

eat and drink what he pleases in his own house interfered with. He may make rum for himself if he chooses, but he shall not traffic in it, nor shall others be permitted to sell it to him for drinking purposes, because such business is contrary to the public welfare.

On this point, our first position is that the right so to prohibit is assumed in all the license laws on our statute books. It underlies the whole of them, and is affirmed in the very process of granting permission to follow the business; for why permit if there is no right to restrict? And if ninety-nine men out of a hundred may be prohibited, why may not the other man also? The right to do so is unquestionable.

Our second position is that the principle of prohibition, in direct contradiction to that of license, is right, morally, socially, and politically. This is admitted very generally by the advocates of license, especially the advocates of high license, who are aiming at prohibition ultimately. The late Dr. Crosby's avowed policy was: Put the screws on tighter and tighter; dry up the low dives; create a wholesome public sentiment in the process, and by and by we will suppress the whole business—a pleasing theory if facts did not show it to be utterly impracticable. But it sanctions the principle of prohibition all the same.

But the principle, it is alleged, cannot be applied, and when applied it does not prohibit. These are the two imaginary mountains in the way. As to the first, *cannot* is a very poor and cowardly word for those who believe a thing to be right and desirable. It was not the cry of our forefathers when, against immense odds, they determined to prohibit unjust taxation; nor of loyal men thirty years ago, when they determined to prohibit the dissolution of our Union; nor of Paul when he said: "I can do all things through Christ Jesus, which strengtheneth me;" nor is it the cry of our missionaries as they assault the bulwarks of heathenism. It should have small place in the vocabulary of

those who believe God and truth to be omnipotent. We can if we will. It has been applied in several States, and it can be in others. And the farther it goes the easier it will be to apply it. If the seventy-five or eighty thousand evangelical preachers of this land, who almost to a man believe in the principle of prohibition, and the many hundred thousands of voters who agree with them would but drop their "can't" and go to work for the end they admit to be desirable and right, we should soon see a very different state of things in the progress and triumph of the cause. This "cannot" for the most part means simply "will not try." It is giving up the battle before it is begun. Query: Has not the supposed inimical bearing of prohibition on the fortunes of the two great political parties had much to do with this outcry of "can't"?

But when applied it does not prohibit. This is the cry, in the first place, of those who wish it not to prohibit—the manufacturers, saloon men, corrupt politicians, and time-serving newspapers. They have an axe to grind. They try in every way, foul or fair, to discredit the law and to hinder its execution. Their testimony, therefore, is worthless. If it does not prohibit, if the drinking goes on all the same and even worse, as some allege, why should the law disturb them so seriously? They know it does prohibit; hence their ire and perversion of testimony. A leading New York daily a few years ago sent a special reporter to Maine to examine the matter. Of course prohibition did not prohibit in his eyes. He could get intoxicants in abundance, and so could others. But how? By going through back alleys, by having it secretly placed under lock in his bedroom, he having the key! Ergo, prohibition does not prohibit. At the same time there was not an open saloon in Maine, and many of her county jails were absolutely empty. And at this very hour (1893) there is a generation living there who have never seen an open saloon in their own State.