

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	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE CAMP FIRE.

A Monthly Record and Advocate of the Temperance Reform.

VOL. VIII. No 10.

TORONTO, ONT. APRIL, 1902.

25 CENTS PER YEAR

Every one who receives this paper is respectfully requested to read every part of it carefully. It is a journal that no Canadian temperance worker can afford to be without. The subscription price is almost insignificant. In the present campaign for prohibition legislation in Ontario it will be of intense interest and great value.

ELECTORAL ACTION.

We strongly urge our friends to carefully consider and promptly act upon the prohibition Manifesto that has been issued by the Alliance.

Too much importance cannot be placed upon the important duty of immediate electoral action to secure the return of a legislature that will represent the public opinion of Ontario better than did the legislature whose term of office has just expired.

In the coming campaign, strenuous efforts will be made to convince the people that the government policy on the liquor question is right and not antagonistic to the true interests of the temperance cause. The voting requirement precedent to the bringing into operation of prohibition has in it a plausibility that is better evidence of the skittishness than of the good faith of its authors. It may by clever presentation be made to appear attainable and prudent.

Our workers must not be misled. The Ontario Liquor Law is a well-framed and effective act. The conditions on which it may be brought into operation are undoubtedly favorable to the liquor party and exceedingly difficult for prohibitionists to attain. The prohibitory law with the unfair referendum attachment may fairly be said to be legislation in the liquor interest.

The requirement of votes to be polled is unreasonable. The time of voting is not the time that is convenient and desirable. The measure as it stands is not a fulfilment of the Government's pledges. Had the Referendum Act been amended as Mr. Marter proposed, it would have been a practicable measure of attainable prohibition. Those who voted for Mr. Marter's amendments are therefore definitely ranged in favor of reasonable temperance legislation, and those who opposed him are ranged as voting for conditions favorable to the liquor traffic.

Mr. Marter's action has given us an issue which must settle the matter of whether a candidate is or is not satisfactory to prohibitionists as far as the temperance question is concerned. Prohibitionists have a right to support Mr. Marter and have a right to support any good candidate who will take Mr. Marter's position, as against any of the Liberal or Conservative members who

opposed the Marter amendments of the legislature.

Every candidate nominated ought to be definitely placed. Prohibitionists ought to know who are friends and who are foes of the cause they advocate. There may be cases in which both candidates will commit themselves to stand by prohibition in the legislature. Only in such cases are prohibitionists free to follow their party preferences. Where one candidate is with us our duty is clear and imperative. Where no party candidate can be relied upon, the duty of independent action, if at all practicable, is equally clear.

The only representative we can rely upon is the man who, like Mr. Marter, will refuse to accept party dictation on the prohibition question. Our cause can only win through the election of men who in this matter will be "independents" if their party organization opposes the effective legislation which the people have endorsed and which is "the only right legislative remedy" for the drink evil.

THE MANITOBA VOTE.

The result of the voting in Manitoba on April 2nd, was what might have been expected from the peculiar condition of affairs in that province.

The Manitoba Liquor Act was passed in 1900 to come into operation on June 1st, 1901. The question of the constitutionality of the measure was submitted to the courts and, this question not being settled when the provincial legislature met in 1901, that body passed an Act providing that the coming into operation of the law should be deferred to a date to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The general expectation and the understanding was that the government would bring the Act into operation if it were declared valid by the Privy Council.

In November last the Privy Council rendered the final judgment declaring the Liquor Act within the power of the provincial legislature, and prohibitionists confidently expected to have the measure put into operation during the present year. Instead of doing this the Manitoba Government adopted the policy of submitting to a popular vote the question of bringing the Act into force. The legislature approved this policy and the result was "The Referendum Act, 1902" which provided that a vote should be taken on the question, "Are you in favor of bringing the Liquor Act into force on the first day of June 1902?"

The Referendum Act further provided that the Lieutenant Governor in Council should issue an order bringing the Liquor Act into force if this Act should be approved by forty-five per cent. of the electors entitled to vote on the question, or sixty per cent. of those voting if sixty per cent. of all entitled voted, or sixty-two and a half per cent. of those voting.

A very largely attended provincial Convention of prohibitionists called by the Manitoba Branch of the Dominion Alliance, denounced the proposed referendum and called upon prohibitionists to ignore it and refuse to

vote on the question. The Alliance policy was to stay away from the polls at the time of the referendum and to unite in electoral action to defeat at next general election the government that failed to put the liquor law into operation.

