

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
			✓								

THE CAMP FIRE

A Monthly Record and Advocate of the Temperance Reform.

VOL. V. No. 10.

TORONTO, ONT. APRIL, 1899.

25 CENTS PER YEAR

THE SITUATION.

In his letter to the Dominion Alliance the Premier sets out the ground upon which the Government decision was based in the following terms:—"The record shows that the electorate of Canada, to which the question was submitted, comprised 1,233,849 voters, and of that number less than twenty-three per cent, or a trifle over one-fifth, affirmed their conviction in the principle of prohibition."

The conclusion arrived at by the Government is stated as follows:—"In our judgment, the expression of public opinion recorded at the polls in favor of prohibition, did not represent such a proportion of the electorate as would justify the introduction by the Government of a prohibitory measure."

The discussion that has followed the Government decision both in Parliament and outside it, has largely turned upon the question of whether or not the Government was bound by some previous promise and a prohibition majority, to introduce into Parliament a prohibitory measure, and too little attention has been paid to the Premier's argument that the magnitude of the vote was not such as to warrant this action.

The statement of the Premier above quoted, might convey the impression that only "a trifle over one fifth" of the electorate was polled in favor of prohibition. The number of prohibition votes was nearer to one-fourth than to one-fifth of the number of names on the voters' lists. Everybody knows, however, that the number of names on the list is not the number of possible voters. If we deduct the dead men, the duplicates, the absentees, and the other voters who for various reasons could not go to the polls, it is pretty certain that the possible vote would sink below 1,000,000. It is safe to say that at least twenty-eight per cent of the actual electorate voted for prohibition, being a majority of a polled vote amounting to fully fifty-five per cent. of all that was possible.

This was sufficient to warrant the statement made by the Premier on November 2nd that "the vote is under the circumstances a large one." In the contest on the prohibition side there were none of the strong inducements that usually stir men to activity. There were no offices to be filled, no patronage to be secured, no personal benefit to be attained by those who gave their energies to the cause. No one could expect the vote polled under such circumstances to equal the vote polled in ordinary elections.

It must be remembered that in this case electors had to go to the polls specially to vote upon this question. In the provincial plebiscites the voting was at the same time as other elections. The voters were at the polls and had the prohibition ballots tendered to them. This is usually the case with the plebiscites that are frequently taken upon questions submitted to the electors in the United States where such voting is generally necessary to change constitutional state law. The vote in the Canadian Plebiscite was

remarkably large when compared with such votes. It must be remembered also that in the United States the questions submitted are printed on the ballot paper used in voting for political candidates so that every elector deposits a ballot blank or marked, relating to the constitutional amendment submitted.

In November last at the regular California state election, seven constitutional amendments were submitted to the voters. The total number of votes polled for Governor was 284,208, the highest aggregate votes polled for and against any of the constitutional amendments was 149,880, and one amendment that was adopted had polled in its favor only 70,718 votes. The aggregate number of ballots marked in reference to legislation was about fifty per cent. of the number cast, or say about thirty-five per cent. of the possible vote, supposing that seventy per cent. of those actually went to the polls. The state constitution was changed on a vote in which less than thirty-five per cent. of the voters took part, and less than twenty per cent. of the voters recorded themselves in favor of the change, although seventy per cent. of them actually deposited ballots on which the question at issue was submitted.

Hon. Albert M. Todd, Member of Congress for a Michigan constituency recently said that "in his state during ten years there had been twenty-nine referendums submitted to the people and that there was a vote of only an average of ten per cent. of the ballots cast in reference to them."

It would be easy to quote a very large number of such cases all showing that on abstract questions the opinion of the people is expressed and recognized by very small votes.

The City of Toronto has a voters list of persons qualified to vote on money by-laws of not less than 20,000 names. It would naturally be supposed that men would be eager to vote upon the questions which affect the amount of taxation to be imposed upon them. Two money by-laws were submitted to the voters at the municipal election of 1897. The number of votes for and against the by-law aggregating most interest was 7,292. A few months before a similar by-law had been submitted when there was not the element of a personal election to bring the people to the polls, although the voters were directly financially interested in the question submitted and the total vote polled for and against the by-law was only 995.

Even in Switzerland, the home of the Referendum, where people have been trained for many years in direct legislation, and look upon the popular vote as the regular method of settling important questions, the same difficulty is found. The total vote of the Swiss Republic is about 750,000, and the number of votes polled for and against important measures in recent years has frequently fallen below 250,000, or less than thirty-three per cent. of the voters' lists. The Canadian vote in the prohibition plebiscite was forty four per cent.

The percentage-of-possible-vote theory if lived up to would place Sir Wilfred Laurier and his Party in rather an embarrassing position. The Liberal Party claims the right to control the legislation and administer the affairs of the Dominion of Canada in relation to all political questions. The Liberal Party however, is not supported by fifty per cent. of the electorate, nor even by a majority of the electorate. It holds power because of having secured majorities in a majority of the constituencies. Here the prohibitionists have far surpassed it.

In making comparisons between the Plebiscite and the political vote it must be borne in mind that there are seven constituencies in each of which two candidates are elected and in which each elector therefore has ordinarily two votes, only one of which he could use in the Plebiscite. A fair comparison therefore will require a doubling of the possible vote in these seven constituencies to enable us to ascertain the exact per centage that was polled of either the listed vote or the available vote. If this is done we shall find that in the last general election the Liberal Party polled less than twenty-nine per cent. of the voters' list, while Conservatives and Independents polled nearly thirty five per cent of that vote. If the Liberals win by a majority of the constituencies against a majority vote, have not the prohibitionists a right to win by a much larger majority of constituencies against a minority vote.

