

and leads to conditions that help spiritually. This may be true of right kind of laws, but surely not of laws that are paternal; that step in and interfere with men's personal and private liberty. Laws are all right when they protect the liberties of all, but not when they interfere with the individual in his private capacity as a free and independent soul.

But the three arguments on which the greatest stress is laid are, that Prohibition would protect the young, that the curse and ruin of drunkenness would be removed and that the citizens of the State, which licenses liquor-selling, are thereby co-partners in the business. In regard to the young we should aim to expand and develop the individual. Christianity demands self-control. Ignorance is neither innocence nor strength. The laws already protect the young if enforced. Liquor-drinking is now confined to a few known places, whereas under Prohibition ardent spirits would be sold everywhere on the sly and in contempt of the law. Such general sale it would be impossible to guard against. Drunkenness is a great evil that no one likes to see, but evil has always existed and this one will perpetuate itself with greater or less vitality as long as men are uneducated in sound principles and untrained in self-control. Evil is one of the mysteries of the world, the reasons for the existence of which have never been explained. Certainly Prohibition has never succeeded in annihilating drunkenness. The argument in regard to licenses is just as weak as the others. Licensing liquor-selling does not create an evil, but confines and restrains one that has always existed and which there is little hope of completely eradicating; and most certainly not by means of prohibitive legislation. The right to license does not give the right to prohibit, as is proven in the case of license to marry.

In conclusion, it is most important that the citizens of