

weekly papers where the advertisement appears in successive issues—three weeks after the first insertion. We would urge our friends in other places to be specially careful in guarding against a similar mistake. The Kent affair has shown us that we cannot get back petitions that once leave our hands, and it is therefore desirable that we see that they are as nearly perfect as possible before we send them to Ottawa.

The position that might be taken is this:—There must be notice given two weeks before the deposit; it takes two insertions to complete the notice; consequently there must have been two insertions two weeks before the deposit. Our Wellington friends have done wisely in again advertising their petition and making things secure.

#### A STALE TRICK.

Rev. D. Rogers, of Ailsa Craig, a veteran prohibition worker, and author of *Shot and Shell for the temperance campaign*, writes requesting that we will expose a profane and contemptible attempt of the liquor sellers to make weak-minded patrons believe that their business has scriptural sanction. Mr. Rogers says: "Two hotel-keepers here got cards printed with their names as heading, followed by 'Dealers in choice wines and liquors, &c.,' and on the reverse of the card the following:—

OLD TESTAMENT.	NEW TESTAMENT.
Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink, and forget his poverty and remember his misery no more. Proverbs 31. 6-7.	Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities. 1 Tim. 5. 23.

We are not surprised at this sacrilegious impertinence. We remember that the devil himself tried to push forward one of his most infernal undertakings by a similar stratagem, and that our great Exemplar, in reply, quietly quoted a few words to show the true spirit and intent of the sacred writings, without even condescending to argue with his malignant and hypocritical opponent, who knew well enough that he was guilty, in what he did, of one of the meanest violations of all fairness and decency in controversy.

The passage from which the first extract is taken is one of the strongest denunciations of even the moderate use of strong drink, and the second is a most convincing piece of evidence that total abstinence from even the mildest form of intoxicating liquor as a beverage, was the practice of at least one of the best and noblest preachers in the early Christian church.

No one need be surprised at such stratagems on the part of those who are interested in sustaining the power of evil: they have been practised in the same interest ever since the arch fiend began them, nearly six thousand years ago, when he tried to seduce the women in Eden by similar slanderous lies about what the Almighty had said. And just as our race was cursed on that sad day by giving credence to the father of deception, so our race is cursed to-day by believing the falsehoods circulated in the interests of the liquor selling business.

#### NO COMPROMISE.

We have been credibly informed that the anti-temperance men propose petitioning the Dominion Parliament at its next session to pass an Act exempting beer and light wines from the prohibition that the Scott Act imposes in localities where it has been adopted. Now we as temperance workers have nothing to do with the present quarrel between the brewers and distillers. In the interests of all

that is good and pure and true we have inaugurated, against the unholy drink traffic, a campaign that will not slacken till there is no longer a legalized liquor shop to disgrace our land and endanger our homes. The men who are opposing us in this patriotic warfare have found out that we have with us a great majority of our God-fearing and right-loving Canadian electorate. The brewers, who lately pooled their funds with the distillers, to resist the Scott Act agitation, seeing that they are utterly worsted in the fight, have determined to attempt to save their own business by professing to favor the assault against the camp of their late allies. With the seeming unmanliness and bad faith of such a line of action we have nothing to do. The brewers may pretend to fight the distillers as hard and as long as they choose; but we must emphatically decline to abate one jot of our opposition to the ruinous traffic in beer, even though the advocates of that alcoholic beer are ready to cry "Down with the alcoholic whiskey," when they imagine it will be to their own advantage to do so. This campaign is a crusade against "intoxicating liquors." We have not made, and we will not make, any distinction between the foes that admit their own vile character, and those who profess to be "angels of light."

The beer-and-wine-promote-temperance cry has never been backed by any attempt at argument in its favor, or any tittle of evidence to support it. We have heard many reckless assertions, that have been met by prompt denial and authoritative exposure of their falsity. We have shown conclusively that beer-drinking produces intemperance and leads to increased whiskey-drinking. It has been asserted that beer in the United States has driven out whiskey, the CANADA CITIZEN has shown that the statement was totally untrue; we have been told that beer and light wines made France and Germany temperate, and we have published pages of statistics, and other incontrovertible evidence exposing the falsity of this fabrication; we have had announcements of the wholesome and nutritious character of beer, and we have met them by medical authority and scientific facts, that no one has even attempted to dispute. We are ready to do all this again, if it is needful to do so, but we must call attention to the fact that our opponents do not even attempt to offer anything in the shape of evidence in support of their theories and assertions.

We know that there are some men of position and intelligence who hold opinions different from ours on this question. Surely if there were argument or evidence in support of their position, these men could furnish it. It is worthy of notice, however, that while some disinterested good men are honestly in favor of the beer and wine movement, they did not originate it; the movement is being pushed by, and in the interests of, the brewers who fought hand in hand with the distillers as long as they thought it would benefit themselves financially to do so, and who are now booming beer in the same interests—the interests of their own pockets.

Legislation on the temperance question must be progressive. Our country is progressive, and men must be very obtuse, or imagine our Legislators very stupid if they think they can induce Parliament to take a backward step at a time like the present. The Scott Act must not be weakened. Parliament dare not break faith with the people that it represents by destroying at once the work of years, and practically repealing legislation, for which we worked hard, and which has been endorsed by such overwhelming majorities. There are too many good men in Parliament to permit of the perpetration of such an outrage. And even if our legislators were unprincipled enough to favor such a proposal, they know better than to wantonly fly in the face of a strong and growing public senti-