



## Temperance Department.

### BRADFORD AND BEER—A LESSON IN POLITICAL ECONOMY.

(Paper by Mr. Wm. Hoyle, read to the British Temperance League Conference in Bradford).

The amount of money expended in intoxicating liquors in the United Kingdom last year (1876) was £147,288,759, or about £4. 9s. per head for every man, woman, and child of the population. The question I propose to consider is—What is the economic influence of this expenditure upon the resources of the nation?

At the late Social Science Congress it was argued by one or two gentlemen that to characterize this money as waste or lost, was incorrect, and at variance with sound political economy; for, say they, the money is still in the country; it is not lost, for it is paid to the publican, and the publican pays it to the brewer, malster, &c., and they in turn pay it to their work-people, and thus it goes round and round, and cannot therefore be lost. These same doctrines have been advocated by correspondents in newspapers; and even Professor Leoni Levi gives some countenance to them in his evidence given recently before the Lords' Committee on Intemperance.

In arguing the point I will, for the time being, dismiss the aggregate of figures and confine myself to a more circumscribed expenditure. I will take the town of Bradford as an illustration. And here permit me to say that I do not take Bradford because it is worse than other places, for I know of nothing that would lead me to think it is; but I take it because I am addressing the Bradford people, and through them perhaps a still larger circle.

I have said that the drink expenditure of the population of the United Kingdom is £4 9s. per head; but in England the quantity consumed is higher than in other parts of the United Kingdom, and amounts to at least £5 per head of the population. I will therefore suppose that Bradford does her share of this expenditure, and if so, with her population of 140,000, the sum of £700,000 annually.

I will suppose that one of our Bradford friends, instead of taking his £5 to the public-house, goes to the corn dealer and buys with it a couple of sacks of grain or flour; instead, however, of taking the two sacks of flour home and baking them into bread he takes them down into the small river upon which your town is situated and shunts the flour into the stream. What becomes of it? Of course, you say it is lost, and society is £5 the poorer for the folly perpetrated. But some political economist here steps in, and argues that it is not lost, for, says he, the money is in the hands of the corn dealer, who pays it to the miller, and he in turn pays his work-people, and thus it goes round and round, and therefore it cannot be lost. The logic in this case is quite as good as in the case of the money spent in drink; but, the truth is, it is good in neither.

The great error which these persons commit in arguing the question is that they only look at one side of the case; they see the money circulating in the hands of the seller, but they forget that the buyer ought to have value as well as the seller. In the case of the person who invests his £5 in flour, and then throws it into the river, the loss is seen at once, but if the argument used in the case of drink had any force in it, it would equally apply to the flour transaction as to the drink-selling; but, as I have said, the whole argument is defective in the simple fact that it only takes cognizance of one side of the case, the seller's. It loses sight of the buyer's position altogether.

Let us suppose that the person who bought the two sacks of grain or flour, instead of wasting it by throwing it into the river, takes it to one of your breweries or distilleries, where it is converted into intoxicating liquor. He brings this liquor down into Bradford to be drunk by your people. The first result of drinking the liquor, perhaps, is that the drinkers get a quarrelling, and hence a policeman has to be employed to preserve the peace. A second result is, that others of the drinkers are helpless, and it is necessary to employ a policeman to take them in charge, and also provide a place where they can be stowed away. They are then brought before the magistrate and fined 6s. and costs, or may be they have committed some grievous assault and consequently get three months with hard labor. Or, it may be, these people do not get into the hands of the police, but go home and kick up a row there, and on the Monday morning, when they should go to their work,

they are too unwell, or too thirsty; hence they absent themselves. This sometimes extends to days, and it may end up by the doctor being called in to correct the follies of the spree that has been indulged in. In the meantime perhaps the wife and children of the drinker are starving for food, and perhaps roaming uncared-for about the streets; they thus become habituated to habits of idleness and often of criminality, and thus is perpetuated the criminal race of our population.

Now I submit to this conference whether the act of taking the grain and throwing it into the river was not by far the least disastrous act of the two of which I have spoken, so far as the influence upon the community goes. Undoubtedly it was, for in the one case the destruction of the grain was the total loss, but in the other, added to the destruction of the grain, there was the breach of the peace, the helpless drunkard, the policeman to be paid, the sickness and loss of labor, the domestic and social misery, the pauperism engendered, &c.; all these are evils incident to the latter case, but they have no existence in the former. What a reflection it is upon our civilization and our Christianity that we tolerate such evils! Nay, we not only tolerate them, but we buy them at a price the magnitude of which is beyond our comprehension.

Possibly the objection may here be started that the illustration used is an extreme one. I admit that it is more extreme than some cases, but, unfortunately, in this business the extreme cases are excessively numerous, for when we have over 300,000 apprehensions for drunkenness in the United Kingdom—and probably not more than one in thirty of the drunken cases apprehended, thus representing nine or ten millions of cases of drunkenness—when we have 1,000,000 paupers, 200,000 criminals, 63,000 lunatics, quarter of a million of vagrants and idlers, when according to the estimate of a Parliamentary committee, one day out of every six is lost to labor owing to habits of intemperance, and when, according to Dr. Richardson, the death rate of the country is increased owing to the habits of drinking near one-third, it almost makes it impossible to exaggerate the terrible character of the evils resulting from the liquor traffic.

