

must be stirred and roused through the popular intelligence. It is but a few days since a body of rum-sellers in this State solemnly and officially declared: "That as citizens and taxpayers we have in common with our fellow-citizens the advancement of the interests of the whole people." These same men further declared their business "to be legitimate and worthy of protection and support." These expressions show to what extent of audacity, toleration and indifference naturally lead. The public are required to "support" the men who are engaged in the most evil and corrupting and degrading occupation the world has ever suffered from, and it is impudently announced that the "advancement of the interests of the whole people" is sought by these venders of poison and manufacturers of crime and ruin.

The national conscience, must indeed need rousing, when such hardy insolence and brutal defiance of decent public opinion passes almost unnoticed. Some influence stronger and more rapid in its operation than the slow process of evolution is required to set in motion effective reform sentiment. The curse of modern civilization may else become its destroyer before a remedy is applied. Let it be remembered that there can be no true freedom with a venal and degraded franchise; that the best devised government institutions are useless when corruption excludes from their control the fittest members of the community; that it is futile to alternate churches with saloons, leaving the weakest elements of society at the mercy of the most powerful temptation.--*N. Y. Tribune, March 19, 1884.*

GRANDLY SAID.

We have seen nothing of late more to the point or more worthily uttered than the following extract from an address by Chief Justice Davis, Chickering Hall, New York; on the 26th ult. It is refreshing to read such words from such a man, in these times, when we are having so much twaddle from would-be leading divines of the Gladden type, and so much space given by prominent magazines and some religious weeklies, to the utterances of those who are violently opposed to Prohibition. But hear Judge Davis:

"If I have a hope I desire to see realized it is that I shall live to see the day when no man, under the sanction of law, shall put a drop of intoxicating liquor to his neighbor's lips. That hour is coming. * * * I read in the newspapers that the prophet of the Soudan sends before him the simple message: 'I am coming: be ready.' I hear in the air and on every hand the same message to the temperance people of this country. I heard it last fall in Ohio, when 320,000 people of that prudent child of the West marched to the ballot-box, and voted for Prohibition in the constitution. I heard it in Kansas and Iowa as it is now being heard in Maine, and, despite all prediction and argument and criticism, I say it is coming with speedy steps everywhere, for it is borne on the hearts and best morality of fifty millions of people.

"God's and man's law prohibits murder, yet scarcely a week passes but some murder, horrible and horrifying, is committed. Shall we abolish the prohibition of murder on the plea that Prohibition doesn't prohibit? We prohibit burglary and larceny, yet every day those crimes are committed, not only by men who pick your pocket, but by men who have taken solemn oaths to obey the law, and yet steal and plunder the taxes in the public treasury. Shall we, therefore, abolish our prohibition of larceny? No, we will maintain the law as far as possible, and struggle to raise the public standard of morality so that all living agencies of hell shall be closed absolutely, and we will enforce it so far as human skill can. * * * My twenty-nine years' experience as judge has taught me that of all the causes of sin and misery, of sorrow and woe, of pauperism and wretchedness, intoxicating liquors stands forth the unapproachable chief. Within the last three days a poor, weeping mother came to me to ask my help in getting her son pardoned out of State prison. I told him that if he would give me the name of the man who sold him the rum which led to his crime I would remit a large part of his sentence, and would impose the severest penalty the law would permit upon the poisoner who served him with the rum. Shall I be mealy-mouthed when I speak of such men? I

will denounce the rascality that sells liquor to men, women and children with as much violence as God gives me power to utter!

"I can't stop the sale of intoxicating liquor here—no body of men can—but the hour is coming when we can. * * * My mouth never shall be closed against the evil that my position shows to be the chief source of all the evil that drags my fellow-men down, and opens the gates of hell upon them."—*Morning and Day of Reform.*

PERSONAL LIBERTY.

Exceedingly erroneous ideas are often entertained as to how much personal liberty a man has, rightfully, in the matter of his own actions. It is a common allegation, on the part of those who are abusing their own powers, of squandering their own possessions, or foolishly wasting their own substance, that it is nobody's business—that they have a right to do with themselves and their possessions what they will. Especially is this true of those who are wasting time, bodily powers, and money in the saloon through indulgence in strong drink. Such assert boastfully, defiantly, as if it were beyond the possibility of denial, that it is nobody's business when they drink, or how much they drink. One of our honorable Assemblymen, not long since, stood up in his place and virtually advocated this idea by declaring that he would not submit to any man's telling him what he should eat or drink. And yet this assertion, so loudly and confidentially proclaimed, is without any valid basis in fact. In many instances the law now steps in to prevent men from doing injury to themselves or to their friends, and it would be vastly better for society and for families if the law did this in many more cases.

Hence we find that personal liberty in the use of intoxicating drinks is narrowed down to very close limits. It only extends so far as their use will interfere with no one, bring unjust burdens upon no one either by unfitting the drinker himself for the discharge of his duties to his family, to society, to the State and the nation or by consequences flowing out upon the public. Within these limits we do not enter upon any controversy with the drinker, but the moment he goes beyond these limits, we have a right to meet him with censure, with condemnation and with the restraints of law. We have a right to say to him here, Forbear; tread upon this ground upon your peril; and if he persists, we may justly use all lawful compulsion of restraint. And here is where we find our authority for the opposition we are making to the use of intoxicants as a beverage. Not one in a hundred who indulges in strong drink, keeps within the limits of personal liberty in the matter. They quickly pass beyond and trench upon the rights of others, make of themselves an offense to the public, a disturbing element to society, an enemy to the general good, a cancerous sore to the body politic, a blight and blot to humanity, which it is both the right and duty of the guardians of the public welfare to remove. It may sound very well in the bar-room for a tippler to stand up and swaggeringly talk about his personal liberty—his right to drink when he chooses, where he chooses and as much as he chooses—but outside of the bar-room such talk is the prating of foolishness born of the silliest folly. No man has a right to indulge in strong drink to the detriment of any human being—not even of himself; and the very moment he passes this limit his personal liberty is forfeited and he becomes amenable to the restraints of law. He injures others at his peril, and has no just cause for complaint when the guardians of the public welfare say to him, Forbear; nay, when they take his drink from him or put him from his drink. Compulsory abstinence for the individual will yet be acknowledged as right and just.—*Living Issue.*

ANTI.

We have received a copy of "The Anti-Scott Act News, being a journal devoted to the disproof of Prohibitionist fallacies and the explanation of the real issues involved: Vol I., No. 1. Circulation 15,000." This is the imposing title of the organ which is to advocate license against prohibition in Kent. We look in vain to discover who are the printers, publishers or projectors of the sheet, and finding none, conclude that all are alike ashamed of putting themselves in print in connection with it. But in lieu of this useful information we have the very mugwumpian title to handle it by, but as it is, also, too big for general