

A SUMMONS.

BY GEORGE S. BURLEIGH.

O ye righteous! O ye strong!
 Armed for battle on the wrong,
 Where the rum-ranks gather black,
 Charge for God and bear them back!

For the hearts that weep and wail
 Where the hopes of manhood fail,
 Withered by the mocker's curse,
 Strike, and lower his front perverse!

For the tears that cannot dry
 In the moaning mother's eye,
 As her sons are lured to shame,
 Lash the fiend with lightning flame!

For the pangs that, deep as life,
 Wring the loathsome drunkard's wife,
 In the wrath of pity rise
 And avenge her agonies!

For the miseries yet untold
 That makes childhood sadly old,
 With indignant heart and hand
 Sweep the tyrant from our land!

Lurking demon of the bowl,
 Ruiner of heart and soul,
 Let not name or place avail,
 Nor his arms of golden mail!

O ye righteous! O ye strong!
 Armed for battle on the wrong,
 Where the rum-ranks gather black,
 Charge for God and bear them back!

—N. T. Advocate.

OUT WEST.

In the first of Joseph Cook's eighth series of Boston Monday lectures in Tremont Temple, he announced that he would answer twelve questions each week if dropped into a box placed to receive them, and the first of these with its answer is as follows:

"What are the prospects of constitutional prohibition in the Western States?"

I have come from three months' travel as a lecturer in the Mississippi Valley, and, standing here in the commonwealth of the East, so near to great and corrupt cities, I feel much like a barbarian on the topic of constitutional prohibition. One hardly dares lift up his head or voice or heart for that reform in Boston or New York or Philadelphia; and yet on the prairies of Iowa and Kansas, and even on the fat lands of the new mother of Presidents—Ohio—it is very easy to stand erect on this theme. The West is immensely in advance of us in the advocacy of strong measures of Temperance legislation. It seems to be thought here in some circles, commonly called religious, that we must not advocate a reform until we are sure it can succeed to-morrow. I am willing to advocate a reform if I see fair prospects for its success next week or next year. [Applause.] Constitutional prohibition is a rising tide, and has already submerged Kansas and Iowa and very nearly Ohio. [Applause.] There have been twenty months of constitutional prohibition in Kansas, and lately full reports have been received from sixty-six out of eighty-one counties in that State as to its operation. In these the number of saloons has been reduced from 708 to 312. More than half of the latter are in the corrupt town of Leavenworth. In 41 counties of Kansas there is not one saloon. [Applause.] In the district courts there have been 460 cases against liquor-sellers tried, resulting in 351 convictions, or five out of seven. In the justice courts there were 378 convictions out of 572 cases, three out of four. The fines have amounted to \$95,000, and 81 saloon-keepers have been imprisoned. [Applause.] In 51 counties, prohibition is reported as growing in favor, in seven as growing weaker, and in eight as at a standstill. (See *New York Independent* for Jan,

31.) In Iowa, after a heated political canvass, prohibition in its constitutional form has carried the State. I regard constitutional prohibition as merely a form of local option. I pity the man who is so benighted and belated as not to think the people have a right to local option on the topic of temperance. In Iowa the party which rules the State has one of the noblest mottoes that any practical contest has recently thrown before the people. I found it impossible to quote that motto to any audience that I saw in that commonwealth without calling out a storm of applause. It is a motto which, I hope, will yet become national: "A school-house on every hill, and no saloon in the valley." [Applause.]—*Rescue*.

IS PROHIBITION A FAILURE?

The *Maine Farmer* lately had a powerful editorial article on the above subject, brought out in answer to a statement in a Boston paper that prohibition is a failure. We should like to give it entire but have space for only a few extracts:

Of all the States where the prohibition of the infamous rum traffic has gained a foothold, the most thorough and continuous test has undoubtedly been made in the State of Maine. Whoever pronounces it a failure here, must be as blind as a bat or so warped by interest or prejudice that he is unable to give a just and impartial verdict. Twice has this direct question been submitted to the people, and twice have they emphatically pronounced in its favor. The voice of the people on this question will again be heard in September, and it will be "heard around the world," endorsing the principle of constitutional prohibition. No political party in Maine dare put itself on record against the prohibitory law; no legislature dare repeal it.

This law has enabled seven-eighths of the towns of Maine to relieve themselves of rum-selling. They have never been able to do so under any other law. It has clearly been found here in Maine that legislation based on the prohibitory principle is more effective in mitigating the evils of the dram-shops, than that based on the license and regulative ideas. It should be at once understood that prohibition is not based on the idea that the sale of liquors as a beverage can be absolutely prevented; but, as Ex-Gov. Dingley tersely puts it, "on the theory that a dram-shop is so serious a danger to a community that law should set on it not a seal of approbation, but a seal of condemnation." Prohibition rests on precisely the same principles that laws prohibiting gambling places, brothels, etc., do, viz. That such dens are public nuisances and should be prohibited by law. The fact that such laws do not extirpate dens of this character, does not stamp the laws as failures. Even the laws against murder and theft do not prevent altogether the crimes against which they are aimed. Anything that will shut up the rum-shops will lessen crime.

In 1833, according to reliable statistics, this State under license, had one dram-shop to every 225 inhabitants. Now, it is believed that there are not over 700 dram-shops, mostly secret, in the entire State. Towns that had a dozen or fifteen places in which liquor could be bought by the glass, are free from the traffic.

We might go on and multiply facts and figures, to show the success of prohibition. The prohibitory law is ample in its provisions to stop the sale of liquors, if it is enforced by faithful officers and courts, which keep up to its letter and spirit. Simply carrying out its provisions as the provisions of any other law are carried out, would accomplish the end for which it was passed.—*Belfast Record*.

THE SNAKE BUSINESS.

ANDREW B. MARTIN, LL.D., in an able article in the Nashville (Tenn.) *Cumberland Presbyterian* on "Sumptuary Laws," writes:

"Suppose a person in the exercise of his personal liberty should conclude to go into the odd business of snake culture. I think there is no law in the State denying any one the right to embark his means in such an enterprise. Suppose, further, that this singular person should select Nashville as the place for opening up, and he should establish himself on one of the main business streets of that city. He would, of course, have in stock every variety of snakes, beginning with the little