Later on some prohibition workers who were dissatisfied with the action of the Convention formed an organization called the Manitoba Prohibitory League, and urged the electors to go to the polls and do their best to poll a sufficient vote to bring the Liquor Act into operation. Prohibitionists were thus divided into two parties, one party campaigning to induce prohibition voters to stay at home, and the other party urging them to vote.

There is little doubt that prohibition sentiment in Manitoba is strong enough to have met the requirements of the Referendum Act. The prohibitionists could have polled sufficient votes to have met the conditions required for the issue of the proclamation bringing the Liquor Act into force. The Alliance, however, took the ground that enforcement of the law could not be expected from a government so hostile to prohibition as the present one, and that the cause of prohibition would be best served by the election of a legislature committed to the policy of enacting a law without any further popular voting upon the question. The League favored action to bring prohibition immediately into operation.

The liquor traffic took advantage of the division of temperance workers, to win a nominal victory at the polls. Immense quantities of anti prohibition literature were circulated. A well planned and vigorous anti prohibition campaign was carried on. Money was freely used wherever it could be made effective. While temperance workers disputed whether it was wiser to vote for prohibition or abstain from voting altogether, the united liquor party appealed to all classes to vote against the Liquor Act.

The result, as might have been expected, was a nominal victory for the liquor party. The Alliance did not succeed in inducing prohibitionists as a body to stay at home, the League did not succeed in inducing the prohibitionists as a body to go to the polls. No doubt some of the arguments used in favor of abstention from voting for prohibition told also in favor of the vote against prohibition. So far as reported the liquor party seemed to have polled about 19,000 votes and the prohibitionists about 13,000.

In the plebiscites of 1891 and 1898 the prohibitionists polled very great majorities and no doubt would have achieved a similar result had they been united in the recent campaign. The figures of the recent vote will be sent all over the world and will convey the impression that there has been a great turn-over in public opinion. The explanation will not go with the figures, and the real opinion of Manitoba will be badly misrepresented.

For the next two years liquor favoring politicians in Manitoba will claim that the people are opposed to prohibition,

and they may go as far as to remove the prohibitory law from the statute books altogether. The bringing into operation of prohibition will be indefinitely postponed, the prohibitionists will be divided and weakened on account of their recent dispute.

The situation however, will be changed if, as the Alliance workers expect, they can unite the temperance men of Manitoba to overthrow the government at the next election, making the prohibition question a definite issue at the polls.

The Manitoba incident has in it much of instruction for Ontario prohibitionists in the present crisis. It makes manifest the wisdom of the unanimous decision of the conference that resolved to do all that can be done to secure a prohibition victory in the Ontario referendum on December 4th.

A CANTEN AVOCATE

There will be a great deal of indignation over the recently published annual report of Major General O'Grady Haley, General Officer commanding the Canadian Militia in which he goes out of his way to advocate beer canteens at the annual militia camps.

Some of the highest British military authorities are unhesitating in their condemnation of the supplying or intoxicating liquor to soldiers. The United States Congress has put legislation prohibiting beer canteens into the most definite and effective form and a campaign to secure its repeal has signally failed.

The action of Major General O'Grady Haley will meet with universal condemnation throughout the Dominion of Canada in which temperance is stronger than in any other civilized country. The sale of intoxicating liquor of any kind at military camps is now illegal and the only change that Canadian sentiment will tolerate is a change in the direction of a more rigid enforcement of the regulations making it so.

The imprudent recommendation of Major General O'Grady Haley in favor of the establishment of drinking facilities at Canadian Military Camps is found on pages 31 and 32 of his Annual Report for the year 1901 and is in the following terms:—

"I would not on any account permit the sale of spirits in the canteens during annual drill, but I must here most strongly protest against a system that forces a soldier, if he needs a glass of beer to resort to the saloons and drinking shops of the nearest town where there is no control over either the quality, nature, or quantity of the liquor supplied him. The effect of this regulation is to largely increase the amount of drunkenness in camp, and it is to easy to show why this is so.

"In a military canteen all liquor has to be consumed on the premises and, if proper supervision is exercised, no man should be served with more than is good for him. But what happens under the existing system of prohibition? The man who would have been contented with his glass of ale or beer had he been able to procure it in camp, has to walk some distance to get his drink, probably takes whiskey instead of malt liquor, and very often returns to camp with a bottle of bad whiskey under his coat, which he takes to his tent, and proceeds to make his comrades intoxicated."

