

right to blame them. Clergymen in active work are not free to take any side but one on this question, and therefore silence on their part is legitimate. There is hardly one who has not in his congregation parishioners who have suffered, directly or indirectly, because of drunkenness, and to these even a Scriptural argument against prohibition seems a plea for drunkenness or a refusal to put a stop to its ravages. When that comes from their own minister it seems to them like a blow from the sanctuary. The average politician has also good reason for keeping silence. He well knows how intensely some of his friends and some of his foes feel on the subject. It is not for him to give offence to the one class and aid and comfort to the other.

But there are men in Canada—employers of labor, mechanics trusted by their fellows, educational authorities, students of history and sociology, literary men, and others—competent and also free to speak out on this great public, non-party and moral question. With submission it seems to me that it is their duty to do so now, and as no man has a right to ask others when he himself is unwilling to give or do, according to the measure of his ability, I propose to offer a contribution to the discussion.

After long and earnest consideration I have come to the conclusion that a Dominion prohibitory law would be hurtful to the cause of temperance and most hurtful to general public and private morality. Believing this, it is surely my duty to go to the polls and to vote "No" to the question "Are you in favor of prohibition?"

In another communication I shall give some of the reasons that have led me to this conclusion.

Kingston, December 4, 1897.

G. M. GRANT.

PRINCIPAL GRANT'S SECOND LETTER.

Dealing with the Experiment of Prohibition in Maine, and its Results, and also with the Failure of the Scott Act in Ontario.

(Special Correspondence of the Globe.)

The people of Canada, as compared with all other Christian nations, are singularly abstemious. In making comparisons I must confine myself to Christendom, for Mahomet and Gantama, the Buddha—unlike Jesus—absolutely prohibited the use of intoxicating liquors. Every good Mahomedan and Buddhist is therefore a pledged abstainer; but, though we are sometimes promised the millennium under a regime of prohibition, no millennium has come yet in Turkey or Armenia, nor where Buddhism has been supreme for more than a thousand years.