

with liquor bars. And we protest against the inconsistency of public sentiment which looks with horror-stricken eyes at a barn door without seeing the barn. One opium "joint" is an evil—one hundred liquor saloons are one hundred times as bad. One den kept by John Chinaman is an outrage on good morals; one hundred bars run by other foreigners are one hundred times as outrageous. We suppress John and his vile influences; we have as much reason and as much right to suppress Hans and Mike and all theirs.

Our State Legislature of 1882 passed a prohibitory law, by virtue of which every Chinaman is forbidden the sale of opium in a public place, and all persons are debarred from using it in such a place under heavy penalties. That law was and is the most direct recognition that could be asked or granted of the principle of prohibition, of the right and justice of that principle. On the statute books, it ought to be enforced, and our contemporaries do well to clamor for its enforcement. But let us all be just. Though opium cannot vote, let us not be more severe upon it than upon the beer, which has the right of suffrage. Let us not stultify a principle by unduly discriminating in its application. There are, beyond question, one hundred liquor saloons in this city to one opium den, and they are ten times as audacious in their defiance of law. Will not our worthy contemporaries stir up the pure public mind by way of remembrance concerning this more frequently? Where one young girl is ruined in a hidden opium den, scores find equal degradation in the licensed beer gardens. Why not make the crusade general against all iniquitous resorts.

—*New York American Reformer.*

PROHIBITION.

"It is undeniable that prohibitory laws have outraged the good sense of the majority, particularly of the more thoughtful and well balanced classes, and done a great deal to aggravate the evil they aimed to destroy.

—*Bishop McLaren of England.*

When a man has lived long enough to become a bishop, and is no farther advanced in moral principles than the above indicates, it is useless for us to waste words upon him. His opinions were formed fifty years ago, and probably in a dark and benighted locality, and he had never sent thought out on an excursion to bring in any new thing. He, and those like him in this country, if there are any, must not wonder if the world leaves them behind.

"Thou shalt not kill."

"Thou shalt not steal."

"Thou shalt not commit adultery."

Have these prohibitory laws "outraged good sense and done a great deal to aggravate the evil they aimed to destroy?"

Let all good people pray the Lord to take all such bishops who are ready right home to Heaven. This world has no use for them. "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?"—*The Lacer.*

WHY LICENSE AT ALL?

If the sale of liquors is beneficial to the community—if the use of liquor produces happiness, in short, if saloon-keepers are, as they claim to be, self-sacrificing public benefactors, why tax their traffic any higher than that of the butcher, the baker or the milk-dealer? If, on the other hand, the sale and use of liquor is an evil producing no good results—a prolific cause of crime, misery and pauperism—causing an unjust taxation upon other industries to meet the expenses incident to the punishment of criminals—the building of asylums, almshouses and prisons, and the care of paupers and their offspring, as we believe it to be—then why tolerate it, or license it at all? A license may be considered a permission for a money consideration to do an act that would be otherwise illegal, hence a license permits a wrong to be done, and no government that is of the people should permit or encourage a wrong to be committed: and that government that permits, encourages and licenses an evil, is *particeps criminis* in the evil itself. As well license crime under any other form as under this. In the sight of a dishonored God, and an outraged humanity, the crimes are equal. —*Royal Templar's Advocate, Buffalo, N. Y.*

LOCAL OPTION.

(An extract from *The Alliance News* report of a recent speech of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, at Lambeth.)

