

ONE MORE EDITOR SETS HIS STAKE.

We believe in the total prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating (alcoholic) beverages of every kind, just as we believe in the total prohibition of murder, theft, or forgery. We do not expect that such prohibition against the liquor traffic will ever be absolutely enforced any more than the prohibition of other evils is now enforced. However, because people do now and then commit murder, that is no reason the law against murder should be repealed, and the undoubted fact that liquor would still be drunk, if its manufacture and sale were prohibited, is no argument against the right of prohibition. If the liquor traffic is a public injury, it should be prohibited, and what other business in the world to-day can be mentioned that does the harm to body, mind and soul, that the drinking of liquor does. And the harm is not confined to the drinker, but extends to everyone with whom he comes in contact—his family, his friends, the merchant he buys his goods from, the community in which he lives, and his country. We all know how he injures his family; how he abuses his friends; how the merchant who trusts him is likely to lose what is due him; how the community is injured by the unlovely and often squalid home of the inebriate; how the country is robbed of its manhood and compelled to support inebriate and insane asylums, prisons and dungeons, as the result of the use of alcoholic beverages. If these facts could be gainsaid, then an excuse might be found for the non-prohibition of this devastating business; but, as it cannot be denied that it is the great curse of civilization to-day, we cannot see how any reasoning mind can find any other way to get rid of the evil than by Prohibition.—*Antioch Ledger*.

"THE CHURCH AND PROHIBITION."

Under the above heading Mr. N. F. Thompson, of Savannah, a prominent worker in the Catholic Church, furnishes to the *Catholic World* an important and valuable article showing the status of the church on the question of prohibition. It is an able article and deserves serious consideration. He says:

"What the state may do is to say that the liquor-traffic is the prolific source of certain evils and inimical to the general welfare; and public authority being specially organized to preserve and not destroy, it cannot be a party to the destruction of its own existence by permitting the continuance of so destructive an agent. The State has the power to do any and all things needed to fulfil the end of organized society—viz., the preservation of the general welfare of the people. If the State comes to regard the liquor-traffic as a disorganizing agent, or as destroying its members or otherwise rendering them unable to fulfil their part of that mutual relationship and obligation which exists between the citizen and the State, then the question of prohibition stands forth plain and simple as one for state settlement. Viewed thus, the church could find nothing in prohibition to oppose. For instance from judicial statistics it is ascertained that a very large percentage of crime originates from frequenting liquor-saloons; this fact alone is enough to place prohibition on the list of preventives to be used against crime—a basis which the church could not and would not oppose, since the State has a right to prevent as well as to punish crime. Again, equally as large a proportion of pauperism and lunacy, which demands State aid to provide for, is traceable to the convivial drinking commonly practised in liquor-saloons; that may fairly place prohibition among the preventives of pauperism. Now, the church could not say it was otherwise than right for the state to seek relief from these burdens, which right might be extended to prohibition without infringing in the least upon the province of the church. It will thus be seen that prohibition, when it appears in politics, should be treated as a question of public policy, one of a variety of means for procuring the well-being of the State, the discussion of which by no means necessarily involves a conflict of religious principle between the parties for and against it."—*National Temperance Advocate*.

THE RESCUE SECTION.

The Church of England Temperance Society, not a fanatical body at all, has two sections, one for total abstainers and one for moderate drinkers. But when it organizes a rescue section, and sends agents down into the slums to recover drunkards, it insists always that these men shall take a pledge of absolutely total abstinence. I say that not only every preacher, but every church member, rich or poor, especially if his position as an employer of labor makes him a trellis-work over which many lives run, should be a member of the rescue section of society.—*Joseph Cook*.

TEMPERANCE AND RELIGION.

