

least may be made. For instance, the consumption of intoxicating liquors in England, according to Mr. Hoyle, the author previously quoted, and Leone Levi, another eminent statistician, amounted, in 1872, to 130,000,000^l, or nearly \$20 per head. In the United States, according to Commissioner Wells, than whom there can be no better authority, in 1870 it amounted to \$1,463,000,000, or nearly \$40 per head. It is also generally held that the consumer, taking the dilution of the liquors into consideration, and the large profits made by the retail dealer, pays for his drink five times the amount of the duty. This estimation—and I am sure you will consider it a very reasonable one—would give the sum of \$25,000,000 as the capital absorbed in Canada by the liquor traffic, or about an average of \$6 per head. Now, sir, the argument is this—that this capital absorbs only the labor of 2,000 persons as manufacturers, or, if you choose, you may add the retailers as well, which would make 14,000 in all, whereas the same capital expended in any other way would absorb the labor of over 50,000 persons, at the wages of \$10 per week. Did the workingmen of this country but realize what an enormous advantage would accrue to their interests by the diversion of this large amount of capital to other industries, they would certainly sustain and encourage any movement for the overthrow of this enemy of national industry.

From what has been now said in regard to the destructive character of the liquor traffic, it must be evident to the House that it is a very doubtful source of revenue to the country. It is known to every reader of political economy that revenue is but a tax on the surplus wealth of the people. Then, if any trade has a tendency to diminish this wealth, it destroys that from which alone revenue can be derived, and by destroying the tree destroys the fruit. But even if the traffic were productive of revenue, the cost of collection is so great that we could hesitate before we consented to accept it on such grounds. Let us see what that cost is. In the first place there is the cost to the Department, which might fairly be put at \$100,000. Next, there is the sacrifice of one-tenth of the industrial energy of the country. What this amounts to may be fairly estimated on the following grounds: The industrial energy of a people is seen in the amount of the goods they produce over and above what they consume. This production is seen annually in the exports of the country. Last year the exports of Canada, that is the production of her one million laborers, amounted to \$90,610,573, or an average surplus production of \$90 to each laborer. Then the loss on 100,000 laborers would be \$9,000,000. Then we have the annual sacrifice of at least 4,000 lives, or one-tenth of one per cent. In England the loss is put at 60,000 annually, or one out of every 650 inhabitants. Now these lives represent, according to the statement made in the House by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), while speaking on another subject, a cash value to the country of \$1,500 each, or an aggregate of \$6,000,000. Then we have the amount spent on liquors already put at \$25,000,000—this, of course, includes the cost of the material consumed in the manufacture of these liquors. Then we have the cost of the administration of justice; the maintenance of police force; the payment of police magistrates, jurors and other officials; the interest on the capital absorbed in prisons and penitentiaries, a certain portion of which is chargeable to the traffic, and which cannot be very easily reduced; and this we pay, all for the sake of the paltry revenue of \$5,000,000.