Morning Edition.

London Advertiser

Two Cents Per Copy.

VOL. XXX., NO 305. SATURDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 14, 1893. WHOLE NO. 9698

The Liquor Traffic.

The Dominion Commissioners Meet in This City.

Testimony of City Officials, Liquor Dealers and Temperance Men.

Strong Evidence in Favor of Total Prohibition.

Interesting Statements Regarding the Scott Act.

Liquor Men Say It Helped Their Business, Yet They Worked for Its Repeal—How to Punish Drunkards—Growth of the Temperance Sentiment Emphasized by Facts and Figures.

"The Royal Commission" appointed by the Dominion Government to inquire into and report on the liquor traffic began its sitting in London yesterday morning in the council chamber.

Only two members of the commission are here—Judge McDonald, of Brockville, and E. F. Clarke, M.P.P., of Toronto. There are also present: P. Monohan, of Halifax, secretary of the commission; Mr. J. H. Carson, of Montreal, representing the Dominion Temperance Alliance, and Mr. Horton, stenographer. Sir Joseph Hickson, the chairman, is on his way from Europe; Mr. Gigault, deputy minister of agriculture for Quebec, another member, may be in London before the sitting closes, and Rev. Dr. McLeod, the other absentee, has gone home to Fredericton, N. B. L. P. Kribs, late of the Toronto Empire, who is looking after the interests of the brewers and distillers, was not present.

The commission had summoned the police magistrate, the chief of police, the license inspector, the mayor, the city clerk, and a score of others to give evidence. Only three of these turned up during the morning. In the absence of Sir Joseph Hickson, Judge McDonald is acting chairman and puts the questions. Witnesses are sworn on a copy of the Holy Evangelists by Secretary Monahan.

THE FIRST WITNESS.

The first witness called was the mayor, who was the only one in the room when the commission started. Witness said the city had two breweries largely known all over Canada. This was what might be called an old English town—composed of a great many settlers from the old country; a sober and industrious class.

Q.—Do you believe the number of licensed places here is excessive? A.—We could do with less. I am a prohibitionist. Alcohol should only be used in manufacture, fine arts or medicine.

Witness continuing said he would commit the enforcement of a prohibitory law to both the Dominion and Ontario Governments. The Provincial should assist in carrying out any law passed by the Dominion Government. Yes; he admitted that the loss of revenue occasioned by prohibition would have to be made up in another way. Direct or increased taxation was preferable to the destitution caused by liquor. No; brewers and distillers should have no compensation. When they went into the business they took the same chance for the future as anybody else.

As to the Scott Act in Middlesex, witness thought it had been in a degree beneficial. Hotel-keepers always said that more liquor was sold under the act than ever before, yet why did they always want to get rid of it? The fact that London was centrally situated and that people in the county could easily procure liquor in the city impaired the efficiency of the act in Middlesex more than if no part of the county had been exempted from its operations.

Q.—Have you much poverty in the city? A.—We have some, but in comparison with other cities over the line, very little.

Q.—Can you trace any of this poverty to drink? A.—Yes.

Q.—Has the license law of the Province been improved the last few years? A.—Yes.

Q.—Has not every license enactment of late years been beneficial? A.—Yes.

Witness said some hotels violated the law by selling in prohibited hours and others observed it. Why were the delinquents not punished or their licenses cut off? In the first instance they could often get evidence to prevent a conviction; in the second some license-holders stood in favor, religiously or politically.

Q.—Has the reduction of licenses in London been beneficial? A.—Yes.

Q.—In these reductions have the undesirable places you speak of been the ones to go? A.—Not always. Very often to please the Government the good ones have to go and the poor ones stay.

Q.—Which should go first, the hotel or the saloon? A.—The saloon, where only liquor is sold, by all means.

Q.—The hour of closing has been made earlier here. What is the effect? A.—Simply that those in the habit of drinking have less time in which to drink.

The mayor believed that a prohibitory law could be enforced as well as any other law. In conclusion he invited the commissioners to visit the waterworks before leaving.

