

"I tell you what, Hammon," he is saying, "I'm going to sweat off. I said I'd do it years ago when I married her—Eliza, you know. I did swear I'd break off, but d—n the stuff; it gets such a hold on a fellow, and, by Jove!" his voice sinks to a stage whisper. "so're devilish poor! She says day and night, 'Eliza, you know—but for all it's a hard pull—a hard pull. It's a d—n shame! I say I'm going to pull myself together. I swear off—this night I swear off, old man.'"

We must really beg our readers' pardon for taking up space with such stuff. And we may inform our good friend of the *Templar* who in all sober faith repudiated the whole matter that he has good grounds for another ringing article on newspaper fakes.

As to the *Nero* we have nothing to say. As to "Vic Weinberg," if that "young lady" exists we wish to say nothing.

### WHAT IT MEANS.

In Toronto Ald. Lamb has again introduced his 9 o'clock closing by-law. In Hamilton a large petition has been signed asking not only for the 9 o'clock closing, but that twenty licenses be cut off. In other cities and towns the same attempt will be made. This is the present temperance propaganda, and is being pushed by the most bigoted of the prohibition fanatics. It is an outcome of bigotry, of insensate hate in fact, for it is not seriously contended that the reduction of licenses or the reduction of hours will cause less liquor to be drunk.

In Toronto the matter is not serious. It is merely an electioneering movement on the part of Ald. Lamb, who has the mayoralty bee in his bonnet, and thinks this a good plan to catch the temperance vote. But in other places the matter is more serious. Closing the bars at nine o'clock means simply making a legitimate trade illegitimate. If the license holder does not break the law an unlicensed place will do the business, and the man who will not enter an unlicensed place will take home a supply of liquor and introduce it into the family. This has been the invariable experience; it has been proven over and over again, it is found now to have been the case in Gothenburg as will be seen in another article. Early closing when enforced does not lessen the sale of liquor, but it transfers it from the respectable hotel to the dive, and yet this is the "reform" our golly temperance friends are working for.

The cutting down of licenses is an iniquitous thing. It does harm to the cause of temperance and it ruins the individuals deprived of their licenses. In no case have we found that it decreased the total consumption and in every case it has increased drunkenness. We have before published facts and figures to prove this, and as the matter is again up in practical shape we will repeat some of them and give others additional.

Is another column will be found an extract from an English paper which is worthy of special attention. The Mayor of Newcastle a few weeks ago produced

figures to prove that that city is "the most drunken in the Kingdom." And his statistics made out his case. On the other hand Norwich stands at the head of the other list for exemption from drunkenness. Now Newcastle has among the fewest licenses of any of the large towns while Norwich has absolutely the largest number in proportion to population. Ponder over this: where there are the fewest licenses there is the greatest drunkenness in the kingdom, where there are the greatest number of licenses you have the most sober town in the Kingdom.

It is claimed that reducing the number of licenses will reduce crime. The facts are just the reverse. In Montreal a large number of licenses were cut off at the beginning of last year. Now what are the crime statistics? The number of prisoners in the jail for 1893 was: Males, 2,133 and females, 478. In 1894 the number of prisoners was: Male, 2984; female, 566. This shows an increase of 551 males and 88 females over 1893. There are your facts.

In Toronto the Fleming by-law, which struck off seventy-four hotel and sixteen shop licenses, came into effect on May 1, 1887. The "headless" hotels had three months in which to dispose of their stock and close up business, so that the by-law actually took effect on August 1st. A comparison of the arrests for drunkenness for the months following with the corresponding months of the previous year show, what?

#### ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS BY THE TORONTO POLICE.

	1886.	1887.
August.....	336	472
September.....	336	463
October.....	312	469
November.....	312	366
December.....	292	375
Total.....	1647	2145
INCREASE.....		498

In the five months after the cutting off of seventy-four hotel and sixteen shop licenses, the arrests for drunkenness increased by nearly one-third.

Nor was this increase of drunkenness merely temporary. The reduction in the number of licenses caused a great jump in the number of drunks, which high figure held year after year, and even to-day Toronto has not recovered that moderation which was so unfortunately upset by the ill-advised Fleming by-law. That this may be apparent, we give the figures of arrests for drunkenness in Toronto Police Court for a long number of years:—

Year.	No Arrests for Drunkenness.
1880.....	2873
1881.....	2908
1882.....	2974
1883.....	3407
1884.....	3644
1885.....	3864
1886.....	4283
1887.....	5299
1888.....	4882
1889.....	5441
1890.....	5623
1891.....	3758
1892.....	2657
1893.....	3644

From 1880 down to 1886 the increase in the convictions were scarcely commensurate with the growth of population; 1887 and the subsequent years tell their own story.