Putting the percentages of the voters lists polled in both cases in the form of a table we get the following result:—

For the Liberal Party	28 per cent
Against the Liberal Party	35
For Prohibition	22
Against Prohibition	21

Yet the Liberals win but the prohibitionists are beaten, although a twenty-two and a half per cent vote at a special election is a much stronger expression of public sentiment than is a twenty-eight per cent vote taken under the pressure of party excitement, personal feeling and all the other influences that come into play in an election contest. Anyone who calmly considers the situation will say that there is at least as much public opinion in favor of prohibition as in favor of the policy of the Liberal Party.

In the Provinces of Quebec and British Columbia the Liberals polled a larger percentage of the voters' list than did the prohibitionists. In the remainder of the Dominion the percentages of votes polled stood as follows:—

	Liberal Vote	Prohibition Vote
Ontario	24	27
Nova Scotia	33	34
New Brunswick	29	30
Prince Edward Island	36	37
Manitoba	18	25
Northwest Territories	19	27

The vote for prohibition was a very large vote. The ballot box is a register of public opinion showing the proportions in which the people are divided in support of and opposition to questions

and policies and parties. The doctrine that it is a register of the actual number of persons favoring any policy is altogether new in representative government. Under that doctrine no party in Canada could hold power, no question could be decided, no government would be possible. As used in relation to the Plebiscite it is both absurd and unjust. Government has no right to adopt it in relation to the liquor traffic. That traffic stands condemned in spite of desperate efforts to mislead voters, and even in cases to manufacture votes. It is safe to say that the liquor traffic has polled as many votes as it can really command. Why should the Government declare that the legislation of this country must be in harmony with the views of a minority percentage of the electorate, while the views of a majority percentage are ignored? The majority is not strong enough to prevail, but the minority is to have its way.

The grievance of the prohibitionists is intensified when we consider the fact that their asserted weakness exists in only one province and that there the opposition to them was helped by Cabinet Ministers and active politicians with appeals to motives and prejudices that should never have been suggested in a mixed and united community like ours.

Outside of Quebec the prohibitionists are in a majority of 107,948. They polled twenty eight per cent. of the voters list, while their opponents only polled sixteen per cent. They carried the constituencies of 120 out of 148 Members of Parliament. The average majority of votes in these constituencies was over 1,000. They won a ballot box victory such as has never been heard of in Canada before. The Government has not treated them fairly in proposing to do absolutely nothing in view of this wonderful demonstration of public sentiment.

If Quebec is to have what she wants the rest of Canada must have equally fair treatment. Conservative Members of Parliament must respect the views of their constituents. Liberal Members of Parliament are bound to do the same, though perhaps in the present case they are more formally though not more actually committed to such a course. The expressed will of the people cannot be considered to mean anything except the will of those whose will is expressed. The present Minister of Agriculture when in the presence of his Leader, he laid before his Party Convention the plebiscite policy which was enthusiastically approved, stated the meaning of that policy in the following terms:—"I propose to read the resolution which pledges the Liberal Party if returned to power, to give the people of Canada an opportunity to express their views upon this question, and the Government in power must necessarily carry out the expressed will of the people. There is no doubt that this is what the Liberal Party would do, for we know their pledges can be trusted."

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, APRIL, 1899

A DASTARDLY ATTEMPT.

When the late session of the Ontario Legislature was drawing near a close, a bill was introduced by Mr. German, of Welland, proposing to amend the Liquor License law so as to provide that liquor might be sold in hotels on Sundays to "bona fide travellers and lodgers."

This proposal, if carried out, would practically annihilate the law against selling liquor on Sunday. Any person who chose to take a room for a Sunday at a hotel, could purchase and distribute to his friends liquor as freely as he desired. Any person away from home could freely patronize the bar. In these days of bicycling any man who wanted a drink could become a bona fide traveller. Mr. German's plan would make Sunday a day of unlimited liquor selling and disgraceful debauchery.

The vigilant secretary of the Ontario License Holders' Association was on hand at the Parliament Buildings during most of the session. In all probability he was lobbying members and striving to exert influence in favor of the proposed outrage. The license holders had asked the Government to introduce legislation giving them more opportunities for selling liquor. Their request was not granted, so that they could only get their wishes before the House in a Bill introduced by a private member. The Bill introduced went far beyond what the Government was asked to promote.

There was no time to do much by way of stirring up public sentiment. The Bill was printed only a few days before adjournment. The Dominion Alliance promptly took hold of the matter, communicated with members of the Government and sent a strong personal letter to every Member of the Legislature, asking him to oppose this uncalled for and infamous attempt to practically repeal a law that has the endorsement of all good citizens. Leading friends of the cause in different parts of the Province were notified and responded by telegrams to Members of the Government and others, protesting against Mr. German's action in the strongest terms. The Bill did not come again before the House. No doubt the quick action of the Alliance had its influence. It is not likely, however, that the Legislature would have allowed itself to be made the tool of the liquor party as Mr. German desired it to be.

In the incident there is a warning. The liquor traffic is active and unscrupulous. It would sacrifice every institution and custom that our people prize, to increase its own profits and help it on in its selfish preying upon humanity. Only by eternal vigilance can we successfully cope with it.

