

would follow an open support of the trade in intoxicants, so general had the feeling of repugnance and hostility to the liquor become. The Queen's Speech at the opening of a recent British Parliament contained a paragraph congratulating Parliament upon the reduction in the item of revenue derived from the duty on alcoholic liquors. No such reference would have been made to a loss of revenue from cotton or any other industry. The whole temperance question, he thought, rested on two pivotal points, whether or not the traffic in its nature and results was such as demanded total legal suppression, and whether or not the rightness and efficiency of prohibition were capable of proof. The overwhelming testimony of scientific and medical men in all countries went to show that the use of alcohol as a beverage was productive of by far the largest proportion of disease, misery, and crime in existence, while the highest state of human happiness and health resulted from total abstinence. Science stripped of all prejudice spoke out on this question with no uncertain sound, and it warned people that not only was alcohol valueless as an article of food, but that it was the most destructive agent in existence. The voice of economic science too, was no less decided and outspoken on this question, declaring as it did, that the liquor traffic antagonized all the conditions which were necessary to the high state of national prosperity; that the country would be most prosperous, other things being equal, under the conditions which ensure the most frugal use of all its material resources. (At this point in the hon. gentlemen's speech two baskets of natural flowers, presented by the W. C. T. U. of Canada, were sent into the chamber, one being placed on the hon. gentleman's desk, and the other on desk of the seconder of the motion, Mr. Fisher.) Again, other things being equal, the maximum of the prosperity of a country was secured by a wise conservation of its labor and power. The result of the investigations made by a committee of the British House of Commons proved the fact that the labor of at least one out of every six laborers was lost to the country through the liquor traffic. Another axiom in political economy was that the maximum of prosperity, other things being equal, would be reached in that country which had a minimum of non-productive and dangerous or criminal elements. Every non-producer, therefore, was a burden upon the people, and retarded the progress and accumulating wealth of the country, and no trade threw so large a percentage of the non-producers upon the country as the liquor traffic. No trade effected so large a waste of human energy and producing power, and therefore economic science demanded that it should be abolished. But the claims of social science called still more loudly for this reform than either physiological or economic science. When the traffic entered into society it resulted in taking away a large amount of labor from its proper employment, and it introduced disorder and instability. There was no more potent seed of disorder in this or any other Anglo-Saxon country than that which came from the liquor traffic. Plenty was dragged from its seat, and pauperism took its place, robbing its victims of all manly and independent aspirations, and worse than this there was inflicted upon society a great portion of that crime which was such a dark blot on the country's history. He read from statistics of the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor, in which it was shown that during the last twenty years the percentage of what was known as rum crimes, or offences directly traceable to the influence of the use of liquors, formed 60 per cent. of the whole crimes of the State. For all these reasons he thought he had a right to demand the total legal suppression of the liquor traffic at the hands of the State. (Cheers.)

WHERE IS THE RIGHT OF IT?

BY THE HON. NEAL DOW.

Some time ago I saw it proclaimed in the press, by authority of a prominent and influential clergyman, that he did not favor abstinence from alcoholic drinks, but, on the contrary, that he approved their habitual use. It seems to me there must be a right and a wrong as to this matter, and it ought not to be difficult to find.

Some time ago, a stranger to me, and I were the only occupants of a carriage on an English railway. The gentleman knew me; he was a rector of the English Church. He commenced a conversation brusquely by asking:

"Mr. Dow, do you (temperance people) hold that to drink a glass of wine is a sin for us?"

"We say nothing of that; but this is our view. An intelligent man must know something of the sin, shame, crime, horror, which in this country come from intemperance. He must know that intemperance comes from the drinking habits of society. He must know, also, that these are upheld and perpetuated by the example and influence of the better classes of the people. For a man who knows all this to lend the influence of his example to uphold the customs whence all this mischief comes, is a mortal sin. We hold it to be a primary Christian duty so to live that if all the world should follow our example no harm could come from it. If our example of total abstinence should be adopted by all the world, the sin, shame, crime and infinite misery coming from intemperance would cease in a day, and the world would be relieved of nine-tenths of the wretchedness by which it is now cursed.

The rector made no reply.

PORTLAND, ME.

—*Delaware Signal.*

THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION.

We are very much gratified at the general awakening throughout our country against the drinking usages of society. The determination of the Alliance to move for the general submission of the Scott Act, the announcement that the parliament now sitting will be asked to consider something definite in the way of prohibition, the activity of the counties which are already preparing for the contest, combined with the pronounced stand now taken in many quarters of the Christian church, make the outlook altogether promising. If, now, all friends of this movement will go unitedly to work, put aside trivial differences, be willing to accept the second best thing rather than give their countenance to nothing, there may be an end sometime to this long endured curse.

It will be needless to point out that disunion in plans or in object will result as it always has in the history of temperance reform. Let societies spend their strength in the maintenance of rivalry, or temperance men refuse to co-operate in the less because they cannot have the greater, or time and revenue be exhausted upon side issues to the detriment of the main question, and it will be failure again.

A lesson from the opponents of this movement ought to be well learned. They believe in their cause as a sense-gratifying or money-getting institution, and prosecute it unitedly and with a determination which so far has been ingloriously successful. Everything is grist which comes to their mill. They work their case upon the line of license or liberty equally well. They make their moral and patriotic appeals. They use in their cause the influence of clergymen and distillers, statesmen or tavern-keepers, it matters little which so long as their end in view can be gained, and—the point to be observed—they go at it with these means unanimously. So say we in reference to the matter now in agitation. Let every legitimate means be used and brought unitedly to the work wherever one step of advantage may be made possible, whether Grocers' License, Crook's Act, Scott Act, or Prohibition. If temperance people would do all they can in any way which lies open to them, and if especially Christian churches would bring unequivocally the whole weight of their influence to the settlement of the question, the country would very soon rid itself of this grievous burden.—*Canadian Baptist.*

DROWN THE OLD CAT.

Passing along a prominent street not long since, I was attracted by a large concourse of people before a shop window, in which was displayed a motley collection of cruel weapons, consisting of clubs, sharp-pointed sticks, knotted ropes, an old frying-pan—in fact almost every instrument of petty torture that a cruel mind could invent. Over these things was displayed a placard something like this: "The articles exhibited below were captured by the 'Society of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children,' from inhuman parents, and were actually used by them to inflict torture on their helpless children." Underneath were a dozen or more photographs of the "little innocents," who had been rescued by the Society from their unnatural protectors, with a short printed history of each case of cruelty. But the strangest (?) part of it was that they all read nearly alike, something like this: "Maggie Burns, aged eleven years, scarred with a hot poker by her drunken mother." "John Edwards, aged nine years, ribs crushed by an