

The aim is to make prohibition a *first* party movement. A political party which "should not, at the very utmost, pass beyond the sphere of State politics" is an absurdity. The creating of such a party "has never succeeded even once in the whole history of the government"—and for obvious reasons.

It is asked, why not adopt "the strategy of what is called the rum power"—the Prohibitionists, instead of forming an independent party, to ally themselves with the party (in the North the Republican) "that is most likely to sympathize with their views?" Much of what I have said already will apply in answer to this question. This has been the policy of Prohibitionists for thirty years, and it has signally failed, and must continually fail. There is to-day less territory in the North under prohibition than when the Republican party came into power. In 1863, the first year of the Internal Revenue tax, 62,000,000 of gallons of beer were consumed; in '84 this amount had increased to the enormous quantity of 588,000,000; during the same time the use of whiskey as a beverage greatly increased *per capita*. True the Republican party submitted Prohibition to a popular vote in Iowa and Kansas; it is also true that the same party repealed prohibition in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and Michigan. Gen. Neal Dow reveals the reason for this in his recent letter, in which he announced his intention of hereafter identifying himself with the Prohibition party. He says that, although the people in Maine last fall voted three to one in favor of prohibition, the Republican party fears to enforce the law because of the effect this enforcement will have on the whiskey vote in doubtful Republican States. History repeats itself. Salmon P. Chase, in a speech in Oberlin, in 1850, said:

"You ask me why we need an Abolition party; is not the Whig party sufficiently abolition? The Whig party can't oppose slavery, because that party needs the votes of the border States in order to carry elections."

Besides, it is impossible to rally Prohibitionists, North and South, under either the Republican or Democratic banner.

A movement of this kind, we are reminded, is likely to help the party least favorable to the temperance cause; that it so resulted last fall. This evil is temporary, and is unavoidable in any movement to bring to the front a new party. Dr. Spear will call to mind that this result followed the Liberty party and probably defeated Clay in '44. And yet, if there had been no Liberty party there would be to-day no Republican party. Can the Doctor suggest to Prohibitionists a solution of this problem: How may a man work into a new building the materials of his old building, and occupy the old one until the new one is complete? *The N. Y. Independent*, a paper with which Dr. Spear is connected, contained, last fall, in defence of the attitude of Prohibitionists, the following, which seems to be a very pat answer to the Doctor's objection: "You cannot make an omelet without break-