



3 1735 060 222 670



# PROHIBITION

VIEWED FROM A LEGAL AS WELL AS A  
MORAL STANDPOINT.

BY

HON. DANIEL AGNEW,

Late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania,  
BEAVER, PA.

---

ISSUED BY THE PERMANENT COMMITTEE ON TEM-  
PERANCE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
IN THE U. S. A.

---

PITTSBURGH, PA.

PRINTED BY STEVENSON & FOSTER, 529 WOOD STREET.

1889.

PRICE 5 CENTS; \$3 PER 100.



## PREFACE.

The following discussion of the temperance question, which first appeared in the *Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette*, produced a very decided impression upon this entire community, especially on the part of the more thoughtful who were seeking light in the very directions indicated. These newspaper articles are now put in a more permanent shape in a slightly modified form, with the entire concurrence and approval of their author.

There is no man in this community who stands higher than Judge Agnew, both as a sterling Christian gentleman and a profound and an experienced jurist. His long experience on the bench, first as a district judge, and then on the supreme bench, over which he presided as chief justice for a number of years gave him an insight in regard to the evils of the liquor traffic and the only means by which they can be avoided, which but few of any generation can possibly have, and now that he is far advanced in years, he can have no possible motive for speaking as he does but the good of his fellow men. Upon all those who wish to be informed in regard to the real facts and relations of this great subject the words of our excellent ex-chief justice must produce a profound impression, and we commend them to their most thoughtful and prayerful consideration.

On behalf of the Permanent Committee.

I. N. HAYS, Chairman.

The magnitude of the evils connected with the liquor traffic is universally acknowledged. How to get rid of these evils is the difficult question. Three plans have been devised, viz., Moral Suasion, High License and Prohibition.

#### MORAL SUASION.

A Senator of the United States, arguing against the control of liquor by law, once said: The morbid physical fact of intemperance, in cause and effect, is the proper view, to be met by personal example and precept. So others say, and call it *moral suasion*, who yet would leave open the door of the saloon. Moral suasion is a grand element in right education. Without it the world had never attained the education of to-day. Good men and the church have been teaching and preaching by precept and example for generations and their influence is justly felt in society.

But moral suasion, precept and example have never closed the door of the saloon, have never shut the bar or banished strong drink, or kept youth and the sober off the highway which leads to habit and drunkenness. How strange that such men—men who wish society well, and whose example is often right—should narrow their minds and confine their sight to a single view of the means of protecting society! How strange they should reject the help of law! Let them teach, let them exert all their powers of persuasion, but on what principle of sound reason or good sense will they refuse a law which comes in aid of precept and example by closing the avenues of drink? On what principle will they persuade the young and the yet sober to avoid the

danger and yet leave wide-open to their appetite the gate to the broad highway which leads to habit and finally to ruin? They have seen thousands traveling this road sink and fall to rise no more; they yet see thousands more entering on the same road unrestrained by law and constantly on the way to the same scene of death and woe.

Drunkards are not made at once, but with open doors and tempting lures to appetite the habit comes; and indulged again and again is fixed at last. How strange then that, taught by the experience of ages, any one will refuse a law intended to aid precept and example by closing the open-door of temptation! Why should the open bar inviting to hilarity and the brilliant saloon remain on the highway of life to lure the young and the unwary, and thus lead them away from precept and example? Let good men and the church continue to sound the alarm, but let no one denounce a law intended to strengthen their hands by closing the avenues to intemperance.

Statesmanship is a high acquirement, a grand knowledge of human affairs; but what would even a common man think of that statesmanship which refused restraint, and provided only for the present, taking no thought of the future? Yet such would be the statesmanship which simply advised against an evil but used no control to restrain it; which took hold of the poor drunkard to-day, but used no means to prevent drunkenness to-morrow. What sort of policy would that be which punished a nuisance by a fine, yet suffered it to remain unremoved, to contaminate and to kill?

Prohibition recognizes the power and influences of moral suasion, and would only add to its strength by removing the open temptation which invites appetite and creates habit.

## HIGH LICENSE.

High license necessarily takes a place in the discussion of prohibition. It has the support of the saloon, of tipplers and unrestrained appetite. It takes in those who doubt prohibition, those uncertain in their own minds, the thoughtless, the indifferent, and those who would escape taxation. It was evidently a tub to the whale to avert prohibition in the hope that these influences will defeat it.

