

and passions, cares for nobody but himself, drinks liquor to excess, becomes a drunkard, injures himself and abuses his family, if he has one; and to save this incorrigible crank from the natural consequences of his own voluntary acts, and innate cussedness, prohibitionists would place under legal restraint the ninety-nine just persons who never drink to excess, and never get drunk, and deprive them of the enjoyments and comforts of life, the fruits of their own industry, economy, and good management. It won't do; and the ninety-nine will not tamely submit to such arbitrary tyranny and injustice. If prohibitionists choose to lead a life of total abstinence from the use of stimulants, let them do so—it is their own affair—but let them not arrogate to themselves the right to impose that restraint upon others who choose to live differently. The voluntary celibate might with equal justice claim the right to impose forced legal celibacy on the whole male population. It won't do.

The Scott Act makes it a crime for any person but a licensed druggist to sell liquor. But a sale always involves a purchase, and there can be no seller without a buyer; and when there are two parties to the commission of a crime, both should be punished alike; but the Scott Act metes out no such even-handed justice as that. It punishes the man who sells, yet says there is no harm in the sale as such, else why allow the druggist to sell; but with a strange perversity of moral sense truly deplorable, the man who buys and puts the liquor to a bad use, and does all the evil by indulging to excess in a mere sensuous gratification, is petted and sympathized with, and held held up to the public gaze as a perfect paragon of injured innocence. This morbid, sickly sentimentalism which is always lavished on unworthy objects, inflicts on society a vast amount of evil by giving genuine philanthropy a wrong direction.

It is not my intention to trespass on the ground taken up by Mr. Kyle in his articles in the *Globe* for some time past, further than this:—Mr. Kyle has challenged prohibitionists to quote from the Bible one solitary passage condemnatory of the manufacture and sale of spirituous liquors, or in Scripture language wine and strong drink, and they have not done so, for the simple reason that they cannot. The Scriptures abound in warnings against intemperance, and denunciations against drunkenness, but nowhere is the manufacture and sale of wine and strong drink prohibited, and in this respect the Scripture and the Scott Act are in direct antagonism. The evil consequences of intemperance and drunkenness are vividly portrayed in the sacred writings, while temperance and sobriety are strongly inculcated and enjoined, and the blessings resulting therefrom are held up as inducements to lead a sober and temperate life. But, at the same time, perfect freedom of choice of action is left, and on his own shoulders rests the responsibility of the choice the man makes. If he eschews the evil and chooses the good, he reaps all the blessings resulting from a sober and temperate life; but if he gives himself up to wine and strong drink, he suffers all the evils resulting from a life of drunkenness and debauchery. Deprive