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, 1902

DRINK

In a recent issue, the New Voice of Chicago, edited by John G. Woolley, discusses the murder of Bridget Kilroy, reported on another page of this paper, and makes an appeal based thereon, to Bishop Potter, Dr. Rainsford and other prominent clergymen and scientific men who lately have been arguing against prohibition and prohibitionists. From this forcible and personal appeal, we clip the following paragraphs, only stopping to say that the liquor traffic in Ontario does the same work that the liquor traffic does in the United States:

"We respectfully call the attention of these gentlemen to the tragic death of Bridget Kilroy, floor scrubber and woman of general work, drunkard's wife and the mother of a drunkard's children, lying dead upon the floor of a basement tenement of the city of Boston on the morning of the Sabbath day, January 26, in the year of Christ 1902.

"Gentlemen, upon various occasions in public addresses and in the public prints, on dates more or less recent, you have given utterance to views concerning the saloon and concerning the use of alcoholic drinks, to which we have felt obliged to take exceptions, and the fallacies of which it has seemed to us necessary to point out. Concerning these views we raise no discussion at the present time. We will allow, formally, of course, and merely for the sake of argument, your contention. Let it be taken for granted that the prohibitionist is a fraud and a hypocrite, as Bishop Potter has insisted; let it be accepted without dispute that the saloon is a beneficent institution and has come to stay, as Dr. Rainsford has told the public; let it be conceded that the encouragement of beer drinking, taking place in certain of our institutions of learning, notably in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, arises from the best of motives; let it be accepted as scientific truth that alcohol is a food, valuable both in sickness and in health, as Dr. Atwater and his disciples contend; let all these things be granted upon your side of the contention, and in the face of them all, and in recognition of them all, we do you to wit the lot of Bridget Kilroy.

"It was the saloon that killed Bridget Kilroy; it was the drink that choked out her life, pounded and kicked her body into a mass of wounds and bruises. The saloon,

gentlemen, that you praise, conditionally, it is true, but praise none the less; the drink, gentlemen, that you defend, under limitations, of course, but defend none the less! The home of the Kilroys, bare, cheerless, poverty stricken, a place of suffering and sorrow, a place where hungry children cried for food and little ones shivered for lack of clothing, a place where a father and husband forgot his duty to his wife and children, where a despairing mother, in the last extremities of anguish fought day by day to merely continue the torture of life for herself and her little ones — that home, a fit place for the commission of such a crime, a place ready prepared, as it were, for such a scene of blood and violence — that home, gentlemen, was the product of the American saloon system, as clearly marked as such, as well recognized as such, as if the saloon's "hall mark" had been stamped upon it. It was not only a product of the saloon system, but it was merely one of the innumerable host of similar products, such as the saloon, to the knowledge of all men, constantly and unceasingly creates.

"We call to your attention further, gentlemen, that no other agency known to men creates such places. Not poverty alone, not ignorance alone, not wickedness alone, makes a place so forsaken of God and man, so remote from heaven and the possibility of good, so elected by the devils and hell, as a drunkard's home. But the poverty, the ignorance and the wickedness of the saloon make such places by the uncounted thousands.

"When Michael Kilroy reeled home in the early hours of the holy Sabbath of Sunday, January 26, in the Christian city of Boston, his pockets empty of the money that he promised to his wife to buy the clothing for lack of which his children were freezing; when he answered her appeal for the fulfilment of his promise with a blow that knocked her to the floor; when he choked, with his fingers upon her throat, her appeal for mercy; when he kicked her with his heavy boots, and she about to become the mother of another child; when he sat for hours, unmoved, listening to her moans and watching her sufferings; when he brutally mistreated the children who would have brought her help; when he struck away the water that her little daughter was lifting to her bloody, thirsting lips—it was drink, gentlemen—the drink that Professor Atwater tells us is food—the drink that you gentlemen recommend in "moderation", that made him do it; and neither in earth nor hell has any other agency been found, in the history of the whole human race that inspired men to such deeds.

