

further embodied in the sentiments expressed at the Presbytery, by an address on Temperance delivered on Monday evening of this week at the Church of the Ascension.

As regards the Presbytery's discussion, it partook principally of an objection to the Church itself being committed on the matter of prohibitory legislation. All our leading church bodies within the past few years have expressed themselves in very strong terms in favor of prohibition, and none have been more so than the Presbyterian Church in their deliberance at the meeting of the Assembly in Winnipeg last year. It will be remembered that among the clauses of that deliberance are the following: "That this Assembly again declares its conviction that the liquor traffic is contrary to the Word of God and to the spirit of the Christian religion, that total abstinence is right in principle, that it is the duty of the State to pass a prohibitory law; that this Assembly with renewed earnestness and emphasis again expresses the hope that the electors in their choice of representatives will elect only able and good men, who are known to be in sympathy with prohibitory legislation; that the General Assembly petition the Dominion Legislature in favor of the total prohibition of the liquor traffic, and call upon the Dominion Government to take all necessary steps for the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act."

This resolution obtained almost the unanimous vote of the Assembly, and it is against this that the Toronto Presbytery moves in the resolution proposed by the Rev. Dr. Kellogg. Why should not the church boldly take its stand against evil and wickedness and corruption, in whatever shape it may appear? Where has come the downfall of nations but from the people themselves, backed by the church, letting "the strings hang loose" in matters seriously affecting the moral well-being of the individual? Everyone knows, of course, that the abolition of slavery was opposed from the pulpits of many churches; but where is the minister to-day who would want to take the stand that was taken by some of his brethren? And I have no doubt in my own mind that there are those who will read these lines, who will live to see the day when there will not be a clergyman but who will regret that in any way he lent his voice or example in favor of intemperance.

The bible statement is that, "He that is not with me is against me." I know the reply of Mr. Macdonnell, Mr. Milligan and others to this question, that it is stretching the sentiment of scripture to make any such quotation applicable to a question of this nature, but is it? What are the real facts? Some years since, when the bible wine question was a burning question amongst the clergymen of the United States, in particular, in one of the leading Presbyterian journals of that day, a series of articles were written by a prominent Presbyterian minister, who advocated then much the same views in regard to wine drinking and the subject of temperance as are held to-day by these gentlemen of the Toronto Presbytery. The liquor manufacturers had placed in every bar-room certain liquors with the cognomen of the reverend gentlemen who, as they believed, so ably advocated their interests. It may be said that one is not to be held responsible for the outcome, or it may be the misinterpretation, of views honestly and conscientiously expressed. No one can free himself from the responsibility that is attached at all times to his utterances and his public example. It may seem a hard thing to say, but it is a fact that can be corroborated by these gentlemen if they will move around amongst the people generally, that such views as they express are quoted by every man who wishes an excuse for his intemperate habits, and as an authority by those, who from mercenary motives, desire to encourage the sale of intoxicating liquors.

I have no fear that the Presbyterian church will go back on her record on this question, but it is an unfortunate matter that there are to be found within the precincts of any of our churches any who will even lend the appearance of evil in a matter of this kind.

Mr. T. C. Wells, Chemist and Druggist, Port, Culbourn, Ont., writes, "Notrop and Lyman's Vegetable Discovery and Dyspepsia Cure sells well, and gives the best satisfaction for all diseases of the blood." It never fails to cure out all diseases from the system, cures Dyspepsia, Liver Complaint, etc., purifies the blood and will make you look the picture of health and happiness.

HOW LIQUOR IS SOLD UNDER THE SCOTT ACT.



THE ANTIS' BEST ARGUMENT ANSWERED.

ANTI-SCOTT ACT ORATOR—YOU SEE, NOTWITHSTANDING THE SCOTT ACT, DRINKING GOES ON: MR. IMPROBABILITY.—YES, OF A CERTAIN KIND, BUT I SHOULD RATHER DO WITHOUT IT THAN COME HERE FOR IT. WOULD N'T YOU?

