

facturing drunkards. \* \* \* Every citizen who casts a ballot for candidates supported by rum men contributes to the support of the liquor traffic and drives a nail into the coffin of national virtue and prosperity. The honest voter will be told, "Of two evils choose the less;" we say, of two evils choose neither. It will be said, "if you do not vote for our man you will elect the man on the other ticket, who is much worse." Just here good men are deceived. The rum people are in both parties, and if they vote the party ticket it is safe to say that the party ticket is satisfactory. If a respectable citizen, or even a church member, will vote for license, such a man is more objectionable than a saloon loafer, for the reason that his respectability is an endorsement of crime. \* \* \* You cannot write "Holiness to the Lord" on a rum barrel, neither can you cast a Christian vote for men who will vote for license.

Two masters and two services confront us. The Lord is on one side, and that means that he is against the other side. No man is so foolish as to believe that the Lord is on the side of rum, of drunkenness and crime. How then can a man be on the Lord's side and yet cast his vote for licensing the devil's cause?

Every vote given for a candidate who will vote for license is a vote to endorse the rum-seller's work, and every such vote has a part in the legalized crime of drunkard-making. It will be said, "If you vote for the temperance candidate you will throw your vote away." Votes cast for good men and good principles are never thrown away or lost. They are like seed sown in good ground, they will bring forth an abundant harvest. When politicians find that temperance men will never accept candidates who vote for license, they will respect us just as much as they now fear rum men, who will never vote for men who will vote the liquor traffic a crime. In this war there can only be two sides—the side of the Lord and the side of the devil. On which side will you cast your vote?—*Temperance Gazette.*

#### A SERMON FOR ELECTION DAY.

"Choose you this day whom ye will serve." JOSHUA 24: 15.

There are two fields of moral activity in this world, one belongs to God, and the other to the devil. No man can serve two masters. God calls for volunteers; no conscripts have ever been marshaled under his banner. The voice of God comes to every man in the language of my text: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." The work you do indicates the choice you have made. The angel of prohibition and the rum devil are the candidates for your ballot. You cannot compromise, for God never compromises. The ticket you vote, indicates your choice of masters. Will you vote men the privilege to make drunkards? If you do, then the rumseller's sign should read, John Blank & Co., dealers in wines and liquors. The company stands for you. You are a silent partner in the business. If your son is made a drunkard, you have a share in that work, as you are a partner in the business that ruined him. If you have no son, you vote to open a trap that will ensnare and destroy the son of your neighbor. Your ballot is for license or prohibition. If for license, you elect the rum devil as your master, and authorize saloons, which are his schools and churches. As you pass saloons you will have the satisfaction of seeing the kind of work your partners and masters are doing. If you vote for prohibition, you will vote for sobriety, religion, good men, and good government. You cannot be a neutral; you are either on God's side, or you are on the devil's side. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve."—*Temperance Gazette.*

#### CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION.

Rev. Joseph Cook, as a "prelude" to his "Monday Lecture" on the 3d ult., in the presence of a great audience in Tremont Temple, Boston, discussed the subject of "constitutional prohibition." From his able and powerful presentation, contrasting constitutional prohibition and high license, we quote as follows:

"And now, to come at once to the heart of my topic, let me raise the central question, Why is constitutional prohibition better than any other form of temperance legislation?"

"1. Constitutional prohibition takes the question of temperance legislation out of merely partisan politics and puts it into the hands of the people at large.

"2. Experience has shown that, under party government, by universal suffrage, the Legislature is not the proper place in which to deposit discretionary power in dealing with the liquor-traffic.

"The Hon. Mr. Finch, of Nebraska, has emphasized this point with such vigor of thought and weight of moral earnestness that I pause only to point out the fact, which all history shows, that, under the action of our party government thus far, whiskey-rings have often and easily bought their way to power in important contests. We have had for a wonder, prohibition passed under party government several times. In some States that have no very great cities it has been kept on the statute-book, but it has been erased in most States where great cities exist. The whiskey-rings wished to have it erased, and were able to buy their way to victory. Many a State politician, many a city government, is a mere tool of the whiskey rings. That is a commonplace fact of politics in our yet young municipalities. Do you believe that, as the cities increase in size and party government has in it more and more of greed and trickery, it will be safe to leave to the Legislatures the control of the liquor-traffic? Are we to give discretionary power to Legislatures in States whose laws are notoriously evaded or defied by the whiskey-rings in their great cities, and whose Legislatures those cities largely control?"

"3. Constitutional prohibition presents the question of temperance legislation untrammelled by any other issue.

"4. It makes repeal as difficult as adoption, and so protects the expressed will of the people. As it can be passed only by the people it can be repealed only by the people at large. Both adoption and repeal are necessarily under forms that prevent hasty action.

"5. It necessitates legislation and secures a fair trial of the law before it is repealed, and gives agitation the fruits of its victory.

"6. It closes one of the worst avenues of political corruption, for a legislature under constitutional prohibition can vote only one way.

"7. It undermines the distillery interests, as a steady execution of statutory prohibition has done in Maine, and so vastly weakens the financial power of the whiskey-rings.

"8. The power of the whiskey-rings must be overthrown, or republican government will be a farce in great cities.

"9. We have had centuries of license, and under it the drunkenness of the land has grown up. High license will not make the rich dealer keep the unlicensed poor ones in order; for the rich will sell to the drunkard and the minor, and so be open to retaliation if they prosecute the poor dealers for violating the law.

"Do you seriously believe that lifting the tax for a license from \$300 to \$500 is likely to overthrow the mischiefs of the liquor-traffic? Have we not had very high license already, and have we not seen those who have taken out license at a considerable cost violating the law? Most of the men who have licenses, under a high license system, sell to drunkards and minors. Their hands are not clear. How can they use their soiled palms in smiting their poorer neighbors who do not observe the law? You affirm that high license will make the few rich dealers keep the poor dealers, who have no licenses in order? I have two reasons for not accepting your opinion on that point: First, history; second, human nature. [Applause.] History is that men who have high licenses sell to drunkards and minors, violate the law in various ways—not all of them, but most of them—and they cannot with any moral dignity, attack their neighbors who have no license and who violate the law by selling liquor. If suits were brought by the rich men against the poor men retaliatory suits would be brought, and the whole trade would be in hot water. Do you believe the house of the liquor-dealers will thus divide itself against itself? Are you such careless readers of history as to believe anything of the kind? We are told by certain men, whose opinions in general I respect, that high license is to cure the evils of the liquor-traffic. When has license elevated to \$300 approached doing that thing? If you can show me any such approach by the lifting of license I shall begin to believe that \$300 or \$1,000 will do something for it. We have had high license in various cities, East and West; we have it now in Chicago; but it is notorious that it is an inefficient measure. I am opposed to every license law on principle [applause] but I am also opposed on the ground of expediency. [Applause.] You ask me if I am a rebel against the laws of the commonwealth in which I happen to be a citizen. By no means. If you have a license law on the statute book I will help to execute it. God bless the citizens' law and order leagues! But, although I will assist you in executing a license law, so help me Heaven, I will never vote to license any dram-shop [applause], large or small, at a high price or at a low! [Applause.] Nay, I say with John Gough that I had rather be the most corrupt liquor-seller that ever stood on the pavement than the man to grant him a license! [Applause.] At this point, however, I am emphasizing history and the argument of expediency in the case. And yet I would not have you forget that the friends of constitutional prohibition, although they have not taken ground on other issues, are most of them opposed to license in any form. Most of them would help execute license laws, but you will find very few of them voting for such enactments."

At the close of Mr. Cook's "prelude" he introduced Mrs. J. Ellen