

The number of barrels of beer produced in 1871 is given by Lewis Schade at 7,159,740, divided as follows :

New York.....	2,305,145
Pennsylvania.....	918,986
Ohio.....	656,966
Massachusetts.....	525,701
New Jersey.....	514,189
North Carolina.....	51

Let us see what an astonishing expansion is made in the next ten years. The census of 1880 reports concerning the breweries :

Number of establishments	2,741
Capital.....	\$91,208,223
Persons employed.....	26,200
Wages paid in a year.....	\$12,198,053
Cost of materials used in a year.....	\$56,836,000
Value of a year's products.....	\$101,058,386

It must be remembered, too, that these figures were taken the year after the resumption of specie payments, when everything yet felt the full effects of the panic. The quantity *per capita* had risen from less than one quart per person in 1850 to over 10 gallons per head in 1880.

This terrible growth of a most pernicious interest must frighten all who give the matter a moment's thought. Pulverize the rum power.—*Toledo Blade*.

PROHIBITION WHICH PROHIBITS.

Rev. N. B. Randall writes that he has spent some weeks in the town of Johnstown, N. Y., which includes the villages of Johnstown, Gloversville, and Kingsborough, with sixteen thousand people. The excise board have refused licenses since May, 1882, and the "Law-and-Order" Society reports as follows :

From May 1, 1882, to January 1, 1883, eight months, the sales of beer in the entire town of 16,000 people were 39,520 gallons less than during the same period of the year before under license.

The sales of distilled liquors in the same periods were :

Under license.....	10,200 gallons.
No license.....	1,160 "
Showing an actual decrease in sales of nine-tenths.	

During the same times again the arrest for drunkenness per month were :

Under license.....	17
No license.....	3 1/2

The town criminal expenses were :

Under license.	2,475 20
No license.....	407 00

Number of places where liquors were openly sold :

Under license.....	32
No license.....	0

—*Ohio Good Templar*

Contributed Articles.

WHY NOT LICENSE THE GROCERS?

The reasonable question is asked, what is gained by separating the sale of intoxicating liquors from that of groceries?

Several answers are given, and some reasons also which may not be considered fairly forcible, or may be sometimes overstated. But then there are good and indisputable reasons which possibly are in danger of being kept in the shade by putting too prominently forward those which may be controverted or denied, such as grocers treating customers or charging liquors as other goods, &c. Many persons think too that the representations as to danger of female drunkenness from this cause are greatly overstated. However, there is no controverting :

1st. That the association of the harmful drink with the needful family supplies is liable to mislead the young and thoughtless. Moreover, few parents would be disposed to have their glass at the family table without giving the little ones a taste ; so a *beginning* may be made sometimes leading on to a disastrous end.

2nd. That some drink is bought with groceries which the buyer

would not purchase in a place where strong drink *alone* was on sale, so that family drinking is specially reduced by the dissociation.

3rd. Sad cases are on record where reformed men and women have been led again to the evil course by the present of a bottle instead of a turkey (on a festive occasion) from the family grocer.

4th. Fully verified cases are forthcoming where men have compelled their wives to purchase along with the sugar and tea a bottle for home consumption, who would not insist on them going for it to a separate establishment. Moreover, when brought home the drink is sometimes shared with a visiting friend, and so drinking customs are sustained. Tavern keepers seem to understand that their business would not be increased by stopping the grocers' sale, but rather that the more drink the shop supplies the more the tavern customers increase, and so they commonly make common cause!

5th. What appeared sufficient reasons must have been present in the mind of the legislature to lead to enacting that Municipal councils may pass such by-law, so as to provide that advanced committees might take advantage of such provision. Surely ample reasons exist in Toronto city at the present time.

6th. There are manifestly facilities for purchase and strong inducements to drinking peculiar to the association of the bad traffic with the good business which separation will materially tend to counteract. The fact that the traffickers see in this by-law a reduction of the quantity of intoxicating liquors consumed, was plainly the ground of this opposition to it, and the *same* supplied good reason why good citizens should vote in its favor.

7th. The sufficient reasons which led the Dominion Parliament to enact six years hence the separation of the traffic from the grocery business are quite as strong in 1884 as they can be anticipated to become in 1890, and in the meantime the additional good results between now and then secured by adopting the improvement at the nearer time.

The promoters of the agitation, in harmony with the progressive enlightened sentiment of the day, press immediate action; the parties financially interested, oppose.

The public good demands the improvement.

Temperance News.

TORONTO.—The excitement during the past week, over the voting on the by-law to separate the sale of liquor from that of groceries, was intense. Meetings were held in every part of the town, sermons were preached, immense quantities of specially prepared literature were circulated, and temperance men and women went heart and soul into a thorough and energetic canvass of the city electors. The liquor-party, too, used every effort, the whole force of the brewing, distilling, wholesaling and retailing interests was thrown into the contest. Saloon and hotel keepers joined the licensed grocers, and on the day of voting, Monday, there was a united rally of all agencies and influences that could affect those who had votes. But they fought in vain. Dead men and absent men were personated, fraud and misrepresentation were rife, all means fair and unfair were employed, but all were not enough. The determined, prayerful, energetic work of thousands of our best men and women resulted in the rolling up of a good majority for the cause of right out of the largest vote that this city has ever polled. The following is the official return of the total votes cast in each ward for and against the by-law :—St. Andrew, 630 for, 663 against; St. David, 602 for, 730 against; St. George, 318 for, 356 against; St. James, 707 for, 485 against; St. John, 625 for, 626 against; St. Lawrence, 426 for, 486 against; St. Patrick, 894 for, 780 against; St. Paul, 341 for, 263 against; St. Stephen, 537 for, 384 against; St. Thomas, 485 for, 443 against. Total for the by-law, 5,565; total against, 5,216. On Tuesday a strong deputation of temperance men waited upon the Mayor, and that gentleman at once summoned a special meeting of the Council. This meeting was held on Wednesday. A wonderful change had come over the sentiment and purpose of that worthy body since the expression of public opinion against the present unjust and inexcusable system. A by-law was at once introduced, and passed its first and second readings. Meantime the licensed grocers were not idle. An affidavit was laid before the court of chancery, affirming that the council's action was illegal, and before the third reading of the by-law was reached an injunction stopped the council's proceedings. Next day, Thursday, the whole question was ably argued before Vice-Chancellor Proudfoot, who unhesitatingly dissolved the injunction, leaving the council free again. At another meeting, upon Friday, February 29, the by-law, after a long and exhaustive debate, received its final reading, and the hard-fought battle was won. In many other parts