

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

un. P
se no. 792. A.

REPORT

OF

— LOUIS P. KRIBS —

IN CONNECTION WITH THE INVESTIGATION
HELD BY THE

Canadian Royal Commission

ON THE

LIQUOR TRAFFIC

TORONTO :

THE MURRAY PRINTING COMPANY

1894.

T

REPORT

OF

LOUIS P. KRIBS

IN CONNECTION WITH THE INVESTIGATION
HELD BY

THE CANADIAN ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

TORONTO :

THE MURRAY PRINTING COMPANY

1894.

HV 5091

CE

KT

To AUGUSTE BOLTE, Esq.,

Secretary of the Canadian

Brewers' and Distillers' Association.

SIR,

In pursuance of my engagement with your Association as their representative before the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic, I appeared before that body as a witness, having been duly notified that my evidence would be taken in Montreal. In preparing my notes of the evidence, I found that the accumulation of nearly two years of work had grown to such proportions, that, though I rigidly excluded everything that had already been testified to by other witnesses, it would be impossible to deal with the subject satisfactorily by merely speaking from notes. This was more especially the case when large tables of figures had to be dealt with. I therefore had the matter printed, and, in the greater part, it formed the evidence I gave before the Royal Commission.

This pamphlet is not to be taken as dealing exhaustively with the question of Prohibition. It was designed to place before the Commission only such evidence as they had not already received. Its scope was, therefore, necessarily, very limited, but even so, it may not prove uninteresting to the members of your Association and others.

Respectfully,

LOUIS P. KRIBS.

Toronto, December, 1898.

REPORT OF LOUIS P. KRIBS

IN CONNECTION WITH

The Canadian Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic



To Sir Joseph Hickson and the Members of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic :

When Parliament appointed the Royal Commission on the liquor traffic the distillers and brewers of Canada decided upon having their interests represented before that body through an agent. I was selected for the position and have since, through the courtesy of your hon. body accompanied the Commission throughout all its travels. With your permission I shall now give you the results of my observations and investigations, being careful not to repeat evidence already upon your records.

QUESTION I.

The first question submitted for consideration in Her Majesty's Commission, viz., ((1) The effects of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada) is so broad as to be somewhat indefinite. However, the first effect of the traffic is, I take it to be, the establishment of an enormous industry throughout the Dominion. I have spent a good deal of time, hard work and money in an endeavor to take such a census of the trade as will give us accurate and reliable data in this respect. I took for the purpose the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1892, and have to submit the following results :

DISTILLERIES.

There are seven distilleries in Canada, to be found in the Inland Revenue divisions of Toronto, Windsor, Prescott, Guelph, Belleville, Hamilton and Halifax. In some of the succeeding statements reference will be found to the Perth division as well. This will only be, however, where comparisons are made over a term of years—the Perth manufactories being but very small concerns. Having first then reference to the product of these establishments :—

The following is a memo. showing quantities of spirits manufactured in the various Inland Revenue Divisions of Canada from the 1st July, 1882 to 30th June, 1892 ; being a period of 10 years.

	Gallons.
Toronto	19,920,570.50
Windsor	15,188,535.98
Prescott	4,905,536.63
Guelph	2,529,773.48
Belleville	1,379,402.99
Hamilton	1,036,479.68
Perth	128,491.18
Halifax	757,025.10
Miscellaneous	46,941.48

45,892,757.02

Of which the following quantities were manufactured during the year set opposite them :—

	Gallons.
Year ending 30th June, 1883	4,281,207.68
“ “ 1884	4,207,575.84
“ “ 1885	3,579,332.17*
“ “ 1886	4,355,736.23*
“ “ 1887	5,119,506.33*
“ “ 1888	5,514,589.03*
“ “ 1889	5,847,508.40*
“ “ 1890	5,091,475.43
“ “ 1891	4,397,594.40
“ “ 1892	3,498,231.51
	45,892,757.02

*Scott Act years.

The amount of gallons of spirits entered for consumption from the distilleries during the term of years, was as follows :—

	Gallons.
Duty \$1.00, 1882	2,851,512.45
“ “ 1883	3,092,175.19
“ “ 1884	3,000,491.96
“ “ 1885	3,888,012.08
Duty \$1.30, 1886	2,412,818.04
“ “ 1887	2,864,935.20
“ “ 1888	2,326,326.99
“ “ 1889	2,960,446.73
“ “ 1890	3,521,193.96
Duty \$1.50, 1891	2,687,664.28
“ “ 1892	2,545,934.78
Total for eleven years	32,151,711.36
In ten years	29,300,198.91
An average of	2,930,019.00
In five years	14,041,566.43
An average of	2,808,313.29

Allow me here to direct attention to the fallaciousness, if not the actual dishonesty of an argument frequently advanced by Ontario prohibitionists, and made to do duty even within a few months. It is the statement that in 1886, when the larger number of counties in Ontario were under the Scott Act, the amount of liquor taken out of bond for consumption was a million and a half of gallons less than in 1885. Not long ago a prominent temperance editor placed the decrease at 1,900,000 gallons. We will suppose that he had not himself looked up the figures. No argument is needed in refutation; the change in the duties is ample explanation. But one is led to wonder why these good gentlemen never happened to compare the figures of 1887 with those of 1886, when the same number of counties were under the Scott Act.

The stocks of spirits held in warehouse all over the Dominion from the year 1882, year ending 30th June, to the present time, were as follows :—

	Gallons.
Duty \$1.00, 1882	1,642,577.22
“ “ 1883	1,841,123.05
“ “ 1884	2,201,034.27
“ “ 1885	1,242,196.82
Duty \$1.30, 1886	2,832,474.25
“ “ 1887	4,563,977.42
“ “ 1888	7,423,207.70
“ “ 1889	9,948,182.30
“ “ 1890	11,099,179.17
“ “ 1891	12,415,785.98
Duty \$1.50, 1892	12,836,079.48
“ “ 1893	13,502,814.00

Here I beg to direct attention to the enormous increase in the stocks held by the distillers owing to the ageing laws, and to once and for all set at rest the insinuation that the latter was a device of the large distillers to squeeze out the small fry. As to this latter there is no truth whatever.

Perhaps a comparison of the stocks held by the distillers during the past two years in the different Inland Revenue Divisions in Ontario, may make clear the recent great accumulations of stocks and form the basis for certain deductions.

There was held in stock by the distillers :—

	Gallons. 1st July, 1892.	Gallons. 1st July, 1893.
Toronto Division	5,327,639.75	5,426,268.51
Windsor "	3,951,643.58	4,428,232.63
Prescott "	1,205,865.54	1,304,467.20
Guelph "	707,436.18	821,363.59
Hamilton "	433,663.97	491,605.74
Belleville "	548,300.84	604,836.96
	<u>12,174,594.86</u>	<u>13,079,774.63</u>

This immense amount of spirits, held in stock by the distillers—held in stock because of the regulations of the Government—has a most important bearing when the questions of "loss of revenue" and "compensation" come to be discussed.

Let me come now to the quantities of grain used. I herewith present a table showing the different amounts and kinds of grain used in the distilleries during the ten years from 1883 to 1892, taking the years ending 30th June. The totals show as follows :—

	Bushels.
Malt (from barley)	1,090,071
Corn	10,984,710
Rye	2,199,875
Wheat	101,087
Oats	342,970
Barley (not malted)	16,087
	<u>14,747,800</u>

In which is not included 121,237 lbs. of mill offal used in 1886, 1,392,654 lbs. of molasses, 13,065 lbs. of buckwheat and 379,923 lbs. of ground apples and cider. The detailed statement is too bulky to be transcribed but is available at any time.

We have now statements of the product, amount entered for consumption, stocks in hand, grain used, etc., for a term of years, and all taken from official sources. I will now give you a census of the trade obtained from the distillers themselves, and which is not to be obtained from any official source. I have secured from each distiller a statement of his business in detail for the year ending 30th June, 1892, and which I believe to be correct in every particular. The statement contains within itself all necessary explanation, and the totals are as follows :—

SCHEDULE OF DISTILLERS, YEAR ENDING JUNE 30TH, 1892.

GRAIN PURCHASED :

Corn :

Number of bushels	1,380,252
Freight paid on same	\$86,109
Duty paid Customs	111,350
Cost of the grain	793,067

Rye and Wheat :

Number of bushels	273,045
Freight paid on same	\$12,668
Duty paid Customs (job lot)	15,888
Cost of the grain	170,586

Barley:

Number of bushels	136,407
Freight paid on same	\$5,007
Duty paid Customs
Excise duty paid on the malt produced	52,187
Cost of the grain	64,092

Oats:

Number of bushels	46,884
Freight paid on the same	\$1,850
Duty paid Customs
Cost of the grain	17,011

Hops:

Number of lbs. purchased	29,933
Value of same	\$7,125
Duty paid Customs
Freight paid

COAL:

Tons of hard coal purchased	1,620
Value	\$3,799
Freight paid	300
Duty (50c. ton)
Tons of soft coal purchased	32,379
Value	\$63,913
Duty paid Customs (60c. ton)	14,337
Freight paid	15,022

PROPERTY ACCOUNT:

Value of real estate (in part buildings and plant)	\$3,586,589
Value of buildings	896,374
Value of plant and machinery	272,659

STABLE ACCOUNT:*

Value of horses	\$5,550
Value of harness	1,310
Value of vehicles*	4,850
Blacksmith's account	6,210
Value of hay, oats or other fodder	2,862

BARREL ACCOUNT:

Number of barrels made	\$36,989
Value of same	90,891
Number of coopers employed	60
Amount paid coopers in wages	\$29,469
Value of material imported	34,261
Amount of duty paid	7,100
" freight paid	3,781
Value of cases	9,309
Amount paid for ice	4,030
" of taxes paid	37,811
" paid for water	5,202
" " gas or other light	4,150
" " stationery, printing and advertising	10,978
" " capsules	2,878
" " corks	4,074
" " bottles, imported (and duty)	36,638
" " domestic	11,110
Freight on same	936
Freight paid on output	43,700

INSURANCE ACCOUNT:

Amount of insurance carried:	
(a) On buildings and plant	\$1,186,800
(b) On stock	6,429,062
Amount of premiums paid	106,930

*One of these distilleries does 40 per cent. of the entire trade, and another 30 per cent., we have therefore in Stable Account only 30 per cent. of actual amount. The two largest distilleries hire all of their truckage.

FEEDING OF CATTLE:*

Number of cattle fed	7,440
Value of same when bought	\$252,000
Tons of hay consumed	9,450
Value of same	\$111,450
Number of hogs or other animals fed	795
“ men employed in feeding	83
Amount of wages paid them	\$21,206
Total number of men employed in and about distillery	451
Total amount of yearly wages paid employees, including cost of management	\$384,802

FEEDING OF CATTLE AT DISTILLERIES.

Regarding the two items in the above table concerning which full information is not to hand; the matter of cartage is not to be considered as outside of local importance, but with reference to the feeding of cattle a different story is to be told. This is a subject of very great importance indeed, so much so that I desire to devote a short space to its consideration. In this regard we are fortunately in possession of data that enables us to arrive at an absolute conclusion. I beg herewith to submit a statement furnished by Messrs. Gooderham & Worts of Toronto, to Mr. Geo. Johnston, the Dominion statistician, containing the number of cattle and hogs fed, and hay consumed (together with other information) fed at these byres, from 1882 to 1892. Upon this subject I speak with a certain amount of personal knowledge, having once been connected with that business, and I have no hesitation in saying that the figures given by Messrs. Gooderham & Worts are below rather than above the mark. The statement is as follows:—

GOODERHAM & WORTS, LIMITED,

Established 1832.

Distillers, Maltsters and Millers,
Toronto, Canada, May 9th, '92.

SIR,—In accordance with your letter of the 14th April we have had prepared and now submit herewith the following table setting forth the number of cattle and hogs fed and the quantity (in tons) of hay used for same during the 11 years 1881-2 to 1891-2:

	Cattle.	Hogs.	Hay.
1881-2	4,197	470	6,295
1882-3	4,702	568	7,053
1883-4	4,631	568	6,917
1884-5	4,370	487	6,555
1885-6	4,514	568	6,771
1886-7	4,794	620	7,191
1887-8	4,742	620	7,113
1888-9	4,279	568	6,419
1889-90	4,480	466	6,720
1890-91	3,195	410	4,793
1891-92	3,226	410	4,839

The quantity of hay was arrived at by estimating $1\frac{1}{2}$ tons per head per season. It may be mentioned that in the earlier part of the period referred to the stock of this distillery—and no doubt of others also—was somewhat low and we were running above the normal capacity; and then for the next few years up to 1887-8 distillers were accumulating stock to comply with the two-year clause of the Inland Revenue Act lately put into force. Since then the out-put of distilleries has slightly decreased and is now about normal.

*In the case of one distillery the cattle are fed by a company, in another all the “grains” are sold. These two are not included in statement. In each of the distilleries “grains” are sold to a greater or less extent.

In respect to values: up to the year ending 1st July, 1887, the average price of cattle when tied up was \$34 to \$35 per head; from that period up to 1890-91 the average price was \$37 per head, whilst in the present 1891-92 \$40 was the original cost. Now it is generally agreed among feeders that cattle about double their value during their feeding season, so that the values at the end of the different seasons would be about double the figures above given. The value of hogs average about \$5 at the beginning of the season and about \$12 at the end.

Yours truly,

GOODERHAM & WORTS (Ltd.)

(Sgd.) W. G. GOODERHAM, Manager.

GEO. JOHNSON, Esq.,

Government Statistician, Ottawa.

I have, in addition, a considerable amount of detailed evidence, but will only trouble you with a statement from Messrs. L. Coffee & Co., who contract for a portion of the feeding at Gooderham & Worts' byres. Their statement is to this effect:—

Cattle purchased, 572; cattle culled out, 58; cattle exported, 514.

Hay purchased, 659.1190 tons, cost \$7,174.36, being over 1½ tons per head, at an average cost of nearly \$11.00 per ton.

Number of men employed, 5; total wages paid, \$1,380.

Freight paid on these cattle coming in would be from \$20 to \$30 per car of twenty or twenty-one head.

The outward freight to Montreal is \$39 per car of sixteen to eighteen head. Ocean freight paid was 60 to 65 shillings per head without insurance.

From this we are able to make an accurate calculation of all the cattle fed at the Canadian distilleries. Throwing aside altogether the feeding of hogs—which I may say is not by any means a small matter—we find from the table given above that the average number of cattle fed at Messrs. Gooderham & Worts' byres in the past ten years exceeded 4,000. This past year not so many were fed, owing to the fact that a great deal of offal was sold to outside parties and to other causes, but whether the offal is sold or fed on the premises, the result must be the same. So many bushels of grain distilled must produce so much offal, it matters not whether the distillation takes place in Halifax or Windsor, and that offal must be used in the feeding of cattle. Without further argument then, this statement may be given, based upon the figures of Messrs. Gooderham & Worts and Messrs. L. Coffee & Co., and other statements that I have in my possession:—

Statement of cattle fed and particulars thereof at Messrs. Gooderham & Worts' cattle byres, Toronto:

Average yearly number of cattle fed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,000
" " men employed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35
" " wages paid	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$9,660
" " tons of hay consumed at 1½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000
Cost of hay at 11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55,000
First cost of cattle at \$40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	160,000
Freight coming in at \$1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,000
Value of cattle going out	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	320,000
Freight to Montreal, \$230 per head	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,200
" England, \$15.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63,000

Messrs. Gooderham & Worts do 40 per cent. of the distilling business of Canada, as shown by the official returns before quoted. This allows to the other distilleries 60 per cent., and calculating upon this basis—a perfectly correct calculation—the total feeding capacity will be, and is, whether utilized at the distillery or outside by neighboring feeders, as follows:—

Cattle fed yearly	10,000
Number of men employed in feeding	87
Yearly wages so paid	\$24,150
Tons of hay consumed	12,500
Cost of the hay	\$137,500
First cost of the cattle	400,000
Freight to stables	10,000
Selling price of cattle	800,000
Freight on same to Montreal	23,000
" " England	157,000

This does not include cost of drovers, of men employed in shipping, on the cars, on the vessels, or at landing. In every particular, too, the lowest estimate has been used, yet it will be seen at a glance of what great importance the cattle industry in connection with distilling is.

In concluding this branch of the subject let me summarize thus :

The distillers use in an average year 1,836,588 bushels of grain.

At a cost of (paid the farmer) \$1,044,756.

With freight charges of \$105,634.

Customs charges of \$179,425.

They have in real estate, buildings, plant and machinery, transportation facilities, casks, bottles, etc., etc., an investment of \$4,933,210.

They carry an insurance of \$7,615,862,

With yearly premiums of \$106,939.

They feed 10,000 head of cattle and pay out nearly \$400,000 in wages yearly to 451 employees, besides carrying a stock of nearly 14,000,000 gallons, together with all the incidentals noted in the abovetables and statements. The effect of prohibition upon this industry may be considered later.

BREWERIES.

There are in the Dominion of Canada 125 breweries. (The census returns place the number at 162, but in this as in many other instances the census returns are inaccurate.) These breweries are found in every province, and though many of them are small concerns, together they aggregate an enormous industry. The output has been steadily increasing for many years and is still increasing. The following table gives the output of malt liquor, ale, lager and porter from the year 1884 down :

	Gallons.		Gallons.
1884	13,098,700	1889	16,363,349
1885	12,071,752	1890	17,196,115
1886	13,282,261	1891	18,069,183
1887	14,786,285	1892	16,946,245
1888	15,944,002		

NOTE.—The Scott Act years may be taken as from 1885 to 1889.

This steady and rapid increase in the annual consumption of malt liquors is to-day one of the marked features of the liquor traffic in Canada. The duty in connection with beer is levied upon the malt. This among other things securing that deleterious matter shall not be used in the manufacture. The malting business, therefore, becomes one of great importance. All of the larger breweries have their own malt houses, but in addition, to supply the smaller concerns there are six malt houses—five in Ontario and one in Quebec, who do a malting business only, with a combined capital of \$223,500, and a yearly output valued at about a quarter of a million of dollars. These malt houses give employment to 45 men, and have a yearly wage bill of \$15,300.

The following statement gives particulars of the malting industry :

Statement showing malt manufactured, malt exported, and malt consumed in Canada:—

Year.	Malt Manufactured.	Malt Exported.	Consumed in Canada.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
1880	67,132,206	22,517,553	44,584,653
1881	70,507,220	40,055,907	30,451,313
1882	85,516,222	46,882,486	38,633,736
1883	55,447,616	4,961,383	50,486,233
1884	49,517,962	11,868,299	37,649,663
1885	48,212,695	9,793,202	38,419,493
1886	54,662,804	6,064,360	48,598,444
1887	51,282,943	5,470,338	48,812,605
1888	60,500,427	3,339,627	57,160,800
1889	61,314,257	5,471,737	58,842,520
1890	52,999,874	3,333,633	49,666,241
1891	52,718,956	4,734,957	57,909,201
1892	55,952,712	69,855	46,425,882

The malting business is largely confined to Ontario, where most excellent barley is grown, and where consequently the business can be carried on most profitably. The subjoined statement throws light upon this phase of the subject:—

Year.	Grains placed in steep.		Malt Manufactured.	
	Ontario.	Dominion.	Ontario.	Dominion.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
1884	58,304,910	71,059,171	45,166,149	51,945,693
1885	50,308,703	62,849,640	39,560,742	49,225,213
1886	49,008,115	62,605,106	37,756,495	48,073,218
1887	53,860,581	69,762,573	42,131,943	54,327,924
1888	53,547,833	68,990,304	41,907,609	53,931,067
1889	60,007,696	75,270,514	48,379,239	60,310,848
1890	63,944,104	79,757,873	51,615,794	64,141,315
1891	51,243,216	66,334,732	40,715,878	52,718,956
1892	56,695,785	70,458,779	45,126,791	55,952,712

I now come to the brewing industry itself, of which I have taken a very careful census. I collected returns from 64 of the 125 breweries. The 64 comprise all of the concerns of any magnitude whatever, but in adding only ten per cent. for the other 61, I have kept well within the mark. That these figures possess every element of accuracy there can be no doubt, as in point of the amount of grain used they agree with the census returns. The amount stated as given in excise falls slightly below the official returns, as does the number of men employed which is over 100 below the census figures. Undoubtedly any error is in being below rather than above the mark, and I prefer that it should be so. The statement is for the year ending June 30th, 1892, and is as follows:

SCHEDULE OF BREWERS, YEAR COMMENCING 1ST JULY, 1891, ENDING
30TH JUNE, 1892.

Barley used for the manufacture of ale, porter and lager, 1,112,229 bush.	\$908,999
Hops purchased, 1,177,403 lbs.	465,965
DUTIES PAID—Excise	816,537
Licenses	17,144

VALUE OF PROPERTY :

Buildings		\$3,356,987
Plant		993,269
Horses		50,108
Harness		17,628
Wagons and other vehicles		58,969
Expenses for the year in repairing harness, wagons, etc.		21,142
Blacksmith's account		19,653
Hay, oats and other fodder		59,996
Value of casks		617,206
cases		74,354
Amount of freight paid		211,805
insurance		44,746
paid for ice		32,727
" taxes, water and gas		75,955
" fuel		110,778
" labels		14,561
" corks		52,567
" capsules		12,031
" bottles		121,228
" tin foil		2,505
" wire		2,131
of wages paid		774,411
Grains sold for feeding of cattle	689,158 bush.
Estimated number of cattle fed	
Number of men employed		1,724

MAINTENANCE OF OFFICE :

Printing	}	51,358
Advertising		
Show cards		
Sundries		121,992

The feeding of cattle is also a large factor in connection with this industry. A close estimate is that the 1,412,229 bushels of grain steeped in 1892 furnished food to fatten 9,000 head of cattle. These cattle would use 11,250 tons of hay, at an average cost of \$11 per ton—\$123,750. At \$40 per head, the first cost of the cattle would be \$360,000, and the selling price when fattened, \$720,000. Freight would be, at \$1 per head on the incoming cattle, \$9,000; at \$2.30 per head to Montreal, \$20,700, and at \$15.75 per head to England, \$141,650.

These foregoing figures show that the brewing industry affords an average yearly market of a million and a half of bushels of barley, \$360,000 worth of cattle, and \$123,750 worth of hay for the farmer, that there is invested in the business in buildings, plant, casks, etc., etc., of the nature of property, no less a sum than \$5,373,554, that employment is given directly to 1,724 workmen, whose annual wages amount to \$774,411. The value of the yearly product is estimated at \$5,721,666.

THE RETAIL TRADE.

It is, however, only when we come to the retail trade that the truly enormous interests involved in the liquor traffic are apparent. Upon this subject I have collected a large mass of statistics which I shall endeavor to compress within reasonable limits. There are to be considered in this branch of the subject the houses which act as importers and middlemen, which we may call wholesalers, the hotels and saloons with bars, and the shops that sell in certain quantities. The conditions of sale vary in the different Provinces, but that information is already in the hands of the Commission, and need not be referred to here.

The importation of liquors has grown to be a very large business, and is one not to be overlooked in this inquiry either as regards the extent of the business itself, or its revenue producing qualities for the Government. The following table gives the classified importations from 1887 to 1892 :—

ARTICLE.	Year 1887.	Year 1888.	Year 1889.	Year 1890.	Year 1891.	Year 1892.
Miscellaneous spirits.....	5,187	6,702	16,469	16,317	21,626	18,990
Cordials and liquors, N.E.S.....	5,921	21,713	22,763	21,321	15,729	16,575
Brandy, artificial and imitations	151,054	184,265	196,416	208,662	197,252	182,832
Rum.....	80,754	87,212	99,570	120,837	70,414	77,168
Gin, N.E.S.....	390,313	448,933	484,569	498,791	409,042	366,627
Whiskey.....	119,120	131,474	154,375	180,502	164,028	181,402
Wines (except sparkling) of all kinds, containing up to 40 per cent. spirit.....	433,526	452,248	480,444	525,249	514,148	473,641
Champagnes, and other spark- ling wines.....	15,104	13,905	16,205	18,432	21,587	20,176
Ales, beers and porters.....	333,206	315,456	333,365	384,662	426,476	455,175
	1,534,185	1,661,908	1,804,176	1,974,773	1,840,302	1,792,586

To get at an approximate idea of the extent of the retail trade, let us take first the city of Montreal.

There are 15 large wholesale and importing houses in Montreal. From these I have gathered statistics of which I give you the totals for the year 1892 :

Value of property, including capital	\$1,535,000
" stock, plant and fixtures	390,009
Paid in premiums in insurance	7,810
Yearly amount paid in freight	46,800
No. of persons who would be thrown out of employment by a prohib- itory law	180
Their yearly wages	\$96,500

There are or were at the time of the gathering of these statistics 458 licenced hotels and restaurants in the city of Montreal. I ascertain the value of the property in these hotels to be \$8,817,075 ; the estimated depreciation thereof in the event of the passage of a prohibitory law to be \$4,743,392 ; the value of plant, stock and fixtures to be \$1,794,215 ; the number of persons who would be thrown out of employment by the passage of a prohibitory law to be 3,996, and the yearly amount of their wages \$1,073,906.

Grocery stores and shops selling liquor numbered 477. The total value of the property thus employed is estimated at \$2,628,000, the estimated depreciation \$657,000, the value of plant, stock, etc., \$1,430,000, the total number of persons who would be thrown out of employment 551, and their yearly salaries \$220,400.

