

As a result of prohibition there are forty-eight counties which did not send a prisoner to the penitentiary and eighty-seven counties that did not send an insane patient to the asylums last year; more than a dozen Kansas counties have not called a jury in ten years to try a criminal case; fifty-three counties were without paupers in their alms-houses.

The Kansas death rate is the lowest in the world— $7\frac{1}{2}$  for each 1,000 persons; there are more students in the Kansas colleges and universities in proportion to population than any other state in the Union; the bank deposits in ten years have increased from \$100,000,000 to more than \$200,000,000. Kansas, with a population of a million and three-quarters, has as much wealth as Chicago with a population of two and one-half million, and the per capita wealth of Kansas is the greatest of any state in the Union—approximately \$1,700 for every man, woman and child in the state.

The annual expenditure for liquor has been reduced from \$21 per capita, the average in the United States, to \$1.25 in Kansas; illiteracy among Kansas people has been reduced to two per cent—the lowest in the United States.

The value of the field, orchard and live stock crops for 1914 was 638 million dollars. I do not claim that the prohibitory law is the sole cause of this great agricultural wealth, but surely this wealth is evidence that prohibition does not destroy business and the property of the state. The state of Kansas has no bonded debt except \$370,000 held by the Kansas school fund.

As a matter of fact, there is no sound argument against prohibition, either moral or economic, not even the argument that it increases taxes, which it does not do. The taxes in Topeka are just about the average of cities in the Middle West, many of which get a large revenue from saloon licenses.

The attacks on prohibition in Kansas are simply the false representations of that enemy of the home, the church, and the state—the saloon power.

National prohibition is coming and Kansas and her people are ready to take the lead in the fight.

(Signed) Arthur Capper,  
Governor.

I have read Governor Capper's communication and heartily concur in all that he says.

(Signed) S. M. Brewster,  
Attorney General.

I do not intend to refer at any greater length to Kansas, but here is a State which adjoins part of our western country, and in which prohibition has been tried; I refer to North Dakota. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read an extract relating to that State in order that Canadians may know what is going on alongside their border. Here is a statement by Judge Charles A. Pollock, in the *Christian Advocate*, a publication of the highest standing. Judge Pollock has been presiding judge of the district court for nineteen years. This is what he said:

When prohibition was adopted in North Dakota we had a population of about 180,000. It was urged that if the prohibitory system was

engrafted upon our statute book the state would not develop. This statement, like others from the saloon source, has been shown to be untrue. We now have a population of about 700,000, and the per capita wealth of our people is approximately \$2,000—the highest of any state in the Union. South Dakota, when admitted to the Union, had something like 250,000 inhabitants. After having had prohibition for four or five years it returned to the license system. That state now has a population of less than 600,000.

With us as the saloon interests decrease in a community the banks and trust companies increase. The last reports from our banking interests show a constant and healthy development, the aggregate deposits mounting up into the millions. Statements of the banks in Fargo alone show an aggregate of about \$10,000,000. Fargo has grown from a city of 6,000 under the license system to one of 20,000 under the prohibitory. It has all modern improvements—like heat, water works, paved streets, street cars, electric lights and every convenience attendant upon city life.

Many of those who were most bitterly opposed to prohibition have been won over and are now planted firmly upon the side of the present system, convinced, it is true, against their will, but now firm in their new position because they cannot put aside what they see and know to have been fully demonstrated. They have in a large number of cases been manly enough to step forward and give utterance to the unshaken faith which they now possess. They declare that under no considerations ought we to permit the saloon to return to our borders. I have the written statement of most of our leading business men, speaking from their special viewpoint of the beneficial effects of prohibition. Many of them were determined opposers of prohibition when it was adopted.

Under these conditions it is the height of impudence for the liquor men to assert that our law has been a failure, and, therefore, we ought to cause its repeal. If it is a failure, it is because liquor has been sold in larger quantities, and if that be true the vendors of such liquor do violence to their own interests by attempting to destroy such a valuable field in which to carry on their traffic.

I do not need to quote any more on that point, because I think that is a very good statement of the case. The United States affords us in some of its States an example of the results of prohibition. These should not debar us from doing what we think ought to be done under the circumstances and for the very special reasons that we have to contend with. Mention was made this afternoon by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) of what Russia had done. I shall not refer to Russia, because that country has witnessed the greatest change of all time, so far as the liquor question is concerned. The people of this country have a particular interest in the problem outside of what has happened in Great Britain, to which I shall refer in a moment. There is France, the land of the vintage, the land of liqueurs,