

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

"The subject who is truly loyal to the Chief Magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures."—*Junius*.

Vol. I.

TORONTO, ONT., JULY 28th, 1877.

No. 1

Murphy Talk..

The following "Murphy wave" from Chicago should flow over some of the reckless agitators who nightly hold forth in this city in favor of the Dunkin Act—it might wash away some of their bigotry. Yet we remember that it is difficult for the "Leopard to change his spots" and equally strange would it be if moderation were shewn by the heroes of the Dunkin Amphitheatre.

Hear him: "If I have had success it is due to humility, patience, and loving kindness for drinking men. I never spoke an unkind word to any drinking man, and they have always treated me well, though I have gone down into saloons and taken men away from the bar. Even when drunk these men appreciate kindness. Take a drunken man in out of the street and he is grateful to you for it. In a great many cases I find saloon-keepers won't sell to my boys. At the outset I put over my pledge the motto, "with malice towards none, with charity for all." I do not abuse the tavern keepers, why should I? Licensed to sell, they are personally as much entitled to respect as the best merchant in the city, provided, of course, they lead honourable lives. I don't present wild statistics, nor describe the horrors of *delirium tremens*, nor threaten hell nor anything of that kind. That sort of thing cannot effect any real, permanent good. I treat the honest man in the hotel business as a worthy citizen, and it grieves me—I cannot describe how grieved I am—when I hear a so-called temperance orator cursing hotel-keepers and picturing them as the direct agents of the devil. That's not the way to win converts. Our cause suffers much from fanaticism and overheated language."

As to his views on prohibition, he is thus reported by the *Times*: "I have nothing to do with any agitation for a prohibitory liquor law. My only hope is to get men to stop drinking, to cease being drunkards, by moral suasion." MURPHY was at one time an hotel-keeper in Portland, Me., and probably knows something of the working of the prohibitory law there. The turning point in his career is thus described by himself:

"In 1869 I was proprietor of the Bradley Hotel, corner of India and Commercial streets, in Portland, opposite the landing of the St. John boats. On the morning of September 3rd, a party of travellers from the boat came up to my hotel for breakfast. After they had washed up and gone in to breakfast, I found one of them remained in the office, and sat with his face in his hands. I asked him if he wasn't going in to breakfast, and he said he had no money. I told him to go and get breakfast, and it would be all right. He said he didn't feel well, and would like a glass of liquor, and I gave it to him. I saw from his face that he was recovering from a debauch. He told me his name was Murray, that he was a tailor, penniless, and a stranger. I felt sorry for him,

and told him that if he would avoid drink and get work I'd trust him for a week's board. He seemed grateful, and soon got work in a tailor's shop. Two days after that, unknown to me, he began to drink again, and a few days later, while drunk, he insulted a lady boarder at supper, and after supper, when she was going to her room, he attempted to outrage her. My clerk rescued her, and I ran up stairs and took hold of Murray to get him down stairs. He resisted some, but I got him down to a landing eleven steps from the floor, when he tried to throw me over the bannisters, but failed, and I threw him over. He didn't seem hurt, and started to come up stairs again, but I forced him back, called a policeman, and had him taken to the station house. That night he was very sick. A medical examination showed that there was a slight fracture of the skull, and in a few days the poor fellow died. I was tried for murder. The case came before Judge Goddard. The prosecuting attorney was William P. Frye, now member of Congress, and he was assisted by Nathan Webb. My counsel were George F. Shepley, now United States Judge, and Col. Bradbury. I was convicted of manslaughter. In the first place there was a great rivalry between Frye and Shepley, and Frye would do anything to beat Shepley. In the second place, people believed that Murray got liquor at my place, and they were fanatical enough to feel that a liquor seller ought to be hanged. The fact is, Murray never had a glass of liquor in my house except the glass I gave him the first morning. My case was appealed and I was let out on bail, Shepley being my bondsman by permission of the court, though it was contrary to usage. But the charge of murder hung over me. All my property had gone to defray the expenses of my trial. My family was in poverty. I was in despair, and took to drinking. I had always drunk some, but I had not previously been dissipated. Three weeks after I got out of gaol my wife died. That threw me into greater misery, and I drank more. I drank to such excess that my friends had me put back in gaol as a place of safety. While there Captain Sturtevant visited the gaol and held religious services, and I was converted. The result of my appeal was that I was sentenced to thirty days' imprisonment. After I got out of gaol Mr. William Deering, now of this city, befriended me, and helped me to quit liquor and lead a useful life. Pretty soon after I was released I went into this temperance work."