Soda water manufacturers have \$72,500 in property in their business which would depreciate \$26,330, their plant, stock, etc., is valued at \$77,604 ; 91 of their employees would have to be discarded in the event of the passage of a prohibitive law, whose yearly salaries aggregate \$30,701. In the same way coopers engaged in this trade have property valued at \$13,500, depreciation \$10,000, employees 19, yearly wages \$9,880 ; while a cork manufacturer, whose whole business is with the trade, has property valued at \$12,000, plant, stock and fixtures \$18,000, employs 14 men at a yearly wage of \$6,500. Taking in addition the breweries, and we have the following figures for the trade in Montreal :—

Designation.	Value of Property.	Estimated Depreciation.	Value of Plant, Stock, and Fixtures.	No. of Persons thrown out of Employment.	Their Yearly Salaries.
Breweries	\$670,000	\$670,000	\$1,085,828	502	\$216,440
Wholesale	1,535,000	390,000	180	96,500
Hotels and restaurants	8,817,075	4,743,392	1,791,215	3,996	1,073,901
Groceries and shops	2,628,000	657,000	1,430,000	551	220,400
Soda water manufactories	72,500	26,333	77,604	91	30,701
Coopers	13,500	10,000	19	9,880
Cork manufacturers	12,000	12,000	18,000	14	6,500
Total.....	\$13,748,075	\$6,118,725	\$4,795,647	5,353	\$1,651,322

In Toronto the liquor interest is also very extensive. The wholesale trade occupies property valued at \$274,000, on which the estimated depreciation would be \$92,000; value of plant, stock and fixtures, \$610,000; number of persons who would be thrown out of employment, 152; yearly wages, \$137,676. The hotels have property to the value of \$4,988,616; estimated depreciation, \$2,266,200; value of plant, stock, etc., \$1,230,138; number of persons who would be thrown out of employment under a prohibition law, 1,580; with yearly wages of \$429,902. The liquor shops have property valued at \$505,357; estimated depreciation, \$107,638; value of plant, etc., \$323,750; employees, 175; yearly wages, \$102,839. Soda water manufacturers have property valued at \$23,100; estimated depreciation, \$7,050; value of plant, stock, etc., \$40,000; persons who would be thrown out of employment, 37; yearly wages, \$14,650. A cork manufacturer has property valued at \$18,800, which would depreciate only slightly; plant, \$5,979; persons employed, 34; yearly wage, \$12,775. Add to this the distilling and brewing interest and we have for Toronto the following:

Designation.	Value of Property.	Estimated Depreciation.	Value of Plant, Stock and Fixtures.	No. of Persons thrown out of Employment.	Their Yearly Wages.
Distillery and Breweries	\$2,048,207	\$2,048,207	\$1,171,749	582	\$350,788
Wholesale	274,000	92,000	610,000	152	137,676
Hotels	4,988,616	2,266,200	1,230,138	1,580	429,902
Shops	505,357	107,638	323,750	175	102,839
Soda Water Manufacturers	23,100	7,050	40,000	37	14,650
Cork Manufacturers	18,800	5,979	34	12,775
Total	\$7,858,080	\$4,521,105	3,381,616	2,560	\$1,048,630

I have also gathered statistics from various other cities and towns, but not to load up the record, I will, with your permission, give a table of the totals and omit, except in the case of Halifax, the manufacture which has already been covered. The figures are as follows:

Name of City or Town.	Value of Property.	Estimated Depreciation.	Value of Plant, Stock, and Fixtures.	No. of Persons who would be thrown out of Employment.	Their Yearly Wages.
Halifax, N.S.	\$1,681,315	\$935,255	\$316,755	618	\$248,120
St. John, N.B.	729,485	297,172	378,416	355	166,280
Ottawa	1,292,000	543,650	284,425	488	134,630
Hamilton	637,850	287,400	297,000	372	91,040
London	581,000	283,200	161,300	349	85,440
Guelph	178,200	86,100	40,650	151	31,412
Windsor.....	462,000	242,500	69,200	251	55,052
Woodstock.....	194,000	115,000	22,350	106	17,708
Berlin.....	167,000	96,000	25,100	65	18,876
Walkerton (no shops).....	66,500	37,500	5,800	44	8,014
Waterloo (no shops).....	111,000	71,200	4,000	47	8,040

In selecting these cities and towns it will be observed that some are on the border, while others are as far inland as can be desired. They represent, as fairly as can be, all classes of population, and busy bustling as well as staid, quiet country places. My object now is to get a fair average census of the trade along the lines indicated in the above tables, an object not easy of absolute attainment, unless one were clothed with all the powers of the national government. Still an effort may be made. For instance, in Toronto the averages for hotels (which would be considerably increased were wholesale and retail shops included) are :

Value of property	\$33,257	4-9
Estimated depreciation	\$15,108	1-17
Value of plant, stock, fixtures, etc.	\$8,200	25-27
Number of persons thrown out of employment	10	29-54
Yearly wages of these	\$2,866	1-54

In Montreal the averages for hotels and restaurants are :

Value of property	\$19,251	1-4
Estimated depreciation	\$10,356	3-4
Value of stock, plant, fixtures, etc.	\$3,917	1-2
Number of persons thrown out of employment	8	29-40
Wages of these	\$2,423	3-4

I venture to submit that the average town and village hotel has as large an investment in property, as large a stock, and as many employees, at as good wages as the average city hotel, outside the few that are known as "leading." Outside the cities there are few shop and no wholesale licenses. The average town or village hotel would suffer just as much as that situated in the city. The combined shop and wholesale licenced establishments run along about the same lines as to value of property, depreciation, plant, stock, employees, wages, etc., as the average hotel. Bearing these facts in mind we arrive at something like a fair basis of calculation. There are in round numbers say 7,000 retail licenses (licenses include *hotels* selling liquors over bars in prohibition counties) of various kinds issued in the Dominion of Canada. Let us take a very low figure: Let us place the average value of a licenced property, not at \$33,000 as in Toronto, but at \$10,000. Take the depreciation at, not \$15,000 for each licence, but at one-third of the \$10,000, or \$3,333. Place the average stock at \$3,000, instead of the \$8,200 in Toronto, the average number of persons who would be thrown out of employment at 5, instead of about 11, and their yearly wages at \$1,500, instead of \$2,800, and what result do we reach?

On this basis the retail licenced property in Canada is valued at \$70,000,000.

The estimated depreciation in the event of the passage of a prohibitory law is \$23,331,000.

The total value of stock plant and fixtures is \$21,000,000.

The number of employees who would be thrown out of employment is 35,000.

Their yearly wages amount to \$10,500,000.

I do not state that these figures are accurate, but I am prepared to place all the information at my disposal in the hands of the Commission, when your honorable body may figure out the problem for yourselves. I believe that I am much below the true figures.

These last figures of course do not take into consideration what may be called the cognate trades, such as bottling, brewers' and distillers' supplies, soda water manufacturers, cooperage, corkage and many other trades which are interwoven into the general traffic.

WINE AND CIDER.

There are two other branches of the trade with which I have not yet dealt—the manufacture of wine and of cider. With regard to the former, all the information I have been able to obtain goes to show that the census figures with regard to this industry are totally inaccurate. With reference to the cider business, there is no possibility of obtaining information except through the census.

The census returns for wine makers give the capital invested as \$396,475, the value of the product as \$249,489 (a ridiculously low figure), the number of industries as 41, the number of employees as 150 and the yearly wages paid as \$37,955.

The figures for the cider mills are given as : Capital invested, \$136,795 ; value of product, \$186,835 ; number of industries, 175 ; number of employees, 321, and yearly wages, \$47,129.

With this I have done with the statistics relative to the proportions of the liquor traffic in Canada. Other "effects of the liquor traffic" are insignificant compared with the establishment of this tremendous industry.

PROHIBITIVE MEASURES.

Clause 2 of the Commission : "The measures which have been adopted in this and other countries with a view to lessen, regulate or prohibit the traffic," I need not discuss, as I know the Commission is fully informed upon the subject. I would beg, however, to direct attention to a work entitled "Liquor Laws of the United States, their Spirit and Effect," a copy of which I beg to lay before you. In brief, this pamphlet shows that prohibitive attempts in the United States are as old, almost, as the Union itself, that they have all been attended with the same unerring blank failure, that partial prohibitive attempts in early times led not alone to riot but to armed insurrection, that the range of experiment in the United States has run from one extreme to the other, from "free whiskey" under the law to "free whiskey" under prohibition, and that the result of it all is that the United States to-day ranks third among the beer consuming, and well to the front among the whiskey consuming nations of the earth.

RESULTS OF PROHIBITION.

Question 3 : "The result of these measures in each case." Under this heading I may be permitted to give the results of my investigations and experience in different communities where prohibitive laws are or were in force. In doing so I shall follow largely in the footsteps of the Commission.

NOVA SCOTIA.

Nova Scotia has, probably, the most nonsensical licence law that a white people ever laughed at. It was passed by politicians on account of supposed political exigencies, but why it is allowed to remain upon the Statute Book nobody but a Nova Scotia politician can pretend to understand, and even these do not attempt to explain. There is one law for the capital and another for the rest of the Province, and it would be hard to say which of the two the more signally fails of its (alleged) purpose. Take the places as I have visited them :

Halifax.—Here the law says that hotels shall have no bars, but may sell to guests in their rooms or at table, while shops may sell in certain quantities to be consumed off the premises. It is required also that the Inspector shall be a member in good standing of some temperance lodge. One can hardly speak in fittingly respectful terms of this last provision. However, what is the result? Practically nobody in Halifax wanted such a law, and as a matter of course it is inoperative. Every hotel has a bar, and every shop has the same convenience. The law is broken openly and flagrantly every minute of every hour of every day, 365 days in the year. It is a thing of contempt to both prohibitionists and liquor dealers. Something might have been done with ordinary restrictions—now there is no restriction at all, and in the city which legally has no bars I saw more reeling drunkenness than I have observed in any other city in North America, except where total prohibition prevailed. Prohibitionists call Halifax the “Gibraltar of Rum.” It is exactly what they have made it—what they have only themselves to blame for, and what is apparent in many other parts of the Province if you get below the surface. I speak of Halifax after four or five visits thereto, and after inspecting nearly all of the hotels and dozens of the shops.

Outside of Halifax (except in a couple of isolated cases in Halifax county) the law imposes such severe conditions that no licenses can be obtained. Travelling through the Province in company with the Commission and otherwise, I found these results :

Windsor Junction.—This rocky sterile meeting place of two railroads, outside of Halifax, contains nine buildings, including a church. Four of these sell liquor. Of three of these I know by personal experience. To whom do they sell?

Truro.—Another railway junction and a place of considerable importance. I have visited Truro half a dozen times. The bars are practically wide open. A stranger can get off the train, run across to a hotel, get a drink and get back before the train starts. Here for the first, last, and only time, I beg to refer to the members of the Commission, and I only do it here because in his evidence Mr. Spence spoke of seeing members of the Commission breaking the law. It was at this place, it was in reply to a challenge by Mr. Spence as the train rolled into the depot, “to get out and see the workings of the prohibitory law of Nova Scotia.” Therewas five minutes to do it in. Certain members of the Commission accepted the invitation, did get out, accompanied by Mr. Spence, did investigate the working of the law, and returned. Thereafter I did not hear Mr. Spence repeat his challenge, not during the whole course of the Commission. At the time the Commission took evidence in Truro there were from twenty to thirty-five places selling liquor regularly.

New Glasgow.—Here on the occasion of the passing through of the Commission, and on two former occasions, liquor was served openly at the hotel table.

Pictou.—Practically open sale on the occasion of my visit.

Port Mulgrave.—A dozen places selling liquor.

Grand Narrows.—Served openly at the table.

North Sidney.—Open sale, no pretence at concealment. From thirty to sixty places said to be selling.

South Sidney.—About the same.

Windsor.—Stopped there over night, a week or two before the Commission went through. There was apparently no attempt at enforcement of the law.

Kentville.—Has a bar wide open in the railway station. In the town they have signs on all the bar-rooms. The citizens will not permit of any attempt at enforcement of the law, and consequently there is no restriction whatever. Yet it is one of the most prosperous and wide awake towns in Nova Scotia.

Annapolis.—I was told that here no liquor was sold. In the short time at my disposal after dinner and before the train started, I walked up street, and though a total stranger, had no difficulty in walking straight to a place where liquors were sold. I do not know how many others there may have been.

Yarmouth.—Of this place I want to speak at a little greater length. It has "enjoyed" prohibition for seventy years, and yet there is no shadow of doubt that it is not as orderly and sober now as it was years ago. Two generations, at least, have grown up without knowledge of "the baneful influence of the saloon," yet I have scarcely ever met a Yarmouth man *away from home* who would not drink, and very few at home who would not drink on the sly. Take, too, the Yarmouth election trial of 1887, when—and this is a matter of court record—the county was carried by an enormous expenditure of whiskey. The prohibitionists had previously always passed resolutions to support only tried and proved prohibitionists. At the election following these disclosures, a tried and proved advocate of prohibition, Mr. T. B. Crosby, ran against the gentleman against whom the disclosures had been made—and was defeated. Did a single prohibitionist drop his party and vote for Crosby? If so, he has not yet been discovered. So much for seventy years of prohibition along that line. Again, is there not just as much need of temperance work in Yarmouth as ever there was? Why, even the farmers from outside come into town and get drunk. As a matter of fact, and on this point I made careful enquiry, most of the old time temperance societies have died or are kept alive by a handful of old people. Even Ex.-Gov. St. John of Kansas, prohibition candidate of the United States, when he visited Yarmouth, could scarce get together a decent audience. Not because there was no need of temperance work, for in all these years, the selling of liquor in its most dangerous form has gone steadily on, until now there are "walking bar-rooms." Men so low and degraded that no licenced or other respectable person would sell them liquor, are thus supplied in alley ways and vile dens, and so are boys. Convictions are made but still the sale goes on. This peddling by "bootleggers" to those who could not and would not be served in a licenced place is one of the worst crimes that follows prohibition. Then the prosecution of offenders has become a speculation for the money there is in it. These speculators are either blackguards themselves, or they enter into conspiracies with blackguards offering them rewards to give evidence against parties in position to pay fines. These hirelings commit perjury without restraint. For instance, a man named Lambert, a seedy looking laborer, swore against Mr. A. J. McCallum, one of the most respectable druggists in the Province. Mr. McCallum was convicted and fined on this evidence, but had Lambert arrested for perjury. Lambert confessed the perjury and was committed for trial, but later on got off on a technicality in the committal papers. Again, E. M. Nicholls, proprietor of the Queen's Hotel, was convicted and sent to jail for sixty days on similar evidence. He took proceedings against the perjurer who fled the country and has never since returned. The papers in the case were sent to the Minister of Justice. These are specimens of prohibition in Yarmouth. I visited Yarmouth twice. My own observation showed me that there was a great deal of drinking in private houses. The effect of this is a large consump-

tion, as when one, two or more people sit down, in this way the tendency is to drink a great deal. At the hotel at which the Commission stopped there were two bars doing a big business. The windows of this hotel were propped up with empty whiskey bottles, a thing I have never seen outside a prohibition town. There were piles of empty liquor bottles in alley ways and in the vacant places behind stores. I saw six drunken sailors march up the principal street hand in hand, singing boisterously, and the police looked the other way. There were drunken, quarrelling men in the hotel, in one case a little daughter was trying to get her father away. A drunken man fell down a flight of stairs long after midnight and awakened everybody in the hotel. In short I saw more drunkenness in Yarmouth than in any other town in the Maritime Provinces. I have no hesitation in saying that there were at least twenty places regularly selling liquor, and I was told by druggists and others of an enormous consumption of liquor, and a great increase in the chloral and opium habits in recent years.

Digby.—Has one hotel with a bar in the cellar, but which serves liquor openly at the table. Other places do not take the trouble of going down cellar.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

New Brunswick's licence law not being of the farcical character of that of Nova Scotia is much better observed. This does not pertain to Scott Act counties, of which there are several. In the city of St. John, for instance, the licence law is much more strictly observed than is the Scott Act in Fredericton, though it cannot be said that there is a really strict observance in St. John. Probably in both places the people have the degree of enforcement they are prepared to submit to. In connection with St. John I wish to relate an incident which bears directly upon this investigation, viz., the inability of many men to know what is transpiring all around them. At the sittings in New Brunswick's great maritime port a reverend gentleman, a good old Methodist divine, stated, in reply to a question as to whether he knew of any place in New Brunswick where liquor was not sold, that such a place was McAdam Junction. Upon this point he spoke with no uncertain sound, as the evidence taken by the Commission will show. He had been there almost constantly for two years and he *knew* that no liquor was sold in that burgh. Well, a more unlikely place than this rock-bound desolate junction of two railways out towards the Maine border in which to find anything contrary to law could not well be conceived, but just to test the matter, the next day, being at McAdam Junction on the way to St. Stephen with the Commission, and stopping at this point for five minutes, I jumped off the train, walked across the platform and addressed the first railway man I met, asking him where I could get a drink. He directed me at once: "Go into the station and turn to the left." I did so, and there, in the very railway depot, was fitted up a snug little bar, at which all and sundry were served, and from which I secured a drink of the worst whiskey it has ever been my misfortune to encounter. Now, I fully believe my old Methodist friend spoke the truth so far as he knew, but the trouble was he was talking about something he knew nothing about. Similar examples may suggest themselves as I proceed.

St. Stephen.—This town has enjoyed the blessings of the Scott Act for several years. There are, I think, not above a dozen places selling liquor regularly. The leading hotel when we were there had a bar, and had quietly notified the authorities that if another prosecution were entered into they would close up the place entirely. One saloon, down at the bridge, was fined \$50 the day the Commission sat in that town. I went down that evening. Two men behind the bar were industriously serving a large crowd, while the proprietor told me he "would have to hustle for a day or two to make up for that fifty dollars."

While here I may dismiss a trip made to Calais, just across the river, in Maine, by saying that once the bona fides of the party were established there was plenty to drink. Only the leading hotel in the place was visited.

Fredericton Junction.—Open sale.

Fredericton.—Practically open sale. The whole enforcement of the law here is a regular fraud. And a miserable fraud at that. This was the first place in Canada to adopt the Scott Act. It has been maintained ever since, but it has not, if the residents themselves are to be believed, decreased the sale of liquor one iota. There are at least twenty-one places selling liquor, not counting drug stores, and while there I saw an order for liquor from one of the drug stores that was something amazing. I visited a saloon late on Saturday evening that was running wide open, and was certainly doing a rushing business. The proprietors have, I understand, built a new block this past summer. Within a month or so, I have heard from Fredericton that that saloon is still doing as large a business as ever. Regarding the sale of liquor generally in that city, they have tried fines, they have tried imprisonment, and such imprisonment was a fair sample of the fraud of the whole thing. Yet the sale goes on, and everybody knows that it goes on, and in some places of the most demoralizing character. The only check is that the leading hotels are allowed to sell practically with a licence collected in the shape of fines at certain intervals.

Moncton.—In the shire town of Westmoreland County the sale is flagrantly open. There is no pretence whatever of obeying the law. Some twenty-eight places are selling, and the bar-rooms are as wide open as those in any licenced district in Ontario. I might refer here to that celebrated advertisement of the chief of police requesting that the bars should be closed on July 12th. Perhaps no stronger comment on the enforcement of the law could be given. With all, Moncton is a most orderly place.

Amherst.—The county seat of Cumberland has open sale, and one of the largest wholesale liquor establishments in the Province of New Brunswick.

Even at a little junction where the Commission had to wait for a train connection, Painsec, consisting only of the station and one little house, the said little house contained an elaborate supply of beer, which was plentifully sold to the waiting crowd. So far as I was able to learn, because I visited many other places in New Brunswick besides these mentioned, I do not think there is a single village or place of a dozen houses in that Province where liquor is not sold, unless it may be the town of Marysville, which, as you are aware, is owned entirely by Mr. Gibson, an ultra-prohibitionist, and which lies convenient to the city of Fredericton, where the residents of Marysville get their supplies.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

With permission, I will devote a little time to this gem of the sea, for the reason that there such prohibition as is contained in the Scott Act has had opportunity of working under peculiarly and exceptionally favorable circumstances. Prince Edward Island, surrounded entirely by water, the whole Island under the operation of the Act, its neighbors across the Straits also possessing the Act, peopled almost entirely by a rural population, having no large centres of industrial population, and only one city of any size, having no "foreign element" of population, having no immigration, its population made up of only two elements, who have lived for generations in the land, and one of whom—the French—of notably temperate habits—having all these, it would seem that every one of the usual excuses offered for the non-success of the Act was eliminated. It is not claimed that the officers have not done their duty, or that the Courts have been negligent. The Act was carried by immense majorities, and, with the exception of the city of Charlottetown, has been allowed

uninterruptedly to run its course. Everything, therefore, has been in favor of a successful administration of the law—and yet I venture to say that not even in the Province of Ontario has the Scott Act been a more dismal failure, and of this it is not far to seek the proof. I had the advantage of studying the working of the Scott Act on the Island some four years ago, and also upon the occasion of the visit of the Commission, and, therefore, saw Charlottetown under the Scott Act and under the licence law. All other parts of the Island were under the Scott Act upon both occasions, and each time I studied the matter with the greatest possible care. First let me say that the general character of the P.E.I. islander is in the aggregate most praiseworthy. They are an intelligent, moral and religious people, and when such a people break a law it is for no light cause. They are not given to sectarian strife, a very large proportion of the Provincial revenue is spent in providing free education, and society frowns most rigidly upon a dissolute life. From such a people might not the best results have been anticipated? Until the time that the temperance teacher became a dictator and, later, a coercionist, the people lived in harmony, temperance associations were vigorous, the churches happy in their relations to each other, and drunkenness was comparatively little known. Now there are heartburnings everywhere, temperance associations are declining, the statistics before your Commission will show that drunkenness has increased, the drinker has become, as well, a hypocrite, drink is sold in all manner of places, country places are infested with wayside grogeries, liquor is sold, I believe, in every town and village almost openly, illicit stills are not unknown, there has been an alarming increase of drinking among the young, the harmony between churches has been destroyed, and vituperation and abuse have taken the place of temperance instruction and mutual confidence. These things I know. But a few weeks (June 25, 1891) before the visit of the Royal Commission to Charlottetown the *Guardian* of that city, the organ of the prohibitionists, did not hesitate to admit to its columns a communication in which everybody opposed to prohibition were sweepingly characterized as “saloon keepers, gamblers and other criminals.” I doubt whether the annals of border state politics can furnish anything more infamously untrue than this. Members of the Commission will recollect how a respected clergyman of Charlottetown was stigmatized in the press for the offence of having testified against prohibition—stigmatized in terms that I do not care to set down here. The venerable Bishop Courtney is denounced as “unmanly” and so on to the end of the chapter. In a word, everybody who cannot see in their way is held up to reprobation as “advocates of drunkenness,” “rummies,” “in the rum interest,” etc., etc. A Bishop, a Judge, a Senator, or the keeper of a vile place in the slums, are all classed alike. Can it be wondered at that bad feeling is prevalent. So much for one of the beauties of intemperate temperance.

How then came the Scott Act to be adopted? Simply because a little pea rattling around in an empty tin pail can make more noise than a brick of gold locked up in a bank vault. The Scott Act never had either the respect or support of anything like the majority of the people of P.E.I., and this I will prove. In Charlottetown the Act was carried on April 24, 1879, by 584 majority, there being polled 1,090 votes of which 253 were against. On September 17, 1878, six months previously, 1,813 votes were polled at the Dominion elections. This shows that 723 possible votes were not polled, and that the Act was carried by a majority of 392 of the possible, or rather ordinary vote. In King's County the Act was carried by 1,017, a large majority truly, yet only 1,135 votes were polled, as against 3,576 at the general elections. Over two-thirds of the voters did not vote. In Prince County 2,033 votes were polled, as against 3,321 at the Dominion elections, and in Queen's only 1,416, as against 4,564. In the face of these figures, is it any wonder that the Act is not successful? Moreover, I state that the real sentiment to-day in favor of prohibition in P.E.I. is absolutely insignificant, and I shall show you why.

An analysis of the cry for prohibition in that Province, and this is true of some places besides the Island, reveals itself into five elements :

(1) Men, mostly young and immature, actuated mainly by pure motives, and a little by the hope that their professions of temperance, may procure them worldly advancement.

(2) The clergy of certain denominations, whose views as to public amusement and private relaxations are of the strictest, and who, as spiritual guides, feel it their professional duty to urge their views without regard to secular consequences. Good men are these and well meaning, as a rule, but usually sadly and woefully ignorant of the world's ways and doings.

(3) Certain matrons, with an assortment of maidens under their wing, who spare time from domestic duties to "reform" the habits of the age. These follow devoutly in the footsteps of their clergy, and far be it from me, the "vile agent of an accursed traffic," as one good "temperance" journal dubbed me, to impugn the purity of their motives or their singularly clear preceptions as to the chief duties of women on this terrestrial sphere.

(4) The usual class known in all communities, who to gain notoriety put themselves forward in any current movement, and who are the unmitigated curse of any and every movement of whatsoever character.

(5) Those good people who on all public questions follow the lead of those making the most noise, most estimable people but not remarkable for force of character. These are but lambs in the hands of the professional agitator.

These five classes have of course associated themselves with one or other of the temperance organizations on the Island. These are the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Sons of Temperance, the Independent Order of Good Templars. It is a legitimate inference that every person who is really in earnest in wanting prohibition, will be in affiliation with one or other of these organizations. And taking this ground, and pressing it upon the attention of the Commission, I find that the grand total strength of the prohibitionists, divested of all press, pulpit and platform brag to be :

	Members.
Woman's Christian Temperance Union.....	400
Sons of Temperance.....	1,920
Independent Order of Good Templars, Adults 1,363, Juveniles 517, total. 1,880	<u>1,880</u>
A grand total of both sexes.....	3,200

The figures for the W.C.T.U. are an estimate, carefully made, and believed to be a liberal one. So far as I know they have no published report giving their membership. The figures for the S.O.T. and I.O.G.T. are taken from their annual published reports of the (then) last current year. Now Sirs, the census figures show that there are in P.E.I. above the age of seventeen, at which age there are members in these temperance orders, 62,024 souls. The prohibitionists number about one-twentieth of these, old and young, men, women and children and nothing can controvert this fact. They would probably induce many others to vote with them, but upon this one-twentieth would rest the moral obligation of seeing the law carried out and two-thirds of these would not be available for reasons that I need not specify.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, let me refer to a statement I made a short time back that the temperance societies were dwindling. The W.C.T.U., I have reason to believe, have declined in strength, but of this I cannot be positive in the absence of printed reports. As regards the others we have positive information. The Good Templars after a year of active agitation, 1890-91, actually increased their membership apparently by the grand total of 79, though I have not found any record of how many they lost, but that perhaps is due to my negligence. Over this glorious result, evidencing as it does such wonderful strides in the advancement of their great prohibition cause,

they were naturally elated, and jubilantly sent to the Grand Lodge of Nova Scotia, (9th July, 1892), the following telegram :

“Greetings received with great pleasure. Have had good session. Increased membership seventy-nine, total 1,363, juvenile 517. May this be a glorious year.

Signed, A. D. FRASER.

I think the Commission had the pleasure of listening to the gentleman, who signed the above, as a witness while in Charlottetown. This magnificent result of a year's extra hard labor was not however equalled or participated in by the other organization the S.O.T. The official report of this body, while congratulating the order that it has “held its own,” is very despondent in tone. The order, (page 9), “has sustained a slight loss of membership;” (page 10), “divisions will and do go down and it is only by organizing new ones to take their places, that we can expect to hold our own;” (page 14), “seventeen divisions report gains of from one to ten, while fourteen report losses of from one to twenty, *during the quarter*,” and in the report of the Grand Scribe on page 15 he says : “Some divisions I find doing well, some fairly well, some holding their own, and others again seemingly in the throes of dissolution. *No new divisions have been organized the past quarter.*” I will defy anybody to show me such a report as that in the times when temperance societies were doing temperance work. The Sons of Temperance consist of three Division and fifty-two Subordinate Lodges, of which only forty-four are effective, the I.O.G.T. have thirty-four subordinate lodges. A considerable portion of the membership, however, in the country districts is composed of young men and women, not yet settled in life, and who in default of gayer amusement naturally find meeting under the guise of temperance at the lodge room, a not unpleasant way of spending the evening, but which cannot for a moment be seriously regarded as having any more moral or political weight, or as voicing the demands of any section of the community, than the meeting of singing classes, which indeed in practice they very much resemble.

As to the operation of the Act itself its most marked feature, aside from its continual infraction, is probably the lamentable deterioration in public self respect that has followed its adoption. The theory of the Act is that no liquor is to be procurable in the province (aside from sacramental use) unless as medicine for use of the sick, on a medical certificate from a physician presented to a duly appointed vendor. May I ask the Commission to reflect for one moment upon the general self respect of a community, both as regards the men obtaining the certificates, the physician signing them and the man selling the liquor, which would permit of such a state of affairs existing as was evidenced by the examination of the licenced vendor at Summerside. Yet this state of affairs pertains pretty much all over the province and where there is not the licenced vendor, there is an unlicenced one where not even the physician's certificate is necessary.

