

foundation of Canada's future greatness, were men of integrity and honesty, and never thought of putting chains and shackles upon themselves or their fellow creatures to prevent them from enjoying the gifts of nature. They had a greater mission to perform than that of interfering with other people's business, and the results of that great work are apparent to-day from one end of the country to the other.

All laymen do not think alike, nor do all the clergy think alike on this question, and if the prohibitionist feels that he has a right to expound his views and doctrines, he must, of course, allow others the same privilege. But, owing to their own intemperance on these matters, they insult those who desire to express conscientious opinions with which they do not agree.

Talking of the clergy, let me refer to the Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbot, a noted and well-known preacher of the gospel, who once stated:

I do not know whether the Master would be a total abstainer or not, but I am very sure that He would not confound total abstinence and temperance. He would not think that total abstinence in one form of indulgence is self-control. He would not teach that the man who eats pie until his face is as soft as pastry ought to be called a temperance man because he does not drink beer.

Prohibition will never prohibit; the reform must begin with the individual. I make this statement conscientiously, that if you tear down every saloon, distillery and brewery, and everything that looks like temptation, you can rest assured that you will begin a campaign of destruction that will practically empty the world. The only remedy lies in an organized effort to rid the man of his defects: first, by moral remedies, releasing the weak will from bondage; and, secondly, by educating and strengthening the will to a point where it reaches self-control.

According to the beliefs of those who agitate in favour of prohibition, education and moral suasion are no longer necessary in shaping our lightning course towards perfection. They believe that mankind can be made honest, righteous and sober, moral and what not by a mere stroke of the legislative pen. The beautiful theories of these gentlemen are all based on the one fundamental fallacy, that if the manufacture, sale and importation of alcoholic beverages is prohibited, men will cease drinking such beverages. They forget that the destruction and abolition of the sale of liquor can neither destroy the desire of man

to obtain these commodities, nor deprive him of the means of doing so, because there is hardly anything that grows in nature from which alcohol cannot be easily obtained in practically unlimited quantities by all who desire it.

Mark Twain, in talking about prohibition, gave utterance to this statement:

"Since men can get their tittle out of a table leg or a wooden fence rail, what is the use of talking about prohibition?"

I presume that human ambition to exercise power over others will never die out. In saying this I do not wish to be misunderstood. I believe there is no nobler life than that which is devoted to improve the lives of others, to bring greater happiness, greater protection, and greater security to the many who are handicapped in the great battle of life. I am quite prepared to concede that great strides have been made in the past years for the betterment of the human race, but my contention is that if there ever was a time when men required to stand up for their own personal liberty, to assert themselves against an invasion of their personal freedom, that time is now. Though referred to in sneering tones, by those who wish to impose prohibitory laws and restrictions upon our people, it means as much to-day as it did to our wise legislators who framed our laws and constitution in the past. Yes, it means more to-day than at any other time in the past owing to the fact that over-zealous partisans are seeking to take advantage of abnormal conditions, when the public mind is unsettled by war, and not prone to think as normally as in times of peace.

In studying this question I came upon the following paragraph, which to my mind is an answer to prohibition:

The history of civilization which stripped of its unessential features is largely the record of man's strangely contradictory struggle; on the one hand, to assert his right to the exercise of his individual tastes, opinions, and beliefs, and on the other hand, when he has succeeded in securing that right for himself, to arrogate to himself the privilege of denying the same right to those whose tastes and opinions and beliefs differ from his own.

Again I read:

A good deal of that which affords pleasure to my neighbour appears to be the rankest folly to me, but if I legislate where my neighbour's freedom to exercise the pleasure he prizes, is concerned, and which I consider foolish, what is to prevent him, in his turn, from legislating where my freedom to exercise the pleasure which I prize and he considers foolish is concerned?