

These remarks are called forth by an article in a recent number of *Law Notes* (Northport, New York, U.S.A.), which contains so much common sense, that we gladly copy it:—

“Whatever one may think of the merits of the trade union movement, the patriotic attitude maintained during the war by its present head, Samuel Gompers, and his earnest efforts to check Bolshevik tendencies in his organization, give weight to his views on the present industrial situation. He is quoted as having said recently that the effect of prohibition is to cause a spirit of discontent among the laboring classes which furthers the spread of Bolshevism. Its practical working in this respect is beyond our province, but perhaps no man in the United States is in a better position than Mr. Gompers to know whereof he speaks on this point. From the theoretical standpoint, there is every reason why prohibition should engender Bolshevism, since the two are identical in spirit. The theory on which the American republic was founded is that civil liberty is the right of every man to do as he pleases except so far as his acts interfere with the enjoyment of like liberty by others. Opposed to that is the theory that any person or class of persons who may seize the power so to do may rightfully impose on their fellows such restrictions as whim or self interest may dictate. The victory of the allied powers on the bloody fields of France merely cut off one head of that hydra. Between rule by the Kaiser and his junkers, rule by the proletariat as expounded by Lenine, and rule by the pharisaical prohibitionists, there is no distinction in principle. So close is their identity that the decisions sustaining the prohibition laws are sufficient to sustain a large share of the Bolshevik programme if the ultra radical element ever gets control of a legislature. If industries lawful and respected for centuries may be wiped out by a stroke of the pen and individual rights in a recognized class of property destroyed without recompense, where is the stopping place? There are men who are as sincerely convinced that private ownership of land is iniquitous as any prohibitionist is of the evil of permitting the ownership of a quart of wine. If those persons succeeded in controlling a legislature long enough to destroy every landed