The attempt to enforce the law has led to most deplorable perjury, of which the Commission have already ample evidence before them. But I would call your attention to this—what I hold to be a fact—that a greatdeal of this perjury on the Island is traceable to the pernicious theory of the Prohibitionists that “a law broken with impunity is better than no law at all.” This view is not peculiar to the Island, yet is strongly upheld by the Island Prohibitionists and their organ, the *Charlottetown Guardian*. The evils arising from such a doctrine are immensely more formidable than any mere question of what quantity of intoxicants are drunk or are not drunk in a given time. It is subversive of all order ; it leads to anarchy, and it brings into contempt *all* other law. And that this is the cause on the Island, I believe, is beyond dispute. It is an evil seed that has been sown that will yet bring forth even more malign fruit. I

know it to be (with a certain class that figure in liquor prosecutions) considered simply a joke to escape by hard swearing. The public mind has become familiarized with false swearing, and what was at first an offspring of the Scott Act is too apt to be extended to *any* case where perjury will answer the purpose. And I think we have it in evidence that this deplorable fact very much paralyzes justice. It may be that the temperance people, aside from the law, are unintentionally responsible in part for this. The Island has any number of Justices of the Peace. The Act says prosecutions can be taken "before any two Justices." Reference to the official records (which, I think, are in the hands of the Commission) will show that all of the cases have been tried before about twenty out of the hundreds of J.P.'s. These twenty were alleged to be the selection of the Temperance people, and trial before them was believed to result in conviction as a foregone conclusion. I do not say that this was so, but it was believed in many quarters to be so, and persons going before these Courts, having no faith whatever in their impartiality, did not hesitate to swear to anything at all, believing that they were acting no worse than the Court itself.*

I have never heard it charged that the cases tried before the stipendiary magistrates at Charlottetown and Summerside were not disposed of according to the rules of evidence.

Another effect of the attempt to enforce the Act is the great increase of drinking among the young. Of this I saw something myself, but perhaps it will suffice to quote a single high authority:—In the 1891 report of the Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance, the Grand Scribe, on page 17, says—"Every lover of his country must deplore the fact that the claims of our Order and principles have such a feeble hold on the masses. . . . I think I am quite safe in saying *that not for many years* has there been so much drinking among the young. Hundreds—yea, thousands of our boys are fast going the way that leadeth to death." And on page 18—"At the present time many of our Divisions are languishing, are dying, for the want of a little help—help that is denied us by the fathers of many of these same boys. We would save the boys, but they won't help us; we would save the boys, but they won't let us." Of course, nobody believes for a moment that "yea, thousands" of the youth of P.E.I. are going hand in hand calmly down the hill to a drunkard's grave. The Worthy Grand Scribe had probably become so habituated to the intemperate use of language that he could not avoid exaggeration. But the fact that there has been a large increase of drinking among the young men is incontrovertable. I have seen them (quite youths) drinking out of bottles on the cars, in out-of-the-way alleys, behind fences at the Exhibition grounds, and elsewhere. And the worst of it was, that they apparently looked upon it as something smart to defy decency and break the law.

Finally, let me give some few of my own experiences on the Island. I first saw Charlottetown under the Scott Act. At that time saloons were running openly, though there was liable to be a spasmodic effort at enforcement at any time. I saw a number of places selling, was told of a good many more. I made particular enquiries as to the country districts, and so far as my own observation could go, it confirmed what I was told—viz., that drinking had increased rather than decreased under the Scott Act, and that certainly the form of drinking was attended with much greater danger: At the time of the visit of the Commission I again made every possible examination, by personal inspection, by conversation with leading men, and before and since by correspondence. Charlottetown had certainly improved in the character of its drinking places, and the statistics showed a marvellous decrease in drunkenness; but it will be many a long year before that beautiful city recovers from the pernicious lessons learned under the

(NOTE.—I have no doubt this was a result from the manner of the selection of magistrates in the Scott Act counties in Ontario.)

Scott Act. Throughout the country the state of affairs is growing worse, so far as I can learn. The brewery at Charlottetown has never ceased operations, but has increased its output considerably, and sells upon the Island every gallon that is brewed. Beer is sold regularly on the trains between Summerside and Charlottetown, the same as are cigars or newspapers. In Summerside there are eight saloons, with little or no attempt at concealment, to say nothing of that fearful and wonderful licenced vendor, whom the Commission had the pleasure of examining. That gentleman stated in his evidence that no liquor was sold by the glass in his place. I myself saw scores of people purchase liquor by the glass, and they were served by the vendor. As an instance of how the Scott Act is observed I may quote one incident. On the race-track at Summerside, on the occasion of the visit of the Commission to the town, there were many bottles of whiskey kept in the horsesheds and stables. One gentleman found his stock had become exhausted, and he called out to another gentleman, "Doctor, give me an order for a bottle of Scotch." The medical gentleman thus appealed to drew out a note-book, tore out a leaf, wrote out the desired order, and a boy brought it down to the town, returning in a few minutes from the licensed vendor's with the bottle of whiskey. I merely quote this as an example of the ease with which, without visiting the saloons at all, liquor can be obtained by anybody who wishes to get it.

The Scott Act in the Province of P.E.I., whether looked at from the social, moral, religious or temperance points of view, has proven an undoubted, unmitigated and comprehensive failure. It has increased rather than decreased drinking; it has made that drinking ten times more dangerous than it ever was before; it has placed the sale of liquor in most cases into the hands of the most disreputable and dangerous classes; it places liquor within the reach of all, young and old, rich and poor, high or low, man, woman or child; it gives them that liquor at all hours of the day or night, Sunday or weekday; it adds to drinking, hypocrisy and deceit; it has made perjury a joke, and violation of the law a pastime; it has set neighbor against neighbor, made war among the churches, to a large extent destroyed social intercourse and substituted rank acrimony and vicious vituperation for reasonable discussion, and all this among a people as intelligent, moral, sober, neighborly and kindly as any in the world, and under circumstances exceptionally favorable to the good working out of the law if there was any good in it. In my belief, total prohibition such as is now asked for would simply add to these evils the twins of smuggling and illicit stilling on an extensive scale.

With reference to illicit distillation, I forgot to refer to the case of one Joseph McLellan, a blacksmith, at Little Harbor, Lot 46, who manufactured a famous beverage known as "Jack the Ripper brand" of illicit whiskey. He was finally seized upon by Excise Officer Barraidale, of Halifax, and fined \$100, or six months' imprisonment, at Charlottetown.

Lastly, I have this to say of P.E.I. The census of 1871 shows a population of 94,021, that of 1881 108,891, an increase of 14,870 in the decade; that of 1891 109,088, an increase of only 197 in the ten years. Prohibition was not in force in the first ten years, and it was in the last. I leave to my prohibition friends to figure out cause and effect.

QUEBEC.

In the Province of Quebec I have seen the operation of the Scott Act in three counties.

Chicoutimi.—In this county my observation was confined to the town of Chicoutimi. I certainly would not have known the Scott Act was in force there had I not been so informed.

Richmond.—In some places in this county the Act is fairly well observed, as for instance at Danville, where I think very little liquor is sold. In other places the condition of things is quite the contrary. It all depends upon the sentiment of the people in the different localities.

Brome.—I found no place in Brome that I visited where liquor could not readily be obtained by a stranger, but it was sold secretly—that is, the bar-room door was kept locked. The temperance sentiment, undoubtedly, is strong in Brome, but Mr. Dyer, who voted against Prohibition in the House of Commons, in 1881, was re-elected by acclamation for that constituency in 1892.

Many districts in the Province of Quebec have no licenses issued. These are in the midst of small country parishes, within reasonable distance of large towns as a source of supply. There are any number of small country districts in Ontario without licenses, simply because the convenience of adjacent towns and villages having licenses renders them unnecessary in these particular localities. In some of these “no licence” parishes the law is most distinctly violated, but upon that subject ample evidence was taken at the sitting of the Commission in the city of Quebec.

ONTARIO.

It seems somewhat unnecessary to add anything to the evidence already given regarding the failure of the Scott Act in the counties of Ontario, yet I have been so astounded at some of the statements made before this Commission that I hope you will allow me a minute or two in which to relate certain facts.

For instance, I could not have been more amazed than at the evidence given by Rev. Dr. Brethour, concerning Halton, and given, too, in all apparent sincerity, as to the absolute stopping of the sale of drink in that county. The reverend gentleman related a story of a man who drove all through the county and could get no liquor. I had seen the same stuff printed in Scott Act campaign literature, but never dreamed that Rev. Dr. Brethour could be deceived by it. At about the time he spoke of, I myself took a trip into Halton, in fact took more than one journey in that county. Upon one occasion, right in the midst of the second Scott Act campaign, I was sent to Milton, the county town, to report a great series of prohibition meetings that were being held there. Ex-Governor St. John was there, and also that famous Nebraska gentleman, since dead, remarkable for his earnestness and vituperation. Rev. Dr. Brethour presided at this meeting, and the Scott Act workers were gathered together from all parts of the county, and, in fact, from all parts of Ontario. I was there from Friday until Monday. The train I went out on from Toronto was loaded with temperance people going up to the meeting. The baggage car was also loaded, with either fourteen or sixteen barrels of beer, I forget the exact number. These barrels were unloaded on the platform while the train stopped, and were carried down town without any attempt at secrecy. This led me to start a little investigation of my own, and that night I went around the town of Milton. I saw very many places, and was in very many places where liquor was sold. On Saturday night there was a great row—a drinking riot—and some people were hurt. Sunday differed from the preceding two days only in being a little worse—that is, I saw more drinking going on. I myself saw more than one drunken man reeling on the streets of Milton that Sunday. There was a big bar running in the very hotel occupied as the Scott Act headquarters, or at least where the headquarters of the organizers were. This, be it remembered, was in the height of the campaign, and with a monster temperance demonstration being held in the town.

I was at Milton on two or three occasions. I was also at Oakville and two or three other places. I am satisfied that most valorous efforts were made in

Halton to enforce the Act, but it was simply impossible. The men appointed to enforce the Act—Magistrate Young and Inspector Brothers—were men without a single drop of the milk of human kindness in their composition—men who in the olden times would have ridden behind Claverhouse for the mere pleasure of the trampling down and slaughtering of Covenanters. And yet with the vehement efforts of these men, the enforcement of the law was impossible. Is it any wonder that under such circumstances there was perjury, and almost armed resistance to the law. It has been contended that, even as it was, crime was diminished and drunkenness decreased in the county of Halton under the Scott Act. The following table shows how utterly astray that statement is :

HALTON.

Act went into force May 1st, 1882. Repeal carried March 1st, 1888 ; went out of force May 1st, 1888.

COMMITTALS BEFORE HALTON MAGISTRATES.

	Assaults, Threat- ening Language, Larceny and Tres- pass.	Drunk and Disorderly	Miscellan- aneous.	Violation Liquor Laws.	Total Convic- tions.	Convic- tions for other than breach of Liquor Laws.
1879.....	37	5	9	4	55	51
1880.....	26	8	22	3	59	56
1881.....	17	15	11	2	45	43
1882.....	21	2	28	18	69	51
1883.....	9	5	5	29	48	19
1884.....	20	11	17	31	79	48
1885.....	20	15	55	19	109	90
1886.....	18	11	26	27	82	55
1887.....	19	15	51	47	132	85
Average of the last three years before the Scott Act.....	26 $\frac{2}{3}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	14	3	53	50
Average of last three years of the Scott Act.....	19	13 $\frac{2}{3}$	44	31	107 $\frac{2}{3}$	76 $\frac{2}{3}$

During the years of the Scott Act I observed its workings in the County of Wellington, at Guelph and other places. The law was in most instances a dead letter, and nowhere could there be considered fair enforcement.

I was in the County of Bruce, at Walkerton, where the law was simply laughed at, and at Hanover, which is peculiar in this respect: The county line as between Grey and Bruce splits the village of Hanover in half. When the Dunkin Act was in force in Grey, the residents of the Bruce section of the village crossed over on Sundays into Grey to obtain their liquor, and when the Scott Act was in force in Bruce the inhabitants of the Grey section returned the compliment. Practically the only effect of the prohibitive law that could be observed in either county, was that on Sunday the liquor selling went on the same as on week day.

I visited the County of Simcoe at Barrie, and other places. The law was a dead letter.

I was detailed to go with Messrs. Wiman and Butterworth in 1887 when they made their famous Commercial Union tour through Canada, attended all

their meetings, and with them, and at other times, visited such towns as Orangeville, Arthur, Drayton, Port Hope, St. Thomas, Chatham, and many other places. In none was there an observance of the law. I could give details of all these towns if it were not for the necessity of not loading up the record too much.

I was in Carleton County during the time of the Scott Act there. I have been along those roads spoken of by Mr. J. K. Stewart as having had the bars closed, and I am afraid that Mr. Stewart cannot be considered a very good judge. The law was practically a dead letter in all parts of Carleton County in the last two years.

The causes that led to the overthrow of the Scott Act are not far to seek and are exceedingly simple. Not all the excuses of our prohibition friends, as varied in character as they are unsound in logic, can alter the facts. A stream cannot rise above its source, and the Scott Act could not proceed in effect beyond the power that gave it birth. A noisy but most unstable minority invariably brought it into existence, and beyond the moral power of that noisy unstable minority in the community the work of the Act could not go. The Scott Act was a failure just as the prohibitive laws of Maine, Kansas and Iowa are failures, simply because the people at large look upon the efforts at enforcement with contempt. The Scott Act was a failure from the start. Tinkered as it was, and it seems to be the especial province of all such laws to be tinkered at, as witness the Maine law which has been amended 46 times in 40 years. So with the Scott Act. It was amended and re-amended until as it stands to-day it is a positive disgrace to the statute book of any free civilized country, but it was never a success and never could be made a success. And this is the secret of all legislation, whether license law, prohibitive or otherwise. What the people or any large number of them want they will have. The law says that farmers shall cut the thistles on the roadside before his farm, but the farmer does not cut the thistles. If the roadmaster comes down on him once he takes good care the next year to have a different kind of a roadmaster. Sir Oliver Mowat passed a law prohibiting boys smoking cigarettes. The boys laugh at the law, and the people laugh at the genius which devised it. The license law prohibits sale after certain hours and on Sundays, but in sections where the people wish to drink during these hours and on Sundays they calmly do so. In Halifax the law says there shall be no bar-rooms, but the bars in that city are as wide open as the break of day. The Scott Act said no liquor should be retailed for beverage purposes, but, the noisy minority to the contrary, liquor was retailed for beverage purposes in every house where it was before sold, and in hundreds upon hundreds besides, which never sold before the Act and which have ceased selling since. And under any system of Prohibition that can be devised the result will be exactly the same.

To show that the Scott Act has almost invariably been carried by a minority I have here a statement showing (1) the name of each county or city in which a vote was taken on the Scott Act and the date of the voting, (2) the number of votes on the list at the time of voting, (3) the votes polled for the Act, (4) votes polled against the Act, (5) majority for or against the Act (6) total of the votes polled, (7) total votes polled at the nearest Dominion election. This statement which is perhaps too bulky to be placed upon the record is at the service of the Commission; but I shall here extract a few instances to illustrate my contention. Starting first with Nova Scotia, for this argument will apply to the whole Dominion, take the case of Cape Breton County. The Act there was carried by 523 majority, yet only 955 votes were polled as against 3,071 at the Dominion elections. The evidence will show the condition of affairs in Cape Breton. For New Brunswick, take Westmoreland for instance. There the Act carried by 783 majority, but only 1,381 votes were polled as against 4,500 at a Dominion election. I may remark here that this statement shows that where the full vote

or nearly the full was polled the Act was almost always defeated; but even where it was not, and was carried by a small majority, the result was the same, as for instance the city of Fredericton, which on the last occasion polled 672 votes for the Scott Act as against 683 in the Dominion election; and yet the Act is as flagrantly violated in Fredericton as it is almost anywhere. In P. E. I. take the case of Queen's County which gave the large majority of 1,218 for the Act. Only 99 persons voted contra, and only 1,416 votes were cast as against 4,564 in the Dominion election. In Quebec the differences are not so marked. Chicoutimi for instance polled 1,686 votes in the Scott Act and 2,517 in the Dominion elections. In Brome the figures were 1,963, and 2,761; and in Richmond 1,952 and 2,625. In Ontario numerous examples could be cited, but it will do to take the banner County, Halton. When the Act was first carried the majority was 81, the total vote polled 2,885, as against 3,561 at the Dominion election. When the Act was repealed, majority against 197, 3,900 votes were cast as against 4,435 in the Dominion election. The voters on the roll in the meantime had increased from 5,275 to 5,670. On the other hand, Hamilton, which polled 4,472, as against 4,860, nearly the full strength defeated the Act by 1,150; while Hastings which polled 4,745 as against 6,732, only defeated the Act by 7. In Manitoba, Marquette polled only 807 votes for the Scott Act as against 2,253 in the Dominion election; and Lisgar 367, as against 1,480. The Act never came into operation in either county.

The figures tell the true story of the failure of the Scott Act. The people generally did not want it, would not support it, and in Ontario repealed it at the first opportunity. In the Maritime Provinces it is still tolerated, why, the mind of mere man cannot conceive. Some enthusiasts down there still profess to believe that it is doing good, but my experience is that four men out of five laugh at it as a consummate farce. Ontario would not tolerate the state of affairs that exists in the Maritime Province Scott Act counties a day.

We have heard much of the alleged powerful Prohibition sentiment said to exist in Ontario. I have had as good opportunities during the last twelve years of becoming acquainted with the people of Ontario as any man in it. I do not believe anything like one-half or even one-third of the voters of Ontario favor Prohibition. I can find no evidence of it. I do not believe prohibitive sentiment is anything like as strong as it was before the Scott Act trial. I do not believe a man running as a straight Prohibitionist and that alone can be elected in a single constituency in Ontario. The Prohibitionists in Parliament from Ontario have decreased instead of increasing. In very many counties for a candidate to be known as a Prohibitionist is to imperil the party's chances of success. Take the case of Halton, the banner Prohibition county; when Mr. Henderson, a life long temperance man, accepted the platform of the Dominion Alliance, while Mr. Waldie refused to touch it with a ten foot pole, Mr. Henderson was promptly defeated. But when Mr. Henderson again running refused to have anything to do with the Prohibitionist body he was elected over his former opponent, and later has accumulated a majority of nearly 500, and in defiance of the Prohibitionists. Do the different temperance societies show any remarkable increase in their membership of men whose names are on the voters' lists?

But lo! there was the plebescite. It was triumphantly carried? Perhaps it was. The little pea rattled around in the empty tin pail again and its clatter was heard throughout the land. Sundry United States citizens of more or less fame, loud of voice and forceful of gesture, settled down in our midst and the campaign of noise had full swing. There was no opposition, and no discussion. But whether the vote was for or against is of no moment. The plebescite in Ontario was a political dodge, and there begins and ends all that may be said concerning it. Whether it is carried by 10,000 or by 100,000 matters not. It did not mean anything, it was never intended to mean anything, it never can

mean anything. There was a majority of over 80,000 for the plebescite, but all the same only 27% of the electors voted in its favor.

MANITOBA

Is chiefly notable because there we first heard of those two bright examples of Prohibition, Pasadena and Riverside, California. It was there, too, that we heard of a place in Kansas where the law was so well enforced that a person had to drop down into a cellar and crawl through a subterranean passage to get whiskey out of a tin cup. It was some such foolishness as this anyway. A careful survey has failed to locate that town. Manitoba, too, is alleged to be strong in Prohibition sentiment. They carried the Scott Act in two counties away back in 1880-81, but never brought it into effect. They have tried local option in various places with unfailling unsuccess. They carried a plebescite by a large majority, because both political parties voted for it, each with the laudable hope of injuring the other, but they have done nothing with the plebescite. I have met many liquor dealers who voted for that plebescite on political grounds, and I have met scores of Government supporters who declared that they would vote against the Government if they dared attempt to pass a prohibitory law, though they had all voted for the plebescite. Does any one imagine for a moment that Mr. Greenaway would refrain for a moment from passing a prohibitory law if he thought it would be popular, or that his Attorney-General would allow the occasion to pass if he thought it would work? Otherwise I cannot speak of Manitoba beyond what the record of evidence shows.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Here again I need not go beyond what the evidence taken by the Commission shows. But I wish to point out that the large extension of the permit system in later years, did not lead to the breaking down of the prohibitive law. On the contrary, it was only the safety valve afforded by the free use of permits that enabled such small observation of the law as did exist. Upon this point I can offer argument if the Commission so desire. But whether or no, no amount of sophistry, no excuse for this or extenuation of that or explanation of the other thing can alter the fact that this law, most rigorous in all its provisions, tried in a sparsely settled country wherein communication with the outside world was most difficult, having at disposal for its enforcement not only the ordinary officers of the law, but also an armed mounted force of over 1,000 men, utterly failed to prevent the importation and consumption of liquor, and was repealed upon the first opportunity offered to the people, and *when its repeal was made a leading issue at the polls*. The favorable circumstances under which Prohibition was attempted in the North-West are unparalleled in the history of such legislation, the completeness of the failure is equally unparalleled. Before leaving the North-West I should like to add to the records of the Commission the evidence of Rev. Dr. Charles A. Berry, the celebrated divine from Wolverhampton, England, who will be best remembered on this side of the Atlantic as the successor for a short time of the late Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. Rev. Dr. Berry made a trip through the North-West and describes his experiences in a magazine entitled "The Young Man," which is published I think in both London and New York, and a copy of which I herewith present. Allow me to call attention to the closing words. After pointing out the evasions of the law and that men will manage to dodge the law and make a path to their goal, Dr. Berry says:—"Wherefore it is to Christ and not to Cæsar that we must look for better things. The Church and not the State, the preacher and not the policeman

is, or ought to be, the agent of a new and higher condition of life. It is only by the making of new men, that we can hope to reach a better civilization." I would commend this statement to the serious consideration of those well-meaning pastors who have thrown aside the word of God in favor of the policeman's club.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

We saw there a sober community, prosperous, hard working, but with practically nothing in the shape of repressive liquor laws, even Sunday closing only a name.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

It was one of the peculiarities of our Prohibition friends that whenever asked to point out a place where Prohibition has proven successful they refer to some district a very long distance away. In Manitoba all Prohibition hopes were centred upon Southern California and some unknown places in Kansas. In all that long distance from the Red River to the Pacific Coast we saw nothing in favor of Prohibition. On the coast we learned of the prohibitive law in Alaska, but nobody contended that there was anything favorable to Prohibition to be found there.

We then started south 1,100 miles to San Francisco, through Washington, Oregon and California. Outside of Oaklands, opposite San Francisco, there are a couple of Prohibition municipalities, which our friends apparently never heard of, and which I discovered only accidentally. I may say there was no need for investigation there. Then we went about 400 miles further south to Los Angeles, and still another sixty miles to that haven of Prohibition, Riverside.

Riverside.—Here was the place where Prohibition was to be seen in all its glories. Riverside is an orange grove in the midst of a desert, and most certainly, if the people wanted Prohibition they could have it. They had tried it for one year and then gone back to the old system, excepting that they increased the number of saloons. We had come nearly 1,600 miles to find the saloon in full blast.

Pasadena was the other Mecca of our Prohibition friends. This is simply a residence suburb of Los Angeles, 8 miles distant, with a train running between the two places every half-hour or so. A prohibitive law of some sort was supposed to be in force. The hotels all sell liquors to guests, furnish liquors at the tables openly, and have wine cards. The restaurants have beer pumps, and are allowed to sell beer and light wine. The big winter hotel there—the "Raymond"—absolutely refused to close its bar during the season, and the proprietor told the authorities that if the bar was closed he would close the whole hotel. Thereafter he was not interfered with. There is a street railway running straight through the town, from one side of the municipality to the other, about fifteen minutes' ride, and at each end of this street railway, just outside the limit of the town, there is a saloon. So that, under this famed Prohibition in Pasadena, of which we heard such glowing accounts in Manitoba, the traveller is served at the hotel, the citizen is served at the restaurant with lighter drinks and with anything he wants at the two saloons mentioned; or he brings out from Los Angeles his supplies—and the guests at the "Raymond" can stand up and drink at the bar the same as they can at any other licensed hotel in the country. So much for Prohibition in Southern California! The whole trip was a fraud of the gravest and most gigantic proportions. There are

other places about—for instance, Ontario, where the law is said to be partially observed ; Redlands, where it is not observed at all ; and San Bernadino, midway between the two, with licenses and plenty of them. But even had it been found out that the law was well observed, what argument could be deduced from the experience of these small oases in the midst of the great sand deserts of Southern California ? While on this point I may say that on the return trip I stopped, among other places, at El Paso, a frontier town of mixed population. In that town (a live place of some 30,000 people) they license a saloon at \$600 a year, a gambling house at \$600 a year, and a house of ill-fame at \$800 a year. This is, as I have said, a mixed population, where licensing is carried to the extreme, yet there was no more drunkenness visible than in an Ontario or a Maritime Province town of the same size. Returning to the previous question, how can one compare these few isolated alleged prohibition municipalities with the enormous number of those who never dream of such a thing as Prohibition, or how can they be used as an example ? There is not a city of any considerable size, in this or any other country, that has ever tolerated Prohibition or even undue restriction. I have even heard comparisons made between Pullman and Chicago. Pullman is a little place, owned by a company ; Chicago is a cosmopolitan city, the second in size on the continent. How absurd must any comparison between the two be ? The Commission took certain statistics in Chicago which, no doubt, are valuable under certain circumstances. But how can Chicago be compared with anything in Canada ? Its population is much larger than all our cities put together ; its business interests as great in a day as ours in a week ; its population made up of every nation under the sun. As well might one compare London, England, with Fredericton, New Brunswick.

KANSAS.

But now we come to the great Prohibition States. During our visit to Kansas, the *Lawrence Journal* published this : “The testimony given has not been published, but it is safe to say that when the Commission returns to Canada, whatever else it may report, it will declare that Kansas has more bigger liars than any country on earth.” Probably a Kansas newspaper knows the character of the population of that State, and we had perhaps better, therefore, depend more upon what we saw, than what was told us.

Take first *Kansas City*. Kansas City is principally located in Missouri, with a 40,000 population section in Kansas. The Missouri part of the city is held to be bad : the Kansas portion of the city is undoubtedly infinitely worse. Open gambling houses and pool rooms are prohibited in Missouri ; they are open day and night in Kansas. I spent a portion of the Sunday in the Kansas part of the town, going to a park. At this park, under Kansas Prohibition, beer labelled “Malt Extract” was sold right along. There was a baseball game, a baloon ascension, an exhibition of acrobats and tumblers, two bands, a dancing platform, boats for hire on a little pond, and a zoological garden. I never saw anything to equal this in a licensed State. In the city, I speak of the Kansas city, the pool rooms are not open because there are no Sunday races, but the bars and the gambling dens were in full swing. Perhaps I may describe one place in Kansas City, Kansas, as a sample. A large building, the lower flat of which may have been at one time a warehouse. Along one side of this lower flat were blackboards and telegraph instruments, and all the paraphernalia for the selling of pools on races. Running down a large portion of the opposite side of the room was a bar, fitted out just as any ordinary bar is, only of slightly larger dimensions than is ordinarily seen, with several bartenders. The room was filled with from two to four hundred men betting upon the races and drinking at the bar. The place, of course, was wide open to the street,

the flat above being devoted to gambling purposes open of access to anybody, having probably thirty different gambling devices in the shape of faro, roulette, and other tables and well-filled with patrons. This is not an isolated instance by any means. The other barrooms in Kansas City, Kansas, had for the sign in one instance, "Merchant Tailor." Other gambling houses were not attached to a poolroom, other poolrooms did not have a gambling house attachment; but I will venture to say that every poolroom, and every gambling house had the facilities for selling liquor. These people were all protected from the law by paying a monthly fine. A worse condition of affairs than exists in Kansas City, Kansas, I think it would be almost impossible to find in any country on the face of the globe.

