

thoroughly and long beforehand: on the other side there was not only no organization, but there had been no effort of any kind. Two or three meetings were held in centres of population by the Liberal Temperance Union. On the night before the election they held one at Lindsay, in the open air, the hall which they had bespoken having been locked against them by the Scott Act men; and in Lindsay, as well as in one or two other centres, there was a majority against the Act; but over the rural districts, while the supporters of the Act were all brought to the poll, of its opponents a large proportion stayed at home. It is always difficult to organize people or to stir them to exertion on the negative side of a question. The difficulty is of course greatly increased when a certain amount of odium, or at least of abuse, is to be faced; though those who fear being called the friends of the rumseller may comfort themselves with the reflection that the rumsellers are not all on one side: some low tavern-keepers have, as we are credibly informed, been voting for the Act, in the well-founded belief that under it they will be able to sell bad liquor without a license. People wake up to the importance of the question and begin to bestir themselves when it is too late: resistance springs into existence in the towns, but it has not time to reach the rural districts. Unless citizens will make the cause of public liberty their own, this country will soon share the fate of Maine and Vermont. The licensed and regulated trade will have been destroyed, an illicit and unregulated trade will have taken its place, the smuggling system will have been installed, the lighter and more wholesome beverages will have been banished from use, ardent spirits will have become the exclusive drink, and the moral agencies which have been gradually and surely prevailing over intemperance will have been paralyzed; to say nothing of the loss of revenue, the ruin of industries by which numbers make their bread, the injury to the barley trade, and the suppression of such attempts as were put forth to introduce the culture of the vine. Let us entreat men of sense before the yoke is rivetted on them to use a little forecast, and to unite with their forecast a little energy. Let them remember that beyond the question of the Scott Act lies the much broader and deeper question between freedom and what is called coercive morality. The same love of interference which operates in this case, if it is not at once restrained, will operate in other cases, and the "protection of the home" may be some day taken into clerical hands for other purposes besides the exclusion of liquor; though such usurpation would in the end be the undoing of the Churches, since the social revolt which it would surely provoke would become also a rebellion against Church government and teaching. Each county will have to take care of itself. The Liberal Temperance Union has produced its effect in Toronto; at least we may assume that the postponement of the Scott Act election is not wholly an act of mercy towards dynamiters and men with arms steeped up to the elbow in the blood of civilization. But the Union has no Dominion organization, though it has held out a hand here and there to local effort. Let the places in which the question is still pending lose no time in looking to themselves.

THE Temperance Question as it is improperly called when, not Temperance, but enforced abstinence is meant, seems to be tending in a curious way to a distinctly religious issue. Extreme Prohibitionists, who by the wild law which governs enthusiasm are pretty sure in the end to become masters of the movement, have begun to avow that they will not be satisfied till the use of fermented wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has been made a criminal offence. Nonsense, and outrageous nonsense as this seems, it must be allowed that the extremists who utter it do no more than consistency requires. To permit the accursed thing to be used in the most sacred of ordinances would be on their part the acceptance of a standing protest of the most signal and decisive kind against the truth of their doctrine; we might almost say against their religion, for Prohibition seems really to have become the chief religion of a good many of them. In the Prohibitionist ranks are some men and women of the Agnostic school who chuckle over the side-blow given to Christianity by the slur cast on the Sacrament, and joyfully proclaim one element of the Eucharist a relic of immoral barbarism which its founder's want of foresight introduced and which civilization is now about to sweep away. It is needless to say that this view cannot possibly be accepted by any Christians except the Unitarians and of them only by the most rationalistic. The Methodist Church, which has completely committed itself to Prohibition and has dragged the Presbyterians in its train, seems inclined to seek refuge from the mortal dilemma in the astonishing theory that the wine which was used by Christ, and by drinking which to excess Corinthian partakers of the Lord's Supper became intoxicated, was the unfermented juice of the grape. Chemistry, as well as the plain language of the New Testament, is unpropitious to this hypothesis. What

