

(2) Most of those who patronize liquor shops, saloons, gambling houses, brothels, etc., will oppose Prohibition. A few, who are dragged there by their appetites, or by companions, would like the traffic abolished, but most of them will vote against Prohibition.

(3) Some who neither keep nor haunt saloons, or other places where strong drink is sold, but who like to have it in their homes, and to take a glass occasionally, will vote against Prohibition. Very few of them will vote for it.

(4) Some who rarely take strong drink, but would like to be able to get it if they should want to do so, will vote against Prohibition.

(5) Some—very, very few—friends of Total Abstinence will vote against Prohibition, for various reasons;—“that it is not the best way of stopping the traffic;”—that “the country is not ripe for it;”—that “it interferes with individual liberty;”—that;—that;—

Who Will Vote for Prohibition.

(1) Most of the ministers of religion will vote for it; especially the Protestant ministers. Their lives are given to trying to uplift their fellow men. They know, many of them by bitter experience, that there is no one thing which does so much to hinder their work, to ruin and degrade men, as strong drink.

(2) Along with these, almost unanimously, will be the great army of Christian workers of all kinds: S. S. teachers, missionaries, tract distributors, Y. M. C. A. workers, C. E. workers; in short, almost all, who, with love to their fellow men are trying to do them good in any way, will with one mind and heart vote for Prohibition.

The Contrast.

On the one hand, with a very few exceptions, the great host who are trying to uplift their fellow men, to make them better in every way, will be in favor of Prohibition, for they know it would help them. On the other hand, even more unanimously, will be the large class who live by doing harm to others, dragging them down. They do not injure from a desire to injure, but their business injures men and they will try to keep it up.

Look Again.

Against Prohibition will be, almost without exception, all who are sinking to a lower level, and all who are, by their life work, sinking others to a lower level. For Prohibition will be most of those who are trying to lift men to a higher, better level.

A Question.

Will the great body of Canada's voters think carefully of the above contrast, and the character of the two classes to one or other of which they must ally themselves and which they must support. Even though you may have some questionings as to the best method of stopping the drink injury; though Prohibition may not be your ideal, is it not better than its opposite? Would you not rather ally yourselves with those whose life aim and work is to upbuild, than with those whose life work only destroys. Here is a conflict. The lines are sharply drawn. You cannot be neutral. Look at the two companies. With which will you ally yourself? In favor of which will you give your influence and vote?

Responsible for the Evil.

The man who on September 29th votes against Prohibition, saying he does not want it, is responsible—in his measure—for the evils that the liquor traffic will bring, if liquor should win. Further, the voter who stays at home, does not vote, is responsible in his measure for the evil that men, women and children, and homes, will suffer if liquor prevail. Voters cannot get rid of their responsibility. The ballot is a trust. The voter is asked if he wishes to have an evil driven out. If he does not answer by his vote, he is responsible for the harm that the evil does if it stays in. No voter can stay at home and be free from responsibility.

“The Country Not Ripe For It?”

It is ripe so far as need is concerned, and ready so far as a great many of the people are concerned, and some of the people will never be ready for it. So the simple question, in a country where government is by the people, is—“do the people want it?” The vote on 29 September, is to give them the opportunity of saying whether they are ready for it.