

TRANSLATION.

HORACE, *Line I., Ode 3.*

He whose frail bark across the sea first fled,
 Who passed the ocean's barriers without dread,
 Who with an unaverted gaze surveyed
 The swimming monsters to his view displayed,
 The strength of oak and tripple brass did beir
 Around his ample breast; no lurking fear
 Dwelt in his bosom, though in rude assault
 The North wind struggled with the south west gale;
 He faltered not, though in the boundless seas
 He saw the monstrous Hyades arise,
 And watched the south wind, bringing mists and rain,
 Leap into madness the resounding main,
 Beneath whose away the Adriatic Sea
 Tosses its waves, or slumbers peacefully.
 What fear of death had he, whose steadfast eye
 Saw the swollen waters madly rushing by,
 And the fierce lightning, blazing from afar,
 Strike thy dread rocks, Acæronia!

C. D. R.

PROHIBITION vs. LICENSE.

We have decided to open our columns for a limited time, to the discussion of the question of Prohibition vs. License, and have made arrangements with two representative writers to contribute each alternate week a communication upon the subject. We believe our readers will be interested in a fair and manly discussion of this burning question, and we trust the writers will deal with the subject in a manner becoming broad and liberal-minded men.

THE SOCIAL TYRANNY OF THE HOUR.

To those who, either from personal recollection, or from acquaintance with the literature of the period which succeeded the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832, can recall the hopeful tone which then possessed the minds of thoughtful men—a tone based on manly and rational conceptions of Liberty, the contemplation of the wild and crude social empiricism of to-day is in the highest degree melancholy and discouraging.

"Ariosto," says Macaulay, "tells a pretty story of a fairy, who, by some mysterious law of her nature, was condemned to appear at certain seasons in the form of a foul and poisonous snake. Those who injured her during the period of her disguise were for ever excluded from participation in the blessings which she bestowed. But to those who, in her loathsome aspect, pitied and protected her, she afterwards revealed herself in the beautiful and celestial form which was natural to her, accompanied their steps, granted all their wishes, filled their houses with wealth, made them happy in love and victorious in war. Such a spirit is Liberty. At times she takes the form of a hateful reptile. She grovels, she hisses, she stings, but woe to those who in disgust shall venture to crush her, and happy are those who, having dared to receive her in her degraded and frightful shape, shall at length be rewarded by her in the time of her beauty and her glory!"

To-day men seem to have almost lost the true conception of Liberty, for liberty which is not liberty of the individual as well as liberty of the state is but a mocking phantom of Liberty. Individual liberty, the cornerstone of the foundation, men are now ready at every turn to surrender, with the facility of Esau, to bands of enthusiasts whose methods, they do not themselves seem to see, are approaching the methods of Socialism. Is it that we have lost the old Saxon manliness which dictated the sentiment that 'a man's house is his castle,' and sternly bid interferers with his personal affairs to mind their own business? I trust not, I believe not. For already there are signs of a reaction against one of the great social tyrannies which, promoted by good men with sincere, tho' mistaken and extravagant ideas of philanthropy, have carried off their feet community after community in our so-called free country, in their impetuous and indiscriminating crusade.

It is to little purpose that we are free from the personal tyranny of Kings and Kaisers, if we are ready to prostrate ourselves before the Juggernaut car of a faction—a faction which is not even a majority, but only an exceedingly pretentious and noisy minority, whose methods consist, too largely for its credit, in exaggeration, injustice, abuse, and a rapidly growing insolence, which, if the majority had proper spirit, would be put down with a still higher hand than that which they attempt.

Of course I am speaking of the Prohibition movement, which, as the Toronto *World* states, is introducing "a reign of terror in Ontario, tyrannically interferes with the liberty of voting, has muzzled the press which opposes the act, has brought the ministry into a state of subjection, boycotted anti Scott Act doctors, and exercises a power over teachers which makes it impossible for one of them to speak against the act; no matter how strong his sentiments against it." The *World* adds that, in hundreds of instances, men dependent on their situations for their bread were told that instant dismissal would be the penalty if they dared to speak or vote against the Act." This quotation has been published before by a Halifax paper, much to its credit, but I repeat it to add the remark that intolerance is ever cowardly, and nothing can possibly be more cowardly than the methods of the Prohibitionists. Will a free people continue to submit their consciences and their liberties to a tyranny so hateful? If they do, a man might as well have lived under the "blue laws" of New England and had better live under the Czar, who at least refrains from interference with personal tastes and habits.

The attempt to enforce morality by legislation is one of those retrograde steps—or rather back slippings—which cannot but recur now and then in the general onward march of intelligence. For the key to a true conduct of this very fallible world's affairs lies at the top of a high mountain, and the ascent is long, slow, and slippery. The Prohibitionists, most unwisely,

endeavor to identify their cause with religion, and the religious bodies, chiefly those of puritanical tendencies, with equal unwisdom, hasten to grasp at the rungs of a ladder, the top of which seems to them to reach the heaven of an ecclesiastical domination of the state. This, notwithstanding the present subservience of the politicians to great sectarian votes, will be found to be a fond idea vainly cherished, but it leads both clerical ambition and lay pharisaism into an unwitting abandonment of faith.

