

A GREAT NATION'S LITTLE WARS.

We are going to war with Persia about Herat. An expedition has been fitted out at Bombay, the object of which is said to be a demonstration in the Persian Gulf. It is stated that the island of Karack is to be taken—that Bushire is to be occupied—and, after these littoral operations, we do not know "what next."

The announcement of this expedition has taken more people by surprise than it ought to have done. So far back as the 21st of July, the President of the India Board declared, "from his place in Parliament," that the conduct of Persia had compelled the Government of Great Britain to resort to coercive measures. But it is too much to expect the English public to study closely a speech on the Indian Budget. What is beyond the endurance of our representatives overnight, is well-nigh certain to be skipped by the represented the next morning. Accordingly, when Mr. Vernon Smith announced, in substance, that we were going to war with Persia, the statement passed unchallenged and unnoticed, just as though it had been something about a riot, a zemindar, or a "ferocious dooly." But now that intelligence has come from Bombay to the effect that an expedition has actually been fitted out, and that, at the date of the last advices, it was only waiting instructions from England to steer at once for the Persian Gulf, we have begun to understand the importance of Mr. Vernon Smith's disregarded announcement, and to inquire what madness has impelled Ministers—or, as some ignorantly ask, the East India Company—to plunge into so great a calamity as another Central-Asian war. Have we in no way profited by the past? Did we not expend blood and treasure enough in Afghanistan in the course of the last disastrous and disgraceful war?

Nothing is more natural than that there should be an exceedingly ill odour about the very name of an Afghan war. Still, although we spent, between the years 1838 and 1842, some fifteen millions of money and some fifteen thousand lives, in a vain attempt to secure the integrity of Herat by consolidating the Afghan empire under a restored and Suddzye dynasty, that struggle has not been without its uses. It has brushed away some mischievous errors. We may attempt again to keep the Persians out of Herat, but we shall never again play the part of political chifonniers, and hunt among the dust and ashes of Loodhiannah for a pensioned prince to "restore to the throne of his ancestors." We have still some pensioned Suddzye princes—small creatures, enjoying small stipends—held in no account by their paymasters, and continually quarrelling among themselves. But we should as soon think of picking up a stray Bourbon, and setting him on the throne of France, as of carrying one of these Shahzadahs, at the point of our bayonets, to Cabul or Candahar. We have learnt at least the wisdom of recognising the *de facto* rulers of the country, and leaving the Afghans to choose for themselves. Come what may, we shall never try our hands at king-making in Afghanistan again—that great cardinal error will not be committed anew. The last war was both a blunder and a crime—not because we made a great effort to keep the Persians out of Herat, but because we plunged into the defiles of Central Asia after the siege of Herat had been raised, only to outrage the nationality of the Afghans. There were two means of erecting a barrier against Russo-Persian aggression, and we chose the more foolish and wicked of the two.

It was a "grievous fault," and "grievously answered." But out of that nettle, danger, we plucked the rose of safety. We know something now both of Afghanistan and the Afghans. It has cost us much; but experience is ever a high-priced article, and to be valued in proportion to its cost. The Persians are again at the gates, if not within the walls, of Herat; but although Scinde and the Punjab are now British provinces, and we have a frontier post at Peshawur, we do not hear that a single battalion of British troops is to march upon Candahar or Cabul. Our military movements are confined to a demonstration in the Persian Gulf. Before we can do more than conjecture what diplomacy may be doing in other directions, we must wait, in all probability, until Parliament assembles, and until a blue-book is called for.

