

FOUND.

(In answer to the author of "The Deity of my Dreams.")

"A maid most fair" he says he'd have her be
(I think his deity in me I see,
No send this verse to show how I compare
With her, whose kindly face I'm sure, I bear;
And whose soft air of gentleness I wear.)

An open countenance with nought to hide,
Lips that have eloquently sighed
For some true love—for whom these tranquil eyes of blue
Have sought with sweet and friendly glances, through
A term of years—in vain, alas, the true!

A dazzling wit, a great and brilliant mind,
In this fair maid I own you will not find;
But virtue in her "lily cheek" enthroned
Forbids untruth: so after having owned
To want of wit, and mind too dull to cast reflecting light,
She now admits, that "neath these blue eyes bright,
One—not a thousand—only one soul lies

In this one point the dream of your ideal
Differs from her who really seems the real;
Tho' true her voice has not the tone of harp or flute,
Nor does her fair cheek *always* wear a rose-bloom,
Yet these slight differences, obligingly, she'll overlook for you,
Knowing in dreams how seldom one obtains a perfect view.

So wake, awake! Thou dreamer of thy love
Wake from thy winsome dream beside the sea,
And seek this modest golden-headed seraph
Who feels persuaded that you dreamt of—she!

THU.

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.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

To the Editor of the Critic:—

SIR,—I have not the time nor you the space to waste in refuting your correspondent's continued dogmatic but entirely untruthful charges against the prohibitory movement and its prominent advocates. It seems to fancy that he has but to denounce the whole subject as fanatical, and its advocates a lot of ignorant nonentities not knowing what they are about, dealing with the word of God as charlatans, etc. to make it so. Let me remind him that the day for such a style of disputation on this subject has long since gone by among men of intelligence, (and such I regard a majority of your readers) because it is well known that this great movement ranks among its advocates, men occupying the front rank among the leaders in every department of human affairs, men who are the peers of their fellows anywhere to be found, and the weapons of their warfare are those used by all advocates of truth in all ages of the world—argument, logic, fact, reason and common sense. When they affirm they are prepared to prove their affirmations, they do not discount the intelligence of their readers by asking them to take their *ipse dixit* for proof. The literature brought into existence and published by the great "fishing houses" connected with this reform on both sides of the Atlantic, cannot be surpa-sed by the ability of mankind. Let me hurl back then upon the head of this erudite champion of the liquor curse, the spurious counterfeit he seeks to palm off for current coin.

I was informed when invited to undertake this discussion, as the public through the statements you weekly publish at the head of the column we occupy are, that we were to discuss "Prohibition vs. License." France-Tireur has not said one word in advocacy of the license system, but seems to believe with Mill that no restraint whatever should be applied to the traffic. I need scarcely say that not only will he stand almost alone in the advocacy of such views, but is directly antagonistic to the experience, as well as the legislation of the past in relation to this matter. Such has been the uniformly bad character of the traffic that law makers for many centuries have been compelled to enact laws to protect society against the evils of this blighting curse; its own crimes have united the better class of mankind in all ages to resist its encroachments upon public as well as private rights, but with little practical effect, until in these latter times, when the principle of prohibition has been applied with excellent results, and these results, like those of practical Christianity, are rendering the principle "intensely aggressive."

The defenders of the business, like those of the "lost cause" human slavery compelled to use the same weapons which the defenders of wrong and injustice have ever used, *i.e.*, bald assertions, untenable and untruthful statements, misrepresentation, defamation and falsehood. Facts, logic, and argument, they have but little use for, as the bad business they champion cannot be sustained with such weapons. Your readers will notice the abundance of assertion its defender in your columns asks them to swallow and digest, such as have been (as I before remarked) driven off the field of manly discussion a thousand times are reasserted without any attempt at proof, and yet he says "they continue to find their way back again, etc.;" but they have no right to be brought back by honest men until their claims are sustained by proof of some sort, for which mere ability is a poor substitute.

Your correspondent seems disposed to abandon wine producing France as giving no proof in favor of sobriety under an almost free sale of all kinds of liquors, and plants himself squarely upon Canada—sober Canada—as a country needing no legislative interference with the traffic. But besides

this being a young country there are moral and legislative reasons why we consume less than older countries, and to avoid the curses which these countries have brought upon themselves, we will do wisely to act upon the principle that "prevention is better than cure," but a report of a committee of the House of Commons made a few years ago on the liquor traffic of Canada was not calculated to convey the idea that we are but little rum-cursed. France-Tireur would do well to reperuse the document.

Now let us see what mankind has been driven to say and do all along the centuries in relation to this "gigantic crime of crimes," as Senator Morrill of the United States characterizes it, and the civilized world accepts the "mild impeachment" as not misrepresenting its character.