I have said that if Bradford drinks her share of what is consumed in England she will spend about £750,000 per annum in drink. Let us first contemplate this drink expenditure and its results, and then contrast it with the results that would accrue were the money to

In the first place, to manufacture the seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds worth of drink there would be grain or produce destroyed equal to 6,000,000 4lb. loaves. The total grain or produce destroyed in the entire country in manufacturing drink is equal to 13,000,000,000 4lb. loaves, or more than 190 for each family in the kingdom. If the grain had to be all grown in Yorkshire, it would form one vast corn-field, covering about 2,800,000 acres, or three-fourths of the entire country; or, it is equal to about one-third the entire wheat crop of the United Kingdom.

The influence of the drink expenditure in Bradford would be about as follows, calculating the ratio on the average of the country:—

1st. In drunkenness. There would be some 40,000 cases of drunkenness during the year. I don't say apprehensions, but cases where people go home intoxicated and unfitted to perform the duty of life.

2nd. In pauperism. There would be over 4,000 cases of pauperism to be relieved.

3rd. In crime. There would be over 800 cases of crime of one kind or another.

4th. There would be, according to the report of the House of Commons' committee, nearly one day's labor of the population on the average lost to the country.

5th. The extent of industrial employment given by the expenditure of the £750,000 in drink would be the finding work for about 100 of your industrial population.

6th. According to Dr. Richardson the mortality will be about 1.00 per annum more than it would be but for these habits of drinking.

These are some of the results which accrue to Bradford from the large expenditure; they represent an amount of social misery and degradation that is truly appalling.

Let us now look at what would result from a right expenditure of the money:—

In the first place, we should be rid of all the cases of drunkenness, and the deplorable evils resulting therefrom.

Secondly, We should have the grain to use as food. Imagine 6,000,000 loaves coming into Bradford. Nearly 200 for each house. It would supply the whole town with bread food for above four months in the year.

Thirdly, If the money were invested in better houses, more clothing, additional furniture, improving the cultivation of the land, the sewerage of the streets, additional and better schools, etc., it would, besides adding enormously to the comfort of the people during the year, find the town at least three-quarters of a

million, if not a full million, richer at the end of the year in the one case than the other.

Fourthly, The money so expended would find employment during the year for over 7,000 workpeople, instead of one hundred as when spent in drink, and hence the trade of a district would be materially improved, and the position of the working classes greatly benefited.

Fifthly, The mortality of the town, instead of being 24 or 25 per 1,000, would sink down to 15 or 16 per 1,000.

Contrasting the results of these two expenditures, we have on the one side food wasted, labor unemployed, drunkenness rampant, the mortality of the people increased, crime, pauperism, and other social evils engendered and nothing produced; on the other side, there is food saved, labor employed, pauperism, crime, &c., well-nigh extinguished, our industries stimulated, the mortality of the people reduced, and at the end of the year the town of Bradford would be near a million pounds to the good.

If this augmentation of the wealth of the town were to continue for twenty years, what a difference it would produce in the town of Bradford! She would first of all save her drink bill, which would amount to £15,000,000, and then her people being more industrious and healthy, her wealth would grow much more rapidly, so that at the end of the twenty years it is not too much to estimate her additional wealth at £25,000,000, the annual income of which at five per cent. would give £1,250,000; and then, too, to be freed from all the drunkenness and the evils resulting therefrom, would be such a gain to moral and social progress, apart altogether from its material results, as that we can form no conception of.

And now, if we expand our vision, and instead of regarding the influence of these reforms as confined to Bradford, view them as applied to the whole country, we shall be able to form some slight conception as to the change which would be wrought in the nation by a right expenditure of our money. We should save our food, we should multiply our wealth, we should diminish our taxes, we should lengthen the lives of the people, and last, not least, we should remove by far the mightiest obstacle to the social, moral, and religious life of the nation.

At the present time, the trade and commerce of this country is in a condition such as has not been experienced within the memory of the present generation. The warehouses of merchants and manufacturers are stocked with prices, and yet a great proportion of the people are in rags. How is it that the goods from the manufacturers do not find their way upon the backs of the people. The reason is this, that the money which should buy the goods goes into the till of the publican. As the Chinese Ambassador said touching China, many of the people buy opium, and are, therefore, too impoverished to buy goods, so it is in this country, the people spend their money upon drink, and, therefore, are too impoverished to buy clothing and other comforts.

The economic laws of trade are as fixed and inexorable as are the laws of nature, and there can be no violation of them without due punishment. The income of a country is the source from whence its trade and commerce is sustained, but when £147,000,000 of this income is expended upon an article which in itself yields no return of good, but which, whilst it is lost in itself, also adds an enormous additional loss in the shape of the mischiefs which result, it is so much abstracted from the trading person, or in other words the buying power of the people, and as an inevitable consequence, our trade is depressed and our commerce languishes.

