

THE CAMP FIRE

A Monthly Record and Advocate of the Temperance Reform.

VOL. V. No. 8.

TORONTO, ONT. FEBRUARY, 1899.

25 CENTS PER YEAR

Distribute Literature of the very best kind. The Camp-Fire is what you want. Read the column headed IMPORTANT on page 4.

"PROHIBITION HAS COME."

A STIRRING DEBATE.

Churchmen Very Earnest and Definite.

An important feature of the recent session of the Montreal Diocesan Synod of the Church of England was a debate upon Prohibition, which is summarized by the *Montreal Witness* as follows:

"A sudden interest, however, was felt, when the Rev. Mr. Cunningham presented the report of the Church of England Temperance Society. This made reference to the recent plebiscite, and said that the people of the country had pronounced in favor of prohibition. It but remained for the Government to carry out the will of the people and pass a prohibitory measure. It had been said that such a measure would not be effectual if passed; but this was an Anglo-Saxon country, and Anglo-Saxon people were observers of law and order; and if the Government passed a law and provided the proper machinery, and were thoroughly in earnest, the people would rally to its support, loyally obeying it. The trouble with the societies of the Church was that they were not advanced enough. Public opinion was strongly growing in favor of prohibition. He himself was a sincere advocate of prohibition. The temperance societies no longer met the sentiment which was spreading abroad. He did not know if prohibition would pass at once, but he was perfectly certain that it would come; that the Dominion would be freed from the curse of drink.

"Major Bond, in seconding the adoption of the report, briefly referred to the plebiscite campaign. One of the delightful surprises was the assistance which had been given by many of the clergy. This was a most hopeful sign. So far as this province was concerned, the plebiscite was a disappointment. The majority against it had been said to be ninety thousand. This was false. He did not believe it was more than thirty or forty thousand. He had evidence of falsification in the city of Montreal, and he had almost complete evidence as to the state of things outside the city. This might probably be submitted to Parliament, to show the real state of things in the Province of Quebec. But apart from this province, the vote was simply wonderful. The principle was affirmed in every other province of the Dominion. People turned out to vote on a question in which they had no interest other than a moral one. It was unique. Prohibition was bound to come.

"The Rev. Mr. Graham moved, and the Rev. Mr. Elliott seconded, a motion looking to the establishment of a central organization in the diocese which would be a rallying centre for the various Bands of Hope; while Dr. Norton protested against the introduction of a prohibition debate in connection with the report of the temperance societies of the Church. He had made such a protest before. He had not changed his opinion. At the same time he was a total abstainer; he neither smoked nor snuffed. Moreover, he had been a temperance worker for many years, and particularly in England. What was his experience there? In the district in which he was laboring, they had prohibitionists. The latter body never made the least headway. Why? Because, instead of trying to amend the liquor laws, to regulate the traffic, it narrowly insisted on the trade being wiped out at one sweep. Therefore, it rather desired that the liquor traffic should be made as abominable as possible. The prohibitionists accom-

plished nothing because of this narrow stand, but when the Church of England Temperance Society was started in the district, the first thing started was an agitation for the proper inspection of the liquor sold to the public, in order that it must not be poisoned by bad liquor, and the rigid improvement of the Sunday liquor law. He himself had secured the co-operation of every one of the liquor men in this work, except one—clearly showing that when the reform proposed is rational, even the liquor people will be with you. He had not the least belief that they would obtain prohibition in Canada. ("Yes, we will.") "Well," said the doctor, "by all means get it if you can. It will be a good many years before you get it. The young men of this Synod will have grey hairs before it comes to pass. But I implore you, do not waste the years in doing nothing. Do something in the meantime. Improve the laws. Get the liquor inspected. See that the public are not poisoned. Do something reasonable, and you will find the high-minded men of the liquor trade will go with you. Don't lose the precious time. That is what I ask of you."

"Dean Carmichael, speaking very slowly, said that in answer to Dr. Norton, he would congratulate the young men of the Synod upon the fact that they would never see grey hair, for prohibition had come. (Loud applause.)

Dr. Norton, shaking his head emphatically, the Dean said—"I repeat, prohibition has come."

Prohibition, the Dean said, had been passed by the country; it only remained to see that those in authority gave effect to it."

THE MORTALITY OF ABSTAINERS AND NON-ABSTAINERS.

To the Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, January 6th

SIR,—Some of your readers will be familiar with a statement that the trade organs used to trot out years ago, to the general effect that high medical authorities had declared that those who took intoxicants lived much longer than those who did not. The medical authorities quoted invariably repudiated any such absurd statement. Fallacies have a marvellous vitality, and reappear in somewhat altered disguises. This time it is an actuary who is misquoted, in order, it may be fairly supposed, that those who are addicted to pale ale, invalid port, or nourishing stout, may comfort themselves with the idea that their favorite tipples are more likely to prolong than to shorten their lives.

The *Licensing World*, November 26th, 1898, concludes its news on page 386 with the following paragraph, which I quote *in extenso*:

"Mortality of Total Abstainers. It would appear, from a paper recently read before the Actuarial Society of America by Mr. McClintock, that the deaths of abstainers are more numerous than those of non-abstainers. His inquiry extended over a large number of years and among many thousands of policyholders. We are aware that occasionally abstainers reached an advanced age, so also do licensed victuallers."

Knowing Mr. McClintock to be one of the most eminent authorities in the world, I welcomed this appeal to Caesar, but took the precaution of checking the *Licensing World* by writing Mr. McClintock to ask whether he had been correctly reported in the passage given above. He has just replied as follows:

"Actuary's Department, the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, December 23, 1898.

