

Indeed, it would be a most blessed thing if the State should insist that the medical and legal professions must define the meaning of drunkenness; for then it would be seen that drunkenness is a matter not of the degree, but of the kind of manifestation; in other words, that drunkenness commences the moment that the peculiar effects of alcohol—viz., paralysis of functions and dulling of the senses—are distinctly traceable in a man. Drunkenness in incipience is present the moment the peculiar effects for which alone alcoholic liquors are taken are seen in an individual. Therefore every moderate drinker, even the strictest, is at best a moderate, a strictly moderate, drunkard. Hence the restrictive provisions against serving drunken people would logically mean that no drinker could be served with more than one drink, say, in twenty-four hours; but evidently that provision would be even more difficult of enforcement than is the present one against the serving of drunken people. Well, then, as to the provision that the saloon-keeper must sell only pure liquor, Heaven save the mark! Pure liquor means liquor not mixed with any other poisonous ingredient but alcohol, and not even diluted with water. The latter provision must be strictly enforced, because otherwise the amount of alcohol drunk would be lessened and the internal revenue from the sale correspondingly diminished.

As regards noxious ingredients other than alcohol, they are all of comparatively recent origin, but the harmful effects of alcohol date from the very dawn of history. They show that Noah fell through the indulgence in "pure" liquor; that Lot also was disgraced through partaking of "pure" liquor. They show that the great monarchies and republics of antiquity—Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome—owed their decline and ruin largely to drink, and comparatively "pure" drink. It is the alcohol that is the cause of all the mischief, and it is nothing short of a manifest ab-

surdity to try to cure the drink evil by demanding the use of "pure" drink only. Therefore, the securing of what is termed "pure" drink only would nowise restrict the harm of the drink traffic; and so the enforcement of that provision, as of that against the sale to drunken people or that against the sale to minors, would in nowise serve to restrict the drink evil.

Then, as regards the restriction of hours or days of sale. There exists against such the same objection that holds against restrictions as to the persons to whom sales are made—viz., it is wholly arbitrary, and therefore the public sentiment is opposed to it. It is impossible to make the average man see why it is perfectly lawful to sell till half-past twelve o'clock, while a sale five minutes later is a crime. The average individual reasons thus: Any other business man sells as long as he finds it pays, and as long as his customers want him to keep his place of business open. Why should the liquor seller be made a criminal if he acts on ordinary business principles, and keeps open as long as it pays him to do so, and conducts his business in a respectable fashion? Hence laws restricting the hours of sale are not strictly enforced, and if they were would simply lead to a deeper disgust with such restrictions on the part of the public, and therefore would pave the way to more lax instead of more severe provisions.

Then, as to Sunday closing. This is one of the so-called restrictive measures for which nearly every good prohibitionist is working; but the general public are opposed to it, because they consider it arbitrary. They are allowed to drink for six days, why should they be prevented on the seventh, so long as they do not in any sense cause a nuisance. They argue that if hotels and restaurants are to be open, if it is lawful to go into them and eat, why should it be unlawful for them to drink? Drink produces no worse effect on Sunday than on other days. People that drink on six days want to drink on the