

## THE SCOTT ACT REVERSALS.

HAVING opposed the Scott Act from the time we were convinced that it was doing the cause of morality generally, and of temperance in particular, grievous injury, we are glad to find our verdict to have been declared correct by enormous majorities in nine counties, wherein this Act has had a long and a fair trial. Persons who judge public matters from a mere individual stand point are apt to be mistaken hence some of our friends thought we had not justifying evidence for our antagonism to this Act, *which they desired us to judge not by its vicious results, but by its virtuous intention.* We had overwhelming proof that everywhere the Scott Act had increased spirit drinking, developed deceit, falsehood, malignancy, revenge, perjury, contempt of law as law, amongst the young especially, and had directly caused several murders, and other murderous crimes.

One of the oldest Methodist lay preachers said to us to-day, "I was shocked to see men set to get drunk and break the law in order to catch others; such conduct to me is wicked beyond description." But that *the end justifies the means*, was universally adopted by the Scott Act party. A prominent promoter of the Scott Act in January last was arguing against the Act with his pastor, a Baptist minister, who was very wroth at his friend changing his mind. The opponent of the Act said, "On this street are the stores of your deacons who are all strong Scott Act men, now I will give the Church \$100 for every one of their stores in which there is no liquor kept!" The Baptist pastor took the offer, and the pair found whiskey on tap in four cellars, occupied by these vehement Scott Act supporters! That kind of hypocrisy killed the Act, not the weather, as its friends affirm.

On this point we are glad to commend the sensible words used by the Rev. John Burton, Congregationalist minister, on the 15th April.

To attribute the defeat to imperfect voters lists, partisan returning officers, bad roads, etc., is only to continue what has already cursed the progress of a great moral reform, viz., surround it with the atmosphere of partisan politics and excuses. We have had too much stump oratory in this direction already. The causes lie deeper.

"For the Scott Act itself, as an act, I never had nor have a word of commendation. It is cumbersome, unworkable and, as a moral measure, absurd."

On another evil of this Act, this speaker used timely and brave words when he said:—

The wave of temperance sentiment has carried to its crest a number of men utterly unfit to lead in any great reform that like this so intimately affects every interest of home, society and the Dominion. Some, no doubt, of this class are earnest, but their zeal has been without knowledge. We have had place-seekers and needy adventurers, men whose moral influence is as near the zero point as any individual influence well can be. Hence we have had extravagant appeals, false arguments and unjust denunciations of calmer men or of opposite opinions. The spirit of the narrow partisan has been too prevalent, rather than that of the loving philanthropist.

He might have said "women" as well as men used this Act for their greed as adventurers. The Act will, we trust, be repealed and a genuine effort made to reduce the evils of drinking. The cause of temperance has been sadly injured by the Scott Act, and its professional and fanatical friends. One illustration of the danger of such crazes dominating a public man is just now seen in Toronto. During the two years when the whole energy of the Mayor and his party in the Council was absorbed by Scott Act ideas they caused by gross neglect, the lease of the magnificent Park used by the citizens, to be cancelled. We trust the Park will be recovered by the city, for good recreation grounds have incomparably a stronger temperance influence than all that legislation could wield. But there is a danger of fanaticism by monomaniacal attention to its "fad" or "craze," inflicting irreparable injuries upon the community.

