then? Must we fold our arms and give a certain number of bar-rooms swing, in the awful work Lord Chesterfield said a licensed traffic would do: "The propagation of disease, and the suppression of industry and the destruction of mankind." Shall we not rather settle the question right, though at the cost of quiet or the disturbance of peace, when to be quiet and peaceful means to let the barroom carry on its works of corruption and crime, of sorrow and sin, of wasting and wrecking, of despair and death? If we love the right we can never rest while the law aids the bar-room to corrupt our politics, destroy our homes, and "sow the seeds of in morality broadcast over the land." Man's great Master said: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace but a sword." "First pure, then peaceable."

Ruskin says: "No peace was ever won from fate by subterfuge or agreement; no peace is ever in store for any of us, but that we shall win by victory over shame or sin —victory over the sin that oppresses, as well as over that which corrupts." But there are difficulties in the way. What of them ?

> "Peopled and warmed is the lowland, And lonely and cheerless the height, But the peak that is nearest the storm-cloud, Is nearest the stars of light."

I like the words of the late Mr. Grady: "The best reforms of this earth come through waste, and storm, and doubt, and suspicion; the sun itself, when it rises on each day wastes the radiance of the moon and blots the starlight from the skies, but only to unlock the earth from the clasp of night, and plant the stars anew in the opening flowers. Behind that sun, as behind the temperance movement, we may be sure there stands the Lord God Almighty, Master and Maker of the universe, from whose hand the spheres are rolled to their orbits, and whose voice has been the harmony of this world since the morning stars sang together."