

The Camp Fire.

A. MONTHLY JOURNAL
OF TEMPERANCE PROGRESS.

SPECIALLY DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE PROHIBITION CAUSE.

Edited by F. S. SPENCE

ADDRESS - - TORONTO, ONT.

Subscription, TWENTY-FIVE CENTS a Year

NOTE.—It is proposed to make this the cheapest Temperance paper in the world, taking into consideration its size, the matter it contains and the price at which it is published.

Every friend of temperance is earnestly requested to assist in this effort by subscribing and by sending in facts or arguments that might be of interest or use to our workers.

The editor will be thankful for correspondence upon any topic connected with the temperance reform. Our limited space will compel condensation. No letter for publication should contain more than two hundred words—if shorter, still better.

TORONTO, JULY, 1900

THE COMING CONVENTIONS

We earnestly appeal to all our friends to do their utmost to secure the success of the prohibition conventions to be held in Toronto on July 17th and 18th. They will be gatherings of unusual interest. The recent unfair treatment of the temperance cause by politicians of both parties has created indignation in our ranks. We sincerely trust that the result will be more determination than discouragement. A Dominion election is not far away. A provincial election must shortly follow. It is for the prohibitionists of Ontario to place themselves on record now in regard to their intentions and desires, and to place themselves on record at the ballot box in a few months in regard to the manner in which their demands are received by those who ought to be ready to obey the voice of the people, when that voice is so manifestly in favor of what is righteous and progressive.

PROVINCIAL PROHIBITION.

Manitoba and Prince Edward Island have set an example to the rest of the Dominion. Provincial prohibition will never be accepted as a final settlement of the liquor question in Canada. It may be necessary for us however, to use it for a while, pending the development of a better feeling in the province of Quebec.

The Quebec vote in the prohibition plebiscite cannot be accepted as a fair expression of the opinion of our French Canadian brethren on the liquor question. The methods adopted to stampede the French electorate are well-known. Clever and unscrupulous liquor advocates appealed to them to vote against prohibition to save their hero, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, from the defeat that it was said would follow a prohibition majority. Religious prejudices were also invoked and misleading statements made regarding the character and object of the prohibition proposed.

Quebec however, is on record against prohibition, and will probably for some years be a serious obstacle to national prohibition, which however must not be abandoned. The liquor traffic will have to be driven out of Canada with the help of our French brethren if we can get that help, without it if we must fight the battle ourselves. Meanwhile every province that declares for prohibition puts us another step in advance, and weakens the power of the liquor traffic with which we have to contend.

We are thankful then for the success of our friends in Manitoba and Prince Edward Island. It ought to be Ontario's

turn next. The Premier of Ontario is a pronounced prohibitionist. Sir Oliver Mowat declared that he would give the people a prohibitory law if the Privy Council's decision warranted him in doing so. Hon. G. W. Ross cannot afford to do less than Sir Oliver Mowat was willing to do.

The Convention in Toronto on July 17th will be watched with interest. No doubt it will stand by the flag of total national prohibition. It will do wisely in calling for the immediate enactment of as much prohibition as the Provincial Legislature is warranted in enacting.

A NOTABLE EVENT.

A great World's Temperance Congress was held at London, Eng., during the week beginning June 10th. Many temperance sermons were preached on that day, and all through the five following days important sessions were held forenoon, afternoon and evening. Representatives of different lands told of the progress of the cause in their respective countries. The President of the Congress was the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the number of delegates appointed to the meetings was about 1200. The greater number of course were British people, but delegates were present from France, Russia, Denmark, Iceland, Switzerland, Belgium, Italy, Austria, Holland, Norway, Sweden and the United States, besides representatives of Canada, Australia and other colonies. The progress of the cause in Canada was set out in a carefully prepared report submitted by Mr. R. J. Dougall, of Montreal, President of the Dominion Alliance. Papers were read relating to every phase of the liquor question. They will constitute when published, a volume of immense interest and value. The great gathering forms an event in the history of the world's progress.

THE PROHIBITION DEBATE.

The prohibition question was again discussed in the House of Commons on Tuesday, July 3rd. The main motion before the House, presented by Mr. Flint, set out the facts of the plebiscite, and declared that in view thereof Parliament should enact such measures as will secure prohibition in at least those provinces and territories which voted in favor of prohibition. Mr. McClure's amendment declared in favor of total national prohibition. An amendment moved by Mr. Parmalee, declared that a prohibitory law should not be enacted at present.

Mr. Flint argued that his proposal was a reasonable compromise between the radical views advocated by Mr. McClure and Mr. Parmalee. He declared himself in favor of Mr. McClure's resolution if the House would take the advanced position thereon set out.

Mr. Clark Wallace made a strong attack upon the Government for its unfair treatment of prohibition, and argued at length in favor of compensation for those engaged in the liquor business if prohibition should be enacted.

Dr. P. Macdonald did not agree with any of the propositions before the House. He did not consider that the plebiscite was a sufficient mandate for the enactment of prohibition. He argued in favor of further restricting the liquor traffic by enlarging and perfecting the Canada Temperance Act.

