

taken into account not merely the direct returns upon the labor and capital employed in its manufacture; there is the sum total of the economic services rendered by the plow as long as it is used in farming. Indeed, it is really by anticipating, or discounting, these in part that the manufacturing process receives its direct return. The plow pays for itself by economic service.

Very different is the case of an instrument of destruction—say, a field gun. It is true that capital and labor get their direct returns in its making; but, the completed article destroys instead of adds to wealth, or to mankind's wealth-producing power. Therefore whatever gain comes to the world of trade from its manufacture and sale must have reckoned against it the later waste directly or indirectly caused—and the net result is apt to be very much minus.

Again, suppose twenty thousand dollars to be spent in building an incinerator for the sole purpose of burning up some thousands of bushels of perfectly good grain each year—the ashes being dumped around the city in such a way as to interfere materially with its cleanliness and the community's comfort. Would it be possible to find final economic justification for this whole process on the grounds that the farmer was duly paid for his grain, the manufacturer for his bricks, the mine operator for his coal, the railroad for its transportation, the brick-layer, the furnace stoker and others for their labour—even supposing the resultant ashes were no worse than merely useless?

In place of the suppositious grain incinerator, consider the economic processes connected with a distillery or brewery. Is its output from use of grain and other raw materials better or worse than ashes—from the whole public's standpoint? It is not necessary to take the extremist's view, that absolutely no benefit or legitimate enjoyment results from the drinking of whisky or beer. But who is bold enough to assert that the harm wrought in a community does not vastly outweigh benefits derived therefrom—and does not overbalance also the trade contributions of the manufacturing and distributing processes? Especially when it is considered that—after some temporary business dislocation—the capital and labour used could be turned ultimately to more productive service.

The last official Dominion census indicates that for every million dollars of capital invested in the manufacturing of intoxicants, under \$55,000 is paid annually in wages. A similar amount of capital employed in the making of bread, etc., involves the paying of practically four times that amount in wages—while in the making of clothing a corresponding investment results in wage payments of about \$525,000, or a showing almost tenfold that of the liquor business. For every million dollars invested in the making of liquor, Dominion official census figures show 87 employees. For other manufacturing processes the comparative figures are: iron and steel 302, bread, etc., 523, boots and shoes, 684, clothing 1,239.

This, I think, goes far to prove that from an economic standpoint the manufacture of liquor is not an advantage, far from it, that it is more to be considered as a bane to the country.

I come to another phase of the question, to which I alluded a moment ago. Parliament has discussed this question many

[Mr. Marcell.]

times—in 1884, on a motion of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), in 1889, and in 1892. Parliament never voted down a resolution in favour of prohibition, but it has adopted that resolution on three different occasions—of course, with a rider added to it; that the resolution should be given effect to only when it had been adopted by the people. The resolution is as follows, and it contains, I think, all the arguments necessary to support its adoption:

That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good, and by equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

That the traffic in alcoholic liquors as beverages is productive of serious injury to the moral, social and industrial welfare of the people of Canada.

That despite all preceding legislation, the evils of intemperance remain so vast in magnitude, so wide in extent, and so destructive in effect, as to constitute a social peril and a national menace.

That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

On the motion of Mr. Thomas White, the resolution was amended by adding the following words:

And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada.

This amendment was adopted by 124 votes against 40. In 1898, the administration of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave effect to the wishes of the people by calling for a Dominion referendum on the subject of prohibition. I am sorry to say that on that occasion the people of Canada did not seem to have attached to the question the importance which they attach to it to-day. But Canada was not then face to face with the conditions which now confront us. Not more than half the voters cast their ballots in this referendum. A summary of the voting on that occasion is as follows:

Ontario—	
For prohibition	154,498
Against prohibition	115,284
Majority for prohibition.	39,214
Quebec—	
For	28,436
Against	122,750
Majority against	94,324