LICENSE INSPECTOR HENDERSON.

License Inspector Henderson was the next witness. In reply to questions by Mr. Clarke he gave the history of the liquor traffic in figures since 1876. In that year there were 115 licenses to a population of 19,000. From April 30, 1878, to April 30, 1893, there were 921 liquor cases before the court; convictions in that time, 518; fines, 13,000.

Licenses issued for the year ending April 30, 1887: Hotels 56, saloons 5, shops 21; total, 84. Total receipts for year, $23,494 50; expenses, $1,734 20. Cases before the court, 86; convictions, 56; fines, $1,104.

Licenses issued for year ending April 30, 1888: Hotels 50, saloons 4, shops 19, wholesale 2; total, 75. Receipts, $21,467 58; expenses, $1,771 38. Cases in court, 65; convictions, 44; fines, $1,550.

Licenses issued for year ending April 30, 1889: Hotels 53, saloons 4, shops 14, wholesale 1; total, 72. Receipts, $18,933 83; expenses, $1,293 65. Prosecutions, 39; convictions 23; fines, $572.

Licenses issued for year ending April 30, 1890: Hotels 54, saloons 4, shops 13, wholesales 1; total, 72. Receipts, $18,715; expenses, $1,374 70. Prosecutions, 37; convictions, 19; fines, $410.

Licenses issued for 1891: Hotels 51, saloons 5, shops 12, wholesales 1; total, 69. Receipts, $19,297 76; expenses, $1,657 94. Prosecutions, 75; convictions, 35; fines, $804.

Licenses issued in 1892: Hotels 34, saloons 7, shops 10; total, 51. Receipts, $16,320 63; expenses, $1,432 84. Prosecutions, 36; convictions, 27; fines, $482.

Licenses issued for 1893: Hotels, 29; saloons, 5; shops, 6; wholesales, 3. Receipts, $14,357 50; expenses, $1,533 06. Prosecutions, 30; convictions, 23; fines, $770.

Q.—Do you believe you have more licensed places now than the city requires? A.—I think, as we are situated now, that the number is satisfactory. For the accommodation of the traveling public I don't think we could reduce them much more. No; there was only one saloon where nothing but liquor was sold. The other saloons had restaurants connected with them and supplied meals.

Q.—How do you find the Saturday night and Sunday laws respected? A.—Those laws for the last two years have been better observed than ever before. It had become almost impossible to catch a direct violation himself. One place on Richmond street north of Dundas was notorious for the violation of the Sunday law, but by means of watchers they always escaped the law. He did not know how it was that this man continued to get a license. No; there was not a sale of liquor to minors to any great extent. The Indians did not get liquor openly in the city. If they did not get their liquor before coming into the city they gave the money to white men, who purchased liquor for them. He would suggest as an improvement in the law that there be no fine for a second offense, simply imprisonment.

Q.—How do you find the early closing working? A.—I find that in some places after 10 o'clock the sale has continued in cellars, back rooms and up-stairs.

Q.—Is that a better arrangement than the old-time closing at 11 o'clock. A.—I think that it has a tendency from what I saw this year to cause more illicit selling than formerly. He did not know of any inspection of liquor by inland revenue officers. Yes; he thought such inspection would lead to the sale of a better class of liquor. The Scott Act he believed to have been well enforced in East Middlesex. Yes, he favored the enactment of a prohibitory law for the whole of Canada. He preferred that to local option. In event of prohibition the witness did not think that if a man had the facilities he could be restricted from making wine, beer and cider for his own use. He could, however, be restrained from selling the same.

F. C. MORGAN.

Acting Police Court Clerk (Constable) Morgan submitted the following account of the workings of the law in the city court:

Number of persons convicted in 1890 before E. Jones Parke, police magistrate, 429; fines inflicted, 418; amount of fines, $1,822 25; fines collected, $818 25; convictions for drunkenness, 287; fines for drunkenness, 129; sent to jail in default of said fine, 150; sentence suspended, 8.

