

church. It shows that in wet Rhode Island 54 per cent. of the people belong to church—assemble every week to worship their God according to the dictates of their conscience. These same figures show that in dry, prohibition Maine and Kansas less than 30 per cent. of the people belong to church. Why? Because of the inconsistency manifested by the advocates of prohibition, their unfairness, their bigotry. Why, we were to have a man sing from this platform today, he was forbidden to sing here, if he did not want to ruin his chances in the future. That is what drives men away; that is the spirit of prohibition; it is contrary to liberty and it is a menace to religion itself. Men object to going to church week after week in order to be lambasted and hammered over the head with a prohibition club, with this eternal talk about robbing them of their personal liberty. That is one reason why they drift away.

These records cannot be successfully disputed. If I quote any records here this afternoon, and any of you can show that they are spurious, or that I have misrepresented the proposition, I will donate \$1,000 to the dry organization in Ottawa.

Oh, they say prohibition is not involved in this campaign. There is nothing else involved but prohibition, not altogether out in the open but behind batteries. This fight for license reduction in Ottawa is simply a battle in the war for prohibition, that is all. It is a war for prohibition these people are engaged in, and this is one of the battles. If they win this, then, as one of the orators said the other night, in three years they will abolish all licenses.

I might argue this afternoon that it would be impolitic and unwise to abolish 29 licenses in this city because they pay in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 annually to your Government, but that is a dollar argument. You may say, it is a sordid argument. Yet in a sense it is legitimate.

I might stand here and say it would be unfair to the hotel men who lose, because without their bar they would have to put up the price of their service to the people, and they could not compete with the few who retained their licenses, and if they could not compete, they would have to go out of business, have to go into bankruptcy and ruin. I could say that it would be unfair to the people of Canada who are compelled to come to their beautiful capital year after year. It would be unfair, when they came here, not to find adequate hotel accommodation. You might say that that is a selfish argument. All right. Let it stand for what it is worth. I might argue and prove to you that there are not too many licenses in Ottawa today. The men who are engaged in the business are not asking for a reduction. Only the paid or official agitator is asking for this reduction, and he is doing so because he is a champion of prohibition, and hopes to cripple the liquor business here by turning the friends of these 29 who lose into allies of the prohibition movement, who will go out and do for revenge more than they would do for love or for money. This is simply a trick, it is a scheme; it is a plot. They are trying to hide their purpose, but we propose to take the mask off today, and let you see them as they are.

These are sordid or material things, but listen. The big question, the dominant question is simply this: Is prohibition right in principle? Is it Christian in character? Is it effective as a remedy for drunkenness? As honest men, you cannot afford to stand for a thing that is wrong in principle. As Christians, you cannot afford to stand for a thing that is un-Christian in character. As temperance people, you cannot afford to peddle a quack remedy for drunkenness.

Now to the law and the gospel. Now for the real test of prohibition in the field of reason and logic and facts. Prohibition is wrong in principle, because it cannot be reconciled with reason. It is unreasonable, ladies and gentlemen, to prohibit anything the use of which is proper, but the abuse of which may result in evil. People abuse the use of money, but it would be wrong in principle to abolish its use. People abuse the right of free speech, but it would be wrong in principle to abolish that right. People abuse the right to gratify natural passions. Yet it would be wrong and fatal to the human race to prohibit their use. I want to say to you that the man does not live who can appeal to reason in the name of prohibition.

You take a boat ride, drown somebody. It is sad. Funeral. Orphan children. Widow. We are all sorry, but what is the remedy. Why, prohibit everybody from taking a boat ride, of course? No, you won't, because that would be unreasonable. A man dissipates his fortune in riotous living, loses his money. You are his friend. You go into court and you have a conservator appointed for that man. You do not ask the court to appoint a conservator for everybody in town. Why? Because that would be unreasonable. A man gets sick and