

# THE VANGUARD.

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1894.

## THE CAUSE OF HARD TIMES.

As shown by careful calculations already published in the VANGUARD, our Dominion has an average annual expenditure for strong drink of about THIRTY-TWO MILLION DOLLARS. This is the amount paid for the liquor by the consumer. If we were to take into calculation the indirect cost to the country through loss of time and other losses and expenses, the result of drinking, the bill would be swelled to nearly three times the sum named.

Dealing however, with only this actual outlay by drinkers, we have to consider an expenditure, the termination of which would increase the prosperity of our country to a marvelous extent. "Hard times" may always be taken as the result of a number of causes operating together, the liquor traffic being one cause continually at work. If that were abolished, there would be an increase of wealth that would probably put us, even under present circumstances, in a position far more prosperous than we have yet occupied. It must be borne in mind that it has been demonstrated that money spent in drink means invariably so much diminution of the actual wealth of the country.

As illustrative of the great relief which might be secured from a stoppage of this drink expenditure, the following calculation is submitted. The thirty-two million dollars would establish in the occupation of farming no fewer than FOUR THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIVE families, taking them absolutely destitute and equipping everyone with the following outfit:

1 Cleared farm of 100 acres with dwelling house, barn, stabling and all equipments worth .....	\$5000 00
1 Team of horses .....	150 00
5 Cows at \$40 each .....	200 00
20 Sheep at \$5 each .....	100 00
5 Pigs at \$5 each .....	25 00
Poultry, Ducks, Geese, Turkeys .....	20 00
1 Heavy waggon .....	80 00
1 Sleigh .....	40 00
1 Farm cart .....	40 00
1 Plough .....	30 00
1 Set harrows .....	40 00
1 Combined mower and reaper .....	150 00
1 Horse rake .....	40 00
Other tools and implements .....	25 00
1 Set team harness .....	40 00
1 Set plough harness .....	20 00
1 Set cart harness .....	20 00
1 Cooking stove fully furnished .....	45 00
1 Self feeding coal heater .....	30 00
1 Carpet .....	35 00
1 Carpet .....	25 00
1 Carpet .....	20 00
1 Set dining room furniture .....	40 00
1 Parlor set .....	100 00
1 Bedroom set .....	40 00
1 Bedroom set .....	30 00
1 Bedroom set .....	25 00
Crockery, cutlery, linen, bedding, curtains, blinds, kitchen utensils and other miscellaneous furnishings .....	75 00
1 Book case .....	15 00
100 Volumes Standard books .....	100 00
	<hr/>
	6600 00
Cash capital to start work with .....	900 00
	<hr/>
	7500 00

## LIQUOR TRAFFIC RESTRICTION IN ONTARIO.

The time of the year has come when work can effectively be done for the further curtailment of the liquor traffic in different localities. This is specially the case with municipalities in the Province of Ontario.

The powers delegated by the Legislature in the province named may be briefly summarized as follows :—

Municipal councils may pass by-laws for reducing the number of licenses below the maximum statutory limit. This reduction may be by by-law. A municipal council may also fix within certain limits a fee for licenses greater than the minimum statutory fee. If this fee is to be made very large the by-law fixing it must be approved by a vote of the electors of the municipality. A municipal council may also fix the hours of closing places where liquor is sold under shop licenses.

License commissioners may pass resolutions fixing hours for closing, and generally, imposing any reasonable regulation they see fit, on places licensed to sell liquor, as to their mode of carrying on the business for which they are licensed. They may in their discretion issue fewer licenses than those permitted by statute or municipal by-law, but cannot exceed that number.

Electors have a right to petition against the granting or transferring of a license to take effect upon premises on which a license was not previously in operation.

An application for license to take effect on premises not before licensed must be accompanied by a petition signed by a majority of the electors in the polling sub-division in which such premises are situated.

Municipal councils may pass by-laws providing for the prohibition of the sale of liquor in taverns, or the sale of liquor in shops, or the sale of liquor in both taverns and shops. Such by-laws before going into operation must be ratified by a majority of the electors in the municipality effected. Full particulars in regard to procedure to secure the benefits of this legislation will be found in the VANGUARD of January last.

Friends of the temperance cause may take action by petition, deputation or otherwise, urging municipal councils and license commissioners to exercise any of the powers conferred upon them.

It will be seen that the rights enjoyed by the electors in reference to the liquor traffic are very extensive. A determined and judicious exercise of these rights all over the province would result in an enormous reduction in the operation of the liquor traffic during the coming license year. Now is the proper time to deal with the matter. Special efforts should be made to secure the election of municipal councils that can be relied upon to exercise the power invested in them for the restriction of the liquor traffic. In most municipalities municipal councils also control the police officials, who, as well as license inspectors, are charged with the enforcement of liquor laws. The extent of the liquor traffic during the coming year will be to a great extent determined by the character of the municipal councils elected on December 31st, and January 7th.

