

## Temperance Column

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

### GIRL GANGSTERS

"Crime Career Cut Short" is the way the New York papers feature the bombing of two young girls with booze in New York "Taverns" on a recent Sunday night. The girls, fourteen and fifteen, held up a taxi, pointed a thirty-eight at the operator, robbed him of his wallet and overcoat, and drove him from his car. The victim turned in a police call, and the girls were found standing before a neighborhood bar spending the driver's money for drinks.

They then repaired to an elevated station, shot up the waiting room, wounding a passenger. They were taken for a ride in the patrol wagon, and when arraigned in court, the girls, fourteen and fifteen, were too drunk to be questioned. The two girls were booked as "juvenile delinquents," the two barkeepers released on bail on charges of "impairing the morals of minors" by selling liquor at Teddy's Bar. Had they been drinking only, the matter would not have been news for either the press or police. But when the drinking jeopardized property, the law came to its defense.—Clinton H. Howard.

By Rev. W. Edmund Smith

I was coming from Worcester, Mass., to Boston, in a crowded bus, one dark night in the late fall. A heavy wind was hurling the sleet against the windows with great violence, and every one felt the great responsibility that rested upon the driver of the bus, for the safety of his passengers.

Two men back of me, with the smell of liquor on their breath, were engaged in conversation, so loud that I could not help but hear. They were discussing and cussing the 18th Amendment that prohibits the sale of intoxicating beverages. They both were of the same mind and in strong rhetoric interspersed with profanity, deplored the degeneracy of a court that would tolerate such a curtailment of personal liberty as to make it necessary for one to go to Canada to get the beverage that could truly exhilarate.

I listened to their conversation with interest and watched for an opportunity to venture some remarks. It soon came. One made the observation: "It is a d—d rough night." The other replied: "Yes, and that fellow at the wheel has no easy job." I turned and remarked: "Would it not make matters better if he had a couple of drinks aboard?" "Oh, no," they both replied, "That would spoil it all."

I then said: Gentlemen, I have been compelled to hear your denunciation of the prohibition of liquor, but I can prove that you both believe in it to a considerable degree.

If you were getting a shave would you feel very comfortable to have a barber that had taken a couple of drinks, scrape your jugular vein? They both grinned and said "no." And would you like to go under the knife of a surgeon who had imbibed even moderately? "Oh, no," they replied. "And would you like to have a physician diagnose your case if you were sick, when you knew he had been drinking; or would you like for a tippling druggist to compound your prescription?" They both had to admit that drink in all instances mentioned would be hazardous. Then I said,

"If you men were running a bar room you would have far more confidence in a total abstainer than in one who drank moderately." They had to admit it. "Now," I asserted, "you men who believe that personal liberty implies drinking alcoholic beverages that impair a person's efficiency, would deny that liberty to those who were expected to be at their best."

Yes, they replied, that is true, but you can't stop it. More is sold today than ever before. But, I replied, you say you have to go to Canada to get it. The fact is, prohibition is just as effective as the law against robbery, and we never think of abolishing laws against robbery because it is so often violated. I then dropped back into quiet meditation on the fallacious arguments self-indulgent men advance to excuse their degeneracy. The matter of Prohibition is like Banquo's ghost. It will not down. It deals with the greatest moral and economic problem that exists. That is why I am a Prohibitionist.

### A QUIET TALK ON VITAL THEMES

The recent editorial in the Highway pointed out many qualities desired by the churches in a preacher. These desirable things are all right, but I wonder if the churches are asking meanwhile what they have to offer the preacher in return. And does it occur to the church that when dealing with a preacher, they are dealing with flesh and blood, as other humans, who have feelings and likes and dislikes as well as others. The preacher may have also some desires and ideals about the church he would choose to serve. So it would be a wholesome thing for the churches, while discussing what they would like in a preacher, to discuss also what the preacher might like in them, so they might be able to tell him what they have to offer in desirable qualities.

The most vital point of all the machinery of the visible church is the joint between church and minister. If this adjustment gets off center, or becomes a "hot box" for lack of oiling, the whole machinery is in danger of collapse. The most extreme care is needed to keep this adjustment in correct alignment.

As already stated, the churches should have a thought for what might be pleasant, convenient or economical for the preacher. This has not always been so. It is easy to write a "yes" or "no" on a piece of paper, but some never stop to think what this may involve. To cite an instance. A pastor and wife with the care of two small children, one a mere baby, and sickly at that, and the wife weak and nervous, after the ravages of influenza, had torn up their home, and at a personal expense of sixty or more hard-earned dollars, moved to another field. The very next spring at the business meeting, one lady voted against them. She was not a person overly burdened for the advancement of the work, nor one that would pay much to support it. She came around in a few days and told the pastor she had voted against his staying, saying she thought, "perhaps a change might be good." She had nothing against the preacher and his family, and never thought for one moment what a change would involve, in labor, expense, and inconvenience. These considerations weighed nothing balanced against her thought that "a change might be good."

One of the weaknesses of our denomination is the lack of a uniform system of raising

money. A hit or miss "pot luck" way may have done for a start, before organization was complete and the work was in an embryo stage, but this method, or lack of method, has no place now. There is no doubt but what the "storehouse plan" of bringing all the tithes into the church and having a committee to handle the money according to needs is the best plan ever devised. Some of the churches have adopted it, and God is blessing them. All the churches should follow. Another thing that should be introduced is a minimum salary for the ministry. That is, a plan whereby none should receive less than some stated figure. So far as I know we are about the only people that have not already adopted this rule. It is not fair for one man to be getting \$20.00 a week, while another just as capable and deserving, gets \$5.00. The stronger church should be willing to help a weaker.

We have reached a time already that if we expect young preachers to come our way, we shall have to improve our methods of financing the church and ministry. It is too late a day to expect young men who have spent a lot of money for an education, and perhaps involved a debt, to turn down an offer of \$30.00 a week or more, in some denomination that has a system, to take "pot luck" where only the offerings are promised, and these are subject to the fluctuations of wind or rain, or the likes and dislikes of fickle humanity. Our work needs to be spread along all fronts and this can only be done when the lay-people get the vision and are willing to stand by with the finances to the full limit of every member of every church, whether they regularly attend church services or not. All members took a solemn covenant to give as the Lord prospered them, and they must keep this vital obligation or the work will suffer.

H. C. M.

### MARRIED

Grant—Wolverton

A quiet wedding took place at the home of the Reformed Baptist pastor in Perth, Saturday, March 15th, at 8:15 p.m., when Rev. S. G. Hilyard united in marriage Preston Hayward, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Alexander Grant, of Four Falls, and Ruth Minnie, daughter of Thomas and the late Ella Boyd Wolverton, of Four Falls.

The couple were attended by Miss Dollie Grant and Ralph Wolverton, the double ring service being used.

We join in wishing this couple a happy and prosperous life.

S. G. H.

Note: The groom is a grandson of Mrs. A. A. Hartley recently of our Perth Church, but now lives in Woodstock.

Copeland-Long

The marriage took place on Jan. 29th, 1941, of Eva Blanche Long, youngest daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Walter S. Long, of Snider Mtn., and Arthur Burton Copeland, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Copeland, Saint John.

She was attended by Miss Ella Gee, Sussex. Henry Crocker, Cumberland Bay, was groomsman. Following the ceremony a reception was held. They will reside for the present at Hopewell Hill, Albert Co.

According to World Dominion, over eighty per cent for the Jewish-owned businesses in Germany which have been handed over to "Aryans" have failed.