him of his s of Eden, be seen by asequences n prohibite the afnor of the have cominside the ve placed ould have it impos, but it is

hen their ed in the ine questo have or at the ould not, did not. vidence, f all the ind then riptures modern ie never r minds of wine nd does of the le scope y of the ontains mine a ing the ole conon't do. justifiike my , lest I man is conscify the

ple to

itterly

inence

many

him to

do. It may be necessary to subject the unfortunate individual afflicted with dipsomania to a certain measure of restraint in order to wean him from his vicious habits and bring him back to temperance and sobriety; but is that any reason why all the rest of the community, not so afflicted, should be subjected to what is tantamount to the same or similar restraint? The surgeon may find it necessary to amputate the 'diseased limb of his patient in order to save his life; but would that justify him in amputating the healthy limbs of healthy people in order to save them from the possibility of becoming diseased? Why punish all virtuous people because some people are vicious, and all sober people because some people get drunk? It won't do.

Prohibitionists are in the habit of styling themselves temperance men. This is a misnomer. They are rather extremists, absolutists, pessimists or optimists. Temperance is defined by Webster as "moderation, sobriety, habitual moderation in regard to the indulgence of the natural appetites and passions, restrained or moderate indulgence." The difference between temperance as thus defined and prohibition is as wide as the Poles. Temperance is the mean between excess on the one hand and total abstinence on the other.—Where a prohibitory liquor law is enforced there can be no temperance.

In an editorial in a recent number of the Globe it is stated that the evils of intemperance are so great that the adoption of any measure, however extreme, is justifiable that will tend to abate these evils. This is going a little too far, and always is and always has been used to justify every act of arbitrary tyranny that has ever been committed. The end does not always justify the means, and a Government even has no right to do wrong. The majority have no more right to compel the minority to eat and drink certain things, or to refrain from eating and drinking certain things, than they have to compel them to go to a particular church on Sunday. It won't do.

What a vast amount of morbid sympathy and sentimental gush is wasted on the ideal drunkard. This mythical being, who is as different from the real article as day is from night, is exhibited on the prohibition platform in all the gorgeous colouring of a fervid and heated imagination in order to excite the morbid sympathies of a class of people who flow over on hearing or reading a harrowing tale of fiction as easily and naturally as a kitchen swill-pail. Yet these same individuals who expend so much gush on the platform will pass by on the other side lest their sacred persons should be contaminated by lending a helping hand to the poor unfortunate inebriate who lies wallowing in the gutter. It is so much easier to cure, or rather to affect to cure, the evils of intemperance by displays of latform oratory and Acts of Parliament than by actual deeds of charity and benevolence; but it won't do.

I, being opposed to every form of tyrauny over the mind of man, denounce the Scott Act as one of the most arbitrary and tyrannical measures outside despotic Russia, and "the subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures.

Perth, July 19th.

C. RICE.