

hilated, but," continues he, "traders rejoiced to find how vast was the increase in popular expenditure in articles of food or clothing, or of home and personal comfort." In 1838 the Irish revenue from distilled liquors was £1,434,573. In 1841 that revenue had fallen to £864,726. But the general revenue from customs increased from £1,691,515 in 1838 to £2 030,159 in 1841; and by 1845 this revenue had become £2,126,149. These figures are authoritative, and were quoted on May 7th, 1894, in our House of Commons by T. B. Flint, M.P. What took place in Ireland would take place in Canada under Prohibition—an increase of revenue.

### **Testimony of Some of Our Leading Statesmen.**

While the opponents of prohibition tell us that the prohibition of the liquor traffic would increase our taxation, our Finance Ministers since Confederation, and others who are the best informed of our public men, have no fear of that kind.

**SIR WILFRID LAURIER**, Premier of our Dominion, said in Parliament, during the debate on the Plebiscite, on May 3rd, 1898:

"It has been stated that if we were to pass a prohibitory liquor law there must be additional taxation. I do not think the phrase is an apt one. There should not be additional taxation, because taxation has always to be governed by the necessities of the revenue, but there must be a displacement of taxation. The Minister of Revenue will have to provide other sources of revenue."

**HON. GEO. E. FOSTER**, ex-Minister of Finance, said on the same occasion:

"I am ready to vote for prohibition and to pay my share of whatever taxes are necessary, direct or indirect, in order to make up the revenue, and my belief is strong that if you can make prohibition effective it would be a great saving to the people, there would be greater prosperity in the end and greater revenue would come."