

Temperance Column

Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging. Whosoever is received thereby is not wise. Prov. 1:20.

WOMEN DRUNKS

Figures compiled by the police department of Boston fully bear out the impression that the chief feature of the repeal era is the enormous increase in the number of women drinkers. No one can observe conditions in the hotels and restaurants without being struck by the actual preponderance of women drinkers as compared to men.

The police figures show that the number of arrests of women for drunkenness has been increasing by leaps and bounds. In the period since repeal was effective (Dec. 6 to March 21) arrests of drunken women increased 55 per cent. over the corresponding period of the previous year—from 336 to 523.

Each month since December has shown a great increase in the percentage of women drunks. In December, 1932, there were 83 such arrests; in December, 1933, there were 183.

In the first 21 days of March this year there have been 123 arrests. Last year, in the same period, there were but 66.

These figures are startling. It must be remembered, too, that the police are reluctant to arrest women on a charge of drunkenness unless they are extremely disorderly. Women obviously intoxicated and unable to navigate are not molested by the police if their escorts will take care of them.

The figures on arrests of men for drunkenness show no such increase. The men seem to have taken repeal in a conservative manner. The women have evidently gone overboard.

This situation is distressing to the old timers, who never took kindly to the idea of women and liquor. The average saloon keeper of the old days would not sell to women. Some of the present-day restaurant keepers are not keen about women's trade in liquor. Yet the women are actually getting to be the best customers for the liquor business.

The fact that women are barred as customers in taverns has made the tavern licenses far less desirable, and they are going begging. Yet it was the liquor interests who wanted the women barred from the taverns. They felt the men would keep away if the women were admitted. They have now awakened to the fact that women are the best customers of hotels and restaurants, while the taverns can't make money.

It may be the women are just having their fling.—Selected.

THE BOOTLEGGER

The United States has not got rid of the bootlegger. Mr. Joseph H. Choate, director of the Federal Alcohol Control Administration, says these persons with illicit distilleries are doing twice as much as the legitimate trade. This is an amazing statement. Mr. Choate says that more than two thousand stills were seized by federal officials in the first three months of this year, and their combined capacity was 67,000,000 gallons a year. He adds that there are thousands of these stills in operation.

Of course there is a remedy, but it would involve a large loss of revenue. The bootleggers has an advantage. He does not have to

pay a federal tax, a state tax or a license tax. Where the legitimate distiller must get \$33 to \$34 per case because of the taxes, his illegal competitor can accept a far lower price and yet make a fat profit.

We are told it is no easier to cope with bootleggers than it was before the prohibition act was repealed. The Boston Post says: "By reducing the taxes and import duties to such an extent that bootleggers can no longer compete with legitimate industry we can drive them out, but there is no other way to beat them."

Canada can supply somewhat similar testimony. So long as there is a large profit to be made there will be those who do not hesitate to evade the law. On this account the suggestion of Senator J. J. Hughes for the investigation of the smuggling evil is of particular interest at the present time.—Ex.

BORING FROM WITHIN

The hardest enemy to fight is the enemy within. This applies to the enemy within ourselves, and the enemy within the Church. It is of the latter that we think of particularly at the moment. An enemy in the guise of a friend is the subtlest of all enemies. The Church can meet the foes that are without, and overcome the direct onslaughts of Satan, but she succumbs in a multitude of cases to the insidious boring from within of the Modernists. The Modernist is the ally of the atheist. We do not say that of ourselves. Here is our authority in an extract from the last report of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism.

"The Modernists seem to attack Atheism only to screen their own unbelief. No better proof of this contention that the Church is losing can be given than that of the Modernists are now in control of all the larger Protestant denominations and, working from the inside, discredit the basic teachings of Christianity in the name of Christianity. In this grand farce, fortunately for us, the dumb Fundamentalists through contributions pay for the destruction of their own belief in the Bible as a superhuman, infallible book. The Modernists are superior in strategy. When recently President Smith twitted the Rev. Dr. Riley with these facts, the Fundamentalist leader boasted of what he would do at the recent annual conference in Washington of the Northern Baptists. But at that and the other denominational conventions this Spring the Fundamentalists were defeated. They are hopelessly beaten. They cannot vote the Modernists out and dare not themselves withdraw. These two groups are held together by real estate.

Higher Critics within the Church, carrying on the work of Voltaire, Paine and Ingersoll, in milder language, it is admitted, have made many Christians so ashamed of their creed that we now hear of that acme of absurdity, a "creedless faith"—of persons who believe, without believing anything. Thus Christianity slowly dissolves.

But the good work of these Modernists not only does not lessen the need of Atheist propaganda but instead serves to emphasize its importance. Though its activities are on a smaller scale, the advance guard is always the most important unit in the army. We must continue to lead the way."

Could anything, we ask, be more pathetic than this? Christ is again wounded in the

house of His friends. For the atheist blata announcing his disbelief in the Christian revelation of God we can have a certain amount of respect. At least one knows where he stands. For the modernist who bores from within, who accepts a stipend from a church founded upon the infallible Word of Scripture which he is pledged to uphold, and then subtly undermines faith in the essential things of Christianity we have no respect whatsoever. Protestant pulpits across the American continent are in too many cases filled with ministers who are unitarians at heart though rendering a lip service to the creed of the church to which they belong.—The Evangelical Christian.

THE DEMORALIZING DANCE "PAVILION"

Many of the dance "pavilions," so called, in various parts of the country are surely demoralizing influences. There may possibly be some that are not so, owing to the high standards by which they are operated, but too many of them appear to be that way. We have in mind one or two in this part of Maine whose activities do not seem at all of benefit to their respective communities by any means.

In regard to one of these pavilions we heard some well known citizens speaking the other day—citizens who are not of the "high-brow" or "goodie-goodie" type by any means. They suggested that, if a petition against a certain one of these places, which they mentioned, were circulated, it would receive a big number of signers among our well known citizens.

The general impression is that, although the dances and the various activities inside the pavilions themselves may be mostly of an unobjectionable nature, there is generally going on outside and out around the grounds about everything that makes for the injury of a community. Are the impressions that the public have of the influences of these so called pavilions wrong, or right? We fear they are right. If not, then it is extremely unfortunate and unfair that such beliefs have become so general and firmly seated.

If the influences surrounding many of these pavilions are unquestionably injurious, why should our people put up with them longer? Have these influences not already done sufficient damage in too many ways?—Fort Fairfield Review.

Note.—The same demoralizing conditions obtain in New Brunswick, so we have been told. But very little is said and nothing is done to correct them. It is a disgrace to any country to allow such cesspools of iniquity to exist. Everything connected with these places is degrading to those who attend. The liquor drinking, the appeal to the lower nature, fostered by the dances, as young men come in close contact with the scantily clad young women, the remote places where the dance halls are situated, with no fathers or mothers around, make it easy for them to go wrong. The citizens ought to protest to the authorities until all such places are closed, and thus save the youth of our country from these traps of the devil.—Editor.

Get down to business in this dry cause. If you are all the while shooting at the blue sky, a pigeon might fly so that he could get hit, of course, but you waste too many shells.—Selected.