of the other great national questions of the day, such as tariffs, railways, colonization, etc. Many counties, including a majority of those in Nova Scotia, have been under the operation of the Act for periods of several years and less, but most of the time since the early adoptions of the

Act has been wasted through legal and constitutional uncertainties worked up by the opponents of the measure. These obstacles have one after another been cleared away, the supporters of the Act defending it right up to the foot of the throne. Then there were, and in some cases still are, drawbacks encountered in the shape of local disputes as to whom the responsibility rightly belonged of having the law enforced. Notwithstanding all that it has had to contend with, however, the Act has largely reduced the consumption of liquor in nearly if not every district where it was voted into effect. It seems also to have had the important effects of making keen the public eye and quickening the public conscience to the evils of the business, for far more illegal selling and drunkenness under license restrictions did not produce half the amount of outcry against having a law that was not enforced. Although this outcry was raised, as a rule, by opponents of the measure, it has had a contrary effect to what was intended. Instead of producing a popular demand for the repeal of the Act, it has led to the friends of law and order in very many cases waking up to the reproach of allowing the law-despising liquor-sellers to triumph, and assembling in mass meetings to devise means for enforcing the Act. It is very gratifying to notice, in this connection, a change in the tone of the press toward the new law. Newspapers that were neutral or opposed to it when it was before the electors, and which had nothing but sneers and unfavorable criticisms for it after its adoption, having found they were against the popular current, now vie with each other in supporting the Act and making suggestions for its better working. In one town two daily papers on opposite sides of politics are now reproaching one another with instances of their former coolness or opposition to the measure. When the Act has given such evidences of success in the scattered constituencies that have adopted it, it is reasonable to suppose that it would be more effective over wider areas. This consideration, supplementing the desirability of having the whole Dominion placed under the sway of the tentative prohibition the Act provides, should stimulate the upholders of sobriety, order and prosperity to enter upon the campaign now inaugurated with determination and zeal that will not be relaxed until victory all along the line shall be achieved. Valuable information for temperance workers, in connection with the campaign, will be found in the "Annual Announcement" of the Dominion Alliance elsewhere in this paper.

DOCTORS HAVE BEFORE NOW given the explanation of bodies moving in their coffins which a prominent doctor of Oakland, California, is credited with. That is, that the phenomenon, that has caused much distress to those led by its occurrence to suppose their friends were buried alive, is caused by the generation of gases. This doctor says a body has been known to rise partly up, the head and shoulders bending up toward the middle of the body, from the cause mentioned.

THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

Sixty Irish members of Parliament, of all parties, have presented a memorial to Mr. Gladstone, asking that the purchase clause of the Land Act be amended so as to authorize the Government to advance the whole purchase money to the tenants and extend the period for the repayment of the money. The Earl of Dunraven in the House of Lords moved a resolution censuring the Irish Executive for removing Lord Rossmore from the office of Justice of the Peace. Baron Carlingford, Lord of the Privy Seal, warned the House that a vote of censure would have a grave effect on Ireland. It was announced in the House of Commons that England, France and other Powers were urging Chili and Peru to protect the rights of the foreign creditors. The Duke of Richmond moved an amendment to the cattle disease law in the House of Lords, which passed, prohibiting the importation of cattle from countries having foot and mouth disease. The Government is expected to oppose the amendment in the House of Commons. In the discussion of Mr. Parnell's amendment to the address, Mr. John O'Connor Power, an Irish member, severely criticised the course of Mr. Parnell and his followers. He condemned Mr. Parnell's motion as disappointing in that it did not condemn assisted emigration as emphatically as it ought, and did not mention the importance of the development of the resources of Ireland. Mr. Parnell had at length been compelled to adopt the speaker's declaration that intimidation was brutal and immoral. He did not blame Mr. Parnell wholly for his mistaken policy, as he was convinced the Nationalist leader inwardly dissented from many things done by his disciples both inside and outside of the House. The Parnellites had been pursuing a policy adverse to Ireland's interests ever since the introduction of the Land Act. Landlords had to blame their present position upon their own neglect of duties. Irish discontent was due to the denial of equal privileges as well as to historical events. Better times were, however, the speaker believed, coming, when strife would be at an end and England and Ireland would be more united than ever, with the latter enjoying equal privileges. Mr. Power was frequently interrupted with applause and sat down amid tremendous cheering. Mr. T. M. Healy, in reply, compared Mr. Power's speech to dancing on a tight rope, said Mr. Power was balancing between the Whigs and the Orangemen, and reproached him for deserting his party. He said the Government was in league with the Orangemen, and concluded with describing Lord Rossmore as a "bigoted, malevolent, young pup." Mr. Justin McCarthy, historian of "Our Own Times," accused the Orangemen of seeking to involve the country in civil war. The amendment was defeated, after some days' discussion, during which several Irish members denounced Mr. Parnell, by a vote of 81 to 30. This was the last division on the address, and when it was over the Speaker, Mr. Brand, addressed the House, tendering his resignation on the ground of ill health. He appeared deeply moved and was heartily cheered. Mr. Gladstone gave

notice of a resolution thanking Mr. Brand for his services and advising the Queen to confer a special mark of favor upon him. Irish Nationalists decline to take part in this act of usual and due respect, because Mr. Brand suspended the Irish members under the special rules of the House in 1881. After a stormy discussion a motion of Sir Stafford Northcote was passed, reaffirming the decision of the House in its exclusion of Mr. Bradlaugh. That gentleman has decided to take no further action until the courts pass upon his case, and if their judgment be against him he will abandon the struggle. In the House of Lords the Prince of Wales spoke upon a motion to appoint a commission on housing the poor. His speech was well prepared and delivered, and all the more interesting from the fact being known that lately the Prince had been making personal investigations into the condition of the poor of the city of London.

IT IS WITH DEEP REGRET that we have to record the sudden death of one of the leading temperance men of Canada. Mr. Avard Longley, who died at his residence, Paradise, Nova Scotia, on his 61st birthday, February 22nd, was for nearly thirty years an active Son of Temperance. He was one of the Vice-Presidents of the Dominion Alliance from its organization until his death, and from his youth he was a devoted member of the Baptist Church. Mr. Longley entered public life as a member of the Nova Scotia Legislature in 1859, sitting for Annapolis county as the colleague of the late Hon. J. W. Johnston, one of the ablest public men ever produced by that Province. For a time he was Chief Commissioner of Railways in the Government. He represented his county in the Dominion Parliament for the term beginning in 1878, but for private reasons did not offer at the last general election. The deceased was also one of the founders of the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association, organized twenty years ago, and continued to the close one of its most useful members. Shortly before he died, Mr. Longley had an operation performed in Boston to prevent threatened blindness, and he was considered by his friends to have largely recovered his sometime waning health when, on the date mentioned, an hour or two after having eaten his breakfast with his family, he fell down and died.

HIGH LICENSE FEES having been adopted in Chicago, small dealers say that whiskey is malt liquor and they will sell it under a beer license. Whiskey sellers who could not swear that their wares were oatmeal gruel, or anything else that would enable them to evade legal restrictions, would be curiosities.

CHOLERA GERMS have been detected in a water tank in Calcutta, India, by the German Sanitary Commission, and in suburban villages where cholera had appeared were found microscopic organisms identical with those found in the lower intestines of cholera victims in Egypt.