

State. In 1833 there were 500 taverns, all but 40 of them having open bars. Now there is not a tavern in the State with an open bar, and not one in ten of them sells liquor secretly. In 1830 every store sold liquor as freely as molasses; now, not one.

"In 1832, with a population of only 450,000, there were 2,000 places where intoxicating liquors were sold—one grog-shop to every 225 of the population. Their sales amounted to \$10,000,000 annually, or \$20 for each inhabitant. Last year the aggregate sales of 100 town agencies were \$100,000, or fifteen cents per inhabitant. Including clandestine sales, even the enemies of temperance do not claim that the aggregate sales in the State exceed \$1,000,000, less than \$2 per inhabitant. This is but *one-tenth* what the sales were forty years ago, and but *one-eighth* what they are on the average in the remainder of the Union, which is \$16 per inhabitant. Liquor selling is almost wholly confined to the five or six cities of the State, so that hard drinkers are compelled to journey thither for their drams. Hence most of the drunkenness of the State is concentrated in those cities where the police arrest all persons under the influence of strong drink, making the number of arrests for drunkenness seem large in comparison with places where few arrests are made for this offence.

"In 1855 there were 10,000 persons (one of every forty-five of the population) accustomed to get basely drunk, there were 200 deaths from *delirium tremens* annually (equivalent to 300 now) there were 1,500 paupers (equivalent to 2,200 now) made thus by drink; there were 300 convicts in the State prison and gaols (equivalent to 450 now); and intemperance was destroying a large proportion of the homes throughout the State. Now not one in 300 of the population is a drunkard, not one-sixth as many, the deaths from *delirium tremens* annually are not fifty; and criminals and paupers (not including rumsellers) are largely reduced, notwithstanding the great influx of foreigners and tramps."

AN UNREASONABLE ANTI-PROHIBITIONIST.

We are not much concerned to defend the Hon. J. B. Finch from the attacks of the *Week*, or any other attacks. The gentleman referred to can speak for himself and his record as a temperance advocate, which no one need be ashamed of. We prefer to deal with the apologies for argument which are in the *Week's* article, inter-persed with attacks on Mr. Finch.

The lecturer and his critic agree on one point—the personal character of many of those engaged in the sale of intoxicating liquor. "The State," says Mr. Finch, "has no business to license great, lazy louts to stand behind bars and wage war against the wives and children of the land"; and the *Week* re-echoes this description when it says: "The State has done it; it has the license fees in its treasury; and it is bound by considerations higher than the objects of any particular movement to observe towards all classes of its citizens rules of equity which platform orators in the transports of rhetoric are ready to give to the winds." We hope the bar-tenders like the description which the *Week* applies to them.

There are some fundamental points in connection with the prohibition movement which some of the opponents of the latter seem unable to comprehend. For the benefit of our weekly contemporary we state them categorically:

1. The difference between the Crooks Act and the Scott Act is not that the one permits and the other prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquor. Both permit the sale, the difference being that the latter is more restrictive in its operation.

2. The Crooks Act recognizes no vested right in a license any more than the Scott Act does. The license is for a fixed period, and no licensee has any guarantee for the renewal of the privilege after that period has expired. The municipal council has, under the Crooks Act, the power to cut down the number of licenses, and if the number should be arbitrarily cut down, some one would have to give up his business without compensation. As a matter of fact, thousands are dealt with in this way from time to time under provincial license laws, and the *Week* has never taken the trouble to notice the fact.

3. The Scott Act does not shut up a licensee's establishment without notice. He gets notice for months while the petitions are in course of signature, and he gets a minimum notice of several months after the Act is voted on. In some cases this interval runs up to over a year; in no case is it much short of six months. Under the Crooks Act the licensee does not necessarily get even as long a time as this in which to dispose of his stock of liquors.

4. If the principle of equity is not violated by the Scott Act any more than by the Crooks Act, then we submit that the *Week's* fire is misdirected. To be consistent it should advocate the licensing of liquor-selling establishments for revenue purposes only, and should advocate licensing all who choose to go into the business on reasonable conditions. If liquor selling, in the ordinary sense of the term, is a legitimate business, it is as unjust for the State to prohibit A and B and C from going into it as it is for the State to give D the privilege of selling for a year and then transfer the privilege to E.

5. The Scott Act is not a weapon of the prohibitionist's choosing. They want, and have always wanted, a general prohibitory measure. When they asked for the latter they were told to make the most of the local option law which they had to work with. They took Parliament at its word, and now the liquor sellers and their advocates complain. How can the prohibitionists ever convince Parliament that public opinion is in favor of a general prohibitory law except by submitting the Scott Act? A plebiscite vote has been suggested; but the temperance people asked for that years ago and were laughed at, and now those who have thrust the Scott Act into their hands as a weapon can have a plebiscite taken whenever they please. If they submit the question to a popular vote, the prohibitionists will all say "Yes" of course.

6. The Scott Act, or even a general prohibitory law, is not more "arbitrary" in principle than a license law is, as we have already shown. It is only a question of how stringent the prohibition shall be. "Thou shalt not" is the burden of all liquor laws. This shows that there is something exceptional about the liquor traffic, and it is a fair presumption that what requires such exceptional treatment may possibly be suppressed with advantage.

7. There is something to be said for the "wives and children;" something to be said for neighborhoods spoiled by liquor selling; something to be said for the relegation of the drinking, even if it is only to cellars and groggeries to which no respectable man will go. There is something to be said for society which has to support paupers and criminals made so by the consumption of alcoholic beverages. "The Scott Act will not diminish drinking," say the sellers of beer and whiskey and their organs. Evidently the people of Canada are determined to try whether it will or not. If after a fair trial the Scott Act fails, then something else—probably a general prohibitory law—will be resorted to. The restrictions which now hedge the traffic about will never be relaxed.

The Campaign Everywhere.

KENT.—The machinations of the liquor party have succeeded in delaying the submission of the Act in this county, the question of the right of parties, who had signed a petition, to withdraw their names has been decided negatively by the Supreme Court. There was really no reason for referring such a question to the Supreme Court, but the Anti-Scott party is doing everything possible to delay our work. The friends in this county are much annoyed that the delay-movement has been successful, and that their vote cannot be taken in time to have the Act come into operation in 1885, they are however going into their campaign with renewed energy and will no doubt roll up a majority in favor of the Act even larger than they would have secured had the liquor-men simply met them at once in open field and fair fight.