

established or carried out in good faith and with thorough and persistent determination? And is it not true that while prohibition has not perfectly prohibited, yet it has largely curtailed the liquor traffic and liquor habit? We believe that facts will demonstrate it has done both.

We cite as a witness Judge John H. Stiness, of the Supreme Court of Rhode Island, who has had ample opportunities of testing the effects of prohibition in that State. He writes to a Boston friend:

"Prohibition went into effect July 1, 1886. During the first six months the result was almost magical."

He quotes as follows from the *Providence Journal* which was opposed to prohibition:

"Throughout the State the public saloon is reported unknown. This, of course, is a very decided gain. The temptations placed in the way of the young and heedless by open bar-rooms at every corner have been removed, and, in consequence, taking the State as a whole, there was a remarkable falling off in drunkenness and cognate offenses during the last six months of 1886, as compared with the corresponding period of 1885."

This is good testimony to its public effects. The Judge adds:

"At the close of the first year of prohibition the police records of Providence showed the following reduction in arrests as compared with the previous year: Total arrests for all causes, 33 per cent. reduction; minors, 36 per cent. reduction; assaults, 21 per cent. reduction; revelling and disorderly conduct, 38 per cent. reduction; drunkenness, 37 per cent. reduction; common drunkards, 54 per cent. reduction. The favorable condition of things indicated above still continues in a large part of the State."

"Newport shows a decrease of 20 per cent. and of women 50 per cent. In addition to this there have been no startling tragedies or disturbances from liquor saloons and less drunkenness on the streets. In the last three years of license the volume of business, as shown by bank clearings, decreased \$21,000,000, and during the last three years has increased \$32,000,000. Depositors in savings banks have increased 100 per cent over the gain in the last three years of license, and taxable property in Providence in the three prohibition years has increased \$11,500,000."

Judge Stiness shows that in counties where there are vigorous prosecuting officers, saloons that defied the law have been effectually broken up, while in some of the larger towns Providence included, through the packing of primary meetings and otherwise, "the liquor element secured political control," and no effort was made for more than a year

to efficiently enforce the law. It is in such places that prohibition is declared to be a failure. And yet for all that it appears that the restraints of the law, though so poorly applied there, have had some good results. He says:

"For the last four years of license the average number of warrants issued annually by the police courts of Providence for drunkenness, revelling, etc., was 4802. The average for the last two years under prohibition, not enforced, has been 3892, or a decrease of 910 per year. Making no account of increase in population, arrests for drunkenness in 1888 were 7½ per cent. less than in 1885, the last year of license. A comparison of the same years in Boston, under high license, shows an increase of 49 per cent. more in 1888 than in 1885."

It seems that the effort to repeal the prohibition provisions comes from professional politicians of both parties, whose operations are very much hampered by the closing of the saloons. These with parties directly in the liquor interest are laboring diligently to undo the work which has resulted so favorably during the past three years. The fact that prohibition operates against individuals of that ilk is additional evidence in its favor.

The closing of saloons, the placing under the ban of the law places where dram-selling is a business and where dram-drinking is a legalized standing temptation, must be viewed by liquor opponents as a big step towards its suppression. There are a few places where prohibition is really the rule, and they are invariably places where peace and order prevail and the common vices of civilization are rarely to be seen. Colorado Springs is an example. Many small Utah towns may be placed in the same category. And where both prohibition and the license system have been tried alternately, the proofs are clear that the former is greatly preventive of crime and strongly promotive of public order. However, the course of wisdom is that which will lead to the best results. And this may not be the same in different places. Unless there is an overpowering predominance of public sentiment in a town or county in favor of prohibition, it cannot be made practicable. It will be the same where, notwithstanding an expressed desire to restrain the liquor traffic, the disposition prevails to make it a source of public revenue. In such places high license will best regulate that which cannot be suppressed.

And, after all, the true field of the advocates of abstinence is in the

sphere of social humanity rather than in the halls of legislation. The evils of intemperance, the benefits of sobriety, the strength of an emancipated or unenslaved brain and body, the joys of a social condition where inebriety is absent, may all be made clear to rational human beings. And by education and aiding the weak whose will-power fails in the presence of temptation, more will be accomplished in the right direction than by repressive enactments, that stir up resistance in the souls of the undisciplined, and provoke antagonism in the breasts of the pugnacious.

The entire suppression of liquor-making and liquor-selling will be well nigh impossible while the appetite for alcohol so largely exists among mankind. But its restriction and regulation may be rightfully the subjects of legislation, and the teacher, the philanthropist, the evangelist and the schoolmaster must do the rest. They should work diligently by precept, example and influence to hasten the day when prohibitory laws will be needless, because the world will have been delivered from the greatest and most monstrous tyrant of the ages, the demoralizing and insensate craving for the fluid that destroys when it exhilarates, brutalizes while it stimulates and degrades while it seems to exalt.

In the face of these facts, whatever may be said of the impropriety of enforced prohibition in a popular government and a land of liberty, let it not be argued that prohibition should not be established because it does not prohibit. For, in the first place, no law entirely suppresses the crime against which it is enacted; and, in the second place, prohibition can be made to prohibit to a very large extent, and that is only limited in any locality by the true sentiment of its people, and by the means exerted to execute in practice the laws printed upon paper. Prohibition has in no case proven entirely a failure.

#### OUT OF HIS OWN MOUTH.

AN article appeared in one of our late issues, showing that the "Mormon" Church is neither lawless nor tyrannical. It was written in reply to appeals from the organ of the obstructionists here for some young man to come out and proclaim that "no true religion imposed any obligation to fight the just laws of the republic," and "while declaring full faith in his