Only One Way.

It is a good thing for the voter to make his protest against the liquor traffic in the prayer meeting or by his manner of life, but if he would really tell the government, as well as the Lord and the people, that he wants the saloon closed, there is but one method by which he can be recognized; but just one law under which his opinion can declare itself, and his conviction make itself felt, and that law and method are fulfilled when he drops into the box a ballot that calls for Prohibition.—*Frances Willard.*

FEAR NOT MEN. TRUST GOD AND DO YOUR DUTY.

"No! let every heart re-echo;
Rouse, ye gallant men, and true!
Rouse, ye broken-hearted mothers!
See the night is almost through;
Rouse ye, every man and woman,
God is calling now for you."

Crimes.

It is a crime to aid a man in committing crime. Drunkenness is a crime. The man who sells the liquor aids the man to get drunk, and therefore commits a crime. The government that grants a license or permits the sale of liquor, aids the liquor dealer in committing a crime, and therefore commits a crime itself. The voter who votes to license a man to sell liquor, commits a crime, and so on. Rum in the majority of cases is the first cause of crime, sin, sorrow, poverty, the expenses of the city and state, the population of all criminal and charitable institutions, and the support of a tremendous number of sixth-rate politicians. Is there no remedy for all of this? The people are beginning to say, "Yes, try prohibition."—*The Christian Home.*

MARK YOUR BALLOT AGAINST THE PETITION.

John Wesley on the Liquor Traffic.

Those who sell this poison, murder Her Majesty's subjects by wholesale. Neither does their eye pity nor spare. They drive them to hell like sheep. And what is their gain? Is it not the blood of these men? Who, then, would envy their large estates and sumptuous palaces? A curse is in the midst of them; the curse of God cleaves to the stones, the timber, the furniture of them! The curse of God is in their gardens, their walls, their groves. A fire that burns to the uttermost hell! Blood, blood is there, the foundation, the floors, the walls, the roof, are stained with blood! And canst thou hope, O thou man of blood, though thou art "clothed in scarlet and fine linen, and farest sumptuously every day"—canst thou hope to deliver down thy fields of blood to the third generation? Not so; for there is a God in heaven; therefore, thy name shall soon be rooted out. Like as those whom thou hast destroyed, body and soul, thy memorial shall perish with thee!"

VOTE FOR YOUR HOME AGAINST THE PETITION.

YOU ARE A LAW-MAKER, I. GOD'S PROVIDENCE USE THAT PRIVILEGE IN GOD'S SERVICE.

Does Prohibition Work?

Again the old standard is being revived in reference to the working of Prohibition in different parts of the United States where it is in force. Let us have a couple of hard facts that will put this matter in its true light.

It is well known that the American excise laws are thoroughly enforced. The Federal Government knows nothing and cares nothing about State Prohibition, but relentlessly follows liquor wherever it goes and taxes it heavily, enforcing laws with such severe penalties that violation of it is very rare. Then, the amount of liquor tax collected by the Federal Government in the different States will be a fair index as to the amount of liquor consumed in those States. The following table gives the duty paid per head in Prohibition States, and neighboring States which have license. Georgia is mainly under Prohibition through a local option law amending the Scott Act.

Georgia, prohibition, duty per head, \$9 12	
Nebraska, \$10 00 high license	1 44
Iowa, prohibition, not fully enforced	0 97
Illinois, \$500 high license	0 76
Kansas, prohibition	0 044
Pennsylvania, license	1 00
Rhode Island, prohibition	0 20
Maryland, license	1 40
Maine, prohibition	0 03
Massachusetts, license	1 03
Vermont, prohibition	0 63
Average of the whole nation	1 71

Another fact which we commend to our friends' consideration is that "the United States government has abolished the internal revenue offices in Maine, because the revenue receipts have become so small as to be unprofitable to support a separate office. The internal revenue officials of New Hampshire will collect the Maine revenue."

