

WHY HE WAS NOT REMEMBERED.

"I HEARD a great deal when I first went on the road," said an actor who was in Toronto recently, "about the extraordinary ability of some hotel clerks to remember names and faces, and I can readily understand that such an accomplishment would be very desirable in a hotel clerk. Nearly everybody, unless he is travelling under an alias, is vain enough to enjoy a hearty recognition by a hotel clerk, particularly if the hotel is an expensive one. But I had up my doubts about the truth of the tales I had heard of these wonderful exhibitions of memory, and when I came to Cincinnati I determined to make a test. I did so, but I am still undecided about the matter."

"In 1862, when I was about two years old, my mother brought me from the northern part of the state to Kentucky, where my father, an officer in the Union army, was stationed. I had been told that I was covered over night at a certain hotel in Cincinnati. When a company that I was in came here, I went to that hotel. An elderly clerk was behind the desk. I looked him up."

"How do you do, sir?" he said politely, but without a sign of recognition in his eyes.

"You don't remember me, do you?" "No-no," he said, a little bit reluctantly, as if he didn't like to admit it.

"Why, I said, 'I stopped here in 1862.' "Spring or fall," said he, apparently recovering himself.

"Spring, I think," said I.

"Oh," he answered, and he looked me right in the eye, "that accounts for my not recalling you, sir, I didn't come here until the fall of 1862."

BILL NYE'S VERSION

Of the Maine Liquor Law in Action. BILL NYE, in one of his recent letters from Maine, explains the working of the Maine law as follows:

The Maine liquor law is always a very interesting endeavor to me. In fact, I have roamed around the charnel house of dead prohibitory measures for several years in the various States. They simply make drinking incontinent and produce a more ruinous breed of rum.

In Lewiston, the gin palaces are under the streets, and a labyrinth of passages known only to members in good standing leads to the interior, with ever and anon a door marked pull, when it means push, and push when it means to be initiated pull. This confuses the officer, so that by the time he gets in fairly the doorkeeper has been emptied down the sink, followed by an acid that removes all traces, even of the odor. A guard is above both day and night, whose duty is to press the button when the sheriff enters, and when he gets out last through this devious way he finds the bartender engaged in lathering and shaving a customer or shampooing him with a bottle of Angostura bitters. Liquor is shipped all over Maine inside of molasses and tobacco barrels, in tobacco boxes and inside of big boxes ostensibly containing mill supplies and machinery. Bangor openly sells all sorts of liquor, and is considered the smartest city in Maine. In Portland the office of Sheriff is said to be worth \$50,000. The Sheriff manufactures a cigar which he sells to those who also sell rum. But he raids these places regularly. It is an exciting spectacle to see the Sheriff with his foam flecked steed flying toward a liquor joint of which he has just heard. He has a loud, vociferous chime of bells on his foam flecked steed, and when he gets to the door of the rum palace he climbs out, carefully blankets his horse, "trigs" the

steigh runner so that he cannot back up, clears his steed in several intricate knots and enters the place. By that time the Sheriff has to get the frost out of his whiskers, and that takes time also.

"So all is nice and legal there. He sells the proprietor a thousand of his Stencher cigars, casts twenty cents worth of cloves, empties the silver dish of calamus root into his pocket, and then goes away to raid another sinkhole of iniquity and sell some Old Slaw cigars."

To be Sheriff of Portland is regarded as the goal toward which all the boys in Maine should aspire. It is as good as being President of the United States and is less exposed to assassination. Those who would not be sheriff hope some day to marry into his family and inherit his cigar trade.

MORAL BOYCOTTING.

The recommendation of an organized body of our law-abiding citizens that those grocers who hold a license to sell liquors be boycotted, is one of those unfortunate exhibitions of intolerance which are exceedingly harmful to the cause of which they are the official representatives by whom it is proposed. It is one also calculated to injure more than help the cause of temperance, in the interests of which the advice is unmistakably given.

The clergy who take this position virtually declare that no trader who deals in the popular beverage can be a Christian. They pass a sentence of excommunication upon: they wish to turn out of the synagogue "to ostracize from reputable society, a large body of citizens solely because they are carrying on a business which is patronized by a large body of the members of all our religious organizations." The official representative is shielding by its license and deriving an income from sharing in the profits of persons who, in their judgment are engaged in an immoral, anti-Christian business. If the trader who sells liquor is a member of the church, then the members of the Government which shares in his profits and officially charters him to carry it on, are equally worthy of punishment; against the Ministers and their supporters in Parliament, a boycott ought in justice to be proclaimed; they also should share in the penalty of excommunication.

Why do not those clergy proceed to the logical end of their avowal by proclaiming a crusade against every Government in Canada? Then, if the storekeepers are to be so treated, why not their customers? Surely the church member who patronizes a licensed store for his beverage supply is equally guilty, and according to their own words? Let the boycott proceed, and all the pew renters, the members, the office bearers of churches, be severed with a writ of excommunication! If the man who sells beverages alongside of tea, sugar or other groceries, is worthy of being ruined by the withdrawal of custom of all good people, why do the churches accept the money of such wicked persons? Why are they allowed to rent pews when part of the rental money according to their own words—from a sinful business? A church that takes the money made by a dealer in beverages, shares in his alleged guilt. A church that suffers any man to be one of its members, one, in most cases, therefore one of its rulers and governors, who buys liquor at a store, shares in whatever wrong is committed by that traffic.

To boycott the seller and keep in with the buyer is not inconsistent merely, it is cowardly, for it is a shrinkage of duty from fear of man, far in fact of pecuniary loss. But, intolerance is never brave or charitable, therefore never inspired by the higher Christian virtues. Temperance is not served by being linked with bigotry.