THE WHINERS.

There are a few friends of the temperance cause whose faith in the movement seems to be very limited and weak. They are with us theoretically, and have the reputation of being on our side. They have however, so little contact with the practical part of our work that they know almost nothing of the strength of conviction that lies behind it. These half-hearted friends sometimes do us more harm than open foes. Claiming to be on our side, they minify our strength and magnify that of our opponents. When the Plebiscite was over, when we had won the greatest victory that the temperance cause has ever seen, when we were in a position of strength, enabling us to demand effective legislation against the cruel liquor curse, these whiners leaped to the front with cries of defeat. Instead of standing by the flag and fighting for principles that are right, they weakly avowed that we were beaten and invited the Government to rob us of the fruits of the victory we had won.

Our cause is based upon justice and benevolence. The liquor traffic has no rightful place in Christian civilization. To claim for it the right to exist until a majority of the people declare against it, is to drag morality down to the level of expediency and claim that a majority of votes can make evil lawful or good unlawful. The whiners go much further than this. They are continually seeking excuses for what is bad and throwing the weight of their influence on the side of wrong, while they claim to be leaders in what is right. Weak hearted allies are more dangerous than open foes.

A STRONG PROTEST.

THE GOVERNMENT DECISION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

Prohibitionists are Insisting upon Their Rights.

The prohibitionists of the Dominion of Canada are united in refusing to accept the decision of the Government that no legislation is to follow the Plebiscite victory. Here and there a few weak-hearted adherents have taken sides with the Government and claim that our victory was a defeat. These, however, are rare exceptions. Unitedly and indignantly the loyal prohibitionists of Canada have denounced the injustice of the Government position, and repudiated the sophistry by which it is defended. We have only space to mention a few of the strong declarations that have been made.

The Executive Committee of the Council of the Dominion Alliance in a series of stirring resolutions reviews the history of the reform, expresses its strong dissatisfaction with the Government decision and calls upon Parliament to carry out the mandate of the people at the polls.

The Temperance Committee of the General Conference of the Methodist Church takes the same ground, criticises the unfair decision and calls upon the people's representatives to carry out the people's will.

The Annual Meeting of the Alliance Legislation Committee at Ottawa, made up mainly of Members of Parliament, by a large majority declares that Parliament should not ignore the demand made, and appoints a committee to plan parliamentary action in harmony with the majority vote.

The Ontario Provincial Grand Division Sons of Temperance declares that prohibitionists have as much right to the legislation they seek as the Members of Parliament have to the seats they occupy, and calls upon members of the Order to insist upon their rights.

The Ontario Provincial Woman's Christian Temperance Union endorses the action of the Alliance and refuses to accept the Government decision that nothing is to come out of the people's declaration against the liquor traffic.

The British Columbia Branch of the Dominion Alliance, expresses its views in a series of very strongly worded resolutions, pressing upon the Government and Parliament the duty unmistakably laid upon them by the mandate of the people, and urging immediate action in response thereto.

Resolutions by Churches, Presbyteries, Committees, Divisions, Lodges, Councils, Unions and all kinds of organizations, as well as strong personal letters, are pouring in upon the Members of Parliament. The temperance press is unanimous in its demand for legislation, and nearly all the religious newspapers of the country definitely take the position that the prohibition vote must not be ignored.

It is a time for decision and a time for action. Friends of the cause are earnestly urged to make their opinions known and their influence felt by letters to the press, by resolutions at meetings and by personal letters to their representatives in Parliament.

PROHIBITION AT OTTAWA.

The principal event in the history of the prohibition movement during the month of March, was the meeting of the Legislation Committee of the Dominion Alliance, which was held in the Railway Committee Room of the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa on March 22nd.

The attendance was remarkably large, about sixty Members of Parliament being present, besides the special members of the Committee appointed by the Dominion Alliance. Hon. A. Vidal, President of the Alliance, occupied the chair. Mr. J. H. Carson of Montreal acted as Secretary.

Mr. F. S. Spence at the request of the Chairman, gave a short outline of the history of the cause since last meeting, referring particularly to the refusal of the Government to introduce a prohibitory measure. He claimed that the vote polled by the prohibitionists was large enough to form a safe basis for effective legislation, this being especially the case in regard to that part of the Dominion outside the Province of Quebec. In this great territory the vote in favor of prohibition was a much larger percentage of the possible vote than what was polled in favor of the Government at the last general election.

Addresses were also made by Messrs G. Taylor, M.P.; T. B. Flint, M.P.; T. D. Craig, M.P.; Dr. P. McDonald, M.P.; Firman McClure, M.P.; A. Broder, M.P.; F. Oliver, M.P.; W. H. Orr and J. S. Carter.

On motion of Mr. McClure, seconded by Mr. Moore, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas, in the opinion of this meeting the vote polled by the electors of Canada in favor of prohibition at the recent plebiscite was so large, and influential and parliament should not ignore the demand thereby made for prohibitory legislation, and whereas the government has declined to introduce and become responsible for such legislation, therefore resolved that a committee of seven be appointed by this meeting to decide upon a plan of action, whereby the views of those in favor of prohibition may be brought directly before parliament at this session."

The following were appointed a committee in accordance with the resolution. Hon. A. Vidal; Dr. T. Christie, M.P.; F. McClure, M.P.; G. W. Ganong, M.P.; T. B. Flint, M.P.; A. H. Moore, M.P. and James McMullen, M.P.