Hon. Mr. Foster blamed the Government for not keeping faith with the prohibitionists. He stated that there had been a secret agreement that a great majority vote would be required before prohibition would be enacted. He had no faith in plebiscites as a basis for such

legislation as prohibition, which could only come by the electing of prohibitionists to Parliament.

Hon. Mr. Fielding defended the Government, and argued that the vote was not sufficient to warrant legislation. He stated that the experience of the Maritime Provinces had clearly proved that many people would vote for prohibition who would not endeavor to secure its enforcement. He challenged Hon. Mr. Foster to define the position of the Conservative party on the question.

Sir L. Davies attacked Mr. Foster for his change of ground on the question of prohibition, and argued that from a constitutional standpoint it would not be lawful for parliament to pass prohibition for part of Canada alone.

Hon. S. A. Fisher fully endorsed the position set out in Mr. Parmalee's amendment. He believed that the vote did not warrant legislation and could not see how anyone could hold a different view. He accused the Conservative party of endeavoring to use the position in which the temperance cause was now placed as a catspaw for their own party ends.

Mr. F. Dixon Craig blamed his colleagues for want of honesty and sincerity on the prohibition question. He declared himself a prohibitionist, but believed that the time for prohibitory legislation had not yet arrived and therefore gave his support to Mr. Parmalee's amendment.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated that the question was not a ministerial one. He claimed that the Government's Plebiscite pledge had been fully carried out by the taking of the vote, the result of which in his opinion was not such as to make the enactment of a prohibitory law advisable. There was no unanimity of opinion among prohibitionists as to the course that ought to be taken. A number of propositions had already been advanced by different Members of the House. He was strongly opposed to the enactment, for any Provinces, of legislation that did not apply to the whole Dominion. Legislation ought to tend to promote unity rather than to separate the different communities. Believing that the country was not ready for prohibition, and that the question of temperance was largely a question of education, the Premier declared that he was not a prohibitionist. He favored legislation however, that would be progressive, and believed that the Canada Temperance Act had rendered good service to the temperance cause. If temperance people asked to have that Act improved the Government would be ready to respond to their request.

Mr. McClure argued that the plebiscite did not fairly and fully represent the prohibition sentiment of the Dominion. He thought the best method of solving the problem before the House would be the election by prohibitionists of prohibition representatives. The liquor traffic ought to be suppressed by law. That was his position and he accepted no compromise.

After discussion by a number of other members the vote was taken and resulted in the adoption of Mr. Parmalee's amendment by 98 yeas to 41 nays.

After Mr. Parmalee's amendment was adopted, Rev. Dr. Douglas seconded by Mr. McGregor, proposed the addition of a clause declaring that with a view to the further restriction of the liquor traffic, it was expedient to enlarge the scope of the Canada Temperance Act and perfect the provisions for its administration. After a good deal of discussion this amendment was adopted by a vote of 65 to 64.

IMPORTANT.

TORONTO, 1900.

DEAR FRIEND,—

You are respectfully requested to carefully examine **The Camp Fire**, a neat four-page monthly Prohibition paper, full of bright, pointed, convenient facts and arguments; containing also a valuable summary of the latest news about our cause. It is just what is needed to **inspire workers and make votes**.

The victory won last year was only the opening of a campaign in which the liquor traffic will do its utmost to block, delay, and if possible prevent our securing the enactment and enforcement of prohibitory law. We have plenty of hard fighting ahead of us. We must keep posted and equipped, knowing all that is being done by our friends and foes, and sophistry and misrepresentation that will be advanced.

The Camp Fire will be one of the best aids you can have in the struggle. It will contain nothing but what you need. Every number ought to be preserved. You cannot afford to be without it, and the subscription price is only nominal, **Twenty-five cents per year**.

While a necessity to every prohibition worker the **The Camp Fire** will also be of special value for distribution. Literature won the plebiscite victory. We must keep up the educating work. Printed matter tells. It does its work continuously, silently, fearlessly and no form of literature is so generally read and so potential as the up-to-date periodical. It comes with the force and interest of newness and life. For this reason the form of a monthly journal has been selected.

This journal will be in every respect reliable and readable. Every article will be short, good and forcible, containing nothing sectional, sectarian or partizan. The literature of the old world and the new world will be ransacked for the most helpful and effective material. The price is very low.

Such literature will convince many a man whom his neighbors cannot convince. It will talk to him quietly, in his own home, in his leisure moments, when he can listen uninterruptedly, when he cannot talk back and when the personality of the talker cannot interfere with the effect of the talk.

It will ply him with facts, arguments and appeals, that will influence, instruct and benefit him. It will set him thinking. This is half the battle. Its wide circulation will swell the victory that we are about to win. This is its object.

Your help is asked in this great work. Every society should subscribe for and distribute hundreds of copies. This is the easiest and surest plan of making prohibition votes. Look at the terms:

Twenty copies will be sent to any one address every month for six months, for ONE DOLLAR, payable in advance

On no other plan can a small investment be made to produce so much of educative results. One hundred and twenty copies may be placed in as many homes. And have more than HALF A THOUSAND readers. One dollar will cover this placing of the claims of our cause before five hundred people. Ten dollars may reach FIVE THOUSAND. WILL YOU HELP US?

Address,

F. S. SPENCE,

52 Confederation Life Building,
Toronto.