

dies proposed, they have failed hitherto to meet the necessities of the case. Still, it must be confessed, the failure is to be attributed not so much to the insufficiency of the remedies themselves, as to the unwillingness of the public to adopt them. For instance, there can be no doubt that total abstinence from all intoxicants is a certain remedy for intemperance, if its universal adoption could only be secured; but experience shows that this is not likely to be accomplished very soon, at least by the methods ordinarily employed. So long as the traffic continues, the results of the traffic will continue too. We are far from undervaluing the good that has already been accomplished by workers in the temperance reform. Through their unselfish labors, thousands of inebriates have been reclaimed, and thousands have been saved from entering upon the drunkard's career; but there is no use in shutting our eyes to the fact that *the liquor traffic is making drunkards far more rapidly than we can reclaim them*; and thus our work has been that of one heaving a huge stone up the mountain side: a vast expenditure of strength, with but little real gain.

Now, it seems to us that a serious defect in the working of the temperance reform has been a tacit recognition of the liquor traffic as a legitimate branch of trade—a business to be "regulated," but not "suppressed." Effects have been dealt with, while the cause which produces them has been left almost untouched. The evils of intemperance have been pointed out and mourned over, and stringent laws have been passed for the punishment of drunkenness, while, at the same time, every possible facility has been given for the extension of the traffic by which drunkards are made. Drunkenness has been condemned as a grievous sin—an "iniquity to be punished by the judges"—while drunkard-making has passed without legislative or judicial rebuke. These things ought not so to be. It is high time this question was stripped of all false surroundings, and placed in its true light, which, in our opinion, is this: that the traffic itself is a moral, social, political wrong; that it is a traffic whose results are evil, and only evil, and which, therefore, should be outlawed altogether—placed beyond the pale of legal recognition.

As an important step towards the prohibition of the liquor traffic, the present licensing system should be abolished. The system is evil in many ways. It makes the traffic to some extent respectable, by throwing around it the shield of legal protection; it goes upon the assumption that the evil is not in the traffic itself, but only in selling "without a license;" and, worst of all, it makes the traffic a tremendous engine of political power. It is so at elections; for in most constituencies political parties are so equally divided, that a few votes will turn the scale either way; and there are few candidates for parliamentary honors who dare declare themselves opposed to the traffic, lest they might lose the votes controlled by the liquor interest; (an illustration, by the way, of the results flowing from the party strifes of the day). Besides this, there is little hope of securing the prohibition of the traffic while the licensing system continues. Government is not likely to place under the ban a traffic from which it derives a revenue—we speak of the Dominion Government—of some two and a half millions of dollars. But let the facts be fully known—let the people once be convinced that it is they, and not the liquor-sellers, who pay this enormous revenue—and the day will come, perhaps sooner than we anticipate, when Government will be compelled to apply the only effectual remedy for the evils of the liquor traffic—LEGAL PROHIBITION.

We copy the following specimen brick from a very able and exhaustive (not to say exhausting) article on the "Finite and Infinite" in a Chicago quarterly: "What is present is, therefore, Otherness in general, or a universal Being-for-Other, which, because it is a Being-for-Other, is more properly Being-for-One. That is, the singleness of the determination sublates the Otherness." Of course it does. Who needs to be told that? It is just as plain as that the Totherness upsets the Otherness when the doubleness obfuscates the Singleness, and the ears of the animal flap symphonically with his tail. It always is so.

TRADES' UNIONS.

"STRIKES" have been so numerous of late in this and other countries as to attract more than usual attention to the causes and consequences of these "social evils," and their melancholy results. Rising above everything savoring of prejudice, privilege or caste, and setting aside every feeling having a tendency to warp our justice or our judgment, let us take our stand on a national platform, and endeavor to discuss the subject of Trades' Unions in a patriotic and Christian spirit.

A Trades' Union may be defined as a voluntary association of "people of like occupation" for mutual assistance, protection and improvement. In most of the great cities of America and Europe, each trade has its own union. As a rule those organizations sympathize with, and support, each other, and in places where the advantages of mutual co-operation are perfectly understood and discipline fully established, the respective societies form a kind of "federal brotherhood," and pledge their faith to one central authority—to one chief executive.

There always has been, and probably ever will be, a kind of intermittent "civil war" between labour and capital. Full many a time has the battle been fought and won, and "won yet fought again," but the result has always been, and ever will be, the same—the contest has been, and ever will be, decided on the principles of supply and demand. Labour and Capital are dependent on each other. The interests of the employer and employees are mutual if not identical. For this reason, if not for higher and holier motives, both parties should bear and forbear, "live and let live."

