

LICENSE RESTRICTION IN CANADA.

Let us come home and inquire how license restricts in our Dominion. Think of \$37,885,528 wasted every year on strong drink. This means \$7.85 *per capita* or \$40 for every family in the Dominion. And what are the returns for this vast outlay? The answer from ocean to ocean is one wail of bad ! bad ! evil and only evil and that continually.

From an official document entitled "Crime in Canada," just issued by Mr. Johnson, Dominion Statistician, we learn that there have been in Canada for the ten years ending with 1891, no less than 348,462 convictions for crime of all kinds, making an average of 34,846 per year. The number of convictions for 1892 amounted to 34,997. In regard to the drinking habits of these convicts the document is well worthy of consideration. Here is the showing :

	Per cent.
Moderate drinkers.....	47
Immoderate "	40
Others (supposed abstainers)....	13

This simply means that eighty-seven of every hundred convicted are drinkers, either moderate or immoderate, while the other thirteen are total abstainers. Such is the restriction of license in this Dominion ; and I submit if, in all earnestness, we ought not to pray, "from such restrictions, good Lord deliver us."

Take the Province of Ontario. How does license restrict? We give the an-

swer in the words of our Premier, Sir Oliver Mowat. His answer is : "An enormous proportion, probably three-fourths, of the vice which prevails at the present day, of the crime which they had to contend with, of the lunacy, the idiocy, the poverty, and the misery of every kind was owing to the foul evil of intemperance." No intelligent, impartial observer will doubt the correctness of Sir Oliver's judgment in this matter. Last year there were 2,736 persons imprisoned for drunkenness in the various county jails of our Province. Think of the desolate homes, the broken hearts, the diseased bodies and the ruined souls caused by 3,464 licensed liquor selling places of Ontario, then ask yourself, should a system be legalized and perpetuated by the votes of a Christian people? What are the church members thinking about anyway? Could lying hypocrisy go further than for a man to say—"I am a Christian ; God has saved me ;" and then go arm in arm, with the rum seller, and vote for that which the churches declare "Contrary to the Word of God" and which our Premier says produces "three-fourths of all the crime, lunacy, idiocy, poverty and misery in the community." License, high and low, has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. It is wrong in principle, it is an utter failure in application. What then, shall we give up in despair? No, God forbid.