Persons convicted in 1891, 442; fines inflicted, 286; amount of fines, $1,869 85; fines collected, $1,174 85; convictions for drunkenness, 150; persons fined for drunkenness, 73; sent to jail in default, 70; suspended sentence, 7.

Convictions in 1892, 353; fines inflicted, 193; amount of fines, $1,745; fines collected, $1,371; convictions for drunkenness, 78; fines for drunkenness, 31; sent to jail in default, 42; sent to jail without option of a fine, 1; suspended sentence, 3; sent to asylum, 1.

Convictions for year ending Sept. 30, 1893, 516; fines inflicted, 331; amount of fines, $1,627 30; amount collected, $1,465 30; convictions for drunkenness, 181; fines for drunkenness, 122; sent to jail in default, 33; sent to jail without option of fine, 15; suspended sentence, 11.

Judge McDonald states that the list as submitted spoke well for London as a moral town. The convictions were not large, considering the size of the place.

Mr. Morgan, in reply to questions, stated emphatically that he thought the present early closing system by far better than the former late closing. It was a decided improvement and was instrumental in keeping young men off the street and out of temptation. One improvement in the system that Mr. Morgan suggested was the closing of billiard rooms in connection with hotels. He regarded the saloon as the greatest curse of the country, the blight of the young men, leading them into loose, idle habits and disorderly ways.

ROBT. REID, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. Robt. Reid submitted the following statement, showing the liquors entered officially for consumption for the following fiscal years:

	Gallons.	Value.	Duty.
1885	19,235	$19,251	$10,851 83
1886	5,532	5,800	3,061 19
1887	12,619	12,891	16,501 22
1893	5,964	6,356	13,048 83

Mr. Reid considered the present early closing system an immense step in advance. The temperance sentiment in the community was improving all the time. He could not account for the repeal of the Scott Act in the several counties in which it had been enforced. He thought that a prohibitory law would be beneficial to the country but could not say from personal experience. If Canada enacted a prohibition law it would no doubt lead to some smuggling at the border.

CITY CLERK KINGSTON.

Mr. Kingston stated that it cost the city $5,000 a year for charity. The drink traffic was to a certain extent responsible for the condition of numbers depending upon charity. If a prohibitory law could be properly enforced he would favor it. He thought that some would oppose it on the belief that one man had no right to question what another should eat or drink. He had seen liquor sold openly in East Middlesex during the Scott Act. He believed that the sight of the law being flagrantly violated had a very injurious moral effect. He did not think that it would be well, supposing prohibition should become law, to allow the Government to manufacture liquor for medicinal and sacramental purposes.

The commission adjourned at 1 o'clock to resume at 3.

Friday Afternoon.

At 3 o'clock the commission resumed. Mr. Kribs, representing the Brewers' and Distillers' Association, was on hand.

THE POLICE MAGISTRATE.

Mr. E. Jones Parke, Q.C., the police magistrate, was the first witness called. He had lived in London for many years. He had been police magistrate for twelve years. During this time he had had excellent opportunities of judging the criminal record of the people. A great many traveling tramps were intercepted in the city—it was a resting place on a general highway for these people. There were two prominent classes of law-breakers. There were those charged with drunkenness and those who committed assaults while under the influence of liquor. A very prominent excuse for petty larceny was that the culprit had imbibed too freely. He was very seldom troubled with small boys for any class of misdemeanors whatever. He did not have many cases of breaches of the Liquor License Act. There was not much perjury connected with the investigation of these—only slight deviations in the evidence given. The licensed saloons in this city were orderly and well conducted. The Scott Act throughout the county did incalculable good. It had a tendency to keep young people away from the saloons.