"Dear Sir,—Pressure of work and temporary illness are my excuse for delay in replying to your favour of November 27.

"I enclose herewith a copy of my paper of 1895, the only one on the subject from my pen, by which you will

see the exact contrary of the conclusion ascribed to me in your quotation, namely, 'That the deaths of abstainers are more numerous than those of non-abstainers.' Yours, etc.,

EMORY MCCLINTOCK, Actuary.

Edward Neild, Esq."

Of course I never supposed he had written such nonsense as had been ascribed to him, but felt it was only fair to him and the general public that he should have the opportunity of denying it. He had been good enough to mark more than a dozen paragraphs in his paper which prove the abstainer to be, on the whole, a better life than the non-abstainer, such as

Par. 2. "The abstainers show, therefore, a death loss of 78 per cent. of the maximum and the non-abstainers 96 per cent."

Par. 3. "There is a third large class of drinkers, who, while never intoxicated, nevertheless habitually take more than the daily allowance of alcohol found to be digestible by the medical authorities."

Par. 9. "The difference between those who drink beer and those who drink water is unmistakable, while the loss on beer drinkers has been almost the same as upon wine and spirit drinkers."

Par. 10. "On the whole, however, the teetotal habit, not only before but after middle age, must be counted as a favorable indication in judging of proposals for insurance from persons not known to be careful and moderate in the use of beverages."

There is not a single sentence in the whole paper that justifies the paragraph in the *Licensing World*. A very common fallacy is that drink is the supporter of old age. Mr. McClintock gives a heavy blow to this theory by the results of actual experience, showing opposite each other on pp. 8 and 9 the results as compared with expectancy on policies issued on non-abstainers and abstainers above the age of 60. Here it may be remarked that in this country the proportion of abstainers to non-abstainers is about 2 to 11, but in America the insurance on abstainers' lives amounts in dollars to 51 to 98, well over half. This probably is due to two circumstances—that abstinence is more general in the United States, and that the abstainer is more thrifty if not also more self-denying. When we come to policies issued on lives over 60, we find that on non-abstainers there was expected a loss amounting to \$16,583, but that there occurred a loss of \$31,000. On the other hand, among the abstainers, who at this advanced age were in a majority, there was expected a loss of \$19,791, but there only occurred a loss of \$4,000. Possibly the believers in intoxicants will have some new figures to confute these I have verified from an authority whom they called as a witness. Yours, etc.,

EDWARD NEILD.

Hon. Secretary, Manchester, Salford, and District Temperance Union, Eccles, January 14th, 1899.

HOW THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC ROBS LABORING MEN.

In every \$100 worth of boots and shoes you buy is \$20.71 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of furniture you buy is \$23.77 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of hardware you buy is \$24.17 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of clothing you buy is \$17.42 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of cotton goods you buy is \$16.01 of labor.

In every \$100 of men's furnishing goods you buy is \$18.34 of labor.

In every \$100 of worsted goods you buy is \$13.55 of labor.

In every \$100 of woollen goods you buy is \$12.86 of labor.

In every \$100 worth of the above goods, \$100 worth of each kind in \$800 lots, \$147.73 of human labor is employed.

In every \$800 worth of liquors you buy is \$9.84 of human labor.—Forward.

MODERATE DRINKING

We frequently hear a good deal about the desirability of having moderate drinkers and total abstainers work together in effort for the suppression of the terrible evils of intemperance. We appreciate and will cooperate with every agency and effort for the promotion of the cause we advocate, and earnestly wish every worker a hearty God-speed, but we will none the less persistently call attention to the real position of those who indulge moderately in alcoholic beverages.

Canada is cursed today with the drinking system and its inevitable results. Liquor shops, taverns and saloons are working incalculable harm in our young community and it is well to study and understand wherein lies their strength. The total abstainer is not a saloon patron; his position is a clear and emphatic protest against the whole institution. The drunkard is not the man who mainly upholds the drinking customs and the liquor traffic. The drunkard's example is not a dangerous one, comparatively speaking. The results of unbridled appetite in his case are so manifest as to have a deterrent effect on the would-be drinker. The drunkard is not a desirable saloon customer; he is generally poor, has little money to spend, is not an attraction, but rather a discredit and a disgrace to the establishment he frequents. Many saloon-keepers refuse to sell to these degraded creatures, and would rather be patronized by men of respectability, position, influence and wealth.

But how about the moderate drinkers? It is from their ranks that the drunkards almost invariably graduate. They are the parties whose example is seductive and dangerous. It is their respectability, influence and money that sustain the liquor shop, the tavern, and the saloon. The men who "can take it or leave it alone," but who do not leave it alone, are the backbone, the up-holding power, the stronghold of the whole liquor system. Without their assistance the liquor traffic would be disreputable in this generation and unknown in the next. If so-called "moderate drinking" were abolished, drunkenness would soon be a thing of the past. We ask in all fairness and reason can such people be considered as on the side of temperance, morality, and reform?

"No man can serve two masters." "He that is not with us is against us." The dividing line is definite and unmistakable. The members of our community are arrayed in opposing attitudes, on one side is the saloon system, with its awful concomitants of ruin, poverty, disease and crime; on the other side are the home, the church, the school, the philanthropic efforts of Christian workers in God's name, for the uplifting and ennobling of our common humanity. We ask each of our readers to look calmly at the situation, to consider the whole case, to see where the moderate drinker stands, and to ask and answer for himself, the question: Where ought I to stand?

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, FEBRUARY, 1899

LAWLESSNESS.

There has been a great stir in Toronto recently over the question of liquor-selling in unlicensed places. The *Evening News* charges the License Inspectors with neglect of duty, and calls attention to the leniency with which the Police Magistrate treats violations of the liquor laws. The city council has appointed a committee to enquire into the matter.

