

would not be received on any terms. This is the case, I believe, with the General Assurance Office. When cool-headed business men risk their money on abstainers, at a lower rate than non-abstainers, and though eager for business refuse to insure a publican's life at any price, it is a powerful argument for total abstinence. In proof that their decision is well founded, the Registrar-General's Report shows that 138 publicans die to every 100 of 70 other trades, and Dr. Edmunds shows that 30 publicans die to every 15 of several trades. This shows that we are not the enemies of the publicans when we try to deliver them from such a dangerous business,—a business compared to which, even the occupation of a coal miner is safety. If we turn to the abstainers from these drinks, what do we find? Certainly that, as a body, they enjoy better health, can do more work, and live longer lives, than their drinking neighbours, and friends.

Some time since the *Morning Post*, in an article bearing on this subject, said with a sneer, that "Teetotalism did very well for amiable old gentlemen, but that it wouldn't do for strong men; that we had no heroes among us, but only inferior characters! that the Volunteer movement had exploded the notion that a man could be as strong without the use of drink as with it, or else the prizes that had been offered would have been won by abstainers." To this we might reply, that when abstainers have entered the force, they have been at least equal to their companions. And we all know that the Queen's Prize of £250 at Wimbledon has been won on several occasions by abstainers.

If, then, what I have said is true, that these drinks have done very little to strengthen us, have they done nothing to weaken, and destroy? It is clear they have. I go to the medical men, and they unite to declare that "a large portion of the disease that exists, is produced by them." As to the cases of sickness caused by their use, these are