If the stores aimed at by these mistaken clerics were suppressed, it would simply add to the business of saloons, which would not be helpful to temperance, but far otherwise. The action of those who have recommended this boycotting proceeds on the utterly false and dangerous assumption that the selling of beverages is immoral. Those who so judge their fellow-creatures are guilty of a far worse offense against Christian ethics than that those they condemn, for they display such a lack of charity as shows they have boycotted the highest of virtues.—Montreal Trade Review.

AN ENGLISH VIEW.

How the Riots Against the Dispensary Law in South Carolina are Viewed in England.

(From the London Times.)

The legislation by which the State of South Carolina lately endeavored to deprive her citizens of the means of obtaining from alcohol has not been suffered to remain unchallenged. By a law which came into operation on the 1st of July in last year, all private shops for the sale of intoxicating liquors were closed without compensation to their proprietors, and the wants of the public in this respect were to be supplied from a limited number of so-called "dispensaries" carried on by salaried officials of the State. Even the previously recognized right of the private citizen to import from a neighboring State for his own consumption seems to have been taken away, and heavy fines were imposed upon carriers for the offence of conveying liquor illegally. In commenting last week upon Mr. Herbert's "Further Report on Liquor Traffic Legislation in the United States," we mentioned that the law in question, although it had only been in operation a few weeks at the date of the report, was said to satisfy nobody: the former sellers and the drinkers being necessarily hostile to it, while the Prohibitionists were shocked at the idea of the continued sale of liquor in a "demonializing traffic." The dissatisfaction smouldered for nine months, but on Saturday it burst into open flame. At Darlington a party of police entered a house in which liquor was being illegally sold, and attempted to arrest both the sellers and the consumers. Resistance was offered, two of the policemen and two citizens were shot dead, and, after a sharp conflict with an armed and infuriated mob, the rest of the police were driven to take refuge in a swamp, where, according to some reports, they were all to the number of nineteen, shot by the rioters. Some companies of militia were ordered on by the Government of the State, but refused to obey, and disbanded themselves rather than take part in supporting the law. The Governor has endeavored to procure the necessary force from other places, but no soldiers had arrived in Darlington when the last reports were despatched, and in the meanwhile the other places had declared in favor of the insurgents, and the inhabitants of the town of Florence had burnt open and hoisted the Government drink "dispensary."

The Governor, Mr. Tillman, appears to be an energetic personage, very little disposed to submit to defiance of his authority, and he is said to have seized all the railroads and telegraphs of the State so as to prevent the sending of messages either by or to the insurgents or the arrival of sympathizers to assist them. By these proceedings he has practically declared the lawless districts to be in a state of siege, and has put a stop to the conduct of ordinary business. The embargo placed upon telegrams has introduced an element of uncertainty into the reports which have reached us, and which may, in some particulars, be exaggerated; but

there can be no doubt that serious fighting has taken place, and that lives have been lost on both sides. The action of the Governor is described as being "autocratic," and is said to have occasioned "consternation," as if the number of a few policemen and armed resistance to the law by the majority of the citizens were matters which did not call for very active interference. So far as we have present heard, the party in opposition to the law remains in the minority, and it seems certain that, after such very convincing evidence of its unpopularity, the law itself must before long be repealed. The "sovereign people" are not likely to tolerate conditions in which they are compelled to abstain their own policemen as a means of attaining the small measure of liberty which would allow them to buy drink when and where they may think proper.

We have lately had occasion to observe, and we have already mentioned, the operation of prohibitory liquor legislation that the conditions here and in America are so widely different as to render it unsafe to draw deductions with regard to either country from the experience of the other. It is not probable that the law is to be at least one deduction which may be drawn with safety, and it is that such legislation is not attended by success—that is to say, by the attainment of the objects of its promoters, unless it has the complete approbation of the affected community. In other words, a population which does not want alcoholic drink will welcome prohibitory laws, will submit to be bound by them, and will insist upon their being strictly obeyed either by individuals or by an insignificant minority. When these conditions are not fulfilled, the laws, more especially if passed by some kind of management or stratagem, will either be evaded or openly defied. It seems to be a waste of legislative power to enact laws for the purpose of forbidding practice which few desire to adopt, and it is a waste of money to exercise power, amounting to bring all law into discredit, to enact any which the people legislated for are determined not to obey.

We published on Saturday a letter containing the suggestion that the rural districts of England need not "deprive" of the advantages of a "Liquor Traffic Control Bill" because the urban populations were unwilling to submit to it. Surely, if the inhabitants of rural districts feel the absence of such a law to be a deprivation, they are at full liberty to be a law to themselves, and to close their liquor shops by the simple expedient of ceasing to frequent them. Many constitutions have been brought against the persons concerned in carrying on the "drugs traffic"; but as yet, so far as we have seen, they have not been charged with such disregard of their own interests as would be shown by carrying it on in places where the law is so manifestly in force. From the reports that we have reached us would appear that the very stringent law of South Carolina was engineered through the State Legislature by methods well known to American politicians, and was passed by strenuous action on the part of Governor Tillman, rather than passed in a manner which would entitle it to be considered as the deliberate act of the community. In England a similar measure, if it were passed at all, would probably be more what it professed to be, and, if its operation were disappointing, it would be repealed without the shedding of any fluid more toxic than ink, or the expenditure of any greater force than that of the locality. Still, the disastrous failure of this last achievement of American restrictive legislation cannot but confirm the doubts of those who believe that all measures of the kind would be of greater mischief than they would cure.

Advertisement for A. J. B. & Co. featuring a circular logo with 'A. J. B. & Co. Montreal, P. Q.' and 'BREWERY'. Below the logo, it says 'MONTREAL, P. Q. QUEBEC - LEVIS'. At the bottom, it says 'HEAVY ST. In all' and shows an illustration of a building or structure.

LONDON, T