

know that ours is the promise "of a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." Either this glorious prospect is a delusive dream, and the Book is filled with God-given pledges that will never be redeemed, or else the liquor traffic is doomed—condemned already, and lives now only because it is the two, and not the ten spies of this modern Canaan, who are bravely affirming, "Let us go up at once and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it."

But listen to one more quotation from Mr. Abbott's discourse:

"God has filled the material universe with forces that make for civilization, and the moral universe with forces that make for righteousness. You are responsible for using these powers. You are to hold yourselves to account, as God will hold you to account, not merely for what you can do by your own arm, and your own force of will, but also for all that you can do through Him that strengtheneth you."

"Whatever is right is practicable. Whatever ought to be can be. And you and I are to blame if we do not help to make *the right the real.*"

"In just so much as these words set forth the deepest feelings and thoughts of our souls, in just so much are we in working accord with the divine architect when He said, 'Behold I make all things new.'"

OUR LAST PLEBISCITE.

It has been a weary wait, but the fruit of it is ripening fast. Nothing but a dishonor that we will not for a moment consider possible can snatch it from our grasp.

"Are you in favor of the immediate prohibition, by law, of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage?" shouted the Ontario Government into the people's telephone—the ballot box. Back came a thunderous chorus of, "*we are.*"

"But what if you are?" says the liquor dealer; "possession is nine-tenths of the law." Not of an honorable government, pledged to oust you, should their supporters give permission, be in power.

In the Government bill that accompanied the Plebiscite Act the Legislature said: "Electors in voting 'yes' on this question will be considered as expressing an opinion in favor of prohibition *to the extent to which the Legislature of this Province, or the Parliament of Canada HAS JURISDICTION, AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE COURT OF FINAL RESORT.*"

Sir Oliver and his Cabinet, on the 6th of February, 1894, with the people's decision before them, reiterated their previous promise, and explicitly stated, "should the decision of the Privy