It was said that liquor could not be sent into Kansas from the outside and safely delivered to customers. Before leaving for the interior of the State I saw an advertisement in a Kansas City, Missouri, newspaper, stating that Druggist so and so did a special Kansas trade. I went to this druggist's place, which is immediately opposite the depot, and to test the matter of the importation of liquor into Kansas, purchased two small jugs of whiskey which I had addressed to the most prominent Prohibition towns we had been told of in the State—one to Topeka and one to Ottawa. Both arrived promptly on time and were delivered, the one at Topeka being even delivered at the bedroom at the hotel.

Topeka, a place of 35,000 people, is a nice clean town. The law of Prohibition was better observed in Topeka than in any other place I have ever visited. Not that there is any difficulty in anybody getting what liquor he requires, or may want, but there is not open or flagrant violation of the law. A druggist will sell to you if you will state that you want it for illness. Hotels will deliver to your room whatever you order. There are any number of club-rooms, and there are not a few joints. The Prohibitionists' representative with the Commissioner says that the law was better enforced in Topeka than he had ever expected to see it anywhere. Either the gentleman made no investigation or he is satisfied with the day of small things. Look at the number of druggists' certificates issued in one year, totalling, if my recollection serves me, over 7,000. And let me say here that the number of druggists' certificates returned to the Probate Court Judge, represent but a small proportion of the liquor sold by druggists, because where one printer can print a certificate, another printer can print a duplicate of it, or ten thousand duplicates if desired. I know that this is done, and largely done. I have said that Topeka was not without joints. From a copy of the *State Journal*, published in that city, of December 26th last, I learn that there were on Christmas Day thirty-six arrests, seventeen of which were charged with drunkenness, and all the rest, with two or three exceptions, being due to drinking: The record of the Police Court on Christmas morning, and the morning after, is something remarkable. There were cases of violent and disorderly conduct, women assaulted by men, in one case a man knocked senseless by a beer mug, and numerous fights and brawls. Commenting upon this the *State Journal* says: "With over thirty cases of drunkenness in two days' session of the Police Court, the police authorities should be led to enquire into the cause of the drunkenness, and the probable place where the men and women got their liquor. They hardly sent out of town for it as they are mostly a set of loafers who don't know enough to get liquor by express. Some of them can scarcely write. Probably a great deal of it came from the drug stores, but more of it came from the joints. People who patronize joints say that Topeka is more joint infested than it has been for a long time, and these thirty drunks would give some strength to the assertion." All of which would make it appear that Topeka is not so truly good as the outsider may be led to believe.

To fully appreciate the position Topeka takes, and the difference between that city and other Kansas towns, it must be remembered that the capital never

was a border town. It was settled at the time of the old Free Soil agitation, by the remnant of the Blue Soil agitators from New England, who brought with them there an immense temperance sentiment. I think it is Briggs' History of Kansas which tells of the mobbing, a great number of years ago, of a German who tried to start a saloon. This was in the early days. The poor man escaped with his life by hiding in the river, with his head concealed under a log. But even as it is I have no hesitation in saying that Topeka would be better with a few respectable bars, than with the young men's clubs, the dives, the importation into private houses, and the hanging around of drug stores that characterize the place now.

Ottawa.—I did not go to Ottawa, though one of my jugs did, just to show how easy it was to get liquor into that town. Otherwise I cannot speak about the place.

I visited Salina, the centre of the great wheat belt of Kansas, a country town of 5,000 or 6,000 people, and a nice place. We were told to go there by Prohibitionists, as a place where the prohibitory law would be found to be working well. Upon arrival at the town I went first to the Justice of the Peace's court-room and where a trial of a liquor case was in progress. The prisoner was a noted character, and was being tried by a jury of his peers. The District Attorney prosecuted, and there was a lawyer for the defence. The jury took some hours to come to a conclusion, but finally returned a verdict of guilty. Speaking to the presiding Justice after the trial, I was surprised to find him expressing great satisfaction at having secured a conviction, and from him learned this was the first conviction he had obtained in a liquor case during his term of office. The only reason, it seemed, why the verdict of guilty was given in this instance, was because they wanted to get the man out of town. He was rather a tough case, and the people were tired of him. In consequence, I believe, he was allowed to go without paying his fine. I interviewed Mr. R. A. Levitt, the District Attorney, a Prohibitionist, and a very sensible man. He told me that in two years he had had twenty arrests of liquor dealers, but found it especially difficult to obtain a conviction. He said he tried to avoid jury cases because the jury could not be depended upon. He was evidently a good man, trying to do his duty, but found it impossible to enforce the law. I also interviewed J. B. Hutchison, the City Attorney. He had lived in Holton, Maine, and practised law there ten years ago. He said the law in Maine had got practically to be a failure before he left, and that he believed there was not a town in the State where liquor could not be procured. He had been in Selina since 1888. He said the law there did not prohibit, and advised me to watch the express office for a day. It was nothing, he said, to see a one or two horse drayload of beer distributed about in broad daylight. (I afterwards did see such a drayload being distributed.) He spoke of the tendency of the law to produce perjury, saying that it was almost impossible to procure credible evidence. He further said that he was going to have a liquor dealer arrested that night, and added: "If he did not sell 'White Eye' he would not be in this trouble." "White Eye" I discovered to be a particularly pernicious drink, being composed mainly of pure alcohol of the cheapest grade. The man, I saw by the papers next day, was arrested that night. That evening I was shown about the town in order to see for myself as to the enforcement of the law, and the person chosen to escort me was the chairman of the Republican County Association, which association of course supports the Prohibitive law. I saw the son of this man, who is an agent in the town for a beer firm. He said he brought in 600 dozen of beer per week on an average, and often from 200 to 250 dozen for a single holiday. These men all laughed at the idea of the law being enforced. My conductor, the Republican chairman, explained carefully to me that there was a great difference between the workings of a party and the observance of a prohibitive law. I visited in his company probably a dozen places that sell

liquor, and I have no doubt that the statement made to me, that there are 42 in all in the town, was quite correct. Many of these places were quite open, quite as much so as the ordinary saloon in Toronto, although they do not have a sign up. One man I was introduced to ran eight or ten joints, as they are called, he being the proprietor, and keeping a manager at each place. The Knights of Pythias Grand Lodge of the State was in session at Salina at the time of my visit, and the ladies connected with the organization had a room for a reception place opposite one of this man's joints. So as not to inconvenience them, and at their request, he closed the joint while the Grand Lodge was in town. This was thought by the citizens to be a very decent thing on his part, and was very favorably commented on. A short time before my visit the Fire Brigade held a holiday, and had games and sports at some place close at hand. In connection with their games they ran a beer garden, selling beer to all who wished to purchase, the understanding with the authorities being that they were not to be interrupted. Some of the temperance people protested, but they were looked upon by the general community as going too far. I saw the express agent and his figures corroborated the statements made as to the immense amount of liquor brought into the town weekly. In confirmation of this I herewith submit a statement made by a citizen of the town whose character is vouched for by the positions of public trust he has held.

At this place and on my journey throughout and back, I spoke with gentlemen from Junction City, Lawrence, Fort Scott, Wichita, and numerous other towns. All of them were said to have much less observance of the law even than Salina. I myself saw that this was the case in Junction City.

Leavenworth.—After being assigned to my room at the hotel in Leavenworth, I walked into the office and said: "What do you do in this town when you want to get a drink?" "Why, walk into the bar and get it," was the reply. This accurately describes the condition of affairs in Leavenworth. After a somewhat considerable effort at enforcing the law, the authorities have given up the contest in this city, and the saloons run openly under the sanction of the municipal authorities. The place is filled with open saloons, and with gambling dens. I visited a sufficient number of these to ascertain that what was told in evidence was perfectly correct, and found the saloons to be practically of the character of those in any licensed state, some of them being fitted up with considerable elegance, others again of a lower grade. There are two or three clubs, but these are ordinary social clubs that one would find in any city. The sale of liquor in them, of course, is confined to members, but is equally contrary to the law with the sale of liquor in saloons. The hotel at which we stopped had a very commodious bar-room, and on another flat, in a separate building but connected with the hotel, and owned by the same proprietors, an equally elaborate gambling room. The manager of this, when I visited it, it being somewhat early in the evening and business not very brisk, very kindly explained to me all the mysteries of the different games. Seventeen different games were carried on in this establishment. Leavenworth has lost very largely in population since the passage of the prohibitory law. In part that was due to the fight made by the State authorities to compel observance of the law, but in a greater degree, I imagine, to the building up of Kansas City, Missouri, which drew away from Leavenworth the trade of the river. As it is now there are too many empty business places and houses in Leavenworth, to make it a comfortable thing to walk along the streets.

Atcheson, which is north of Leavenworth, has always defied the law, and has kept its brewery running to the present time.

KANSAS GENERALLY.

Prohibition has been the law of this State for twelve years. The prohibitory amendment to the constitution was adopted in November, 1880—vote for 91,874, against 84,037, majority for 7,837, total vote polled 175,911—total vote cast at the elections of that year 201,236; Prohibition vote fell behind 25,325, or 17,488 more than the majority for prohibition. The law is of a most stringent character and has been several times amended in order to give increased severity until now the penalties are of the most rigorous nature. Ample evidence as to the carrying out of the law is already before the Commission, but I may give a few additional facts and statistics.

The population of Kansas (census returns) increased 173 per cent. from 1870 to 1880, and 43 per cent. from 1880 to 1890—Prohibition from 1881. Not only has there been this decreased per centage, but in 1889 and 1890 there was an actual falling off. The figures are :

1880	996,096†
1885	1,268,530*
1886	1,406,738*
1887	1,514,578*
1888	1,518,552*
1889	1,464,914*
1890	1,427,096†

Alleged Diminution of Crime (of which we hear a great deal). Specimens are :

Governor John A. Martin :—“The abolition of the saloon has enormously diminished crime.”

Attorney-General Bradford :—“It is depopulating our penitentiary and reducing crime and pauperism to a minimum.” (See Bradford’s letter to Governor St. John).

Capital—Commonwealth, of Topeka, official organ :—“Drunkenness and crime has diminished eighty per cent. since the saloons were closed in Kansas.”

Prohibition pamphlet, “Does Prohibition prohibit” :—“All jails show a marked falling off in the number of prisoners.”

What are the facts? According to the United States returns, Kansas had more prisoners in its penitentiary and county jails *in proportion to its population* in 1890 than it had in 1880. The proportion was in 1880, 893 prisoners per million of population and in 1890, 946 prisoners per million. Moreover, of all the twelve States in what is known as the “Northern Central” group, Kansas had in 1890 absolutely the largest ratio of prisoners to population. On the other hand, high license Nebraska shows a decrease of from 738 in 1880 to 576 in 1890. Even the much-talked of and berated Missouri, and Illinois with all the wickedness of Chicago make a better showing than “saintly” Kansas. I append the twelve states with the number of prisoners in penitentiaries and county jails per million of population :

Ohio	587	Iowa	497
Indiana	858	Missouri	823
Illinois	708	North Dakota	841
Michigan	720	South Dakota	841
Wisconsin	519	Nebraska	576
Minnesota	492	Kansas	946
	Average		670

† U. S. Census. * State Census.

Admissions to Kansas State Penitentiary from 1870 to 1890, year ending January 1st :—

LICENSE.		PROHIBITION.	
1871	127	1881	487
1872	173	1882	196
1873	155	1883	252
1874	148	1884	295
1875	248	1885	321
1876	173	1886	396
1877	170	1887	415
1878	227	1888	360
1879	256	1889	375
1880	131	1890	331
	1,808		3,428

The population increased from 1870 to 1880 43 per cent., the penitentiary population nearly doubled. Or take it this way. In 1870 the population of Kansas was 364,399; 1880 the population of Kansas was 996,096; in 1889, 1,464,914. During the first term there was one committal to the penitentiary for every 343 of the increased population, and in the latter period one for every 130 of the increase of population. This would seem to disprove the theory that good people flocked to Kansas to be under Prohibition.

There have been confined (authority published statement by Charles Willis, Attorney-at-Law, Wellington, Kansas), in Kansas Penitentiary during the ten years 1881 to 1890, for murder in the various degrees :—

Murder in 1st degree	59
“ 2nd “	75
Manslaughter in 1st degree	21
“ 2nd “	30
“ 3rd “	24
“ 4th “	31
Total	240

Ontario, under license law, makes a very poor showing beside this; not only so, but the paupers in almshouses per million of population increased in Kansas from 356 in 1880 to 416 in 1890; while in Nebraska they increased only from 250 in 1880 to 275 in 1890.

If the penitentiary and the county jails are taken separately, Kansas with 643 penitentiary prisoners per million of population stands second but almost equal to Indiana, which had 646 per million. But for prisoners in county jails Kansas shows by far the highest ratio—303 per million, Indiana coming next with 212. These are the figures for 1890. In 1880, before Prohibition, Kansas showed better, standing third in the group with a ratio of 203 prisoners in county jails per million, and second with 690 per million for penitentiary prisoners.

The official biennial reports from the Kansas State Prison show the daily average number of prisoners in the years named. (Year ending June 30th.) :—

1879	538	1888	938
1880	647	1889	892
1885	764	1890	889
1886	837	1891	894
1887	934	1892	902

A jump from 538 under license to as high as 938 under Prohibition.

The sixth biennial report of the State Reform School at Topeka, to which juvenile offenders under sixteen years of age are committed, shows that the number of inmates was : June 30th, 1890, 186; June 30th, 1892, 220.

The official reports show that the number of admissions to the State Reform School have increased from forty-nine in 1881, to 117 in 1892. The Board of

Trustees of the State charitable institutions in their last report said of this school, as well of other institutions under their control, that it was "full to overflowing," and strongly urged that its capacity should be increased.

Much is made, and has been made before this Commission of the statement that certain county jails are at times vacant. On June 1st, 1890, twenty-one out of 106 counties in Kansas had no prisoners in their jails, while at the same time in Nebraska thirty county jails were empty out of a total of ninety counties. (U. S. Census Bulletin No. 95, p. 10.) Right here I may as well throw out this suggestion, that there cannot be found under any law, in any State, province or territory in the United States or Canada, any county that—in the matter of arrests of all kinds, or of different kinds, committals to jail for different crimes, absence of the graver crimes, and frequency of intervals when the county jail has no inmates and absence of poverty—can compare with the county of Waterloo, Ont., a county that possesses a large distillery, eight breweries, and in which the wildest enthusiast has never yet dreamed of attempting to introduce a prohibitive law.

Number of persons in Kansas who paid U. S. Internal Revenue tax to sell liquors: 1891, 3,336, U. S. Statistical Abstract, p. 214: 1892, 2,500, U. S. Statistical Abstract, p. 218. This gives one liquor dealer to every 450 and 600 inhabitants, respectively.

The records of the collector of Internal Revenue for 1890 show that Atcheson took out 68 U. S. revenue receipts for the sale of liquor, Argentine 25, Arkansas City 28, Abilene 20, Burlingham 8, Beloit 11, Coffeyville 14, Clay Centre 9, Dodge City 11, Emporia 16, Eldorado 10, Ellsworth 11, Fort Scott 52, Galena 20, Harton 21, Hayes City 16, Hutchison 24, Independence 11, Junction City 25, Kansas City 78, Leavenworth 114, Lawrence 23, Lexington 15, Newton 22, Osage City 10, Parsons 20, Pittsburg 35, Salina 20, Topeka 61, Wichita 127, with a population of 24,000.

Allow me to draw attention to the extraordinary number of gold cure institutes in Kansas. These institutes cannot flourish except where there is hard drinking. I am told that there are over fifty of these institutes in Kansas, but have not statistics to vouch for it. I know, however, that there are very many, and I wish to cite one instance. Madison is a town or village of 1,000 people, and at the last municipal election every successful candidate from the mayor down was a bi-chloride of gold graduate. I venture to suggest that though unique this is pertinent.

Regarding insanity: From November 30th, 1870, to June 30th 1880, ten years prior to the enactment of the prohibitory law, there were 760 insane received into the State Asylum at Ossawatomie.

From June 30th, 1880, to June 30th, 1890, received at Ossawatomie 1,479 patients, and at Topeka Asylum 1,822, a total of 3,301.

During first period, average of one to every 1,301 inhabitants, and one to every 830 inhabitants of the increase of population.

Second period, average of one to every 443 $\frac{2}{3}$ inhabitants, and one to every 141 $\frac{2}{3}$ of the increase of population.

Increase in population first period 631,697; second period (1889) 468,818.

To those who still hold a lingering belief that the law is generally enforced in Kansas, let me quote from the utterances of Mr. John A. Murray, author of the law, and published by the Kansas State Temperance Union in this year:—"The inertia of public sentiment upon the temperance question is cause for apprehension. The prohibitory law, once the emblem of our pride has in parts of our state become a burden of apology. * * * The very atmosphere of the principal streets of some of our flourishing cities is laden with the noxious odor of the undisturbed, defiant and prosperous 'joint.' * * * It is time for an awakening." This from the author of the law after twelve years of trial.

I have under my hand the annual address delivered by President Rev. Dr. Milner, to the Kansas State Temperance Union, at Topeka, on October 3rd, last. President Milner says: "Prohibition has not had a fair trial in Kansas." (The old complaint.)

Again:—"In the great part of our state the illegal traffic is carried on out of sight of the public." (And that is the best even their president can say of it.)

Again:—"No one will deny that there is much violation of the Prohibition law in Kansas." (I should say not after his trip with us.)

Again:—"We have to-day in cities of Kansas, cases of 'municipal nullification,' of cities trampling upon the law of the State."

Finally:—"We are compelled to recognize the fact that within the past two years there has been an increase of violations of the law." (Dr. Milner then retired from the presidency.)

Having quoted from the two leading authorities in favor of Prohibition, perhaps I may be permitted to give the published views of a leading opponent, Mr. David Overmeyer, Attorney-at-Law, of Topeka:

"Prohibition is an exotic in our fundamental law. It should be torn from the constitution root and branch, and the legislature should be forbidden to pass any law prohibiting the conversion of the products of Kansas into any merchantable commodity or prohibiting the sale of such products. Instead of wasting time and money in vain and foolish efforts to build cotton and sugar mills, let us remove the restrictions and permit the upbuilding of industries that will work up our immense crops of corn, grain and fruits, and thus furnish a "home market" for the farmer, employment for labor, investment for capital, increase of prices, and inducement to immigration. Men stand ready to engage in these enterprises without the aid of a protective tariff and without bounty. This is one "way out" for Kansas. Another "way out" which depends upon the repeal of Prohibition, is to unload our surplus lands for cash, and still have enough land left for homes. Our people have gone heavily into debt for lands and improvements, hoping, and justly hoping as pioneers, that the incoming population would relieve them of their surplus acres, while the money thus realized would relieve them of debt. Prohibition came and the people quit coming. During the ten years of Prohibition a mighty tide of emigration has swept over, beyond, and around Kansas.

"At the advent of Prohibition Kansas was the best advertised State in the Union. While it, like other places, has its drawbacks, it is, after all, an enchanted land, in which salubrious air, fertile soil, and sublimity of scene are so blended that the eye of man is gladdened and his heart rejoiced by the rapturous charm of burnished sky and shining plains, and yet in ten years we are short at least 1,000,000 of people by reason of Prohibition. People will not make homes where they cannot be free. Tear Prohibition from the constitution and hurl it into the dark vortex of things accursed; firmly control and wisely tax the traffic in intoxicating beverages, make known to the hardy and industrious home-seeker and worthy immigrant that the curse of bigotry and fanaticism has been lifted from the State, and we shall witness such an influx of population and such a wave of rising prosperity as has never been seen in Kansas."

I could multiply evidence but it is unnecessary. From the facts gathered by the Commission and those herein set forth, I submit that any unprejudiced observer must come to the conclusion, in the words of Senator Ingalls (one of the greatest men Kansas has ever produced), "The Prohibitionists have the law and the people have the whiskey." Under this law industry has languished, population has diminished, crime and poverty have increased, law is scorned, drinking is carried on in its most degrading form, while gambling and many

other evils flourish openly. The law is a curse to State and people, a breeder of hypocrisy, perjury and calumny; the plaything of politicians and the scorn and contempt of honest men. So much for Prohibition in Kansas.

NEBRASKA.

In Nebraska we visited Lincoln and Omaha. Both are fine places, Omaha being a large city. They are under a high license law, all the facts of which are detailed in the evidence already before the Commission, and the law, so far as I was able to observe, is well carried out. Omaha is more like Toronto on Sunday (with the exception that street cars are allowed to run) than any American city I have ever been in. I visited a park there on Sunday, larger than the one in Kansas City, Kansas, but a direct contrast to it in every particular. It is beautifully situated and laid out, with large numbers of shade trees. Thousands of people came out on the street cars and enjoyed the shade and the flowers and the beauty of the scene generally, and for their amusement an excellent band performed a programme of a very high-class character. When the programme was completed the crowd gradually wended their way home. No refreshments of any kind were sold. As to the observance of the Sabbath closing law in Omaha, those who try can undoubtedly get into the side-doors without much trying. I found one of these places, a man standing at the door keeping watch for the police, and we being admitted through the side-door. But nevertheless, I am perfectly safe in saying there is very little drinking done in Omaha on Sunday, although there are a large number of Omaha people who drink. These cross the river to Council Bluffs, in Iowa, where they can get uproariously drunk without fear of trouble. The statistics regarding Nebraska will be given in comparison with other States. Before leaving Omaha, however, I wish to refer to a statement published by Professor Hutchins, a gentleman from Nebraska, who, accompanied by another distinguished Professor of Prohibition, perambulated Ontario last fall. The Professor said he had lived near Omaha for thirteen years, and he knew that the saloons were as open for business on Sunday as on any other day of the week. I have no hesitation in characterizing this as a distinct falsehood, known to be so by the gentleman who uttered it. It was on a par with the statement of his travelling companion, "Hon." W. F. Wolfenberger, who, in a Toronto church, said that the Royal Commission, presided over by Sir Joseph Hickson, took its witnesses from the gutter, and that every one who appeared there to give evidence against Prohibition had a danger signal at the end of his nose.

IOWA.

I had been through Iowa twice before the visit of the Commission, but saw little of the workings of the law, except to ascertain that probably the only men deprived of the right to use liquor, were the travellers or other persons on the trains who were most entitled to it. In connection with the trip of the Commission my first visit was to Council Bluffs.

Council Bluffs.—I went over to that town from Omaha on Sunday. There is communication by railway between the two towns, and an electric street car service. The trains and cars were crowded with people going over and coming back. On the streets of Council Bluffs I saw some drunkenness, but not a great deal. There was no difficulty in walking right into the bar-rooms; they were wide open. Some had the front door shut, but a man on duty directed you to the side door. Others did not trouble themselves with this precaution, but left

the front door wide open. I saw in one bar-room a set of stereopticon views of a character that would never be allowed in any saloon under license. Every saloon there has its sign out and fills the windows with bottles and other devices to attract attention. There is no pretence whatever at concealing the existence of the traffic. Two days later I again visited Council Bluffs in company with the Commission. Being a week day the business was going on perhaps not quite as freely as upon the Sunday, but quite as freely as is to be found in any licensed place. The population of Council Bluffs is 21,000, and there are 78 places selling liquor. I was given a drive about the city by the City Marshal, who had previously testified before the Commission, and who told me he was glad of the chance to "cut loose," as he expressed it, and tell the truth. The people there thought that the town was being seriously injured by the attempt to enforce the prohibitive law. They were not progressing as in Omaha, and they took the law into their own hands. The records show that despite the large—what we would consider unusually large number of drinking places, the town is orderly and quiet, one of the best in that respect in the State. To show that the Marshal spoke the truth I beg to quote a clause from the Mayor's annual address to the City Council, April 3rd, 1893, as follows:

"The report of the City Marshal shows that he has collected and paid into the hands of the City Clerk \$46,234.15. This has been accomplished in a great measure through his energetic and efficient attention to his official duties," etc. And this: "We are in the right path, for notwithstanding desirable and valuable improvements are being constantly made, still within the past year our current expenses have been reduced, our taxes have been reduced, our indebtedness largely reduced and the value of our city warrants increased from 93 to 97 cents. Let us persist in following the same course, undeterred by the clamor of noisy demagogues—who are nearly always influenced by personal motives—for it will certainly lead to a sound and independent financial condition and ultimately to the greatest prosperity."—Signed, N. D. Lawrence, Mayor.

While we were at Council Bluffs a State Convention of Bankers was being held. I conversed with many of them, and heard the same story of non-observance of the law from all parts of the State. These were leading financial men whose testimony can be relied upon.

Des Moines.—This is the capital of the State and has a population of 30,000 or slightly better. The average Des Moines citizen will tell you it is anything from sixty to eighty thousand. On our entrance to the city we were greeted with the following from the Des Moines *Leader*: "If the distinguished visitors from the Dominion are really seeking information and will consent to place themselves under the guidance of any private citizen and carefully avoid association with officers during their visit in Des Moines, they can easily gain access to not less than three hundred places in Des Moines where liquor is sold.

"If they will call upon the Federal District Attorney he will tell them that the revenue collector for this district has granted three hundred Government licenses in Des Moines alone for the sale of liquor. If they will visit the District Court and inspect the records, and later call upon the Justices of the Peace, the Police Judge, the Chief of Police, they will strike a lead that will open up a mine of information. They will discover that two-thirds of the culprits arraigned and tried in the Federal Court at the term now in progress were arrested for violating not only the Government revenue laws, but the State Prohibitory law. The gentlemen will remain in Des Moines two days, and if they follow the course indicated the reading of their subsequent report will awaken lively interest in Des Moines."

