

a certain other denomination had said: "We do not intend to stop until the use of intoxicating wine in the Sacrament is made a criminal offence." Another advocate, even more zealous, is reported to have pointed to the gallows. Verily the worse foes of temperance are its intemperate advocates.

WILLIAM ELLIOT.

London, 11th July, 1885.

[We have already given much space to this controversy, and it must now cease.—ED.]

IN REPLY TO JUDGE ELLIOT.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—Will you permit me to find expression in your paper for a few thoughts which occurred to me on reading Mr. Elliot's interesting letter on Prohibition. Mr. Elliot objects first, that Prohibition has no authority in the divine law; but it strikes me rather forcibly that the real question is not so much whether Prohibition has the direct authority of divine law, as whether there is any antagonistic divine law in the way, should the Legislature consider it expedient to enact a prohibitory law. Every well informed person knows that while there are many acts in themselves criminal, there are acts, otherwise innocent, which are made criminal by statute. The Liquor License Act supplies a notable instance. It will not be contended that there is a divine law against the sale of liquor after seven o'clock on Saturday night, yet the Liquor License Act forbids such sales and makes the breach of this law a crime. The reasoning which justifies the Saturday night prohibitory law must surely be equally applicable to a law of total Prohibition. The question therefore resolves itself into one of expediency, and the only matter to be settled is whether the total prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor would be conducive to the public good.

But although there may be no direct authority of divine law, there are many principles of divine origin, to be found chiefly in the teaching and sayings of our Lord, as recorded in the New Testament, which must surely be considered of sufficient authority. One such principle in particular I will refer to, for it requires us to give up anything and everything that will "cause offence to come." Surely since the world began there has been no greater cause of offence than intoxicating liquor.

Mr. Elliot's second objection, "because it is an unwarrantable interference with personal liberty," depends upon the word "unwarrantable," all laws being more or less interferences with personal liberty. The question, therefore, is whether the interference resulting from Prohibition would be unwarrantable, and of course this depends upon whether it is likely to be beneficial or otherwise. That it is permissible and in this sense not unwarrantable, can hardly be disputed by persons who approve of the Liquor License Acts, which are all more or less prohibitory. It is, therefore, only a question of degree, the principle having been conceded by previous legislation. Whether total Prohibition would bring with it all the benefits its friends anticipate is of course as yet undetermined; but the benefits are likely to be so great and the evils to be overcome are so grievous, that many like myself are anxious to try the experiment.

Lastly Mr. Elliot objects, "because it is in contravention of common justice, inasmuch as it punishes the innocent for the guilty." Mr. Elliot would not punish the innocent for the guilty, and yet while he would incarcerate the drunkard he would let his tempters go scot free. Mr. Elliot says drunkenness in most cases proceeds from disease, but has no remedy to suggest but the gaol or the asylum. He exclaims that Prohibition must rely upon brute force for its enforcement. Strange inconsistency, when it is the gaol and the asylum that he himself invokes as the sole remedy for the evils of drunkenness.

But how many would Mr. Elliot's method reach, and what amount of the evil resulting from drink would it alleviate? After all there are not many in such a diseased or openly degraded condition as to fall within the scope of Mr. Elliot's remedial measure. It would miss the worst offenders, and exhaust itself on the poor enfeebled drunkards, no longer able to injure others than themselves. Prohibition indeed seems the only remedy in which any confidence can be placed, and whether it would accomplish all that its friends desire is, I admit, uncertain and remains yet to be proved. Yours truly,

CHARLES HUTCHINSON.

London, July 6th, 1885.

THE CHURCHES AND PROHIBITION.

