

mobbed and tarred. Ex-Gov. St. John, the Prohibition Party's candidate for president, was shot at recently in a railway carriage. The supporters of the liquor traffic are feeling defeated and desperate, and some of the baser sort of them are evidently ready for any outrage or violence. It is true that there are in the liquor business men of intelligence and honor who are far above any such methods of warfare,—who are neither wicked enough nor foolish enough to countenance such suicidal villany, but we know that unfortunately the drink-business has a fearfully demoralizing tendency, and also that in support of it are arrayed all the lowest and worst elements of society. The whiskey business has cursed us with the demoralization and wretchedness of our lowest and vilest city slums, and now the wretchedness and dishonesty bred in these slums are enlisted for the support of the whiskey business. The liquor traffic must be held responsible for the crimes that these, its supporters, commit in its interest.

The duty of every order-loving and patriotic citizen is becoming more and more manifest as the fight goes on. The present struggle is a struggle between the deadliest foe to society and the state, and a movement in the interests of order and law. The depraved and degraded of the community are arrayed in defence of rum against the best men and women of the land, who are working in the interests of morality and progress. It does not alter this state of affairs to name some isolated good men who favor or engage in the drink-selling business, or some bad men who are in favor of prohibition. No one will dispute the proposition, that on the whole, the bad elements of society are supporting the liquor traffic, and a majority of the better class of the community supports the movement for prohibition. We cannot then wonder at these, the latest developments of the fight. We must simply recognize the seriousness of the situation and rise to the responsibility it places upon us. Even insult, theft and assassination will fail to stay the onward march of a free and progressive people in the path of duty and benevolent action, and the liquor traffic is only making more manifest the righteousness of our cause, and the necessity for its own extermination.

#### SOME OPINIONS ABOUT PROHIBITION.

The distinguished publicist, who writes over the pen-name "A Bystander," gives a good deal of prominence in his weekly papers to the question of prohibition. In the *Week* of October 9, he repudiates the insinuation of being "a whiskey organist," and then goes on to advocate "as the one honest and effectual measure the suppression of the manufacture with due compensation to those engaged in it." If we were disposed to be captious we might ask "A Bystander" why those who manufacture the whiskey should be compensated, while those who have built up a business by selling it should not; and if he says they are all alike entitled to consideration, we might further ask him to explain how he would adjust the compensation. Being in favor of prohibition with compensation he is bound to show that his scheme is feasible if it is to be listened to by the public.

It is easy to see, however, that he is not a sincere friend of prohibition at all. The whole tendency of his argument is in favor of dietetic freedom, with which he holds a prohibitory law to be incompatible. It would be interesting to know what he has to say for or against license laws, as, for instance, the Crooks' Act. Does it go too far in the way of "sumptuary reform?" If it does, where should the line be drawn between legitimate and illegitimate interference with the liquor trade.

For the purpose of showing "A Bystander" and others, how this question of the suppression of the traffic in alcoholic beverages has been viewed by eminent statesmen and publicists, we call a few opinions. Henry Fielding in 1751, wrote:—

"Nor will anything less than absolute deletion serve on the present occasion. It is not making men pay £50 to £100 for a license to poi-on; nor enlarging the quantity sold from two gallons to ten, which will extinguish so stubborn an evil."

Bishop Berkeley wanted to know why such a traffic "should be tolerated in the State under any pretence, or in any shape whatever." Oliver Goldsmith said:—

"In all the towns and counties I have seen, I never saw a city or village yet, whose miseries were not in proportion to its public houses. . . . Ale-houses are ever an occasion of debauchery and excess, and either in a political or religious light it would be our highest interest to have them suppressed."

We commend to "A Bystander," as an offset to his plea for beer the above remark by Goldsmith, and also the following by the late Charles Buxton, M.P., who was a brewer by occupation and was therefore well qualified to give an opinion:—

"It is in vain that every engine is set to work that philanthropy can desire, when those whom we seek to benefit are habitually tampering with their faculties of reason and will—soaking their brains with beer, or inflaming them with ardent spirits. The struggle of the school, the library, and the church, all united, against the beer house and the gin palace, is but one development of the war between heaven and hell."

Speaking of the Alliance for the Suppression of the Liquor Traffic, Lord Brougham, as far back as 1860, in his address as President of the Social Science Association, said:—

"The proposal of the Alliance well deserves a careful consideration—the plan of enabling a certain proportion of the inhabitants in every district (a proportion considerably above the numerical majority) to give the magistrates authority for placing the district under a general repressive Act, passed with such modifications as, according to the Act's provisions, may be allowed in the peculiar local circumstances."

With the exception of the extent of the majority, the measure here described is very like the much-abused Scott Act, and in a county like Simcoe the majority is anything but a bare numerical one. Of a measure similar in principle to the Scott Act, Dr. Richardson says:—

"I have come round largely to the view, and it was greatly against my own political opinions, that your Permissive Bill is right; I have come to the conclusion that it is a good bill."

The Bishop of Exeter in 1870 declared that so far as the discussion had then gone "the advocates of the permissive bill had distinctly the best of the argument;" and Thomas Carlyle, speaking of the inaugural meeting of the Permissive Bill Association in his own borough of Chelsea, said in 1872:—

"I cannot attend your meeting, but my complete conviction goes, and for long years has gone, with yours in regard to that matter; and it is one of my most earnest and urgent public wishes that some such bill do become law. From the bottom of my heart I wish you success, complete and speedy."

Language quite as strong was used four years earlier by Prof. Goldwin Smith, whom we have special pleasure in introducing to "A Bystander." In a letter on the Alliance and the Licensed Victuallers to the *Manchester Examiner and Times*, he says:—

"If the community has no reason to be surprised at the combination of the Licensed Victuallers, they assuredly have no reason to be surprised at the rise of the Alliance. The ultimate issue of the struggle is certain. If anyone doubts the preponderance of good over evil in human nature, he has only to study the history of moral crusades. The enthusiastic energy and self-devotion with which a moral cause inspires its soldiers always have prevailed, and always will prevail, over any amount of self-interest or material power arrayed on the other side. The Alliance is already powerful and growing in power. It will conquer."

Compare with this cordial endorsement the following depressing comments from the pen of "A Bystander," whose diction nevertheless closely resembles that of Mr. Goldwin Smith:—

"Nobody questions the goodness of the end which the friends of Temperance pursue. But they must allow us freely to discuss the