

to have been. If that is not civil law dealing with moral wrong, what is it?

The moral argument likewise holds in the saloon-keeper's case. Every man must be held to *intend* the natural consequence of his acts. No one knows so well as the saloon-keeper the woe and crime sure to be wrought by his business, and to inflict on men, women and children poverty, insanity, criminal madness, sickness and death for the money to be made out of it. If that is not wrong, then nothing is wrong. It is competent to prove the moral wrong for legal purposes in the saloon-keeper's case, just as much as in the case of any other offender who compasses the death and harm of his fellowmen. The admission of moral wrong will change the whole attitude of legislatures, judges, juries and police toward the saloon business.

It is here that the "soap-boiling" illustration fails. If the soap-boilers were boiling down 60,000 men every

year, whom they had slowly murdered, we do not believe arguments against their business would be confined to the fact that it smelt badly and depreciated the value of surrounding property. We should fall back on an old moral law, "Thou shalt not kill." The law does deal with sin that is injurious to society, and it treats it very differently from injury to society without the sin. The law will never deal adequately with the saloon till it deals with it as doing a *criminal* business—injury to society involving moral wrong. In this view, it is as competent to prove the moral wrong as it is to prove the social injury.

Especially is the pulpit to deal with the consciences of men. To convince the consciences of the great mass of right-meaning, thoughtful men that any prevalent vice is a *great moral wrong* is to add immense weight to all social or economic arguments that may be brought against it, and is sure to create an irresistible public demand for its overthrow.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

"Concerning Tobacco."

THE brief note on this subject in our last issue has called forth two or three vigorous protests because of our lenient treatment of the subject. But if our correspondents had noticed, we expressly declined to go into "the merits of the case," at that time, and simply referred to the discussion which had been going on in the daily papers. So far as our personal example went, we declared that we would have nothing to do with the vile thing; we had *never* used tobacco in any form, as we believe it to be unclean in habit, injurious to health, and a bad example for any man to set. But while we thus declared our views and practice in a word, we were not willing to "condemn unreservedly" such men as we named, and the class they repre-

sent. We are not willing to class the use of tobacco with the use of "strong drink"; we think it unwise and unjust to do so. And we see no necessity for so doing. There are good and substantial reasons enough, we think, against the habitual use of tobacco—reasons that cannot be called in question—without resorting to those of doubtful expediency. And since we are challenged to touch on "the merits of the case," we unhesitatingly give a few reasons why we object to the habit of smoking or chewing tobacco by man, woman or child. And these reasons apply with *special* force to *clergymen*, for weighty and obvious reasons which we need not stop to name.

1. The habit is a *needless* one. No one will argue that it is necessary,