If any one has watched passing events, he has noticed how eagerly a part of the press has taken hold of high license as the best system, the surest, most conservative and most burden-relieving—how the first execution of the law has been praised—the reduction of the number of saloons, the increase of revenue and decrease of crime, while the same papers have been foremost to slur prohibition. He may also have noticed that with the popular advance towards prohibition there has been a slight modification in their tone.

But I do not intend to decry high license. Let it have credit for any good it has brought. Between it and the former system of low and indiscriminate license much is to be said in its favor. This is not the point now. The question is between high license and prohibition. High license means the open saloon, the rich and gaudy attraction of splendor, the lures of fashion, the temptation of youth and the yet unfallen. The evil is not banished, but drinking continues. What follows? The saloon is made only more respectable and inviting, drunkenness will revel, crime will flourish, woe and sorrow will still await wife, children and friends. Poverty comes with its train, and dishonesty and fraud contrive means for the further gratification of appetite and pleasure. The prison, and the almshouse, and in-



sane asylum are replenished, and death and woe close the scene. This is not all; courts are kept busy, taxes are not reduced, and the police are demanded. In short, private ruin and public burden follow always the current which flows from the license to sell intoxicants. License high or low means *sales*, and these mean drunkenness and all its evils. Those who advocate high license overlook both economy and the public welfare. The money expended on the consequences of drinking exceeds by far all the price of license no matter how high, while society is demoralized and health destroyed. Men will drink until the price of license reaches the point of prohibition. License, high and low, is but a sliding-scale of public loss and private ruin.

High license means agitation. The liquor interest rallies to repeal and avarice, self-interest, appetite and intrigue assist. Legislative halls become scenes of contest, and permanency in the laws is banished. Those who remember the law of 1855 and its total prohibition of liquor as a beverage from hotels and all places of resort will recollect the speedy rush of the liquor interest to its overthrow; when Allegheny sent its distinguished, old and honored citizen to repeal the law, and it was done. The contest has continued ever since with varying results. High license means agitation, vacillation and dubious results. Prohibition found in the Constitution, the will of the people, can alone be permanent.

Nor does high license give pure liquors. Adulteration, made more necessary by high tax, goes on and society swallows the poison. High license means the suppression of some low dens, but what does it give in return? Wealth and fashion display their finest art. The palatial edifice rears its high head, its front of elegance captures the eye, its interior adornments strike the imagination, its brilliant

lights dazzle the poor moths that fly to its flames, and to young men, even pure daughters, and the yet sober it holds forth lures and temptations which have but one end—ruin.

### PROHIBITION.

Will prohibition prohibit? I believe it will: but my view differs from the common one. Most persons look for an *immediate* effect. In the main the experience in other States is favorable, but that is not the proof. In all, the subject is in *transition*, and the time for full proof has not arrived. What is meant by transition? I mean this: A prohibitory amendment when adopted finds a people indulging in drink. It finds saloons, drunkards, tipplers, moderate drinkers and appetite yet untrained. The amendment closes the *open* saloon; but the people are unchanged. Lovers of drink will have it. The depraved pander to it.

The condition prevails most in cities, where population is dense, and the lowest and most depraved are found. There opportunity for evasion is greatest. Here the opponents of prohibition seek and find it. They do not inquire of the vast country, but in the towns: and tell of secret rooms there, hidden pipes and confidential hints. By seeking thus they find. But this does not determine the question. It proves the real power of prohibition. It has closed open doors, and driven the drink habit to low and hidden dens. The fashionable saloon, arrayed in rich and shining attraction, beckoning to foolish youth and sober men, no longer assails their path. The temptation to the unfallen is removed. This is a great victory; but we must look still beyond.

From what source are the ranks of drunkenness recruited? From the sober. All drunkards were

once sober men. But mirth, hilarity, good fellowship and boon companionship, led them first to the open bar or respectable saloon. Nothing repulsive forbade entrance there, and the invitation to drink was accepted. There habit began, gradually formed, and finally fixed itself. What does the closing of these open doors—respectable resorts—proclaim? It tells of a frequented place and an alluring invitation withdrawn from the young and the yet sober. It tells of a public opinion which makes the secret haunt of drink difficult to be reached, and disgraceful when found. The yet unformed habit feels no impulse to enter in, and the young and sober are not induced to seek the hidden dens.