It is easier in such cases to say what ought to be done than to surmise what is likely to be done. The eccentricities of statesmen baffle all attempts to fathom them. As a general rule, if one would gain credit for a political vaticination, it is the safest course to make up one's mind what ought not to be done, and to predict that it will be done. Considering at how very small a cost, some eighteen or twenty years ago, we might have secured the good offices of Dost Mahomed Khan—then and now the Ameer of Cabul—and bearing in mind how little the advice of such men as Sir Henry Ellis and Sir John McNeill was heeded, we can hardly venture to hope that the very obvious policy of supporting that chief with everything but troops will be resorted to at the present juncture. In 1837 Dost Mahomed wanted only money and arms to keep the Persians out of Herat. He wants money and arms now. Let him have them. He is heart and soul in the cause—he will strike vigorously when he has the means. We need have no fear that he will not make good use of them. He has always been eager to arrest the advance of the Persians. When, twenty years ago, the Candahar Sirdars were willing to throw themselves into the arms of Mahomed Shah, he rebuked their want of loyalty and wisdom. Sir John McNeill then thought that we might best secure in Afghanistan the bulwark of a strong and friendly Power, by placing Candahar and Herat under the government of Dost Mahomed. We have a much better reason now for such a course of policy than we had when the Heratees were vigorously defending their city, but we would abstain from all interference beyond that of which we have spoken. A few laes of rupees, and a few thousand stand of arms, will enable the Cabul Ameer to operate effectually to the westward. If he retain permanent possession of Candahar, so much the better; but he must not be suffered to extract from us any guarantee upon this score as the price of his alliance. It is more to his advantage than to ours to keep the Persians out of Herat, and he will, therefore, have no just cause of complaint if we are not disposed to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan; whilst it is manifestly advantageous to us to encumber ourselves as little as possible with promises and pledges, which might lead to embarrassments worse than those which they were designed to avert.

If this moderate and safe course of policy is pursued, we have no fear for the result. Of the justice of striking a blow at Persia, no reasonable doubt can be entertained by any one who is tolerably acquainted with the recent conduct of that dishonest State. We do not lay any stress on the "Mrs. Hashim" affair. Doubtless, something may be said on both sides of that question. But the whole bearing of the Persian Court has been, for some time past, disrespectful, if not insolent, and its conduct has been practically hostile. It has made overtures, offensive to Great Britain, to other European States; and it has sedulously endeavoured to foment bitterness against us among the rude Mahomedans of Central Asia, by representing us as the enemies of their national faith. Even our alliance with Turkey has been turned against us, and occasion has been sought to declare the Sultan's recent Firman, and the religious liberty which it grants to his subjects, to be the growth of his dangerous connexion with the infidels of Great Britain. But the substantive cause of the present movement is the direct infraction of an engagement entered into by Persia with the British Government in 1853—an engagement not to violate the independence of Herat. This Persia has now done; and she has refused, upon remonstrance, to withdraw her troops from the Afghan frontier. All the answer she is disposed to return is that, if the English will compel or induce Dost Mahomed to retire from Candahar, Persia will withdraw from Herat. Of course,

we can give no such guarantee. So the Persians continue to beleaguer, if not to occupy, Herat; and an expedition is waiting orders at Bombay, to sail for the Persian Gulf.

We do not disguise that this is a great misfortune, but we do not see how it could be averted. Even on the limited scale on which it is proposed to conduct these operations, it is certain that they will cost a large sum of money—a sum which India, at the present time, cannot well afford to pay. Of course, India will be compelled to pay it; but it should be understood that wars of this description are not made by the East India Company in Leadenhall-street, or by the servants of the Company at Calcutta. They originate in Cannon-row or in Downing-street. The Directors of the East India Company, as a body, knew nothing about the first war in Afghanistan until it was made; and we may safely predict that they will know nothing about the present until the subject is freely ventilated by the publication of a Parliamentary Blue Book. Of course we except the members—three in number—of what is called the Secret Committee, who sign ministerially the mandates of the Board of Control. Meanwhile, if any odium attach to the war, the Company will be condemned to bear it; and whatever the cost may be, the Company will be called upon to pay it. And then, with the usual justice which pursues that governing body, it will be declared that the authorities of Leadenhall-street squander their finances upon unjust wars, instead of spending them upon great reproductive works.

[FOR THE EXAMINER.] THE HOLY FIFTEEN.