He favored the adoption of temperance principles all over the Dominion. For years he had been a total abstainer. He saw no use for liquor at all. The present method of dealing with drunkenness was unsatisfactory. It was no punishment to put a drunkard in jail for a week or ten days; if the man was poor his family suffered. Any better method? Yes; he thought hard labor would be better. He would do away with the sale, importation and manufacture of liquor altogether, except for medical or sacramental purposes. Witness would favor the separation of billiard rooms from saloons. He could not say he had noticed any improvement in the number of cases since the hours of selling liquor here were shortened.

THOMAS ALEXANDER.

Thomas Alexander, collector of inland revenue, produced some interesting figures. His district, he said, covered Middlesex, Elgin and Lambton. There were breweries at Sarnia, St. Thomas and Strathroy, and three of them in London. The following figures represented the amount of malt used and the consumption of malt liquor in the district:

	Pounds of malt.	Gallons malt liquor.
1886-87	4,699,272	1,686,225
1887-88	4,775,689	1,750,783
1888-89	4,619,364	1,666,313
1889-90	4,980,184	1,787,985
1890-91	4,668,338	1,711,812
1891-92	3,894,558	1,425,629
1892-93	3,981,210	1,461,251

Mr. Alexander further stated that during the Scott Act there was a diminution of the sale of liquor in St. Thomas and Strathroy. In 1888 there were 82,981 gallons of spirituous liquor taken out of bond, the duty amounting to $107,875. In 1889 87,529 gallons were taken out, duty paid $115,788; in 1890, 81,927 gallons, duty paid $106,505; in 1891, 57,063 gallons were taken out, duty $74,296; in 1892 the figures decreased to 56,149 gallons, with $84,224 duty. Mr. Alexander stated that the gradual diminishing of the quantity taken out of bond was caused by the growth of the temperance sentiment. An increase in the price of liquor also had something to do with it. He had not found any illicit stills in this district. One was found at Sarnia six years ago. He regarded the Scott Act as a failure as a public educator. He had seen the law openly violated. There were no liquor compounders in the district as far as he knew. Any adulteration of liquor that occurred was done by dealers themselves and consisted principally in the addition of water.

Q.—Do you find that the temperance societies and churches have, during the last few years, been producing a temperance sentiment? A.—I think the sentiment is growing, but sometimes the temperance advocates overstep the mark and defeat the object they have in view.

JOHN GARVEY.

Mr. Garvey has a shop liquor license. He said that he made more money during the Scott Act than before or since. They got better prices for the article then. He shipped liquor for private use into several of the counties where the act was in force, in quantities ranging up to five gallons.

Q.—Was there any liquor shipped to dealers in Scott Act counties? A.—Yes. We sold more liquor direct to the store than we do now.

Q.—Do you think the present restrictions of the local license law are fair? A.—Generally so, with a few exceptions.

Q.—What are these exceptions? A.—Well, I do not think it is any great benefit to close public houses so early in the evening.

Q.—Where do you draw the line? A.—At 11 o'clock. If the bars were abolished altogether, the hotel-keepers, to make their business pay, would be obliged to double their rates. A man who paid 25 cents for a dinner and bought nothing else did not pay the hotel-keeper. The latter was better without his custom. He would vote against a prohibitory law on the principle that what one man ate and drank was no business of any other man.

INSPECTOR WILLIAM BELL.

Mr. Bell said that out of 143 cases of charity relieved by the city during last year 40 were directly traceable to drink.

Q.—In making your visits to the houses of these poor people, do you find drinking going on to any great extent? A.—Well, sometimes we find them sending out for liquor. Witness, continuing, said that since the city had amalgamated with London East and London South the city's needs for charity had not increased to any extent.

Q.—Would you favor a prohibitory law? A.—Well, I have not gone so far as to consider that part of the question.

JOHN LABATT BREWER.

Q.—In case of an enactment of a law prohibiting the manufacture of malt liquors, would injury be inflicted upon you in the way of loss of machinery and plant? A.—Well, I think my premises would not be worth a cent. They are not suitable for anything else the way they are constructed. This witness, like Mr. Garvey, made more money during the Scott Act than either before or since. His business did not fall off at all during the continuance of that act. He promised to forward to the commission his sales for three years before the Scott Act, during the Scott Act, and since; also the amount of grain used.