There is sufficient ground for all the complaints that have been made, and more. It is a mistake, however, to imagine that this persistent disregard of law is confined to any special locality or any particular class of liquor-sellers. All over the Dominion the liquor laws are violated, and the prosecutions of violators are comparatively few. There are cities and towns in which every man holding a tavern license is known to disregard the law. In too many cases officials are known to be friendly to the liquor traffic, and do vastly more to oppose than to aid those who endeavor to secure its suppression.

The evidence gathered by the Royal Commission bears out these statements. Judges and other experienced men testified to the lawlessness of the liquor traffic. In fact this lawlessness is often urged as a reason for sanctioning the traffic, men pleading the hopelessness of any effort to suppress it, and presenting the failure of restriction as an argument in favor of prohibition.

As a matter of fact the liquor traffic degrades and demoralizes those who carry it on. It makes men heartless, cruel, dishonest, and disloyal. Licensed or unlicensed it produces the same results. It defies all attempts at regulation. Licensing this traffic is practically promoting lawlessness and crime. It is the duty of the Government to relentlessly suppress it. Prohibition is the only kind of liquor legislation that is practicable or right.

A SERIOUS MISTAKE.

A celebrated bishop in New York recently made a speech that was construed as an apology for the saloon. His utterances were echoed by a noted Toronto preacher, who claimed that taverns were practically working-men's clubs, where toilers met for gossip, rest and recreation. He was afraid of doing these men wrong by abolishing the taverns before there were provided other social institutions to furnish the club feature of the working man's life.

The Toronto preacher simply made

clear his utter ignorance of the facts and conditions of the life of working-men. There is in this city no such state of things as he imagines. The working-man's club-tavern is entirely a fiction. There are only 150 licensed bar-rooms in Toronto, and the patrons of these places are mainly men who come for drinks and go. There are some loafers and loungers, but of our 30,000 toilers, those who spend any considerable time in bars and bar-gossip are very very few.

As a rule the Toronto man's social instinct seeks in other places what our taverns cannot give. Our city is full of social institutions, lodges, divisions, unions, tents, encampments, courts and the like, to an extent that but few realize. Religious and secular, friendly and fraternal, Catholic and Protestant, limited and unlimited, purely social and mainly beneficiary, everywhere these societies thrive, and the toiler who is not a member of some of them is the rare exception. Whatever may be said of these organizations, it is certain that nearly all of them are practically temperance organizations, and those in which liquor would be tolerated at all are comparatively few.

Again there are thousands of working-men who spend their evenings at home, and find no necessity for any club or such resort. It may be that other cities are different from ours, and that the New York bishop referred to conditions that existed in them, but it is safe to say that the total closing of every bar-room in Toronto, would not affect as he suggests the social life or comfort of one in one hundred of our working-men. The Toronto preacher should have learned the facts, before making statements and championing theories. Had he done so he would have avoided so gross a misrepresentation of a great number of his fellow-citizens, many of whom are earnest advocates of the prohibition concerning the rightness and value of which he seems to be so dubious.

SOBER SOLDIERS.

STRONG TESTIMONY AGAINST STRONG DRINK.

The Liquor Habit Must Go.

The action of the United States Congress against the Canteen System is one of the most significant signs of the times. It is a most emphatic practical condemnation of the beverage use of alcoholic liquors. From an article upon this measure, in the *New York Evening Post*, we clip the following forcible paragraphs:—

"The unanimous action of the House in adopting an amendment to the Army Bill which abolishes the army canteen and forbids the sale of liquor in any camp or post of the United States, formulates a conclusion towards which impartial students of the problems involved have been drifting for some time.

"The canteen is a place where the lighter kinds of 'drinks' are sold, under the regulation of the authorities and without the incentive that the ordinary saloon-keeper has to promote excess in order to help his business. The argument for this institution has been that drinking could not be entirely prohibited, and that there would be less drunkenness if the Government allowed the soldiers to buy beer in camp than if they were tempted to go outside for whiskey. This seemed plausible, and a good many army officers were at first inclined to endorse the system. But the experience of the recent war furnished overwhelming evidence for the opponents of the canteen. Each colonel was allowed to establish a canteen or prohibit it, and in Florida, in Cuba, and in the Philippines alike those regiments which were forbidden it not only suffered much less from drunkenness than the others, but had by far the smallest percentage of sickness and death from disease.

"Every general in the army who has expressed an opinion now opposes the canteen, except one—and his dissent is the strongest argument on the side of the majority, for he is Eagen. Gen. Wheeler has said that: 'I am utterly opposed to soldiers being sold intoxicating liquors, and I believe that every effort should be exercised to remove the temptation of such dissipation from them.' Gen. Shafter said that he had 'always been strongly opposed to the canteen system or the sale of intoxicating drinks of any kind on military reservations, and have opposed it until absolutely overruled, and required to establish a canteen at my post. I regard it demoralizing to the men, besides impairing seriously their efficiency.'

"The experience of our army only duplicates that of England in showing that soldiers who do not drink intoxicating liquor are far more efficient and far less subject to disease and death than those who do. Experiments were made with three regiments from each of several brigades in the British army at different times, and in several instances where forced marches and other hard work were required. In one every man was forbidden to drink a drop while the test lasted; in the second, malt liquor only could be purchased; in the third a sailor's ration of whiskey was given to each man. The whiskey-drinkers manifested more dash at first, but generally in about four days showed signs of lassitude and abnormal fatigue; those given malt liquor displayed less dash at first, but their endurance lasted somewhat longer; while the abstainers improved daily in alertness and staying powers.

