

## \$5,450,000 PROFIT REPORTED FOR 1933 BY LIQUOR BOARD

Compares With \$9,260,000  
for 1932—Total Returns  
Are \$6,000,000

\$49,735,000 SINCE 1927

The Liquor Control Board of Ontario turned over \$6,000,000 to the Provincial Treasurer in the year ended Oct. 31, 1933, according to the annual report tabled yesterday in the Ontario Legislature. Of this sum, profits on liquor sales totalled \$5,450,000, permits brought \$485,000, and forfeited liquor purchased by the board returned \$65,000.

The liquor sale profit of \$5,450,000 compares with \$9,260,000 reported for the preceding year, and \$10,000,000 for the peak year of 1930-31. Total returns to the Treasurer for the board's operations since its institution in 1927 are: From profits, \$49,735,000; from permit sales, \$5,333,390; from forfeited liquor purchased by the board, \$103,000.

The board's balance sheet shows fixed assets of \$167,683, including the value of the real estate, land and buildings used as warehouses at Toronto and Fort William. Accounts receivable, from hospitals, beer commissions, recoverable duty, etc., amount to \$25,232; inventories on liquor and supplies total \$1,683,461, and prepaid insurance, etc., \$42,569. Liabilities amount to \$1,495,985, including a bank loan, less cash on hand and in transit, \$158,092; accounts payable, \$1,327,572, and due the Provincial Treasurer, \$10,321.

Sales of \$30,143,247 were shown in the profit and loss account, made up of: \$18,673,046 through liquor stores and \$11,470,201 through the breweries and brewery warehouses. This, compared with a total of \$36,099,562 for the preceding year, is a decrease of \$5,956,315, or 16.5 per cent. "The world's economic difficulties," reads the report, "continued to reflect themselves in the volume of business done by the board; but the decrease in sales, while amounting to 16.5 per cent., was not so great as in the previous year, when the decrease was 21.2 per cent. There was a somewhat noticeable abatement in the falling-off of business during the latter months of the year, which, we trust, is an indication that better times are in sight.

Permits issued totalled 192,894 of the resident type and 21,762 of the non-resident. In the preceding year were issued 250,709 resident permits and 44,191 non-resident.

## STRICTER SALE OF NATIVE WINE HINTED BY HENRY

L.C.A. Best Statute of Its  
Kind, He Tells Prohibi-  
tion Delegation

PLEBISCITE IS DEMANDED

Warmly denying that Moderation League wets were leading him into any loosening of the Liquor Act, Premier George S. Henry yesterday addressed a large delegation from the Ontario Prohibition Union, which waited on him at the Parliament Buildings.

Members of the delegation, referring to themselves as a "parliament of moral forces," had pleaded with the Premier to forego his reported plans for extended sale of beer and wines. They pointed out the evils of liquor, and called for a plebiscite instead of summary Government alteration of the liquor laws. Spokesmen were: Dr. Charles T. Scott, Toronto; H. T. Foster, Bronte; and Mrs. W. R. Lang, Toronto.

In reply, the Premier refused to recognize the delegation as speaking for any large section of the people; spoke of the influence which broader liquor laws in the other Provinces and in the United States must have on Ontario; gave no new information of the Government's beer intentions, but hinted at stricter sale of native wine, which he considered an outstanding cause of drunkenness, even since the permit system had been applied to it.

Never, said Premier Henry, had he been visited by Moderation League delegates and urged to loosen the law. They had sent him resolutions passed at their meetings; that was all. The

hotelkeepers had waited on him eighteen months ago, and he had told them he was not in sympathy with their demands.

Recently a new factor had entered into the situation—the beer-by-one-glass legislation in other Provinces and the comparatively wide-open sale in the United States. North America was a community in which neighbor States felt strongly the influence of each other's thought, and changes elsewhere had prompted in Ontario renewed consideration of the liquor question.

Reviewing "progress" in Ontario liquor laws during the past thirty-five years, Mr. Henry called on the delegates to compare today's situation with that existing before Whitney's time. He was convinced that, after trial and error, the Ontario Government had evolved the finest statute of its kind in existence. Many, he said, who had been doubtful of Government sale's effect now were convinced that the 1926 action had been wise.

In passing, he said that statistics disproved the delegation's contention that liquor was a prime cause of highway accidents. Rather, the chief cause was a sober man's reckless endeavor to travel too fast.

Concluding, he said he realized that the delegation would never be satisfied with anything short of complete prohibition. "I hope you live to see it," he added, "but you'll have to live a long time for that."