

the most influential of English periodicals, which had said this:

We must economize, and the only great national economy open to us is the cutting off, root and branch, of our expenditure on intoxicants. If we do not, our waste on the non-necessity of alcohol will undo us even more surely than the force and brand of Germany and Austria.

If we mean to win the war, we must prohibit the use of intoxicants in order to save money and get more munitions. * * * The sellers of intoxicants warn the nation off their preserves. Yet the ministers know as well as we do that the only great saving attainable would be from prohibition.

Commenting on these utterances, the Toronto Globe calls for legislation both provincial and Dominion, in a very strong editorial, in which are the following paragraphs:

Let the King's ministers, in Ottawa as at Westminster, note that word. Its meaning is as large, its alternative of failure as perilous, and the imperative of its "must" as uncompromising for Canada as for Britain. What answer has the Dominion Government, what answer can it have, to the protest, in these war times, that last year 275,000,000 pounds of foodstuffs were destroyed in the distilleries and breweries of Canada in order to produce some 66,000,000 gallons of intoxicating liquors with an estimated value of more than \$103,000,000? The most authoritative voice in the journalism of British respectability calls out for what? For "prohibition during the war." Will the King's ministers at Ottawa listen?

I shall now quote a few lines from a lecture delivered by Professor Cudmore, the professor of economics in the University of Toronto. This lecture was delivered before the Royal Canadian Institute and in it he described the position of Canada, from an economic point of view, at the present time, and pictured what it would be in a year or two. He said:

Canada should save at least \$500,000,000 a year during the war to hold up her end of the financial burden. The economy of the British people will have to be extended to Canada as well. Instead of expecting money from England to finance our munitions industry Canadian capital should be used to relieve the mother country of the additional strain. The \$100,000,000 loan raised last November was just a small part of what Canada will have to do. By cutting down the luxuries and by rigid economy Canada's national saving should be increased from \$200,000,000 to a sum two and a half times that size.

This great issue has also been summarized very briefly by the Pioneer, the organ of the temperance organizations in the province of Ontario, and I shall give the summary to the House. It reads:

The biggest question in Canadian politics to-day is the question of the liquor traffic. The remedying of the evils of intemperance would

be the greatest boon that any legislative body could confer upon the country.

To set the powers, and purposes, and resources of this country free to grapple with other social problems, the settlement of the liquor question is necessary; because the drink traffic stands in the way of every progressive movement, and while it is approved by law it will be an influence for evil in every department of life with which it comes in contact.

By it religious work is handicapped, domestic happiness is impaired, poverty is induced, crime is promoted, political life is corrupted, honest business is defrauded, and physical and mental efficiency is lessened, to the loss of the nation as a whole, and the ruin of thousands of individuals who otherwise would be self-supporting citizens and a strength to the nation, but who are now miserable parasites, a weakness and a discredit to the community of which they form a part.

Since we are taking up this question chiefly as an economic question, I wish to quote from Canadian Finance, a newspaper published in Winnipeg, a few observations on the economics of prohibition. This paper said:

A question that many are looking at from a new angle in days of war is that of the liquor traffic. Even those who heretofore have held out for non-interference with what the individual puts down his own throat, are asking whether the community burden of the drink habit should not be sloughed off by the majority's will. That Great Britain has temporized in its dealing with so deeprooted a problem—despite acute experience of its drag upon national efficiency in time of stress—need not necessarily deter a younger country from more radical treatment.

It is not to be denied that many individuals and some lines of trade will be acutely disturbed by ending the liquor trade as an organized business. But the liquor interests attempt an impossible task when they seek to prove that the net economic result of banishing their trade would not be a gain to the community as a whole.

The ending of the war will badly dislocate the business of manufacturing munitions in Great Britain—will leave much plant and equipment idle if not useless, and put thousands of men to the necessity of seeking other work. Yet what manufacturer of munitions, however seized with the importance of war profits, could delude himself by thinking it possible to delude the public into believing its economic well dependent upon the war's continuance.

From the viewpoint of national economics there are two possible kinds of manufacturing. The first is where the joint employment of labor and capital results in commodities which contribute in turn directly or indirectly to further production—whether they be machinery for factories, partially worked materials for more finished products, food and clothing for workers, or even luxuries contributing to the healthful enjoyment of life. (Happiness has a more real place in economics than some of the schoolmen would have us believe.) The second kind of manufacturing is where the labor and capital together bring forth that which conduces to waste or actual destruction.

In considering the effect to the world of business of making a plow, there are to be