A SAMPLE OF DRINK'S DOINGS.

A Kingston despatch dated March 16th, tells of the death of a traveller in one of the hotels of that city. He was an apparently strong, healthy man, thirty-five years of age, but had been drinking so heavily as to be helpless. He was taken to his room by the hotel proprietor and found there dead next morning.

IMPORTANT.

TORONTO, 1899.

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 ramsacked 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 result. 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,

51 Confederation Life Building,

Toronto

Selections.

TELL THE PEOPLE.

Tell the people we are coming
With the banner of the free;
Tell them Prohibition's marching
To a glorious jubilee.

Tell the father, tell the mother,
In the confidence of truth,
Tell them Prohibition's coming
And will guard the path of youth.

Tell them Prohibition planted
By the hand of truth and light,
And by tears of children watered,
Now is growing day and night.

Tell them patriots now are rising,
Coming forth a mighty throng,
With their ballots, no disguising;
Hear them shout, in speech and song

—The Issue.

THE CONQUEROR.

The barkeeper's wife has a sealskin coat,
But mine has an old plaid shawl;
She has jewels for finger and ear and throat,
But mine has none at all.
Her only ring I stole one night
And pawned for a poisoned drink!
Oh, mother of mine! Bring back the light
Of youth and the power to think!

The barkeeper's child has books and toys—
My children have want and woe;
They never have dwelt in the land of joys
The barkeeper's child may know.
At a tiny doll my baby's eyes
Would dance and her heart would swell,
But I've always taken the price to buy
A cup of the liquid hell.

Oh, the girl I wooed in the good, glad years—
Whose pure lips touched with mine—
I swear to banish her bitter tears
In the strength of a love divine!
And hearts so broken and sad, to-day,
With new-found bliss shall thrill,
For the devil of rum I'll cast away—
God helping me, I will!

—N. T. Advocate.

THE DEVIL'S DRINKING SONG.

Here's a fair, young boy. Hunt him down!
Hunt him down! Hunt him down!
He's his mother's joy. Hunt him down!
We must have recruits; whom it kills little boots.
Hunt him down! Hunt him down!
Hunt him down!
Down! Down!

See that clean young man. Hurl him down!
Hurl him down!
Give him his first dram. Hurl him down!
Hurl him down!
Tell him there's no harm. Let him feel the siren's charm.
Hurl him down! Hurl him down!
Hurl him down!
Down! Down!

And the pure young girl. Drag her down!
Drag her down!
Into fashion's whirl. Drag her down!
Blemish her fair name. Stain her deep with all our shame.
Drag her down! Drag her down!
Drag her down!
Down! Down!

Hear the preacher talk! Pull him down!
Pull him down!
All our plans he'd balk. Pull him down!
Pull him down!
Twist our thumb-screws down, till we starve him out of town.
Pull him down! Pull him down!
Pull him down!
Down! Down!

And the aged mother. Bring her down!
Bring her down!
Cries and tears we'll smother. Bring her down!
Bring her down!
Her gray hairs in woe, to the silent tomb must go.
Bring her down! Bring her down!
Bring her down!
Down! Down!

—Henry R. Cope in Ram's Horn.

"OUT OF THE MOUTH OF BABES."

BY REV. CHARLES HERBERT.

Dr. Andrewes was in his garden at Routh, pondering the position of his affairs with a rueful countenance, for a large proportion of the "practice" he had purchased some time since had transferred itself to another doctor, who had none of the objectionable points which annoyed people in himself.

"I suppose I am a fool," he mused; "no one else would have offended the young squire as I did. But it is better to speak the truth at all costs!"

He had just been called in to see the magnate of the place, who was really suffering from a drinking bout, but expected to be treated for his liver, or anything else to which any common-sense doctor might assign it. However, Dr. Andrewes was not sufficiently suave and abruptly informed Mr. Russell that it was no good his wasting his time in giving antidotes to alcohol. If he would give up stimulating he would take him in hand, but not unless.

Young Mr. Russell's answer had been to curse and rave, in the midst of which Dr. Andrewes walked out, saying:

"If you think better of it, laddie, send for me, and I'll come to you."

That was yesterday, and this morning he was ruminating over his folly in throwing away such a good patient, when their little servant maid, tiny enough in all conscience, but the best they could afford to keep, summoned him indoors. She seemed in an unusual state of excitement.

"Please, doctor, the young squire's come, and wants to see you. I showed him into the parlor, but the children have been in and it's all of a litter."

Dr. Andrewes went in, and the two men met somewhat constrainedly. Mr. Russell had come bent upon a further conversation with the eccentric man, who for once had let him hear the truth, and after a few commonplaces, suggested that Dr. Andrewes should drive back with him to the Hall.

The doctor brightened visibly. "Go?" Of course he would.

He had been thinking of this young fellow ever since he left him the day previously, and wondering how he could be the means of helping him. So, asking his guest to wait a little, he proceeded to his room, to change, and on the way informed his wife, who, good soul, was not altogether pleased.

"I can't go in to him," she said, exhibiting her hands and arms, covered with soap suds. Monday was always washing day with her. They were too poor to put the washing out.

"Never mind," he said; "I'll excuse you. But that room is in an awful mess, dear," he went on ruefully.