Q.—Did you favor the repeal of the Scott Act. A.—Yes.

Q.—What reason had you? A.—Well, it was a great humbug.

Q.—But you were making more money while it was in force? A.—Yes, I was, but I would rather do business in a legitimate, straightforward way. It was a constant worry, and when you sold to these people you could not legally collect money. This made it so harassing that I would sooner do less business and have it steady all the time.

MR. WILLIAM BOWMAN.

Mr. Bowman testified to the increase of temperance sentiment in the city, and to the corresponding increase of sobriety and good morals. Mr. Bowman spoke of an experience he had in Liverpool, where in the estate of the Earl of Derby a district of twenty square miles was without a license. The prohibition in that part worked well. Mr. Bowman's experience in the Scott Act counties was far from satisfactory, but East Middlesex observed the law better than Elgin. He favored a prohibitory law for the whole Dominion. He could not say whether it would be wise to manufacture wine for sacramental purposes; for medicinal purposes he might allow it.

Q.—Do you favor compensating the brewers and distillers in case of a prohibitory enactment. A.—Well, from a business standpoint I would say that they ought to be compensated, but when you come to look at it from another standpoint I don't think they should. They make $30,000 or $40,000 a year out of the people, and I don't think the people should again make it up.

Q.—In case of the enactment of the law, how do you propose to make up the Dominion and Ontario revenues? A.—Well, I say that people pay that revenue through a circuitous channel by ruining their health, and they might as well pay that revenue direct and save their health. I would consider it an honor to pay my share of the extra taxation incurred by prohibition. The witness did not consider the present hours of closing early enough. He would like to see hotels close still earlier, say at 7 o'clock. He did not think that people would, in event of prohibition, go into manufacturing and distilling their own liquor. During Mr. Bowman's long railroad experience he was very careful in keeping a temperate force. No accidents happened through liquor that he was aware of, but on one occasion an engineer was so drunk that his fireman had to take his engine into Port Stanley. Owing to the sort of Freemasonry existing among the railway fraternity he did not find this out until some time afterwards.

T. W. CASEY.

Mr. T. W. Casey, who gave evidence before the commission when it sat in Hamilton, was asked to repeat his statement, which he did as follows:

"In regard to the workings of the license system I think it is generally conceded that the system has been universally a failure, so far as preventing the evils of drunkenness. It has been honestly tried in England for centuries and to-day, in spite of it, the evil of drunkenness is the most formidable of the evils of the country. It has been tried in Canada almost since we have had laws of our own at all and the very fact of a government commission like this gives good indication of how unsatisfactory its workings have been. I do not think we need look for any much more effectual regulation and restraint of the liquor traffic under any license laws than under those now in force in Ontario. The law is very stringent and the provisions for its enforcement, much as they may be abused in many districts, seem better than those in any of the other provinces. As a matter of fact the law was not nearly as well enforced under the old system of municipal control as it now is, and it would be a retrograde step to go back again to a system of municipal control.

"To show that not much change for the better need be expected under the present license system, of itself, I think the following facts are illustrative: The present Ontario License Act went into force in 1876, and at once the number of tavern licenses in the Province was reduced from 4,459 to 2,977, showing a decrease of 1,482 in the change from municipal to provincial control. In 1877 there were but 2,845 tavern licenses issued in the Province, and until 1883 the license law was not interfered with to any considerable extent by the Scott Act. There was not any such gradual falling off in the number of tavern licenses during that time, however, as many expected there would be. On the contrary, the number increased from 2,845 in 1877 to 3,363 in that seven years, or nearly 20 per cent. At the same time the number of commitments to the county jails for drunkenness increased from 3,868 in 1876 to 4,897 in 1883, or over 25 per cent. I have never seen anything to convince me but that both these classes of figures would have gone on increasing had the license law been left undisturbed.

