

to show you that this is the case, I will only read one or two quotations. The most important, and I think the most conclusive, is that which I shall read from an article written in *Fraser's Magazine*, in 1875, by the gentleman who founded, and has controlled the extraordinary settlement in the State of New Jersey, called the Vineland Settlement. I dare say many hon. gentlemen are familiar with the place and the name. In establishing this colony and working it out so far as he was able to do so successfully, this gentleman took into account the liquor traffic. What he says with regard to it is as follows:—

"The next important question was in reference to the sale of liquor, a subject I now find greatly agitating the British public, and even the Government. I considered the subject solely as it would affect the industrial success of my settlement. I had witnessed the evil effects of the immense number of taverns which usually planted themselves in new places; I had seen very many towns with every natural advantage to favour them, and which at first were highly prosperous, finally fail, in a manner most unaccountable to the ordinary observer; but when I noticed the abundance of taverns, and considered the number of people they would draw from productive industry to carry them on, and the effects on their customers, I could easily account for such enterprises falling sick and becoming paralyzed. My success depended entirely upon the success of each individual who should buy a farm of me. I had noticed that those individuals who were sober in their habits were usually the successful ones in all pursuits; that those who were intemperate were the unsuccessful ones; that the families, whose heads were sober, were happy families; that where they were intemperate they were unhappy. It was of vital importance to me that a man's means should be economized, that he should be inclined to labour, and have the health to do it, and that his family should be contented, especially his wife. Intemperance is productive of discontent in families, and when the wife is in a new place, away from her relatives, and friends, and the husband grows intemperate, she becomes panic-stricken. Happy, cheerful homes were necessary to the success of Vineland. As the best account of my action in reference to this subject, I will give you an extract from a speech I delivered before the Judiciary Committee of New Jersey, in 1873, which was appointed to examine into the question:—"I am in candor compelled to say that I did not introduce the local option principle into Vineland from any motives of philanthropy. I am not a temperance man in the total abstinence sense; I introduced the principle because in cool abstract thought, I conceived it to be of vital importance to the success of my settlement. If I had seen that liquor had made men more industrious, more skilful, more economical, and more esthetic, in their tastes, I certainly should have made liquor selling one of the main principles of my project. Whilst disclaiming all motives of philanthropy, I cannot deny the feeling of intense commiseration that I have felt for the victims of intoxication."

This, Sir, is the cool, dispassionate, business-like statement of a man whose sole energies were devoted towards the business success of his colony. He says himself that he was not a total abstainer, that he did not wish, on general principles, to bring that question before his people, but that because the stern logic of facts was so strong he had to bring it before his people. He felt it was his duty to his people to restrain them from drinking any intoxicating liquors, so as the better to bend their energies and efforts to the advancement of his colony and the success of his undertaking. I have already alluded, Sir, to the quotation from Mr. Hepworth Dixon and others, as to the State of Vermont. I have another very strong testimony to which I am going to allude—that is the testimony of a gentleman in Massachusetts with whom I am personally acquainted, and whose opinion on this question I know from frequent conversations. He is the head of one of the largest manufacturing firms in that State. I mean Mr. Ames, of the Ames Manufacturing Works, in Easton, Mass. There they adopted, for a short time, a totally prohibitory law. But that law was repealed, and this is what Mr. Ames says in regard to its influence on his workpeople, to whose amelioration and increased efficiency his chief efforts have been for a long time directed. What he says is this:

"We have over 400 men at work here. We find that the present license law has a very bad effect upon our employees."

I may say that the license law succeeded the prohibitory law in Massachusetts. In 1867, they had total prohibition, and 1868 they had a license law. He goes on to say:

"We had, on comparing our production in May and June of this year (1868) with (1867), that in 1867, with 375 men, we produced 8 per cent more goods than we did in the same months in 1863, with 400 men."

That is to say, under total prohibition, Mr. Ames' manufactory produced 8 per cent more than it did with twenty-five men more under a license law. This, I think, is strong evidence, not only that the waste that goes on under the use of liquor is bad for the work people, but also that the manufacturers themselves and the whole community through the length and breadth of the land are deeply interested in the suppression of this traffic. Mr. Ames adds:

"We attribute this falling off entirely to the repeal of the prohibitory law, and the great increase in the use of intoxicating liquors among our men in consequence."

I have met Mr. Ames since that law has been repealed and the licenses issued, and I know that it is one of the dearest wishes of his heart that the licenses should be abolished in his town in Massachusetts. I have several other quotations in regard to the effect of restrictions on the traffic in various places, which, however, I shall not read, as I find that the time has gone much faster than I had any idea it would. But I cannot refrain from alluding to testimony which comes from nearer home in regard to this traffic in our own country. I am not going to quote the statements of temperance people. I have tried as much as possible to take an unbiased view of this question, and to put aside wholly what is called by a great many, though unjustly, the fanaticism of temperance reformers; and I have endeavoured to bring forward the evidence of those opposed to the principle of prohibition rather than the evidence of those in its favour, because I do not wish to be thought to be advocating, without careful thought and consideration, the adoption of the principle proposed to the House. I will read an extract from the report of the Chief of Police of the city of Montreal for last year, in which he says:

"Less crime was committed in Montreal than in any other city comprising as large a population on this continent. This was no doubt greatly owing to the influence of the clergy, and the good moral character of the majority of the citizens, but most certainly in some degree to the vigilance of the police. The number of criminals arrested during the year was less than last year, the greater part of them being young and illiterate, or addicted to drinking; this fact should stimulate all who have the public morals at heart to use their utmost endeavours to lessen the number of liquor shops in the city. According to the returns of the Revenue Department, there are at present in the city 382 hotels and restaurants, and 418 groceries, where liquor is sold. The amount of money paid annually for licenses for those places, added to what is spent in them for liquor, and recklessly squandered or lost by persons intoxicated, would amount to an almost fabulous amount. Some of our influential citizens had lately been devising a scheme for the suppression of prostitution in the city; if they would use their influence for the restriction or abolition of the liquor traffic, they would be thereby dealing a death-blow at prostitution, the tavern being to most young people a stepping-stone to the brothel and all other kinds of vice. It would be a step in the right direction if the Police Committee would get a by-law passed regarding registry offices for servant girls, in order to protect inexperienced girls from the misleading advice of some unprincipled keepers of such places."

This is certainly very strong testimony of the evil effects of the liquor traffic in our very midst, coming from an authority which has been shown not in any way to be biased in favour of prohibition. Now, I have some Canadian manufacturing statistics which, I think, will be suggestive to read. They show the proportionate value of the products which are paid as wages in our different manufactories, that is to say, how much the workpeople get out of the profits of the goods which they manufacture; and they show very clearly that the smallest proportion of any is made by those who work in the establishments where the manufacture of liquor is carried on. In brass founderies the workpeople get 12 per cent; in distilleries, 6½; in founderies, 36; in cordage manufactures, 24; in printing establishments, 28; in cabinet making, 31; in carpentering, 33; in machine shops, 31; in clothing establishments, 21; and in carriage manufactures 34 per cent; showing that the lowest paid workpeople in the country in proportion to the value of their work in the market of the country, are those employed in the manufacture of drink. This does not certainly show that it is for the benefit of our workpeople that these manufactories should be carried on; and I think it is a very potent argument why