

Happiness and safety—Does not the liquor traffic interfere with these invaluable rights of every man, woman, and child, in the State? And does not the Legislature, when it authorizes a license to be granted, *alienate* or barter away these rights for a paltry consideration? We know it has been said that "liquor will not hurt any one if he will let it alone." But this is "willainously false." Tho' whose let it alone are frequently, if not generally, the greatest sufferers. The wife and children of a drunkard—the father of a drunken son feel more keenly "the bite of the serpent" and "the adder's sting" than the victims themselves. The drunken driver of a stage coach, or engineer of a steamboat may kill scores of sober citizens and escape unhurt. If all the safe-guards of property, health, personal security, life, and the pursuit of happiness, of the innocent and unoffending are broken down by the liquor traffic, God could not license it without derobing himself of his holy attributes. Either every line of this section of the "bill of rights" is false, or the license law is a libel upon both its letter and spirit.

"LIQUOR WILL BE SOLD ANYHOW."

We are sometimes met with the remark, that liquor will be sold whether the sale is licensed or not. This may be very true, but is this a reason why Government should take it under its especial guardianship and protection? Counterfeiting and theft, gambling and robbery will be carried on whether licensed or prohibited; why not, inasmuch as men will perpetrate crime, authorize and commission those who wish to do it? Bring the case home. A guilty wretch may seduce your daughter, but because of the possibility of such a calamity, will you sell the privilege of doing so, and make merchandize of her virtue? Your sons may drink, and become drunkards, but we ask you, in the name of God and humanity, will you stand by, and authorize and commission your neighbor to put the bottle to his lips, and deposit in your pocket the price of his blood? If you license the villainy, any court of morals in the universe would make you a "*particeps criminis*" in the inhuman deed.

"NO RIGHT TO PROHIBIT THE TRAFFIC."

We are told that "Government has no right to interfere with a man's business." Surely if society may not protect itself from that which weakens and destroys the fundamental principles of its very organization, the bond by which it is held together must be frail as the spider's web! But the right to prohibit the traffic is not the question to be decided in June. If it was, we would discuss the proposition, and we would ask the advocates of *license*, if the act of licensing does not of itself simply the right to prohibit if the public good requires it.

The only thing the people are now called upon to decide is, whether or not the vender of innoxious poisons shall act under a sealed commission—not whether he shall make drunkards, but whether he shall pour his stream of burning lava upon society "*according to the law in such case made and provided.*"

WHY NOT PROHIBIT THE LICENSE OF OTHER WRONGS IN THE CONSTITUTION?

The answer to this question is easy. Government never has assumed the prerogative of licensing theft, arson, rape or murder. If the Legislature of Ohio had, for fifty years, prescribed a way by which these and other crimes might be lawfully committed, it would be highly proper for the people, when giving limits to Legislative action, to declare, in their organic law, that it should be done no longer.

Section 6 of article 15 of the Constitution, declares—"Lotteries, and the sale of lottery tickets for any purpose whatever, shall for ever be prohibited in this State?" Why insert this provision? Simply because lotteries have, in some States, been licensed by legislative authority, and it is proper that this abuse of power should be interdicted by those in whom all political power finally resides, viz: *the people.*

You do not in this section merely prohibit a license to sell lottery tickets, but absolutely prohibit the sale. Who will pretend that this is an invasion of the rights of any citizen? Are there not a thousand fold more reasons for prohibiting the liquor traffic than the traffic in lottery tickets? The evils of the latter are limited, while those of the former cannot be estimated. By the liquor traffic families are beggared, robbed or murdered, domestic altars broken down, wives widowed, children reduced to worst than orphanage, and the whole State converted into one vast charnel house. While the people might very properly prohibit the traffic itself, the adoption of this section of the

Constitution will leave the Legislature to provide against the evil resulting therefrom, but it cannot roll its all-prevailing courses onward interminably, shielded by the strong arm of Government.

WHY NOT LEAVE THIS SUBJECT WITH THE LEGISLATURE.

Simply because it has been left with it already too long—Legislators have abused their power—they have transcended their authority. They have quartered upon us an army to eat out our substance, riot upon our happiness; their banners rolled in blood, and the shrieks of murdered innocence, constitutes the music of their march. It is time for the people to undertake the holy, righteous, and indispensable work of self-defence. The experience of the past shows that this subject cannot be safely left to the tender mercies of party politicians.

We have no wish, and even would protest against this cause, "the cause of all mankind" being wedded to any political party. Nothing but politics can live and flourish within the atmosphere of politics. One bar room or grog-shop would do more to rouse the *partizan* passions of the multitude, than the warmest appeal of the most eloquent advocate of truth. This question has been made the rallying point of political party revolution. Put the no-license clause in the organic law, and it is beyond the reach of heartless demagogues.

S. F. CARY.

I. SCHMUCKER,

BEMAN GATES,

E. M. GREGORY,

F. D. KIMBALL,

Committee.

Great Juvenile Teetotal Demonstration.

A great demonstration of juvenile abstainers, got up under the auspices of Mr John Hope, W.S., took place in Edinburg last month. It was a gathering which, for numbers, has never yet been exceeded in this country. Mr Hope got up a similar demonstration two years ago at Houghton House—but the day proved rainy. This year, the demonstration partook as much as it could do of a national character; and, so far as the weather was concerned, a finer day could not have been selected. There were parties of children from Greenock, Port-Glasgow, Glasgow, Paisley, Kirkintilloch, and Kilsyth, in the west; from Berwick, Dunbar, and Haddington, in the east; from Dundee, Perth, and Fife, in the north; and from Hawick, Kelso, Biggar, &c., in the south. For some weeks past the local organizations set a-going by Mr Hope, did all that they could in their districts to bring the youthful adherents of the abstinence cause to Edinburg on the occasion, and that they succeeded is evidenced by the fact, that there could not be fewer than twenty thousand young persons from the country, with fully a sixth of that number adults. The numbers brought by railway, apart from other conveyances, were, as nearly as could be computed, as follows:—

Edinburgh and Glasgow,	6000
Caledonian,	5000
North British,	4000
Edinburgh, Perth, and Dundee,	5000

From the arrangements previously made, the railway companies kindly consented to convey those taking part in the demonstration, in some instances (those instances having reference chiefly to the more distant places) at about a fifth or a sixth of the usual fare. Trains arrived in Edinburg as early as half-past seven o'clock with detachments; and from that hour up till one o'clock in the afternoon there were gradual accessions to their numbers. The children were all dressed in holiday attire, and wore in most cases rosettes or medals on their breasts. On arriving at the railway terminus the earlier parties of youngsters were marshalled in bands of twenty—each of which was placed under a leader of more mature years. Mr Hope had succeeded in obtaining permission for the young people to visit free of charge the Royal Institution on the Mound, the Castle, Parliament House, Forrest's Statuary, Calton Hill, and the Chapel and Palace at Holyrood; while the parents and adults had the *entrée* on the same reasonable terms to the Antiquarian Museum, the Regalia and Armoury at the Castle, the Agricultural Museum, George IV. Bridge, Heriot's Hospital, and the Botanic Gardens, Inverleith Row. Proceeding on their tour of inspection, they passed from the station along Princes' Street to the Royal Institution. Entering by the north, and leaving at the south front, they got in