In the course of some remarks upon the Prohibition controversy Mr. Geo. Bousfield says:—

Of the prevalence of intemperance in the declining days of the Roman Empire it is needless to speak. Every one who reads knows how peculiarly shameless were its orgies. Drunkenness had even in Apostolic times invaded the Agapæ, yet the Church only lays down the law of the Scriptures, "and as to food, bear what thou canst," and also provides that the first fruits of the wine jar shall be given to the prophet. In succeeding years the evil grew until in the time of St. Jerome and St. Augustine it had invaded the most sacred feasts of the Church. Treating of the enormity of the offence Augustine advises, what? Prohibition? No—but "dealing with gentleness, teaching rather than command, warning rather than menace." The Apostolical Canons above referred to certainly represent on this matter the teachings of the early Church, and are still in force in the Orthodox Greek Church. And that Church does more practically for the suppression of intemperance than perhaps any other Christian body. It issues tracts on the evil, illustrated with anatomical plates, and also posters, and, under the direction of the Holy Synod, the clergy are forming societies for the suppression of vice, which not only preach temperance but keep the taverns under surveillance, and undertake the practical reformation of the drunkard, a vastly superior method to the spouting so much indulged in by our so-called temperance bodies. The result of one phase of this movement in Russia is seen in the reduction of drinking shops, which fell from 257,000 in 1863 to 146,000 in 1881. Here we have an instance of true temperance work under the guidance of a Church that does not teach Prohibition.

Thus, so far as Catholic experience and law go, so far as the teaching of the Church of God for 3,000 years enjoins concurrence, we cannot but approve those who oppose Prohibitory law.

Intemperance in Canada, it is now generally conceded, is less than in any other civilized country; yet we find our Prohibitionists recommending the adoption of as stringent measures as Cardinal Manning apparently deems necessary for the intensified vice of the Old Country.

So far as our home population is concerned intemperance is on the wane, and therefore we are primarily concerned with these new born-babes of freedom. Archbishop Lynch thinks, and many with him, that the cause of religion and the welfare of our country will be better served by moral guidance; that education is necessary before these untaught citizens can appreciate the blessings of abstinence or moderation, and that any attempt to place them under constraint will but rouse in them the spirit of obstinacy, and finally destroy them. We cannot, by law, alter human nature. Education may help much in controlling these unfortunates; but above everything is the pleading of religion, which appeals to all that is best in man when it persuades, but as a force has ever and always will fail to accomplish a harsh aim.

OTHER DRINKING.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—It can hardly be deemed necessary to say that drunkenness is an enemy to religion. That there are other enemies too is undeniable; but it is denied that they are as bad as alcoholic drinking, to say nothing of drunkenness. This, in my opinion, is open to question. In intensity drunkenness as an enemy of religion can hardly be surpassed, but in point of extent and cumulative power some unsuspected things are worse, things warmly patronized by the sworn foes of drink. It is well known that Church teas and similar amusements almost take rank among the religious institutions of the Canadian churches, especially the Methodist Church of this Province; and a religious society that began by frowning upon every form of amusement now takes the foremost rank as the sacred patroness of pleasure. But the pleasure must not minister merely to recreation and the brightening and unifying of society; pecuniary profit is steadily kept in view; so that one must think of the words "supposing that godliness is gain," and pleasure too, we are forced to add. More especially are we compelled to think thus, when we see flaming posters announcing teas, concerts, pie socials, sugar socials, strawberry socials, negro concerts, all "under the auspices of the church," to which "all are cordially invited," and tempted with the assurance that they shall have "a good time." In the villages and country parts lectures, even by very funny men, don't draw; there must be the inevitable swilling of green tea and the cheerful consumption of cakes; for the sake of which the interpolated speeches are endured. The speeches usually consist of the most miserable commonplaces, adorned with stale jokes and irreverent stories, in gross phrase, and of course all about religion. A prayer usually begins these proceedings and "the benediction" ends them. But no prayers or blessings or texts can save such modern orgies from the charge of irreligion and mischievousness. An ambitious church is paid for by a ten years' succession of these abominations; and when to them are added oyster socials and election cakes to pay the minister's salary, and an occasional diminutive Donnybrook scrimmage over the latter, there is no man of sense who is not disgusted at seeing religion made the patroness of such sensuality and low comedy, and a whole people debased and vulgarized. When religion, the true refiner, is itself degraded, the worst injury possible is done. When the salt has lost its savour, what remains to be done? I have for many a year noted this process of degeneration in Ontario, and I have come to the conclusion that all the expensive alcoholic drinking of the country is not nearly so injurious to the higher and religious life of the people as this other drinking "under the auspices of the church," and with its grovelling accompaniments. Yours,

PAGANUS.