Crotchets are only principles in the egg, when the egg is cracked out they come, and instead of being crotchets they are called no longer, "the visionary dreams of crack brained enthusiasts," but great statesmen term them "important principles which it is perfectly clear public opinion has made up its mind upon, and such as soon must be incorporated in the legislation of the country." Well, our crotchets are getting on. What a time we have had of it lately! I never knew such a time for crotchets in the House of Commons as it has been during the last few weeks. Mr. Rylands had a crotchet. Now I am not saying that these crotchets are right, but only using them as illustrations, for we are talking of no crotchet being right save mine, but I am showing you how wonderfully crotchets are growing. Mr. Ryland's came down and said we ought not to spend so much money, and the House of Commons, and the Government agreed with what he said. Then came Mr. Stanhope who said that too much money was spent in India, and the House agreed to that without a division. Then Mr. Stansfeld had a crotchet about some odious laws which exist in this country, and by an overwhelming majority his crotchet was carried in the House of Commons. And then came Lawson with his crotchet, and you know what came of it. And now I am going to explain to you what this crotchet is. This crotchet has at last become what is called a "plank" in the Liberal party. But when I say that, do not let me frighten away any Conservative friends. Our policy is far above the factious cries of Whigs or Tories, but if the Whigs, or the Liberals, or whatever else they are called, have taken it up so much the better for them, and so much the better for us, but do not let it frighten our Tory friends away. You remember the Tories suddenly became reformers. That did not frighten the Liberals; and so do not let the Tories be frightened away now that the Liberals have become Local Optionists. What is the principle of this crotchet? The principle which the House of Commons has affirmed is this, that the people of this country ought to be allowed in their own localities, where they wish to do so, to protect themselves from nuisances. Ah! you may say, "that is rather a sweeping statement. What right have you to call the liquor traffic a nuisance?" There is no accounting for tastes. Everybody has his hobby. I daresay you have all heard of the old tallow chandler who had retired from business, but who never could resist coming down to the factory on melting days. That was his satisfaction, his amusement. He took a delight in the smell of boiled tallow; and there are plenty of people who take a delight in the liquor traffic, and in its works. We are only saying what we believe, viz., that the liquor traffic is a nuisance; and we did not start that idea. It was started long ago in the *Kilmurgh Review*, an organ of "sweetness and light;" and this organ declared that the liquor traffic was a nuisance, "socially, economically, and politically," and we wish people to say whether they think so or no. Most people do not like to have a drinkshop near them; some few people do. I have heard of an old lady to whom somebody said—"Do you like having a beer-shop close to your house?" and she said "Yes I do, because I always know where to find the coachman." But that old lady was exceptional, and we want to give people the option, or the choice of saying whether they will have these places about them or not. Of course if there be a large number of the same way of thinking as the old lady they will let things go on as they are and keep the public-houses, but if there exists a majority who believe that they are a nuisance, then they will have the opportunity to sweep those places away. * * * * The Tory Government, before the present one, tried their hand at mending the licensing system, and the Liberal party before them, then as now, under the auspices of Mr. Gladstone. The Liberal Government under Mr. Gladstone, with Mr. Bruce as Home Secretary, made the thing a little better. Then came Sir Richard Cross, and he made it a little worse, and what am I to do? Am I to get up and say that I understand this matter better than Mr. Bruce or the "Grand Cross?" I am not so bumptious, I assure you. Whenever you hear of me proposing a licensing scheme, you may recommend my friends to send me to Bedlam straightway. I believe I am the only man in England who has not got a licensing system. The chairman is sitting there very quietly, but I'll be bound to say he has a licensing scheme. It is the "last infirmity of noble minds" the desire to draw a licensing scheme. Here is the Rev. W. Barker—I'll be bound to say he has one, and Mr. Raper, he is not quite free from it. I know when he gets up he will explain to you that he never conceived such a thing in his life, but I think he is a little bit tainted. I am the only man, I repeat, who has not a licensing scheme. I leave all these schemes to statesmen. I must say about statesmen that the more I see of them the less I like them, but still I want them to have a fair chance. I won't hamper them in anything they propose if they believe they can improve the licensing system; but as I have already told you, more than once, and as you must understand now, that all I want is to give you the option of saying licenses or no licenses. I think that if we get that change effected we shall secure the maximum of benefit with the minimum of change. You may ask me why I am so anxious for this? Well, because experience tells me that where there are no licenses, there the people are wiser, and better, and happier than the places where they have licenses. Many large landlords who have rule over great territories have said—"We will have no public houses or drinkshops of any kind upon our land," and the consequence is that the people instead