### NO LONGER MARTYRS.

It is difficult to realize that total abstinence in Scotland is a thing of yesterday—not yet fifty years old. Yet this fact must not be overlooked; for, to a large extent, it explains the closeness of the grip with which the liquor traffic has fastened on the throat of this country. We have not only got to pay our own debts, which most men find heavy enough, but also those accumulated by our ancestors' neglect.

Yet while we may blame our ancestors, we must remember their position as contrasted with ours. When the first teetotallers took up their stand in this country, they were informed by the nearly unanimous testimony of medical science, "You may make martyrs of yourselves if you like. We cannot shut you up in asylums, but we warn you that you are running a serious risk to health if not to life." This was a grave position for any man to be placed in. But our fathers saw that no example but that of total abstinence could be effectual for the reclamation of the drunkard. They ask why they should not do for their fellow-countrymen what Jesuit missionaries were doing for the heathen. They resolved to defy the doctors and accept martyrdom were that necessary.

Now for us martyrdom is simply out of the question. What a change! Doctors say to us, "You martyrs, indeed! Why you are doing the very best thing for your health, physical and mental." Insurance agents address us, "Talk of martyrdom! It is a remarkable thing that, if you are martyrs, you should live longer than anybody else." Employers of labor ask us, "Wherein does your martyrdom consist? We can't see it; for we would rather have you in our employment—particularly as butlers—than anybody else." And those fathers and mothers who are fortunate enough to have marriageable daughters indicate the same preference, knowing that teetotal husbands do not make heartbroken wives. We have had to put up the shutters on the martyrdom department of our business. It has been with us as with the man of whom Lord Beaconsfield said "he had retired from business; or rather business had retired from him."

What has produced this marvellous change? Surely, so far at least as the insurance agents, the employers, and the fathers-in-law go, it has been due entirely to the results of total abstinence as exhibited by total abstainers. May the same be said of the change in medical and scientific opinion? I think so; and I will tell you why. The change in that direction has been immediately due to the startling discoveries made in Europe and America by scientific men unprejudiced by any favor for teetotalism. But I should like to know what led to these discoveries? The law of gravitation may not have been discovered by Sir Isaac Newton's observation of the fall of an apple. The discovery was the result of laborious investigations, continued for years, yet the fall of the apple may have suggested these investigations. So it has been here. The results threatened by the doctors did not follow. Instead of health suffering, it improved; instead of dying faster, the early teetotallers outlived their compeers. Testimonies in favor of total abstinence poured in from every side; from Richard Cobden, the statesman, on the one hand, "The more work I have had to do, the more have I resorted to the pump and the teapot," and from Tom Sayers, the pugilist, on the other, "When I have got any business on hand, commend me to cold water and the dumb-bells." The doctors were puzzled. These testimonies did not square with their old theories, which evidently, therefore, needed to be overhauled. They were overhauled, and we know with what unexpected results. Thus it is not too much to say that total abstainers have led to the change in medical and scientific opinion.

Now, I hold it to be a sacred duty incumbent on every total abstainer to make himself and herself acquainted with the facts of this change. Everybody knows that it is drink which fills our gaols. You may sum that up in the language used by the late Horace Greeley, the editor of the New York Tribune, in reference to his political opponents, "I don't say that every Democrat is a blackguard; but I do say that every blackguard is a Democrat!" It is equally certain that every criminal is a consumer of strong drink. Remember the striking way in which a veteran teetotaler, Georg Cruickshank, the great caricaturist, bought that out, when he offered £100 to any one who would produce a case of a teetotaler having been convicted of a crime accompanied with violence. That £100 still lies unclaimed. But medical opinion in reference to the physical evils of drink is not so well known.

Don't let us ignore it because as yet it may not go so far as we should like. If the weapon with which it furnishes our armory will not kill our enemy outright, is that any reason why we should decline to use what will permanently maim him?—C. J. Guthrie, M. A., in Advocate, Edinburgh.

—We are glad to know that public sentiment to-day is demanding of teachers an example in favor of temperance, and the day is not far distant when total abstinence from strong drink and tobacco will form an essential qualification for teachers in our public schools and colleges. Supposing, then, the teacher to be favorable to our cause, how can we promote it in his school? We answer that in the first place he must supply the absence of instruction in our text-books, by explaining to his pupils the nature and effects of intoxicating liquors. Let him use every opportunity, and they will be many and frequent, of impressing on the minds of the children the shame and sin of drunkenness. By verbal description and earnest exhortation, by appeals to God's Word and actual facts about them, lead them to see that it is not the light matter the world would have them believe, and only one to be laughed at; but that it is a sin against one's self, against all about us.—Temperance Union.

—Ex-Gov. Dingley, of Maine, denies the statement, which has been going the rounds of the papers, that "the practice of opium-eating has increased enormously in Maine." He says there is no truth in it.