Special Notice.

The TEMPERANCE JOURNAL is devoted to the Principle of Temperance and is designed as a family newspaper. It is issued on Saturday morning of each week.

The articles are specially selected and are such as to recommend the Paper to all.

Deputies of all temperance organizations are Authorized Agents.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

One Copy, one year, - - -	$1.00
" six months, - - -	60
" three months, - - -	30

Subscriptions must invariably be paid in advance. Postage stamps will be taken when more convenient to the party remitting.

SPECIAL RATES FOR DIVISIONS.

While the subscription rate for the JOURNAL is $1.00 per year, where two will send their subscriptions together we will send a paper to their separate addresses for 80 cents each. Clubs of 5 will be sent the paper for 70 cents each—or where a division orders 5 copies, at the same rate—70 cents. Divisions ordering 10 copies, at the rate of 60 cents per year.

As a Son of Temperance, and no doubt anxious to promulgate the principles of our order, will you not kindly bring the matter of the JOURNAL, and this method of distributing temperance literature, before your division. Every subscription helps us make the paper better, and more useful as a temperance medium. The divisions are as a general thing not particularly burdened with funds, but almost any division could subscribe for 10 copies, or at least 5 copies. or surely ONE copy, and every one helps.

ADVERTISING RATES:

A limited number of advertisements will be taken at the rate of 10 cents per line, minion measure, five cents for each subsequent insertion. Special rates given for yearly advertisements.

All communications to be addressed to

HERMAN H. PITTS,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
Fredericton, N.

RAISE THE STANDARD.

—OUR MOTTO—

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

Temperance Journal.

SATURDAY, FEB. 22, 1889.

LOTS OF fraternal visiting these days.

SEND IN your returns promptly only a few more days left.

KINGSCLEAR Division reports a good attendance and much interest.

SCOTT ACT cases in Fredericton have been adjourned over for two weeks.

LOTS of excitement these days in Ontario where the Scott Act is being placed on trial in several places.

A DIVISION will likely be shortly organized at Whitneyville, North. Co. On Friday evening last, a largely attended temperance meeting was held, at which some thirty persons signed a petition for a charter. The meeting was addressed by Rev. Mr. Murray, Messrs. N. S. Brown, W. C. Anslow, R. P. Whitney, Jas. Falconer, Robt. Adams, Geo. McLearn, T. F. Sherard and others.

THE PROHIBITION resolutions have been introduced again this year by Mr. Jamieson. An amendment was offered that such resolution became law when the public sentiment of the community is ripe for the reception and report of such a provision. An amendment to the amendment was moved asking that a plebicite be taken of the qualified electors on this subject. We are strongly in favor of a vote being taken, and if a majority of the people are in favor of total prohibition let the same be come law.

THE FLAG THAT FLOATS OVER A RUM-SHOP.

When the appointment of the present American Consul was made, it was received with no little surprise by the general public, who wondered and are still wondering, what special endowment that individual possessed that entitled him to this recognition. Persons who had held the office in previous years had been recognized as good law-abiding citizens, but this cannot be said of the present incumbent. In fact the American flag has been floating over a rum-shop and the consulate has been held by an individual who has been repeatedly before the bar of justice for violating one of the laws of the country. The American Flag has gained no respect in the town by its associations and the office has got into very ill-repute. However a government will shortly be in the power who knows not Joseph, figuratively speaking, and doubtless there will be a change in this office.

KEEP THE CLERGY STILL.

How anxious the rum-sellers are that the clergy should not mix up in politics, or express their earnest and outspoken convictions on the rum-traffic? But the trend of the times is to bring religion and temperance matters into politics, and the way they are conducted by the authorities. Every year shows progression on the part of the religious bodies, and church members, and the better class, the more educated, and those who reason for themselves are arraying themselves against the rum-traffic.

JUST SO.

One of the rum-sellers on trial expressed the opinion some time ago, that the rum business was the meanest business in creation, and he was right. He deplored the fact that he could not make a living without selling liquor, which in our opinion was a most humiliating confession.

Fraternal Visits in St. John.