This tendency (which has become very marked within the last few years) is well deprecated by an excellent writer, Professor Mathews of Chicago University, in the following terms:

"One of the saddest signs of the times we live in, is the increasing scepticism which good men manifest regarding the efficacy of moral influences in repressing vice. After ages of bitter experience—after Bartholomews, auto-da-fes, and 'booted missions' without number—the world has at last learned that the true way to exterminate heresy is not by the sword, the dungeon, and the stake, but by letting truth and error grapple. When will men also learn that sin is to be exterminated, not by the 'beggarly elements' of force and compulsion, but by the moral weapons of argument and persuasion? When will they learn that to reform men by force,—to break down individual independence, whether of judgment or choice, to frown and scold men into self-denial,—to rely upon custom, law, opinion, anything rather than conviction and persuasion, as the means of changing moral conduct,—to jam the reluctant between a noisy public sentiment on the one hand, and a statutory prohibition on the other, and to drive them, thus guarded, into the line of sobriety and morality is the worst kind of scepticism, because it is a distrust of the holiest influences, a substitution of mechanism for soul, law for gospel!"

But the faith of the Prohibitionist, who also wishes to pose as the Religionist fails him, and he falls into the vulgar rut of coercion. Why he does so is made evident by John Stuart Mill, who will be found in the long run, by a freedom loving people, the truest apostle of liberty since Milton. His words are pregnant with a significance which the sooner the masses educate themselves to understand and assimilate, the better:

"There is in the world at large an increasing inclination to stretch unduly the powers of society over the individual both by the force of opinion and even by that of legislation; and as the tendency of all the changes taking place in the world is to strengthen society and diminish the power of the individual, this encroachment is not one of the evils which tend spontaneously to disappear, but, on the contrary, to grow more and more formidable. The disposition of mankind, whether as rulers or as fellow citizens, to impose their own opinions and inclinations as a rule of conduct on others, is so energetically supported by some of the best and by some of the worst feelings incident to human nature, that it is hardly ever kept under restraint by anything but want of power; and, as the power is not declining, but growing, unless a strong barrier of moral conviction can be raised against the mischief, we must expect, in the present circumstances of the world, to see it increase."

This increase it is the duty of every freeman to oppose with such vigor as God may have endowed him withal. Mr. Mill goes on to say:—"The acts of an individual may be hurtful to others, or wanting in due consideration for their welfare, without going to the length of violating any of their constitutional rights. The offender may then be justly punished by opinion, but not by law." But this does not involve immunity for the drunkard, who merits condign punishment. Mr. Mill was an indignant critic of the Prohibitory Liquor Law movement. The tenor of his criticism may be summed up in the Bishop of Peterborough's declaration that he would consider a free people who drank, in a more hopeful way than an enslaved people who kept sober. "There is no invasion of human liberty which the theory of this movement would not justify," is Mr. Mill's declared opinion, and I think all sound thinking men will agree with him, if they give sufficient thought to the subject.

I have before me a letter addressed to the Critic by a gentleman who is conscientiously earnest in his advocacy of Prohibition. It does not seem to me to call for much remark; but, without the slightest disrespect for honest convictions, it does not appear to be happily conceived. I am but little concerned with the so-called statistics of the movement. Every one knows that statistics are a facile and pliable instrument in the hands of the partisans of a movement which has attained any degree of popularity. Statistics which have passed thro' the hands of the United States enthusiasts of total abstinence are particularly open to suspicion. I have some on hand which, so far as I can judge, might be opposed to them with advantage, but I am not anxious to parade them. I am far more concerned to awake, if possible, the spirit of freemen to resist what promises to be an abominable tyranny. For the Prohibition movement has passed from the phase of a legitimate moral agitation into the foul and corrupt region of politics, and the ambition of domination of the state.

The quotation from Dickens is but little applicable to our state of society. Paris is, of all sinks of iniquity, the deepest. Every student of history, as well as everyone who has ever studied it from personal observation, knows very well what it is, and that, in questions of morality, Paris is not France, whose rural population is moral, sober, and thrifty to a remarkable degree. In the 'canaille' of Paris are concentrated and intensified all the worst features of the French character, and Dickens might have known better, (or at least been more precise in his diction) than to identify the "poor in France" with the truculent rabble of her metropolis.

The quotation from Professor Huxley does not go for much. He, or I, or any sober citizen having great questions at heart, have been sickened and appalled by the reeking and crawling mass of misery, brutality, and debauchery to be daily seen in great cities. But one need not lose one's head because one's susceptibilities are outraged, and I have not the shadow of a doubt that, if you put the question fairly and squarely to Professor Huxley,