And further information in regard to the matters above mentioned will be cheerfully furnished by the Secretary of the Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance, F. S. Spence, whose address is 51 Confederation Life Building, Toronto.

## SUNDAY PROHIBITION IN TWO CITIES.

BY COURTNEY FESSEY.

Editorial Staff Montreal Daily Witness,

The simultaneous campaigns in New York and Montreal to sweep away the Sunday prohibition should command the earnest attention, and arouse the righteous indignation of all who recognize in the saloon the deadly foe of law, order and true liberty. The argument (?) of the trad. in those cities in which they are, strange to say, largely backed by the expressions of certain police officials, is that Sunday closing cannot be and never has been successfully enforced.

Unfortunately for their propoganda, the facts do not sustain the liquor-sellers' plea. On the contrary it is a simple and inspiring task to show that faithful and courageous officers can and do, every Sunday throughout the year in the cities of Ontario, enforce Sunday closing with marked success, and, as will be seen by the evidence here-with presented, in most cases with comparative ease, and always with most gratifying results.

Eighteen months ago, commissioned by the "Witness," the writer was assigned to report the prohibition plebiscite campaign, and the temperance movement in Ontario in general. During the period which has intervened, a close observation and investigation of the workings of the liquor law of Ontario has afforded ample and overwhelming evidence: (a) that the law is faithfully administered by the provincial inspector, (b) that the prohibitive clauses of the liquor law are successfully enforced, (c) that Sunday

and election day prohibition minimizes intemperance, (d) that the license reduction movement together with the rigid enforcement of the law has resulted in an astonishing reduction in the number of convictions for drunkenness; (e) that the firm administration of the prohibitory clauses of the present law, together with the magnificent prohibition majority given in the plebiscite, demonstrate Ontario's readiness for total prohibition and the practicability of its enforcement, and the fallacy of the saloon plea in New York and Montreal that Sunday prohibition cannot be carried into effect.

## IN TORONTO.

A close study of the effects of Sunday prohibition in Toronto shows that in the Queen City the liquor-sellers have given up the struggle, and hence for one day out of the seven they can feel to some extent the self-respect of citizens not engaged in a destructive and brutalizing occupation. So much is this the case that eminent visitors, especially those from the United States, constantly express their admiration of this annihilation of the Sunday saloon.

During the past year three Americans of international reputation, among many others, have given public expression before large audiences here, to the delight which the observance of the enforcement of Sunday saloon-closing in Toronto has afforded them.

The first was George W. Bain in an address before thousands of auditors in the Pavilion. Colonel Bain said that in some places to enforce Sunday closing it needed a policeman at each saloon door and another policeman to watch him. Being vigorously assured by voices in the audience that Toronto's police force were all right, Colonel Bain expressed satisfaction that the outward appearance of sobriety and order was not belied by illicit sales of liquor and drunkenness unrevealed.

Terence V. Powderly, also speaking in the Pavilion to a large audience, contrasted the drunkenness which it had often pained him to see in Scranton with the absolute sobriety of the Toronto Sunday.

More emphatic than all others has been the testimony of D. L. Moody, the evangelist. Mr. Moody was in this city for four Sundays, and stopped at the Rossin House, the second largest hotel in the city. The Rossin House is on one of the most important corners on King Street West. On other corners also stand hotels, with licensed barrooms. Speaking before 5,000 people, Mr. Moody said that nowhere from Atlantic to Pacific on this continent had he in any city, north or south, been refreshed by such quiet Sabbaths.

The secret of the successful enforcement of the law is told in very few words. The authorities are in sympathy with the law, and the officials entrusted with its enforcement are zealous, conscientious, and courageous.

This state of things has, however, not been attained in a day, a month, or a year; but the visible transformation from lax to strict enforcement may be said to have been gradually developed within the last ten or twelve years. The honor of it is indirectly attributed to the example set in New York by Anthony Comstock. It began with a meeting at the Y.M.C.A. parlors in Shaftesbury Hall where a Law and Order League was formed. The late W. H. Howland was one of the active spirits of the League, which is now only a reserve force, the authorities having left little for it to do for the past few years. The president is Dr. J. J. Maclaren, Q.C.; secretary, Mr. J. A. Patterson; and treasurer, Mr. James Thomson.

Before the law attained rigid administration by the regular authorities the league scored a great victory in stamping out lotteries, securing a conviction with heavy

penalties against parties participating in an attempt to conduct a lottery throughout the province to erect a hall.