"But drink, gentlemen, alcoholic drink, not only made Michael Kilroy do that brutal, devilish deed, but has transformed uncounted thousands of men into fiends of the same character and has driven them to deeds equally brutal. Drink, gentlemen, has inspired tragedies so commonly and in such multitude, that the public scarcely pauses to notice their occurrence. Drink, gentlemen, is to-day preparing more men for just such deeds as that; and you know, and we know, and the world knows, that it will take boys from your churches, boys from your schools, aye, God pity you, perhaps boys from your homes, and will make them into such brutes to work such crimes

in future years on women who to-day are lovely and loving girls

"It was only twelve days before the butchery in that Boston tenement that Vincent Vincelsk came home drunk in Pittsburg and chopped his wife and little children to death with a rail cutter. It was only thirteen days before that John Blissett, of Detroit, drunk, emptied his revolver into his wife's body and poured kerosene over her and stood with lighted match to make her a burnt offering to drink when the police broke in upon him. It was just one month and a day before that a father in Indiana came home drunk, sought to kill his wife with a hatchet and was shot dead by his son.

"But why go on with such a list? The cases are innumerable; and before Michael Kilroy came home to kill Bridget, you and we and everybody in the whole land knew that such a man, because of the drink traffic, would come home and kill his wife, and that the terrible procession of crime would keep right on.

"Gentlemen, we bring no accusation against you; we question the motives of none of you; but, as if in the presence of the dead, before the intelligent people of the land, and before God in high heaven, we submit that amid the crying of the blood of Bridget Kilroy, as its voice rolls like thunder to the judgment seat of a just God, the naming of your names is heard."

LAW ENFORCEMENT.

On March 18th a strong delegation representing the Prince Edward Island Branch of the Dominion Alliance, waited upon the Provincial Government and presented a petition asking for more vigorous enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act. In reply the Premier expressed himself thoroughly in favor of law enforcement and promised to give careful consideration to the details of the petition submitted.

LORD ROSEBERY'S VIEWS.

In his great speech a few weeks ago at Liverpool, Lord Rosebery made the following reference to the Government Temperance Bill:—

"But what did the Home Secretary say in introducing that bill? He said he brought it in because as Home Secretary he could say this, that nine-tenths of the crime that came under his notice was due to the curse of drink. If that be so, what a damning condemnation for his Majesty's Government. For six years and a half they have exercised supreme and uncontrolled power in Great Britain and Ireland. Knowing all the time that nine-tenths of the crime of Great Britain was due to the curse of drink, they have not lifted up a finger to deal with that intolerable curse—worse than plague or pestilence—beneath them. They have not lifted up a finger to remedy it; they have flouted and jeered in the mouth of Lord Salisbury at the efforts of those who did so.

"In that course of action, or inaction, they have received the blind, the unswerving and the uncriticising support of the Parliamentary Liberal Unionists. To the Liberal Imperialists these matters are questions of Empire. They are questions of Empire as truly as are any questions of territory, because they relate to the well-being and development of the race, which is to animate, encourage and develop that Empire. In my belief the true policy of Imperialism is one that relates not to territory alone, but to the race as well. The imperialism that, grasping after territory, ignores the conditions of an Imperial race, is a blind, a futile, and an effete Imperialism."

IMPORTANT.

TORONTO, 1902.

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.**

We are embarking on a campaign for prohibition legislation in which the liquor traffic will do its utmost to block, delay, and if possible prevent our securing the enactment and enforcement of useful 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. We must keep up our 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 uninterrupted, 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.

THE WAY IT WORKS

A SPECIMEN OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC RESULTS

One More Victim Laid on the Altar of Law-Protected Evil.

WHAT LIQUOR IS AND DOES.

It is not pleasant to read or write of the revolting tragedies that are every day enacted in some part of our fair country as the direct result of the legalized facilities for the supplying of strong drink. Every issue of the "Camp Fire" could be filled with records of such cases. To read the record would be simply to tell what everybody knows occurs and names and dates would harrow the feelings of the already sorely tortured victims of this terrible evil. As an instance, however, to remind our readers of the kind of ruin this evil works, we take the following report from a recent Boston daily paper. The survivors of the tragedy are strangers to us and it is not likely that this statement will affect them, while it may be useful in reminding our readers of the nature of the liquor traffic which Sir Oliver Mowat said is the cause of three-fourths of the crime that curses our country. The Boston Post says:—

Mrs. Bridget Kilroy died in her home in the basement of 200 Marion street, East Boston, yesterday forenoon, supposedly from the effects of blows and kicks administered by her drunken husband, Michael J. Kilroy, who is held on the charge of murder. Kilroy is a big coal heaver, and a few months ago was sentenced to a month in the house of correction for wife beating.

