

trade would be affected, but the banks, the loan companies, and the financial institutions. The retiring secretary of the Toronto Board of Trade sounded the note of warning to the financial institutions to be up and doing so that their interests would not be sacrificed by any bill such as was proposed to be passed.

All this would be lost by the passage of the "Liquor Act." It would have to be made up by DIRECT TAXATION.

Premier Ross, too, knows how serious a matter it would be should all this revenue be lost to the province, as is evidenced by a speech in the Legislature last Session when he said :—"This bill not only involves serious changes in the operation of the business of a great many people, and a change perhaps in the social organization of many families, but it also means a substantial loss of revenue. . . . We must not be blind to the fact that there will be a substantial loss of revenue. The Province receives between the municipalities and the Provincial Treasury a revenue of about \$700,000 in tavern and shop licenses, and the licenses on distilleries and breweries."

Sir Wilfred Laurier has placed himself on record as declaring emphatically that if prohibition were to come into force a vast amount of revenue would be lost which would have to be made up in some other way, "and," he said, "Direct Taxation is the only source open."

The *Globe* thinks the same. In one of its editorials it said :—"The Premier of Canada has declared, and no one seems to deny, that prohibition means direct taxation." Hon. David Mills holds a similar opinion. He says :—"The greater portion of the loss of revenue can, in my opinion, only be made up by Direct Taxation."

Besides the enormous amount of revenue that would be lost, it would cost millions to enforce the Liquor Act. There would be an immense amount of territory to guard so that it may readily be seen what a vast army of paid officials would have to be constantly