"Hark! Whatever was that?" his wife exclaimed. "I do believe that silly girl has let the children run in, and Mr. Russell there, too! O, James, whatever will he think?"

"Think!" returned her husband. "If he's the man to be bored with children, it will do him good. If not, he'll do them good. Leave them alone; I won't be long."

Mrs. Andrewes' forebodings were quite correct. Her two children were in the process of interviewing Mr. Russell, who felt decidedly awkward.

Shyness, however, was no feature of their character. The boy stopped short on the threshold. He was the elder, and more alive to the strangeness of strangers. But his little sister pushed past him, and gliding confidently up to Mr. Russell, laid one hand upon his knee, and looked up interrogatively.

"Well?" said the young squire, bringing out the word as if he were choking, he felt so much at sea.

"Why don't you kiss? You should kiss everybody," said the tiny mite.

Mr. Russell accepted the situation sufficiently to dust her cheek with his moustache.

"Tat ain't a kiss," she said scornfully. "My papa kisses me with his doo lips. Let me kiss you. There!" she continued joyfully, "tat was right on your pimple."

"My pimple!" said Mr. Russell, putting up his hand to see if any undue excrescence had appeared unnoticed.

"Yes; don't you know? Your nose. Papa calls my nose my pimple."

Mr. Russell laughed.

"Tat's right," said the little maid; "everybody laughs at me and Norm."

"Oh, is that Norm?" queried the squire, glad to find a subject for conversation.

"Yes; Norm's my brudder. Come here, brudder. You's not to swing that door; it's naughty."

"Norm" came with one jump, land-

ing on Mr. Russell's toes. Then both laughed aloud.

"Did it hurt? I say, man, what's your name?"

"Russell," he said, stiffly.

"Fain't pretty," she declared, with a shake of her head. "I like mine better. I'm Queenie. He's Norm," with a jerk of her thumb.

"Norman, I suppose you mean?"

"Yes, Norm. Where does you come from? I com'd from heaven. Mamma says so."

"All good little boys and girls come from heaven," chimed in her brother.

"Did you come from heaven, Russell?"

"I don't know," he said miserably.

"Weren't you good, then?" persisted his little tormentor.

"No, I wasn't good," he answered, just for the purpose of saying something.

"Ain't you good now, then?" asked Queenie, with a wistful glance. Mr. Russell felt cornered.

"She don't know," broke in Norm, standing with his hands in his pocket. "Men are always good, of course."

Queenie's lip quivered at her brother's scornful remark.

"Men ain't always good!" she answered. "They drinks nasy beer and ale, and sings loud in the streets. I've seen em," she went on, in a tone of conviction. "Does you drink beer and ale?"

"Sometimes," he said, hesitatingly.

"Oh, you naughty man! How can you?" Then, running to Norm, she said, "Norm, let's say prayers for Russell."

Down these *enfants terribles* knelt, the boy beginning, "Please God"—but his sister pulled him up.

"You be criet; I'll pway."

"No Queenie, I'll pray. You always want to do everything. Girls don't pray; it's only papa's."

"Let your sister pray," said Mr. Russell, amused, in spite of himself, and curious to know what she would say.

Reverently the little hands were folded, and the little eyes shut.

"Please, Dord, Russell is a naughty man. He takes tat nasy beer and ale and sings loud in the streets. Please make him good. 'Sake, amen."

"There," she said, "Dord'll make you good. You won't take tat nasy ale 'gain, will you?"

"No," said Russell, now thoroughly moved.

"You see," said Norm, "Queenie and I tried to sing in the streets the other day, but we hadn't any beer first, so we didn't do it properly. Only tipsy people make a real good noise."

Here Mr. Andrewes came in.

"Ah, my turks have been plaguing you, I see?"

"Not at all; I have been very much amused. They've been praying for me. They think I'm a heathen and publican, I fancy."

Dr. Andrewes looked grave.

"What have you been saying to Mr. Russell?" he said, turning to Norm.

But here Queenie dashed in, the picture of childish excitement.

"Oh, papa, Russell ain't going to take any more nasy beer and ale. He said so."

The doctor laughed.

"They're rabid teetotalers, these children. I hope when they become older they won't put it away with other childish things; shall we go?"

They departed, Mr. Russell stooping to kiss the children before he went, and Queenie followed him to the door, and lifting one little fat finger at him, as he looked back, cried,

"Mind your promise. Don't crack it!"

The conversation with Dr. Andrewes that day had some effect upon Mr. Russell, and when Dr. Andrewes reached home he left behind him a man full of good resolutions, of which time alone would reveal the value.

Some days later Dr. Andrewes drove up to the Hall and asked to see Mr. Russell immediately.

"Why, is anything wrong, doctor?" exclaimed the squire, noticing the man's haggard face.

"My little girl is terribly ill. I'm afraid she can't rally, for she was never very strong and this attack of typhoid fever finds her out. But she keeps asking for you. Will you come and see her? There is nothing to be afraid of in typhoid."

A pathetic recollection of the little figure which a few days before had lifted a fat little finger at him in warning recurred to him, and he consented with alacrity. Softly they crept into the tiny bedroom, where lay the child, with two bright spots on her cheeks, and with shining eyes which seemed to recognise Russell in an instant.

"Russell," she said, "papa says I'm going to Dord 'praps. Sell I tell Him you's kept tat promise?"

"Why, yes," cried Russell. "Bless the child, I haven't even cracked it."