THE SCOTT ACT WORKING.

"In 1883 the Scott Act began to be adopted in the counties of this Province, and in 1886 came pretty generally into force. The number of tavern licenses then went down to 1,567, and the next year to 1,496. The number of commitments to jails for drunkenness went down to 3,696 in 1885 and 3,555 in 1886, being a reduction of considerably over 25 per cent. I know of no reason whatever for these reductions but the adoption of the Scott Act.

"The Dominion inland revenue returns also show that the quantity of spirits consumed per capita in the whole Dominion fell from 1.126 gallons in 1885 to .711 of a gallon in 1886. This was for the whole Dominion. I have reason to believe that the falling off in Ontario was considerably greater than that, but can not now lay hand on the figures. The average consumption of spirits per capita ever since Confederation to 1885 had been considerably over one gallon. Since that year the average has been considerably less than three-fourths of a gallon. I believe that the operations of the Scott Act and local option measures since have had largely to do with that fact.

"That the Scott Act was fairly successful as a temperance measure in the estimation of the people seems pretty evident from the fact that the temperance people everywhere and almost universally opposed its repeal, while the liquor interests almost universally and everywhere worked with great energy for its repeal. The act, however, was not a success for several reasons:

"1. It was a local measure only. There were few districts where it was in force where liquors could not be legally and lawfully obtained near by. In the counties of Lennox and Addington, for example, there were but four committments to the jail for drunkenness during the last year of its enforcement, and I know that two of these cases the liquors that had to do with them were purchased in a licensed tavern only a mile beyond the boundary. In the other two cases I do not know the history. Kingston on the one side of the county is but eight miles distant, and Deseronto on the other side one mile distant, and both had licensed liquor shops all the time in full blast. Men easily reached these points, and small quantities for illicit sellers were easily brought in, and yet the amount of drinking and drunkenness fell off wonderfully. In the three years that the act was in force the total number of commitments to the county jail for drunkenness was but 19. During the next three years—the only reports published up to this time—the number increased to 57. In a number of other counties the official figures tell a similar story. At one time the jail was without a single criminal for some weeks, a circumstance that has not occurred since, I believe, or had not occurred for years before. Even though the law has been repealed, I have it from the authority of the very intelligent and reliable clerk of the peace that the liquor traffic has never recovered its former standing in the county.

"2. It was inefficiently enforced. This in some instances was, no doubt, owing to the Provincial inspectors being unwilling or incapable men. In many places, however, the lack for funds to carry on prosecutions greatly interfered. It was a Dominion Act and left to Provincial enforcement. The act needed amendments to make it workable by the Provincial machinery and did not get them until it was too late to be of much value. The fines from prosecutions and the fees from druggists' licenses were, for a time at least, taken away by Dominion acts and the county councils refused, in a majority of instances, to provide anything for their share of the expenses of the prosecutions. These difficulties were removed in the end, but by that time the repeal movement began, and it became evident that the act would not be generally adopted. I do not think that any mere local prohibition measures will again meet with the general approval of the people.

A PROHIBITION LAW.

"The great body of temperance people of Canada has always understood a prohibition law to mean one prohibiting the manufacture and the importation as well as the mere sale. Nearly all of the thousands of petitions that have been sent to Parliament during the past 40 years have been for a threefold law of that kind, and not for any partial measure. Such a law, I am convinced, would be efficient and successful.

"For years and years past it has been found an easy thing to prohibit the unlawful manufacture on anything of a large scale. It cannot be done 'on the sly' to any such considerable extent as to supply the sellers throughout the country. The importation can also be pretty effectually prohibited by the present customs machinery, and quite as easily as many other things are now thus prohibited. What can be smuggled across our borders would be but as a drop to the bucket of what the sellers now use every day. With the supplies thus cut off the sellers would not be at all difficult to manage. A general law of that kind would, I am fully persuaded, be much more easily and effectually enforced than was the Scott Act, or the present License Act. Cut off the supplies, as the prohibitionists have always been praying for, and the selling will easily be stopped.

