

cal science, not for the sentiment of the platform or for Methodist enthusiasm, to decide.

We have seen how in Vermont, Prohibitionism, exasperated by its inevitable failure, has heaped up penal enactments, and at last invaded the most sacred liberties of the citizen and the sanctuary of his home. It is the tendency of all tyranny, whether it be that of a sultan, a crowd, a sect, or a party of zealots, when it finds itself baffled, to pile on fresh severities instead of reconsidering the wisdom of its own policy. Prohibitive legislation in Canada has not failed to betray the same arbitrary spirit. There is a clause in the Scott Act (sec. 12) setting aside the common legal safeguards of innocence. It provides "that it shall not be necessary for the informer to depose to the fact of the sale as within his own personal or certain knowledge, but the magistrate, so soon as it appears to him that the circumstances in evidence sufficiently establish the infraction of the law, shall put the defendant on his defence, and in default of his rebuttal of such evidence shall convict him accordingly"—convict him, in short, and send him to prison on hearsay, if in the opinion of the magistrate, who may be a strong partisan, he fails to prove his innocence. There is a clause (122) requiring a man when interrogated respecting previous convictions to criminate himself, which seems intended for the very purpose of breeding mendacity. There is a clause (123) compelling husband and wife to give evidence against each other. When the wife has sent the husband to prison, what will the wedlock of that pair thenceforth be? Which of the two is the greater sin, to refuse to give evidence under the Scott Act, or to break the marriage vow which bids husband and wife to cherish and protect each other? There is no appeal on the merits from the arbitrary decision of the magistrate, and zealots have not been ashamed to demand in the plainest terms the ap-

pointment of partisans to the bench. It never occurs to them to consider whether intemperance itself is a worse vice than injustice.

The treatment of the hotel and tavern-keepers has also been utterly iniquitous. These men have been earning their bread by a trade which when they entered it, was not only licensed by the State, but deemed everybody perfectly reputable; and therefore when their trade is suddenly suppressed they are apparently entitled to the same compensation which another trade in the same circumstances would receive. But compensation is inconvenient and migration fatally weight the measure. It is necessary, therefore, to put the tavern-keeper out of the pale of justice; and do this pulpit and platform vie with each other in kindling popular passions against him. He is represented not only as the agent of a traffic to which it is desirable to put an end, but as a criminal and the worst of criminals—as a poisoner and a murderer "steeped to the elbow in the blood of civilization." Yet money made by the poison which he sells is accepted even by the most scrupulous of the Churches for its religious objects, while one Church at least, which has synodically declared for total Prohibition, counts its dealers in liquor among its members.

We do not want a selfish and isolated liberty. Milton himself did not want a selfish and isolated liberty—at least he deliberately sacrificed his eyesight rather than decline to serve the State. But after all this struggling against the paternal despotism of kings and popes, we do want a reasonable measure of freedom and self-development. We do want it to be understood, as the general rule that,

All restraint
Except what wisdom lays on evil man
Is evil.

In case of extremity, such as war or plague, we are of course ready for strong measures, provided they are effectual. Not only war or plague