

sepulchre of his fathers. When the old people lift the coffin lid and see the changed face and see the gash in the temples where the life oozed out they will wring their withered hands and look up to heaven and cry, "Cursed be rum!"

CURSED BE RUM!

Lorenzo de Medici was sick, and his friends thought that if they could dissolve in his cup some pearls and then get him to swallow them he would be cured. And so these valuable pearls were dissolved in his cup, and he drank them. What an expensive draught! But do you know that drunkenness puts into its cup the pearl of physical health, the pearl of domestic happiness, the pearl of earthly usefulness, the pearl of Christian hope, the pearl of an everlasting heaven, and then presses it to the lips? And, oh, what an expensive draught! The dram-shop is the gate of hell. There are some in the outer circle of this terrible maelstrom, and in the name of God I cry the alarm. Put back now or never. You say you are kind and genial and generous. I do not doubt it, but so much more the peril. Mean men never drink unless some one else treats them. But the men who are in the front rank of this destructive habit are those who have a fine education, large hearts, genial natures and splendid prospects. This sin chooses the fattest lambs for sacrifice. What garlands of victory this carbuncled hand of drunkenness hath snatched from the brow of the orator and poet? What gleaming lights of generosity it has put out in midnight darkness? Come with me and look over—come and hang over—look down into it—while I lift the cover and you may see the loathsome, boiling, seething, groaning, agonizing, blaspheming hell of the drunkard. There is everlasting death in the pot.—*J. DeWitt Talmage.*

PROHIBITION AND PERSUASION.

"We have suffered more in our time from intemperance than from war, pestilence and famine combined—those three great scourges of mankind."

So spoke Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, in a debate upon a bill the purpose of which was to remit to the people of the cities, towns and parishes of the kingdom the right to prohibit the liquor traffic in their several localities. For more than four hundred years—since the time of Edward VI.—the British Government has been endeavoring, through the policy of licensing the liquor traffic, to diminish the evils coming from it to the nation and the people. To this end more than four hundred and fifty separate Acts of Parliament have been adopted, but with no appreciable benefit in any way; on the contrary, the condition of the country has been growing constantly worse, so far as intemperance is concerned, and the poverty, crime and insanity coming from it have steadily increased.

The governments of all civilized countries agree that the liquor traffic must not be left free, because it is dangerous to the public welfare. The only question concerning the legal control of it has been, to what extent should it be restrained, and in popular governments this has been determined by the public opinion of the time. In Liverpool, some years ago, the city authorities adopted a new policy in relation to it, that of granting license for the sale of liquors to all persons who asked for it. The purpose was to test the theory of some prominent members of the council, that to multiply temptations to intemperance would not extend that habit among the people. This policy was persisted in till its results became so marked for evil that Liverpool was known throughout the kingdom as "The dark spot upon the Mersey," and England was acknowledged to be the most drunken country in the world, with more poverty, pauperism, suffering and crime coming from intemperance than any other. All this, notwithstanding the honest, earnest and persistent endeavors of the government to diminish the evil, by the only remedy known at that time, to wit: stringent license laws.

Royal commissioners were appointed to inquire into British intemperance, its cause and its cure. Elaborate reports were made of the results of these inquiries, but not one of them recommended the adoption of the only possible remedy for the tremendous evil of intemperance, viz.: the prohibition and suppression of the liquor traffic. Many earnest men in England turned their attention to this subject, as being more important than any other to the prosperity of the nation and the welfare of the people. Intem-

perance, with all its evils, was increasing in the country much more rapidly than the population. Pauperism, crime, insanity and the expenses to the country growing out of them, were shown by the government Blue-books, to be increased with frightful rapidity.

English temperance men were startled by an announcement in the London *Times* that the Legislature of Maine had reversed the policy of license to the liquor traffic, and had substituted for it the policy of prohibition, and the *Times* added, that if the State of Maine persisted in that policy, it would show better than any other thing its people were qualified for self-government. A minister of the Society of Friends from Maine, was in England at the time on a religious mission. When crossing St. George's Channel, on his way to Ireland, a Friend from Manchester inquired of the particulars of this extraordinary movement in Maine. As a result of that conversation a meeting of seven persons, specially invited, was held in an upper room in Merchant's Exchange, Manchester, and a society was formed with a title, "The United Kingdom Alliance, for the Immediate Legal Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic." From that insignificant beginning this society has become great, rich and influential, having through its Parliamentary champion, Sir Wilfred Lawson, its President, obtained from the House of Commons, at three succeeding sessions, a declaration in favor of its proposition to remit to the people the right of prohibiting the liquor traffic in their several localities. Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright and a majority of the Cabinet voted for it, and Mr. Gladstone, on the part of the government, promised to bring in a bill to give effect to the vote of the House.

It was only after a contest of more than twenty years that Sir Wilfred obtained this victory. At the first division he had only thirty votes, and at the last session of the late Parliament he was beaten by a majority of one hundred and twenty-seven. A general election followed, the question of prohibition being a leading issue, and at the first session of the new Parliament the adverse majority was changed to a victory by a majority of twenty-six votes. Mr. Low, an eminent member of Parliament, objected to prohibition on the ground that it was an interference with personal liberty. Many other leading members of the House followed his lead in opposition to the measure. Mr. Low attempted to make distinction between vice and crime, and he maintained that as the liquor traffic was not a crime it could not rightfully be prohibited by law.

About that time I was the guest of a gentleman in the suburbs of London, a warm friend of prohibition and a special friend of John Stuart Mill, who objected to it. My host wished me to meet Mr. Mill, and he was invited to the house. In the course of conversation Mr. Mill said:

"Do you deny that the people have a right to drink whatever they like and as much as they like, provided they do not interfere with the rights of others?"

"No, we do not deny that."

"Very well, then it follows that those who drink have a right to the establishment of places, or at least to the toleration of places, where they can obtain what they wish."

"I beg pardon, Mr. Mills, I do not think that follows. The liquor traffic does interfere with the rights of others in many ways, and to a greater extent than any other evil. If the persons who wish to drink can devise some way to obtain what they desire that is not inconsistent with the general good, we cannot object. The liquor traffic is a great public nuisance, a greater nuisance than any other; it inflicts a thousand miseries upon the community; and our contention is, that those who drink have no just claim to the toleration of places for their benefit, which, in fact, are a greater mischief to the community and a greater danger to the State than all the other evils combined."

"But I do not see that the State has a right to interfere with the personal habits of the people so far as to prescribe what they may or may not drink. Personal liberty should not be trespassed under any pretence of providing for the general good."

"Prohibition does not prescribe what persons may or may not eat or drink, though indirectly it seeks to put out of the way what persons may desire to drink. Prohibition deals with trade like a hundred other laws which prescribe what may or may not be sold and the way in which things may or may not be kept for sale. The sale but not the use of unwholesome food is forbidden, and the keeping for sale of such food is prohibited under severe penalties. In 1832, when the cholera was in my