Let us turn to the statistics of England. Official statistics for 1880 (Police Returns, Counties and Boroughs), prove that at the close of that year there were in England and Wales 110,500 public houses and beer houses, representing 5.1 per 1000 of the population (1881 census). The convictions for drunkenness and drunk and disorderly during 1880 were 127,664, or 6.0 per 1,000 of population. Since 1880 there has been a tendency to reduce the number of licenses, and nearly 10,000 were cut off before 1891, the number in that year in England and Wales being 101,496, or 4.3 per 1,000 of population. Did this large reduction cause increased sobriety? While other crimes, owing to various causes, were reduced to a large extent, there was an INCREASE OF OVER 17,000 in the drunkenness convictions in 1891 as compared with 1880. In 1891 there were 144,412 convictions, or 6.6 per 1,000 of the population. Let us see how these figures look in tabular form:

	No. licenses.	Convictions for drunkenness.
1880.....	110,500	127,664
1891.....	101,496	144,412

  

	No. licenses per 1,000 population.	Convictions for drunkenness per 1,000 population.
1880.....	5.1	6.0
1891.....	4.3	6.6

A reduction of 10,000 in the number of licenses caused an increase of 17,000 in the convictions for drunkenness.

A pamphlet issued by Mr. W. Gurney Benham, of Colchester, England, gives most valuable and elaborate information upon this subject. He has taken from the 1891 census and placed side by side the actual ratio of drunkenness in every police district in England and Wales, and the actual numerical ratio of licensed houses in each district. This compilation shows the startling result that in districts with an excessive amount of drunkenness the number of licenses is, as a rule, specially small, while in districts comparatively free from drunkenness there are, as a rule, large numbers of licensed houses. The volume of the statistics given makes it impossible to reproduce them here, though we shall take occasion to refer to them again at a later date, but a few of the counties may be given to clinch the argument. We give the convictions for drunkenness and drunk and disorderly per 1,000 of population and the licensed houses per 1,000 population:

County.	Convictions.	Licenses.
Durham.....	15.3	3.1
Northumberland.....	11.4	2.7
Glanuzganshire.....	11.4	3.6
Huntingdonshire.....	1.7	10.3
Oxfordshire.....	36	6.6
Suffolk West.....	53	5.3
Cambridgeshire.....	56	8.5

The Federal Legislature of Switzerland appointed a Commission jointly with the Federal Bureau of Statistics to investigate

this among other questions connected with the liquor traffic, and in reviewing the various kinds of restrictive legislation resorted to in different countries, the report dwells at length upon the attempt to diminish consumption by reducing the number of drinking places. The conclusion arrived at is that this favorite device of realizing the objects of temperance is not sustained by practical experience. On this point the report reads as follows:—"In the course of our investigation we have not found any data warranting the assumption—now become almost a dogma in many places—that the reduction of the number of drinking places tends to restrict the consumption of ardent spirits. On the contrary, we are constrained to state that we have frequently found the evil effects of alcoholism most prevalent in the very localities where the number of drinking places was smallest—an apparent anomaly which finds its explanation in the fact that in the absence of conveniently located public bar-rooms, the people of the localities in question became accustomed to tipping at home, laying in great or smaller quantities of spirits according to their means. The number of saloons is not a criterion of the consumption of spirits. We hold that a much more effective temperance measure than the reduction of saloons is to be found in all those rules and regulations which, by exacting certain securities from the person licensed to retail ardent spirits, renders the retailers, as a class, more respectable, and improves the condition and management of drinking places."

We commend these facts to our friends. They will convince any fair minded man if they will not a Prohibitionist.

### IS NEAL DOW CRAZY?

THE great prohibition apostle of Maine has been attacking Chief Justice Peters in a most virulent way of late, to the extent that His Lordship has felt constrained to reply. This is what the Chief Justice has to say:—

"I have at present no time to waste on Neal Dow. I regard him as a crazy man and suppose everybody else does. But I will say that in all of his ravings for two years past he has not truthfully stated any facts concerning me, and that the opinion which he chatters about as my ruling was an opinion of the full court."

ISAAC F. ABBOTT, of Dover, N.H., was quite a model man. We say "quite a" because he shot himself on the 14th inst. to escape the legal penalty for having stolen \$80,000 of other people's money. Isaac was a member of the Washington Street Baptist Church, was a leader in an anti-liquor crusade, cashier of the Five Cents Savings Bank, City Treasurer, and cashier of the Dover National Bank. It was from the latter institution that he embezzled the \$80,000, being all but \$20,000 of its entire capital and leaving hundreds of families entire destitute. He did well to take his worthless life, but as he never drank his name will not have place in Bro. Casey's Column of Horrors.