The race of drunkards and tipplers must necessarily die out without new recruits. But it requires time to pass through this transition. Yet the administration of law, the removal of temptation, and public opinion increasing and preponderating by the new condition, finally will reach a time, perhaps ten or more years hence, when prohibition will exhibit the same strength that is acquired by other laws. No human laws can be perfectly executed, but when prohibition is executed as the laws against crime are, prohibition has succeeded. Prohibition then prohibits. It is the enemy who suggests prohibition will not prohibit. It was not until the third and fourth centuries the religion of Christ became able to resist the obstacles it encountered. And on what principle of sound reason or good sense shall we proclaim prohibition a failure, until society has passed through the transition from the old to the new system?

It is only when the dying out of secret liquor places by the continued administration of law, when the numerous drunkards and tipplers have been reduced to a few, when the young and the yet sober

have been educated by the absence of open temptation to look upon the vice as vile, and the violator viler, and public opinion has become the true arbiter, that we must look for the real proof. A renewed society will then proclaim that prohibition does prohibit.

#### THE SOURCE REACHED.

The first thing to be noticed is that the amendment prohibits *manufacture*. This is its *vital* point. Prohibited *sale* merely is but little. Whisky once made, like a hidden spring, throws out its ooze, and you discover them not but by the rank grass which covers the saturated soil. It will find its way underground, if not otherwise. But regulated *manufacture* grasps its source, and holds it until the manufactured article fills only the channels permitted by law. This is the true source of legal prohibition, and if our law-makers are faithful to duty the task is not difficult.

Breweries and distilleries are visible. Being visible they are capable of the knowledge of the law. The first thing is to compel their return by the law officer, under heavy penalties and punishment. Next make the officer vigilant by authorizing any citizen to give him information and require his return under a heavy penalty. The place of manufacture is now within the grasp of the law. Then take hold of the owner or manufacturer. Compel him under severe penalties to come into court and comply with the law. Make him give bond and adequate security and bind him by oath to execute the law fully and without reserve. Require him to keep a full account of his business—all the materials he uses, all he works up and all the product. Require full and frequent returns to the court, and punish him if he fails. If

the magnitude of his business requires it, put a watch over it, at his expense. Compel him to submit his product to inspectors and gaugers, and store it up under guard for sale. Let his bond and sureties be liable also for his sales. He must keep a full account of them, to whom and the amount sold and the purpose of sale. Let the law fix and regulate his sales and their purposes. Does anyone say this cannot be done? Let him refer to the control of manufacture and sale by the United States. It is done, and so well done that no one escapes, except an occasional small still in the mountain recesses, and even these are eventually discovered and forfeited.

If the laws do not reach the end it is because legislators fail. The people must hold their representatives accountable. The proper legislation will come though delayed awhile.

But there is one obstacle to State control which cannot be ignored—the interstate commerce which the Constitution of the United States alone preserves. It is true liquor can be imported into the States in unbroken packages, such as casks, barrels and boxes. This is unfortunate, but not without remedy. We have the right of inspection and can prevent the packages from being broken and sold by retail. We must be the more diligent and guard the entrances. We can clothe even private persons with powers enabling them to aid in discovery. Vigilance will overcome the evil.

Then there is still the element of time to stimulate hope. The example of Pennsylvania will not be lost on sister States. Already the wave of temperance is rising high everywhere, and State after State will be swept into the harbor of prohibition by the tide. Then the Constitution of the United States will be amended to suit the general good.

THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT WILL NOT  
ANNUL LICENSES.

I think the adoption of the prohibitory amendment will not cut off existing licenses to manufacture or to sell liquors.

In the interpretation of the Constitution provisions which protect personal rights and those which forbid injury by legislation are construed as immediately effective. For example, the rights of personal liberty and of conscience and of security in person and papers. So commissions of Oyer and Terminer cannot issue, trial by jury shall be inviolate, no *ex post facto* law or law impairing contracts shall be passed.

All such are operative at once.

But a system of administration which needs legislation to give it effect, or to pass from an old into a new one, must be construed to await the necessary legislation. Licenses to exercise governmental privileges are a part of the civil system, and cannot be stricken down without injury to the State. The peace and order of society and the interest and welfare of the State demand an interpretation to protect these. It cannot be presumed the people intend to throw their civil affairs into chaos and leave themselves without system and order.

