

September of that year. At that time the Crooks Act had been in force seventeen months. In 1881 it had been in force five years and a half. The decrease between '77 and '81 was 145 per cent. If the Crooks Act is to be charged with the increase, then it must by the same rule obtain the benefit of the decrease !!

Perhaps the supporters of this new theory will explain how it came to pass that in the Eastern States, where they had no Crooks Act, but in several of which prohibition prevailed, the country was five years ago overrun with tramps and vagrants, while at the present time the decrease has been quite as great as in Ontario !

COMMITTALS FOR DRUNKENNESS.

The charge, that to the Crooks Act is due increased drunkenness, is equally false. The accusation is as follows :

"Licenses issued in 1876, the first year under the Crooks Act 3,938
 "Licenses issued in 1880 4,049

"Increase in four years..... 111"

Therefore, according to the chief organ, increase in drunkenness is the result of the Crooks Act, which permitted an increase in four years of 111 licenses. The very slight increase of 111 licenses in four years may be accounted for by the large increase of population during that period, the Act itself having regard to population as the basis of the issue. The *Mail*, in its issue of the 13th of September, 1882, in quoting the above figures, says : "Could proof more damning than this be demanded at once of the increase of licenses, of the partisan character of the working of the law, and of the increase of drunkenness to which we called attention?"

The *Mail*, therefore, boldly charges increase of drunkenness as a consequence of an increase of 111 licenses within four years; that is, between 1876 and 1880.

What is the result of this admission? Simply this, that if the issue of 111 additional licenses increases drunkenness, a diminution of the number of licenses must cause a corresponding decrease in drunkenness. The figures are as follows :

Licenses (tavern, shop, &c.), issued in 1874 under the old Act 6,185
 " " " issued in 1880, under Crooks Act..... 4,049

Decrease..... 2,136

Percentage of decrease, 53 per cent.

The question becomes a very simple one, and may be put as a proposition in the rule of three, namely : If the issue of 111 more licenses causes an increase of drunkenness, by how much more will a decrease of 2,136 licenses lessen drunkenness? Judged by the rule thus laid down by our opponents, the decrease by the non-issue of the 2,136 will be more than 19 times greater than the increase caused by the issue of the additional 111 in four years, of which the organ in hypocritical tones affects to complain. If the *Mail's* standard is at all reliable, drunkenness in Ontario in 1880, with an increased population of 120,000, was one-third less than in 1874 under the old Act, with a much smaller population.

The facts are clear, and the statistics abundantly establish, not only that the Crooks Act, after it had been fairly put in force and had begun to be recognized as not merely a temporary law, did actually check the increasing number of committals for drunkenness, and from 1877—the first full year