"As a result, the War Department decided that in the Soudan campaign not a single drop of stimulant should be allowed in camp, save for hospital use. The officers, even including the generals, were forbidden the accustomed spirits, wines, and malt liquors at their mess-tables, and an order was issued that the liquid refreshment for all hands, including even camp-followers, must be limited to tea, oatmeal water, or lime juice and Nile water. The wonderful freedom of the Kitchener expedition from disease, although making forced marches through the desert under a heavy burning sun and in a most unhealthy climate, fully justified the new rule.

"The truth is that the requirement of abstinence from intoxicating liquors for soldiers is only the application to the army of a principle which is coming to be generally accepted in industrial life, that men occupying responsible positions, like locomotive engineers, motormen on trolley cars, and men in charge of delicate machinery, must be men who are never in danger of getting drunk."

A BIG VICTORY.

The Quebec Branch of the Dominion Alliance has won an important victory in the judgment of the Court of Appeals on the long contested "Georgeville Licensing Case." Under the Quebec law the license authorities cannot issue a license until the council of the municipality in which the license is to take effect, certifies its approval of the application. The Council of Stanstead township, elected on the temperance issue, refused to grant a certificate of approval for a license in Georgeville. The applicant appealed to the court to compel the Council to issue the certificate. The Council would have surrendered, but the Alliance took up the fight, guaranteed the costs, and pushed the case. A great deal of litigation, in the course of which many curious judicial decisions were given, has at last terminated in the ruling of the Court of Appeals that the Council had authority either to grant or refuse the certificate, and was within its rights in its treatment of the application. The Alliance incurred very heavy expense in this fight for the right of the municipal Councils, and has rendered an important service to the cause of temperance reform.

AN OLD TRICK.

The Scott Act is being enforced in Kentville, N.S., and some liquor-selling hotel-keepers are notifying the public that they will refuse to accommodate travellers. So far, however, no one has been inconvenienced except those who want liquor, as there is ample room for all who need it in places that will not violate the law.

SAMPLES FROM THE SAMPLE ROOM.

Daily life is more tragic than any tragedy. Behind windows we glance at heedlessly, nay, in the very streets through which we saunter, bloody dramas are enacted which are beyond Shakespeare or Goethe—beyond Hamlet or Faust.

During one recent week, in a single locality, life in New York was marked and marred by the following occurrences:

A farmer from Goshen, tiring of milk and honey, came to New York. After some hours in the city he was arrested at the corner of Eight avenue and West 28th street, wild as a Malay running amuck. He shot at anyone, at everyone who past, shouting: "I've got to kill somebody." What ailed this farmer? Alcoholic drink.

A promising young actor, newly arrived from Australia, put a pistol to his head and blew his brains out. He had lost a prominent position in a leading theatrical company because he neglected his duties. Why did he neglect them? What made this actor a suicide? Alcoholic drink.

A husband came staggering home. "Oh, John," exclaimed his wife, "you promised this should never happen again!" The infuriated man seized a chair, brought it down with a crash on the woman's head, and fractured her skull. What made this husband a murderer? Alcoholic drink.

A mother crooned her infant to sleep, laid him on the bed, and hurried away to an adjoining saloon. In a daze she fumbled her way back and threw herself on the bed. When she recovered consciousness, she found the baby smothered beneath her. She shrieked herself into insanity. What was the matter with this mother? Alcoholic drink.

On Staten Island a saloon-keeper enticed a number of boys, ten or twelve years old, into his saloon, fired their brains with strong drink, then set them a-fighting, while he sat by and encouraged the sport. What made these lads, the sons of respectable parents, fight one another? Alcoholic drink.

Sad enough in themselves, the occurrences get additional horror from the fact that they were sanctioned by the state. The grogshops whence came the maddening liquor were all run under a license for which each paid for permission to sell it. Therefore the state was an accomplice. A legal adage asserts that a confederate is as bad as the wrong-doer. In the cases under consideration the state lacked the excuse of those who retailed the liquid damnation. They were low-browed men, with brutal instincts; the state represented the wealth and culture of Caucasian development. They sold whiskey for the immense profits in it; the state went into the guilty partnership for the pitiful license fee.

Government exists to safeguard life, liberty, and property. By common acknowledgment, whiskey imperils each and all of these vital interests. The late Mr. Gladstone used to say that a Christian Government should make virtue easy and vice difficult. Our so-called Christian Government reverses this maxim—makes vice easy and virtue difficult. A reformed man with a will weakened by former excesses and with depraved appetites yet couchant within him, cannot walk the public streets without being beset by legalized temptations which he often finds too strong to resist. Unsuspecting youth and innocence are decoyed into pitfalls which yawn under a license from the powers that be.

The sale of other poisons is restricted by law. Arsenic, for instance, can be gotten only on a physician's prescription. Why leave the most insidious poison of all unrestricted?

People will drink, we are told. Some will; but is it the business of the state to encourage them to drink? Does the state permit sellers of arsenic to open arsenic shops to entice customers? Why, then, should it give a license to sellers of whiskey and put saloons under the protection of the law?

When the state goes into partnership with drunkeries it necessarily makes itself responsible for drunkenness and the horrors that result. A Christian Government is thereby transformed into a propaganda of the devil.

But in this country the people are the Government. When the people want a Christian Government they can vote it into existence.—*N. Y. Voice.*

Selections.

THE EXPLODED DEVIL.

Men don't believe in a devil now, as their fathers used to do; They have opened the door of the widest creed to let his Majesty through, And there isn't a print of his cloven foot, nor a fiery dart from his bow, To be found in earth or air to-day, for the world has voted it so.