Again, the following figures, carefully compiled from Government returns, by H. W. Hanco, will show what effect on the community thoroughly enforced Prohibition has—

California has one criminal to every 900 of population.
New York has one criminal to every 1,400 of population.
Massachusetts has one criminal to every 2,100 of population.
Maine has one criminal to every 3,200 population.
Showing fewest criminals when least liquor is used. Maine having less than one third the proportion of criminals of wine growing California.
Iowa has ninety-nine jails and of these fifty-five are empty.
Notwithstanding the terror of the Kansas law and the number of saloon-keepers whose personal liberty was taken away at the gates of the penitentiary, there were fifty-five fewer convicts sent to that institution in 1887 than in 1886.

In Providence, Rhode Island, a city of 50,000 population, there was a falling off in arrests for drunkenness of 1,733 in 1887 as compared with 1886, and there were 427 less arrests for all other crimes and misdemeanors.

Take these facts in connection with the figures given elsewhere of the commitments for drunkenness in our own province. Ponder them well, and you will be constrained to

VOTE AGAINST THE PETITION.

The crime is upon us! face to face with us it stands:
With solemn lips of questioning, like the Sphinx in Egypt sands.
This day we fashion destiny, the web of life we spin,
This day for all hereafter choose we hold us to our
Ever now from misty Gormuz, or Elbal, cloudy crown,
Call we the dew of blessing or the bolt of cursing down."

A Terrible Argument.

Rev. P. G. ROBERTSON states that some years ago, when the great liquor depuration which went down to Ottawa to ask for the repeal of the Scott Act, were returning, he happened to be in a car where there were several of the "Delegates." Three of them were opposed to him, on seats facing each other. They talked very loudly—they "were going to kick the Scott Act higher than the moon!" they were going to do a great many things: "The government were going to repeal the Scott Act!" and so forth.

An old man sat behind them; and frequently put his hand up to his ear, to catch their words. After a while he came forward, and addressed them "Gentlemen," said he, "I heard you speaking of the county of Halton. Gentlemen I live in the county of Halton, and when the vote was taken for the Scott Act, I went up to the poll and voted against it, and my three sons followed me, and they all voted against it! Gentlemen, when the vote on the Repeal was taken, a few months ago, I went up to the poll, and voted against the Repeal! And two of my sons followed me, and they voted against the Repeal. Gentlemen, you'll wonder why my other son didn't vote? Gentlemen, he couldn't! He was dead. He was in a drunkard's grave!"

"Gentlemen!" concluded the old man, with the tears now coursing fast down his cheeks, "When one of you has a son in a drunkard's grave, you'll think and speak of the Scott Act with more respect!" and then went quietly back to his seat. The "Delegates" said nothing then and not much afterward.

For the homes where sin is raging.
Fight the drink!
For the wives whose hearts are breaking.
Fight the drink!
For the love of God and right,
Let us go forth in His might,
We shall win if we unite,
Fight the drink.

"Shall law or liquor be king? Let your ballot answer."

MR. HENDERSON, merchant, of Milton, brother of D. Henderson, M.P., of Acton, states that the business done by him during the year 1887 was more than forty per cent. greater than his last year under license. The Scott Act pays.

VOTE FOR THE SCOTT ACT.

IT WORKS.

Messrs. J. A. Nichols and Hon. Ansley Gray, called at our office a few days ago on their way to the Simcoe county battle ground. Mr. Nichols comes from Quebec where he has lately been touring with great success on behalf of the Dominion Alliance. Mr. Ansley Gray comes from the Western States, and gives glowing accounts of the progress of prohibition there. In reply to inquiries as to the practical working out of prohibition, he emphatically repudiated the slanderous statements that are made about failure to enforce prohibition in Kansas and Iowa, and submitted to us the following letters recently received by him from the Governor of Kansas, the Mayor of Topeka, Kansas, and the Attorney General of the State of Iowa. We have much pleasure in placing this correspondence before our readers, as overwhelming evidence of the strong and growing sentiment in favor of legislation on lines of total prohibition.