On Monday evening last, Mariners and Mechanics' Division paid a fraternal visit to Portland Division, and a very agreeable evening was spent. The hall was well filled, there being a number of representatives present from the various Divisions in this city. The visitors were given a hearty welcome by Miss Hill, W. P, which was responded to by Irvine Bissett, W. P of Mariners and Mechanics' division. The programme was as follows: Speeches, A Y Paterson and William Lewis; song, John Stratton; reading, Miss Jennie Irvine; song, Miss Norris; reading, Miss Jennie Emmerson; Speech, John Kenney; reading, John Campbell; duet, Miss McCabe and Miss Dunham; reading, J Vincent; song, S Henderson; reading, Jas Edwards; speech, Mr. Irvine; reading, Miss Mulhay; song, Wm. Grant; speech, Abner Secord; reading, Mr Lester; speech, John Scott; song, Wm Lunn; song, M Morrisey; speech, John Crowley.

On Tuesday evening Mariners' and Mechanics' division visited Almond lodge, Millidgeville, leaving the hall in the Starlight at 7.15 o'clock.

PRIVILEGE AND DUTY.

BY FRANK J. BROWN.

(Article No. 15.)

Not unfrequently are matters presented to a Division in which members entertain different opinions.

To enter into a free discussion of such matters are the equal rights of all.

Our deliberations are to promote the best interests of the Order, but to arrive at those interests immediately is not always possible. Hence, the good old injunction of the Bible: "Come, let us reason together."

Such freedom is in direct harmony with the principles of all republican form of governments—with the principles of our Order, and the toleration of any oligarchical or monarchical tenets is but injurious and ruinous.

In fact, a free discussion, even if spirited, should be encouraged by every Division, for no matter of weighty import should be disposed of till its merits or demerits are considered.

An organization is a tame affair, indeed, that is in the habit of allowing important matters to go by, by careless indifference, by a mechanical raising of the hand or by a one man or a one woman power.

All innovations or infringements upon our organic laws should be carefully guarded against and rebuked.

In the adjustment of all business a cheerful compliance to the constituted majority is the equal and imperative duty of every member.

Politeness and civility and a kind regard for the feelings of others should temper all our deliberations, and angry, vain or bombastic words are forbidden and unbecoming.

"He who ruleth well his heart,
And keeps his temper down,
Acteth far a greater part,
Than he who takes a town.

Laconia, N. H., U. S. A.

A PLAIN TALK WITH THE "VOICE."

BY REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER.

On the 31st of January the *Voice* published an elaborate editorial arraigning me for inconsistency, inconstancy, and moral cowardice. The chief count in your indictment was the following bold declaration which was printed in impudent italics:

"Back of the war no man was more zealous against the encroachments of slavery and more uncompromising than was Dr. Cuyler. But when the pivotal moment came, in 1860, at that hour when it was most essential that every enemy of slavery should stand like adamant, to the surprise and grief of Abolitionists, Dr. Cuyler came out *in favor of returning the fugitive slave* and *in favor even of permitting the slave master to bring his slaves with him on visits to the North.*"

This charge of high treason to the cause of Freedom you sought to substantiate by quoting a large slice from a speech made by Theodore Cuyler, in Philadelphia, in 1860. If you had exercised the ordinary courtesy due to a co-worker in the Temperance cause you would have sent to my house an inquiry whether I had ever made such an extraordinary utterance, and I could have told you that the estimable gentleman who made that speech was the celebrated lawyer of Philadelphia, (whose name even was not like mine), the President of the City Council, and the man chosen to make the speech of welcome to Mr. Lincoln on his way to Washington. Mr. Cuyler was a prominent Democrat, and strongly wedded to the "compromise measures" of the fugitive slave law.

Instead of inquiring whether there was any ground for your libel, you eagerly published the old speech which you had excavated; you appended to it the flagrant untruth that *Dr. Cuyler's* speech had occasioned "grief and surprise among Abolitionists"; you deliberately stated as a proof of my being a whiffling turncoat that when the war began I "swung back again" to the right side and hoisted the stars and stripes on my church; and you wound up your malicious farrago by pronouncing over me Whittier's sad dirge over Webster's "seventh of March" speech! "Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein"; and so down you plumped into your own excavation, where you now lie as a laughing-stock and a solemn warning to all defamers of their brethren.