"Tat's right," she murmured. "I was 'fraid you was naughty man." And, turning over, she closed her eyes.

"If she can only sleep well it may be all right yet," said her father. "Somehow she seemed to have you on her mind."

Mr. Russell turned away to hide the feeling which threatened to show itself, and the two men crept out of the room again, leaving the anxious mother watching by her darling. But Queenie didn't die; a long sleep helped her to rally; but Mr. Russell never forgot the scene and in the days of struggle he had yet to go through, the memory of the little one stood between him and failure, crying, "Mind your promise; don't crack it." And he didn't.

He could never do enough for the doctor and his children, who had won him from the curse which had threatened to blight his life so early, and such is the snobbery of human nature that when the good folks of Routh saw the friendship of their squire for the doctor the result was his practice greatly increased, though he still kept up his habit of speaking the truth.—*Alliance News.*

STORY OF A JACK-KNIFE.

More than seventy years ago a young man owned a jack-knife, which he sold for a gallon of rum, and by retailing it by the glass made enough to buy two gallons, and by selling that he was able to increase the quantity he purchased. He got a barrel, then a cask, and at last a large stock, and having a turn for business and industry he became rich—and when he died left \$80,000 to his three sons and one daughter. The daughter married a man who spent her money, and she died. The sons entered into folly and extravagance, and two died of dissipation and in poverty. The last of the family lived for many years on the charity of those who had known him in his prosperity.

He died a short time since, suddenly, in a barn, where he laid himself to take a drunken sleep. On his pockets being examined, all that was found in them was a string and a jack knife.

So a jack-knife began and ended the fortune of that family.

This is a true story; and the father who bought and sold rum, no doubt had plenty of it in his house and on his table. In giving and recommending it to others, his sons learned to like it.

They were like the little boy who was following his father through a field of potatoes. The father several times cautioned his son not to tread on the potatoes.

At last the boy said, "Father, I am walking exactly in your footsteps."

Let every father ask himself, "Do I wish my son to walk in my footsteps?" and let every boy ask his father, "Do you wish me to walk exactly in your footsteps, father?"—*The American Friend.*

CAMPAIGN EQUIPMENT.

There is a hard struggle ahead of Canadian prohibitionists. They will obtain magnificent results from the victory won at the polls in September last. There is, however, hard fighting ahead of us before the people's mandate is embodied in legislation, well enforced.

Anyone who wants to be well equipped for this campaign will act wisely in sending to the CAMPFIRE office **One Dollar**, and in return being credited with a year's subscription to this journal, and also receiving by mail, postpaid, the two valuable works named below.

The Vanguard, all numbers issued, in neat cloth binding, is the most important Canadian contribution yet made to the literature of the temperance and prohibition reform, containing **over 650 pages** full of invaluable argument, facts and statistics, all reliable, fresh and good, fully and carefully indexed.

The People vs. the Liquor Traffic, a set of lectures by the late Hon. J. B. Finch, is one of the most forcible and comprehensive arguments for Prohibition ever made. Special Canadian edition, **240 pages**. Fine cloth binding, price 40 cents.

THE NEW BRUNSWICK PROHIBITORY LAW OF 1855.

The opponents of prohibition are in the habit of citing the New Brunswick Prohibitory Law of 1855, as a specimen of legislation that proved a total failure and was therefore speedily repealed. The Royal Commission made careful inquiry into the history of the enactment, operation and repeal of the New Brunswick Prohibitory Law. A great deal of information regarding these matters was given them by His Honor, Sir Leonard Tilley, Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, and several other witnesses who took part in parliamentary and popular action at the time. From this evidence the following facts are compiled.

The agitation for a prohibitory law was prosecuted vigorously for three years before the Bill was passed. A great number of petitions for prohibition were presented to the Legislature. In 1855 the late Sir Leonard Tilley who was then Provincial Secretary and Clerk of the Crown, introduced into the Lower House, a prohibition measure prepared by friends of the temperance cause. He introduced it as a private member and not on behalf of the Government. After lengthy debates, the Bill was passed by a vote of three-fifths of the members in both branches of the Legislature.

This Act provided that there should be no intoxicating beverages imported, manufactured or sold in New Brunswick after January 1st, 1856, except for medicinal, mechanical or sacramental purposes. When the prohibition thus provided, came into active operation it was met by a vigorous opposition from the liquor party, who had paid little attention to the agitation that preceded the enactment of the measure.

The law was enforced with a great deal of vigor. A number of persons charged with violating it were brought before Justices of the Peace and convictions recorded against them. The most of these cases were tried in the city and county of St. John. Appeals were made to the Supreme Court against the decisions of the Magistrates on the ground of irregularities and improper proceedings. In a number of cases the appeals were sustained because of informalities on the part of the magistrates who were not legal men. The decisions were set aside and the magistrates mulcted in costs of \$300 or \$400 each.

It is easy to understand how this interfered to prevent effective law enforcement. At the same time the liquor party created disturbances amounting practically to riots in the city of St. John during the trial of some liquor cases. Enforcement was vigorous for about six weeks, then the heavy cost to the magistrates and the disturbances of the liquor party caused some revulsion of feeling. Even strong friends of the new law feared that it could not be made effective and that its enforcement was going to be a matter of much difficulty. Taking advantage of the situation, the liquor men threw open their doors and began to sell freely.

