

The clause of the Dominion License Act above quoted is decidedly at variance with the first part of the decision of the Supreme Court and is not excepted by the latter part of that decision. It must be borne in mind that there are clauses of the McCarthy Act that actually do relate to the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act, and which are altogether different in principle and object from the illegal clause referred to.

Further, the judges of the Supreme Court evidently meant to affirm that the retail sale of liquor should be controlled by Provincial authority. Indirectly they affirmed the soundness of the Scott Act and asserted that it should be enforced. Clearly, their decision sets aside the legislation that attempts to take such power away from the Provincial authorities, and that interferes with the carrying out of the provisions of the Scott Act.

We trust that this common sense view of the state of affairs will be unhesitatingly agreed to by our friends and the Provincial authorities in every part of the Dominion, and that they will at once proceed against these ex-tavern-keeping vendors so as to prevent their illegally selling liquor under licenses "not worth the paper upon which they are written."

BEER AND WINE.

There is being made in the city of Toronto, at the present time, a most desperate and impudent attempt to perpetuate the curse of strong drink, which has already wrought such terrible disaster in our young community. It is seldom that any beaten cause resorts to the shabby and disreputable trick of hoisting the flag of its conquering opponents, and endeavoring to recruit its ranks by treachery and deceit. Yet this is precisely what is being done by the so-called National Liberal Temperance Association. We do not for a moment imagine that this can have taken place with the sanction of those respectable gentlemen who were induced to lend the *prestige* of their names to the new society, and who permitted themselves to be mentioned as its sponsors and friends, but it has, nevertheless, taken place.

The bare facts are these:—The society was organized ostensibly to work for the suppression of the sale of ardent spirits, but it actually works only for the promotion of the sale and consumption of alcoholic liquors and against the cause of prohibition and morality. We had hoped to be able to co-operate with the new movement, imagining that it would be mainly a crusade against whiskey—and we believe in crusading against whiskey; we fancied that if the N. L. T. A. helped us in this, we could accept its aid, but the N. L. T. A. devotes all its energies to championing the cause of beer, and opposing the law that suppresses all kinds of drink. Every stale, mouldy, long-explored sophistry that was hawked about the country, and paraded on every openly-avowed anti-temperance platform by the now discredited whiskey orators until the public was fairly sick of the offensive dose, is now re-paraded and held out as argument by the advocates of this professedly new movement.

It is time that attention was called to the fact that the sole public temperance work of the N. L. T. A. consists in assailing temperance teaching, decrying the practice of temperance, playing the part of an advertising medium for lager beer, and endeavoring to prejudice the public against the Scott Act by outrageous misrepresentations of the results of both prohibition and beer-drinking.

We want to assert emphatically, and we assert only what we are ready to substantiate by irrefutable arguments and overwhelming evidence, that beer and wine are a curse and a hindrance to civilization; that the statement, that wine-growing countries are remarkably free from intemperance and crime, is utterly out of har-

mony with facts; that the sale and use of beer naturally and actually lead to increased consumption of stronger drinks; that prohibition properly enforced is accompanied by a remarkable diminution of crime; and that even if our friends (or as they call themselves, our opponents) of the N. L. T. A. did act consistently, assailing the sale of ardent spirits so effectually as to totally exterminate it, the evils of beer and wine drinking are sufficiently extensive and alarming to justify the Scott Act as it now stands, or an even more stringent measure of prohibition.

The whole testimony of history, sacred and profane, the authentic information that comes to us from countries where beer and wine are common beverages, the facts that come under our observation every day, the testimony of philanthropists, legislators, and students of social science; all combine to demonstrate that wine and beer are fruitful causes of pauperism, idleness, lunacy and crime; besides which it has been found practically impossible to prevent the sale of ardent spirits where the sale of wine and beer has been tolerated. In reference to both these points we wish to call attention to the opinion of an eminent and thoughtful jurist who has had unusually favorable opportunities for studying this whole subject. Hon. Robert C. Pitman, judge of the Superior Court of Massachusetts, says:—

"Massachusetts' experience coincides with that of England as to the disastrous effect of fostering the beer-shop by favoring legislation. The beer-shop is the rum-shop in disguise; the disguise makes it more difficult of detection, and more dangerous in its seduction." * * * "An experience of over twenty years in the administration of the criminal law shows to me also that, if beer is a less speedy and effective agent in producing absolute drunkenness, it is as potent an incitement to crime as the more overwhelming stimulants."

An instructive lesson for the advocates of beer and wine may be found in a recent report published by the Swiss Federal Council, Switzerland, as a wine-drinking country, is only surpassed by France. The following table gives the annual consumption of liquor of different kinds:—

Brandy.....	9.40 litres per inhabitant.
Wine.....	55.00 " " "
Beer.....	37.50 " " "

An important point to be noticed is, that although the consumption of beer and wine (92.5 litres per head of the population) is enormous, the consumption of brandy is also very great, and as to the moral and physical effects, we simply request our readers to carefully notice the facts as stated in the following extracts from the report:—

"On the average 35 Swiss soldiers annually have been rendered physically unfit for military service by the effects of drink.

"Among the rest of the population 254 deaths annually are directly traceable to alcoholic indulgence.

"In Basel 11 per cent. of all the deaths between the ages of 30 and 60 were directly traceable to the same cause.

"Drunkenness is one of the chief causes of suicide, and the number of suicides in Switzerland ranged from 227 per million (635) in 1876 to 239 per million inhabitants (588) in 1882; a larger number than in any other countries in Europe except Saxony and Denmark.

"Of the 7,362 persons who were confined in the Swiss lunatic asylums in the years 1877-1881, no less than 932 were addicted to drink. Of these 827, or 21.30 per cent., were men, and 98, or 2.81 per cent., women.

"Among the 2,550 criminals confined in the Swiss jails, 1,030 or 40 per cent., were drunkards, and one-half of the youthful criminals in the reformatories are children of drunken parents."

The matter which we wish however more particularly to discuss is the question of the relation of beer drinking to health and disease, because it is on the physiological and hygienic aspects of the questions that the N. L. T. A. advocates most extensively dilate. Ordinary common-sense men know that beer and wine make people drunk, beastly drunk, sinfully drunk, and that people excited with beer or wine will commit crimes that they would not commit when sober; and all the sophistry in the world could not convince them that beer drinking does not lead to immorality. The beer advocates therefore wisely confine themselves to a branch of the subject that but few of their hearers understand, and in which they can