

also religionists, and a host of others too numerous to mention, who are incessantly seeking the reformation of inebriates by prayers, establishments of missions, etc.

It is certainly true, as the pro-liquor advocates claim, that the liquor business is no more illegitimately conducted than most of our other commercial pursuits. It is also true that alcoholic beverages are mainly consumed as luxuries. Nor can it be denied that high license is of great beneficency. So too are we unable to deny that moral suasion has been of some use in certain individual instances. Still there is much in the doctrines of each and all of those advocates to which we are forced to take exception.

If the State is not to interfere with the management of the liquor traffic, because in doing so it may curtail, as the pro-liquor element put it, their liberty, it will have to take "hands off" so to speak, of almost everything within the domain of human conduct. The worst criminal could use the identical argument with the same amount of logic. "What right has the state to interfere with my private affairs, it is a curtailment of individual liberty," -- might he well argue. Again, should the State endeavor to do away with the entire liquor business, it is reasonable to expect that by doing so, the State will not only become tyrannical and involved in the destruction of private property, but will really "beat its own head against the wall. For, an absolute prohibition of liquor at the present time is bound to make men more persistent to use it. Stolen fruits are always sweet. Again the high license method, while it may sometimes be an improvement, often encourages ardent efforts on the part of the liquor men to become potent. So too, government monopolies are more often a failure than a success. Take for instance Russia as an illustration. There it is in vogue more or less, yet there are not the least signs of the decrease of drinking. So too, religious workers have never been of much effective service, as Mr. Augustin Abbott in his "Necessity for Medical Supervision of Criminal Arrests", read before the Medico Legal Congress, September, 1895, rightly said: "Moral suasion has been tried and though it may have prevented much and cured some individual cases, it fails to accomplish the service which the community needs."

The same author concludes the paragraph by asking: "Is it not time now that scientific suasion should be tried?" This query must be answered in the affirmative, for it is indeed scientific suasion and scientific suasion only that could lead us to the proper solution of this much-vexed problem. Science and Science alone, "can instruct the community how to deal with it by measures directed towards diminishing the sources. It would be futile in the present state of public opinion to propose measures for prophylactic treatment of crime, but is it premature to propose such measures in a practical form in respect to dealing with inebriety?"

The last sentence is a question put by Prof. Abbott. In answering the same we would state that it is *not* altogether premature to propose measures for prophylactic treatment of crime, much less is it to propose such measures in a practical form in respect to dealing with inebriety. The main remedy is beyond question in the nature of a prophylaxis.