

A few moments contemplation of the above figures should be sufficient to convince the most sceptical of the indisputable fact, that there is less crime in Halton than in any other county in Ontario, and that the decrease of crime here is greater than in any other place.

In connection with these statistics we might further notice that there were only 3 drunks reported for 1883 from Halton, while from Brant there were 102 drunks; Wellington, 272; Wentworth, 839; Carleton, 344; Peel, 12; Huron, 18; Norfolk, 39; Simcoe, 151; Oxford, 70; Hastings, 423; Grey, 52; Ontario, 28.

This goes a long way to nail another anti-Scott lie, namely that there is a large amount of drunkenness in Halton, greater than in most other places, and greater than in former years. But look at the above figures and see how they bear out that assertion, 3 in Halton, and all the way from 12 to 839 in the other counties. In 1880 there were 7 drunks reported from Halton, and in 1881, 13 drunks. Where is the increase?

Another mis-statement made by the anti-Scotts in other counties, is to the effect that the Act cannot be enforced; that it is impossible to secure convictions. Again do known facts come to the rescue, and again prove these assertions false. At the inception of the Act there were 42 licensed bars in Halton. In 1883 there were 34 persons convicted for violations of the Act. We could not expect a more thorough enforcement of any law. We may further remark that since the Act came in force nearly every hotel-keeper in the county has been fined twice, and several sentenced to prison. In fact so vigorously has the law been enforced that nearly one-half of the hotels are now closed up, and only those are yet in the business whose houses are necessary for purely hotel purposes. Then in its power to lessen crime and immorality among the people, we must pronounce the Scott Act VERY GOOD and worthy of the support of the people.

### THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT FOR PROHIBITION

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE TORONTO MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION ON  
MONDAY 22ND DECEMBER 1884.  
BY REV. R. WALLACE,

(Continued from last week.)

And ever since that time earnest Christians have been asking themselves as before God: "Can a traffic be right and Christian which by its very nature destroys multitudes of men and women for time and for eternity,—which brings unutterable misery on thousands of families, which entails poverty, disease and wretchedness on wives and children, handing down ruined constitutions to future ages, and which causes three-fourths of the crime, and nine-tenths of the pauperism in Christian lands,—thus inflicting very heavy burdens on society, and very greatly hindering its progress and prosperity?" Yea, a traffic which causes the waste of over 3,000 millions of dollars yearly in Christendom, (the direct cost of which to Great Britain is about \$700,000,000, about twice as much as the cost of bread for her people, which is \$350,000,000, and twelve times as much as the education of her people,—namely, \$55,000,000)—when only about \$9,000,000, not the twentieth part of the funds can be obtained which are needed to give the Gospel to the nations in obedience to the command of Christ; a traffic which is one of the chief hindrances to the conversion of the world. And the number who have come to the conclusion that it cannot be right has gone on increasing in proportion as the subject has been examined in the light of Christ's spirit and aim, and the influence of the law of love till now in many places a majority are prepared to vote as Christian citizens, that this ruinous traffic must cease. And we doubt not that this traffic, like slavery, is destined ere long to be overthrown. Like slavery it has its foundation in the spirit of mammon-worship, which too often leads men to engage in a wrong or doubtful business for the sake of gain. Acts 19. There are those indeed who tell us that this is not a question for the Church of Christ, that is for ministers or Christians to decide, but is only a matter of municipal and national arrangement, embracing as it does questions of finance and business. It is no more so with this traffic than with slavery; yet the Christian public of Great Britain and America deeply felt that it came under the condemnation of the principles of our holy religion. The liquor traffic relates both to the moral and spiritual welfare of mankind, and therefore

it is the special duty of the Church of God to labor faithfully for its entire suppression, and meantime for the lessening of the evil. Morality lies at the foundation of Christianity. Most of our Lord's sermon on the Mount relates to Christian morality, and there can be no true religion without it. It is folly for any man to claim to be a Christian and neglect or trample on the first principles of morality, honesty, truthfulness, temperance and purity, or doing to others as we would that they in like circumstances should do to us. The Church of Christ would be unfaithful to her high commission if she were silent in this matter. As Esther said when evil was threatened to the Jews, so should the Christian Church now say about the results of the liquor traffic. "How can I bear to see this evil come upon my people."

Some tell us that "the natural condition of man is not total abstinence, but temperance." In reply we ask what is temperance but the moderate use of that which is beneficial, and entire abstinence from that which is injurious. Now it is surely evident from what we have set forth, that the use of alcoholic liquors is both unnecessary and injurious, and that the natural condition of man is to obtain from all, such liquor, or that total abstinence from alcoholic liquor is not exceptional, but the designed and best condition of man. This indeed, is the united testimony of more than two thousand of the most eminent physicians and physiologists of the world, who declare "that the most perfect health is compatible with total abstinence from all such beverages, whether in the form of wine, beer, ale, porter, etc., that total or universal abstinence from all such beverages of all sorts, would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality and the happiness of the human family." Such were the views of the late Dr. James Miller, of Edinburgh; Dr. F. R. Lees, Dr. Carpenter, Dr. D. B. Richardson, Dr. A. Clark, physician to the Queen, Dr. Norman Kerr, F.L.S., Sir Henry Thompson, etc. Sir Benjamin Brodie, Sir Jas. Clarke, and other eminent medical men, declare that man in ordinary health—like other animals—requires no such stimulants as wine, beer or spirits, and cannot be benefitted by any quantity of them, large or small, nor will their use during his life increase the aggregate amount of his labor. In whatever quantity they are employed they will rather tend to diminish it. Liebig, the prince of chemists, says, "he who uses intoxicants, draws, so to speak, a bill on his health which must be always renewed, because for want of means he cannot take it up. He consumes his capital instead of his interest, and the result is inevitable bankruptcy of the body." Sir Astley Cooper says, "We have all been in error in recommending wine as a tonic—ardent spirits and poison are convertible terms." The leading chemists tell us that alcohol causes diseases of the vital organs, debilitates the vigor of the physical system, while it weakens the mind, and promotes in both premature decay. The testimony of several eminent travellers and missionaries in both hot and cold climates, accord with the teaching of medical science, that men can endure great heat and the severest cold better without alcohol. What is the meaning of all this, but God's own testimony in favor of the observance of His own laws, which He has stamped on our nature, by which He shows that the natural and proper condition of man is total abstinence from alcoholic liquors, and by which He also shows His displeasure at the use of intoxicants, as a violation of His laws? Is it not then the duty of all Christians to come to the help of the Lord in this matter? "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Again we are told that respectable and Christian men have long been, and are yet engaged in the liquor traffic. But does this prove it right? Assuredly not. Such men were long engaged in upholding slavery. But Christians did not rest till that evil was done away. Besides when public attention is called to any evil, the guilt of those who continue to uphold it is greater than before. The progressive character of the knowledge of God's will, and of man's responsibility arising from that, is often referred to in the Scriptures. Our Lord says to His disciples, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." God also holds communities and individuals responsible, and deals with them ACCORDING TO THEIR OPPORTUNITIES FOR KNOWING HIS WILL. This principle is clearly set forth by the Apostle Paul, when preaching to the people of Athens. "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." This principle of progress in the moral practice of mankind, according as their advantages increased, was also applied by our Lord in the matter of divorce so common among the Jews. On this principle we hold that God requires more of Christians in