

An Independent minister, in a paper read before the World's Temperance Convention, says: "More than 3000 children have passed through my school, and not one in fifty is making a creditable profession of Christianity, and the principal cause is drink."

A Sunday-school teacher says: "The opening of a tea-garden, connected with a public-house near our school, on the Sunday, entirely destroyed the select class of seventeen young men."

Another teacher says: "I have just found that four of the most promising boys in my class spend their Sunday evening at the public-house."

A missionary in Hull says: "The other Sunday evening I went into a public-house, and found three young men from the Sunday school sitting with three girls from the same school."

I might go on with this sad monotony of evidence to prove my position, but knowing that every teacher will have long since been satisfied of its truth from his own experience, I refrain.

I have, then, I think, proved that the Sunday traffic in strong drink is most injurious to the Sunday school, and I now ask, Why is it permitted to continue? Is it that the article sold is so beneficial? or that the shops in which it is sold are such centres of light and purity? or that the men who dispense it are so intelligent, and virtuous, that we are bound to make an exception in their favour? To each of these questions, the national answer is "No."

Is it, then, that a majority of the people demand that they should be open? To this I answer "No." The majority, the immense majority, of the people are in favour of their being closed. Am I told that there are cases where the majority is in the wrong, and the minority in the right, and that a wise and patriotic statesman will be guided more by the opinion of an intelligent minority, than by that of an