

by compulsion of law. This sum has been taken from him as a penalty for no offence. His business was just as lawful the day before the Act passed as that of the dry goods merchant. Even more he had the expressed license of the Government. Therefore this \$40,000 has been taken from the individual against his will for the public good. I do not think it can be successfully contended for one moment that any public necessity can justify the taking of a man's property against his will, and for no offence of his own, without compensation for that property. Consider, for instance, when the public take from a man an acre of land by expropriation. His right is to keep his land. Public necessity compels him to give it up, but it has never been held in any country, or under any form of law that public necessity required that he should lose the value of his land. In fact the most stringent regulations are made in his behalf that he shall recover to the last dollar the value of the property expropriated for the public good. It may be contended that the property of the distiller or the brewer is not taken by the Government.

True, the Government does not take away the property but it takes away the object of its existence, and in saying to the manufacturer, "You must not use this property for the only purpose for which it is of any use," the Government as effectually deprives him of it, as though it had been expropriated and the owner prevented from entering therein. The compensation given by the British Government for the abolition of slavery in the West Indies is frequently referred to. In this case, however, the claim for compensation is much stronger than even that of the liberation of the slaves. Slavery was founded on a false principle, was inherently wrong, and in that case compensation might have been refused because the end sought to be obtained, was the righting of a gross wrong. Nobody will contend that the liquor traffic is in the same category, that inherently it was wrong, or that the citizen who consumed a glass of beer committed a wrong to society. Therefore, how much stronger is the claim for compensation in the case where property is lost through statutory enactment, than in the case where property by right could not exist at all. Undoubtedly justice requires that if a prohibitory law is passed, brewers and distillers, and others whose business will be ruined should be compensated. Where the Dominion of Canada could acquire sufficient means to give adequate compensation in the event of the Government passing such a law I will have to leave to others to ascertain.

RETURNS FROM BRADSTREET'S.

I have what I consider irrefragable proof that a Prohibitive law does not conduce to business prosperity in the returns of Bradstreet's. This great commercial agency certainly can be accepted as an independent authority, and I quote from their record the number of failures. I am taking States that closely approximate each other in population, situation, character of population and products, for comparison. For instance Maine has a population of 661,086 and Connecticut a population of 746,258. These states are similar in most respects, although the latter has the greater industrial interests. Kansas has a population of 1,427,096 and Kentucky 1,858,635. They too are partially similar in their people and products, though Kentucky has large industrial centres, which Kansas has not. Then take Iowa with 1,911,896 population and Minnesota with 1,300,826. Iowa has the larger population but Minnesota has the larger industrial centres, St. Paul and Minneapolis. Both are great agricultural states. Now what are the figures. Bradstreet's gives the failures in the first six months of the last three years, and for the States indicated, as follows:—