

Maine, Iowa, Kansas, and Ohio. 4. The growth and development of the temperance sentiment, as the result of wide discussion, local option, and high license laws, citizens' leagues, and efforts to enforce existing license laws. 5. The present unparalleled position of the two chief political parties—the issue now being chiefly in reference to men, and not to great political principles—both parties having put in nomination candidates admitted to be objectionable to a very respectable minority, both in the Republican and Democratic ranks; and this minority, in both parties, is largely made up of men likely to vote where their moral convictions lead. Hence, as their sense of duty will not allow them to cast their votes for the head of either party, a very large number of them will be likely to go for Prohibition, who would not have done so under ordinary circumstances. Even the political organs concede that the Prohibition party now before the nation will develop a strength far in advance of anything before known. They have ceased to sneer and denounce, as formally; while shrewd and sagacious observers in the political world do not hesitate to assert that Prohibition is the one great overshadowing question in American politics of the immediate future. “A million of votes” cast for

it in the coming election will be a powerful factor in our future history, in the present state of political parties and policies.

One fact will, and ought to, have a stimulating effect on the friends and advocates of temperance principles and measures. The Brewers and Maltsters' Association of New York State has formally demanded of all candidates for Congress and State offices, *a pledge that they will oppose Prohibition*. The same thing, we presume, will be done in all the States. All that money, political trickery, and the rum-interest organizations of every kind can do to defeat Prohibition and perpetuate their power, will be done. They defiantly appeal to the polls. They combine and marshal their forces to defend a traffic that is the supreme curse of the world. Let every minister, patriot, voter, and friend of his race and of religion, accept the challenge and put forth his influence in every proper way to overthrow this horrible monopoly, and crush beneath the heels of public sentiment an evil that for long generations has rioted on human virtue, happiness and life, and scourged the earth—to quote Mr. Gladstone's words in the House of Commons—“more than war, pestilence and famine combined: those three great scourges of mankind.”

AROUND THE EDITOR'S TABLE.

Quoting Authorities.

Many a preacher has damaged his influence with intelligent hearers by careless reliance on some defective authority, or by an emphatic statement of one view of a point in dispute. He would not have used the authority if he had known it to be defective; he would have recognized the existence of other opinions if he had known that there were any. A great many supposed facts have some element of uncertainty; many such are not very important; but in stating a fact it is well to recognize the uncertain element, if there be one. Dogmatism about little things that are only used as illustrative matter, is a

most offensive and dangerous species of dogmatism. We have before us a criticism of Dr. Schaff's new *Encyclopaedia*, in the course of which the critic dogmatizes in an unbeautiful way about assumed errors in dates as given by Dr. Schaff. He says, for example: “David Oliver Allen's birth is given as 1804, instead of 1800.” Probably the critic does not know that Drake (*Dict. of American Biog.*) gives this date as 1804. It is very unwise to build heavy accusations on fine points of this kind. We have heard a preacher offer to stake his reputation and his faith in God on a point of this microscopic character, though it had nothing whatever to do