

The Canada Citizen

AND TEMPERANCE HERALD.

A Journal devoted to the advocacy of Prohibition, and the promotion of social progress and moral Reform.

Published Every Friday by the

CITIZEN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Office, 8 King Street East, Toronto.

Subscription, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, strictly in advance.

This number is sent to many friends whose names are not yet on our subscription list. Will they kindly aid our enterprise by forwarding their dollars and addresses? It is desirable to subscribe early, as we propose making every number well worth preserving for future reference and use.

Subscribers will oblige by informing us at once of any irregularities in delivery.

Subscriptions may commence at any time. Back numbers of the present volume can be supplied.

Agents Wanted Everywhere.

All communications should be addressed to

F. S. SPENCE, - - - MANAGER.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, AUGUST 24, 1883.

WE very much appreciate, and are sincerely grateful for the many commendations that THE CANADA CITIZEN is receiving from the public in general, and our brethren of the press in particular. We shall do all in our power to merit a continuance of the approval that has been so warmly and kindly expressed.

GAMES AND PRIZES.

A friend has sent us a programme of the Picnic held at Carlton Grove by the Sons of England Benevolent Society, on the Toronto Civic Holiday. Among the prizes awarded for success in various athletic performances, we notice that liquors and cigars occupy a very prominent place. At least *seventeen* of the enumerated prizes were quantities of intoxicating drink. Bottles of brandy, kegs of lager, &c., figure conspicuously all through the list. One of the prizes offered in the "Married Ladies' Race" is "one pound tea, bottle gin, bottle whisky." Here is the list for the "Picnic Games Committee Race":

1. 1 assorted hamper; 1 ham.
2. 15 gallons ale; 1 box cigars.
3. 8 gallons keg lager; 1 box cigars.
4. 2 bottles brandy; 1 bottle Scotch whisky.
5. 1 album.

We did not think that there existed in Canada a society that would do what the S. of E. has done. To call together for a day of happiness and fun a gathering of people of all ages, ranks and sexes, and then distribute among them under the guise of something worthy striving for, agencies of incitement to debauchery and crime of every kind. While the whole country is standing aghast at an unusually terrible record of violent deeds under the excitement of drink, a "Benevolent Society" is using its influence to encourage the use of the cause of this violence and crime; actually holding up this ruin-working poison as something worthy the efforts of our young men to secure, a meet reward for deeds of manliness and strength. Surely the S. of E. society cannot have fairly considered the position in which it was about to place itself when such a programme was announced. It is true that these prizes were donated

to the society for the purpose for which they were used, but that does not exonerate the society that used them. Brewers and drink-dealers can afford to be generous in giving away liquor that creates the appetite out of which they make their money.

We earnestly hope that neither this society nor any other, will ever again so far forget what is due to its position and name, as to degrade itself by being to any extent at all a party to proceedings of which, we have no doubt, the better part of its members are heartily ashamed.

The question is worthy of examination: Is the law not violated in such cases as that just criticised? The society named charged a fee for admission to its grounds, and the chance of winning a keg of beer was one of the considerations for which the entrance fee was paid. Would a man, who is not licensed, be permitted to charge admission to his house, and then give liquor to those who had paid that fee, or even to a part of them? At any rate, the spirit and intent of the law is violated, whenever an unlicensed party gets money and furnishes liquor in return, no matter what sophisticated pretext he can invent to make it appear that such furnishing is not a sale. If the law is wanting in technical details to meet such cases, we earnestly hope that our friends in legislative positions will see that this defect is removed at the very earliest opportunity.

THE MURDER OF MARONEY.

Charles Morgan is in gaol awaiting his trial for murder, and almost certain sentence to the gallows; the grave has closed over the remains of the murdered Maroney, and his home is robbed of its light and support, the community has held up its hands in horror at the awful occurrence, the press has freely commented upon it, fairly and unhesitatingly denouncing the LIQUOR TRAFFIC as the cause of the terrible tragedy; everybody has said "something ought to be done;" and yet the maddening agencies of this unholy institution keep on in full blast. Ten thousand of them all over Canada to-day, under the sanction and license of law, are depraving the community and producing appalling results of which the recent murder in Toronto is only a specimen. The daily *Globe* in an article, that we quote in another column, says, "If the traffic which produces such results cannot be completely abolished, let us by all means have as few drinking places as possible." We feel more inclined to say, "Since making the drinking places few has failed to suppress intemperance, by all means let the traffic be completely abolished." We have burdened our statute books with laws for the limitation of this traffic, and in spite of them all its ravages still go on. Some other plan ought to be tried. It is easier to prohibit evil than to regulate it. It is *safer and easier* to get rid of a mad dog than to confine him to certain streets and license him to do them all the mischief he can. A law that would stamp the whole traffic as immoral and intolerable, that would prohibit it altogether, would be more easily enforced than a law that sanctions it, elevates it to the position of a business, encourages it up to a certain point, and then undertakes to stop it at that point. A deadly pestilence is raging in our midst; law has recognized its character and our peril, and attempts to protect us by limiting the plague to certain localities, and licensing its ravages within prescribed bounds. The attempt at restriction is nearly as futile as the sanction is immoral. We agree with *The Globe*, that if Prohibition were impossible, it would be wise to limit the number as far as possible, but common sense will say "that is not very far." If you can limit, you can prohibit; if prohibition is impracticable, you cannot restrict. The fact that limitation has done some good, proves that prohibition would be a success to even a greater extent. It is as much easier to totally prohibit than to partially prohibit, as it is easier to stand upon two feet than to stand upon one.