Come listen, ye folks, whilst I tell you of all Who assemble in conclave at Gallipoll Hall: First and foremost the famed constitutional lawyer, By common acclaim, rules supreme the Top Sawyer. Were Solon or Minos, Justinian or Pitt, Allowed in this far-famed assembly to sit; Were Plato, Demosthenes, Cicero there, They must bow in confusion at sight of the chair. Then hide your diminish'd heads, ye Coles' and Swabys, Ye Hensleys, Youngs, Warburtons, you are but babies; Pretend not to rule o'er an ignorant people; Compared with this chief, you're as moles to a stepple. Then there's he who goes backwards, yet still will engage To reach in due time to the end of the stage. There is "Watt-do-you-call-him," who, greedy of pelf, Has left the old stand and set up for himself, With visage like Solon, yet radiant with fire, No three may compare with big Jemmy Gohier. For everything prompt, and learned each text on, Is Jemmy the lesser, the son of a sexton. Then comes the Philologist, skilled to indite For children and women who ne'er learned to write: He's the lad a few yards of pottion to carry, In hands so long practised it cannot miscarry. There's he, of deep learning, who vends Polyglott, The Bibliomaniac, the sage W—t—t. Then the dread of young calves, old wethers and lambs, Renown'd for the cure of pig's shoulders and hams, The illustrious George, once a slayer of oxen, But late an attendant freights, corgoes, and docks on: Ever ready to second the motion of H—th. When too drunk for the charge is the Drawer of Teeth. There's a Cobler far-famed, an out-and-out Snarler, Dad sits in the kitchen, and he in the parlour. Nor must be forgotten the Tanner of Leather; Who sticks fast to the Union in fair and foul weather: He wisely withdrew from the Tewn Corporation, Saw breakers ahead, so escaped profanation. Then there's he who of yore might have lent out his types, But they're long been converted to "baecic and pipes; In chair editorial no more can he sit, And he still has for sale some small remnant of wit, And should not the faith of the Assembly diminish, Will engage, ere he's paid, all their business to finish. Two Inkeepers zealous, but still rather crawling, The one's yeasted B—g—ll, the other's called M—l—y. And the last, yet not least, who can cure all our ills, The namesake of him of Hygeian Pills. In short the assemblage, from every profession, Of patriots and statesmen, surpass all expression. There are lawyers and dentists, and vendors of drugs, Teetotallers solid, and drainers of mugs; There are keepers of taverns and vendors of grog, Some who drink by the sly, some who go the whole hog; But one trade is still missing, as I'm a free thinker, 'Tis the one that's most wanted, a thorough state tinker. Then hide your diminish'd heads, ye Coles' and Swabys, Ye Hensleys, Youngs, Warburtons, all such are babies, Nor longer shall rule o'er an ignorant people, Compared to the chief, they're as moles to a stepple.

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., DECEMBER 8, 1856.

"THE LAND QUESTION."

For many years the above was the watchword of discussion—the text of newspaper articles and tavern politics. To define its meaning or its application was always difficult, and we cannot recollect to have seen it intelligibly explained. Messrs. Cooper and Co. used it to establish the escheat clamour, which to them was a stalking-horse to ride into the Assembly, until the old hack was fundered and fell down, and the riders were precipitated into their kindred mire. Indeed their interpretation of the shibboleth, though it referred to an imposture and an impossibility, had still something rather more definite than some others; nor could it be much wondered at so long as starving men were made to believe that they could get land for nothing, that they found followers amongst the desperate, who, against hope, and in defiance of common sense, will still abide a promised issue. But the escheators were not the only parties who talked of "the Land Question," and others there were who took up the watchword, in answer to the challenge of the political sentinel, in whose mouth or in whose ears it was *vox et preterea nihil*—a name and nothing more; but the far larger part had a conceit that the "Land Question" was really a substantive thing—that some enormous change was impending to alter the relations between landlord and tenant, and though they knew not what, yet imagined that there really existed a hidden meaning and a future result. Parties of all sorts have used it—Tories found it convenient to preserve it in their vocabulary for the hustings, and Liberals were equally profuse in promising its adjustment. In fact it was used from habit, although it had no more entity than "the baseless fabric of a vision." Well, escheators, whether sincere or insincere, have been forced to acknowledge what they have long known, that the Legislature of P. E. Island had no more power to escheat proprietary lands than they had to make the grass grow which covered their surface. Then, driven from their main position, they began, for the sake of carrying on the illusion, to talk of Courts of Enquiry into titles. It could do no harm—O no, none at all; but it could unsettle every man's mind—it could interfere with the project of buying proprietary estates, and so it might jeopardize the Government which had the manliness to confront the old outstanding difficulty.

