table their et of lany pertiseiblic icial the l for y, if rom arge

g to

s or ccaism emded in ous of nay and ricto ent

power of those who are subjected to them. There is no reason to suppose that the like results will not follow from similar restrictions imposed by public authorities unless they are decreed in answer to a practically universal demand and are in harmony with the general will and conscience of the whole community. All honor let there be to the man who abstains from liquor by way of precept and example to his weaker brother and seeks to convert men's minds. To him there is nothing due but respect, but the man who seeks to force upon the community what he thinks is good for them and who is out to use the temperance issue as an avenue to further his own political, social or commercial aggrandisement is in a different case. His efforts are more likely to injure than advance the cause he thinks to promote, and he may be the deadly enemy of liberty, purity and justice. He is the lawful descendant of the ancient Puritans, who forbade cock-fighting, not because it hurt the poor birds, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. Such men brought about the moral anarchy of the Restoration and their successors will never do autht for Canada. They are more likely to bring her into ridicule. In public life they are usually Pharisees, tools or knaves and the settlement of the liquor problem must be taken out of their minds and