

the requisite two-thirds in Congress would be secured. Surely our learned opponent will admit that much. So the problem resolves itself to this: Is it madness to suppose that a majority of the voters in three-fourths of the States can be secured to the side of prohibition? Let us see if this expectation is without reason. In one way or another, and at one time or another, the people, either by direct vote or by a majority vote of their State legislators (who are never apt on questions of this kind to go ahead of the people), have voted in favor of prohibition: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Indiana, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota,* Kansas, Delaware, Texas and South Carolina, three-fourths of Georgia, nearly all of Mississippi, a large proportion of Florida, North Carolina, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, West Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, New Jersey, Alabama, Illinois and Wisconsin. In all, nearly, if not quite, three-fourths of the people of the United States have already voted, at one time or another, for prohibition. To secure an amendment to the Federal Constitution we will need a majority vote in twenty-eight States. With a clear policy, and a union of the friends of temperance on this line, and the agitation which the cause is worthy of, surely it is not so absurd a thing as the Doctor would lead us to believe, to think that an enthusiasm can be awakened which will sweep the country from Maine to California. Look at Canada. The General Government has taken the question of prohibition in hand and submitted it to the vote of the people by districts. Great majorities are rolling up almost everywhere. So far in but four counties has prohibition been defeated; and there is every reason to believe that at no distant date the liquor traffic in Canada will be destroyed wholly by the action of the General Government. The question of prohibition possesses all of the elements essential to kindle an irresistible moral and religious enthusiasm. Unless the signs are very misleading, never before were all things so favorable for a great temperance awakening. And here it is well to bear in mind that an aroused public sentiment which will place prohibition in the Federal Constitution, will have accomplished a work that cannot be undone when the tide of enthusiasm is at its ebb. That wheel has a ratchet that the liquor power will never be able to break or lift.

A third objection is that the national movement is impracticable because this question cannot be pushed to the front so as to compel a division of parties at the whiskey line. Dr. Spear in presenting this objection thinks it necessary to remind party prohibitionists that a new party cannot succeed as a *minority* party; that it must get a majority of votes before it can carry an election. Artemus Ward used to tell in a most amusing way, how, when he was young, a man of learn-

*Prohibition of Spiritous Liquors but not of Malt.