

surprised to find that any organization of Friends (in this enlightened age) could be interested in the regulating business as applied to any acknowledged evil, much less so when it is applied to the liquor traffic, which is the parent of most of the evils we have to contend with. It appears like taking a long step backward for Friends to countenance the sale of intoxicating drinks in any manner, and the more we do towards assisting to regulate and control the liquor traffic, under the sanction of law, the more responsibility rests upon our shoulders for the evils that are sure to follow in the wake of the business, whether controlled or untrammelled by law.

Friends in an early day were pioneers in the cause of temperance; yet there were many Friends that looked upon liquor as a good thing in its place; hence the temperance cause advanced but slowly in the Society, but there was a steady growth, until the sentiment against the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage became so strong that total abstinence became the law as laid down in the Discipline. It did not leave any middle ground to stand upon. It did not say, "It is a bad thing to have too many kinds of wine and strong drink upon the sideboard," and Friends should have a care and see that they do not place too great a variety of intoxicating drinks before their friends and families. They should regulate the number, and keep them within *reasonable limits*.

What would we think of "early Friends" if they had left such a record of their views upon this subject? I think we would feel that "the light" they had received upon that question came from a poor lamp, filled with poor oil, and a wick that needed trimming. A Friend was expected to be a total abstainer from all intoxicating drinks; not only that, but he must not allow his property to be used for saloon purposes. If it is wrong to rent a room for such purpose, is it any less sin to vote to allow some other person to use

his building for the same purpose? If the liquor traffic is an unmitigated evil, why should we handle the question with gloves, and waste precious time in devising means whereby it can exist within "reasonable bounds?" When I was a boy living in a new country, where rattlesnakes abounded, when I came upon a colony of the reptiles, I did not spend any time calculating how many would be required to keep them within reasonable limits, but I went at them to kill, and if one escaped, it was just one too many to please me. And that is my feeling to-day in regard to the legalized liquor traffic. If we are living under the new dispensation as enunciated by Jesus, in reference to all evil, is it not high time that all professing Christians should "stand forth" at the ballot box and proclaim to the world their undying opposition to the "regulated, controlled, and legalized saloon of the 19th century," which exists only by and through the votes of those who profess to be followers of Christ.

Take away the sanction of law, and get rid of the so-called respectability that the law is supposed to throw around the business, and it would be but a short time before the whole traffic would be declared a nuisance, and would vanish from sight. It is true it might still lurk in dark places and do some deadly work, but the Christian voters would not be held responsible by the great Judge who never judges wrongfully.

In conclusion: If one saloon is one too many to place before *our boys*, is it not one too many to place before *our neighbors' boys*? Are we not, in a measure, our brother's keeper?

N. P. WILSON.

We never can say why we love, but only that we love. The heart is ready enough at feigning excuses for all that it does or imagines of wrong; but ask it to give a reason for any of its beautiful and divine motives, and it can only look upwards and be dumb.