At Athens in the palmiest days of ancient Greece, taverns were deemed such disreputable places, that not even a servant, with any pretence to morality, dare be seen eating or drinking in them. Plato, in his model laws, puts the following language into the mouth of a Lacedemonian:—"That whereby men cling chiefly fall into the greatest luxuries, insolence, and all sorts of moral madness, our laws have effectually rooted out of our country. You shall, neither in villages nor towns belonging to the Spartan State, see any such things as drinking clubs, or their usual consequences;" (Plato, de Legibus Book I). A tavern is simply a house for the encouragement and accommodation of such a club. From the *Acta Diurna*, under date of the 4th of the kalends of April 167 B. C., Dr. S. Johnson gives this entry:—"A fray happened in a tavern at the lower end of the Butcher's Street, in which the keeper of the Hog-in-Armour tavern was dangerously wounded." *The Law-Book of the Anti-Nicene Church* has the following as its 54th canon:—"If any one of the clergy be taken eating in a tavern, let him be suspended, except when he is forced to bait at an inn upon the road," (Bunson's Hippolytus). "The tavern," as an old writer quaintly declares, "is a fountain of sin, and a School of the Devil, where he worketh his miracles after his own manner. . . . The lessons which are learned in this school, are drunkenness, swearing, lying, perjury, blasphemy, to deny God and commit many other sins. This is the place where, for the most part, are raised all quarrels, slanders, contentions, and murders, and those who keep the taverns, and suffer this, are partakers of the sins and evils there committed," (history of the Waldenses, 1658) How like Dicken's description!

In the earlier ages of its history in Scotland, according to *Hector Boetius*, the sellers of strong drink (then chiefly confined to mead) were looked upon as public enemies, who made provision for the voluptuous pleasures of men rather than their necessities, and who for profit, generally enticed men to a debauched and vicious life." ARCADUS, administrator of the realm, A. D., 160, confiscated their goods, pulled down their houses and banished themselves. CONSTANTINE the Second, at a later period, when the evil had ravaged, re-enacted this law at Seone, A. D. 861, adding the terrible penalty of death, in case the taverner refused to depart or resisted the execution of the decree. An act of Parliament was passed in the year 1431, of which the following is the essence:—"It is statute and ordained, that gif any man in a burgh be fund in a tavern, or wine, or ale shop, after the strike of nine hours, and after the bell that shall be ringing in the said burgh, the aldermen and bailies shall put him in the King's prison; tho' whilk gif the aldermen and bailies do not do they shall pay for ilk time they be found culpable fifty shillings."

The history of the liquor traffic in England is not less pregnant with instruction says Dr. Lees. "As early as A. D. 995, an attempt was made to restrain by law the evil of drinking. Taverns were introduced in the 13th century," and very speedily manifested their peculiar character. The business of a taverner seems never to have been held as respectable, a fact which shows that it has been always associated with immoral or low life, and always must until that which pollutes is removed. In the reign of Edward I, (1285) complaints were frequent, and it was enacted that taverns should not be open for the sale of wine and beer after the tolling of the curfew. In the reign of Edward III, only three taverns were allowed in the metropolis." In the reign of Edward VI., taverns were denounced by act of Parliament, as the resort of evil disposed persons, and the cause of "much evil rule." The preamble of the act states that they were "nearly sette uppe in very great number, in back lanes, corners and suspicious places within the cytie of London, and in divers other townes and villages of this realme."

The 4th, James I., furnishes as clear evidence of the ineffectual character of the licensing system as can be desired. It shows the evil to have become prevalent and unabated, at least materially, by simple restrictions, declaring that "the odious and loathsome sin of drunkenness is of late grown into common use, being the root and foundation of many other enormous sins, as bloodshed, stabbing, murder, swearing, fornication, adultery, and such like, to the great dishonour of God and of our nation, the overthrow of many good arts and manual trades, &c. Intoxication was then made punishable by a fine of five shillings, or confinement in the stocks for six hours; and these laws, foiled in their ostensible object, the licensed taverns spread broadcast their seed, and the rank weeds of drunkenness and debauchery, of course, sprung up, the lash being applied to the back of the wrong man, who, instead, received the sanction and protection of law, to enable him to supply victims for the stocks and the prison. By long experience, the world has learned that the other man must be punished, and "woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink," is the voice of God, which must, in order to success, be reached by human statutes, and upon this line modern prohibitionists have determined to fight their battle to the bitter end, and are sure to win. But F. T. would punish the drinker as of old, and still cry out against sumptuary laws.

During the reign of Charles I., the complaints against ale houses were loud and frequent. In 1623, the Lord keeper, COVENTRY, in his charge to the Circuit Judges, says:—"I account ale-houses and tippling houses the greatest pests in the Kingdom. I give it you in charge to take a course that