Subsequent investigation proved this challenge to be well founded, and the statements contained therein practically correct. On the night of our arrival, putting up at the leading hotel, the Savary House, having got in late, I put the usual question, "Where is the bar?" The clerk said they did not have a bar,

but they would send to my room anything I wanted, or I could go to the drug store. This drug store opened out of the rotunda of the hotel, and is one of the leading places in the town. I do not think that in this drug store at least liquor is sold by the glass. I asked them if they had any Canadian whiskey. The man sold me a bottle of Walker's Club rye without asking any questions or requiring from me any statement whatever. I may say here that I found Walker's Club rye in Kansas in every place which we visited that I asked for it. The following day, in company with the Commission, I visited the capital building, where Governor Boies made his statement, and where the Republican Secretary of State, strong Prohibitionist though he was, frankly admitted that the working of the law convinced him in favor of license, or, rather, local option. I have no doubt that already at that time the Republicans had decided to adopt the platform which later on they carried to such marked party success. I visited the Police Court, and was shown in the cellar a large quantity of confiscated liquors. I noticed that many of the barrels were marked John Doe and Richard Roe, and in one instance it was Mrs. Roe, but the object of this I learned later on. During the day I had been told, and had partially satisfied myself, that although Des Moines professed to enforce the prohibitive law, that yet the enforcement was a marked piece of hypocrisy and fraud, and in visiting a newspaper office I asked the Editor if he would detail one of his staff to show me about the city for a short time in the evening, so that I could satisfy myself as to what really was the practice. He complied, and that evening his City Editor accompanied me, the Editor himself being of the party a short time. We went about probably for an hour. I need not go into the details of all the places we visited, but, in a way, the modus operandi was this: The drug store would have in the front a few bottles and a big cigar case. Back of the prescription counter would be the bar. A person entered, walked back of the prescription counter and ordered what he wanted and paid for it. We went into a number of such places. The first we went into the city editor remarked to me that if the person in charge was asked to put up a medical prescription he would probably drop dead. The bar-room from one of these drug stores opened into the rotunda of a hotel. We crossed the rotunda, went through a door, and found ourselves in the bar-room of another drug store. So that this hotel had practically two bars running to supply its guests. We went into one or two restaurants. These sold liquor, and I was told that practically every restaurant in the city had a bar attachment. Then the city editor said he would show us a saloon, and we went to a saloon. This saloon was exactly on a par with one of the Toronto saloons, except that it was not as well fitted up. The front room was a cigar stand, and passing through the folding doors you found yourself in the bar-room. Five minutes before we entered the police had raided this place, seizing a barrel partially filled with lager beer and carrying it away. They seized nothing else. There were bottles on the stand, there were bottles of whiskey and other liquors in the ice-box, but they took nothing but the beer keg. Apparently nobody had gone away, nor was any excitement created, and when we were there a few minutes afterwards there were seventeen people in the place, if I recollect, besides our party, some of them drinking and others talking. I here ascertained what the labelling of the kegs "John Doe" and "Richard Roe," the old English legal fiction, meant. It appeared that next morning at the Police Court the keg, and not the proprietor of the saloon, would be tried, found guilty and condemned. Could anything more ludicrous be imagined than the solemn trial in court, in public before the people, of the keg of beer, the condemnation of it, the glorious vindication of the law that would follow its destruction, and the proprietor of the illegal saloon, within two minutes of the departure of the police, having another keg of beer on tap and business going on as usual. Leaving this, we were shown, among other places, two clubs. One was a club of the better class, there being several rooms fitted up comfortably,

and a very nicely appointed bar in one of them. I believe that nobody but members of the club could purchase liquors at the bar. Above this, on the next floor, was the second club, more of the character of a workingmen's club, with a barrel of beer on tap, two or three rooms in which games of amusement could be held, and smoking rooms. It was an ordinary, comfortable place. There were a number of men there, apparently workingmen, and they were enjoying themselves quietly in conversation, and were having a glass of beer with their pipe. I saw nothing objectionable in either place. We did not visit any of the lower class of joints, although the places where they exist were pointed out to us. We were out probably an hour, and at no time were we away, I should judge, more than 400 yards distant from the newspaper office from which we started. Yet in that time, and in that radius, we must have visited probably twelve or fifteen places where liquor was sold, and had a great many others pointed out to us. I have no doubt whatever that the challenge thrown out by the Des Moines paper was perfectly correct, and that at least from 250 to 300 places are regularly engaged in selling liquor at Des Moines. Yet there is where was held a week or two later the world's conclave of Good Templars as a chosen spot of Prohibition, and at that conclave the glories of Prohibition in Iowa, and especially in Des Moines, were loudly chanted. Probably if a saloon fell upon the heads of some of these people they might then discover it.

Cedar Rapids.—In this place the saloons are perfectly wide open. The city practically takes a license fee for these places, and there are some seventy of them in operation. Two breweries exist, or did exist, in Cedar Rapids. The one was in full swing when I visited it. The proprietor of the other told us to come down the hill, and he would show us his new brewery. The new brewery consisted of a railway siding upon which stood a train of thirteen cars loaded with beer from St. Louis and Cincinnati. A police officer took me around the town, and showed me the system of running the saloons. We visited a great many of high and low degree. They were exactly the same as the saloons in any license town, and seemed to be conducted very satisfactorily.

Clinton.—The next place visited makes no pretence whatever at observance of the law. The number of saloons in this place was something amazing. On the main streets they predominated over any other business, and one was led to wonder how they could all make a living. Many of them were fitted up with considerable magnificence.

Dubuque.—This is the most considerable town in the eastern part of the State, and is probably the largest city in the State, with the exception of Des Moines, closely approximating that city in population. It has industries of considerable size and has large railway interests. Four breweries are in operation there, two of which I visited. Standing at one street corner I counted eight saloons in sight, and in a walk along a short block counted fourteen. There are altogether some 280 places selling liquor, so I was informed, in this city. There is of course no pretence at concealment. The city Marshall, Sam Rice, collects fifty dollars twice a year from them on the charge of conducting disorderly houses. The authorities there told me that they had run them in this way ever since the prohibitive law came into operation. There are no gambling houses allowed in the city, nor any houses of ill-fame. The city directory in its business column gives 2 breweries, 6 bottlers, 35 hotels, 10 wholesale liquor houses, and 181 saloons. Not bad for a truly prohibition community.

Davenport.—I did not visit Davenport myself but conversed with many residents from that place. There too, there is no pretence at concealment of the sale of liquor. The bar-rooms and the hotels are quite open, the saloons have their signs out, and there are said to be nearly 300 places selling. The principle, however, upon which they are conducted is what is known as the "beverage license." That is, a saloon gets a license to sell beverages of a non-

intoxicating character from the city, and by paying this license fee, are not molested when they sell intoxicating liquor. There was at one time a project to establish a State police for the enforcement of the law. Davenport sent to the Capital a warning that any such attempt would be at the risk of the lives of the men sent, and it was dropped. Yet with all, there is less crime in Scott County, in which Davenport is situated, than there is in Polk County, of which Des Moines is the centre. The figures are : Scott County population 43,100, convictions in 1890, 18 ; convictions in 1891, 48. Polk County, population 65,400, convictions in 1890, 83 ; convictions in 1891, 98. The *Globe* commissioners to Iowa were very much shocked at the system of practically licensing the social evil in Davenport, and appeared inclined to ascribe this in a degree to the lawlessness prevailing owing to the defiance of the prohibitive law. If they had gone north to Dubuque they would have found a much larger and a more busy place with an equally large number of saloons, and an equally open defiance of the law, without a house of ill-fame allowed within the city limits at all. I merely mention this as showing that the question of the social evil is entirely dis severed from the question of a prohibitive law.

Burlington.—A very considerable town has open saloons running on the same system of beverage license as prevails in Davenport.

Sioux City.—The most considerable town in the North Western part of the State, with a population of 38,000, has always run open saloons. A municipal ordinance was passed requiring liquor dealers to make a monthly payment to the city. This, collected in the shape of a fine for the violation of the law, is in fact, as are all these devices, a return by the municipality to the licensing system in defiance of the State law.

IOWA GENERALLY.

Iowa first adopted Prohibition in 1855. In 1858 it having been discovered that the law was retarding the progress of the State it was modified to permit the sale of ale, beer and wine. During the war period the prohibition of the sale of spirits fell into disuse. A constitutional amendment was carried in 1882, was declared unconstitutional, but the legislature passed the present law in 1883. As in almost every instance the prohibitive law never did have the support of the majority of the electors. On the constitutional amendment June 27, 1882, there was polled for the act 155,436, against 125,677, majority 29,759 ; total vote 281,113. For Governor the following year there was polled 327,266 votes, and for President a year later 375,877 votes. It will be seen at a glance how large a number of people abstained from voting on Prohibition. That the law has not been successful, even to the extent of reducing in any reasonable percentage the sale of liquor, nobody will deny. Even the spasmodic attempts at enforcement in certain places leads only to ill-feeling, perjury and expense, and are quickly abandoned. To-day I do not believe there is an honest attempt at enforcement in any municipality outside of those where no liquor would be sold no matter what law might be in force. And more liquor is sold in more places to-day in Iowa than was sold under license. Let me give you some statistics on this subject.

Following is a table giving the number of government licenses issued from 1882 to 1892, inclusive :

	Retail Dealers.	Wholesale Dealers.	Retail Malt Liquors only.	Wholesale Malt Liquors only.	Brewers.	Rectifiers.
1882.....	4,104	55	321	51		
1883.....	5,001	86	283	57	117	20
1884.....	3,989	63	216	54	86	16
1885.....	3,549	52	229	60	100	7
1886.....	3,769	57	152	64	98	8
1887.....	3,584	54	283	66	78	13
1888.....	2,928	36	249	48	74	6
1889.....	3,575	42	270	68	50	7
1890.....	3,975	35	225	85	22	8
1891.....	6,874*	54*	395*	267*	29*	11*
1892.....	5,846†					

In 1885, the year after the prohibition law took effect, the retail licenses were 3,549; eleven months in 1892 show 5,846. Further comment is unnecessary. Perhaps it will be claimed these are all drug stores? Mr. Spaulding, secretary of the Iowa State Board of Pharmacists, puts the number of drug stores at 1,350. How many of them are of the character of the drug stores I visited in Des Moines I do not know. Further, the annual report of the State Temperance Alliance, delivered at Des Moines, in March, 1890, stated: "The Alliance has the name and post office address of every one who has paid a government tax for the purpose of selling liquor." More than that, they published a list giving the number for each town and county, making a total of 5,867. (Government returns for 1889 only give 4,012.) In this table Clinton is credited with 105, Burlington 170, Dubuque 288, Cedar Rapids 166, Des Moines 202, Council Bluffs 180, Davenport 275, Ottumwa 155, Sioux City 351, etc., etc.

Iowa has 1 liquor license to every 455 of population, as compared to one for every 771 of population in its high license neighbor Nebraska.

The law prohibits the manufacture of liquor within the State. There are now many brewery licenses issued, and the product for a number of years past has been as follows:

	Barrels.	No. of Brewery Licenses.
1886	197,372	98
1887	183,464	78
1888	174,339	74
1889	112,470	50
1890	88,266	22
1891	105,943	29
1892	114,923	29

Of course the amount manufactured is inconsiderable as compared with the amount consumed, but the running of about 30 establishments turning out 3,677,536 gallons of beer is a curious commentary upon the law and its enforcement.

How has Prohibition affected crime in Iowa? In 1880 Iowa had 493 prisoners in her penitentiaries and jails per million of population, and in 1890, 497. The following table shows the number of criminals sent to the reform school, jails and penitentiaries since 1884, when the prohibitory law was passed:

*1891 for 14 months, ending June 30th.

†Eleven months, ending 30th April.

	Reform School.	Jail.	Peniten- tiary.
1884	21	152	361
1885	18	163	406
1886	20	188	330
1887	10	261	306
1888	13	127	196
1889	8	193	318
1890	36	191	319
1891	14	175	327
1892	31	277	438

For the same years we may give the number of convictions for more serious crimes :

	Assaults.	Mostly Liquor Cases, Nuisance.	Adultery.	Man- slaughter and Murder.	Burglary.	Larceny.
1884	167	488	4	22	76	191
1885	162	372	6	26	84	241
1886	146	607	9	18	66	217
1887*	180	304	14	29	63	247
1888	93	190	3	15	44	143
1889	127	137	9	12	96	190
1890	175	249	12	17	99	176
1891	153	333	11	16	84	131
1892	154	367	7	16	153	285

A feature in connection with the prohibitory law is to be found in the following table, showing for the same years the court expenses for criminal prosecutions in the State :

	Fines Imposed.	Fines Col- lected.	Paid Dis- trict Attor- neys for Criminal Prosecu- tions.	Total cost of Prosecu- tion, not including District Attorney's Fees.
1884	\$65,543	\$35,381	\$26,239	\$379,530
1885	75,581	30,728	26,232	413,349
1886	117,624	46,362	31,648	421,024
1887	180,557	50,871	41,469	382,877
1888	95,170	39,771	53,518	300,424
1889	136,930	37,008	67,897	399,420
1890	111,866	37,316	56,348	452,294
1891	149,990	48,268	79,391	455,204
1892	175,514	56,568	84,027	575,638
	\$1,078,778	\$382,210	\$ 466,769	\$3,779,810

There were eighty-four more convictions in 1884, the first year after license, than in 1892, and yet the cost of prosecutions in 1892 amounted to nearly \$200,000 more than in 1884. County Attorneys received \$84,027 in 1892 as against \$28,239 in 1884. I beg to commend these features to those who profess to believe that Prohibition would effect a saving in the cost of the administration of justice.

*1887 was the year of greatest enforcement; more assaults, adultery, and larceny. Why?

Let me give one detail. In 1889 Polk County, which includes Des Moines, paid \$92,646 in court costs, of which \$37,755 was Justice and Police Court costs. In the summer of 1890, on the authority of the "Register," and which authority I am assured has never been denied, in the first six months there was taken from the treasury, for the criminal costs of Justices Courts in that city alone, over \$30,000. Of this amount \$11,000 went to five Justices, the remainder to their constables, witnesses, jurors, etc. This was all outside of the ordinary Police Court, where ordinary criminal cases are disposed of, and was mostly in the search and seizure business. This paper raised such a row over the seizing of a bottle of beer at a cost of \$5, and then trying and convicting it at a cost of \$10 to \$15, that in measure the practice had to be stopped. It is now largely run at the Police Court, where "John Doe" and "Richard Roe" are daily on trial.

Now, take the question of the increase or decrease of population. Have the peoples of the earth, throbbing with anxiety to live under the glorious privileges of Prohibition, flocked in countless numbers to settle within the borders of Iowa? A fairer, a more fruitful State is not to be found in the Union. The following table of comparison with surrounding States, all of which have licenses, gives the facts of the case:—

	Pop. 1870.	Pop. 1880.	Pop. 1890.
Iowa	1,194,020	1,624,615	1,911,896
Illinois	2,539,891	3,077,871	3,826,357
Wisconsin	1,054,670	1,315,497	1,686,390
Minnesota	439,706	780,773	1,301,826
Nebraska	122,993	452,402	1,058,910
Missouri	1,721,295	2,168,380	2,679,184

	Gain 1870 to 1880.	Gain 1880 to 1890.	Per Cent. Gain 1870 to 1880.	Per Cent. Gain 1880 to 1890.
Iowa	430,595	287,271	36.06	17.68
Illinois	537,980	748,480	21.18	24.32
Wisconsin	260,827	371,383	24.73	28.23
Minnesota	341,067	521,053	77.57	66.74
Nebraska	329,409	606,508	267.82	134.06
Missouri	447,085	570,804	25.97	23.55

Will anybody explain the decreased immigration into Iowa and the increased immigration into all these neighboring states, north, south, east and west, and leave out the prohibitive law as the factor. Twenty-seven counties actually decreased between 1880 and 1890. Illinois increased three times as much as Iowa, Wisconsin went ahead of her by nearly 100,000, Minnesota's increase was about double that of Iowa, wicked Missouri's more than double, while over 600,000 people travelled across prohibition Iowa to get into licensed Nebraska.

Again take the statistics as to poverty in Iowa. In 1880 the proportion was 717 paupers in almshouses per million of population, while in 1890 the percentage had increased to 848. In other words, in 1880, with a population of 1,624,015, Iowa had 1,165 persons in her almshouses, in 1890 with a population of 1,911,896 she had 1,621 paupers. In 1880 the ratio was one pauper to every 1,394 inhabitants, while in 1890 after a term of Prohibition, there was one pauper to every 1,178 inhabitants.

Now take the figures as to insanity. The Superintendent's reports of the State Asylums show as the average number of patients in two selected years as follows: (year ending 30th June in each case).

Mount Pleasant	1883	1891
Independence	518	793
Clarindo, not open in 1883	552	810
	...	309

1,070 · 1,912

The statement is made in connection with the above: "In addition to the number of insane confined in the hospitals there were, on June 30th, 1891, 737 public insane cared for in the various counties, and sixty-six private insane persons. Forty-nine of the counties had county asylums where incurables were confined. Practically all, if not all of the county asylums have been built since 1883 in order to relieve the State Asylums of the incurables. The total insane in the State hospitals at the end of the last biennial period was 1,958, and the total in the State 2,761." Of course I do not charge this enormous increase in insanity to Prohibition, but as the prohibitionists have raised that issue they are welcome to the conclusions to be derived therefrom.

In conclusion I have only this to say: Prohibition is and has been a screaming farce in Iowa, but the farce seems now to have been played nearly to the end. Were it not so near the end a great deal more might be said.

MAINE.

The investigation held by the Commission in Maine was so thorough, especially with regard to all statistical information, that I shall add nothing to the record except my own personal experience. Going down from Montreal the train stops for dinner at some place in Vermont, I forget the name. We were in a Prohibition State but liquor was served at the table, just as it would be anywhere where there was a license. Later on, at Gorham, to test the law, some bottles of beer were purchased and brought aboard the train in the few minutes of stop there. There was no concealment whatever.

Portland.—The effect of the prohibitive law in Portland is bad, bad in every respect. I cannot honestly find one redeeming feature about the whole business. The law has been pretty persistently enforced in this city for forty years, a generation or two has grown up under it, and what are the results. The most rank hypocrisy permeates every grade of society except the lowest, which apparently has fallen beneath hypocrisy; the law is made the plaything of politics, degrading alike the law and the politicians, official corruption is something amazing to a Canadian, drinking places fairly throng certain parts of the city, drinking clubs are numerous, prohibitionists for political purposes keep their cellars well filled, the city agency is nothing but a gigantic saloon, drink often of the most atrocious character is sold indiscriminately by men, women and children, and drunkenness the most debasing is prevalent and continuous. I have no hesitation in saying that in Portland, even under the strict rule of Sheriff Cram, money can buy immunity from the law every time, and in saying this I do not wish for one moment to reflect upon Sheriff Cram, whom I judge tried his best to enforce the law. Perhaps the most amazing thing to me was to find reputable citizens appear before the Commission and "profess" ignorance of what the slightest investigation must have revealed to them. I recollect sitting in the room while the Commission was in session and hearing a witness testify that no liquor, or practically no liquor was sold in the Portland drug stores. I got right up, walked across the street to the nearest drug store, went in, purchased a bottle of whiskey, no questions asked, the man even offered to send it to the hotel for me, and I was back to the Commission room within, I should say, ten minutes at the outside. Remember I was a perfect stranger, had never been in the place or seen the man before, and asked for the whiskey just as I would have had it been an ordinary liquor store. My experience and information is that practically all of the drug stores sell liquor to a greater or less extent, but only to a certain class. They keep good liquors, and their customers are those who do not care to go to the City Agency. They are a large class.

Again one day while the Commission was sitting, it was stated that very few illicit places for sale now existed. I went out, and within two blocks and a half on one of the principal streets, I entered seven places where they sold me beer. These places were fruit stores, tobacco stores, and places where they ostensibly sold soft drinks and candies, etc. I was not gone an hour, was a perfect stranger, had no directions, and did not have to use any great circumlocution in getting the beer. I mention these two instances simply to show how ignorant even the best of people may be when they try. Afterwards I made a more thorough investigation. Without going into details I may say that the number of liquor sellers in Portland cannot be estimated. All of the hotels sell, I believe, with one exception, and even at that you have only to step to the door and tell the hackman standing there to bring you a bottle, and it is furnished you in a few minutes. It was estimated for me that there would be at least 100 places selling more or less regularly, but this does not include an army of bootleggers, kitchen bars, saloons under the steps, stable saloons, back yard saloons, establishments consisting of bottles kept in an empty barrel box or dog house in the back yard, and the hundred and one methods of evading the law constantly practised; nor does it take into consideration the enormous quantity brought in day by day for private houses and home consumption. Accompanied by a resident I went through the lower part of the town as well as the more select neighborhood. In this lower part some of the streets seemed to be at night largely devoted to the sale of liquor and it is in this section that the sheriff's officers do their most work. But the frequency with which they are outwitted is best shown by the record of the number of search warrants taken out as compared with the number of seizures made. Why all these places should exist when each person could legally keep a private stock for his own use is to me, I frankly confess, utterly incomprehensible, but that they do exist and in large numbers I had the evidence of my own eyes.

The liquor Agency is condemned as being loosely run. That its sales are enormous there is no doubt, but that this is an unmixed evil is a question. I spent several hours there at different times watching the character of the trade. The people who bought liquor there would have bought it anyway. If they did not get good liquor there, they would very probably have got bad liquor elsewhere. I examined thoroughly into the methods of the Agency, saw the invoices and prices of sale, and this much at least is certain, that the people who buy from the Agency get good liquor at very reasonable prices. I have a suspicion that some of that good liquor is afterwards "fixed up" for use down town, and that a little of the "good" thing is made to go a very long way. A common drink down town, however, is "Portland Split," alcohol imported and diluted to suit the taste. This beverage has a tendency to drive a man to madness, and frequently kills him. Deaths occurred while we were there.

Why do they drink this when they can get other? Why does it not hurt French-Canadians? It must be the character of the alcohol and the people. The Agency sold \$600 or \$800 worth the day before 4th July and closed at six o'clock—mostly to people going out of town.

Drunkenness is very prevalent in Portland, but the arrests for drunkenness are no criterion. The police do not arrest if they can conveniently avoid it. We have evidence to that effect and what I saw would confirm it. I never saw such beastly disgraceful exhibitions of drunkenness in any city on Sunday as I saw in Portland. Before noon, for attacking the police, drunken men were being handcuffed and carted off in the patrol wagon, and in the late afternoon and evening (went out to Orchard Beach at noon) plenty of drunks around, fights in the park, etc.—no policeman. Next morning saw fourteen of these men sentenced; don't believe they represented one in twenty of the visible drunks. Neither morning paper mentioned the matter, evening paper simply said so many drunks so disposed of; must have been the regular thing. Such

a state of affairs in Toronto would have raised a howl that could have been heard from one end of the country to the other. Drunkenness in Portland does not excite remark it is so common, even the death of a man found lying on the street through an overdose of "Portland Split" created no excitement and was given only a paragraph in the newspapers.

I have spoken about official corruption. While we were in Portland seizure was made of liquors in two hotels. The liquor was seized and taken to the Police Station. Neither party was fined. Two sheriff's officers made a descent upon a hotel in Maine with a search and seizure warrant. There was a bar running in the hotel. Liquor of any kind was served in the rooms and at the table so that there must have been a large reserve stock somewhere within the place. At the very time, I, with another gentleman, was at dinner in the dining room, and we were having a pint of Bass' ale with our meal. Perhaps a dozen or twenty others were having liquors at the same time with their meals. The sheriff's officers searched the house and found nothing, and returned the warrant. I have reason to believe that \$75 was what it cost upon that occasion. The proprietor of one of the leading hotels outside Portland told me it cost \$150 each to three officers to run an open bar during the season. I saw the open bar running. I myself have seen sheriff's officers drinking at the bar with other people, and have no doubt of the truth of what I was told; that everywhere except Bangor the officers have to be tipped. Now let us leave Portland for a while.

Augusta, the capital of the State, is a very pretty place. The *Augusta House* has a bar that is open all through the session of the Legislature, day and night, and never closes. I have this on the authority of the proprietor who introduced me to the place. In the summer time the bar is only open when it is needed, as the *Augusta House*, being somewhat away from the centre of the town, is not a place of general resort, except when the Legislature is in session. In the down town hotels the bars run all the year round. I was in two of them. A peculiarity here is that restaurants are not interfered with if they only sell beer, consequently half a dozen restaurants along the main streets have bars with beer pumps and all the attachments for serving beer, but supply nothing else. In one of them I asked for spirits, the proprietor obligingly came with me to the door and pointed out the drug store at which I could get what I wanted. I counted thirteen of these restaurants in the town during the course of an hour's walk. Drug stores do the general liquor trade outside the hotel bars, but there is a great deal of private importation, so I was informed. The proprietor of the *Augusta House* told me that he knew of only two members of the State Legislature who did not drink some, but he thought that a great many of them only drank when away from home.

Bangor.—Here we had a return to the Iowa system, only with somewhat better regulations. The saloons are wide open, but are required to close on Sunday. As a rule I think they do so, though the bar in the hotel at which I stopped ran on Sunday the same as any other day. The saloons are very numerous in this town. I counted five in succession on one street, and fourteen in a block and a half. There is of course no pretence of concealment, from the highest to the lowest. Out of curiosity I visited the City Agency. The old gentleman in charge sold me a bottle of liquor without going through the formality of getting an application of any kind, and in conversation complained bitterly that the saloons were destroying his trade, although he held that he had still the best class of customers in consequence of selling the best quality of liquor. There is mighty little hypocrisy as far as regards the liquor business in Bangor.

Pittsfield.—A place visited by the Commission in search of a town where-in the Maine law was strictly enforced. It is a little place with one hotel. You either stopped at that hotel, or you lay outside. The hotel sells liquors to

guests, and to residents of the better class and the temperance people there, according to the landlord knew it. He said he would close the hotel if he could not sell to his guests, and as a matter of fact, the hotel was closed for a time before he took hold of it. The gentleman served us immediately after our arrival with whiskey and apollinaris, and with Nuremberger beer imported from Germany, all off the ice. It will be observed that a poor class of liquor was not kept here. I have reason to believe that there were two other places selling liquor in that village at the time we were there.

Winthrop.—I missed the visit to Winthrop, having gone back to Portland to study that city upon a holiday, and also for the purpose of obtaining some additional evidence with regard to Old Orchard Beach. I got back to Portland late at night, and I may say that the drunkenness in that city the following day exceeded anything I have ever seen of the kind in either Canada or the United States.

Orchard Beach.—What caused me more particularly to visit this summering place, was the statement of the Hon. Neal Dow that no liquors were sold there. On the train many of the passengers had bottles, and the newsboy was hawking about lewd illustrated papers that were prohibited in Canada. The season was not then practically open, but I put up at a hotel which had a bar and was furnishing liquor at the dinner table. Visiting another hotel I was also shown the bar. On the occasion of the 4th July, in four or five hotels which I went into, all the bars were wide open. Places along the street were selling openly. At the race track there was a bar as long as a house, open to everybody, and crowded with people drinking. A pool room was running in connection. So much for Old Orchard Beach, which, as far as I can learn, has always been the same.

Returning to Portland the drunkenness there had increased during the day and was something amazing. They were selling beer even in the Grand Trunk station so openly that nobody passing the door could fail to see it. I never saw as many drunken men upon a train in my life, as I saw on that train that took me to Lewiston that night, and many of them were offensively drunk.

Lewiston.—This place can be dismissed in a few words. There are about 300 places selling liquor, and I saw lots of them myself. There is no trouble whatever about getting it.

Biddisfield.—Here I went to a drug store and purchased a bottle of liquor without being asked any questions. I did the same at the City Agency.

This ended my investigation in Maine so far as actual experience went, but I may mention that on the road to Boston, at the place in New Hampshire where the train stopped for lunch, there was a large dining-room in the station, and the bar run all along one end of it. Apparently in that place the prohibitive law of New Hampshire is not better observed than the prohibitive law in Maine.

It is claimed that in the rural parts of the State the law is well enforced. I have no doubt that places not large enough to support an hotel do not have sale of liquor, but the same is equally true of the Province of Ontario or Quebec, and proves nothing. The farmers of Maine, as the farmers of Ontario, do not, as a rule, drink to any extent, but if they do, they have the towns to supply them, and in Maine it is literally true about freezing one barrel of cider to strengthen up the other. Take the Internal Revenue tax receipts for the different towns.

I have abstained from statistics which I know are already in your possession. They tell their own story of drunkenness not diminished, of population at a stand still, of industries decayed and died away, of prisons and alms-houses filled, and I ask you to compare these with Massachusetts or New York or Pennsylvania, or our own province of Ontario, and see if you will not find the contrast between decay and progress.

OTHER STATES.