ABOUT THE REVENUE.

"The legalized liquor traffic is not, so far as I can ascertain, any source of real net public revenue. The Province of Ontario, for example, got last year just $300,604 of revenue from the license system. There was paid out of the Provincial treasury during the year the following sums:

Administration of justice	$321,689
Hospitals and charities	151,574
Insane asylums	185,681
Reformatories	9,216
Central Prison	46,915
Lockups in outlying districts	11,967
Crown council prosecution fees	8,882
Total	$865,224

"Sir Oliver Mowat estimates, and very correctly, no doubt, that three-fourths of all the crime and poverty and misery of the country are due to the results of the liquor traffic. All of the above items come under some of those classes, but even allowing but one half of the above payments to that one source it will be seen that over $100,000 besides the revenue would be required to meet the expenses thus entailed.

"The Dominion Government gets revenue of less than a $250,000 last year from the importation of liquors and the grain for its manufacture. There went out of the country, however, a larger sum of money than that to pay for liquors imported and consumed and the corn and malt imported and consumed in the manufacture. To meet that bills of imports which added neither to the wealth, peace or progress of the people, it took about two thirds of all our coal exported. It took more than the total value of all our exports of gold, copper, nickel, iron ore, silver, salt and coal oil. It took nearly all the value of all our barley exported or of the 6,500,000 bushels of oats exported.

"The Dominion Government got nearly $5,000,000 all told of excise duties in connection with the liquor manufactured in the country. The country, however, lost over 1,000,000 bushels of grain destroyed in the manufacture, which ought to have been a part of our surplus for exportation, and ought to have brought back wealth to the country from its sale in foreign markets.

"It lost, too, as our late census returns will show, the labor of 378 persons directly employed in distilleries, and 1,865 employed directly in breweries, or 2,143 in all. It is well known that more than as many more are indirectly employed in that way, or over 5,000 men. There are at least another 5,000 men employed in connection with the sale, or over 10,000 in all. The labor of these men, so far as promoting the real industrial wealth of Canada, is worse than lost. It is estimated that all labor, if judiciously employed, adds to the country's wealth and resources to the extent of at least $1 a day. By any such estimate as this the country is losing $10,000 a day in labor because of the continuance of the traffic. The figures go to show that Canada loses more labor each year because of the drink traffic than it gains by all its immigration.

CAPITAL INVESTED, ETC.

"There is also, according to a late Dominion Year Book, $15,368,953 of capital invested in the manufacture of liquors in this country—just at the time when many important industries that would add much to our wealth cannot be carried on for want of capital. That is a larger sum than is invested in all our cotton mills, and over three times as much as in all our cheese factories, and nearly twice as much as in agricultural implement making, and over three times as much as in iron smelting, and eight times as much as in our ship building, and nearly twice as much as in all our woolen factories.

"A prohibition law that would effectually stop the manufacture and importation and sale would let loose fully $20,000,000 of capital to be invested in other and more wealth-producing industries. It would let loose the 5,000 men now engaged in the manufacture, and the 5,000 more in the sale, for other lines of industries that would add wonderfully to Canada's resources, besides the probable 5,000 more who have ceased to become actual laborers because of drink, who are in the prisons, the hospitals, the sick or disabled resorts, or the asylums, eithers as prisoners or keepers or the like.

MORE TAXPAYERS.

"One other source of revenue in connection with prohibition often overlooked is in the reformed men who would become sources of revenue to the Government. I know one well-known citizen who, a few years ago, drank heavily, and as a consequence was poor. He paid less than $5 a year for municipal taxes, and a leading merchant who knows him well, estimates that his family purchased less than $50 worth a year of dutiable goods. He quit drinking when the sale was prohibited by the Scott Act and has remained sober ever since. He is now fairly prosperous. Last year he paid $45 50 of municipal taxes, or five times as much as before, and the family purchased during the year a little over $300 worth of dutiable goods, or nearly six times as much as before. The increased revenue to the Dominion Government on these dutiable goods, at 20 per cent. was at least $50. His case is not an isolated one by any means. Under successful prohibition there would be thousands of such cases, that would add to the revenue of the Government and the municipalities more than the total loss of revenue from the entire drink traffic."