At one period the liquor element could control a Toronto contest ; but now in municipal affairs no man has a chance of success at the polls who is known to be friendly to the traffic.

Toronto has a population of two hundred thousand. The barrooms, hotels, and saloons number 150 ; retail liquor-shops, 50 ; wholesale, 10. The city contains seven breweries and one distillery. The total liquor-law prosecutions entered in 1893<sup>3</sup> were 286. The cases of drunkenness before the police magistrate on a Monday morning which include all the arrests from eight o'clock on Saturday morning, rarely exceed a dozen. The evidence usually discloses that the prisoner became intoxicated during the open hours on Saturday, or with liquor secured before closing time, which is 7 p.m., and is rigidly observed. The minimum is believed in police quarters to have been reached in illicit liquor-selling. The best proof of this is to be found in the fact that for the past five years, which includes one Dominion election, two provincial elections, and five municipal elections, only one solitary drunk during the whole period appeared in the police court on the morning after election day, and he was a stranger, who admitted that he was drunk when he reached Toronto

The law regarding Sunday closing prohibits liquor-selling by license-holders from seven o'clock on Saturday night until six on Monday morning. The penalty for selling liquor without license is \$50 to \$100 for the first offence, or three months' imprisonment ; for the second offence four months' imprisonment, without the option of a fine. For selling during prohibited hours by license-holders the penalty for a first offence is \$20 to \$50 or two months' imprisonment ; second offence, \$40 to \$60 ; third offence, three months' imprisonment, without the option of a fine.

THE MORALITY DEPARTMENT.

One of the most interesting episodes of the battle against saloon lawlessness was the establishment of Toronto's morality department. This unique branch of the police force originated in the mind of the noble champion of morality already mentioned, W. H. Howland, who immediately upon his election as Mayor, turned his attention to the weakness then apparent in police administration, necessitating Law and Order League activity. As mayor and one of the commissioners of police, he proposed the placing of the enforcement of the laws affecting morality under a special officer with the necessary subordinates. Formerly this work had been nominally performed by the officers of the police divisions. Mr. Howland having secured the adoption of his proposition, the then chief of police nominated Inspector Archibald for the new superintendency, as a discreet, efficient and reliable officer. Mr. Archibald was appointed by the police board, being promoted to the rank of staff inspector, a position which he has held to the unqualified satisfaction of the friends of the community at large, the results having been marked in the securing of moral progress and the enhancing of the good reputation of the city.

It is nearly thirty years since Inspector Archibald joined the Toronto force, coming to Canada from Ireland in 1865. Previous to that he served with credit in the Royal Irish Constabulary. Of Scotch descent, from Puritan stock, Inspector Archibald evinces all the best characteristics which might be expected from such ancestry. On his appointment as superintendent of the morality department the staff-inspector had a sergeant and constable placed under his direct control with authority to employ special officers when required.

The duties of the morality department are onerous and many. Summarized they are : To enforce the laws relating to the sale of liquor illicitly and to houses of ill-fame and assignation ; to suppress lotteries and prize fighting ; to regulate baby-farming institutions ; to prosecute for indecent exposure, cruelty to women and children ; desecration of the Sabbath : indecency and immorality of all kinds ; to superintend the licensing and regulating of newsboys and bootblacks, and generally to deal with all cases of a domestic nature requiring police intervention.

Since receiving his original instructions the superintendent of the morality department has had the enforcement of the truancy act added to his duties, with two truancy officers to put it into operation ; and he has also been called upon to take charge of the court for juveniles recently established.

The results attained cannot be adequately tabulated, being too widespread and far-reaching. One of the most gratifying is the zeal now manifested for the enforcement of the laws under consideration by the officers of the police divisions of the city.

#### A CRUSHING ANSWER.

The statement furnished recently by request of Sir Joseph Hickson, of the Royal Commission on the liquor traffic, by Mr. Robt. A. Cunningham, manager of the Central lodging house, for unfortunate men, is a crushing answer to the allegation that Sunday closing cannot be enforced.

It is a simple statement of the number of men taking advantage of the nightly shelter provided by that institution, and is as follows :

YEAR ENDING OCT. 31ST, 1892.

Inmates, week nights .....	20,463
Drunk .....	1,367
Inmates, Sundays .....	3,741
Drunk .....	9

YEAR ENDING OCT. 31ST, 1893.

Inmates, week nights .....	17,449
Drunk .....	1,247
Inmates, Sundays .....	3,038
Drunk .....	4

THE DOMINION CAPITAL.