The Governor of the Province, Mr. Manners-Sutton, was known to be a strong opponent of the law which he looked upon as tyrannical. He claimed that there ought to be held immediately a general election to ascertain whether or not the people would approve of the measure. The last election had been held in 1854 and the question had been freely discussed at the polls. A number of the Members of the Legislature had been elected mainly on the prohibition issue. Disregarding this fact, the Governor addressed a communication to the Cabinet, stating that he thought the House should be dissolved and the country appealed to. He referred to the fact that some offenders against the law were punished while others escaped and said "When justice ceases to be even handed, it ceases to be justice."

Several Members of the Government had been opposed to the prohibitory law, but when this memorandum was received there was no difference of opinion in the Council. The ground was definitely taken that the law had been in force only three or four months; legal questions regarding it were pending; it ought to have a twelve months' trial; and no action towards dissolution should be taken until the next meeting of the Legislature in 1857. The Governor would not agree with his Council, and sent an order to Sir Leonard Tilley to prepare a proclamation dissolving the

House and calling an election. The Provincial Secretary declined to act upon this request, and the Government sent in their resignation to the Governor stating that they differed with him as to the course to be pursued and declined to continue to be his advisers. The resignation was accepted, the Governor called in a new Council of men who advised him to dissolve the House and an election was ordered.

The action of the Governor was resented by a large section of the people. Another section took the ground that the Governor was within his rights, and the question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of his action became to a certain extent a factor in the campaign. Voters were called upon to stand by the Crown. The liquor party gained by this outcry. They carried on great campaign, making the most of the open sale, the difficulties of enforcement and the disturbances that were caused. As a result the prohibitionists were badly beaten. Only a few of the candidates who supported prohibition were elected. The new Legislature was summoned to meet in July, 1856, and at once repealed the prohibitory law.

It will be noticed that the law was in force for a very short time. The legal difficulties mentioned interfered with its operation, and from the time that the Governor accepted the resignation of his Council and an appeal to the people was ordered, no attempt at enforcement existed. The period of prohibition really only lasted from the first of January to the first of May, and the repealing Act was passed in the month of July.

It is a curious fact worth noting, that the new Legislature although opposed to prohibition, was otherwise much divided. Twenty-one members supported the new Government and twenty were in opposition. When a Speaker was elected the House tied on party questions. The Government found out that one of their supporters was weakening. The defection of this supporter would have put them in a minority. They forestalled his action and again dissolved the House. The Government that had been previously defeated came back from the new elections with a large majority behind them. They wore back in power in about twelve months from the time that the Governor had accepted their resignation. No proposal however, was made for a re-enactment of the prohibitory law.

Many strong prohibitionists claimed, and still claim, that if fairly treated the prohibition law would have vindicated itself and proved a great benefit to New Brunswick. They believe that a fair period of trial and the removal of the temporary defects would have resulted in such a measure of effective enforcement, as would have made prohibition as permanent in New Brunswick as it has been in the adjoining state of Maine.

SLIDING DOWN TOWARD DEEP HOLE.

"Buzz-z-z-z!" went the old saw mill, and Grandpa Jameson ran it. As the sharp saw buzzed away, the heap of sawdust below grew steadily. There was another heap that grew, though at intervals, as the first heap was transferred to it, and this was behind the mill. It was an immense heap, sloping down to the river below, and not far from the base of the heap was "Deep Hole." Grandpa Jameson was careful to cut down this big heap and cart off a section every month, but sometimes, when he was very busy, the removal might be delayed a few days.

The miller knew that this might bring to somebody a danger, for if a person should venture out upon the unstable pile, it would let him down further and further, and what about Deep Hole below waiting to receive him?

"I had a tech of trouble myself," he would say, "for one day I got out there and began to slide down, and might have got into Deep Hole, if a customer had not seen me, run a pole down to me, which I grappled, and then he drew me up."

And the morning of this story, whom did he see playing about the summit of that heap?

His grandson, Henry Jameson.

"Good mornin', Henry!"

"Good mornin', grandpa!"

"Come in, won't you?"

"Yes, sir."

"Well, Henry," asked grandpa, when the boy was in the mill, "what's the news?"

"Nothing, unless you mean my invitation to Mr. William Rogers' dinner party to the boys and their friends tomorrow afternoon."

"Then you're goin'?" Wall, look out for Mr. Rogers' punch bowl. They say he has it out every chance he can get. Does he offer it to the boys?"

"Oh, only sips."

"Sips! Don't you tech it. You get a-goin' and you may not be able to stop."

"But, grandpa, a sip, what harm will that do?"

"But a sip starts. You get a-goin', and will you stop so easy? Every sot once was jest a sipper."

"Oh, grandpa, you—you're to particular."

"Buzz-z-z-z!" went the old saw just then, and it cut through the words of the talkers, and the conversation came to a sudden end.

In a few minutes work was interrupted again, and in the hush of the sawmill, Grandpa Jameson heard a shriek:

"Help—p—p!"

"My!" exclaimed Grandpa Jameson. "It is that boy, I know, in the heap back of the mill!"

He seized a rope lying on the floor, rushed to the rear of the mill, and, looking down the slope of the big heap, he saw a boy with scared, staring eyes, clawing at the heap with his hands and trying to plant his feet firmly, but all in vain! Below was Deep Hole, black and threatening!

"Here, Henry," shouted the miller, "grip this fast!"

Oh, how good looked the rope that came sliding down the slope of the heap and touched Henry's outstretched hands eagerly clawing away. How he gripped that rope!

