

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

VIVAT LINGUA GALLIÆ.

Come Highland Gael from Grampian glens and hills,
And Irish Kelta from Cork to Cusheadall,
Come Cymry from the rocks and streams of Wales,
And kindred Bretons ling'ring yet in Gaul:
Tell what your sages wrote on early history's page,
And what your minstrels sang in that fair Golden Age.

Come, welcome still your ancient mother tongue,
Whose echoes murmuring float from days of yore,
When barbs beneath the shaly oak trees hung,
Ere yet the alien landed on your shore:
As mountain streams retain their freshness to the sea,
So let your language flow as full, as pure and free.

Let healing rays that lit your ancient fields
From earlier beams that rose on Eastern height
Shine clearer still on mountain crown and vale,
When clouds withdraw that long have hid the light:
While politics may change, let Keltic stand
Firm as the pyramids amid the drifting sand.

Most noble Kelta that meet in Montreal,
To count your kith and kin from olden time,
Since the great Roman wrote of you in Gaul,
Till now dispersed afar in every clime:
Let candour, love, and learning ever be your aim,
And urge the Keltic youth to emulate the same.

Long parted friends that hope to re-unite
A mighty band of all the Keltic race,
Now consecrate your tongues to truth and right,
From vulgar slang and songs devoid of grace:
As the Gulf Stream which thro' the ocean warmly glides,
While waves unsympathetic dash against its sides.

N. McN. B.

PROHIBITION vs. LICENSE.

We have decided to open our columns for a limited time to the discussion of the question of Prohibition vs. License, and have made arrangements with two representative writers to contribute each alternate week a communication upon the subject. We believe our readers will be interested in a fair and manly discussion of this burning question, and we trust the writers will deal with the subject in a manner becoming broad and liberal-minded men.

To the Editor of the Critic:—

SIR,—As it would require two or three articles to properly discuss the wine of the supper, and as you have decided to close the discussion with this letter, I will devote the little remaining space at my disposal to the consideration of some of your correspondent's delusions.

He charges us with "intolerance," with making the people "slaves of a gloomy tyranny," with "throwing aside the mask of philanthropy," and with boldly proclaiming Prohibition's "lust for power," its "spirit of persecution, its freedom from the restraints of justice, and its liberty to advance by crooked and sinister steps of expediency" (a little proof of all this would be in order, but there is none.)

This is rich, coming from the defender of a business which has been proved—by experience, by observation and by evidence overwhelming, coming down to us from the past, and from almost all nations, rolling in upon us from the pulpit, the bench, the platform and the press, heard in the sighs and moanings through the crevices of the prisons, the poor and alms houses, aye, and the silent voices from the cities of the dead—to be the parent of almost all the crime and misery inflicted upon the race—the business of which the silver-tongued Chalmers said, "Before God and man, before the Church and the world, I impeach it, I charge it with the murder of innumerable souls. In this country, blessed with freedom and plenty, the Word of God and the liberties of true religion, I charge it as the cause, whatever may be the cause elsewhere, of almost all the poverty, and almost all the crime, and almost all the ignorance, and almost all the irreligion that disgrace and afflict the land. 'I am not mad, most noble Festus, I speak the words of truth and soberness.' I do in my conscience believe that these intoxicating stimulants have sunk into perdition more men and women than have found a grave in that deluge which swept over the highest hill tops, engulfing a world, of which but eight souls were saved. As compared with other vices it may be said of this, 'Saul has slain his thousands, David his tens of thousands,' and of which Rev. C. H. Spurgeon said 'the fewer of these licensed slaughter houses the better,' and Dr. Oliver Goldsmith, 'I never saw a city or village yet, whose miseries were not in proportion to the number of its public houses.'

The champion of a business that robs mankind of that best of heaven's gifts, the "domestic institution," that denudes it of its heavenly influence; that makes war upon the Christian Sabbath, turning it from a day of sacred rest and heavenly worship into a day of drunken carousings and obscenity; that fills the land with widows and orphans, criminals and paupers; that augments the public burdens, that drags down to infamy and disgrace the daughters of men, would be just the man to frame such a paragraph as that quoted above.

He talks of "compensation to a lawful business." The slave trade was lawful too, but as the Bible began to shed its purer light upon the world, it was discovered to be a crime, and laws and international treaties soon pronounced it such, confiscated its ships and hung their officers, while nobody talked of compensation for their losses.

He says "it lurs for political power, seeking to bind its adherents to vote for Prohibitionists alone," etc. To this we have to say that the liquor shops are the headquarters of the political primaries of existing parties in all countries, and the liquor lords control governmental action in relation to their criminal business almost entirely, but that state of things is to come to an end pretty soon; they have been the upper dogs in these political fights

about as long as they can hope to,—other and better men mean to take a turn at the wheel which guides the ship of state. The conventions recently held in the United States for the nomination of third party or Prohibition candidates were not made up of gambling ring masters, beer and whiskey makers and sellers, but clean men and women; the saloons, beer-gardens, and other doubtful places in the cities where they met were not filled with these delegates, but the churches and libraries were. It is coming to pass very soon that "the righteous shall inherit the earth," shall control governments, and not the wicked.