The record of Ottawa, the Dominion capital, adds its quota to the accumulation of evidence that Sunday prohibition *does* prohibit. Owing to its social conditions, location and diverse creeds, Ottawa might have been looked to with confidence by rum-sellers as the one Ontario city where the enforcement of such a "blue law" would have been an impossibility.

The social conditions peculiar to the capital of a country like Canada, the rendezvous of the politician, colonial aristocrat; the fact that parliament is in session there for months annually; the extent of the office-holding class, an element not specially inclined to favor Sabbatarianism or rigorous moral discipline; the location of Ottawa, being a place where lumber men return in great numbers at different periods to be paid off; its proximity to the Quebec city of Hull, a fact not favorable to liquor law enforcement, all these circumstances must be borne in mind.

Religiously considered Ottawa's fifty thousand population is more Roman Catholic than Protestant, the Catholics being in large proportion Irish and French. The officials include Police Magistrate O'Gara, Roman Catholic, Inspector O'Reilly, Roman Catholic; Inspector George St. George

These inspectors and city police rigorously enforce the laws, and are upheld in so doing by the clergy irrespective of creed, a notable worker in this being Rev. Father Whalen, Irish Catholic parish priest. On Sunday neither hotel nor other bar is open, and the slightest violation of the Sunday prohibition prescribed in the provincial act is a rarity. The clergy are unanimous in its support, and the most fanciful citizen of Ottawa would never dream of proposing the legalization of Sunday liquor-selling. The temperance organizations are extremely vigilant, and have in the United Temperance Association a watchful force ever ready to bring any symptom of laxity on the part of the officials to the attention of the provincial inspector.

The official record of the past three years is before me. It shows simultaneously a license reduction movement, decrease of intemperance and strict enforcement of law. In 1891 the Dominion capital was oppressed by 88 saloon, or tavern, licenses and 59 shop licenses; 1892 saw one tavern license lopped off. Last year witnessed a sweeping reduction, the tavern licenses being decreased to 78 and shop licenses to 56.

What are the consequences? (1) A total of but 105 commitments for drunkenness for last year for the City of Ottawa and the whole county of Carleton in which it is situated. (2) Absolute satisfaction by clergy and temperance organizations with the vigilance of the officials, no complaint for a long period having been made by them of official negligence. (3) Only 49 proven violations of the liquor law for the whole 365 days of 1893, 22 being secured by the inspectors, and 27 by the Ottawa police; the fines imposed aggregating \$1870. These conditions exist, notwithstanding the fact that Ottawa contains three breweries.

A subsequent article will deal with the Province of Ontario as a whole,

## UNITED STATES PROHIBITION PARTY VOTE, 1894.

The subjoined table gives the votes polled by the prohibition party in the different State elections for the year 1894, and also the votes polled for Mr. Bidwell, presidential candidate in 1892. The figures for 1894 for the States of California, Colorado, Iowa, Michigan, New York, North Dakota, Texas and West Virginia are not official. The figures for Virginia are incomplete.

It will be noticed that some States show a material increase in the vote polled, although in many cases there is a heavy falling off. On the whole the aggregate vote for 1894 is much smaller than that for 1892. The comparison of a national presidential vote with the vote polled in State elections does not of course give an accurate comparison between the strength of the party at the one time and its strength at the other.

It must also be remembered that probably a great majority of the ardent prohibitionists of the United States do not approve of the third party plan of work, and the figures given are not in any sense representative of the strength of the prohibition sentiment in the different States :—

	1892.	1894.
Arkansas .....	113	1,551
California .....	8,096	12,000
Colorado .....	1,687	4,500
Connecticut .....	3,999	2,310
Delaware .....	516	585
Idaho .....	288	205
Illinois .....	25,870	19,419

Indiana .....	13,044	11,157
Iowa .....	6,317	6,845
Kansas .....	4,553	5,496
Maine .....	3,062	2,730
Maryland .....	5,877	7,500
Massachusetts ..	7,539	9,965
Michigan .....	14,069	18,978
Minnesota .....	14,017	6,879
Missouri .....	4,331	3,099
Montana ..	549	522
Nebraska .....	4,902	4,439
New Hampshire ..	1,297	1,750
New Jersey ...	8,131	7,246
New York .....	38,190	23,525
North Dakota ..	899	1,000
Ohio .....	26,012	23,237
Oregon .....	2,281	2,312
Pennsylvania ..	25,123	23,433
Rhode Island ..	1,654	2,241
South Dakota ..		1,011
Texas .....	2,165	3,000
Vermont .....	1,415	457
Virginia .....	2,681	1,735
West Virginia ..	2,130	1,000
Wisconsin .....	13,045	11,240

The Prohibition party had in 1894 no party ticket in the following States:—

Alabama .....	239	.....
Florida .....	561	.....
Georgia .....	988	.....
Louisiana .....	150	.....
Mississippi .....	910	.....
Nevada .....	85	.....
North Carolina ..	2,636	.....
South Carolina ..		.....
Tennessee .....	4,856	.....
Washington ...	2,553	.....
Wyoming .....	389	.....

