

*prohibiting the sale.* For this reason, my lords, they have petitioned that none of this delicious poison should be imported from Britain: they have desired us to confine this fountain of wickedness and misery to our own country, without pouring upon them those inundations of debauchery by which we are ourselves overflowed."

At a later date, 1754, Stephen Hales, D.D., Clerk of the Closet to H.R.H. the then Prince of Wales, wrote as follows: "Now, since it is found, by long experience, extremely difficult for the unhappy habitual dram drinkers to extricate themselves from this prevailing vice, so much the more it becomes the duty of the governors of the nation to withhold from them so irresistible a temptation."

In more recent times, that distinguished jurist, Lord Brougham, has thus expressed his opinion on the constitutionality of prohibition: "Intemperance," he says, "is the common enemy. The philanthropist has no more sacred duty than to mitigate, if he cannot remove, this enormous evil. The lawgiver is imperatively bound to lend his aid, when it appears manifest that no palliatives can avail. Certainly we have the example of the United States to prove that repression is practicable, and their experience to guide us toward it."

Mr. Stansfield, the late Finance Secretary of Her Majesty's Government, said at Bristol, "that it was the intention of Mr. Gladstone's ministry, at the earliest possible period, to deal in a bold and comprehensive manner with the licensing system, in order to check and diminish the facilities and the temptations to drink." Mr. Gladstone himself, in the debate on the Sunday Closing Bill, stigmatized the drinking habits of Great Britain as "one of the greatest scandals, disgraces, and misfortunes of the country." In the same debate, Mr. Thomas Hughes said the House should not go against the religious and respectable portion of the community in their demand for the restriction of the traffic, and in favour of the drunken and dissolute, by leaving it unrestrained.