Five children, the eldest a boy of thirteen, were witnesses of the assault on their mother, and for hours the two eldest were the sole guardians of the corpse after their brutal father had left the house.

Kilroy, according to the neighbors, was always in a quarrelsome mood when he had been drinking, which was usually whenever he could obtain the money.

He worked two or three days last week and was paid off Saturday night. About 11.30, after the saloons had closed, he returned to his home, three ill lighted rooms in the basement of the house. The family had been living here but a few weeks, as Kilroy paid his rent so irregularly that he was forced to move at short intervals.

Mrs. Kilroy went out washing and cleaning, doing any work that she could find to earn money with which to feed her children, but this was not much.

The wife had been watching for her husband all of the night, as she knew that he was to be paid off, and she had promised to give her money to buy the children clothes, which they sorely needed.

But the coal heaver had spent most of all of his earnings in the saloons, and when he was asked for money he answered with a blow, knocking his wife down.

Maime, aged 13, and Mamie, aged 9, were awake at their father's entrance, and the sound of his loud, angry voice, aroused the other three children, who had been sleeping on the couch.

Mrs. Kilroy struggled to her feet and put up her hands to ward off the attack, crying: "Don't, Mike; you will kill me!"

But Kilroy, crazed with liquor, was merciless. Blow after blow he struck her, and when she fell, unable to rise, he kicked her with his heavy boot. The five children standing about, wide-eyed and frightened.

When the wife and mother lay upon the floor, bleeding from a dozen cuts, moaning and helpless, Kilroy sank into a chair and surveyed his work moodily.

Mamie Kilroy started on a run for the door to seek the police, but with an oath her father was upon her

and flung her heavily into a corner. A dash by the 13-year-old son met with a similar treatment.

Until nearly 4 o'clock the woman lay upon the floor suffering untold agony. In a few months she was to have become a mother again, but her pitiable condition did not touch the heart of her husband.

The girl Mamie hurried the other children into another room and put them to bed, soothing them to sleep like the little mother she was to them.

When the last pair of eyes were securely closed she tiptoed back to the kitchen, where her brother and father were with her dying mother.

Once Mrs. Kilroy came to herself sufficiently to ask for some water. Her husband did not stir, but little Mamie ran to her mother's assistance. The woman raised herself a little to receive the eagerly awaited draught, but before her bloodstained lips touched the edge of the dipper Kilroy struck it away, spilling the water over the floor.

"If she wants a drink let her git up an' git it," he told Mamie.

Fainter and more faint came the moans of the dying woman, until at last all was hushed in the room save the heavy breathing of the man and the stifled sobs of the children.

Kilroy called to his son, and though the giant could have lifted the corpse easily, he forced the boy to aid him in lifting the woman onto the couch.

The gray light of morning began to stream in through the low basement windows before there was any change in the house. Returning day seemed to rouse Kilroy, who got up and went out after threatening the children should they leave the house.

For four hours the boy and his sister were left alone with their dead. About 10 o'clock Mrs. Mary Boyan, who lives in the rear of 298 Marion street, sent her little girl over to the Kilroys' for some water. The child came back with startling news so that Mrs. Boyan hastened over.

She found the two children of her neighbor sobbing on her dead body. Under Mrs. Boyan's direction the boy hurried to notify the police.

The sight that confronted her was enough to turn the most hardened sick at heart. There were jagged wounds on the woman's head and face. Her throat was discolored and showed where strong fingers had pressed their way into the flesh. Her body was black, blue and bruised. Appearances indicated that she had been kicked heavily on her sides.

The father and mother slept on a couch in the kitchen. Besides the two sleeping places there was a chair or two, the remnants of a table, a few cracked pieces of crockery and a bit of a stove. Nothing else except dirt was in any of the rooms. Not long ago there were two more occupants of this place called home by the Kilroys, but illness had ended in their death.

Kilroy had made no effort to escape, but had wandered about the neighborhood. When apprehended he was on Havre street and said that he was on the way to give himself up.

The boy Johanie was also locked up by the order of Captain Irish, to be held as a witness.