## CANON LIDDON ON THE RESURRECTION.

THAT the soul of man survives the body at death might be inferred, as from other considerations quite independent of Revelation, so specially from the observed Law, as it is called, of the Conservation of force or energy in the physical universe. We are told, apparently on solid ground, that when a human body dies and decays, there takes place in reality, not a cessation, but only a transformation of energy. The organic compounds which made up and sustained the living human frame are merely resolved by death into new combinations, which may again be partly taken up into other and living forms. And thus the force or energy of the human body not only does not cease at death—it undergoes neither diminution nor increase. It is after death what it was before death, only it has entered upon new conditions, which it has itself actually brought about; and when death has taken place this energy is already at work in modifying and transforming such conditions still further. This estimate of death from the purely physical point of view assumes, and we need not dispute the assumption, that there is no such thing observable—I do not say no such thing possible—as the annihilation of one's energy; and it points to the fact that the chemist is perfectly able to trace after death the persistent action of the various compounds which have sustained the human body during life. Be it so. But if this law of the conservation of energy or force is good for one department of our being, why not for another? Is there then no energy, properly speaking, except that of the substances which are known to chemistry? Are not thought, will, love, truly energies? Are they not just as much energy as any energy that we can identify with oxygen, or hydrogen, or nitrogen, or carbon? And if thought, and affection, and will are energies, what, pray, becomes of them at death? Chemistry knows what becomes of physical combinations. Give chemistry time and opportunity, and when a man has been dead for

a year it will tell you upon analysis what each of the physical forces which one year ago combined to sustain his living body is now doing. But what can chemistry tell you about his thought, his affection, his will? And if these are, properly energy, have they ceased only because they are unrepresented in the transformations of the physical forces which were for years their partners and organs? Surely, to suppose that they are extinct is to reject this admitted law of the Conservation of Energy, and for no better reason than that for the moment we are unable to verify its applicability to a particular detail—a proceeding which would certainly be deemed irrational if nothing beyond a physical doctrine were at stake. In this way some minds outside the Christian faith might be fairly led up to the great conviction to which so much else tends that is independent of revelation—the conviction that the spiritual nature of man survives the death of his body. If it is reasonable to think that the physical energy does not perish at death, but only takes new forms, then it is at least equally reasonable to believe in a like survival of spiritual energy.

But there arises a momentous question. How, or in what shape, will this survival of spiritual energy be preserved? Will the living spirit, like the body, be dissolved, while the spiritual forces which made it what it was to us survive, entering perhaps into new associations, new combinations, new beings? Will what was strictly personal in the living man have ceased to be, while his ever enduring thought and love and resolve sink back into and blend with some spacious ocean of Universal Life, in which they will endure for ever, though without consciousness of their separation from any other created existence? This, since Spinoza's day, has been a widely accepted form of the doctrine of the immortality of man. But remark, brethren, this vital difference between physical force or energy and spiritual force. Physical force exists independently of the living subject to whose life it belongs or contributes. A gas is just as much a gas whether it enters into the composition of a human body or is contained in a jar in a chemist's shop; but spiritual force has no existence whatever, as far as we know, apart from the seat of being or the person whose force it is. Thought, love, resolve, these cannot be treated like a gas; they cannot be detached from the soul into whose life they enter, and packed away in some laboratory. And, therefore, it follows that if at death the thinking, loving, resolving subject or person ceases to be, through his supposed absorption into some ocean of Universal Life, or otherwise, then his thought, and his love, and his resolve cease to be simultaneously: and the vision which would represent them as enduring when the human personality has already perished, is indeed a dream—it is an airy compound of phrases and of sentiments to which nothing can really answer in the world of fact. Such an immortality is only another name for practical annihilation. The only real immortality of a personal being is a personal immortality; and a doc-

May 8, 1  
trine of im  
separate co  
down the w  
person, does  
because it  
claiming hi  
Life.

This, per  
a question  
trary, be we  
for the hun  
which more  
of us when  
whom we h  
I ever see  
Will he kno  
and lost c  
the answer  
true which  
losing the o  
through al  
If this supp  
nothing to  
nised woul  
and consti  
supposed p  
well altoget

WHY  
T  
good man  
Pride may  
because the  
this answe  
more for  
stand in ne  
ren do of t

Traili  
F  
There i  
does us go  
of music, c  
their bea  
softens us,  
plicably, f

Wordsw  
just cited  
in Dante,  
soul:—

Forth f  
Befor  
Weepir  
Issue

There i  
newly-cre  
Let us

At

W

En

Ti

O

But as  
matrimo  
excellent