fluous indulgence—if by that sacrifice a just prospect exist of checking and eradicating evils so extensive and momentous as those of intemperance.

Fourthly.—We presume that if the men raised to high stations—the men on whom providence has conferred education, refinement, and wealth—still more, if the men separated to teach the truths and obligations of religion; and if they who profess those truths and acknowledge those obligations—were universally to abandon voluntarily the indulgence of intoxicating drinks—the business of the importer and retailer would be so curtailed, and the influences that would encircle the inebriates would be so extended and potential, that comparatively little aid would be required from legislative enactments, and what was required would be accorded without hesitation and would be effective.

Fifthly.—Believing that societies and governments should exist for the general good, and that a supreme authority in the state is created for the purpose of prohibiting what is generally injurious, although at the expense of individual interest; and believing that the sale of intoxicating drinks inflicts evils on the common wealth of an extended and scrious nature, without returning to society compensating benefits, we see nothing in the right to sell or to drink intoxicating liquors that should form an exception to the general rule.

Lastly.—We know of no class of persons entitled to complain of the prohibition, if the propositions we have affirmed are correct. Not they who upon the principles of religion and the obligations of benevolence and patriotism, are required voluntarily to abandon alike the traffic and the use—still less they who are the victims, for whose deliverances this remedy is applied—and, least of all they who make a cruel profit by a traffic that offers A2