

blame and the shame of such inaction. These are matters that are clear, and plain, whatever uncertainty there may be at other points in the management of our Indian affairs.

If reference is made to the government reports of Indian affairs it will be seen that very general reference is made to the havoc the liquor traffic is making on these people. The agents see this terrible work going on. Many of them lament it, but they seem to have no power to stop it. The amendment to the "Scott Act" prohibits liquor from being taken into towns or counties where the Act is in force. Since the governments can do that, they can surely enact a law prohibiting it effectively from being taken within easy reach of Indian reservations. And they will not surely admit they have no power to enact and *enforce* such a law. Liquor should not be allowed within at least twenty-five miles of an Indian reservation. Better remove the Indians far back, which we seem to have power to do, than leave them within easy reach of liquor, where their ruin is wrought in spite of all missionary efforts to save them. In the few places where liquor is removed from them, the agents of the government report: "Liquor is removed from them, and there is little to complain of in respect of their morality."

Dr. F. C. McConnell said at the B.Y.P.U.A. convention, held at Cleveland, July, 1908: "The prohibition movement in the South means more to the negro than when Abraham Lincoln made proclamation of