

massing its forces against that gigantic atrocity, that diabolical conspiracy, that nameless monstrosity, that nothings nine-tenths of the woes and sorrows which blight and curse our modern age—the traffic in intoxicants, which hides its deformity under forms of law. How long shall the face of our Christian age blister with this worse than pagan shame? Has the virtue of our time degenerated so low that we do not even blush at the legislative traffic in the souls of our own children? That by the very doors of our own homes and our temples an army of miscreants should, by authorization of laws made by Christian law-givers, prosecute a work of murder and death? . . . How can we go to the heathen with this cancer of worse than heathen infamy festering in our bosom!"

What an arraignment is this! Can the "Christian law-givers" enter any plea except that of guilty, and can Christian voters fail to see that they are *particeps criminis*? They unite, it is true, in demanding a prohibitory law, but they do not agree in support of men to enforce it, or even to enact it. They readily declare in favour of total abstinence for the individual, and legal Prohibition for the State, but after so declaring, a large proportion of them go to the polls and vote the ticket of a party that insists that the saloon shall be licensed. They petition earnestly for prohibitory legislation, and in most cases perhaps vote Local-Option and for Constitutional Prohibitory Amendments, but when urged to support a man or a ticket that declares for Prohibition and its strict enforcement, large numbers of them find some reason for declining. They adhere to the "old party" and "straight ticket" and the "regular candidate," and then they go forth saying, "Prohibition is, without doubt, the best thing: but if we cannot prohibit, we must try to restrict."

The sad experiences of the past

ought to teach all Churchmen the lesson which saloonists have learned so perfectly, namely, that men are necessary as well as measures. Prohibition measures are good, but alone they are not sufficient. They need to be enforced; they cannot enforce themselves. As well might we, at the very outset, ask that they enact themselves, as to ask, later on, that they carry themselves into effect. The strongest cannon may be heavily loaded and accurately aimed, but it will never harm the enemy unless there be some friendly hand to apply the spark. Of what avail is a Maine law if rummies are to be elected to enforce it? What benefit can result from even constitutional Prohibition, so long as Christian men vote for candidates who are out of sympathy therewith, and who will, if elected, wink at the violation thereof?

Saloonists will defeat, if possible, all Prohibitory measures, but if, in spite of them, Prohibition be enacted, they will redouble their energy and open wider their purses for the election of their "friends." They know full well that even though their business be forbidden by law they will be able to prosecute it just the same if they can only place in office men who will violate their oaths and neglect to enforce the law.

Oh for the coming of the time when the power of the saloon to elect whomsoever it will shall be challenged by the Church, and when the Church in the greatness of her strength shall march forth and trample this boastful, this wicked Goliath beneath her feet! When once the Christian voters of America form and execute the determination to vote only for pronounced and proved Prohibitionists who stand upon unequivocal Prohibition platforms, the end will be at hand—and the saloon will go. May God speed the day!—*Christian Advocate.*

"A LITTLE sanctuary;"—gracious Lord,
Make true for me the treasures of this word;
Thyself hast brought me whither I am come,
And may no more go out until Thou call me home.