"Hold on tight, and I'll haul ye up!" Grandpa Jameson assured him. "I've got some help."

It was Mr. Rogers who, passing by, heard the shout, and came just in time to pull on the rope.

Up—up slowly came the frightened boy, and he finally stood in safety in the mill.

"Look out, Henry!" said Mr. Rogers.

"Look out another time." "There, Henry, I am going to cart off that stuff to-day," said grandpa, when alone with Henry. "And you, when you go to Mr. Rogers' dinner party, don't sip any punch. When one starts, they may go sliding down towards Deep Hole—the drunkard's deep hole."

The morrow came. The dinner party assembled. The host was in excellent spirits.

"I welcome the boys and their friends," said he, "and I want you all to take with me a little—a little of this punch."

A number of the boys thoughtlessly lifted and sipped the proffered glass.

Henry shook his head.

"Henry," called out Mr. Rogers.

"No, I thank you, sir."

"Why—why not?"

"You saw me back of the mill, sliding down, yesterday. What, if I begin now, and should slide down, and—"

"Nonsense!" said Mr. Rogers, pettishly.

He looked mortified though, and did not further press the matter, which should not have been pressed at all.

Henry Jameson told his mother the whole story when he went home.

He was busy telling it to her, when the outside door opened and somebody came into the little entry leading to the sitting-room where Henry and his mother were seated.

"That was the reason, mother, why I did not take that punch—"

"I am glad you did not, Henry."

"Why, I seemed to see Deep Hole right before me, and I had begun to slide toward it, I thought. I stepped back, quick, I tell you; I suppose I offended Mr. Rogers. I am sorry for that."

"Oh, don't be sorry!" said the person in the entry, now coming forward. It was Mr. Rogers himself.

"Excuse me! Nobody came to the door when I knocked, and I thought, Mrs. Jameson, you would excuse an old neighbor for entering, as I wanted much to see Henry's mother, and tell her about Henry's excellent stand yesterday. I have thought it over, and I, too, am going to stop this business, give up my punch and everything else in that line, for what if I should get into Deep Hole?"—*Presbyterian*.

A WITTY SPEECH.

In an address on the "management" of public houses, at the recent Scottish Temperance Convention, Mr. Jas. Guthrie, J. P., of Brechin, made as many points as there are prickles on a porcupine, as well as enlisted "apt alliterations' artful aid." Here is an interesting specimen or two:

"If you want the life that is long, if you wish to be healthy and strong, and happy as you go along, then don't drink. This dealing in alcohol from the babe to the bar, and on to the gallows, begins with destruction, tends to destruction, and ends in destruction. It ruins both customer and seller, and while it may be a legalized trade, is not a legitimate one. This is not trade; it is swindle. Pharaoh's daughter took a little prophet out of the water, the publican takes a big prophet out of the beer. Alcohol is certainly good for cleaning silver, especially out of a working-man's pocket. As to the public management of a public-house for the public benefit, it is false. The only way to reform the traffic is to manage to do without it. We want management to extinguish; they want management to perpetuate. There is nothing easier than to believe a lie, unless to tell one, and half the truth is sometimes worse than a whole lie. A liar may be reformed, but not a lie, unless you reform it off the face of the earth. I have no personal objection to the publican. We are told to love our enemies; but we are never told to like them. So, though I love the publican as a man, I hate him as a publican. Yet he claims compensation. Zaccheus also believed in compensation. Now, Zaccheus was a publican. But it was the other way round. He called it restitution. That shows a mighty difference between Zaccheus and our modern publican. That is not the only difference, for, as you know, Zaccheus was really a factor; he collected the taxes. Our publican is a malefactor; he creates the taxes. The one lived off the taxation of the people; the other makes his living off the intoxication of the people. Further, we read about Zaccheus that he was a little man and climbed a tree, and then made haste to come down. But none of these things are true of our publican friends of to-day. They are big men, do not climb trees, and if ever up a tree they don't come down in a hurry. One distinction, more important, I have forgot. Zaccheus, you remember, could not get forward for the press; that is more and more unlike the publican of our time, for we see by every newspaper, that instead of not getting forward for the press, why, it is the press nowadays, that puts the publican forward."—*National Advocate*.

CAUSE AND CURE.

The drunkard who votes for prohibition is a freer man than the total abstainer who carries water on both shoulders and then votes for liquor, or to put it in the harness of high license. Just as the saloon-keeper must answer for every glass he sells, so we must answer for voting for liquor. It is simply a question of whether or not we are in favor of the saloon. It isn't a question of high license. The quibble that prohibition does not prohibit has nothing to do with it. The law against stealing does not prevent stealing. The same power that puts the amendment on our constitution will attend to the enforcement of the law. It is our duty to make it as difficult to get liquor as it is to get poison.—*Hon. J. Wannaker, U.S. Postmaster-General*.

WHISKEY DUTY FREE.

In answer to a question by Sir Wilfrid Lawson in the British House of Commons recently, the Secretary of the Treasury stated that it was a general custom for owners of distilleries to issue to their workmen a certain daily allowance of spirits, and that they were not required to pay duty upon the quantity so used.

EARLY CLOSING.

The report of the English Government Licensing Commission has not yet been issued, but sundry announcements have been made regarding the recommendation that it is expected to contain. Among these is one for earlier closing of public houses, the licensing authorities to be given some option in the matter.