But who is mixing the terrible draught that palsies the heart and brain? Who loads the bier of each passing year with ten hundred thousand slain? Who blights the bloom of the earth to-day with the fiery breath of hell? If the devil isn't and never was, won't somebody rise and tell?

Who dogs the steps of the toiling saint? Who digs the pits for his feet? Who sows the tares in the fields of time wherever God sows the wheat? The devil is voted not to be, and of course the thing is true.

But who is doing the terrible work which the devil alone should do? We're told that he does not go about like a roaring lion now, But whom shall we hold responsible for the everlasting row To be heard in Church and State to-day, to earth's remotest bound, If the devil by unanimous vote is nowhere to be found?

Won't somebody step to the front forthwith, and make his bow and show How the frauds and crimes of a single day spring up? We'd like to know. The devil is voted not to be, and of course the devil's gone. But simple people would like to know who carries his business on.

—C. E. in N. Y. Tribune.

THE BROKEN SCHOOL.

A TERRIBLE WARNING.

The story that I am about to tell you, reader, is absolutely true in essence and in fact, save for the discretionary substitution of names of persons and places; and, if it should meet the eyes of any young man or woman who is just launching on the trying, troublesome, tempting waters of this life, and who is wavering as to whether to join the ranks of the total abstainers or the moderates (membership of the drunkards' brigade being acquired through evolution of the latter), I trust its terrible teachings may lead he or she to one firm decision only. Nay, I cannot imagine, in the face of its ghastly tragedies, any free-will novitiate hesitating for a moment between the right course and the wrong.

When in my quiet, contemplative moments I look back on that broken school, of which I was at one time a prominent member, when I think of my jovial, generous, kind-hearted colleagues, and the fate that ultimately befell them; when I realize my own narrow escape from a prison cell, a suicide's grave, or the direst poverty, then do I wince, and shudder, and almost cry aloud with a fear that still inexplicably haunts me, although I know my danger's past. I grieve in the memory of the men I once loved, and in whose fascinating company I spent many, many pleasant, but sadly wasted, hours. They were witty, happy, careless fellows, with ne'er a thought of the morrow; but where are they to-day? Listen, and you shall know.

A good many years ago I was resident in a large provincial town. I had a good business of my own, the nature of which gave me considerable leisure time, cared I to accept it, instead of directing my energy into paths of further profit.

I was a young man with a light heart and a great love for merry company. A dear friend, the man I liked best of all my acquaintances, a well-educated, well-read, sterling fellow, whose friendship I regarded as an honour, and whom I thought the very soul of integrity and uprightness, one morning invited me into a tavern for a nip, saying, "Come, and I'll introduce you to a few of the best fellows you ever met in your life."

At this time I was, I suppose, what you would call a moderate drinker.

We descended into a sort of wine cellar, a quiet, cosy, alluring place, where there were assembled some half dozen young fellows, to whom I was introduced. They were all fairly well-to-do men, none of them earning less

than £300 a year, while one had a salary of £800 and another £500. The majority represented big London firms. Then there were one or two professional men, practising for themselves, and others in very good positions.

It was their custom to meet every morning (save Sunday), at this rendezvous, to have a drink and a chat; and, also, at other intervals during the day. I was very soon a full-fledged and popular member of the school, and a very regular pupil, too. I had never met a jollier lot of chaps in my life. I can hear the walls of that veritable little hell now, echoing our peals of merry laughter, our jokes, our witticisms.

Whiskey and soda was the general order of the day, but instead of having one drink, and then returning to our respective avocations, we found our own company so fascinating that it seemed we could not sever ourselves quickly; consequently it became the custom to seldom separate until we had consumed at least three or four drinks; and, furthermore, some of us invariably arranged, as our engagements permitted, to meet again in the afternoon. There was a little ante-room adjacent to the bar, that our school practically monopolized, so frequent became our visits to it.

Were I to tell you the number of drinks that I myself could, and did, consume every day during my connection with these fellows (and I was perhaps the most temperate of the lot), I fear you would hardly credit the statement. For nearly twelve months I continued this daily drinking, until the time arrived when I realized that, if I did not leave the town altogether, and so cut the cord that was binding me tighter and tighter to the stake of downfall, degradation, and damnation, I was a doomed man; I knew it would be utterly futile to remain in the district, even though I renounced intoxicating drink; so great would be the temptation to resume the life that had, I must admit, the greatest fascinations for me.

Prior to this decision I had heard certain rumours concerning at least two members of the school. They had been sadly neglecting their businesses, and much worse. But you shall hear all.

I sold my business at a great loss. I threw away excellent commercial prospects (I would not have remained in that town for £5,000 a year), and I went to London to live.

My great friend, whom I shall call Harry Hudson, he who, quite innocently, had been my introducer to the fatal school, promised to keep me posted in all interesting local news. Harry was a far-seeing, comparatively careful fellow, who knew where to draw the line, so that I feared not for him.

Some two months after my departure, I heard that one of the youngest members, who had been in receipt of £300 a year, plus a liberal allowance for expenses, had been discharged from his berth for embezzlement, neglect of work, and drinking. Poor Lionel!

My next information, but a few months afterwards, was to the effect that Charley James, a married man, with several young children, had lost his situation through having been found in his office by one of the governors, who had gone down from London specially to see him on important business, hopelessly intoxicated at mid-day. His salary had been £500 per annum.

The next news I read in a local newspaper that was sent me.