While we hear a great deal about Maine, Kansas and Iowa, and considerable less about Vermont and New Hampshire, where the law seems to be practically a dead letter, and still less about the Dakotas, where the cyclones mayhap have driven the Prohibitionists into the cellar, how is it that we hear so little of those other states which have tried Prohibition and rejected it? Are we to learn nothing by the experience of these other great commonwealths?

Michigan.—Enacted a constitutional prohibitory law in 1850, and in 1853 enacted another law which was declared unconstitutional in 1854, re-enacted Prohibition in 1855, and it ran for twenty years. Here was a western state that gave Prohibition a full, fair trial, had a quarter of a century of it in fact, made every effort to enforce the law, and what was the result:

Hon. George W. Moore, in an address before the Detroit Board of Trade, said: "The Prohibition was as absolute as it could be made. The ingenuity of the ablest lawyers, preachers, business men, legislators and women was exhausted in devising penalties and means of enforcing them. Liquors were declared no consideration for a debt, and any sale of other goods where liquors were part of the trade, was declared unlawful and the debt could not be collected; it was declared that every person injured by such sales should be able to sue the seller and recover damages; that owners of the buildings should be also liable; that any lease of premises where liquor was sold could be declared forfeited; that every act of selling should be a separate offence, punishable with fines not exceeding \$100, and imprisonment up to six months, until the liability of every liquor dealer in the state would aggregate perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars and imprisonment for many lifetimes. Common law rules of evidence were changed to make convictions easier, and the simple solicitation of any intemperate person to drink subjected the inviter to the penalties provided for the seller."

It all went for naught. The law soon fell into contempt, produced the greatest of evils; saloons were run openly in defiance of the law, and were upheld by public opinion. Two years before the repeal there were 8,500 saloons in the State, and the condition of affairs became intolerable. Then the temperate and law abiding people banded together against the extreme Prohibitionists, and the groggery keepers, and the obnoxious law was swept away, being replaced by a moderate license law. A writer says: "Within a short time 2,000 of the lowest groggeries in the State were swept away, offences against public peace and order decreased to a marked degree, and the liquor interest, which for twenty-five years had paid no taxes to the State, was made to bear its fair share of the public burdens." The following table, giving the number of liquor dealers in the last five years of Prohibition, and the first five years under license, would seem to bear out this assertion in part, and speaks for itself:

	Liquor Dealers.
1870—Prohibition	5,020
1871 "	5,095
1872 "	5,816
1873 "	8,188
1874 "	6,392
1875—License	5,680
1876 "	4,828
1877 "	4,384
1878 "	4,505
1879 "	4,373

Michigan is now under a high license law which has still further decreased the number notwithstanding that the population has increased since 1870 over 66 per cent.

A Prohibition amendment was submitted in 1887 and was defeated: for 178,636, against 184,281, majority 5,645; total 362,917—vote at nearest important election, 380,855, therefore did not vote 17,938. Michigan has a local option feature for counties. In 1890 (annual report Auditor General) only four counties under local option. Of these counties, Isle Royale is the island of that name in Lake Superior, and has a total population of 135 who heroically deprive themselves of the open saloon; Manitou County is a group of islands in Lake Michigan with a total population of 860. Van Buren and Kalkaska, the other two, have neither of them a town of 2,000 people. (Hillsdale County, now said to be under the law, but not enforced. Local option apparently does not work in Michigan any better than Scott Act in Ontario.)

MASSACHUSETTS.

Massachusetts, with its great institutions of learning, its great manufacturing industries, its great population, its great lawyers, doctors, professors and engineers, has tried Prohibition, returned to license, and is determined to stay there. In 1852 a law was passed which was declared unconstitutional, enacted a general prohibitory law in 1855. This lasted until 1868 when it was repealed, and restored the following year. In 1870 a "free beer" amendment was carried, which was repealed in 1873. The election in 1874 was decisive against Prohibition, and the law was finally repealed in 1875, local option being added in 1881. In 1889 a vote was taken on a constitutional amendment which was overwhelmingly defeated, the vote standing: for 85,242, against 131,062—majority against 45,820—total vote polled, 216,304; at nearest election 344,517.

In this State was tried the experiment of an independent State Police so often talked about to enforce the law, but with no success. They were appointed in 1865, but the opposition to the law developed to such an extent that in 1867 a joint committee of the two Houses of the State Legislature was appointed to enquire into the whole subject. If the Commission have not a copy of that report they should try to get it. The committee reported that the number of arrests for drunkenness in Boston had increased under Prohibition from 6,983 in 1854 to 15,542 in 1866, and they concluded as follows: "That the time had come when this prohibitory law—unsound in theory, inconsistent with the traditional rights and liberties of the people, tempting to fraud and protecting those who commit it, in many communities not enforced because of thorough disbelief in its principles, in other communities when enforced driving the liquor traffic into secret places, and so increasing rather than diminishing the amount of drunkenness and other crime—should be so far modified as that the rights of the citizens will be respected, while at the same time the general peace and order of the community will be promoted." They gave a detailed license law. Eight members signed this; four signed a minority report in favor of Prohibition.

When Prohibition was before the people in 1889, six out of eight college presidents in the State spoke against it, 88 clergymen signed a manifesto in a Boston paper against it, and 127 physicians of Boston signed a published protest. At the Presidential elections in this State votes were cast for the Prohibition candidate as follows: (Massachusetts casts from 350,000 to 400,000 votes.)

1884	10,000
1888	8,700
1892	7,500

At the elections for Governor the Prohibition votes cast were :

1885	4,714
1886	8,251
1887	10,945
1888	9,374
1889	15,108
1890	13,554
1891	8,968
1892	7,067

This is the record of Prohibition in the great commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Rhode Island.—This little State has made three trials of Prohibition and three times given it up, the last time by a decisive majority. The first Prohibitory law was passed in 1852 and continued until 1863, the second was passed in 1874 and lived one year. The third was a constitutional amendment submitted to the people in 1886 with this result: for 15,113, against 9,230, majority 5,883. In 1889 another vote was taken with this result: for 9,956, against, 28,315, majority against Prohibition 10,359. The history of the three years of Prohibition, resulting in liquor being sold in an immensely greater number of places than under license is too long to be related here, but I beg to lay before the Commission an extract from the report of the proceedings of the 10th annual meeting of the charity organization society of the city of Newport in this State, published in 1888:—

REPORT CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETY NEWPORT, R.I., 1888.

A difficulty encountered by our visitors with increasing frequency during the past two years, and one likely to become still greater, is the sale of liquor in dwelling houses. Our policy has been, when the fact is well-ascertained, to bring it at once to the attention of the person visited and to cease visiting unless a promise is given to immediately stop the objectionable and unlawful practice. Of course we endeavor to see that the promise is kept. There are cases now under our care where there are uncomfortable and well-founded suspicions that such practices prevail, but where. Nevertheless, the evidence is not sufficiently clear to justify the termination of our oversight and care. That the gravity of the situation in this regard may be apparent, some facts of a general nature may be stated.

During the efficient administration of the office of mayor for the past three years in this city, the sale of liquor has practically been driven for our public streets. It may fairly be said that there are no open saloons here. Yet the evidence that large quantities of liquor are brought here and sold is unquestioned. By accounts officially kept, it appears that the importation of liquor has largely increased during the past eighteen months; that by the Old Colony steamboat company alone, during the past summer season, from forty to two hundred barrels of kegs, chiefly of malt liquors, arrived here daily. During the nine months of 1888, from February to October inclusive, there were in Newport 127 searches for and seizures of liquors on warrants in buildings where it was alleged to be sold. Eighty-one of these were in dwelling houses kept by fifty different persons. This shows that there were repeated seizures in several cases. The remaining forty-six searches were in stores and small shops kept by seventy-one different persons, many of which places were immediately adjoining to or connected with the dwelling houses. Eleven of these seventy-one persons were women. The reports of police officers, as well as the statements of those whom duty calls to visit such localities, show that these places which have been raided, do not constitute a majority of those where liquor is sold. Indeed, there is a good reason to believe that there are streets where liquor has been sold during the past year in nearly every house. Many of these

people have never sold before, and the daughters of some of them are in our homes as servants. They are easily led into it. A friend and neighbor has perhaps started in upon the business, induced, it may be, by the liberal terms of the wholesale dealer, who is reported to put in the first barrel on credit, to be paid for when sold. The example is contagious; here appears to be an opportunity to make a little money in a household where spare pennies are not over-abundant; the moral forces are not strong enough to resist the temptation; such scruples as exist against the wretched business go by the board, and soon, perhaps, the majority in some little neighborhood are engaging, to a greater or less extent in this miserable employment, and if it is thus easy for persons removed from pressing want to take up the business how much easier is it for those upon whom the burden of extreme poverty bears heavily. "If I don't sell liquor how can I live?" is a question which has been heard more than once the past year.

In this city in many homes liquor is sold to men by women in the presence of their children. As one thinks of the influence of such practices not only upon themselves, but upon their children, of the future evils to flow from these lessons so easily learned in the evasion and breaking of law, of the probabilities of these young people becoming future drunkards, of the vulgarizing and degrading influence upon girls resulting from the conversion of a mother's kitchen into a bar room; visited by coarse, drunken, indecent men, the simple suggestion of what possibilities the future has for them in store is appalling. Of what avail are this and other charitable organizations against the disorganizing, corrupting power of this evil, poisoning the home, and the moral tone and life of whole localities? Respectfully submitted.

Edmund Tweedy, president; F. W. Tilton, vice-president; J. T. Burdock, treasurer; M. S. Burdick, secretary; Joseph P. Cotton, William P. Buffum, John H. Crosby, jr., William P. Sheffield, jr., Darius Baker, Anna F. Hunter, Andrew K. Quinn, Catherine White, K. P. Womeley, M. Downing, M. T. Berry, from the Dorcas Society; Lydia Melville, from Townsend Aid to Aged; P. G. Hammett, from Home for Friendless Children; Emily B. Chace, from Flower Mission.

OTHER STATES.

Making reference to the other States in as short space as possible:

Delaware passed a prohibitive law in 1848, which was declared unconstitutional, and has never been re-enacted.

Minnesota tried a prohibitory law as far back as 1852, but soon gave it up, and is now a steadfast high license State.

New York—In 1853 the Legislature passed a prohibitory law which Gov. Seymour vetoed. In 1855 another law was passed, but declared unconstitutional. Not tried since.

Connecticut passed a prohibitory law in 1853, and kept it in operation until 1874—voted on and defeated a constitutional amendment in 1889.

Indiana passed a prohibitory law in 1855; courts equally divided on its constitutionality; became a dead letter; nothing since.

Nebraska and Illinois passed prohibitive laws in 1855; don't know how long they were kept in operation, but both have been replaced by license laws, and both States have since defeated constitutional amendments, Illinois 1880, Nebraska 1890.

Pennsylvania, Washington, Oregon, Tennessee and Texas defeated prohibitive amendments in recent years.

Ohio carried Prohibition in 1883, but it is a dead letter.

HOW THE VOTES STOOD.

The votes on the prohibitory amendment to the State constitution have been as follows :

	Year.	For.	Against.	Majority For.	Majority Against.
Kansas	1880	91,874	84,037	7,837
Iowa	1882	155,436	125,677	29,749
Ohio	1883	323,189	240,975	82,214
Maine	1884	70,783	23,811	46,972
Rhode Island	1886	15,113	9,230	5,883
Michigan	1887	178,636	184,281	5,645
Texas	1887	129,270	220,627	91,357
Tennessee	1887	117,504	145,197	27,693
Oregon	1887	19,973	27,958	7,985
West Virginia	1888	41,668	76,555	34,887
New Hampshire	1889	25,786	30,976	5,290
Massachusetts	1889	85,242	131,062	45,820
Pennsylvania	1889	296,617	484,644	188,027
Rhode Island	1889	9,956	28,315	10,359
South Dakota	1889	39,509	33,456	6,053
North Dakota	1889	18,552	17,393	1,159
Washington	1889	19,546	31,489	11,943
Connecticut	1889	22,379	49,974	27,595
Nebraska	1890	82,296	111,728	29,432
				179,817	486,033

In other words seven (7) States in the ten years adopted a prohibitive amendment with combined majorities of 179,817, while twelve (12) States rejected the same with 486,033 combined majority. Of the seven, Ohio, with its 82,214 majority, must be taken out of the ranks, leaving the actual working combined majority less than 100,000 in favor of Prohibition in six States. If Rhode Island, which has voted both ways, but with much the larger majority against, be taken out, the total figure is reduced to less than 90,000.

The population of the States that have voted in favor of Prohibition is 4,511,605.

The population of the States that have voted against Prohibition is 17,201,536. Not including Ohio and Rhode Island with a combined population of 4,017,822.

Twenty-seven States (not including the Territories) have never, at least not in modern times, seen fit to vote on the subject at all. This combined population is 37,945,465.

Prohibition is ostensibly in force over four and a half millions of the sixty-five or seventy millions population of the United States. It has been tried and rejected by about four times of that population.

In the last four elections for the Presidency of the United States, the Prohibitionists have had candidates in the field. The strength they have developed is interesting. This table gives the result:—(Tribune Almanac).

	Total Vote.	Prohibition Vote.
1880	9,218,251	10,305
1884	10,052,706	150,369
1888	11,373,498	249,665
1892	12,041,298	263,299

I do not know that I have anything further to say under this head.

THE FOURTH GREAT QUESTION.

We now come to Question 4. "The effect that the enactment of a Prohibitory liquor law in Canada would have in respect of :

- (a) *Social conditions.*
- (b) *Agricultural business.*
- (c) *Industrial and Commercial interests.*
- (d) *Revenue requirements re Municipalities, Provinces and the Dominion.*
- (e) *Its capability of efficient enforcement.*

Taking these in their order, we have first to consider the effect of a prohibitory law upon social conditions. By this I assume is meant "would there be an improvement in the social condition of the people if a prohibitory law were passed. The prohibitionist will answer this question glibly enough. He will tell you that drunkenness and poverty would disappear, crime would be almost unknown, the jails would be emptied, policemen would be out of a job, the burglar would beat his "jimmy" into a ploughshare and the barkeeper turn his corkscrew into a pruning hook. Unfortunately your Prohibitionist, especially if he be a "Rev." or a "Prof." is not to be held accountable for his statements. I have before me, as an example, a statement made by Rev. Ward B. Pickard, at Toronto, on Nov. 20th last, who said: *Wherever the liquor traffic is encouraged prostitution grows. Omaha has a thousand dollar license, and in connection with a large number of saloons are houses of prostitution.*

This absurdity was started by "Prof." Dickey and "Rev." Sam Small, two brilliant Prohibition lights, out in Nebraska at the time of the Prohibition contest there. I knew it had travelled around a good deal since, but must confess to surprise at hearing it repeated by a gentleman such as Rev. Mr. Pickard. In the light of morality and decency Omaha is as much ahead of his own city of Buffalo as can well be expressed. In the same way, the Prohibitionists' talk about the improved social condition of the people under Prohibition is usually the vaporings of some demagogue or fakir, uttered a long distance away and thereafter gravely repeated by every side-line, lodge-room orator until it actually gets to be accepted as a fact, whereas the slightest investigation would prove its absurdity. The facts, proven by statistics are that drunkenness is greater, crime is greater, infractions of the law are more numerous, while general prosperity is less under a prohibitive than under a license law. This being so do we not at once arrive at the true effect of a prohibitive law on social conditions.

Now for the facts. Prince Edward Island, off out by herself in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, under total Prohibition for the Island, increased her convictions for breach of the liquor laws from four in 1880 to 90 in 1891, and increased the committals for drunkenness from 260 in 1880 to 311 in 1891. The only thing P.E.I. did not increase was her population, which practically remained stationary. Nova Scotia, with Prohibition everywhere outside the city of Halifax, but with open sale in many of the counties, increased the convictions for breach of the liquor law from fifty-five in 1880 to 118 in 1891, drunkenness 677 to 635. New Brunswick, the banner Prohibition province, increased the convictions for breach of the liquor laws from 36 in 1880 to 245 in 1891, and the convictions for drunkenness from 850 to 1628 in the same period. Quebec which is claimed to be from one-third to one-half under Prohibition, had 339 convictions for breach of the liquor law in 1880 and 434 in 1891. Drunkenness 1,348 in 1880 and 4,199 in 1891. Now take Ontario, which is all under license law. In this province the convictions for breach of the liquor law were 1,089 in 1880 and 1,220 in 1891, but in 1886 under the Scott Act they were 1646, in 1887 under the Scott Act 2,664, and in 1888 under the Scott Act 3,108

dropping to 1,982 in 1889 when the Scott Act went out, and to 1,131 the following year. Convictions for drunkenness in Ontario were 5,282 in 1880 and decreased to 4,973 in 1891, but in the Scott Act years the figures were : 1884—4,694 ; 1885—5,868 ; 1886—5,453 ; 1887—6,200 ; 1888—6,633 , 1889—7,059. Manitoba convictions for breach of the liquor license laws decreased from sixty-two in 1880 to eleven in 1891, and convictions for drunkenness from 525 in 1881 to 518 in 1891.

Now Prince Edward Island increased in population in the last census decade 0.18 per cent. ; Nova Scotia 2.25 per cent. ; New Brunswick 0.02 per cent. ; Quebec 9.53 per cent. ; Ontario 9.65 per cent. ; Manitoba 148.06 per cent. I have the detailed tables if necessary.

I wish just for a moment to glance at the industrial side of the question in a general way. The following table shows the position of the Provinces towards each other in respect to industrial establishments and employees for 1881 and 1891 (Census Bulletin No. 8, p. 6) :

	1881.		1891.	
	Establishments.	Employees.	Establishments.	Employees.
Ontario	23,058	118,308	32,028	165,335
Quebec	15,848	85,673	23,110	116,467
Nova Scotia	5,459	20,390	10,372	34,250
New Brunswick	3,117	19,922	5,419	26,609
Other Provinces	2,441	10,642	4,836	24,835

Prince Edward Island had 5,767 employes in 1881 and 7,906 in 1891.

Manitoba has increased from 1,921 in 1881 to 4,375 in 1891—an increase of 127 per cent.

The North-West Territories returned 83 employes in industrial establishments in 1881 and 1,081 in 1891.

British Columbia had 2,871 in 1881, and 11,473 in 1891—an increase of nearly 300 per cent.

Ontario increased the number of her industrial establishments by 8,970 and her employes by 47,027. New Brunswick increased the first by 2,302 and her industrial population by only 6,687. P.E.I. made the great gain in the ten years of 2,139 to her industrial population. Compare the increase in Manitoba and in British Columbia with any Prohibition province, section or state in America, and it will be found that the advantage by a long way is on the side of the Canadian license provinces.

Kansas increased in population from 1880 to 1890, 43 per cent.

Iowa in the same time increased 17 per cent.

Manitoba, without a title of the advantages of these older States, increased 148 per cent.

Maine only increased 2 per cent.

Kansas had more prisoners in 1880 than 1890 (given elsewhere). Ontario had 11,300 of a jail population in 1880, and only 9,011 in 1892.

At the State Reform School, Topeka, Kansas, the inmates numbered (June 30th, 1890), 186 ; June 30th, 1892, 220—a great increase. Ontario's Reformatory—Sept. 30th, 1890, 201 ; Sept. 30th, 1892, 168—a most gratifying decrease (all under 16 years go to both of these).

This table also tells a story :—

	Population.	No. licenses to sell liquor 1890-91.
Kansas	1,472,096	3,336
Iowa	1,911,896	6,874
Maine	661,086	-
ONTARIO	2,112,989	4,256

In Iowa, in 1892, the liquor fines collected amounted to \$56,568; in Ontario, \$23,316. In Iowa the cost of prosecution was \$659,665; in Ontario, \$75,517, and this latter includes salary and expenses of Inspector and expenses of License Commissioner. I do not know whether the social condition of the people of Iowa is exalted by having to pay this enormous sum for the prosecution of liquor cases.

It may not always be competent to compare one province with another or one state with another, or a province with a state; but if we take a province such as Ontario, where statistics are carefully prepared, and compare results year by year over a long term of years we must arrive at a fairly accurate conclusion as to the effects and possibilities of the laws in operation. In taking up the record for Ontario, I beg first to call attention to the report of the Inspector of Prisons for the year 1892. (Read pp. 6 and 7.) The views of Inspector Chamberlain I take to be worth recording.

Coming to the statistics, these in each case show most gratifying results since the adoption of the Crooks Act in 1876. I take it that no more accurate test can be had than the committals for drunkenness year by year. I have a table showing the number of licenses of all kinds granted year by year since 1876, and the committals to jail in each of these years. This table reads:—

Year.	No. of Licenses of all Kinds.	Committed to Prison for Drunkenness.
1876-7	3,936	4,032
1877-8	3,754	3,785
1878-9	3,760	3,581
1879-80	4,068	3,795
1880-1	4,195	3,328
1881-2	4,760	3,497
1882-3	4,903	3,895
1883-4	4,940	4,650
1884-5	4,516	3,696
1885-6	3,608	3,555*
1886-7	2,326	4,130*
1887-8	2,290	4,551*
1888-9	2,935	4,797*
1889-90	4,246	4,573
1890-91	4,256	3,614
1891-92	4,189	2,736

It will be observed that while the number of licenses has increased with the growth of population, the committals for drunkenness have decreased over one-third, a most gratifying circumstance. Lest it may be said that under a prohibitive system still better results might have been obtained, I wish to point out that during this period we had the Scott Act, for a time, over three-fourths of the Province, and that during that prohibitive period the committals for drunkenness largely INCREASED. Allow me to point out as strongly as possible that under the license law the committals for drunkenness were largely below the number of licenses issued—that is that there was nothing like the proportion of one committal for one license, but that under the Scott Act the committals for drunkenness quickly exceeded the number of licenses issued, that while one went down the other went up, until in 1887-8 there were twice as many committals as there were licenses, and in the following year, the last year of the Scott Act, the committals for drunkenness reached the highest point they have ever attained in Ontario. No amount of explanation or excuse can alter these facts.

Coming to general crime, the case is equally strong. Comparisons of crime in Ontario with other places need not be instituted here, but simply Ontario's own record. The following table gives the total committments to goal in the

† Year Crooks Act came in. * Scott Act years.

Province of Ontario from the years 1876 to 1892 inclusive, and this includes prisoners of all ages and sexes :

Total committments to gaol in the Province of Ontario in the years mentioned (of all ages), year ending 30th Sept. :

1876	11,236
1877	13,431
1878	12,030
1879	11,220
1880	11,300
1881	9,229
1882	9,620
1883	9,880
1884	12,081*
1885	11,426*
1886	10,645*
1887	11,017*
1888	12,454*
1889	12,531*
1890	11,810
1891	10,423
1892	9,011

Here, again, I would call attention to the break in the good progress being made during the Scott Act period. From 1877, the year after the Crooks' Act came into force, there was a steady diminution in crime until that miserable prohibition law came into force. Then crime sprung up to greater proportions than ever, and so remained until the law was repealed. It has taken from that time until this to get back to the condition of affairs we were in in 1881. Just that length of time did the Scott Act set back the cause of temperance.

Coming to the Central Prison, where the more serious offenders are incarcerated, what is found? I have here the committals to that prison ever since its foundation. There is a most gratifying decrease in committals, yet here, again, the greatest number of committals the Central Prison has ever known in all its history was in the celebrated Scott Act year of 1887, when every difficulty in the way of the Act had been settled:

Population of Ontario—1871, 1,620,851; 1891, 2,112,989; increase in population in that time, 492,138; an increase of nearly one-fourth.

The daily average in custody for the year 1882 was 321.

Central prison committals during the following years :

1874 (year prison started)	370
1875	426
1876	637
1877	655
1878	636
1879	567
1880	560
1881	745
1882	767
1883	669
1884	723
1885	761
1886	594
1887	862
1888	669
1889	739
1890	715
1891	674
1892	598

*Scott Act term.

PENETANGUISHENE REFORMATORY.

	Committed during Year.	Number at close of Year.
1880	80	216
1881	96	250
1882	84	263
1883	58	245
1884	81	242
1885	51	220
1886	64	205
1887	60	192
1888	78	193
1889	85	210
1890	63	201
1891	63	185
1892	67	168

Nearly an hundred less in 1892 than in 1882, considerably over a third less.

The figures for the Reformatory at Penetanguishenè are such as must gratify everyone. Upon them I need offer no comment. Another branch of the subject I do wish to touch upon. Prohibition is to make everybody happy, fill everybody's pocket, give everyone employment, empty the poor houses, and turn the jails into factories. I have here in the following table the committals for vagrancy in Ontario from 1877 down and side by side with it, as an object lesson, if you will, I beg to repeat the list of committals for drunkenness :

	Vagrancy.	Drunkand Disorderly.
1877	3,888	4,032
1878	2,524	3,785
1879	2,536	3,581
1880	2,210	3,795
1881	1,580	3,328
1882	1,449	3,497
1883	1,554	3,895
1884	2,130	4,650*
1885	2,455	3,696*
1886	2,243	3,555*
1887	2,192	4,130*
1888	2,301	4,551*
1889	2,164	4,797*
1890	1,958	4,573
1891	1,877	3,614
1892	1,775	2,736

Again I would ask you to note the Scott Act years.

This matter of the committal of vagrants is, however, worthy of another thought. It is this feature which swells largely the committals to gaol in Ontario. That I may be understood I have made a condensation from the specific reports of the Inspector (year 1892) showing the number of inmates of gaols at the time of his visit and the number who were there as vagrants, with mention of one or two other matters. A vagrant is ostensibly and technically a loose, idle and disorderly person having no visible means of support, but in nine cases out of ten he is an unfortunate and not a criminal. This should be constantly borne in mind in comparing our "criminal" class with the criminal statistics of other countries. The extracts I have made read :

*Scott Act years.

	Prisoners.	Vagrants.	
Barrie	22	10
Berlin	5	1
" (2)	4	4
Belleville	16	6
" (2)	21	7
Brantford	9	2	1 insane.
" (2)	10	8
Brampton	3	1
" (2)	1	..	trespass.
Brockville	10	6	1 insane.
" (2)	9	2	1 idiot.
Bracebridge	3
" (2)	2	1	1 idiot.
Cayuga	2	..	assault and drunk and disorderly.
Cornwall	2	..	man and daughter, incest and infanticide,
" (2)	3	..	1 lunatic.
Coburg	14	..	1 lunatic.
"	10	2
Chatham	7	1
"	10	1
Goderich	9	2	4 insane.
" (2)	9	2	4 insane.
Guelph	6	2	1 insane and 1 imbecile.
Hamilton	8	2
Kingston	16	don't say
London	20	10
Lindsay	2	..	1 lunatic.
L'Original	8	2	2 insane.
Milton	7	6	see report, pp. 62.
Napanee	4	3
Ottawa	21	2
Owen Sound	10	8
Orangeville	11	4
" (2)	15	11	2 insane, 1 idiot. See re- port, pp. 65.
Perth	6	..	2 insane, 1 idiot
" (2)	7	6
Picton	3	1	See report pp. 66.
Pembroke	10	5
Peterborough	27	17
Port Arthur	2	1	See report, pp. 67.
Parry Sound	1
Rat Portage	3
Simcoe	3
St. Catharines	5	1	2 trespass.
Sarnia	22	9	1 lunatic.
Stratford	19	15
Sandwich	15	7	See report, pp. 72
" (2)	9	3
St. Thomas	14	..	4 insane.
Sault Ste. Marie	3	..	6 trespass.
Toronto	132	don't say
Walkerton	5	1
"	2	1
Woodstock	14	12	2 insane.
Welland	3	..	2 trespass.
Whitby	5	3

Before concluding this branch I may give the ratio which the commitments for drunkenness bears to the total commitments in Ontario :

1887	37.49 per cent.
1888	35.74 "
1889	38.12 "
1890	38.72 "
1891	34.67 "
1892	30.36 "

I would like to see any Prohibition State that can make as good a showing.

