

criminal institutions. All know that the tide of human wretchedness is swelled to gigantic proportions by the common use of ardent spirits. The police of every city in our land give a united testimony to this prolific source of social disorder and violence. The medical scientists agree that the physical degeneration of families is largely traceable to this same cause. We need not stop to enlarge on the colossal dimensions of the evil. We only assert that *something* must be done for the safety of the country as against this frightful and growing curse. Now, is that "something" Prohibition?

We answer, "No." And our reasons are the following:

1. *Prohibition does not prohibit.* The advocates of Prohibition laugh at this assertion as a ridiculous paradox, and point at once to Maine as a proof of its absurdity. But we must remember that in our country the population of cities are fast outnumbering the population of rural districts, and that a system which successfully applies only to the latter will not be a wise one to inaugurate. In Maine the rural districts are benefited by the "Maine Law," but Portland and Bangor have more liquor saloons to the population than New York city. Mr. Dow may say the cause is that the officers of the law are derelict in duty or it would be otherwise; but that is not the point. The fact is that in Portland and Bangor Prohibition does not prohibit. And what it is in Portland and Bangor, it would, *à fortiori*, be in New York and Philadelphia and Baltimore and Boston. The great centres of population would never obey the law.

Just here comes in the argument of the advocates of the law: "You would not give up laws against stealing and murder, because men refuse to obey them." This is specious. Stealing is felt to be by every human being a wrong in itself. Drinking is not so considered by the vast majority of our race. The law against stealing carries with it the whole human conscience. The law against drinking does not. Hence the two are to be treated in very different ways. There is no fear of conventions being held to prevent laws against stealing. But conventions are held, and most respectable men are open and pronounced advocates, in behalf of preventing Prohibition. The two acts of stealing and drinking stand on different foundations, and arguments from one to the other are fallacious.

It is this fact, that the public conscience is not with the law, which makes it most inexpedient to press it.

The Rev. Joseph Cook runs a somewhat similar parallel between Slavery and the Liquor Traffic. The argument, as in the other case, is fallacious. It demands that the holding a fellow-man in bondage and the drinking a glass of liquor are equally an outrage against justice. Slavery was an abomination *in its smallest degree*. Drinking is an abomination *in its excess*. We cannot make our treatment of one an example for our treatment of the other. The social vice