Tom Smithers, by far the wittiest member of that dreadful school, and a brilliantly educated fellow, with a truly great professional career before him, a man of 24 years of age, surrounded by influential friends, had been sent to seven years' penal servitude for the committal, while intoxicated, of an offence the nature of which I would prefer not to reveal in these columns. Poor Tom, he could no more have perpetrated such a vile deed in his sober moments than he could have flown. I do not know which of the two cases, viz., that which I have just related or the following, upset me most.

When you realize, reader, that I have been so closely related to these poor fellows, having been in their merry company almost daily for twelve months, you may be able to partially conceive the shock I received on hearing the news of these terrible tragedies that o'ertook them.

Again the local press told me a horrid tale. Twelve months had not expired, mark you, since I took my leave of

these fatal friends. Jim Holt, a handsome young fellow, with a charming voice that he knew well how to use when singing, and a splendid physique, had been found dead in bed, he having committed suicide by taking poison, when under the influence of drink. Embezzlement had also doubtless been a potent factor in prompting the taking of his own life.

The school was now rapidly breaking up, although there were still a few of the original frequenters left, viz., my dear, cautious friend, Harry Hudson, Philip Watson, and one or two others.

The next to collapse was Philip. He was the man in receipt of £800 a year, as representative of a large London firm. He had a fine suit of offices and a big staff of clerks; but the demon drink had got a firm hold of him, and one day he was politely informed that unless he cleared out of the country within a very short time, he would be arrested for misappropriation of money.

He quietly fled, and the last I heard of him was that he was a common messenger in one of the colonies.

You will remember the first case I cited, reader, of Lionel, the young fellow whose salary had been £300 a year. Well, I should further tell you, in reference to him, that, through great influence, another excellent appointment, worth, I believe, £200 per annum, was secured for him abroad. He had been a teetotaler since his narrow escape from prosecution, and had faithfully promised his friends to remain one all his future life.

He sailed for foreign shores, to take up his splendid new berth, with the best of wishes from his relations and numerous friends. He was full of hope and promise, but on the voyage he broke his pledge, and drank and drank to such an extent that, on arriving at his port of disembarkation, he was nearly insane, and had to be sent back home by the first returning vessel.

God only knows what eventually became of him.

Harry Hudson was the last prominent representative of that broken school; and so dejected and sorrow-stricken did he become when he reviewed the awful catastrophe that had overtaken our friends, that he decided to leave the town, and, like me, go to London, and try his fortune there.

He duly advised me of his decision, and, when he arrived in town, I immediately called on him at his hotel.

I can see Harry now, as I saw him on that lovely summer morning walking down the grand stairway to greet me. He looked the picture of health; he was faultlessly dressed, as indeed was his wont, and he wore a pleasant, hopeful smile.

Well, he settled in town, and eventually secured an appointment. We remained staunch friends, and many were the occasions on which we recalled the pleasant days that were once, and their dreadful, saddening sequel. I was practically an abstainer now, but Harry continued drinking, much to my dislike. He said he found it necessary to drown the thoughts of the broken school. As I have previously stated, he was a cautious man, and a fairly moderate drinker; but reader, believe me when I tell you that this so-called moderation in the consumption of intoxicating liquor is a misnomer, a snare, an *ignis fatuus*, a very devil in disguise. Beware of it! Shun it as you would the plague. Have none on't.

Harry was but human. Why, then, with all his caution, his moderation, his superior education, his refinement, should he be proof against the insidious fiend, the hell-hound, the murderer?

He was not. No, poor soul; he was not. He fell, and fell, and fell.

I could do nothing but look on and mourn. Advice he cast to the winds. The devil had him now firm in his grip, as firm as though he were within the jaws of a vice.

He lost his appointment; he sank, and sank, down, down he went, until within eighteen months of his arrival in London he was walking the streets like a beggar.

I and other friends helped him, so far as our means would permit. But he was too far gone. All he wanted now was drink, drink.

Think of it, reader, ponder o'er it. Picture the contrast.

A well-dressed, handsome, refined gentleman, walking down the grand stairway of one of London's best hotels—an interval of less than one year and a half—and then a drink-sodden, ragged, abandoned outcast. Great God! And this is what drink does for those who will not heed a timely warning.

Harry Hudson, the last member of that broken school, had to find shelter in a refuge for homeless, hopeless, penniless paupers. After a time he left this charity institute, and drifted eastwards, with the stream on which floats life's flotsam and jetsam. I know not what eventually came of him, but I found out afterwards that a writ had been issued for his arrest for fraud and forgery. Now, my friends, I have told you a true story of the wreck, the complete ruin, the awful catastrophes that o'ertook these personal friends of my own. 'Tis no fiction you've read, but bare, painful, stubborn facts, the memory of which clings to me with fearful persistency. I marvel at my own miraculous escape. The words "intoxicating drink," believe me, are but a synonym for hell.

Waver not, then, on the brink. Be strong, be determined, be teetotal.

Accept a grave warning from the tale of "The Broken School."

—The Alliance News.

A CHRISTMAS TEMPERANCE SERMON.

"Will you please tell me where the 'Red Lion' public house is?" asked a woman of a gentleman walking along sharply over the snow-covered pavement of one of the smaller streets of London, on Christmas Eve. He was hustling home, laden with presents for his expectant wife and little ones.

She was meanly clad, and wet with the melting snow, which had quickly penetrated her threadbare garments; her face was haggard from want and sorrow; but her lips were set with determination, though now and then a tremour ran over them, whether from hunger, or grief, or physical weakness, or womanly timidity, could only be conjectured.

She was not going after drink, the gentleman thought. Despair had evidently nerved her to some desperate course repulsive to her nature. So he kindly pointed the way, and followed at a distance to see what came of it.