is put on the market as Sacramental wine unfermented is declared on analysis to be not the pure juice of the grape but a colored and sophisticated concoction. The introduction of such a fraud into the Eucharist would be rejected both by Catholics and Anglicans with the utmost horror; and if enthusiasm has its way, we may see the Prelates and clergy of both those communions carried off to gaol for celebrating in what they deem the only legitimate way an ordinance absolutely essential in their eyes to spiritual life. Their conviction under the Scott Act will be easy, since the informer will not be required to have personal knowledge of the criminal act. We suspect, however, that the use of wine in the Lord's Supper will survive Prohibitionism. With it will survive that moral ideal of "genial innocence," as opposed to asceticism, of which bread and wine are symbolical and which was presented in the life of the Founder.

UPON the political situation in England generally not much new light has been thrown in the past week. The increased Liberal majority at Aylesbury, an agricultural borough, may be a slight indication of the tendency of that element, but till the new Franchise has been actually tried all calculation will be at fault. The defeat of the new Ministry in a thin house on a question so secondary as that relating to the forfeiture of the franchise by the acceptance of medical relief has no significance except, perhaps, as a display of insolent power on the part of the Parnellites. What is of more importance is the apparent progress of the schism between the extreme and the moderate section of each party, between the Tory Democrats, or as they ought rather to be called the Tory Rowdies, and the Conservatives in one camp, and between the Liberals and the Radicals in the other. Conservatives protest against the desertion of the Executive by the Tory Ministry under Mr. Parnell's orders in the case of Lord Spencer. On the other hand the Radical leaders, Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke, skulk out of the House when their Liberal colleague is to be defended, and send hollow excuses for absence from the banquet given in his honour. It is impossible that the Liberals and Conservatives should fail in time to be led to the conviction that on the vital questions which are destined to form the subject of coming struggles their interests are the same and pressing necessity bids them combine their forces. The unfortunate part of the situation is that the organizations are in the hands of the ultra-Tories and the Radicals, so that neither Liberals nor Conservatives are likely to come back strong in numbers from the November polls. Those who, like Sir William Harcourt, aim above all things at holding the Liberal-Radical Party together as the means of recovering power after the elections, are of course intensely anxious to keep as their leader Mr. Gladstone, whose personal authority is and has long been in fact the only bond of union between the discordant sections. Mr. Gladstone apparently consents to remain leader, and it is possible that his name may lend to the party a sufficient aspect of unity to enable the sections to support each other in the election, though the selection of candidates cannot fail in many places to be a very trying operation. Instead of being asked to accept the programme of Lord Hartington or Mr. Chamberlain, the nation may be asked simply to put the government back into the hands of Mr. Gladstone, and it will probably respond to that appeal. But a combination which depends for its existence on the life and strength of an overworked man of seventy-six is a frail security for the future, and if present tendencies continue to operate, the split between the Liberals and the Radicals must soon come. If we could suppose that Mr. Gladstone had undertaken, as the editor of the *Fortnightly* confidently assures us, not only to retain the leadership of the party but himself to carry into effect the dismemberment of the nation, in accordance with Mr. Chamberlain's scheme and in the interest of Mr. Chamberlain's ambition, we should say that he had better a thousand times be in an honourable grave. Nothing could be darker than the political outlook in England at the present hour.

ALL possible allowance being made for the passionate greed of office, it was still difficult to understand the pertinacity with which Mr. Chamberlain and his friends fawned on the Irish Party after the more than humiliating rebuffs which they had received. But a new light seems to have dawned upon the mystery. Mr. Davitt is in full revolt against Mr. Parnell, and Mr. Parnell having unquestionably made a compact with the Tories, the game of the Chamberlain Party apparently is to form a counter alliance with Mr. Davitt. Mr. Parnell's object is political; he wants to separate Ireland from England and make himself king of his own Island. He is himself a landlord; the other day we heard of his ejecting a tenant; and the curious discovery appears to have been made that he had inserted in a lease a clause prohibiting the lessee from taking advantage of agrarian legislation. His New York admirers can proudly say of him that he is a "gentleman," and that in excluding himself from the best English