Before any temperance party was organized, the Brewers' Congress, held in Chicago, June 5th, 1867—

"Resolved, That we will use all means to stay the progress of this fanatical party, and to secure our individual rights as citizens, and that we will sustain no candidates, of whatever party, in any election, who is in any way disposed toward the total abstinence cause."

Here we have a determined opposition by political party action to moral reformation—total abstinence. Every Brewers' Congress from 1867 reaffirmed this as "its standing creed and unchangeable purpose." In 1875 they adopted the following:—

"Resolved, That where restrictive and Prohibitory enactments exist, every possible measure be taken to oppose, resist and repeal them;

"Resolved, That politicians favoring such enactments, who offer themselves as candidates for office, be everywhere strenuously opposed, and more so if it be found that their personal habits do not conform with their public professions."

And these are the people who subsidize the press to publish the utter failure of Prohibitory laws, and that more liquor is sold under them than under license, and so forth.

When Abraham Lincoln was elected upon a platform adverse to slavery, the South drew the sword in defence of its "peculiar institution," and "it perished by the sword." The beer and liquor men as above have drawn the political sword in defence of a business infinitely worse than slavery, and we gladly accept the issue and meet them in their own chosen field of conflict, feeling confident that the God of battles will cause victory to perch upon our banners. We know in the future as in the past we shall have to encounter the usual weapons called into requisition by the defenders of rum and rowdism, i. e., defamation of personal character, falsehood and abuse, the incendiary's torch, dynamite, pistols and bludgeons, etc.;—but these are poor tools with which to obtain justice, and will prove, as over, utter weakness in the defence of wrong.

The people are growing the hemp which the State will soon twist into a legal rope, with which to hang the business "higher than Haman," and much sooner than many people suppose. And simply and only because the Book of divine inspiration is behind this greatest reform of the century, before which all opposing power will prove but as stubble. He who cannot see this is the coming conflict, as well as its inevitable outcome, has been a superficial observer of human progress during the past half century.

We are charged with "throwing aside the mask of philanthropy." This means that the leaders of this reform are and have been a lot of hypocrites, and a thirst for power has been the stimulating cause of their past zeal, as proved by their entering the political field in quest of legal enactments. F. T. seems to ignore the fact that it is the crime of the business, inflicted upon mankind everywhere, that is compelling the people to rise in indignation to demand protection from their worst enemy, and that a law to prohibit the business is simply moral truth, crystalized into moral force to remove that which all experience has proved cannot be removed by mere moral sentiment—treating this great criminal and parent of criminals, as crime is treated by all Christian peoples, and is in entire harmony with Bible teachings as to its treatment.

Since writing the foregoing, your correspondents conclusive blow has been struck with apparently a somewhat ungenerous and unnecessarily excited spirit inspiring it. As I have but little space left to devote to this lengthy, irrelevant, and incoherent compilation of literary rubbish, which his narrow reading upon the subject has led him to drag into the light of day from the oblivion into which much of it has long since been consigned by the scholarship and research of the past half century, I can but allude to a few of the most absurd of his absurdities, and leave his dogmatic denunciations to be disposed of by your intelligent readers, who will not readily swallow sophistry, even if uttered in fine phrase.

I am sorry all that find of information which F. T. has been accumulating in support of license had not been hunted up sooner, as I am curious to see something in that line, even based upon good common sense, for all facts and experience condemn the system.

If all that Dr. Van Dyke, Eli Smith, Gavozzi, etc., say about the non-existence of unfermented wine in Eastern countries in modern times was true, (as it is not) it would prove less than nothing as to whether or not such wine was common there in Bible times, and the Bible itself fully settles this question, and is corroborated overwhelmingly by contemporary classic literature. Dr. Crosby's utterances, coming as they do from a man anxious to sustain or justify his own use of alcoholic poison in form of wine, and much of it never guilty of the grape, have been thoroughly scattered to the winds again and again by more able and disinterested scholars, the proof of which I have now before me, but space forbids reproductions from them now.

There is no fact better known than that all conforming Jews do and always did use unfermented wine at their sacred feasts. On this subject Dr. G. W. Sampson addressed a letter to Hon. Judge Joachimson, a leading Rabbi of New York, and received the following reply:—

336 East 69th Street, Feb. 15, 1881.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—

In answer to your favor of yesterday's date, I repeat that the great majority of conforming Jews in this city use wine made from raisins at the