Mr. Murphy has some belief in moral suasion and the influence of genuine Christianity. It was equally noticeable that his follower, Mr. Rine, when speaking at the Amphitheatre on Thursday evening was very careful not to say one word in favor of the Dunkin Act. His abstaining from touching the topic now being nightly discussed in Toronto in no way suited some of the reckless agitators by whom he was surrounded, but regardless of their influence he would not say a word in favor of such a miserable law as the Dunkin Act.

The Carriage builders of Napanee are unable to get mechanics sufficient to fill the orders for carriages, pouring in on them through the passage of the Dunkin Act. Such is the bosh talked by Mayor Williams of Napanee at the Amphitheatre the other night, to induce our citizens to vote for that specimen of chimerical legislation.

Dunkin Increases Drunkenness.

In Prince Edward county between the first day of June and first day of December, under the old law there were ten convictions for drunkenness. The Dunkin Act came in force in that county on the 1st day of May, 1876, and between the first day of June and the first day of December in that year this veritable drunken breeding law increased the drunkard's from ten to sixteen. For proof read on page 40 of the Provincial Secretary's report. One grain of such substantial proof is worth a bushel of the chaff nightly disseminated by excited Dunkinite agitators.

A Government Warning.

The following from the Provincial Secretary's Report is just what has occurred in Prince Edward County. The Council shirked the question of imposing a direct tax upon the people, to meet the heavy expense, and as a result 17 out of 21 dealers who were under trial for evading the law escaped punishment. If the Dunkin Act was passed in Toronto it would require an immense amount of money each year to be raised by a direct tax upon the people, to prosecute those who break the law. Read what the Government says on the subject and record your vote against such a monstrous burden of taxes:

"At present officers are appointed by the Government under the License Acts, and there are ample provisions from the license fees to encourage their highest efficiency, but if municipalities decide by their votes, to prohibit licenses, there is no fund out of which such officers can be paid except by appealing to the City or County Council, and it is doubtful how far these bodies will be willing to impose a tax to pay salaries to officers to enforce the provisions of the Dunkin Act, especially as the revenue of the Council has already been seriously depleted by the loss of the license fees, and the question will meet with further serious difficulties when it is considered that it will be necessary to employ a much larger number of officials than are now required. If the municipalities omit to raise the required funds, and I have reason to believe that they will do so, then the law will be a dead letter, as those persons favorable to prohibition will not undertake the duty of enforcing it, and it cannot be expected, as many of them besides having a personal objection to become active agents are so complicated in matters of business directly and indirectly with those who are dealing in intoxicating liquors, that they abstain from taking any part in connection with prosecution."

The Dunkin Act in Toronto.

NO DIRTY WORKING MEN NEED APPLY.

The extreme and bigoted conduct of the advocates of the Dunkin Act in this city is daily weakening their cause, and the nightly ravings of such clerical mountebanks as the Rev. Mr. Affleck is disgusting the more respectable portion of the community. A few nights since at a meeting of the Dunkinites at the Coliseum a working man (a consistent temperance man) dared to mount the platform in his every day garb, and for so doing was grossly insulted by the above agent of the temperance party. He was ordered in the most insulting manner to wash his face, don better clothes and encase his feet in more gentlemanly boots. Such gross and uncalled for abuse is as unnecessary as it is vindictive, and proves most conclusively that the agitators who are running the Dunkin Act campaign have no sympathy and no respect for the working men of this city.

Let every artizan and laboring man of Toronto resent the insult thus cast upon them, and vote against the Dunkin Act—the rich man's law.

Deal Gently with the Rich Man.

Deal in kid gloved hand with the pleasures of the rich man, but show no respect for the privileges of the poor. The wealthy citizen has a legitimate right to his recreation, therefore for him the introduction of the five gallon clause and one dozen bottles. The workingman has no right worthy to be respected, therefore when one of their number dares to mount the platform and express his opinion of the Dunkin Act he is ordered to wash his face, put on genteel boots, and don society clothes. Such was the treatment extended by the men who are running the Dunkin Act in Toronto towards the working man who mounted their platform at the Coliseum in St. John's Ward a few nights ago. Workingmen of Toronto, remember the insult, and vote down the bigots who deny you liberty to act according to your own judgment. We want no rich man's law at the expense of the poor man in Canada. The voting commences on the sixth of August; let your verdict condemn the professional agitators who have no respect for you as a class.

Go home you apology for a Man. Use a bar of soap on yourself, put boots on your feet instead of ventilators, you dirty working man. Advice given by the Rev. Mr. Affleck Dunkinite Missionary in the Coliseum a few nights ago when a working man dared to express his opinion against the Act.