Finally, in this branch, I beg to hand in a statement showing the number of licenses and the committals for drunkenness in each county in Ontario for the past ten or eleven years. These figures, though too bulky to be placed upon the record, are some of them very curious and instructive.

The statistics of the Penitentiary at Kingston are in line with those of the Central Prison and county jails. In the year ending 30th June last the number of convicts in this institution decreased 51, and in the previous year there was a decrease of 54. Inspector Moylan in his last report says that "the falling off for some years past in penitentiary population is a subject for rejoicing," with which sentiment we will all agree. It may be worth noting that while Ontario's penitentiary population decreased 51 last year, Quebec's remained absolutely stationary, Dorchester increased six and Manitoba decreased four. British Columbia increased 15. Indians, half-breeds and Chinese form a considerable proportion of the convicts on the Pacific slope.

In 1892 the penitentiary population of Maine was 170; Iowa, 438; Kansas, 902; Ontario, 481. Ontario has 200,000 more population than Iowa, 700,000 more than Kansas, and nearly four times as much as Maine.

I think nothing more need be said as to the relation of Prohibition to crime except in this general way. Intemperance undoubtedly produces some crime, but Prohibition does not reduce intemperance, and therefore does not reduce crime. On the other hand it greatly increases certain classes of crime, and by bringing law into contempt increases the probability of crime being committed. At one time a judge said that 95 per cent. of all crime arose through drink. This statement has done duty with our Prohibition friends ever since, yet a more untrue assertion could not well have been made. Statistics prove it to be false; history proves it to be false; common sense shows it to be absurd. Your temperate Chinese is the rankest thief in the world. A drunken Chinaman is an unknown thing on the Pacific Coast, yet 28 Chinese are in the British Columbia Penitentiary, and all for serious crimes. Your abstemious Spaniard will plunge a knife into your vitals with as little compunction as he will eat an onion. Italy is a temperate country, yet its criminal population is large. Turks are forbidden by their religion to drink, yet where will you find a worse crime cursed country than Turkey? Mexicans very seldom drink, yet a large proportion of them seem to be natural criminals. And so one could go on through the nations of the earth. Drink may make a man bad, and a bad man may drink, but the mere absence of drink, even if that could be attained, will never make a bad man good. Nor can the mere statement that, such and such a proportion of our criminal population are intemperate, have effect. Are they criminals because they are intemperate, or are they intemperate because they are criminals? Nearly all criminals in our country drink, yet very few who drink are criminals. Are we to reason that those who are not criminals are so because they drink, or are we to argue that our Prohibition friends are teetotalers because they fear that if they drank they will become thieves or burglars or embezzlers?

INSANITY.

Into this branch of the subject is incorporated the question of insanity, though why it should be so is not clear. Intemperance figures to so small an extent in the causes that produce insanity that it is hardly worth while founding an argument on the matter. Dr. Clarke, of Toronto, after an exhaustive investigation fixed the cases of insanity caused by intemperance at 9 per cent., which included "supposed" as well as known causes. The official reports of Ontario do not place the percentage at above five. At any rate the ratio is very small. Then again I should like to know how anybody is to separate the cases of insanity caused by drink from the cases of drinking caused by insanity. Is it a case of the drink making a man insane or an insane man drinking?

Then will any man explain to me why by far the greatest number of cases of insanity are from among the farmers who are our most temperate class. Heavy tea drinking, causing constant constipation, will predispose to insanity, and it may be that the food and drink used by farmers may have this effect. Whatever the cause there is certainly a constantly increasing number of cases of insanity in this and every other civilized country, and the increase is usually greater under Prohibition than under license, due probably to the greater number of cranks under the former. For instance, in 1891, Ontario had 3,506 inmates in her asylums, and New Brunswick 602. Ontario has about seven times the population of N.B., giving the latter in ratio of population, 4,214. Maine's yearly average increased from 75 in 1850 to 685 in 1891-2. Iowa's increased from 1,070 in 1884 to 1,912 in 1891, but these figures do not tell the whole story for Iowa. Governor Boies is the authority for the statement that 44 insane persons were kept in the Polk County poor house alone, and that the superintendents of the different insane asylums, after making proper inquiries, find that there are from one thousand to eleven hundred persons kept by the different counties at home. For purposes of comparison, I append the daily average of patients in the asylums of New Brunswick and Ontario since 1877:

Year.	New Brunswick.	Ontario.
1877	277	1,819
1878	287	1,925
1879	301	2,054
1880	309	2,215
1881	316	2,354
1882	345	2,457
1883	369	2,580
1884	363	2,634
1885	394	2,708
1886	424	2,830
1887	445	2,915
1888	443	2,985
1889	447	3,167
1890	445	3,266
1891	465	3,506
1892	...	3,537

In Ontario the statistics are carefully kept, among others, the causes where ascertainable of the insanity. Where intemperance is the cause it ought to be easily ascertainable although even then, as I have before stated, there is the difficulty as to whether the man became insane through drink or drank because he was insane. This difficulty will have a tendency to make the figures even higher than they deserve, but taking them as they are, the report for 1892 gives the following:

Asylum at	Admissions for year.	Intemperance as pre-disposing cause.	Intemperance as exciting cause.
Toronto	239	1	3
London	142	..	8
Hamilton	149	..	6
Kingston	103	..	4
	<u>633</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>21</u>

These figures show conclusively how immeasurably slight is the relation between drunkenness and insanity, and should finally dispose of the absurd claim of some Prohibitionists that liquor is responsible for a great deal of insanity, the claim running all the way from 30 to 90 per cent. The claim may be made, however, that as there are "some" cases of insanity attributed to liquor would it not be better then to prohibit the liquor. I find looking through the reports for many years past that a much greater number are attributed to religious excitement. Would you, therefore, prohibit religion? We have no statistics as to the number of persons who, inclined to insanity, have been kept moderately straight through the stimulus of an occasional glass of liquor.

For purposes of further comparison, I append the returns from several of the provinces for a term of years, showing the number of committals to the asylums and the number whose affliction was attributed to liquor :

NOVA SCOTIA.

Year.	No. of Committals.	Caused by Intemperance.
1880	89	9
1881	80	2
1882	91	5
1883	96	6
1884	86	6
1885	112	8
1886	114	3
1887	112	4
1888	104	7
1889	76	1
1890	94	2
1891	111	0

ONTARIO.

Year.	No. of Com- mittments.	No. of Cases Caused by Intemperance.
1880	507	10
1881	502	15
1882	493	15
1883	519	16
1884	493	19
1885	457	16
1886	519	7
1887	425	14
1888	566	23
1889	514	14
1890	666	12
1891	928	15

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

(Cause of insanity attributed to
intemperance in drink.)

Year.	Total Admissions.	Male.	Female.	Total.
1882	7	0
1883	8	1	..	1
1884	11	0
1885	21	3	1	4
1886	27	8	..	8
1887	39	1	..	1
1888	29	4	2	6
1889	41	0
1890	57	7	..	7
1891	54	5	..	5

THE SOCIAL EVIL.

Now we come to the question of the bearing that Prohibition would have upon the social evil. In the first place I utterly deny that there is any relation whatever between the liquor traffic and the social evil or that one has any influence or bearing upon the other directly or indirectly. A prostitute becomes so because of her evil nature, a man consorts with her because of his evil nature and drink has no more to do with it than bread. The statement is made that these places sell liquor invariably. This may or may not be so, and either way does not affect the argument. I imagine that under Prohibition they would to a certain extent take the place of saloons, to a greater extent certainly than they do now, but that I do not suppose to have much bearing upon the case. In some of the Prohibition towns in the Maritime Provinces, notably in New Brunswick, we found there existed known houses of prostitution; in license towns of the same size in Ontario no such thing exists. I do not believe the liquor law has anything to do with it in either case. One might think that where Prohibition was the law, but that where this law was openly violated, it might naturally lead to violation of the law against prostitution, yet we found in some of the cities of the west where the Prohibitory law was most flagrantly violated, the law against prostitution was rigorously enforced, while in others where there were strong attempts at enforcing Prohibition the social evil was tolerated.

The statement of Rev. Ward B. Pickard that Prohibition drives out three-fourths of the prostitution is amply disproved by the evidence taken before this commission.

The subject altogether is a difficult one to touch upon. Different communities deal with the evil in different ways. I have been in cities where houses of prostitution were regularly licensed and inspected, in cities where they were regulated by fines, in cities where they were tolerated in a certain quarter, in cities where they were let do just as they pleased and I live in Toronto where the law against such places is rigorously enforced and where Inspector Archibald says they are suppressed. Each of these systems was claimed to work well. What "working well" means in this connection I am at a loss to say. If the Toronto system worked it would be well, but unfortunately the Toronto system, does not work. I have made careful enquiries upon this subject and have no hesitation whatever in saying that the evil is greater, more wide-spread, more disastrous in its results, ten times over than it was before the worthy Inspector commenced his celebrated campaign. Yet I cannot conceive of any compromise with this evil. However, as we are to discuss the liquor traffic and subjects bearing thereon, and as I contend that this subject has no connection whatever with the liquor traffic we may perhaps let it drop. If there be any connection it may be that under Prohibition you would in part transfer the liquor traffic from the respectably conducted hotel to the brothel.

Before leaving the subject, however, that the commission may not be left under a misapprehension, arising from the statement made by a witness in Toronto, I beg to submit certain figures. Inspector Archibald, Chief of the Morality Department of the Toronto Police Force, in giving his evidence before the Commission, stated that no houses of ill-fame existed in the city, or at least not to his knowledge.

There were, according to the report of his own department published in the Annual Report of the Chief Constable of the city, in 1891, 171 prosecutions for keeping houses of ill-fame, in 1892 132, and in 1893 151 prosecutions for keeping houses of ill-fame and 125 prosecutions for keeping disorderly houses. Inspector Archibald, in his report for 1892, said: "The usual supervision was exercised

over what is known as the social evil, and the city continues to present, outwardly at least, a moral aspect. Prostitution, as a business, is unprofitable, hence the limited number of women who carry it on as a means of livelihood." Speaking in his report for 1893 he says: "It should be borne in mind that a policy of repression in too severe a form may lower rather than improve the moral tone of the people, by causing disreputable women to seek the shelter of private lodgings in respectable localities, instead of confining themselves to places where their presence is not objected to." Between these two statements Inspector Archibald made his now celebrated declaration to the Commission.

I think I have now sufficiently shown that in respect of social conditions past experience does not warrant us in expecting an improvement under Prohibition, but that, rather, we will have an aggravation of the evils sought to be remedied. Prohibition communities have had this experience invariably, and we have no reason to expect to be an exception to the general rule. Social conditions will never be improved by an increase of crime and a decrease of prosperity, by an increase of drunkenness and a decrease in respect for the law, by an increase of perjury and a decrease of respectability.

AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS.

When we come to the question of the effect a prohibitive law would have upon agricultural business we reach a subject of great moment. Taking first the subject of barley. The annual average of barley manufactured into malt for brewers *only* for the four years ending June 30, 1889, was 1,511,519 bushels. The yearly average product of barley in Ontario for the past nine or ten years is twenty-five bushels per acre. The amount of barley for brewers' purposes would, therefore, take the product of 60,460 acres yearly. Or, the entire product of 604 farms of 100 acres each devoted entirely to barley. But, on an average, only one-half of the farm is devoted to grain, the balance being taken up with bush, pasture, fallow, hay, roots and waste land. If the grain part of the farm were devoted entirely to barley it would take the product of 1,208 farms to produce the supply required by brewers. Allowing five to a family and one farm laborer to each farm, 7,248 of our agricultural population would be devoted to raising this supply of grain. But the average amount of grain land used in the raising of barley is in Ontario only about one-sixth, as shown by the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for 1893:

It will be seen that as barley bears its fair proportion to the five great cereals (fall wheat, spring wheat, oats, peas, barley), the barley produce of 7,248 farms would be left without a purchaser by the enactment of a prohibitory law. This would mean a loss of one-sixth of their income from grain (counting five to a family and one farm laborer to each farm) to 43,488 of our farm population. This pertains only to the brewery business. In addition, Prohibition would mean the entire loss to the farmers of the corn product of Essex, which is purchased by Hiram Walker & Co. Further, the distillers purchased and used in the last year 273,045 bushels of rye and wheat, 136,407 bushels of barley, 46,884 bushels of oats. Add these all together and an idea of the loss to the farmer will be something like this:—

Amount of grain used, calculating 400,000 bushels as the quantity of corn purchased in Ontario: 2,350,000 bushels. Average price, say 50c. per bushel: \$1,150,000 that would be lost to the farmers in grain yearly. But this is only one item.

Take hops, for instance. The amount of hops used in 1891 by brewers and distillers was 1,507,336 lbs., which, at an average of 20c. per lb., would mean \$301,467. The amount of hops imported that year was 606,464 lbs. It may, I think, be fairly calculated that the amount of Canadian-raised hops used for

other purposes would equal the importation, leaving the hop-grower of Canada a deficiency in his market, if Prohibition were passed, of the amount quoted above.

Then take the question of the feeding of cattle at distilleries and breweries. The figures in this item are as follows:—

Cattle fed.	Head.	Cost of cattle.	Tons hay.	Cost hay.
By Distillers - -	10,000	\$400,000	12,500	\$137,500
By Brewers	9,000	360,000	11,250	123,750
	<u>19,000</u>	<u>\$760,000</u>	<u>23,750</u>	<u>\$261,250</u>

The farmer would lose a market for 19,000 head of cattle, valued at \$760,000, and 23,750 tons of hay, valued at \$261,250. In addition, he would lose the sale of the fodder for all the teaming and truckage of brewers and distillers, which must mean a very large amount.

The effect of a prohibitory law upon the agriculturist who produces grapes and apples for cider may be fairly calculated. The great bulk of the grapes produced in Canada are made into wine. They must either be made into wine or rot. At any rate, 41 industries, employing 150 men would be destroyed, and in cider 175 industries, employing 321 men.

And finally calculate the loss to the farmer when an enormous number of men are thrown out of employment and their wages gone, as would be the case under Prohibition. There can be only one conclusion as to the effect upon agricultural interests—it would be most disastrous. The farmer would be hurt, and hurt badly in his surest point—his home market. It is argued that other crops could be substituted for barley and hops; that changed conditions would be met by changed methods. This talk is fallacious; supply is only the result of demand. A man is not going to eat more wheat because he cannot take barley in a liquid form, nor will he devote himself assiduously to the consumption of beef because he cannot sell his cattle. When he cannot sell his barley or his hops or grapes or cattle advantageously he is injured, and anything that tends to prevent him thus selling to advantage is to him an injury. Moreover, I say as a practical farmer—as one who has had practical experience in the growing of grains and in the feeding of cattle, both upon the farm and in distillery stables, that both barley and cattle are what are known as “ready money” products. Barley is a crop only produced on certain lands. It is easily cultivated, is the best grain known with which to get a good catch of clover, matures early, is a safe crop, is quickly harvested and threshed, and can be sold at once. It brings the farmer ready money just at the time he most needs it; the home market is always open to him; he is not subject to foreign competition; and he is always sure of a sale. With cattle and hay, the latter can be sold at any time when he is at leisure, and his steers, having looked after themselves during the summer, are ready to be disposed of before the winter sets in. In these he is again not subject to foreign competition. But in both the law of demand rules, and to interfere with that demand is to injure him most seriously. I may say, in conclusion, that the excessive duty on malt was the greatest mistake the Dominion Government has made since Hon. Geo. E. Foster has become Finance Minister. I will not discuss that subject here further than to say that it has hurt the barley market in Canada, and consequently the farmer, ten-fold more than the McKinley tariff on this same grain.

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL INTERESTS.

Under this heading we discuss, perhaps, the most serious aspect of the Prohibition propaganda. The proposal is to calmly annihilate a trade, a commercial industry, of most gigantic proportions. Our Prohibition friends speak of this destruction as one would say “go to swallow a gooseberry.” They speak of “a

"\$50,000,000 drink bill," as though it were the veriest trifle, and in that "drink bill," as they are pleased to term it, they include a commercial enterprise involving interests which none of them apparently have ever dreamed of, or taken the trouble to enquire into. For the credit of their sanity, I must assume that they speak in ignorance, nor do I wish to be unduly severe, but I may express the belief that if one out of ten of the horde of "Profs." and "Hons." and "Revs." who swarm through this country advising the people to "stamp out" (a favorite expression) this industry, taking up a silver collection at the door, and living free upon the country, had one five dollar bill of his own to rustle against another, we would hear less of this "stamping" business and perhaps a little more common sense. Your man who lives by his wits has always the least respect for the honest hard earnings of others.

What do these people propose?

The distillers have a property investment of \$4,933,210—wipe it out.

They are carrying a stock of nearly 14,000,000 gallons—wipe it out.

They have a total capital invested of, say, \$10,000,000—wipe it out.

Brewers have a property investment of \$5,373,554—wipe it out.

A probable total investment of capital of over \$10,000,000—wipe it out.

A yearly product, the value of which is \$5,721,666—wipe it out.

The selling trade have a property investment of \$70,000,000—wipe it out.

A value of stock, plant and fixtures of not less than \$21,000,000—wipe it out.

What difference whether it be one million or one hundred million—wipe it out.

Nearly 40,000 people would be thrown out of employment—wipe them out, too.

The yearly loss of wages would be over \$10,000,000—wipe that out also.

What are a few million dollars of wages, hardly earned, compared with the silver collection at the door.

Now, let us look at the details. The commercial industry proposed to be wiped out is as follows:

The loss to the farmers we have already considered. It can be added to the total if so desired, but I am now considering solely the commercial enterprise.

Leaving out altogether the total capital invested, there are in distilleries:

A property investment of.....	\$4,933,210
Stock held, 14,000,000 gallons at say 50c.....	7,000,000

Total..... \$11,933,210

Which would all be absolutely destroyed. I will discuss the question of any possible use that could otherwise be made of this property later.

In breweries there is a property investment of \$5,373,554.

We will throw in any loss of stock on hand for the benefit of our friends.

In the selling trade there is a property investment of \$70,000,000,
 which would depreciate..... \$23,000,000
 An investment of stock, plant and fixtures (not including furniture) 21,000,000

Total..... \$44,000,000

There is a loss on the feeding of cattle, price between when entered and when taken out, 19,000 at \$40, \$760,000. (Class this as property).

Wine trade, capital \$396,475, take half of that as invested in property, \$198,237.

Cider trade, capital, all property, \$36,835.

Cognate trades: In this is included such trades as soda-water manufacturers, ers, brewers' and distillers' supplies, coopers, case makers, etc., etc. I have

some information on this subject, and place the property investment in these trades that would be lost under Prohibition at a very low figure, at \$200,000.

From three corks manufacturers I have returns as follows :

Property (that would be destroyed), \$55,779. See returns.

This shows a total property in the trade, and which is cooly proposed to be destroyed, of :

Distilleries	\$11,933,210
Breweries	5,373,554
Selling trade	44,000,000
Cattle	760,000
Wine manufacturing	198,237
Cider Manufacturing	36,835
Cognate trades	200,000
Cork trade	55,779
	<hr/>
	\$62,557,615

This sum, it must be remembered, does not represent the total capital invested, but the actual loss, the "wiping out," that will take place if our good friends have their way.

Then there are the men who will be thrown out of employment and their yearly wages to be considered. These figure up as follows :

Employed in—	No. of Men.	Yearly wages.
Distilleries	451	\$384,802
Breweries	1,724	774,411
Selling trades	35,000	10,500,000
Wine trade	150	37,955
Cider trade	175	47,129
Cork trade	49	29,275
Cognate trades	100	100,000
	<hr/>	
	37,649	\$11,864,572

This is a "wiping out" which our friends the Prohibitionists have little studied. These men will be, if they are successful, absolutely out of employment, and their wages will be absolutely lost. The great mass who are going to save ten cents a day by being deprived of their two glasses of beer will have to put up considerable above their savings if they are to compensate for the loss of trade by the "wiping out" process.

Take the loss that will ensue in freight rates. The distillers pay freights, including cattle, amounting to \$359,746 yearly, the brewers \$383,155 yearly—I do not know what is paid in other branches, but here is a total of \$742,901 from these two branches alone. Then consider the freights on imported liquors and on the various supplies that go to hotels. The railways do not look upon this as a small matter. In reply to questions put by me, the three great railway systems have responded as follows :

Intercolonial Railway, 1891 : weight carried, 2,427 tons ; freight, \$12,376.

Canadian Pacific Railway, 1891 : weight carried, 27,372 tons ; freight, \$200,000.

Grand Trunk Railway : The general manager writes that the company's accounts are not made to show each variety of traffic separately, and to compile it at the numerous stations would take a very considerable time and be an expensive work. "I can say," he continues, "that the traffic in question does represent a very large interest of considerable importance to the company."

I may say that the Intercolonial Railway must do an immense traffic among the Prohibition counties in the Maritime Provinces that does not appear in its true colors.

Approximate, too, if it be possible, the loss there will be in passenger travel to the railways, hotels and business houses, for once let it be known abroad that Canada has adopted a Prohibition law and tourist travel will shun us as

though we had the plague. Take these and other minor matters into consideration and it can readily be seen that the effect of the enactment of a prohibitory law in industrial and commercial interests would be most disastrous.

I have classed the brewery and distillery properties as a total loss simply because that would be the result. It is folly to talk of turning them to other account. Built as they are, they are not suitable for any other business, and even were they, it would make no difference. There is never progress sufficient in a Prohibition country to require them for other purposes. Maine lost over eleven hundred industries under Prohibition in ten years. What did she want with her empty breweries and distilleries for industrial purposes. The breweries of Kansas and Iowa, where they have not defied the law, are to-day lying in ruins. Prohibition in Canada would cause such a tremendous loss, such an enormous displacement of capital, that commercial industry would feel the blow in every branch, and no man now alive would live to see a recovery sufficient to require a brewery or distillery building now standing to be used for other industrial pursuits.

It is said that capital would find investment in other channels of trade. Will any man tell me to-day of a profitable branch of trade lacking capital? If so, I will undertake to find him all the capital he can use. Will any man to-day tell me of any branch of trade that is not producing more than is consumed, and that is not even now being hurt by the keenness of competition? If so, I will, in twenty-four hours, find him the capital to bring this branch of business into the keenest competition. It is not one million or five millions of capital that is in question. An enforced Prohibitive law would mean 140 to 150 millions of capital that would either require prompt investment or be lost. And even if investment could be ultimately found elsewhere, calculate the loss there would inevitably be in transferring such amount of capital from one branch of business to another. And when you have the other branch of business you are no better off than you were before.

How comes it that no Prohibition State has within its borders a city worthy of the name? This is a fact. No State or Province in North America enjoying the blessings of Prohibition has a city of 40,000 inhabitants except in Nova Scotia, Halifax, which was built up under license law. St. John, New Brunswick, much as that bright little city has struggled, lost in population instead of gaining during the last decade. Fredericton has been stationery ever since she has had Prohibition, and even Moncton, which grew while openly defying the law, has now been struck by the general stagnation. Meanwhile, Toronto doubled her population in ten years, Montreal added about 100,000 to hers in the same length of time, and big cities are growing up in the west. Maine has Portland with less than 40,000, but when a license State is struck, there is Boston with 450,000. The most striking example is Iowa, with such paltry towns as Des Moines, Dubuque, Council Bluffs, etc. Bordering this State are Illinois, with Chicago, 1,098,000; Wisconsin with Milwaukee, 204,000; Minnesota with St. Paul, 133,000, and Minneapolis, 164,000; Nebraska with Omaha, 140,000, and Missouri with St. Louis, 450,000, and Kansas City, 132,000. There is another bordering State, wind swept Dakota, but it, too, is suffering from the blight of Prohibition, and has no town of importance. The same is true of Kansas with Kansas City, Omaha, Denver and other large cities in the bordering States, but no industrial centre worthy of the name within her own borders. Now, why is this? Why, especially, should Iowa, with all her advantages, be in this position? Simply because capital, the most sensitive thing in the world, and immigration, the next most sensitive thing, will not settle where this constant war is being waged by fanaticism. Capital requires stability, and stability is just the thing that your Prohibitionist cannot have and does not want.

The effect of Prohibition would be to bind, shackle and manacle commercial industry in Canada.

REVENUE REQUIREMENTS.

Revenue requirements of the Municipalities, Provinces and Dominion, how they are to be met, is the next question. Let us first, as nearly as possible, ascertain what revenues are now received from the liquor traffic. Commencing first with the Municipalities I can give the figures exactly so far as Ontario is concerned. The following table gives the figures received by the Municipalities from all licenses and liquor fines since 1876-7, the time of the inauguration of the Crooks Act :

1876-7	\$281,243	1884-5	\$283,589
1877-8	249,166	1885-6	231,433
1878-9	229,902	1886-7	154,438
1879-80	269,647	1887-8	156,979
1880-1	271,574	1888-9	190,297
1881-2	258,945	1889-90	297,353
1882-3	284,379	1890-1	294,968
1883-4	287,246	1891-2	289,487

In Quebec I cannot find that any portion of the fines goes to the Municipality.

In New Brunswick—

In Nova Scotia, Halifax receives—

In Prince Edward Island there are no license fees.

In Manitoba—

In the North-West Territory, for the year ending 30th June last, \$7,675.

In British Columbia, none.

However, the great loss of revenue to the Municipalities will not be in the license fees, but in the assessment. A business that has been destroyed cannot be taxed, and this loss would prove a serious matter, and one that cannot well be calculated. I tried to furnish evidence on this point at Halifax, but the commission did not see fit to receive it.

The revenue to the Provinces we can arrive at to a certainty. In Ontario, the amount accruing from licenses and fines amounted to :

1876-7	\$79,714	1884-5	\$192,867
1877-8	77,516	1885-6	165,285
1878-9	75,213	1886-7	216,455
1879-80	87,198	1887-8	201,542
1880-1	89,207	1888-9	232,511
1881-2	91,948	1889-90	307,281
1882-3	93,523	1890-1	308,200
1883-4	93,225	1891-2	300,604

I give the full table to show that the Province has been looking more and more to this source of Revenue. The Revenue from liquor licenses was more than trebled in ten years, the fees being increased, I think, twice in that time in order that more Revenue might be raised. The same is true of the Province of Quebec. The total amount received from licenses and fines in that Province in 1867 was \$68,953. In 1875-6, it had increased to \$195,322, and the figures from that time on are :

1876-7	\$197,130	1884-5	\$247,362
1877-8	183,489	1885-6	272,611
1878-9	190,698	1886-7	315,011
1879-80	167,611	1887-8	333,160
1880-1	227,487	1888-9	400,377
1881-2	243,031	1889-90	401,154
1882-3	260,953	1890-1	552,317
1883-4	245,822		

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
	<u>\$4,819,250 09</u>	<u>\$2,233,738 03</u>	<u>\$7,052,988 12</u>

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.