State of Kansas.
Executive Department,
Topeka, March 13, 1888.

ANSLEY GRAY, Esq.,
Oberlin, Ohio.
MY DEAR SIR,—I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 9th. In answer to your enquiries I would say: First, it is true that for several years after the passage of the Prohibitory Amendment, the laws enacted to enforce it were disregarded in nearly all the principal cities of the State. As late as January, 1885, nearly four years after the passage of the Prohibitory Amendment, saloons were open in the capital of the State, and in half a dozen other cities. Second, at the present time there is not, within my knowledge, a single saloon in the State of Kansas. The Prohibitory Amendment is now enforced as well as other laws on our statute books are enforced. It is true that liquor is sold occasionally in violation of law, just as highway robbery or larceny or other crimes are committed. But as a rule, the violators of the Prohibitory Law are arrested and punished, just as other violators of the law are. There can be no question of the fact that the sale of liquor has been enormously decreased in this State, since the passage of the Prohibitory Law. Every intelligent and impartial observer, familiar with the situation in Kansas six years ago, and at the present time, will willingly bear testimony to the fact that nine-tenths of the drinking and drunkenness prevailing in 1880 have been abolished. In my judgment there is less drinking and less drunkenness in the State of Kansas to-day, than in any other community of 1,600,000 people on the face of the earth.

Yours, very respectfully,
JOHN MARTIN.

Topeka, Kansas, March 13, 1888.
HON. ANSLEY GRAY,
Oberlin, Ohio.

DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 15th inst. just received. It is true that it took several years to perfect and strictly enforce the Prohibitory Law, but now it is enforced generally throughout the State, to the great benefit of the people, and it was especially noticed to be beneficial during the last strike, everything remaining quiet and peaceable, and we as a city of between 45,000 and 50,000 people have only about 20 policemen, including all officials, and have better order and less crime than in some of our cities in neighboring Anti-prohibition States with a police force of one to every 1,000 inhabitants.

Yours respectfully,
D. C. METSKER,
Mayor of Topeka,
State of Iowa.

Office of the Attorney General,
Des Moines, March 12, 1888.

ANSLEY GRAY, Esq.,
Oberlin, Ohio.

SIR,—Yours of 9th at hand. When the late Prohibitory Law of Iowa was first enacted, it was fought bitterly in about one-half the State. About one-half the counties submitted at once. The first two years the fight was rather against us, then we got the amended enforcement law, with more stringent penalties and better regulations as to injunctions, etc., and therefore the work of closing the saloons was rapid and successful, except in about eight or nine counties. In that many counties the law is practically a dead letter owing to the fact that the judges of the courts therein choose to ignore their official oath and official duties. The result has been a large decrease in crime where the saloons are closed, and a material falling off in the numbers in the penitentiaries of the State.

In many counties there has not been an occupant in the jail within the last year. This is true in scores of counties. The criminal costs in all those counties where the law was enforced without opposition has fallen off from 50 per cent. to 75 per cent. In the counties where the liquor interests made stubborn fights against enforcement, as they did in this county, the criminal costs were increased. In those counties where the law is not enforced at all, and where no effort has been made to enforce it, there is no sensible difference in court costs. The last named counties, however, have in the last two years furnished most of the convicts for the State prisons.

The school records in the counties where the saloon is suppressed, show that a great many children who never attended school before are doing so now.

The testimony of citizens is that a large class of men whose families were before semi-paupers are now supporting their families in decency and thrift. Where enforced, the law is a great public as well as private blessing.

Yours truly,
A. J. BAKER.

Ill-fitting boots and shoes cause corns. Holloway's Corn Cure is the article to use. Get a bottle at once and cure your corns.