Is there no such thing as a "Land Question?"—is there no difficulty to be solved?—no amelioration to be effected? Yes, there are all these things, and the present advisers of Her Majesty's Representative have not shrunk from the task of

meeting them. The proprietary burden was felt and recognised by them, not only as odious to the tenantry, but as an incubus on the general prosperity. They, therefore, determined on the adoption of the Land Purchase Bill. No other Government had had the manliness to meet these circumstances, or to undertake all the difficulties which the detail and experiment of such a measure presented. That this undertaking has met with the cordial and grateful co-operation of the tenantry, is evinced by the nearly universal acquiescence of the people on the Worrell Estate—nay, entirely universal, except where the promises of unprincipled deluders have led the tenant to expect that which they knew it was impossible he could obtain; and so induced him, by making no preparation, to avail himself of the crisis, to lose proffered and manifest advantages, which, in consequence of this friendly counsel, are now lost forever. The guilt of this will be on the heads of the deceivers, and the execrations, which are the natural consequence, already greet their unprincipled ears. However, let that pass; it cannot be recalled. In the meantime, as is well known, the tenants on Lord Selkirk's estate—willing to seize on the auspicious moment, and justly appreciating the advantages in prospect—have petitioned his Lordship to step in and disappoint the Land jobbers, and sell to the Government, in order that they too may become freeholders on easy terms; whilst, we are informed by a correspondent, that those on Lots 63 and 64—(we believe the property of the Hon. Samuel Cunard)—have expressed a desire, too, that the settlement of the "Land Question" may include them. To carry out all the just wishes of the people of the Island, it requires a firm hand and a determined Government. That this movement may not be a partial operation, but extend its effects over the whole land—bestowing on all its inhabitants the relief which they pant for, and that without injustice—the Government which has survived the first difficulty will not scruple to imperil its own existence by demanding from the House of Assembly the means of emancipating the whole land. Unwilling as we know many members will be to acquiesce in the measure which the Government are prepared to submit to them, we yet venture to believe that none will be found so fool-hardy as to resist a whole people in this matter.

The Home Government has been applied to, and no reluctance in the absence of a final answer seems to exist to affording an Imperial guarantee for a loan of money to effect this benevolent purpose; and we, indeed, believe the day is not far distant when, excepting the resident proprietors, there will none remain. Here is a consummation which none but the present Government can bring to pass. To them belongs the credit of bringing about a steady and progressive improvement in all the varied interests, social and political, of the different classes of our community. It is not because there can or should be the slightest fear of all the capital and all the interest being returned, without loss to the Colony of a single farthing; but, we further assert, that even if a large sum were absorbed at the end of the time designed to elapse before all the prices for which land shall be sold, have reached the Treasury—it still would be the duty of all benevolent men, well-wishers of their Island home, and of all persons calling themselves statesmen, or guardians of the public peace, and desirous to witness public and individual prosperity,—in short, of all philanthropists,—to provide cheerfully for any contingent deficiency, in order that "the Land Question" may be forever settled. Here then is the solution of "the Land Question"—solved by the people's true friends, the existing Government. No one can deny that the undertaking in the outset was a bold and determined step, and that the danger attached to it was great to those who embraced the enterprise—disregarding its consequences to themselves, so that they might extinguish proprietary estates, and distribute them without injustice amongst the tenants on terms perhaps little or not at all differing from those which might now be obtained, if the expensive process of escheat at the time when it was practicable had taken place—the land been reinvested in the Crown, and retailed to the tenants as occupiers.

We were afraid the Order of the Sons of Temperance in this Island had become extinct—we have heard so little of it lately—until we read in *Hazard's Gazette* the other day a notice of the Grand Sessional Meeting, at which the usual interchange of courtesies took place, and the customary addresses agreed to. We find that "Brother" Arbuckle's duties as travelling agent have for some time been suspended, owing to illness; but now we are happy to learn, the "Brother" being quite convalescent, he will resume "the duties of his mission," the hopeless task of spreading the delusion of the Maine Law, combined with a most vigorous propagation of the doctrines of that other equally popular movement, the Unholy Alliance. We have considerable respect for "Brother" Arbuckle, for with all his nonsense about the Maine Law, he has a good understratum of fun and pleasantry, which makes one forget, what we have charity enough to think he does not believe himself—his crude theories about cold water. Now, having such respect for the worthy agent, we are willing to assist him, as far as possible, in performing the duties of one part of his "mission," and knowing that the arguments against the Maine Law, which he has hitherto had to combat, have been worn quite threadbare, we here present him with a few weighty reasons—contained in an admirably written article of a late No. of the *London Saturday Review*—why Liberal subjects should not adopt so arbitrary, tyrannical and impracticable a law as that which forms the subject of much of "Brother" Arbuckle's eloquence, and which even Maine itself—its birth-place—has had the good sense to repudiate. The zealous Brother will find the arguments of the *Saturday Review* to be excellent texts for original sermons, which will of course be quite a rarity to his hearers; and if he succeeds in answering any of them satisfactorily, he will well deserve the poor pay which he is said to receive for his services, and keep fresh and verdant the appreciation in which he is held by his numerous admirers, among whom we beg to be remembered as one.

