

the retail sale of liquor within its district. Then came the Scott Act, which was similar, only perhaps a little more effectual.

A few benefits of these laws were that they destroyed the licensed liquor sellers trade of making drunkards under sanction of the law, and helped to make the business unpopular.

They took the responsibility of the drunkenness, disease and poverty caused by the use of liquor, off the people, and put it on the shoulders of the law breakers.

They took the respectability away from the seller and consumer on account of the broken law. If a man does not obey the law he is a criminal and so considered.

They destroyed the treating system which is the most important school in connection with manufacturing drunkards.

If we drive liquor into holes, dens and back rooms, we will save hundreds from seeking it that would take a glass if it were before them. This being sanctioned by the law is where the liquor traffic gets its strength.

Even with people who recognize the drink system as a terrible evil the fact of its permission tends to prevent their total horror as it would if outlawed and disgraced. If any other evil of half the size of this were to be suddenly put into operation without the protection of the legislature, destroying life and morals for the enrichment of a few money grabbers, society would rise in indignation at once and proceed to punish the promoters.

Our present prospect of prohibition may seem small, but public sentiment, antagonistic to the whole drink system, is rapidly growing and becoming so important, and wielding such an influence over our elections that politicians dare not ignore it. Even to men who are merely ambitious the situation must seem embarrassing. Those whose motives are purer, and are really interested, feel it necessary

to move cautiously, fearing that over hurry may bring disaster to the cause. There are also strong party men who believe their party will set all things right when they get in power, therefore their first duty is to make that party strong. So thus it is more is not accomplished because our law makers dare not take either side decisively, but try to conciliate both sides by giving the temperance people half measures and promises, and winking at the other side.

While these limitations of the sale of liquor may do good, nothing will be effectual but total prohibition, which must be our final aim.

While we have in Canada no distinctive temperance party there are staunch Conservatives who believe in prohibition, and opposite them sit strong Reformers who believe in prohibition. They both say this is the only and proper remedy for intemperance, but the men will not break from party, and neither party will move.

What would be the result if these temperance men in Parliament would join hands and say, "This is the most important subject before the country at the present time. We will stand by the party that will give us immediate, unconditional, and total prohibition." The government would be compelled to yield to their demand at once, or give way to a government that would. The situation is plain. What we want is a manly, independent stand to be taken by our politicians and voters.

It is time that the thousands of voters were ready to sink party prejudices in the nation's great need, and vote for the good of home and their native land.

The business is inconsistent with all the laws of Christianity and brotherly love. It is inconsistent with that law of God that requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves. It is in violation of that law that requires us to honor God. "Whether ye eat, drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" This is not a business