Temperance is not religion, but it is one of the virtues of religion. A man may be a temperance man without being a religious man; but he cannot be a pious or religious man so long as he remains an intemperate man. Temperance is an aid of religion; the ally of Christianity, preparing the mind and the heart to receive the truth of religion. It casts the devil of drunkenness out of the man; sweeps the temple of the soul with the pledge of abstinence, and fits it to receive the holy influence of true piety. There is no antagonism between temperance and religion, for the former prepares the way for the latter. Temperance societies are the nurseries of the church; temperance tracts are the leaves which are intended for the healing of the nations; temperance lectures are the voice of John the Baptist in the wilderness. Drunkenness is a physical disease, breaking out in blotches upon the face, and sapping and mining the foundations of health and life. The pledge is a panacea which never fails to cure the disease when it is taken in time and kept inviolate. Drunkenness is also a moral malady, and religion is the remedy which is sure to cure it when it is taken from the hand which offers it. Those men who trust to temperance for salvation are like the carpenters of Noah, who built a ship for other folks to sail in, and yet were drowned themselves at last. *National Temperance Orator*.

LIFE INSURANCE AND TEMPERANCE.

The law of average, as exhibited in the experience of life assurance companies during the past forty years, has once for all triumphantly justified the temperance principle of total abstinence. When I was in London I took much pains to ascertain exactly the facts as to the experience of British life assurance societies in making a distinction between moderate drinkers and total abstainers. Every one knows or ought to know, that for nearly half a century now many of the best life assurance societies of England have insured moderate drinkers and total abstainers, in separate sections, and that a bonus has been paid to the section made up of total abstainers of seven, thirteen, seventeen, and, in some cases, twenty-three per cent. over that paid the section of moderate drinkers. Here is a commercial view of the largest philanthropic significance.

Where is the church, where is wealthy society, where are our circles of culture and advanced thought, where are our serious and intelligent young men, that they are not awake to these stern facts of mere business? I have been citing to you not temperance documents, but the reports of life assurance societies. They are not fanatical organizations; they are not governed by this or that pet theory as to temperance reform. Here is a cool, stern business sagacity applied to one of the most complicated commercial matters, and the outcome we have in this great proposition, sustained by the most exact application of the law of averages, that nearly twenty-five per cent. bonus must be paid to total abstainers above what is paid to moderate drinkers. Of course, many of these total abstainers have not been such for all their lives. Their health may have been injured in many cases by early indulgence. By and by, when these societies come to have sections filled by men who have been total abstainers from birth, the averages of bonuses will be higher to the temperance sections. You ought, also, to keep in mind constantly that the section not totally abstaining is not a section of drunkards, but a section of those who are merely moderate drinkers, respectable men, most of them only wine drinkers.—*Joseph Cook*.

BITTERS.

We see some of our temperance exchanges are advertising Hop Bitters, Hostetter's Bitters, and other quack nostrums, the vile concoctions of alcoholic liquors. It is a very questionable business for them to be engaged in, to say the least—it smacks unequivocally of "stealing the livery of Heaven to serve the Devil in." Nor are the temperance journals alone guilty in this particular, but many religious papers sell their space to the drunkard-making business of advertising "bitters," which is but another name for intoxicating beverages in many instances. The young, the inexperienced, and the thoughtless seeing these advertisements in the *Grubbing-hoe of Truth* or in *Peter's Club to Break Beelzebub's Head*, they naturally conclude that these are good, harmless medicines, and the more they take of them the more they like them and imagine that they cannot do without their stimulating and soothing effects, until in course of time they make the discovery that any man-trap, doggerly or rum-hole in the land can mix up a dose that will answer all their purposes as well as one from the higher priced, fancy-labelled bottles from the drug stores. It is to be hoped that all true religious journals and all honorable temperance papers will discard all advertisements of bitters and alcoholic nostrums, that are likely to develop an appetite for the strong drink of the drunkard. The few dollars that go into the pockets of publishers, is a very small consideration for the incalculable damage done by fastening the alcoholic appetite upon trusting and unsuspecting readers.—*Tennessee Good Templar*.