

polled, and the balance might safely be set down as in the main opposed or indifferent. The enactment and repeal of the Scott Act were legislation approached by the voter with a full sense of responsibility. The plebiscite was not legislation; it was a mere fancy vote.

It may be said that the Scott Act was local and that the area was not large enough to keep off contagion. But would the area of Canada be large enough to keep off contagion? Would not the taste be revived in every Canadian who crossed the line or went to England? Popular literature, such as the works of Dickens, is full of the convivial use of liquor, and its influence no law could annul. There would be little hope, therefore, of eradicating the desire in the long line of provinces stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

It is said that the repeal of the Scott Act was followed by an increase in drunkenness. This is not unlikely. Overstraining is naturally followed by a recoil. Puritan over-strictness was avenged by the outburst of licentiousness in the reign of Charles II.

Massachusetts, the model State of the Union, tried Prohibition for a series of years, and gave it up, finding that the closing of the public places of sale multiplied the secret places; that more liquor and worse liquor was drunk; and that there was more drunkenness in Boston than ever. "The mere fact," says the report, "that the law seeks to prevent them from drinking, rouses the determination to drink in many. The fact that the place is secret takes away the restraint which in more public and respectable places would keep them within temperate bounds. The fact that the business is contraband and liable to interruption, and that its gains are hazardous, tends to drive honest men from it and leaves it under the control of dishonest men who will not scruple to poison the community with vile adulteration."

Vermont, a rural State without alums, tried Prohibition for forty years, piled one repressive enactment upon another, heaped up penalties, gave the police power to enter any house without a warrant. The result, as stated by Mr. Edward Johnston, in the Popular Science Monthly for May, 1884, was that for all practical purposes the law was a dead letter. There were dram shops in the principal streets, and no concealment of the illegal traffic. Nobody dreamed of enforcing the law, as the laws against burglary and larceny are enforced. Perjury and subornation of perjury, disregard and contempt of all law, were practically fostered and encouraged.

In Iowa, a correspondent of Harper's Weekly reported that Prohibition in the cities meant free liquor. A correspondent of the New York Nation confirmed the statement. Dr. Die Lewis, in places where he had been assured that drink could not be had for love or money, saw drunkards reeling in the streets. In Iowa City he saw from seventy-five to one hundred kegs of beer delivered on trucks. The business directory of Dubuque, a city of 35,000 inhabitants, comprised two breweries, thirty-five hotels, ten wholesale liquor places, and one hundred and eighty-one saloons. Formal prosecutions were a mere mode of raising a tax. Druggists' shops were turned into liquor shops, with a few drugs in the window.

In Kansas, the State of Governor St. John, the chosen chief of Prohibition, where the most stringent Prohibition has been enacted, the result, according to Dr. Gardner, was that the drug stores were little more than rum shops, and that their number was astonishing. In one town of four thousand people, fifteen of them were counted on the main street. Leavenworth, with a population of 23,000, had a hundred and seventy-five places where liquor was sold. In Kansas City the police collected in 1882 \$45,000 in fines for illegal sale of liquor. There is a general tendency to convert Prohibition, where it prevails, practically into license by taking the fees under the guise of fines. In Tongawoxie, a small town in Kansas, where there was no saloon before Prohibition, there were three or four afterwards. This is against the theory that Prohibition works well in small places, though in large cities it works ill. At Topeka in Kansas there are no saloons. But there were none when Prohibition was introduced, popular feeling being against them. A proof that it is popular feeling that is strong, rather than prohibitive law.

Maine is the banner State of Prohibition. It had been trying the system for nearly half a century, time enough to kill the liquor traffic, if the liquor traffic was to be killed. Yet "Gail Hamilton," who knew the State well, said in The North American Review: "The actual result is that liquor is sold to all who wish to obtain it, in nearly every town in the State. Enforcement of the law seems to have little effect. For the past six years the city of Bangor has practically enjoyed free rum. In more than one hundred places liquor is sold, and no attempt has been made to enforce the law. In Bath, Lewiston, Augusta, and other cities, no real difficulty is experienced in procuring liquor. In Portland, enforcement of the law has been faithfully attempted, yet the liquor traffic flourishes for all classes from the highest to the lowest. . . . In a journey last summer for hundreds of miles through the cities and through the scattered villages and hamlets of Maine, the almost universal testimony was 'you get liquor enough for bad purposes in bad places, but you cannot get it for good purposes in good places.'" "What works against Prohibition," the writer added, "is that in the opinion of many of the most earnest total-abstinence men, the original Maine-Law State, after thirty years of Prohi-