

ence Congress aright in this matter, should not be omitted.

4. Every legitimate means should be vigorously adopted by the ministry and the Church, not only favoring the adoption of such a law, but that shall demand, if passed, a prompt and vigorous enforcement of it.

The Pulpit, and the Church at large,

rendered essential aid in securing previous legislation in this direction, and their moral support has been an important factor in securing good results from it. United, vigorous action at the present time will tell grandly on the present movement to make an end of this infamy.

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

##### Is High License a Solution of the Saloon Problem?

JUST now the advocates of High License, in parts of the country, are pushing their favorite method with great energy. We hesitate to oppose them; we hesitate to oppose any one whose face is set against the liquor evil, however much mistaken we may think him to be in his plan of attack. We oppose High License only because we are most thoroughly convinced that it will prove a hurtful, disastrous mistake. It is not a harmless experiment—a step that may be taken and easily retraced.

We believe that High License, as all license, is a legal recognition of the right of a saloon to exist, and that it extends to the saloon a protection which it does not have under what is known as the Common law; for under the Common law the citizens of a neighborhood could proceed against even a so-called orderly saloon as a nuisance. When a saloon is protected by a license permit it can defy the almost unanimous will of the surrounding residents. Near Dr. Cuyler's Church, in Brooklyn, may be seen one of hundreds of illustrations of this. A saloon was established nearly under the shadow of this church—and this against the wish of ninety-five per cent. of the people residing in the neighborhood. Were there no license law these citizens could have shut up the saloon, the same as they could a bone-dust factory, or as they could abolish any other nuisance. We need no license law to protect us against a nuisance. Such laws take away our rights under the Common law and protect the nuisance. We have a right to demand absolute Prohibition, or the

restoration of the Common-law rights to the citizens. This certainly is not fanatical or unreasonable.

We believe it the worst kind of policy to entrench the saloon, as High License invariably does, behind the cupidity of the tax-payer.

We believe that no other thing is so educative to the masses as is law. With them, that which the law permits is right because the law permits it, and that which the law forbids is wrong because the law forbids it. This supreme educative power should be against the saloon, not for it. It is bad strategy, and something far worse, to permit the law to educate in favor of the saloon.

Nor is it true, as is so often claimed, that, where tried, High License has lessened the evils of the saloon. Were this so we would be silent. But look at the facts. In Chicago the first effect of High License was to cut down slightly the number of the saloons; but this reduction was secured in part by two and sometimes three adjoining saloons being thrown into one by the cutting of doors through the partition walls and the formation of a nominal partnership, one license serving for all. The three saloons, under High License, counted only one, but they sold as much liquor as when, under low license, they counted three. Where was the gain? Then, some hundreds of small grog-shops, which sold only a keg or two of beer a day, had to close, and in block after block where there had been a half dozen of these small places, capable of little harm, there were opened in their stead two or three great gorgeous hell holes, with music