The other children, Mamie, aged 9; Frankie, aged 8; Lizzie, aged 2, and Joseph, aged 1, were taken in by Mrs. James H. Quinn of 218 Marion street. They will eventually be taken to St. Vincent's Home.

FRUITS OF THE TRAFFIC.

The career of the Biddle brothers is deplorable reading and the clos-

ing scenes of it an indelible disgrace to this continent and the twentieth century. Drink has primarily to answer for it that they were criminals at all.

A worse environment for youth than theirs it is impossible to conceive. They were born some thirty years ago at Amherstburg, in Ontario, where their father kept a saloon locally known as "Hell," and after he died their mother's brother took them to live with him.

Neighbors say that this uncle was a victim to this "Hell," and afterwards became the terror of the neighborhood. He used to go home crazy drunk, curse like a demon, and beat the boys brutally for no other reason than to gratify an appetite for cruelty. He frequently drove them out of the house to beg or steal from the neighbors, and the last scene of their home life was when in a drunken frenzy he threatened to shoot them, but changed his mind and blew out his own brains in the presence of the trembling orphans.

Prohibition would probably have prevented this and the subsequent tragedies. Those who do not believe in prohibition have probably some theory by which drink or the drunkard should be dealt with. This, however, is the way things are happening under our laws as they are. All the victims are dead now and their record is a memorable and horrible warning.—Montreal Witness.

THE DRINK TRAFFIC AT WORK.

The following few samples of the drink demon's work are culled at random from the multitude of cases appearing in the columns of the newspapers. Strange work for "a good creature of God" to produce. A system which produces such fruit should not be countenanced or supported by any true patriot. Of course the traffic is legal—but it is not right, and should be pulverised.

An Edinburgh man assaulted his bed-ridden mother with a large bread knife, and afterwards attempted to cut his throat; man found dead in a Glasgow close; wife kicked at Dundee; another Dundee wife dragged out of bed by the hair, and jumped upon until unconscious; and yet another wife in Juteopolis kicked and struck; young girl of 16 arrested for being drunk and incapable in Dundee; an elderly woman found in a helpless condition in an Edinburgh close, died shortly after admission to infirmary; a boy 15 years of age was found lying helplessly drunk in Renfield Street, Glasgow; "a worn-out alcoholic subject" died in Greenock prison; a young man died in Camlachie police station, Glasgow; a woman in Edinburgh was struck and stabbed—"the outcome of a drunken quarrel;" a Dalkeith gardener was sent to prison for three months for wilfully neglecting his two children, aged eight and six; an Edinburgh mother, for neglecting her eight month's old child, was sent 30 days to prison; a West Benhar miner was imprisoned for three months for neglecting his two children.

Oh, God! how the bairnies suffer; and many Christians act as if it were none of their business. "Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord!"—Glasgow Good Templar.

A Saloon Tragedy.

A correspondent of the New Voice writes from Jefferson in Oklahoma as follows: Pond Creek last Saturday evening witnessed a double tragedy, for which the saloon was directly responsible. A poor old negro, his life a whisky wreck, staggered into the "Keystone" saloon of that little town, and on being refused further drinks became uncontrollably enraged. Leaving the ginmill he began to abuse some little white boys and was drawing his gun on them when a bystander interfered. The deputy sheriff had now reached the scene and was attempting to seize the negro's weapon when the latter shot him through the head, mortally wounding the deputy. Less than half an hour after, a mob of half a dozen excited men dragged the drink-crazed murderer from the jail and hung him to a telephone pole. But the rum holes that had changed the old negro into a brute and were thus unescapably guilty of the death of these two men, meanwhile ran on their devilish course, legalized and protected by the state, quite unmolested by the crowd.

BACK AGAIN

THE FAMOUS

"BLACK KNIGHT"



REV. J. H. HECTOR

has returned to Ontario for a short lecture tour and is now open for engagements.

Applications for terms and dates should be made at once to

F. S. SPENCE,
52 Confederation Life Bldg.,
TORONTO, CAN.

Read the following specimen extracts from newspaper opinions of this MARVELLOUS MAN.

CANADIAN.

His speech was irresistible in its earnestness and pathos.—Toronto Globe.

A powerful address, full of humor and sanctified common sense.—London Advertiser.

A veritable outburst of true-spirited, natural eloquence, born of a devoted patriotism.—Charlottetown Guardian.

