

to 146,517 in 1914, the convictions of women have increased from 35,765 to 37,311, or over 4 per cent.

We in Canada have the satisfaction of knowing that the Canadian woman at least has so far been the enemy of the liquor traffic. She is the mother of the family and knows what liquor means; liquor for the offspring, liquor for the present, liquor for the future; she has learned what it meant in the past. Is she not the best judge? The women of Canada have on all occasions stood by an overwhelming majority for prohibition of the liquor traffic, and surely they have reason to be heard. They are in a position to know and to judge. How much better is the position of our women to-day than the position of the poor women in a country where prohibition does not exist; in London, for instance, where the hours have been reduced by five and one-half hours a day. I cite from the official organ of the W.T.A.U.:

Early last year, the Executive Committee of the Women's Total Abstinence Union of Great Britain, undertook to obtain evidence as to the extent of this drinking, by making close observation of certain public houses in London. The work, of course, was mainly done before the new regulations came into force limiting the hours of liquor selling, and some of the evidence obtained was shocking. Here are extracts published in the January 1916 number of Wings, the official organ of the W.T.A.U.:

The first and chief method for obtaining evidence was the watching of public houses. In each case the observations were taken by two workers. The time spent in watching was 149 hours. The number of houses watched, 50. The number of women seen entering these public houses during the above hours was ten thousand six hundred and thirty-one (10,631), an average of over 71 an hour. The number of children left outside was 756.

It is only fair to say that, in a large number of cases, comparatively few women were seen by our watchers to enter public houses, and that many of those who did enter, only remained for a short period. It is cheering to be told by one of our branch secretaries that the women in her town would be ashamed to be seen going into a public house.

But the following facts show that the evil is very great in some parts.

Take the case of a single public house in S.W. London, observed on Nov. 22—a large house with six doors and one bar for women only. In the two morning hours (11.30 to 1.30) 404 women entered; 300 of these with soldiers; 18 women became intoxicated; 13 soldiers treated women; 15 women treated each other; 36 children were left outside.

In four hours on the evening of the same day (5 to 9 o'clock), 325 women entered (182 of them with men); 3 women were intoxicated; 5 evaded the "no treating" order; 14 children were left outside.

In N.W. London on Nov. 22nd, in 4½ hours, 894 women entered one public house.

In N. London, in a single hour (9 to 10 p.m.) there went into one house 268 men and 577 women (total 845), many of the women being young.

In a S.W. London suburb, in 35 minutes (11.30 to 12.05 a.m.) 77 men and 82 women entered one house.

In many cases children were left outside, sometimes for long periods—some in prams and mailcarts; some, scantily clothed, on the doorstep, and this on rainy, chilly nights. One baby was left outside for an hour and a quarter. Children were constantly looking in at the doors to find their parents. A child of 6 said she was waiting for "Mummy" and that she was "inside there." One night at 8.45, a group of miserably-clad children stopped a worker and enquired: "Please could you tell us what time they turn the mothers out of the pubs.; we are so cold and hungry."

One Sunday afternoon, five women, mostly young and quite drunk (one incapable of standing alone) amused themselves for nearly an hour by tossing two babies from one to another.

A young woman was seen hopelessly intoxicated on a suburban common. A friend who was with her, but sober, said she was in this condition every Monday, and more or less so every day as long as her allowance lasted.

In this country fortunately, we have at the present time to deal with liquor as it affects the man; but who can say that, if the liquor traffic is allowed to permeate this country and to go on unchecked—it will not do so, because public opinion will not allow it—the day will not come when the same spectacle which is seen to-day in the city of London will not be enacted in some of our great cities? In this time of crisis it is our bounden duty to give prohibition a fair trial, not only on economic, but on moral grounds. I have given a glimpse of what is taking place in the United States, and in the city of London, and let me read a few lines from the pen of a man who has presided in the municipal court of the city of Chicago, one of the largest cities in the United States. In Chicago the consumption of drink is probably more extensive than in any other part of the American Union. This is the judgment of Judge Wm. M. Gemmill, who every morning has an army of wrecks and derelicts brought before him:

Booze is the mother of crime. It gives life and sustenance to slums, dives, brothels, gambling dens and "pay-off joints." It nerves to his deed the homicide, the burglar, the thief, and the thug. It fires the brain of the prostitute and the pander. It feeds and inflames the passions of the weak-minded and the degenerate.

I have tried an army of 50,000 human derelicts, most of whom were booze-soaked. With faces red and bloated, with eyes dull and languid, with bodies weak and wasted, with clothing foul and ragged, this vast army is forever marching with unsteady step to the graves of