

Neither Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island, derive any fees from licenses. Manitoba received in 1891, \$25,850; the North-West Territories, \$21,420. British Columbia I make \$16,200. Altogether the total is not quite a million. With the Dominion, of course, we can be exact. The figures are:

Statement showing Excise and Customs duty collected on spirits, wines, malt liquor and malt, during the year ended 30th June, 1892.

Articles.	Excise.	Customs.	Total.
Spirits	\$3,876,676 55	\$1,775,842 13	\$5,652,518 68
Wines	367,876 64	367,876 64
Malt Liquor	6,905 90	90,019 26	96,925 16
Malt	935,667 64	935,667 64
	<hr/> \$4,819,250 09	<hr/> \$2,233,738 03	<hr/> \$7,052,988 12

But to the Dominion will come also the loss of the duty on 14,000,000 gallons of spirits at \$1.50 per gallon, \$21,000,000 in one lump.

Here is, then, between eight and nine millions of yearly Revenue that will be lost if a Prohibitory law were enacted, to say nothing of the loss in assessed values. How can this loss be met? There is only one way—by direct taxation. There can be no other way. It is all nonsense to say that the money saved from liquor expended in the purchase of other goods will meet the difficulty. Men are not going to wear two pairs of boots at the same time, nor wear overcoats in August for the blessed privilege of living under a Prohibition law. And it is equal nonsense to brush away the difficulty by saying, "Oh! I will leave the Finance Minister to deal with that." Take the Finance Minister of Ontario, or the Finance Minister of Quebec, both of which Provinces have been increasing the license fees again and again in order to make ends meet, and he will tell you he will have to go direct to the people to make up the deficiency. As to the Finance Minister of the Dominion, he was able to give us free sugar only by doubling or nearly doubling the Excise duties. Take away those duties altogether, and how long will we have a free breakfast table and avoid direct taxation? Some people may agree to direct taxation; I notice a good many reverend gentlemen take that view. Certainly, if they are going to have Prohibition they will have to help pay the shot, but I would most decidedly not like to be the leader of the Government that first tried it. And right here there is another matter to be considered. It is, who is to pay for the enforcement of the law, which brings us to the last clause of this question, the

CAPABILITY OF EFFICIENT ENFORCEMENT.

There is no possibility of efficient enforcement of any such law generally. In peculiar communities there may be some success, but these are very isolated instances, and I personally do not know of one. But with the general community, with people as they are and conditions as they are, the law is foredoomed to failure. And for this reason. A principle can be crystallized into law, and that law enforced. For instance the personal right to property is crystallized into the law against thefts, which law cannot be violated without the whole community having an interest in the punishment of the violator. The principle of the sacredness of the person finds expression in the laws regarding murder, assault, etc. The laws against forgery, embezzlement, breach of trust, are all based upon the principle that what a person "owns" he shall not be defrauded of. And so through the list, all such laws are based upon principles, which if violated constitute crime, and which when committed justify the community in uniting to hunt down the criminal. And they will so unite. The welfare of the community is at stake and the community sees to the enforcement of the law.