

strong drink has taken to itself the name of the "social glass." Never was the word "social" a greater misfit. The many happy homes into which it has come, and caused discord, neglect, cruelty, sorrow, misery, want, woe, death, meet us on every hand, while in no home has it removed an ill or brought a blessing. In communities it has caused feuds and strifes, while in larger spheres its effect upon social life, though less marked, is, in character, the same. In this aspect of it the voter can find little to warrant him in authorizing it as one of the lines of his country's commerce.

3. Its Physical aspect. Medical testimony all goes to show the evil effects of alcohol upon the system, but we do not need to wait for the evidence of experts. The wrecks of humanity that lie strewn along life's highway are ample proof of the fatal effects of strong drink. Were it not that the grave, in pity, early opens to hide such wrecks, the scene would be a more fearsome one by far. Strong drink stimulates and deceives the weak and weary by giving seeming strength, but it gives nothing. It merely makes advance drafts upon the vitality for which heavy discounts have to be paid. Soon there is no reserve upon which to draw and the bankrupt body fails and dies. Let every voter ask himself if it is a good use, the best use, of the ballot entrusted to him for the welfare of his country, to authorize by it a traffic which is responsible for so much of life's physical wreck.

4. Its moral aspect. The universal testimony of men and women who are working to lift their fellow men from sin and misery to God, is, that there is no one form of evil which more surely binds men in the power of their great adversary than strong drink. Its effect is debasing and degrading. It dethrones the reason, fetters the will, sears the conscience, excites the worst passions, stimulates into action all that is basest and most brutal in man, and is the invariable accompaniment to all scenes of debauchery and vice. It is a fact beyond dispute that the effect of the traffic is ever to cause and increase immorality, and never the contrary. Now, Christ Himself tells us that "By their fruits ye shall know them;" that "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit." Therefore, as the effect of the drink traffic is ever to cause and increase immorality, the traffic which bears such fruit must be morally wrong, and by authorizing it, a voter authorizes a moral wrong, and, since God's law condemn all moral wrong, the voter, it may be unconsciously, but yet deliberately, authorizes by law what God's law condemns.

When but a child, sitting one day in a court house, I listened to the county magistrates discussing the question of whether or not they should grant licenses. The usual arguments were presented *pro* and *con*. A massive Justice

of the Peace among them arose, a giant in stature, and bringing down a mighty hand upon the table, he said: The question for us is, "Is the traffic right or is it wrong; if right, we may license it if we will; if wrong we have no such right, we should have nothing to do with it." It was the simple, grand utterance, by a grand man, of a great truth, which should guide every voter in marking his ballot at the coming election.

5. Its spiritual aspect. Brief but awful are the words of Scripture, "No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God." We may follow this with another statement equally true, viz., that the traffic in strong drink makes the drunkards. No traffic, no drunkards. It makes them and sends them by tens of thousands yearly to drunkards' graves. This is the one line of business which, more than all others, projects itself into eternity, and with baleful, terrible effects. Can you brother man, as your brother's keeper, in the exercise of your law-making power, cast your ballot to authorize a traffic which thus eternally ruins multitudes of your fellow-men.

## II. SOME OBJECTIONS TO PROHIBITION.

1. "Prohibition interferes with personal liberty; men have no right to dictate to their fellow men what they shall eat or drink."

To this may be replied:

(a) A prohibitory law does not say what man may or may not drink. It does not interfere in the least with one's personal liberty so far as drinking is concerned. It merely refuses to authorize the traffic in strong drink, because such traffic is believed to be an evil in the community, and it says that if one wishes strong drink he must look for it in some other place. If he complains of this as interfering with his personal liberty, there is another reply for him, viz.,

(b) All law, based upon self-government by the people, is the voluntary surrender of the individual liberty of each, to the will of the whole, for the common good. Further, all such law is based upon the principle that if the *majority* are willing to surrender their individual liberty along any line, the minority must do so too, and the law becomes binding upon all. Only in this way is organization and law possible. Every day the law thus mutually agreed upon interferes with the liberty of some one and prevents his doing what he would like to do, and yet there is no ground of complaint, for it is simply one of the necessary conditions of civilized, organized, society. It is the price which one pays for the protection and privileges of an organized community. If a man does not wish to submit to the conditions of such society for the sake of its benefits, he is free to go elsewhere.

The same objection might be made to other similar restrictions, *c.g.* Some men would like to get up lotteries for gain, and many others would like to patronize them. And if they are