Prohibition on the other hand is not a principle, it is simply an expediency. Frequently expediency becomes the basis of law, and if the expediency be great the law may have a measure of enforcement, but even at best this enforcement will be costly, difficult and unsatisfactory. For instance the snow cleaning by-law of Toronto requires that every citizen shall clean the snow away from the sidewalk in front of his premises. A greater expediency than this, both for comfort and safety, and more just in the means adapted to attain the end could not well be conceived. Yet the law was not obeyed. The most stringent efforts at enforcement were adopted, hundreds of citizens were summoned to the police court and fined, but without success, and latterly the city has hit upon the scheme of doing the neglected work with corporation laborers and charging the cost in the tax bills. I give this as an example of the difference found between enforcing laws based upon principle and those based upon expediency.

Prohibition is an expediency. But a great many people deny the expediency. Never mind now whether they are in the majority or minority, it will not be controverted that a great many, a very very large number of persons, utterly deny that such a law is necessary, is expedient, or founded on any tenable claim of justice. The Prohibitionist says drinking produces drunkenness, drinking therefore is an evil, ergo, drinking should be stopped, we will pass a law to stop it. These other people promptly deny both the premises and the conclusion. They say drinking may produce drunkenness, but in the case of ninety-eight per cent. of those who use liquor it does not, drinking in itself is not evil though excess in this, as in anything else, will produce evil, therefore not being in itself evil it should not be stopped or prohibited by law, and no law you may pass shall or can stop its use because the law in itself will be an injustice. Between these two classes there is the large mass of quite moderate drinking citizens, who do not ally themselves with the liquor interest and look with contempt upon the Prohibitionists, who do not vote when Prohibition is made an issue, but who have their rights, know what they are and propose to keep them. These men believe that personal liberty is an eternal principle of justice and they do not believe that in defence of that principle they should be compelled to chase up and down the country after the defeated "Govs.," the irreverent "Revs.," the perambulating "Cols.," the bogus "Profs.," and the dishonorable "Hons.," whose zeal in the cause of alleged temperance is only equalled by their yearning desire for the silver collection at the door, but they are the men who defeat every political party that takes up and attempts to enforce Prohibition.

Here then we have a law which will have, not the support of the community, but the active opposition of a large part of the people, the passive opposition of many, the passive support of some and the active support of a few. Any citizen will seize a thief or a pickpocket and hand him over to the police, not one in a hundred will give information to convict a liquor seller under Prohibition. A large part of the community will unite in shielding him.

Under these circumstances where then is there possibility of efficient enforcement of such a law? That its supporters do not expect this is evidenced by the fact that they ask for the enforcement of this law powers far beyond anything asked under any other law, powers that degrade the majesty of the law, and deprive the subject of every vestige of civil liberty.

So far I have dealt with the theoretical side. Practically the law is not efficiently enforced in any city, town, village or hamlet I have ever visited where such a law was in force. In some places it is claimed that the law is as well enforced as that against theft, for instance. That this has so often been repeated is my excuse for even speaking of such an absurdity. I certainly would not consider the law against theft efficiently enforced if any number of strangers could step off the train at a town or village, steal each once, twice or thrice or a dozen times, and go away again without even an attempt being made to punish

them. But to show the utter ridiculousness of such a claim. I think Fredricton, N.B., was one of the places where such a claim was made. There are at least twenty liquor sellers in Fredericton. Each must sell in a day to make a living, say fifty drinks—this is a very low estimate. That would mean 1,000 infractions of the law. Can one conceive of 1,000 thefts in Fredericton in one day and 1,000 the next and 1,000 the next. Why such a condition could only exist under complete anarchy and the utter break down of civilization. Take Iowa's 6,000 liquor dealers selling fifty times a day; 300,000 thefts a day—could absurdity go farther?

Under this head reference might be made to smuggling and illicit distillation. The enormous amount of liquor-smuggling up the St. Lawrence has compelled the Government to go to the expense of practically fitting out warships to defend their revenue. If this would occur with practically unlimited sale of liquor in the country, what may be expected under a prohibitive law? As to illicit distillation, there is no limit to the possibilities if occasion required. I could make a still for \$2.50 that will turn out several gallons of alcohol daily, and under Prohibition, if it were attempted to be enforced, the imagination can hardly conceive of the amount of illicit distillation that would ensue.

GENERAL INFORMATION.

“All other information bearing upon the question of Prohibition.” Under this heading we can properly discuss the employment of men with reference to the question frequently asked by the Commission, “Do employees waste much time through drink?” I do not think that as a rule any class of employees waste much time because the man who would waste much time would soon have nothing to waste but time, for he would very quickly find himself out of employment. In factories where I have had experience, as well as in sawmills, flouring-mills, foundries and works of that nature, generally speaking, the men lose practically no time through the use of liquor. I know men, moderate drinkers, who have worked for thirty years in one establishment and never lost an hour through this cause, and I know hundreds of working-men who are moderate drinkers and never lose time. In a printing-office there is some loss of time occasionally by those who are engaged in “piece” work; but I will say this—that I have known printers to lose much more time going to baseball matches than I ever knew them to lose through indulgence in drink.

“Does moderation lead to excess?” I think this is very seldom the case, except where excess follows moderation almost immediately. Frequently as time goes on somewhat heavy drinkers become more moderate—in fact, this is almost the invariable rule. There are to my knowledge now comparatively few moderate drinkers who are habitual drinkers.

With reference to Sunday closing and the other prohibitive clauses of the license law, reasonable restrictions must be welcomed by all and are not distasteful to the liquor-dealers themselves. But it must be borne in mind that people will have what they want, and where infractions of the Sunday-closing law, or other prohibitive features of the license law, are found, it is because of the fact that a portion of the community desire to be served contrary to the provisions of the law. That is the reason why some places observe Sunday-closing better than others. For example, take Omaha and St. Paul or take Toronto and Montreal. Sunday closing, except where the people are favorable to it, is by no means a success, and upon this point I beg to lay before the Commission a report upon the Welsh Sunday Closing Act, which will be found profitable reading. It demonstrates that in Wales Sunday-closing led to unmitigated evils, instead of doing good as was anticipated.

"Is drinking decreasing?" Drunkenness certainly is. Drinking apparently is not, if one is to judge by the statistics issued upon the subject. The following table, issued by the Inland Revenue Department, shows that in the last twenty-five years there has been a considerable decrease in the amount of spirits consumed, but a very considerable increase in the amount of beer and wine.

Table showing the annual consumption per head of the undermentioned articles paying excise or customs duties, and the revenue per head derived annually.

Years.	Spirits. Gals.	Beer. Gals.	Wine. Gals.
1867	1.621	1.973	.098
1868	1.604	2.269	.174
1869	1.124	2.290	.115
1870	1.434	2.163	.195
1871	1.578	2.490	.259
1872	1.723	2.774	.257
1873	1.682	3.188	.238
1874	1.994	3.012	.288
1875	1.394	3.091	.149
1876	1.204	2.454	-.177
1877	.975	2.322	.096
1878	.960	2.169	.096
1879	1.131	2.209	.104
1880	.715	2.248	.077
1881	.922	2.293	.099
1882	1.009	2.747	.120
1883	1.090	2.882	.135
1884	.998	2.924	.117
1885	1.126	2.639	.109
*1886	.711	2.839	.110
1887	.746	3.084	.095
1888	.645	3.247	.094
1889	.776	3.263	.097
1890	.883	3.360	.104
1891	.743	3.790	.111
Average	1.151	2.708	.140

The general supposition is that drinking has very considerably decreased of late years. My own impression is that the facts as shown by the table above are correct; that while there is less immoderate drinking than there was years ago, there is a more general consumption of liquor, especially of beer and light wines.

Adulteration.—This evil is much worse than is generally supposed. The increased duty on spirits has led, not only to a great amount of smuggling, but also to very general adulteration. I know of houses, both in Quebec and Ontario, entirely engaged in the manufacture of adulterated liquors. This is a most serious evil, and one that the authorities should take strong action against. I should favor as strong a law against the adulteration of liquors as could be framed, and have very frequent inspections,

Does reducing the number of licensed places, beyond reasonable limits, decrease drinking? Unhesitatingly I say no. It results, where a number of places are cut off, in granting a larger monopoly over a more considerable area to the places that are left, in larger numbers of people gathering in those places with the consequent temptation to stay where the crowd is; in excessive drinking, in those places when they are very far apart, through the fact that another drink will not be easily obtained before reaching their destination, and in supplies of liquor being kept in private houses. All the facts obtainable go to show that a reduction in the number of licenses increases drunkenness instead of diminishing it, and the cause of this apparent anomaly is to be found in the statements made above. For instance, in Toronto, the Fleming by-law came into effect on May 1st, 1887, and it struck off 74 hotel and 16 shop licenses. Three months were allowed to dispose of the stocks, so that the by-law actually went into oper-

*Duty increased.

ation on 1st August. I submit herewith a statement of the arrests for drunkenness in the five months following, for the year 1886 before the licenses were reduced, and for the year 1887 after they were cut off :

ARRESTED FOR DRUNKENNESS.

	1886.	1887.
August -	336	472
September -	366	463
October -	312	469
November -	331	366
December -	302	375
Total	1,647	2,145

Increase 1887 over 1886 498, or nearly one-third more under the reduced licenses.

Further illustrating this subject I herewith submit a table of the total arrests for drunkenness in Toronto for a number of years :

Date.	Total number of persons apprehended or summoned for being drunk or disorderly.
1880	2,873
1881	2,908
1882	2,974
1883	3,407
1884	3,644
1885	3,864
1886	4,283
1887	5,209
1888	4,882
1889	5,441
1890	5,023
1891	3,758
1892	3,657
1893	3,644

It will be observed that the arrests for drunkenness took a very large upward leap in 1887, and the evil effect which thus arose from decreasing the number of drinking places continued for years, and it is only lately that Toronto has again returned to the sobriety that was always one of her chief characteristics. Exactly the same result has been found in England. The figures there are very interesting:

In 1880 there were in England and Wales 110,590 drinking houses, and the convictions for drunkenness were 127,664. Between 1880 and 1890 nearly 10,000 of these houses were closed up. Yet there was an increase of over 17,000 in the convictions for drunkenness in 1891 as compared with 1880. The police returns, which are very carefully kept in England, show undoubtedly the startling result that in districts with an excessive amount of drunkenness, the number of licenses were, as a rule, especially small, whilst in the districts comparatively free from drunkenness there were, as a rule, large numbers of licensed houses. I submit herewith for your inspection a statistical table, compiled by Mr. W. Gurney Benham, from which a great deal of information upon this point may be gathered.

Again, in 1884, the Federal Legislature of Switzerland appointed a Commission to act jointly with the Federal Bureau of Statistics in regard to an inquiry into the liquor traffic. The report deals at length with this subject, and arrives at the conclusion that this favorite idea of realizing the objects of temperance is not sustained by practical experience. On this point the report reads as follows : " In the course of our investigation we have not found any data unwarranting the assumption, now become almost a dogma in many places, that the reduction of the number of drinking places tends to restrict the consumption of

ardent spirits. On the contrary we are constrained to state that we have frequently found the evil effects of alcoholism most prevalent in the very localities where the number of drinking places was smallest, an apparent anomaly which finds its explanation in the fact that in the absence of a sufficient number of conveniently located public bar-rooms the people of the localities in question become accustomed to tipping at home, laying in store greater or smaller quantities of spirits according to their means. The number of saloons is not a criterion of the consumption of spirits. We hold that a much more effective temperance measure than the reduction of saloons is to be found in all these rules and regulations which, by exacting certain securities from persons licensed to retail ardent spirits, render the retailers as a class more respectable, and improve the condition and the management of drinking places." I would commend this last sentence to the careful consideration of those among our Prohibition friends who hope to increase morality by rendering drinking places disreputable.

"The effects of beer upon those who make and drink it." Upon this subject I beg to lay before you a detailed report of an examination held by physicians as to the condition of brewery employes in New York. Briefly the report shows that the percentage of deaths among brewery employes is much smaller than the general average.

The Biblical side of the question. "Rev." Sam Jones said in Toronto: "If my wife could not live without beer let her die." The *Canadian Citizen* said that the Church which used the fermented wine in the Holy Communion introduced the communicant to "the first step in the downward path—the first step of the drunkard." I will not attempt to argue with these good people, but beg to present for the consideration of the Commission "Papers on Prohibition," by Rev. Geo. J. Low, and likewise other matter on the same subject.

"How will you treat the drunkard?" I should say as a maniac of any other kind is treated, in an asylum. This view was propounded by Dr. Henry I. Bowditch, of the Massachusetts State Board of Health, as the result of an investigation covering practically the civilized world, and participated in by forty-nine resident American Ambassadors and Consuls in foreign countries. He also declares against Prohibition as a remedy for the evils of drunkenness.

"The relation of the Church to the saloon." On this section I beg to hand in an article in *Scribner's Magazine* and Dr. Rainsford's celebrated lecture under the above title. The only observation I shall make is this: Is there anything that a working man can get for five cents that will do him as much good as a glass of good beer?

The idea of harassing restrictions being imposed upon trade is wrong in principle and in practice, just as much as is the temperance idea of making the trade disreputable. It must be remembered that the moderate men still have rights that even fanaticism is bound to respect. This was forcibly exemplified by the manner in which the American and English Prohibitionists were treated at the Antwerp and Zurich International Temperance Congresses.

A proposition has been made to enforce Prohibition by a State police, similar to the Royal Irish Constabulary. This idea might do in some countries, but Canadians would certainly not permit even officers of the law to invade their homes and use the right of search as it would be used under these conditions. This was tried once in Prince Albert by the Mounted Police and resulted practically in anarchy, and finally the imprisonment of a police official without due warrant of law, and the resignation of the resident magistrates.

LOCAL OPTION.

Local option laws are so varied in character and method of application as to be difficult of consideration in a general way. They vary from the little township local option in Ontario, the vote brought on only when the people petition for it, to the Massachusetts law, requiring a vote to be taken every year, whether or no. The Ontario fashion has so far proven a harmless kind of an idiosyncrasy, not attended with any particular results of any kind but still allowing of the little pea to rattle around in the tin pail without doing the general community any perceptible harm. The Massachusetts law is certainly a harrassing and vexatious enactment, a relic of the old Puritan spirit, and like the old Blue Laws, designed not so much for the Glory of God as the mortification of His People. In a general way, however, the fate of local option laws seems to be that of larger prohibitive measures—viz., adopted in haste and repented at leisure. In fact, Prohibitionists themselves are divided as to the wisdom of these local option laws. Mr. Axel Gustafson, it will be remembered, denounced them in unmeasured terms, and I have heard others, staunch in the faith, do the same. Other sections of the Prohibition party, again, look upon them as a step in the right direction, but these, I fear, are those who have not had much practical experience of a local option law. I suspect that the opposition of that branch represented by Mr. Gustafson is not so much to the law as to the fact that these little laws demonstrate altogether too clearly what would be the result of a larger measure of Prohibition. However, putting all this aside, the study of local option is neither a very interesting nor a very instructive study. Since the session held in Toronto I have taken the trouble to study somewhat the working of the local option law in Ontario. I doubt whether the law has had any effect in reducing the sale of liquor in those localities which have adopted it. In some localities I know it has not. In one township I am assured that every place that sold before the Act is selling now. The travellers for liquor houses go into these townships just as they did before, and I have seen some of their bills of sales, which is about as good evidence on the subject as one could wish. Business houses do not send travellers where a profitable trade is not to be done. On the other hand, it must be admitted that time sufficient has hardly elapsed to give the law a full trial. In the first years up to 1892 very many of the by-laws were quashed by the Courts, as the official statements which I have with me show.

I would draw attention here to the fact that in these elections, as in all others relating to this question, a large percentage of the vote is not polled. Take the first name on the list, Lanark township; only 191 votes were polled out of 449 on the list.

This year some few municipalities have passed the by-law, but altogether their number is few, the area covered insignificant; they are almost entirely strictly rural municipalities within easy reach of towns or large villages not under the operation of the law, and whether the law is observed or not is of very little importance. I apprehend that the number, even as it is, will decrease rather than increase.

On the other side of the line the working of local option can be studied on a more extended scale. Massachusetts is, of course, the most rigid local option State, and there Cambridge is pointed to as an example of the beneficial workings of the law in that it has voted against licenses for many years. But Cambridge is practically a part of Boston, just as much as is the section of Toronto west of Yonge and north of Queen. In that section there is a population of 35,000 or 40,000 inhabitants who have no licensed hotel, and that without the operation of any law. Somewhat similar is the case of Cote St. Antoine in Montreal. Other towns in Massachusetts vary considerably, adopting license

one year and no license the next, in some cases with remarkable regularity. Some of the rural districts adopt license, some refuse it, some vary. The whole thing is largely a matter of politics, but in addition, if the law had been designed for the purpose it could not be better adopted for the furthering of private revenge and the working out of private spleen.

While in Missouri I made some study of the working of local option there. This State passed the law in 1887, and the by-law was in the same year adopted in thirty-nine counties and eleven towns. Very few elections have since been held, while the by-law has been set aside in thirty-three counties, and, I think, in all the towns. In some cases, the by-laws were set aside on technical grounds, in others by a direct vote of the people. As nearly as I could judge, the law worked something like our own Scott Act and was disposed of on the same grounds. Where it is still in force the statement is made that it is a dead letter. It is now in force in, I believe, only nine or ten out of 115 counties. I have already referred to Michigan, which has retained the law in only four counties, two of which are composed of islands in Lake Superior, and all of which are of inconsiderable population.

Wisconsin has a local option law in force in several counties, but my information is that it does not work at all well. A Law and Order League organized to destroy the liquor traffic has destroyed itself. In the west, Colorado Springs, a city in Colorado of 10,000 inhabitants, is frequently mentioned. No saloons are licensed, the title-deeds forbidding it. I have seen the statement that the hotel sells to guests under the sanction of the general community, and that the drug stores are not bothered if they do not sell in less quantities than a quart. What is certain is that Colorado City, lying contiguous to the Springs, has no lack of saloons. As to the working of local option in California, we know. Texas is required by the Constitution to pass a local option law, and has done so. Some few counties have tried it and repealed it. My acquaintance with Texas leads me to believe that in that State the Prohibition sentiment is not strong. Several of the Southern States have adopted local option as a measure of defence against the negro population.

It is only enacted in the rural districts where the white population is sparse, in towns it is not used. In Kentucky, where it is in use, in the south, where the large negro population is, enquiry leads me to believe it is not very successful even in preventing the negroes from getting drink. In Virginia where local option was passed in 1886 there was at first a sweep in its favor, but the law has since been largely if not almost entirely repealed. Maryland has local option of a piecemeal character. I cannot ascertain that Prohibition is in force in more than one county though several have tried it, but I must confess my information is not very exact. Now we come to Georgia, which has done more in the Local Option way than any other State. There is no official return on the subject, but apparently—I speak on the authority of residents—many rural municipalities have adopted and retained it. The towns and cities have not. The “negro question” is what predominates here. A very large “jug” trade is, however, done with the whites. In all of the Southern States there is undoubtedly a great deal of illicit distillation.

The City of Atlanta was under this style of Prohibition from 1885 to 1887. The repeal contest was an exceedingly hot one, and if one-half of what was said about the effects of Prohibition in Atlanta was true, this instance should be a warning to other cities. At any rate, Prohibition was carried by 225 majority and two years later was repealed by 1,128, every precinct in the city voting against the measure.

Finally we come to South Carolina with her State Dispensary Law, a curious jumble of the Guthenburg system, Local Option, State control, and State profits. The whole thing is a medley. For instance, the law is an outcome of an agitation for State Prohibition. But instead of the plebescite which is now the

favorite fad of our Prohibition friends they took a separate vote of the Democratic voters at the State primary elections of 1892. The other party were not apparently consulted in the matter at all. 88,500 votes were cast at these primaries, 70,500 voted on Prohibition and the majority in its favor was 10,000. But 18,000 had refused to vote on this question, and Legislature noting this made the compromise of the State Dispensary. In other words they close the saloon and take over the business themselves. Unlike the city agency in Maine, however, they fix a good round profit of somewhere between 75 and 100 per cent. which is divided, one-half to the State, and the other half equally between the County and the municipality. There is thus a direct incentive to the dispenser to sell all he can. Local option comes in, in that a municipality so voting may not have a "dispensary." Prior to this, Local Option in South Carolina had been a decided failure, and I should like to have an opportunity of visiting this State a year hence. I have been told that already the law is practically a dead letter in Charlestown.

Generally speaking Local Option appears to work very well where nobody wants to drink. If anybody wants to drink he will have it. If there are enough of this mind to make it pay they will have a saloon, law or no law. It simply comes back to the first principle of a free people—whatever any considerable portion of the community want they will have. If the Prohibitionist wants Prohibition he can have it so far as he is personally concerned, if the other fellow wants a glass of beer he will have it so far as he is personally concerned.

COMPENSATION.

On this point I may be allowed to offer a short argument. The whole scheme of Prohibition is founded on the alleged necessity of, in the matter of the consumption of liquor, making the rights of capital subservient to the public welfare. It is not denied that the manufacture and sale of liquor are lawful rights until restrained or forbidden by the Legislature. The restrictions placed upon the manufacture and sale of liquor are not because there is anything abstractly wrong in the trade, but because of the idea of protection to a certain class of society. If no one used liquor to excess restrictions would be unnecessary and Prohibition would never be heard of. The idea of restriction is to prevent as far as possible the excessive use, while the idea of Prohibition is to prevent any use whatever. Not being abstractly wrong, it follows that those engaged in the traffic have a right, and the only justification for interference with that right would be urgent necessity. How urgent that necessity must be to justify interference with admitted individual rights, is what each one must determine for himself. But the gravity of such measures will not be lost sight of by thoughtful men. Mr. Cooley in his valuable work on Constitutional Limitations says: "The trade in alcoholic drinks being lawful, and the capital employed in it being fully protected by law, the Legislature then steps in and by an enactment based upon general reasons of public utility annihilate the traffic, destroys altogether the employment, and reduces to a nominal value the property on hand. Even the keeping of that for the purposes of sale becomes a criminal offence, and without any change whatever in his own conduct or employment the merchant of yesterday becomes the criminal of to-day, and the very building in which he lives and conducts the business, which to that moment was lawful, becomes the subject of legal proceedings if the statutes shall so declare, and liable to be proceeded against for a forfeiture." Now granting that the public good demands a prohibitive law, does it follow that the public good demands that the brewer or distiller shall bear the loss thus caused? The property which cost him, say \$50,000, is now worth \$10,000. He has given up \$40,000 for the public benefit. He has not done this voluntarily, but

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:—

	No. Failures 1891.	No. Failures 1892.	No. Failures 1893.
Maine	123	124	114
Connecticut	126	95	117
Kansas	160	130	338
Kentucky	137	80	106
Iowa	129	105	170
Minnesota	95	98	157

The showing is decidedly against the prohibitive and in favor of the license states. I have here Bradstreet's reports in full and comparisons can be made with any other States that may be desired.

But another very marked feature learned from Bradstreet's reports,—and one that fully answers the question frequently asked in this investigation. "Is not the drink traffic responsible for many of the business failures," is that drink has very little indeed to do with business failures, is the cause of failure in remarkably few instances. Bradstreet's defines the causes of failure thus: (See page 5, Report 1892).

A	Causes due to faults of those failing.	I. INCOMPETENCE.	1. INCOMPETENCE (unsuitability, incapability.)
			2. INEXPERIENCE.
			3. LACK OF CAPITAL.
B	Causes not due to faults of those failing.	II. NEGLIGENCE OF BUSINESS.	1. SPECULATION (outside regular business).
			2. NEGLIGENCE (due to doubtful habits).
			3. PERSONAL EXTRAVAGANCE.
		III. FRAUDULENT DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.	
		IV. DISASTER (flood, fire, crop failure, commercial crisis).	
		V. FAILURES OF OTHERS (of apparently solvent debtors).	
		VI. SPECIAL, OR UNDUE COMPETITION.	

It will be seen that the heading under which intemperance would come is "neglect," which, however, would also include gambling and all other doubtful habits. The number of failures under these different heads for the last three years is as follows:

IN THE UNITED STATES.

	1890.	1891.	1892.
Incompetence	2,005	2,021	1,916
Inexperience	611	592	532
Lack of capital	4,052	4,869	3,343
Unwise credits	502	509	410
Failures of others	257	279	196
Extravagance	232	251	148
Neglect	390	383	311
Competition	246	199	180
Disaster	1,358	2,075	1,994
Speculation	604	341	197
Fraud	416	875	1,063
	10,673	12,394	10,270

IN CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

	1890.	1891.	1892.
Incompetence	312	203	164
Inexperience	68	44	28
Lack of capital	905	1,230	1,096
Unwise credits	51	32	13
Failures of others	38	57	20
Extravagance	9	5	7
Neglect	44	26	37
Competition	29	15	17
Disaster	96	142	190
Speculation	44	18	21
Fraud	30	74	89
	<u>1,626</u>	<u>1,846</u>	<u>1,682</u>

These figures show how inconsiderable a portion of the business failures are due even to all doubtful habits. In the United States 390 out of 10,673 in 1890; 383 out of 12,394 in 1891; and 311 out of 10,270 in 1892. In Canada and Newfoundland 44 out of 1,626 in 1890, 26 out of 1,846 in 1891, and 37 out of 1,682 in 1892. Lack of capital is the great cause of business failure.

CONCLUSION.

I am, therefore, opposed to Prohibition because :

- (1) It is wrong in theory and impossible of effect.
- (2) It contemplates a tyranny that cannot be justified by even the good its promoters ostensibly seek.
- (3) It increases the evil sought to be removed, and develops other and far greater evils.
- (4) It is based upon an atrocious injustice to a large section of the community, and boundless brigandage towards a large, legitimate trade.
- (5) It is fostered by gross exaggeration, moral and scientific error and immoral and unchristian doctrine.
- (6) It breeds perjury in the courts, knavery in politics, unrighteousness in the pulpits, and contempt for law among the people.
- (7) Where attempted to be enforced it destroys a reputable and open traffic only to drive it into the hands of the most disreputable classes, robs the community of those wise restrictions they are content to submit to, opens the way for wholesale adulteration, gives free play to all that is evil in the traffic and offers opposition to only that which is good.
- (8) Under it crime increases while prosperity decreases, drunkenness increases while immigration decreases, it destroys industry while furnishing ready avocation to the blackmailer, the bootlegger and the professional Prohibition agitator.
- (9) It asks, for its success (which it even then fails to attain), powers not granted under any other law, robs the citizen of a fundamental principle of British law, viz., that he shall be held guilty until proven innocent; elevates to the magistrate's bench men utterly unfit for the position, and in whose hands justice becomes a mockery; depends for evidence to convict largely upon the scum of creation—the base professional informer, the character assassin, and the social thug who betrays his host through the very means by which hospitality was offered.
- (10) It robs the young man of his manliness and his moral sense, and develops in him sneaking, quibbling, lying or open defiance of law; where attempted to be enforced shields him from the temptation of the open saloon but initiates him into the mysteries of the disreputable "joint," the unsavory "dive," the

grossness of the kitchen bar, the dangers of the "jug" and "bottle" brigade and the drinking club; when not attempted to be enforced familiarizes him with open, constant, flagrant violation of the law until he loses all respect for the majesty of the law.

(11) Professedly designed for the moral regeneration of man, it throws aside the Word of God to take in hand the policeman's club.

(12) It is based upon a false assumption, presupposing a condition of affairs that does not exist.

(13) It deprives the country of a large revenue under false pretences.

(14) It is unchristian, unjust, unworkable and unnecessary.