

ous appetite is more inimical to length of years than intoxicating drinks. Though the amount consumed of various alcoholic preparations increases yearly, inebriety is steadily on the decrease. A multiplying population, and a generally easier condition in pecuniary resources which enables men to purchase what they require, is the solution for this increased demand, not that civilized people are becoming more addicted to drink: the opposite is the fact. The arguments used by prohibitionists are almost entirely unsound. That habitual intoxication does frequently lead to crime we allow. Then legislate for the habitual wine-bibber. Let him or her be treated as human beings wanting in one of the highest attributes of mankind, self-control, and therefore requiring legal supervision until educated up to it. Let the small minority give up pursuing the will-o'-the-wisp idea and take in hand what is possible of attainment.

At the taking of the late plebiscite the general idea prevailed that not casting a vote told against prohibition. Such, however, was theoretically wrong, though practically right. But it gave the promoters of it an opportunity, of which they were not slow to avail themselves. Any one who is desirous to scan the feelings of the people on this subject, can take the populations of cities or rural districts, and count the numbers voting for prohibition. It is certain that all voters in favor of it were drummed up to the polling booths, then count the numbers polling against and add to them those votes unpollled and a correct idea will be arrived at. Take the city of Winnipeg as an instance. On the voters' list are 7,469 names, 1,451 voted for prohibition, 921 against it, giving a majority against prohibition of 6,018. It may be fairly claimed that every one not recording a vote is either adverse to a prohibition law or is unable to see the necessity for it. But is the registersd voters' list a fair criterion of the *vox populi* in a matter where in-

dividuals are so personally concerned? We believe not, and manhood suffrage in taking this and similar votes would be the true and just way of testing the question. Every adult male should have the privilege of recording his vote, and if such was the case, it would prove overwhelmingly against it.

The revenue returns for fermented liquors for the year 1897 was \$5,924,235, and at least a similar amount would have to be expended in the vain endeavor to enforce the observance of the Act, leaving an annual deficit of \$11,968,470. In what way is this to be replaced? Why, by taxation that would set the whole Dominion in a ferment. Could any government pass a prohibition law without first compensating the manufacturers and dealers in liquors for the millions they have invested in their business: encouraged, fostered and protected by the Government in their outlay, by the licenses granted to them? Would it be just to do so? How many thousands would be thrown out of profitable employment, and their wives and children deprived of their bread? And what would the farmer say when the price of his barley was reduced two-thirds, and the hop-grower, whose now profitable crop would only be useful for the ornamenting of verandahs and terraces? And how about the immigration of that class who we desire to see settling on our vacant lands; immigrants whose advent is an immediate benefit to the district they settle in? It would simply cease, and many who could do so would seek other lands, where man's liberty was less restricted. Probably the scouring of the world would not be deterred from coming to Canada by such a law; they would come simply with the intention of disregarding it, and afford full employment to an army of preventive-men who would be required to enforce it. Let honest prohibitionists leave the accomplishment of prohibition to the womb of the future, and promote