A Trades' Union may be regarded, according to the original import of the words, as a mutual benefit society, whose avowed object is to provide against the contingencies incidental to want of employment, sickness or death. Such societies exist under various names and forms, in all countries where the mechanic and labourer have risen above the condition of serfdom. Such societies flourish in the British isles, and bask in the sunshine of aristocratic and royal patronage. But in the old country the principle of co-operation for mutual defence or aggression, is subject to more intelligent guidance, and supported by more disinterested sympathies, than with us; there it is restrained by common sense and political prudence and seldom leads to an infringement of the law. However in Britain, as in America, these societies present one common feature, the funds of the union find their way into the exchequers of designing knaves, and are often expended on such frivolous things as banners and beer, flashing regalia, and periodical festivities. It appears that the numbers and strength of these societies have increased with the spread of education, and it is worthy of note that such organizations do not exist in uncivilized society. If not the direct offspring, they are, at least, excrescences of civilization. As the laborer or mechanic becomes more intelligent, he becomes conscious of the advantages of unity of action in trade as well as in politics, and naturally directs his attention to the laws of demand and supply—the great principles which tend to affect his relations with his employer. This is inevitable. It is best perhaps that it should be so. Trade's Unions are intended to fulfill the same functions towards the "sons of toil" as Masonry fulfills towards the middle and wealthier classes; and if such unions exist at all, it is only natural to suppose that they will turn their attention to those things which most materially affect their interests.

Labour and skill are the mechanic's stock in trade, and it is quite natural that he should desire to sell in the dearest market, and thus "hire them out" to the greatest personal advantage. Impartial people will scarcely deny that trade organizations do (to some extent) improve the condition of the working classes; for if there were no such combinations the power of capital over labour would be unlimited if not despotic. The rich manufacturer, regardless of individual protests, might carry everything with a high hand, in obedience probably to the heartless dictates of his inhuman will. If dishonest, or unjust, or hard to please, and possessed

of "the keys of famine and plenty" the married mechanic might well shudder at the idea of incurring his displeasure. We are inclined to believe that if a Trades' Union be confined to legitimate objects, it is capable of doing much good, not only to the individual sons of toil, but to the capitalists themselves. Through the confidence engendered by membership with a powerful society the mechanic, as a rule, becomes a more manly citizen, a better tradesman and a better christian. His sense of manhood and self-reliance (if not personal happiness) is increased, and his intercourse with his employer is more courteous, if more independent. In countries where "unions" do not prevail, men are often reduced by their necessities to solicit employment as if they were asking alms, yet in such cases their personal regard for their employers is not near so kind or affectionate as in countries (such as Canada) where no favour is supposed to be received or conferred by the formation of such relations. We are of opinion that impartial observers, (who are friends of labour and of man) will freely admit that the Unions seldom fail to instil a feeling of manly independence into the hearts of their members, which if duly checked and properly controlled and guided, would invariably increase the usefulness and efficiency of these bodies instead of entailing (as they too often do) a maximum of evils upon themselves individually, upon their helpless families and upon the luckless community in which they reside. Doubtless it will also be conceded that unless the feelings so engendered, by mutual co-operation, be prudently checked and guided in a liberal and patriotic spirit, the various Unions may be the source of danger to their respective members and a nuisance to society in general.

There is no law human or divine, to compel men to do a maximum amount of work for a minimum amount of pay. If men voluntarily enter a legal association and of their own free will are desirous of continuing therein, and of working therein for the common benefit without giving offence to any man, we do not see why any outsiders (ourselves among the number) can with propriety assume the right to censure such conduct. Every man—professional or otherwise—have or should have the right to determine the conditions on which he will give his services to others. And if this be true of the individual, it must also be true of the Society or Association. If a capitalist or employer does not think proper to accept the services of a "Union" on the terms they propose, then by every principle of reason and justice, they have a perfect right to "stop work" subject to the terms of their original contract, or to seek a more remunerative market for their labour, should they so desire. If by such change they can do better, no honest or impartial person can censure them for doing so; and if "the boss" can procure "hands" equally good for the same or less wages, no sensible man will blame him for not retaining his former employees at a higher rate. In fact it would be absurd to censure either party; although forsooth, certain folks allege that such changes tend to injure trade or give undue advantage to rival Capitalists. Such things will ultimately recover their equilibrium and all such disputes between labour and capital, will finally adjust themselves according to the principle of supply and demand. Recognizing the right of the mechanic to combine with his fellows for the legitimate purpose of mutual improvement, protection and benevolence, we at the same time emphatically affirm that any man, or body of men, are wrong, grossly wrong, in attempting to coerce or intimidate those who may not conform with them in opinion, or those who may think proper to dissent from the rules or regulations prescribed by any Society or Association whatsoever.

Any one acquainted with the elements comprising the union and non-union branches of a trade will readily admit that, as a rule, the best and most skilful tradesmen are in the union. It appears from certain statistics that non-union men are less provident and less successful than their rival brethren. For this reason the non-unionists are regarded as inferior to, and less respectable than their more fortunate confreres "within the pale." So one will deny moreover that the talent and respectability of the various trades are represented in their respective unions; and the creed of