She passed on hurriedly, as if anxious to get through her task, or urged by some pressing need. Entering the public house, she called the person in attendance from his bar, and the gentleman who had followed her drew near and heard revealed one of the saddest phases of the accursed liquor traffic, but one, alas! too common in all our towns and cities.

Her husband is a working man, and, like the rest of his class, makes at least but scanty provision for his family in the winter months, when work is slack. He had drawn his pittance a day or two before, and, in the recklessness of desperation, or in the heartless selfishness of a debased appetite, he had spent it all in a public house, and been sent home penniless and drunk! And now, on this Christmas Eve, when neighbours and friends were preparing for their little festivals, there was not a crumb of bread in the house for the famishing little ones, and she was unable to appease their piteous cry for food! Surely, at such a season as this, he would give her a little of what her husband had spent at his bar, to satisfy the hunger of her children. It was an appeal to move a heart of flint, and the mute anguish in look and attitude was as eloquent as the sad, sad story that fell in broken sentences from her trembling lips.

The fellow laughed in her face!

O, God! where were the lightnings of Thy wrath? All Thy ways are just, but sometimes they are past finding out.

For a moment the woman gazed with wild, startled eyes into the mocking face before her. There was no mercy there! Her nerves had been strung to the ordeal, but her last hope was cruelly shattered, and, bursting into an agony of tears, she turned and fled from the place.

Whither? To her desolate home and famishing children? or, through the blinding snow and piercing wintry blast, to the dark rolling river, in whose murky tide so much of human misery has found rest! If the latter, who is responsible for the drowning of the soul in the flood of privation, and wretchedness, and desolation, and blasted hopes that swept over that miserable home? Answer, ye who deal out the slow, but sure, destruction of the bowl!—*Good Templar Watchword.*

ABSTAINERS AND LIFE INSURANCE

RECORDS OF THIRTY YEARS SHOW TOTAL ABSTAINERS TO BE 25.8 PER CENT. BETTER RISKS THAN TIPPLERS.
(From the New Voice.)

Half a century ago, a well-to-do Londoner rebelled at paying the ten per cent. additional premium, which was then assessed upon total abstainers by life insurance companies. The additional ten per cent. was charged because total abstainers were supposed to be extra-hazardous risks. The tables are now turned. The day is at hand when total abstainers get insurance at a lower rate than tipplers, and liquor-dealers are forced to pay an extra rate in premiums on account of their hazardous occupation.

The rebellion of this Englishman resulted in the formation of what is now known as the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution, a life insurance company that classifies the tipplers separately from the total abstainers, and makes each class pay the rates which its respective death-rate calls for. This company was the original temperance life concern, and it has now accumulated funds amounting to nearly \$10,000,000, and has paid in its existence more than \$25,000,000 in claims. It is the record of this concern that is quoted all over the world on the frontiers of total abstinence agitation. Here is the record in cold type:

RECORD OF 32 YEARS' INSURANCE OF TOTAL ABSTAINERS IN ENGLAND.

Year.	EXPECTED DEATHS		ACTUAL DEATHS		RATIO OF ACTUAL CLAIMS TO EXPECTED CLAIMS		Per Cent. of Advantage in Favor of Abstinence
	General Section	Temperance Section	General Section	Temperance Section	General Section	Temperance Section	
1866-70	1,068	510	914	411	85.5	71.0	18.0
1871-75	1,267	723	1,330	511	105.0	70.7	31.3
1876-80	1,185	633	1,180	651	100.7	68.8	20.9
1881-85	1,070	1,179	1,530	835	141.0	70.8	20.8
1886-90	1,817	1,172	1,750	1,015	94.7	68.0	25.7
1891-94	1,550	1,331	1,583	915	101.5	70.0	31.5
1897	107	370	349	261	87.5	71.3	16.2
Total	9,213	6,557	8,906	4,632	92.5	70.0	*21.0

Averages

The year 1897 showed the smallest difference between the death ratio of the two sections of any year since the foundation of the society 18 years ago; but the average of all these years shows 21.6 per cent. advantage in favor of the total abstainer.

This saving runs into cash rapidly. Below is given the record of cash claims paid out by this society during the year 1897 in the two sections:

DEATH CLAIMS FOR THE TWO SECTIONS FOR 1897.

	Expected Claims	Actual Claims	Per Cent.
General section	\$522,725	\$182,050	92.2
Temp. section	185,120	318,500	71.8

Per cent. in favor of total abstainers, 20.1.

This cash balance sheet shows that the ratio of expected claims to actual claims was 20.1 per cent. in favor of the total abstainers. If the total abstinence section death-rate had equaled that of the general section, the company would have been compelled to pay out \$90,057 more during the year than it did, and of course would have had to deduct the amount from the policy holders' profits. On October 22nd last, *The Insurance Monitor*, the great London insurance journal, printed this society's report for 1897, in which new business to the extent of nearly \$1,000,000 was added to the books of the company, and it said editorially: "The superiority of life in the temperance section is obvious."

RECORD OF 15 YEARS' INSURANCE OF TOTAL ABSTAINERS IN SCOTLAND.

Year.	EXPECTED CLAIMS.		ACTUAL CLAIMS.		RATIO ACTUAL TO EXPECTED CLAIMS.		Per Cent. of Advantage in Favor of Abstinence.
	General Section.	Temperance Section.	General Section.	Temperance Section.	General Section.	Temperance Section.	
1881-87	11	43	7	15	62.	35.	27.
1888-92	49	159	33	79	68.	50.	18.
1894-97	95	290	67	198	70.	48.	22.
Totals..	155	492	107	292	*69.	*47.	*22.

*Averages.

SCOTTISH TEMPERANCE LIFE.

