

temperance question is clearly proven by the opposition of the liquor interest to the enfranchisement of women; they evidently prefer to trust the powers that be. In no religious society have we a right to expect such advanced sentiment on this question; for we have practically experienced the advantage of an equal sense of responsibility and equal opportunity for expression; but even among Friends women are not generally prepared to assume the added responsibility that would come with the application of this principle to State and National government.

I would most earnestly recommend the distribution of a little leaflet, "Our Motherless Government"

Temperance Conferences: Are They Worth While? We, as a Society, are almost entirely free from *intemperance*. Friends, if there is any place where temperance meetings are needed it is in our Meeting Houses; it is here we have a right to expect to find men and women free from prejudice, with an earnest desire to *know the truth* and such unselfish devotion as will *live the truth*. If the majority of Friends already realized the strength of the liquor power it is but charitable to conclude that there would be positive expression against that power where expression counts most—at the ballot box. Many claim that they are expressing their sentiments in the most practical way by voting for a temperance party likely to have an opportunity to do something. Has it proven equal to the opportunity?

Brothers, is affiliation with an organization that cannot rise above saloon influence the best method of temperance work? Is it logical to expect aggressive temperance legislation from legislators elected on platforms that ignore the temperance question, or are less strong in their declarations than liquor organizations, and whose chief executives are almost universally silent on this question in their official communications?

We had abundant proof that we

need not expect courageous action until we have in power a political organization free from saloon influence. Impractical. Not a man or woman with faith in infinite Goodness but believes that there exists more of good than of evil. Many excuse themselves from expression in favor of prohibiting the liquor traffic by saying: "I will help when there is some show of winning." Did Wendell Phillips go back to his office after viewing the Boston mob against the Abolitionists and say, "Abolition is right; I approve of the women doing all they can, and when there is some show of winning I will help them?"

No; with Phillips the *need* was the incentive to *action*. The existence of a high ideal makes possible its realization. We may have this when Christian people have the courage to meet this question at the ballot box.

Some may feel that we undervalue the work accomplished through our Society and by its individual members. In proportion to our membership we are probably doing as good work as any other religious organization, and no religious organization has given to the temperance reform more devoted, self-sacrificing labors than Samuel B. Carr, of Philadelphia, and Joseph A. Bogardus, of New York. Their work is finished. We are left to continue the record of the Society of Friends on the temperance question.

"Give us zeal, and faith and fervor;
Make us winning, make us wise,
Single hearted, strong and fearless;
Thou hast called us, we will rise."

SERMON

BY LYDIA H. PRICE, AT BLOOMFIELD,
ONT., ON FOURTH DAY OF YEARLY
MEETING WEEK, 1897.

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." This declaration was revived in my mind this morning. It portrays a condition that each one of us has some knowledge of in our own experience. The Apostle Paul had it in mind when he de-