THE MAINE LIQUOR LAW.

Dr. F. R. Lees has gained a prize of one hundred guineas from the "United Kingdom Alliance," to procure the legislative suppression of traffic in all intoxicating liquors, for an essay upon the objects of the Society, which has been forwarded to us with a printed request that it may be reviewed. The essay was written between the 5th and the 29th of September, 1855; and as it contains 317 closely printed pages, it is, as might have been expected, very ill written. Dr. Lees says that he knows this as well as "the critics." "It is," he continues, "our pleasure to anticipate and prevent the needless labour by saying—'Perfectly true gentlemen, we could have written a better essay if we had had more time, and we could have had more time if we had had more money.'" He adds that he "knows the stereotyped jokes about prize essays, and that the old platitudes may be revived because con-

venient." We know neither the jokes nor the platitudes, but we do know the stale expedient of apologizing for a slovenly performance by avowing its elusiveness—as if the absence of art or care could be supplied by the presence of an unusual allowance of impudence. An ill-written book, is an ill-written book, whether the author admits it or not; and in this case, the badness of the composition is peculiarly vexatious, as it entails upon a reviewer, anxious to discharge his critical duties fairly, the necessity of reading through a thick volume which might, with a little trouble, have been compressed into a thin pamphlet. In the true style of a provincial prize essayist, Dr. Lees begins with many pages about the province of legislation, including much speculation and criticism on Bentham, Humboldt, Dr. Arnold, and the *Westminster Review*—all of which is meant to prove the self-evident truth, that there are, or may be, trades which it would be wise to suppress by law. In an equally characteristic manner, we are treated to a whole wilderness of facts which establish, beyond a doubt, the indisputable truth that drunkenness is a very bad thing—that it causes a large proportion of the misery of the country—that legislation, up to the present time, has not put it down—and that much evil of every description goes on at public houses. The concluding chapter contains a sketch of the history of the Maine Law in the different States of the Union; and the whole essay asserts, re-asserts, insinuates, and protests, in a thousand shapes, and for a thousand reasons, that a law ought to be made as soon as possible for the suppression of all traffic in spirituous liquors. It is hard to answer, point by point, an argument of this blandering length and confused character. Even Lord Stanley's conscientious and painstaking industry would probably break down under the task. But though we cannot follow Dr. Lees through all his facts and figures, we can, we think, give him, in a succinct form, the reasons which lead us to differ entirely from his conclusions.

Though drunkenness is an enormous evil, it is possible, though difficult, to exaggerate its bad effects; and Dr. Lees has, we think, accomplished this feat. Scotland is a more drunken and more prosperous country than Ireland—England would surely stand a comparison with Naples, in all respects except the relative sobriety of the two nations—and notwithstanding the total abstinence principles of Mahometanism, we should doubt whether the Turks and Egyptians were better off, on an average, than Europeans. For reasons of which these are a specimen, we are inclined to believe that national sobriety and national prosperity are by no means convertible terms. Though the evils of drunkenness admit of being exaggerated, and are in fact exaggerated by the advocates of the Maine Law, they are no doubt so great that any plausible scheme for their removal deserves serious attention. The proposal to declare the trade in intoxicating drinks illegal is advocated by its partisans as being the only one sufficiently comprehensive to face an evil so enormous. But Dr. Lees at least entirely fails to appreciate the difficulties which would make the enactment of such a measure in this country totally impossible, or, if possible, most dangerous.

