

Prohibition Plebiscite. Since the last issue of the JOURNAL two of the Provinces of the Dominion have pronounced upon the prohibition of the liquor traffic. Their decision was "Yes, prohibit it." As theological students we believe we have something worth saying upon it.

We are surprised at the amount of ignorance that prevailed concerning the taking of the vote, and it was not only among the poorly educated, but among those who on ordinary subjects are fairly well informed. The writer assisted in canvassing a large district, and the utter absence of knowledge or the existence of only indistinct ideas was very marked. And what makes this more surprising is that they were newspaper reading people. To give an illustration of the ignorance that existed,—an Ontario Sunday-school teacher did not know that a vote was to be taken till two days before; and canvassers in going from house to house met dozens of cases in which the people did not know that on New Year's day they would be asked to pronounce upon this question. We would draw a lesson from this. Read the newspapers more carefully. Do not skim over them carelessly, and especially over matters that relate to the public good. The newspapers are, all in all, a power for good, and are worthy of careful reading. They published enough on the Prohibition

question, and yet many readers remained ignorant concerning it.

The manner in which some voted gave a good illustration of the detestable selfishness of some natures. We know of a number of cases in which men who did not use liquor voted against Prohibition. They said that as they did not use it themselves it would be of no benefit to them to prohibit it. They would not recognize the fact that they should help their unfortunate fellow-men, who have the appetite for liquor, to free themselves from it. When will men learn that they are their brothers' keepers?

However, notwithstanding the ignorance and selfishness that should not have existed in some localities, the cause of righteousness prevailed. What is the next step? It will not do to remain inactive. It is not likely that we will at once get a prohibitory law; in fact, however much we would like it, we believe it would be a misfortune. We must come to it by degrees. Why not set out to have it in four years? Say that when the sun rises some morning in 1898 he shines upon no intoxicating liquors as a beverage in our land. As a first step in this year '94 let all saloons be wiped out of existence; give licenses, at higher figures, to only (1) hotels with accommodation for a minimum number of lodgers, having that minimum vary according to locality; and (2) to the