Succeeded without any apparent difficulty in keeping his audience in roars of laughter.—Toronto World.

The large assemblage was inspired, amused, thrilled and caused to weep almost in unison.—Montreal Witness

ENGLISH.

The embodiment of all that is best in his race—humorous, solemn, eloquent and pathetic.—South Wales Argus.

His inimitable drollery, mixed with the truest wisdom, completely took the gathering by storm.—Christian World.

Such an amount of hearty, healthy, wit-provoked laughter we have never heard before in one and a half hours.—Methodist Times.

PROHIBITION MANIFESTO

OFFICE OF THE DOMINION ALLIANCE,
ONTARIO BRANCH.

APRIL 1902.

To the Prohibitionists of Ontario

Dear Friends,—In view of the approaching provincial election, we appeal to you to rally for another battle against the terrible drink evil that is to-day the prolific cause of physical, social and moral degradation and ruin; and that is seeking more and more to entrench itself in the vantage ground of political methods and institutions and to control the Government, the legislature and legislation so as to thwart the efforts of earnest and philanthropic citizens for the restraint of its debauching influence and power.

A CRITICAL SITUATION.

The united and energetic liquor traffic has won a temporary victory. The reasonable requests of the Convention of February 25th last have been refused by the Government and Legislature, only four members voting for them. Our only hope for success is in such electoral action, untrammelled by partyism, as will give us representatives who will fearlessly stand for our principles, uninfluenced by any subservience to the liquor interests, or the dictation of any party machine.

Your special attention is asked to the following features of the critical situation which confronts us. The Liquor Act which has been passed by the Legislature and which is to be voted upon in December next, is such a combination of useful prohibition and unjust voting requirements, that careful discrimination is necessary in discussing it, and careful consideration in planning any action to secure its alteration or enforcement.

A GOOD LAW.

The second part of this Act is a prohibitory law of the most complete and comprehensive character that the limits of provincial jurisdiction will permit. It is not fair to compare it with the Scott Act or any other measure more local in its nature or less stringent in its provisions. It is an honest attempt to devise the most effective kind of a prohibitory law. It was the work of skilled and experienced professional men who were also earnest advocates of total prohibition, and it is probably the most thorough-going legislation of the kind in existence.

UNFAIR CONDITIONS.

The first part of the Act makes the coming into operation of the second part conditional upon its being ratified by a majority of the votes cast at a special polling to be held on December 4th next, and upon the total number of votes cast for the Act being equal to a majority of the total votes cast at the general Provincial election held in 1898. The latter condition we consider exceedingly unjust.

The liquor party may be in a minority as they were in 1894 and in 1898, they may even stay away from the polls, not troubling themselves to vote, and yet be considered as successful in the contest. Prohibition may be counted as defeated although approved by a large majority of the voting electorate. Without questioning the ability of prohibitionists to secure the required vote, we must claim that the conditions are so framed as to make it difficult for them to succeed and easy for the liquor party to win. We must protest emphatically against these conditions as discriminating against temperance voters, and being unfair class legislation in the interests of the liquor traffic.

PROHIBITION IS RIGHT.

We stand by the principle embodied in the unanimous declaration of the Convention of February 25th. We cannot consent to the injustice of legislation in accordance with the wishes of a liquor-favoring minority, and against the demand of the voting majority, that majority being on the patriotic and unselfish side. Prohibition is the right legislative method of dealing with the liquor traffic. It has been emphatically endorsed at the polls, and only men who favor it have any claim upon your support as temperance electors.

ELECTORAL ACTION.

It is therefore our plain and imperative duty to strive to elect in the approaching campaign such men as can be depended upon to carry out this principle. We must secure the nomination and election of reliable candidates who will undertake, regardless of party, to support the bringing into operation of prohibitory legislation to the limit of the ascertained jurisdiction of the provincial legislature.

The question of which nominated candidate is best entitled to the support of prohibitionists, and of whether or not it is desirable to

bring out an independent candidate, must be settled by the workers of each constituency for themselves. The first duty is the holding in every constituency of a representative conference of workers to consider these matters and to take vigorous action to give effect to the decision arrived at.

THE REFERENDUM.

While we protest against the unjust requirements of the referendum plan, we deem it our duty to stand by the cause we have always supported, and we earnestly urge our people to organize everywhere and to do their utmost to secure another prohibition victory in the referendum on December 4th next.

