

they not infringements of the abstract rights and privileges of individuals? Yes, it is answered, but the safety and well-being of the community demand such an interference. That is just my position. Governmental authority ought to remove, as nuisances, whatever is injurious to the public interest; and hence, *it ought not to patronize and nurture the grog-shop, the greatest nuisance of them all.*

Judged by its effects, this abominable traffic will be found to have a blacker character than is at all common in the annals of human wickedness. Diversity of opinion in regard to these evils is now out of the question. They are too numerous and momentous to be overlooked by any one, however careless and prejudiced. I turn the tables on the whiskey advocates and say,—no government has a right to license and protect that which has demoralized more young men, wasted more property, beggared more families, destroyed more health, blighted more hopes, crushed more hearts, filled more premature graves, and ruined more souls, than any other evil that is desolating our earth. Widowhood, orphanage, humanity, implore prohibition; how can the Legislature withhold the boon and be guiltless?

Rights, indeed! Who gave any one a right to drink what will dethrone reason and turn the man of mighty intellect into a fool;—nay, worse, make him the jibe and derision of fools! Who gave any one authority to spend his money for that which will keep his children in rags and ignorance, and allow them to grow up, candidates for the prison or the gallows? Has any one a right to use that which will entail the deepest misery on those who love him best, and turn his own last resting place into the dishonored grave of the drunkard? No man has a right to make himself a living, walking, withering curse to all who are connected with him. And no man has a right to follow a business that so frequently brings lasting injury upon those engaged in it, and that is most certainly scattering irreparable ruin around him. Nor can any license law confer upon him such a right, in the estimate of the great Judge.

We are charged, I am aware, with exaggerating the mischievous effects of the traffic. It is true many of its evils have been dragged to the light which formerly passed unnoticed. But every reflecting mind must know that the half has not been told. Exaggerate! No. When we break the seal of silence in regard to the unrelenting past, the shrieks and groans of a million victims come back, as a wail upon the night winds, to testify that we have not exaggerated. The stifled sobs and tears of the wretched outcasts around us declare that the evil cannot be overrated. And when the echoing trump of the last morning shall sound, and the destinies of the human family shall be finally fixed; when the accumulated storm of retribution begins to sweep and howl over the livid lake—then will intelligent beings, throughout the universe, feel and know, that on yonder earth, the magnitude of the evils entailed by the traffic in strong drink, had never been at all realized, much less exaggerated.

Then it is said: "A large amount of capital is employed in the manufacture and sale of liquor, and a prohibitory law would be an injury to those engaged in the business." That is not by any means a settled point. Such a law might be the means of saving themselves or some members of their families, from the fangs of that destroyer which they have been setting loose upon others; and it would compel them to enter some other field of human enterprise in which they would be happier themselves, and might become useful, respectable members of society. But suppose it would result in a financial loss to distillers and tavern-keepers, they might very properly look on that loss as an instance of retributive justice, for the penury and misery which they