

money to be its god; nor allow anything contrary to Christian decorum to soil its pages. That its motto should be "Christ and Christianity." (4.) The fourth thing required is that the traffic in strong drink be forbidden throughout the land. If a man has a dog about his place which has taken to biting, he will likely first warn people, then shut him up; if this does not do he will chain him; then muzzle him. If all this fail so that he bites the very land that feeds him, then he must be destroyed. It is showed so with strong drink. It is a good thing to warn people, to use moral suasion to raise the moral line of society. Right welcome therefore are the words of one of our political papers—on "drunkenness in high places." It says: For a legislator, a statesman, a magistrate—any one in fact who, by virtue of his official standing, lies under an obligation to discountenance and discourage drunkenness, to be himself a drunkard is a strange libel upon the properties and common sense.

"There was, it is true, a time when this deplorable failing was not regarded as particularly disgraceful. Public opinion was not so active as it has since become on this question. Now, the means by which society may be purged of this offence is one of the chief topics of the day. Legislation is invoked, the hand of justice is rendered more active, "moral suasion" is diligently applied in every direction. In decent company drunkenness is regarded as an outrage and an insult. Differing as men do with regard to the means of preventing drunkenness, the public mind is a unit in favour of its prevention. But if that is tolerated in those who should be public exemplars, which the whole country with one voice will pronounce as hateful and dangerous, the whole of the efforts, moral and legal, for the suppression of drunkenness are a mere burlesque, a waste of power, and a huge mockery.

"If a merchant or a banker finds his trusted servant is a drunkard, if he discovers that on some occasion when he most needs his service he is helplessly inebriated, he discharges him. No greater disqualification can anybody present for employment in any ordinary capacity than the habit of "being drunk on duty." The policeman who so far forgets himself is discharged as an unsafe public servant. Why not, then, a magistrate, or an alderman, or a mayor, or any other municipal functionary? The Government clerk suffers the same fate; why not, then, the head of his department? It is a settled principle that drunkenness is incompatible with efficiency. Why is the state, of all employers, to be the one that fails to insist on efficiency? It is hardly necessary to point out that so long as the high officers of any public body are guilty of such a vice and yet allowed to retain their places, or so long as offenders are allowed to aspire to prominent stations, the difficulty of dealing with subordinates is greatly enhanced. If a drunkard is elected to a high position the moral standard of the whole community is deteriorated. It is as detrimental to the moral tone of society to pay this honour to a man who periodically, by the mere indulgence of his appetite, robs himself of reason and sinks to the level of a brute, as it would be to elect to office a thief or a forger who happened in other respects to be per chance "a good fellow," or an efficient man of business.

"The fiat of the people should be that no drunkard, no man who is known to yield himself to the influence of this degrading vice, should hold office however humble, or receive honour however small, at their hands. The knowledge that this rule would be stringently applied to every aspirant for place or honour would be one means, at all events, of advancing the great social reform towards the accom-