

benefactor to your country, for out of that five cents your country gets about one cent, and the rest goes in wages, interest, material, taxes, and improvements. Now why rob the country of this revenue? Why deprive the country of this industry? The country needs the money, and if it does not get it from this source, it must get it from other sources; and ultimately it must come from you anyhow.

At present about 5,000,000 of us contribute this revenue, and if you bring about Prohibition then this revenue will have to come out of direct taxation from about half this number. This will increase taxation enormously. Why should we remove this burden from the shoulders of the 5,000,000 and put it on the shoulders of the two millions.

You say: "But the revenue from the liquor business is more than devoured by the injury it causes—by asylums, prisons, hospitals, poorhouses, etc. Cut out the booze, and the cost of running the State or Province will be reduced by more than the revenue we get from it."

That statement is often made, and many good people think that drink is the cause of all civic and provincial expenses.

But it is not so. I need not quote figures, but here are a few facts: The cost of running a Prohibition town or state, both civically, criminally, judicially, is on a par with the cost of running a town or state where liquor is legally sold. That is a statement which statistics prove. Consequently by prohibiting the sale of liquor, you are increasing the burden of taxation on the people. You are not reducing the cost of government, but you are increasing the burden of taxation. So I will conclude by saying that Prohibition is really and radically unconstitutional and is a most obnoxious legislation. It benefits nobody, while it hurts many.

CHAPTER III. Compensation.

I saw in the papers a remark made by a certain Rev. gentleman at one of the Prohibition meetings.