

In the face of this, will you now take this privilege away, render their buildings useless; will you make paupers of the men who invested their all in what you once sanctioned and bonused?

A great deal is being made in this campaign of the Prohibitionists, of the so-called moral argument. They say that the demands of the weak should compel the strong to give up their rights.

We will grant you this. But you must make the moral law complete. The master moralist said: "Do unto others as you would be done by." That is moral law, is it not?

Now, if you had \$100,000 invested in good faith, in what your country legalized, protected, boosted, derived a big revenue and benefit from, and regulated; if you had \$100,000 invested in such a business which the public by their patronage showed their approval of; if you had invested your all in such a business, would you be willing to be made a pauper, or to be ruined by freak legislation, or by people who refused to act fair and just and honorable with you?

It is no argument to say, as I heard one man say: "Well, if I were fool enough to put my money into such a bad business I would deserve to be cut off without compensation." That is no argument. He had no money invested, and it is easy for those who have no money or property at stake to talk in this manner.

Human nature is the same all the world over, and I want you to bring forward a man who has \$100,000, more or less, invested in this business who says, that it would serve him right to be closed up, without any recompense or compensation or any recognition whatever.

What would our church folk say if the Germans won this war, came over to B. C. and said to our pastors and congregations: "We are going to close you up. You cannot hold any more free church services. We have no use for your doctrines or methods or language. We are Lutherans, and