I sent to you my prompt and indignant denial of your libellous charge. In your next number you published an article with the offensive headline, "Dr. Cuyler Makes a Correction"; and you mutilated my letter—omitting the two sentences which respectfully presented the wrong you had done me. You made no proper apology for the fabrication about the "grief and surprise" of the anti-slavery people and my second somersault of hoisting the flag on my church. You dismissed gross calumny in a single sentence, and then sought to divert attention from your previous assaults by tabulating fresh charges to prove what you call your "working hypothesis" of my alleged inconstancy and vacillations.

(1). You distinctly asserted that three years ago "Dr. Cuyler published to the world that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in their National Convention, had hissed a lady; and to this day, in spite of all denials, thousands believe that report." One would suppose from this that I had first proclaimed that alleged "hissing', to the world. The actual truth is, that it had been widely published already and the Boston *Congregationalist* had commented on it severely. I simply alluded to it in an article (in the *N. Y. Evangelist*) on "Woman's Work for Temperance," and I used it as an illustration of the unhappy effects of being drawn into heated political discussions. My language was too strong, for which I afterward apologized. That the convention was under great excitement—that a few foolish individuals hissed, and that the President, Miss Frances E. Willard, promptly and properly suppressed it—are about the facts, as attested by unimpeachable witnesses. The trivial incident—which in no wise reflects reproach upon the great and noble army of the "W. C. T. Union" or their well-known President—might have sunk into oblivion, if you had not dragged it up, and attempted to use it as a fresh weapon of personal assault. With the Woman's Temperance Union, I am in the warmest sympathy, and constantly delighted co-operation. Nowhere are they more cordially welcomed than in my church. But I firmly believe that their true province is in earnest, effective Christian labor, and the less they have to do with partisan politics, the better.

(2) Your other chief charge enveloped from your "working hypothesis" is, my course toward prohibition, high license, and the Third party. I have been an unswerving prohibitionist since I edited a prohibition journal in Trenton, thirty-seven years ago, and stood beside Neal Dow before State Legislatures and ecclesiastical assemblies. The prohibition of the saloon was successfully maintained in those days, irrespective of party or creed. At the organization of the Republican party I enlisted enthusiastically under the banner of Free Soil and Fremont, wrote campaign documents for the "Pathfinder," and would sooner have been suspected of Mormonism than of wagging my tongue in favor of returning fugitive slaves to bondage. On most national questions I have continued to be a Republican; but for several solid and sufficient reasons I took no active part in the last two Presidential elections. In 1884 I dropped a quiet vote for Governor St. John; and one week before the election, at the request of a few brother-prohibitionists, I signed a circular in his behalf. That solitary step was about the beginning and the end of my very brief foray into "third party" politics, for I very soon returned to *my old and settled conviction*, that it was not the wisest way for me to promote the great object that lies so near my heart. Every Temperance man must be guided by his own judgment and conscience. While I applaud the zeal and honor the sturdy convictions of my temperance brethren in the Third party, I cannot ally myself with you, for three very strong reasons: (1). Long observation has taught me that wherever and whenever prohibition has been successfully enacted, it has *not* been by a separate, distinct temperance party. (2). I am conscientiously opposed to your proposal to burden woman with the trust, duties and responsibilities of the ballot and of civil office. (3). As the President of a non-partisan society for the promotion of both total abstinence and the suppression of the liquor traffic, I do not feel at liberty to identify myself with any partisan organization. Nevertheless, I have joined with you Third party men in labors for the common cause, and in paying honors to the memory of the lamented Finch; and I have not hesitated also in criticising occasionally what I regarded as your grave mistakes. My policy is to labor for the overthrow of the drinking usuages and the entire suppression of the accursed liquor traffic wherever it is possible or attainable. Where suppression is absolutely impossible, I go for any or every method to cripple or curtail it. Therein I aim to follow exactly the example of my distinguished and world-honored predecessor, the late Hon. William E. Dodge: Wherever I can hit the drink-devil I hit him whether the voice of my conscience agrees with your *Voice* or not.

