have only to say of this that such a plea is beneath contempt. No accurate scholar would ever think of thus "handling the Word of God deceitfully." A great deal of capital has been made by some of the fact that two words, in special, occur to designate "wine" in the Hebrew—the one "Yayin" and the other "Tirosh"; and they claim that one of these—it makes no matter which—is alcoholic and the other non-alcoholic. The Rev. Dr. Carry, of Port Perry, has lately issued a pamphlet which effectually disposes of all this sophistry. But it needs no learned Hebraist to understand the matter nowadays. The Rev. Dr. Young, a Presbyterian minister, has within the last few years published a most valuable Analytical Concordance; and any ordinary English scholar, by looking up the words "wine" and "strong drink" in the said Concordance, can see for himself what an amount of special pleading and prevarication they are guilty of who resort to this line of argument. Prohibitionism, it seems, like many other "hobbies," has a demoralizing tendency: it blunts all sense of manliness and truth.

2. The second effort to escape from our dilemma is one not quite so dishonest as the last, but equally short-sighted, and equally opposed to the truth of the Scriptures. It alleges: "We admit that the Bible seems to allow the use of alcoholic beverages; we admit that Christ used them and countenanced their use when He was on earth. But if He had lived now, and seen the evil effects of the practice, He would have done differently." Surely this argument has only to be thus stated in its simplicity to meet its own repudiation at the hands of any honest Christian man. Is it not strange—passing strange—that men who arrogate to themselves the title of "Christians"—men who fancy they have a monopoly of "The Gospel"—men who look upon all those who cannot pronounce their shibboleth as "unsaved"— men who boast of "the Bible and the Bible alone"—should thus speak of "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for