Said Chief Justice Gibson: "A constitution is not to receive a technical construction like a common-law instrument or a statute. It is to be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them." And again he said: "A constitution is made, not particularly for the inspection of lawyers, but for the inspection of the millions, that they may read and discover in it their rights and their duties, and it is consequently expressed in terms that are most familiar to them." And said Judge Tilghman: "Where multitudes are to be affected

by the construction of an instrument great regard should be paid to the spirit and intention."

Again, there is a difference between a constitution adopted as a whole which possesses harmony and consistency and a single provision (such as this amendment) striking right into the frame of the Government, and intended to change a single part by substitution. In doing this the people are not presumed to substitute without regard to harmony or continuity. On the contrary, the natural inference is they intended it to be brought in harmoniously and without disorder.

These natural presumptions are supported by the express terms of the amendment. The first clause says: "Any violation of this prohibition *shall* be a misdemeanor punishable as *shall be provided by law.*" My italics show the force. That is not a *present* misdemeanor which is yet to be defined and the punishment declared. *Future* legislation is clearly intended.

The closing part leaves no doubt. It says: "The General Assembly *shall* at the first *session succeeding* the adoption of this *article* of the Constitution enact laws with adequate penalties for its enforcement."

This applies to the entire article No. 19. The intention of the people is thus entirely clear to provide the necessary legislation to carry the article into operation; and this concurs with the natural presumption that the people did not intend in the adoption to leave their affairs in confusion and disorder, or to violate good faith in their contracts.

Licenses to exercise a privilege, valuable to the applicant, paid for by him to the State, are contracts to enjoy the privilege set forth in the law conferring it. As such they cannot be violated and canceled at once, but must be permitted to run out their term.

Future manufacture and sale, without existing

license, will probably be considered as within the amendment after its adoption, as this would be merely negative, not needing legislation to make it prohibitory.

It is not necessary to assert that this doctrine of immediate destruction of existing licenses is *intended* by the liquor interest to take away votes from the amendment. It may be that or it may be an honest opinion. If true, this would be its effect. It is sufficient, therefore, for the friends of the amendment to know that it will injure no one having a lawful license until its term runs out.

#### THE COST OF IT.

I am unable to obtain all the statistics I need of intemperance in this State, but I have found enough to convey a clear notion how costly to the State and country intemperance is. They are taken from authorized reports of penitentiaries, prisons, work-houses, hospitals, almshouses, reform schools, etc.

The following statistics bear on the question and convey a fair idea of the cost of intemperance :

In 1876 the Eastern and Western Penitentiaries expended \$83,976.82 after deducting credits for labor.

The county jails of the State in 1877 expended a total of \$878,053.82.

The hospitals for the insane in 1877 expended for maintenance alone \$636,663.90.

The almshouses for 1877 expended \$1,433,688.

The township poor for 1877 cost \$191,650. Besides these there are the large expenditures for courts, etc., which cannot be ascertained. Under these circumstances the best that can be done is to take the percentage of intemperance in the institutions named and apply it to the expenditures stated.

The average percentage of drinkers of prisons and



workhouses is 85, that of hospitals, almshouses and township poor is 17.

Eighty-five per cent. (the intemperate in penitentiaries and workhouses) of \$962,030.94 expenditures give the expense \$817,766.04 for the intemperate. Seventeen per cent. of hospitals, almshouses and township poor of \$2,262,001.99 expenditures gives \$384,540.35 expended on account of the intemperates. These two sums give a total of \$1,202,306.37. As many of these statistics are for past years, the present expense is much larger. Now the entire sum collected from liquor licenses, for the year 1888, as shown by the Auditor-General's late report was \$660,332.56, which is less than 55 per cent. of expenditures for the intemperate.

If the unascertained expenditures for courts, judges, justices, sheriffs, constables, jurors, etc., etc., were added, it will be seen what a burden is cast on the State by intemperance.

Now, though these figures are only approximate, they give us a very clear idea how much the money expenditures caused by liquor cost the State and the counties, to say nothing of the crime, misery, woe, insanity, pauperism, and private ruin and public loss.

The proportion of crimes and misdemeanors noted generally by judges, caused by intemperance either directly or indirectly, is four-fifths. Chief Justice Coleridge, of England, stated that to be the proportion in Great Britain. This accords well with the above figures.

