

in any other industry, it would have kept eight or ten times the number of men employed.

In one year our N.Z. breweries employed 978 persons, and made a profit of £237,627. The same year, boot, shoe, furniture, and woollen mills combined made a profit of £208,218, and employed 7634 persons. They made less profit, but employed eight times as many workers. Certainly the money went into the pockets of the workers instead of into the banking accounts of the brewers. Just when our vital industries are languishing, and shareholders consider themselves fortunate if they receive any dividend at all, the prosperity of the Liquor Trade is unchecked. "The Economist" points out that whilst nine brewery companies in one year declared net profits amounting to £7,655,495, the net profits of nine coal, iron, steel, and shipbuilding companies were only £92,916. Just look at these estates left last year by brewers and distillers:—

Lord Dewar, distiller	£5,000,000
Lord Forteviot, distiller	£4,405,347
E. E. Bevan, brewer	£2,127,856
T. W. G. Hewitt, brewer	£951,508
Adam, Sir H. Meux	£910,465

Need the wives of our workers ask where the money goes which is spent on liquor?

Do You Want a Job?

Then see that New Zealand invests her money in trades which employ more workers than this Liquor Trade. What are these trades? Take note of these figures, taken from our N.Z. Year Book.

For every million pounds of output: The Clothing trade employed 2617 workers, and paid 34.5 per cent. in wages.

Woollens employed 2400, and paid 33.5 per cent. in wages.

Furniture employed 2218, and paid 39.2 per cent. in wages.

Boots employed 1846, and paid 32.7 per cent. in wages.

Biscuits, etc., employed 1812, and paid 21.3 per cent. in wages.

Breweries employed 493, and paid 13.4 per cent. in wages.

A meeting of some 40 Wellington business and professional men drew the attention of the Government to these figures by resolution, and urged the Government to make known the un-economic nature of the traffic in intoxicating liquor, and to advocate the diversion of expenditure from that commodity to other channels during the present crisis.

Decrease Your Expenditure.

Not only does this trade rob the worker of his job and decrease his income; but it also causes great increase in National expenditure. It enormously increases our poor relief. When men spend their wages at the hotel their families have to be assisted by the State. In Bermondsey, London, in 1930, the population was about 115,000; every ninth person was in receipt of Poor Relief, but £1,335,000 was spent on strong drink. Had this money been

spent upon food and clothing, the Poor Relief Fund need not have been called upon.

In Honolulu, under Prohibition, every telephone book has this printed upon it: "If you know, tell us of anyone in Oahu needing charitable assistance, telephone 8545, and immediate attention will be given." We don't have to advertise in New Zealand for cases of distress.

All competent authorities agree that the cost of our hospitals, mental hospitals, gaols, and police force would be much reduced if the Liquor Trade was outlawed. A very conservative estimate gives the cost of hospitals and charitable aid, due to drink, as £450,000 for a three year period. Police and Court and prisons expenses due to drink for the same period, £660,000; children in charge of the State due to drinking parents for three years, £87,000. The abolition of the Liquor Trade

would increase jobs, and therefore income for the workers, and it would decrease cost of administration of Justice, Education, and Health Departments, and so help to balance the national expenditure. It is not so much economy needed now as wise expenditure, and expenditure on strong drink is neither wise nor economic. It causes unemployment, and it also is a fruitful cause of unemployable unemployed.

But hush! These facts must not be mentioned in Parliament. Be sure and put on the soft pedal in dealing with alcohol, the greatest criminal of all the ages, the cause of more misery and loss of life than war, pestilence, and famine combined.

Why? Oh! Why?

Women who are suffering, and whose children are suffering, from the present depression make these facts known, and press your M.P. to deal with them in Parliament.

"ANNE OF GREEN GABLES."

Have you seen it?

Seen what?

Why, seen "Ann of Green Gables."

No! Where can I see it and what do you mean? Have you seen it?

Of course I have. It is being shown by the R.K.O. Radio Pictures.

I thought you did not like pictures.

Surely you know there are pictures and pictures. Didn't you enjoy reading "Anne of Green Gables" and the other series of "Anne of Avonlea"?

Yes, I loved them, and I know all about Anne (with an e). How Matthew and Marilla wanted to adopt a boy and were not pleased to get a red-headed girl. I could follow her all through the pages of that wonderful book, and could almost see her winning their love.

Well, you go to the pictures and you will actually see the hurt look upon her face and hear the injured tone in

her voice as she says, "Don't you want me?"

Shall I take my girls to see it? You don't approve of pictures for children, do you?

I approve of this one, and it will do every boy and girl good to see it. Pictures of this kind deserve to be supported and let the Film Companies know we want this type of picture.

CLARENDON HOUSE,

Allington Road, Karori, Wellington.

MISS WALMSLEY,

'Phone 27-631.

Three minutes' easy walk from Karori Park. Accommodation for restful holiday. Spacious sunny grounds.