The policies of the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution are now written wherever the British flag floats. Its success has been so marked that, 15 years ago, the Scottish Temperance Life Association was formed in Edinburgh. Like its London parent, the total abstainers were classified separately from the general section, and the temperance folk were given the benefit of their abstinence. The company now has more than 10,000 members. During the year 1897, 1,424 new policies were issued. New insurance to the extent of \$1,770,875 was written. At the 15th annual meeting of the directors, held last spring, John Wilson, M.P., submitted the table given at the bottom of this page, the results of the 15-years' business with the two sections.

At this meeting, nearly \$14,000 surplus earnings were directly applied toward the payment of premiums of total abstainers, in addition to the regular dividends of 27 per cent. This company recently began issuing accident policies, keeping drinkers from non-drinkers as in the regular life policies. At this annual meeting, about \$1,400 surplus was applied to the premiums of holders of accident policies in the total abstinence section besides the regular dividends.

THIRD TOTAL ABSTINENCE COMPANY FORMED.

Fourteen years ago, the Abstainers and General Life Insurance Company was formed at London, on the same

general plan as that of the original society and the Edinburgh concern. Its reports tell the same story, and practically the same difference in the expectancy of life in the two classes appears. It also has been a big financial success. The following table shows its growth during the past six years:

GROWTH OF THE ABSTAINERS AND GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Year	Income.	Amount added to Reserve Fund.
1892	\$113,545	\$30,720
1893	121,675	15,380
1894	134,005	52,875
1895	115,570	51,210
1896	165,590	70,315
1897	183,480	80,310

It was not till 15 years ago that these facts began to be considered on this side of the water. In the first issue of *The Voice* ever published, September 25th, 1884, President Greene, of the Connecticut Life Insurance Company, gave the result of some investigations that he made on this subject. He said: "In one of our largest cities, containing a great population of beer-drinkers, I had occasion to note the deaths among a large group of persons whose habits, in their own eyes and those of their friends and physicians, were temperate; BUT THEY WERE HABITUAL USERS OF BEER. When the observations began, they were, upon the average, something under middle age, and they were, of course selected

lives. For two or three years, there was nothing very remarkable to be noted among the group. PRESENTLY DEATH BEGAN TO STRIKE IT; AND, UNTIL IT DWINDLED TO A FRACTION OF ITS ORIGINAL PROPORTIONS, THE MORTALITY IN IT WAS ASTOUNDING IN EXTENT, and still more remarkable in its manifest destiny of cause and mode. . . . AND THIS, IN ITS MAIN FEATURES, VARYING, OF COURSE, IN DEGREE, HAS BEEN MY OBSERVATION OF BEER-DRINKING EVERYWHERE."

The letters published in subsequent issues of *The Voice*, the conclusions of President Greene were confirmed by such insurance authorities as Thomas W. Russell, president of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company; George O. Ripley, president of the Home Life; T. H. Bronson, president of the United States Life; J. B. Temple, president of the Southern Mutual; A. G. Ball, president of the State Mutual; Stephen Ball, secretary of the Hartford Life and Annuity; Samuel C. Huey, president of the Pennsylvania Mutual; Charles Dewey, president of the National Life; J. H. Nitvin, secretary of the National; J. M. Holcomb, secretary of the Phenix Life, and J. W. Hull, secretary of the Berkshire Life Insurance Company.

The published opinions of these men attracted such general attention that the formation of two temperance insurance societies followed a few years later, both of which are now flourishing and making good records.

Ten years ago, the American Temperance Life Insurance Association was formed in this city, with offices at 231 Broadway, and which deals in nothing but total abstinence risks. It has had remarkable success, and has paid something like \$200,000 in death claims. President Frank Delano is now for the first time compiling the results of their years of existence. He tells the *New Voice* that, while he would not have the exact data until he has completed his work a few weeks later, THE RESULTS OF THEIR BUSINESS SHOW THAT THE RATIO OF THEIR DEATH-RATE TO THAT OF GENERAL RISKS IS ABOUT 26 PER CENT. IN FAVOR OF THE TOTAL ABSTAINER.

For four years the American Life Insurance Company of this city has conducted a total abstinence section, and now has about 750 risks in that department. In the four years of its existence, not a single loss has occurred in this section. Secretary John Napier is enthusiastic over the experiment, and pronounces it a decided success in every way. He believes that when sufficient time has expired to tabulate the results of their plan, THE SAME RESULTS WILL BE SHOWN AS IN THE BRITISH TOTAL ABSTINENCE COMPANIES.

Summarizing these various facts, we have the following results:

	Per cent. in favor of the Total Abstainer
Thirty-two years' record of the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Instn.	20.1
Fifteen years' record of the Scottish Temperance Life Association	22.9
Ten years' experience of the American Temperance Life Insurance Company, estimated by President Delano	26.0
General average	22.8

THE VANGUARD.

A GREAT WORK—READ CAREFULLY.

The VANGUARD was published during the stirring years of 1893-4-5 in the form of a magazine. It was devoted to expert discussion of the liquor question and the many matters thereto related, special attention being given to details of most interest and value to Canadians.

HOW TO GET IT.

This valuable work is in neat and convenient form, substantially bound in cloth boards, well printed on good heavy paper, clear type, fully indexed, containing over 650 pages. The number of copies now left is limited, but while they last one will be sent to any address in Canada, postage prepaid for FIFTY CENTS.

It will be a splendid handbook for speakers and writers in the Prohibition campaign.

Address
F. S. SPENCE,
52 Confederation Life Building,
Toronto, Canada.

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 ransacked for the most helpful and effective material. The price is very low.

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

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

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

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

On no other plan can a small investment be made to produce so much of educative 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.