It is clear, therefore, that the highest price which can be imposed on liquor-selling cannot repay the mere money loss caused by the use of intoxicating liquors; and what is this compared with the loss in morals, happiness and prosperity in the State? It is evident

the only remedy is prohibition—the entire control by the State of the manufacture and sale of liquors.

#### COMPENSATION.

Inquiries have been made of me as to compensation to those engaged in the liquor business.

The prohibition amendment says nothing of compensation. It is therefore not a question in the election of the 18th of June. The effect is to leave the subject to future legislation. When this question shall arise the people will have an opportunity of discussing it, and instructing their representatives. Whatever may be the result of this future issue it is evident that no one who desires to see prohibition adopted should make his vote turn on compensation now. To do this would be to make the real question of abolishing the evils of liquor-drinking turn upon a side issue. This would be unwise. Sufficient for the day is the good or evil of that question. Let us first secure the real good by adopting the amendment, and when the question of compensation comes up hereafter consider its merits.

There is much to be said on both sides, and then those who consider that justice demands it can throw their whole weight in its favor without periling the greater good of prohibition. It may not be amiss, not meaning to decide its merits now, to consider a few matters bearing on compensation. And first it may be inquired what is compensation? Is it for the direct or the indirect loss? Will it be confined to the capital or the stock on hand; or will it extend to the real estate and fixtures? Will it embrace rental, grain, stills, vats, tubs and machinery? Will it include the profits of business? What will it cover, and how will it be ascertained? All these things are too great a subject to be discussed now, when the question of prohibition is to be decided. In the fu-

ture there will be more time and opportunity to discuss it.

Again, everybody has had *notice* of prohibition. It has been before the people for years. Witness the acts of 1846, 1854, 1855 and 1871. Twice it has been before the Supreme Court, in 1846 and 1874. Now whose hands struck down those acts? These are serious questions.

In all questions of equity and justice *notice* is a most material element. Hence a man acquiring property in the face of *notice* is not an innocent purchaser, he must look out. Men who invest capital in a business alleged to be injurious and immoral, and constantly questioned and contested do not stand in the attitude of one investing capital in a legitimate business. The contest in the legislature between liquor and temperance is of forty years' standing.

Then again, the effects of legislation on public affairs must be considered. Evils have to be removed and public interests advanced, which produce changes of condition. For example when billions of property were sunk in the liberation of four million of slaves, who paid the loss? When the State changed her system of turnpikes to canals and slackwater navigation, who paid the owners of property on canals and slackwater for losses?

Thus, it will be seen the question of compensation is too big a one to be discussed *now*. It will require all our time and means to discuss prohibition before the 18th of June. We cannot permit the amendment to turn on a side issue now, for fear we make a mistake and lose the greater good.

#### PERSONAL LIBERTY.

The right of society to prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquors is often assailed as an attack upon personal liberty. This is a mistake. No one claims

the right to compel temperance by law. What a man may drink is for his conscience. The question is between him and his God. But *drunkenness* is a different matter and affects society.

Put drunkenness before your eyes. See the victim reeling from the bar, perhaps pushed into the street, fallen into the gutter, staggering away to accident, falling into pits, lying on the railway track, and in a moment a mass of torn flesh and crushed bones—death.

Look at him in his family—wife and children fleeing before his brutal rage, the knife or pistol in his hand, then the wife of his bosom bleeding, dying at his feet. Again see him on a bed of sickness, fighting the devils of the brain, mania, delirium, death.

Look at its public aspect, not confined by town or county lines, but spreading over the whole State. What a scene of devastation and ruin, which despoils labor, gluts prisons and hospitals, engulfs taxes, impoverishes families, break up homes, sends the occupants to alms-houses, and carries thousands to untimely graves.

It violates the very Constitution of the State, destroying the God-given rights of men.

Does it not destroy liberty? Answer: courts of justice, prisons and asylums!

Does it not destroy property? The destruction has no measure, but the wages of labor, the earnings of industry, the savings of economy, and the inheritance of wealth, all, all engulfed in the drunkard's ruin.

Does it not destroy happiness? Who can tell the woe, the sorrow, the pain, the broken hearts despoiled by drink?

Reputation? Who can return it to the victim of folly, vice and crime? Lost in the whirlpool of drink.

Drunkenness is therefore a great public wrong, involving life, health, prosperity, peace, property, morals and the general welfare. What is its corrective? The police power, recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States. Said Justice McLean: "The acknowledged police power of a State extends often to the destruction of property. A nuisance may be abated, everything prejudicial to the health and morals of a city may be removed."

