

gling are urged and admitted, it must not be forgotten that the illicit traffic is now carried on ; and that a totally prohibitory law would be less liable to evasion than a system only partially prohibitory. The evidence would be simple, for the offending article in most cases would testify to its own conviction, and the condemnation be easy and certain. Obstacles that now obstruct conviction would disappear ; reluctant witnesses would no longer require to be discovered and forced forward—nor justice be defeated by their evasions, or by refined technicalities on trials.

*Secondly*,—The law would be universal, and would emanate from the highest source, and that a Representative Legislature. Now, neighbouring counties are governed on contradictory principles, enforced by authorities of feebleness of influence, and over which the masses of the people have little control.

*Thirdly*,—The injurious effects on the popular mind of the license system would be removed—a legal sanction to sell, granted to a few for a pecuniary consideration, must place the trade in a false aspect, and entrench it against assaults aimed at its moral character and effects.

So strongly is this sentiment entertained by some of the committee, as to induce the belief that the experiment can never fairly be tested, of “moral suasion” against the drinking habits, while the license system continues ; and that if moral power and not legal coercion, must be the instrument of conflict, there must be a free field on which the seller of intoxicating drinks shall stand alike unprivileged and unrestricted, as the seller of flour, of opium, or of arsenic.

*Fourthly*,—There seems no alternative but in coercive action. Looking at the progress of the cause for twenty years, while we rejoice that large portions of the