July 9th, 1885.

TEMPERANCE.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—I breathe. Leading a country life I should do so exceptionally well, only we have down here been in such unmeasured consternation because it seemed as if no power on earth could eventually save us from the stern tyranny of forced teetotalism; but since reading THE WEEK, remembering, too, the dual pledge of the C. E. T. S., and learning of the doings of the Liberal Temperance Association, I can inhale the breath of hope; and may I not further ask your readers to look with me at one or two features in the character and history of the temperance movement, as it is called to-day? A false theology is perhaps the source of half the evil in the world, and in this matter, if people had not been falsely persuaded that total abstinence was the doctrine of the Scriptures, we should have heard less of it. There are many men to-day who have faith in the sublime principle: "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth." It is the corner-stone of temperance theology, and I am willing to abide by it theoretically and practically. But those who accept this in simplicity are of two classes; the major part have not the faith to believe that the apostle knew how to apply the principle he so forcibly put forth. They would force us to apply it differently, as if the apostle had said to Timothy, "Suffer weakness rather than partake; wine, you know, makes your brother to offend; be not partaker of that offence; take care that you set no bad example"; or as if he had enjoined total abstinence on priests and deacons instead of "moderate temperance." Then, all this being so simply patent, it seemed desirable to some smart practitioner to import a falsity into the discussion and make believe that the wine referred to was a non-intoxicant; but as the apostolic rules would have then been obvious verbiage and nothing more than fallacy has, I think, almost died out. Not so the previous one of name. It became necessary at one stage of progress to hide the real nature of the movement under the holy name of temperance. This helped the cause immeasurably, though nothing but a trick, and one which, were it general, would reduce the whole English language to an unintelligible jargon, or, as an alternative, to one network of redundancy. Who knows now what a man means by temperance? unless he speak of "old-fashioned temperance," or "apostolic temperance," or "true temperance," or "moderate temperance," which last expression seems the very climax of redundancy. What numbers of theologians are there who have such faith in the Founder of a certain religion that they unhesitatingly confess to His divinity, and then in the same breath accuse Him (1st) of imperfection in His life, as being non-temperance in the modern acceptation; and (2nd) of not knowing, when organizing His society, what pledges should be required of His followers; thus leaving it to the nineteenth century to reveal a higher life than He had followed or propounded. The total abstinence stand must undoubtedly be held in certain cases and under certain circumstances; but there is yet a higher stand. Those, however, who courageously hold to that higher stand will often be denied the pleasure of working with many with whom they have strong sympathy, and may very certainly expect a rap over the knuckles from some quarter or other if they will persistently oppose this new-fangled heresy or craze.

There is a non-theological idea which has tended amazingly to help on the "temperance" movement; namely, the notion that government by majorities is the best. In some cases, doubtless, this is true. But in what cases? The majority in England at one time supposed it to be in the interest of society that every man should profess certain beliefs on pain of persecution, and passed the law *de heretico comburendo*. The majority veered over to the other side and dittoed the other way. That was a case of government by majorities; but by majorities who did not understand that individuals have rights, inherent rights, with which majorities have no right to meddle—by majorities whose action was really for the time destructive of government by reducing it to the worst form of tyranny. If I am persuaded by the concurrent testimony of hundreds of experiments that "hollands" very moderately taken are the very best tonic for myself, my private judgment is not, I allow, infallible; but the *vox populi* is far less likely to be so in cases affecting my individual interests. Let the honest men among the prohibitionists, for they are conscientious, doubtless, in the mass, though seeking to rob us of our Christian liberties, do what honest men always have to do sooner or later: begin to show that had they the power to force us to-morrow they, even then, would have the right; let them seek to punish wickedness and vice, and to uphold virtue, for to treat both alike is simply savage barbarism. A Government has just as much right to pass prohibitory laws for temperate men as they have to put the country under martial law. The latter is sometimes justifiable; never so until fair