

world due to the four or five things I have mentioned, you have not got ten per cent. left for the liquor business and all other causes.

You see a working man spending a nickel for a glass of beer. You say that makes him poor. You see another fellow spending four dollars for champagne. Why do you not argue that spending money for champagne makes him rich? The cause of riches and poverty lie entirely outside of a man's bottle of champagne or his glass of beer. Just remember that, and you will realise how absurd is this stock argument of the drys on this question.

The prohibitionists have been discussing this question for 25 years at Chautauquas and have never heard the other side. Give us a chance. Do you want people to decide a proposition without hearing all the arguments in the case, all the evidence? I am ready to meet any man on a public platform on this proposition in joint debate. Why don't they accept my challenge. Because they could wipe me off the face of the earth? They would be glad to do it. It is because they realise the weakness of their case when compelled to defend it before a court of reason and logic; that is why.

I bring one other indictment against prohibition. I have demonstrated here this afternoon that prohibition is unreasonable; that it is a menace to morality; that it is destructive of human equality; that it is an insult to manhood; that it is powerless as a remedy for drunkenness. Now I come to another indictment of prohibition; but before I enter upon that I must admit at this point that I know of three places in the world or the universe where prohibition is a success, and only three. The first is Turkey. The second is the penitentiary, and according to the Good Book hell is a very dry place. (Laughter.) In fact, according to the story of Lazarus, the rich man could not even get a drop of water. They used to bring Sam Small and other prohibition orators from the United States, and these men used to tell you that "beer and whiskey are all right in their place, but that their place is hell." Why, a brewery in hell would be worth a million dollars a minute. Hell is a dry place. (Laughter.) I want to call your attention to another thing in this connection. In the only three places in the universe where prohibition is a success, man is a failure. Prohibition has never elevated the standard of morality, either in Turkey, the penitentiary or in hell. (Applause.)

ANTAGONISTIC TO THE DIVINE ORDER.

I bring one more indictment. Prohibition is antagonistic to the divine order, and I prove that without opening this Bible. Freedom of choice is the divine order. Imagine God accepting the services of people that were stricken to their knees with clubs. If he believed in force, and if freedom of choice were not the divine order, he could write a message across the skies in letters of fire tonight, and the whole human race would fall upon its face. That is not God's way. If he believed in force and did not represent freedom of choice, why, he would long since have destroyed the devil, but he did not do so, as that is not the divine order. The theologians tell you that "God made us able to stand, though free to fall." Have they been telling you the truth for hundreds of years? If so, then prohibition is contrary to the divine order, because it strikes down freedom of choice.

But I will open this Book and see what we find. Luke, Chapter 7, Verses 33 and 34. This is Jesus speaking; and as this is the Sabbath day, it is entirely appropriate to read this in your presence. He is contrasting his habits of life with the habits of John the Baptist. He says: "For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a Devil. The Son of man is come eating and drinking." Eating what? The thing John did not eat—bread. Drinking what? The thing John did not drink—wine. Jesus was the ideal moral character of all ages. It is His own testimony describing His own custom. But he did not please the prohibitionists of his day, because they said, "Behold a gluttonous man, and a wine-bibber." The word "Wine-bibber" means drunkard. There is as much difference between eating and becoming a glutton as there is between drinking and becoming a drunkard. These people lied about Jesus when they said he was a glutton and a wine-bibber. But He Himself told the truth when He confessed that He ate bread and drank wine, which was the basis of this false charge against Him.

We turn now to St. Paul. St. Paul asks a vital question. Paul was the greatest Christian philosopher that ever lived. Did he accept the philosophy of prohibition? He held that if "righteousness come by law then Christ is dead