In union is strength. We earnestly appeal for concentration of effort on the lines of action above stated, and on the plan agreed upon in each locality to carry them out. Let your ballot in the coming contests be consecrated to the temperance cause, and your energies devoted to devising how that ballot may be made to count against the liquor traffic.

OUR DUTY TO VOTE.

Every vote is needed and every vote will tell. To the extent that our influence is felt in the approaching election we will be strong to compel respect and fair play from the next legislature. We shall need that strength to compel law-enforcement if the referendum brings us prohibition. We shall need it, even if our vote should fall short of the unreasonable referendum requirement, to secure the legislation which our certain majority will fairly demand.

IMMEDIATE ACTION.

Steps are being taken to secure the holding of a Convention for each constituency at the earliest possible date. Do not fail to attend the one called for your electoral district. It will be the starting point for both the impending campaigns, and upon its character and action will largely depend the value and effect of your own work for our cause in the near future. Urge others to attend. Go prepared to sacrifice if need be, all party prejudice and your personal convenience, in a determined, earnest effort to win the great boon of prohibition for our fair province.

Yours for God and Home and Country,

F. S. SPENCE,

Secretary.

W. A. MACKAY,

President.

PROHIBITION FOR ONTARIO. THE DIVISION LIST.

Where Members of the Ontario Legislature Stand on the
Question of a Fair Vote at a Convenient Time.

The great prohibition convention held in Toronto, on February 25th, strongly objected to certain conditions of the Referendum on the Liquor Act. One of these conditions is the requirement that, to bring the act into operation, the number of electors voting in favor of it must exceed one-half of the number of electors who voted at the general election of 1898. Another was the taking of the vote at an undesirable time.

The convention desired to have the referendum provisions so amended that the Act would be brought into force if approved by a majority of the electors voting thereon, and that the voting would be upon the same day as the municipal elections for 1903.

In accordance with the wishes of the Convention Mr. Marter moved in the Legislature to amend the referendum part of the Act so as to provide that the voting should be "on the date fixed for the holding of the municipal elections in the Province in 1903." This amendment was defeated upon the following division:

YEAS—Barr, Crawford, Marter, Tucker—4.

NAYS—Allen, Auld, Aylesworth, Barber, Beatty (Leeds), Blezard, Bowman, Breithaupt, Bridgeland, Brower, Brown, Burt, Caldwell, Carnegie, Carpenter, Carscallen, Charlton, Clarke, Colquhoun, Conmee, Dickenson, Dryden, Eilber, Farwell, Foy, Fox, Gallagher, Garrow, Gibson, Graham, Gross, Guibord, Harcourt, Hill, Hislop, Holmes, Hoyle, Jamieson, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Kribs, Latchford, Lee, Leys, Little, Loughrin, Lucas, Lumsden, Malcolm, Matheson, Miscampbell, Monteith, Morrison, Mutrie, Macdiarmid, McKay, McKee, McLaughlin, Pardee, Pattullo, Pense, Pettypiece, Powell, Preston, Pyne, Reid (Durham), Richardson, Robson, Russell, Stratton, Taylor, Thompson, Truax, Wardell, Whitney—75.

Mr. Marter then moved to amend the Act so as to provide that it would come into operation if adopted by a majority of the electors voting on the question, and this amendment was defeated on the following division:

YEAS—Barr, Crawford, Marter, Tucker—4.

NAYS—Allen, Auld, Aylesworth, Barber, Blezard, Bowman, Breithaupt, Bridgeland, Brower, Brown, Burt, Caldwell, Carnegie, Carpenter, Carscallen, Charlton, Clarke, Colquhoun, Conmee, Davis, Dickenson, Dryden, Eilber, Fallis, Farwell, Foy, Fox, Gallagher, Garrow, Gibson, Graham, Gross, Guibord, Harcourt, Hill, Hislop, Holmes, Hoyle, Jamieson, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Kribs, Latchford, Lee, Leys, Little, Loughrin, Lucas, Lumsden, Malcolm, Matheson, Miscampbell, Monteith, Morrison, Mutrie, Macdiarmid, McKay, McKee, McLaughlin, Pardee, Pattullo, Pense, Pettypiece, Powell, Preston, Pyne, Reid, (Durham), Richardson, Robson, Russell, Stratton, Taylor, Thompson, Wardell, Whitney—76.