ALD. CARROTHERS.

Was a traveler for the Carling Brewing and Malting Company. Previous to that he had been a hotel-keeper, but was refused a license. He had not been convicted for eleven years before. He was told that he could live without it.

Q.—Was there any politics in it? A.—Yes; I guess there was.

Q.—Was any one kept on who had violated the law recently? A.—Yes, there was.

This witness, like several others, had had no difficulty in obtaining liquor in Scott Act territory. He thought the license law was better observed in London than in any other city in Canada.

Mr. Carrothers submitted a detailed statement by each of the 34 hotel-keepers of London, setting forth in figures the amount of loss they claim they would undergo in case of prohibition. Judge McDonald accepted them merely as figures taken without oath. The totals will be interesting:

	Value of property.	Estimated depreciation.
Hotels	$529,000	$258,500
Shops	44,000	21,500
Soda water manufacturers	3,000	3,200
Totals	$581,000	$283,200

	Value of plant.	Number thrown out of employment.	Amount of wages lost.
Hotels	$ 78,000	307	$67,654
Shops	59,200	29	14,220
Soda water manufacturers	24,000	13	3,136
Totals	$161,300	349	$85,410

These figures did not relate to breweries at all. Mr. Carrothers had no figures of the Carling Brewing and Malting Company to lay before the commission.

(Continued on Page 6.)

PARIS EN FETE.

Enthusiastic Frenchmen Preparing to Receive the Russians—Strangers Flood the Capital.

TOULON, Oct. 13.—A finer day for the reception of the Russian fleet could not be imagined. The sky is cloudless and the air warm. An hour after daybreak the whole town was awake and stirring. Yesterday's excursion trains brought 30,000 people. Before 8 o'clock two trains from Marseilles had landed 400 more at the station, and there are dozens of special trains scheduled to follow within the next 48 hours. Over 60,000 strangers slept in town last night.

A Bad Break.

NEW YORK, Oct. 13.—The political defeat of the unconditional repeal of the Sherman Silver Act in the Senate caused a bad break in prices at the Stock Exchange this morning.

How to Get a "Sunlight" Picture.

Send 25 "Sunlight" Soap wrappers (wrapper bearing the words "Why Does a Woman Look Old Sooner Than a Man") to Lever Bros., limited, 43 Scott street, Toronto, and you will receive by post a pretty picture, free from advertising and well worth framing. This is an easy way to decorate your home. The soap is the best in the market, and it will only cost 1 cent postage to send in the wrappers, if you leave the ends open. Write your address carefully. t

—FOR THAT—

"After the Ball"

COUGH.

Why suffer with a cough or cold, when one bottle of Tolu, Tar and Tamarack will cure you? This remedy is a specialty of ours, and is a sure and speedy cure for Coughs, Colds, Bronchitis, Asthma, etc., etc., and all affections of the throat and lungs. Price 25 cents. Cairncross & Lawrence, dispensing chemists, corner Dundas street and Park avenue. Branch—Corner Richmond and Piccadilly streets ywt

Retiring From Business

Before retiring from the business of advertising in this corner of the ADVERTISER, we beg to thank our patrons and the public generally. At the same time we wish to remind them that we shall still continue to manufacture and put up our celebrated Bird Seed, Patent Bird Bread, Mustard, Baking Powder and other Grocers' Sundries, for which we have long been famous, and as all our articles are guaranteed, it will be safe, profitable and satisfactory, as usual, to ask for Cottam's well-known goods. And see that you get them.

BART COTTAM

400 Talbot Street, Over Agricultural Bank.

Headquarters for Bird Seed, Baking Powder, Mustard, Washing Compound, etc.