

this question has continued there since 1845. In that year the State of Maine adopted prohibition and has maintained it ever since. It must be remembered that in the United States national prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of liquor has never been adopted by the Federal authority, and under the Interstate Commerce law liquor can be forwarded from one state to another. Therefore prohibition has never had a fair and complete trial in the United States as it would in this country were prohibition adopted by this Parliament, because the root of the whole trouble is the manufacture, importation and distribution of liquor. In the United States on January 1, 1916, no less than 6,800 bar-rooms were closed and seven states went dry. Those states were Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Oregon, South Carolina and Washington. The total population of these seven states is 8,253,993. The conditions in these states have been well described as follows:

**Arkansas:** The new law which goes into force in this State is said to be the most stringent yet enacted in any part of the United States. The penalty for liquor-selling is a year's imprisonment in the State penitentiary. The experience of the people with attempts at violation of county prohibition had made them determined to see that the voice of the people was effectively carried out.

**Colorado:** It is stated that during the last week of 1915 more than \$2,000,000 was expended for intoxicating liquor in Colorado. Besides the saloons set out in the above table there were five breweries in operation which go out of business along with the bars. The city of Denver, which came under the prohibition regime, has a population of 245,423 making it the third largest of the prohibition cities.

**Idaho:** The Idaho prohibitory law is of unusual stringency. It is being attacked at the present time in a suit which is set down for hearing on appeal in the United States Supreme Court. This law provides punishment for the possession even by private citizens of any kind of malt or spirituous liquors.

**Iowa:** Notwithstanding the legal restrictions imposed by existing legislation in Iowa, there were in operation sixteen breweries, with a capitalization of \$4,236,963. There will be no toleration of these so-called industries, and the buildings in which they are housed must be turned to some other use.

**Oregon:** Oregon is a very progressive State. Its natural wealth is vast, and its citizens are exceedingly enterprising. In it the city of Portland takes the second in population among the cities in which the traffic is entirely outlawed. Even drug stores will not be allowed to sell intoxicants for any purpose.

**South Carolina:** As already stated, the dispensary system disappears in this State, in which it practically originated as far as the United States is concerned. The new law allows importation by any person for private use of not more than one gallon of intoxicants per [Mr. Marcil.]

month. There is not much change as authorized dispensaries were very few.

**Washington:** In the extreme north-west of the Republic, lying just south of British Columbia, this big State will by its dryness, help the enforcement of prohibition when it comes in British Columbia. It contains the city of Seattle the largest prohibition urban area, with a population of 313,029. No other State has closed as many bars by going dry. It had also a number of breweries, some of them extensive and prosperous.

**General:** There are now eighteen States under prohibitory law, and the people have voted for prohibition in another, namely, Virginia, in which the change will take place on November 1st next. The dry States are now:

Alabama; Arkansas; Arizona; Colorado; Georgia; Idaho; Iowa; Kansas; Maine; Mississippi; North Carolina; North Dakota; Oklahoma; Oregon; South Carolina; Tennessee; Washington; West Virginia.

Five license States will vote on the question this year—Vermont in March, and California, Michigan, Montana and North Dakota in November.

Campaigning looking to State-wide prohibition also going on in New Mexico, Ohio, Texas, Utah and Wyoming. It is possible that other States than those which have already decided may also vote at the November election. Outside the prohibition States that have been named, there is an immense prohibition territory obtained through the local option method. The question of a national constitutional prohibition amendment is now before Congress. Surely this is a mighty sweep, and a prediction of ultimate and complete success.

In describing the results of the coming into operation of prohibition in the seven States on January 1st, the American Issue said:

"Portland, Oregon, has a population of nearly 300,000—about one-third greater than Columbus, Ohio. Portland, along with the State, became dry January 1st. For the twenty-four hours ending last Monday night, following the closing of saloons on Saturday, not an arrest was made for drunkenness or disorderly conduct. No saloons city in the world of equal size has such a record."

The state of Kansas is often mentioned in connection with prohibition. I do not wish to dwell upon it at length, because members who have at all studied the question of prohibition know that Kansas stands as a shining example of what prohibition may do. Will we be penalizing the people of Canada if we impose prohibition on them for at least three years, during the war and the period of reconstruction following it? Let us see what has been the experience of one of the leading states of the Union. This is an official document, signed by the Governor of the state, and dated the 6th of March, 1915:

Kansas people are stronger for prohibition to-day than ever before. At the end of nearly a generation under prohibition, it may truthfully be said that the prohibitory law of this state was never so well enforced as now, and never so generally approved, nor is the reason for this approval far to seek.