

directly against them, numbering 311, at an actual cost of \$53,776 over and above all the fees you get from them, allowing them also untold perquisites and holding them not responsible for their damages.

Considering the immense influence that your corrective institution the Police force has to contend against and the extent of the work it performs, as well as the great need for the work that is being done by your charitable institutions in relieving distress, we cannot imagine how you could wisely reduce either branch of your expenditure until the cause which produces their necessity should first be abated, and even then, the saving proposed is but as a drop in the bucket compared with the money you are annually paying for the \$268,000 of debt incurred to get up your new jail and so called industrial farm, *not one shilling of which needed to be incurred but for the liquor traffic*, and while we make this assertion we would specially address you who call yourselves public economists and are yet upholders or apologists for the liquor traffic on the ground of its paying properties, and we will give you now another statement for which we shew you figures and challenge refutation, it is this: That all the money received from tavern licenses, shop licenses, license transfers, fines and fees of Police court, fines for breach of license laws, and every other channel having the liquor traffic for its source; *that every dollar of it all put together would not pay the one single item of its own expenses, namely the annual maintenance of the jail and premises alone, without a prisoner or even a caretaker in them.*

It will be seen that we have charged in the account, only three-fourths of the Police establishment expenses to the traffic, although most competent judges maintain that we might fairly charge it with a greater proportion of this as well as of all the other items of expenditure we have put down against it. It is our aim however in bringing the dark things of this subject to the light to make such estimates as cannot be gainsayed by the strongest friends of the business we are writing against.

In case however that some stout hearted and hard mouthed liquor advocate might even venture to dispute the reasonableness of this charge we will just quote for example one case from amongst many at hand quite similar. The city of Middletown, in the State of Connecticut, during the existence of the prohibitory law, with its population of 10,000, had but one policeman and he had no more to do than he could easily accomplish; while at the present day in our city of good law abiding repute, two constables are no more than enough to maintain a very indifferent degree of order in the one short Stanley street alone.

Why not suppress the agencies that make bad citizens as well as support those that make good ones? This would seem a proposition without any good objection, but when we ask why spend in actual money outlay \$53,776 over and above all its income, being nearly twice as much to support the evil agency—your taverns—as to maintain the good one—your schools—we blush to think that there are men, otherwise rational, who would attempt to reconcile even this with reason. What merchant would continue a business where \$75,000 are paid out annually to get the sum of \$21,000?