For example, last year that insolent champion of the saloons, David B. Hill, flung down his challenge before the people of New York. He is the very embodiment of the saloon oligarchy; to overthrow him would have been an object-lesson for all dangerous demagogues. The one man who could possibly defeat him was Mr. Warner Miller, who stood on a platform of "High License." Without uttering one syllable on the right or the wrong of High License, I exhorted all good citizens of New Y., irrespective of party, to support Miller and crush Hill. Thousands of sincere Prohibitionists—including at least one of your Third party leaders—voted as I did, and for the same good reason. What I claim to be honest independence, you denounce as inconsistency and compromising cowardice. Your "working hypothesis" is a Keeley motor; it won't work. Your narrow policy for combating a gigantic evil, after nearly twenty years of experiment, has worked no better. Excellent motive is unavailable without excellent method.

Two things are as clear as the noonday; The one is that our great vital Reform rests, under God, on the enlightened conscience of the American people. That only can be secured by a thorough education of the people as to the nature and perils of strong drink, a thorough education against the drinking customs that feed the dram-shop, and a thorough education as to the appalling iniquities of the liquor traffic; for without the persuasion of the nation's conscience, we can secure no prohibition of the nation's curse. The other truth is that in the face of our cruel and colossal foe there should be no internecine conflict between the honest advocates of our Reform. If offences come, woe unto him by whom the offence cometh!

Gentlemen of the *Voice*, after forty five years of unselfish, unpaid, and untiring labors of our Reform, I shall not submit to the crack of any dictatorial whip, or allow you or any men to defame me with impunity. I will gladly co-operate with every „Union" —male or female, with every Order and League and Society or political organization, for the promotion of our sacred cause; but no man shall charge me with treason to the negro's freedom, or with insulting Christian womanhood, or with disloyalty to the great temperance enterprise, without receiving an indignant blow on the lips that utter the calumny. I trust that this warm discussion may produce some good results. If toward your fellow-laborers you will mend your manners and your temper,—if you will use more of the sweet oil of persuasion and less of the vitriol of vituperation,—if you will turn your artillery away from a constant bombarding of the two great national parties to a bombardment of the nation's greatest curse, you may become a power for the promotion of our Reform. May God give you wisdom to discern the right and valor to defend it!

And now, having bestowed gratuitously these wholesome counsels, I advise you to pin on your editorial desk these salutary words: "Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful."—*From "The National Temperance Advocate" for March.*

What the Beer Business Does for the Country.

Let us carefully summarize what has been said elsewhere in reference to the financial results to the country of moderate beer drinking.

A workingman who drinks daily two glasses of beer at five cents each, will this way spend annually thirty-six dollars and fifty cents.

This represents about 45 gallons of beer.

This represents about 3¾ bushels of barley.

For this barley the farmer gets about two dollars and forty five cents.

The balance of the workingman's $36.50 stays in the hands of the brewer and liquor seller. The workingman has swallowed his beer and has nothing of value to show for his money. He may have weaker nerves, a less clear brain and a dangerous appetite, but we leave these out of our calculations now, and say he has literally nothing.

Suppose that Prohibition became law, and the workingman did not spend this $36.50 for beer, it would be available, and would be spent in needful articles for his home. The bread, the butter, the cheese, the meat, the vegetables, the woolen clothes that it would purchase, are all directly or indirectly the produce of the farm. If we allow the manufacturers and dealers in these articles 40 per cent of their selling price for profit, the farmer will still get $21.90, and the traders have $14.60. But it must be noticed that now the workingman had had something to show for his money. Food in his cupboard, clothing for his family to the full value of $36.50. And it must not be imagined that the farmer has failed to sell his barley. He has exported it either in grain or changed it to beef, and has received the $2.45 for it all the same, but with this difference that now the money to pay him has come into Canada from abroad, and the country has in it $2.45 more than it would have if its workingman had drunk that barley in the shape of beer.

Let us put these calculations in the form of a comparative table showing what is the result of the spending of the workingman's $36.50 in these different cases.