To suppress a branch of commerce is a measure which can only be justified in those extreme cases in which the object of the prohibition is an evil universally acknowledged as such. The catalogue of prohibited trades is very soon exhausted. The cultivation of tobacco is prohibited for a conclusive financial reason. The trade in immoral books and prints is forbidden because no one doubts its pernicious character. But, on the other hand, though the Legislature professes its Christian character in the strongest manner—though it expends and sanctions the expenditure of many millions of money every year for the purpose of extending Christianity—though it has even made the publication and sale of blasphemous libels a crime—it abstains, and we think wisely, from putting the law in force against dealers in them. It virtually tolerates the traffic, because some publications of that class do in good faith advocate the views which they maintain, and a very small difference in opinion as to the character of any action is enough to make it an improper subject for legal punishment or prohibition. Where such a difference of opinion exists, the law loses its moral force over those who deny its policy; and if they are subjected to the legal penalties of disobedience, nothing will prevent them from considering themselves as martyrs, or, at any rate, as victims of oppression. Dr. Lees' proposal is singularly open to this objection. It calls upon us to adopt as the basis of legislation a cotchlet peculiar to an insignificant minority. Substantially, his proposal is that we should interdict the use of spirituous liquors to all but the very rich; for to those who cannot afford to import on their own account, a prohibition of the trade is equivalent to a prohibition of the commodity. Such an interdict can only be defended on the ground that the use of intoxicating drinks is *malum in se*. Now, however true that opinion may be, it is the opinion of but a small fraction of the population, and as such cannot possibly be made the basis of legislation.

The ground which we have indicated is simple and straightforward, but it is one which Dr. Lees is anxious to avoid—probably because it exposes his cause to the consequence which we have pointed out. As he would put the case, the prohibition of the liquor trade is a sacrifice which the law ought to impose upon the sober for the sake of the intemperate. He does his best to separate the question of prohibition from the question of total abstinence, and maintains that the first may be properly and consistently advocated by those who do not approve of the second. This argument appears to us to be not only bad in principle, but to set at defiance all the special facts of the case. To make a sacrifice is one thing—to enforce a sacrifice by law upon a very large minority (to take the view most favourable to the Maine Law) is quite another thing; but this is what Dr. Lees and the Alliance wish for. The conduct of a legislator and that of a private individual in such a case must be regulated by totally different principles. St. Paul would not meat so long as the world stood, lest he should make his brother to offend; but he carefully avoids laying down a general rule that no Christians should eat meat lest weak brothers should be offended. Wise legislation takes into account the interests and prejudices of all classes, even those of the sober and well-conducted; and though it might be praiseworthy in those classes to deny themselves luxuries or comforts which habit has almost made necessary, out of regard to their weak brethren, it would be very harsh in the Legislature to force them to do so. To contend that intoxicating drinks and poison stand exactly on the same footing, is one of those puerile exaggerations which injure any cause. At the very outside, drunkards are a not an inconsiderable minority of the population, whilst those who drink beer or wine are an overwhelming majority. It would probably be an enormous exaggeration to say that a quarter of those who drink intoxicating liquors sustain any other injury from them than that which, in the opinion of teetotallers, is inseparable even from their temperate consumption; and even on that enormous and extravagant estimate, the proposed law would force three people to a painful sacrifice, in order to confer a doubtful benefit on the fourth. But if the general principles upon which the Maine Law is advocated are unsound, their application to the particular case of England is still more absurd. An English Maine Law would be—and, what is of still more importance, would appear to be—an invasion, by the rich, of the pleasures of the poor. The public house and the beer shop would be shut up, but the wealthy and the clubs would import their own wine. The tap would cease to run, but the cellar would be inviolable. It may be a very sad fact, but it is incontestably true, that the public-house is the poor man's favourite, too often his only, recreation. To deprive him of this would be the immediate and palpable effect of the law; and an effect more harsh and more cruel it would be hard to conceive. To force a crude and unpopular theory upon vast masses of people—to deprive them of a favourite, even if it be a pernicious indulgence—to treat grown-up men like overgrown babies, are a few of the methods which Dr. Lees and his friends recommend as likely to conciliate the different classes of society. Whatever may be the possibilities of legislation in an American Republic, such measures as the prohibition of the liquor trade are out of the question in a country like England. To abstain from extreme and violent remedies for social evils is part of the price we have to pay for our enormous wealth, for the vast and complicated texture of English society, and for the weight which is allowed to the interests and prejudices of all ranks and classes. Legislation has its bounds everywhere, but they are sooner reached in England than anywhere else. Society with us is too big to be governed except in the broadest way, and for ends the most universally recognised. There are numberless evils which might be prevented by law in smaller States, but which can only be remedied by private enterprise in England, and drunkenness is, we believe, amongst the number.

Of course a philanthropist like Dr. Lees is quite above troubling himself about any such matter as the question of revenue. A Maine Law, he says, would make the people sober. Sobriety would increase the national wealth, and the channels of taxation would be changed, whilst the subjects of