Said Chief Justice Taney: "If a State deems the retail traffic in ardent spirits injurious to its citizens, and calculated to produce idleness, vice or debauchery, I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent it from regulating or restraining the traffic, or prohibiting it altogether."

Nor does the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States impair the police power of the State. So says Justice Field.

And this power is incapable of limitation says Justice Miller. "Upon it," he says, "depends the security of social order, the life and health of the citizen, the comfort of existence in a thickly populated community, the enjoyment of private social life and the beneficial use of property."

Yet the saloon, the slave of drink, the landlord of the liquor den, the demagogue and the ignorant cry out, "Liberty! I am robbed of my liberty."

Liberty! What law of liberty gives him a right to sell that which imbrutes man, dethrones reason, engenders passion, destroys life and fill the State with disease, accident, insanity, crime, want, taxation and death—an evil which jostles reason from her throne, turns aside justice and outrages sense? What! Liberty to place a cylinder of dynamite under the temple of Liberty and blow it to atoms?

The claim of liberty to fill the State with drunken-

ness and all its woes is as much against law and common right as it is unfounded in reason and justice.

Who make your constitutions and establish your bills of rights? The people. They who are the State and are most interested in the question. Why shall they not tear down the idol, overturn this car of juggernaut in its progress of destruction, crushing the innocent in its path, and pouring libations of blood upon the scene of its triumphant ruin?

The people of Pennsylvania will weigh well this claim of liberty to despoil the State, and it is hoped will, on the 18th of June, add to their constitution another article which will bring prosperity and happiness to all.

#### THE HEAVENLY VOICE.

What means this universal voice, sounding all over the land, crying out to men everywhere to stop, to think, to act? First heard amid the rocks and snows of Maine, then reverberating over the plains and prairies of the West, it is now coming up on the sobbing winds from the savannas of the South. What means this general cry, this throbbing stir? Surely some high power, acting in mysterious silence, some guiding providence is moving upon the hearts of men, calling them to stop, to reflect, to banish that great curse which blights the race, and drives conscience, virtue and religion from the walks of men.

The cry of the sorrowing, even of many a heavy-hearted drunkard himself, has been ascending to heaven, imploring aid to move the minds and consciences of men, and lead them to consider. A mighty king once said: "Israel doth not know—my people doth not consider." Now comes this universal voice calling all men to pause, to listen, and to reflect. What is the greatest obstacle to thought? What hems in the way? The intoxicating fumes rise

to the dome of thought, drunkenness clouds the brain, relaxes strength, and dispels intelligence. It rouses the passions, fires the appetites, and paralyzes the intellect. Oh, the power and influence of liquor! "My people do not know—they do not consider."

Do you seek in the haunts of vice those great thoughts which bless the world and improve the race? Was that grand fire which elevates the soul and carries it heavenward born in a bar-room or a saloon? Is that divine inspiration which sways the intellect and leads on to grandest deeds found in a distillery or the brewer's vaults? Do the haunts of appetite, idleness and vice inspire industry? Do they instill virtue? Do they promote fervor in religion or reverence for God? Do they furnish knowledge or give power? No; the universal voice of mankind cries No! Then what means this general cry, this universal voice sounding over the land and inspired from above? It is the voice of heaven proclaiming "PROHIBIT;" take away that dreadful bane which poisons the springs of social life and overwhelms the public peace, its virtue, its economy, its general good.

What is prohibition? It is the law of the people—their will expressed in the constitution, to give permanency to their act, and prevent agitation, corruption and vacillation. It is not destruction, but regulation. True prohibition denounces that only which enters the brain, destroys thought, drives away decency and exiles learning, refinement and true manhood.

It does not banish those things which benefit mankind. Poisons grow in the garden of nature, yet when their properties are discovered they are used to preserve, not to destroy life. Prohibition does not forbid alcohol in the arts, in science or in medicine.

It denounces no useful purpose, but that only which

disturbs the brain, and destroys feeling, eloquence and manly fervor.

That universal voice speaks from heaven, arousing men to their danger and calling them to PROHIBIT the evil. It is approved by humanity, inspired by love, and demanded by the best interests of the State. Mothers, wives and daughters implore, good men beseech, and the instincts of a pure heart urge its adoption.