## GREAT BRITAIN'S LIQUOR REVENUE.

A number of interesting facts relating to the liquor revenue of Great Britain have lately been made public in an official document, a summary of which has been prepared for the *Alliance News* by Mr. J. A. Gibson. This summary is as follows :—

### THE REVENUE FROM THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

The annual parliamentary return of all taxes and imports from which the Imperial Revenue is raised has just been published. The returns, moved by Mr. Conybeare, was ordered to be printed by the House of Commons in August last, and is for the year ending 31st March, 1894. From this return it appears that the Chancellor of the Exchequer received as taxes and imposts on intoxicating liquors and the liquor trade the gross sum of £34,015,699 for the year above mentioned. The amount represents an increase to the national revenue of £25,967 as compared with the previous year from the sources above stated. The increased charges on beer and spirits ordered in the Budget of 1894, had not come into operation up to the date of the return, and therefore do not in any way affect the above figures, or those given in other parts of this article.

The following comparative statement of the total gross proceeds to the revenue from the liquor traffic, etc., shows the fluctuations of the revenue from this source for the past twenty-one years :—

1874.....	£32,299,062	1884.....	£30,942,273
1875.....	33,052,568	1885.....	30,770,161
1876.....	33,712,964	1886.....	29,606,310
1877.....	33,447,282	1887.....	29,354,193
1878.....	33,044,323	1888.....	29,744,188
1879.....	32,102,136	1889.....	29,956,150
1880.....	29,614,496	1890.....	32,275,662
1881.....	29,497,666		
1882.....	31,037,733	1893.....	33,989,732
1883.....	31,001,587	1894.....	34,015,699

The statement which follows shows the number of barrels of beer paying duty at the rate of 6s. 3d. per barrel. The barrel formerly reckoned at the specific gravity of 1.057 has, since April 16, 1889, been reduced to 1.055 :—

1882.....	27,870,859	1888.....	28,236,483
1883.....	27,141,466	1889.....	28,645,068
1884.....	27,750,911	1890.....	30,868,850
1885.....	27,987,405		
1886.....	27,195,118	1893.....	32,104,516
1887.....	27,949,914	1894.....	32,182,821

The following table will enable the reader to compare the quantities of spirits paying duty in the year just closed with the quantities charged in previous years as given below. It may be here stated that in the years ending 1893 and 1894 the charge on "Home" spirits was 10s. 6d. per proof gallon, and that the duty paid on "Foreign" spirits was 10s. 10d. per proof gallon :—

	Home Spirits.	Foreign Spirits.	Total proof gallons.
1883.....	29,770,822	8,411,099	38,181,921
1884.....	29,810,668	8,105,126	37,915,794
1885.....	29,224,474	8,292,513	37,516,987
1886.....	27,551,983	7,986,542	35,538,525
1887.....	26,935,873	8,100,972	35,036,845
1888.....	27,371,987	8,101,833	35,473,820
1889.....	27,273,186	8,241,719	35,514,905

1890.....	29,621,070	8,976,318	38,597,388
1893.....	31,392,884	7,839,144	39,232,028
1894.....	31,222,844	7,913,391	39,136,235

Attention has often been called to the concentration of the brewing trade in the hands of corporations and large capitalists. The "massing" of capital so characteristic of modern commerce is especially illustrated in the business of the brewer. Whilst there has been no inconsiderable increase in recent years in the quantity of beer produced, yet there has been a most remarkable decrease in the number of brewers who brew for sale. The following table bearing on the point may be of interest:—

Brewers.		Brewers.	
1882.....	15,774	1888.....	12,508
1883.....	15,071	1889.....	11,997
1884.....	14,392	1890.....	11,364
1885.....	13,799	1893.....	9,664
1886.....	13,308	1894.....	9,337
1887.....	12,938		

The details of all licenses granted during the year are given in the parliamentary return which has just appeared. The numbers of the various licenses issued during the year are given below, and also, for comparative purposes, the number of licenses for the previous years undermentioned.

## FOR CONSUMPTION ON THE PREMISES.

	Publicans.	Beershops.	Beer and Wine.
1882.....	92,493	34,520	4,082
1883.....	92,348	34,077	4,270
1884.....	92,064	33,705	4,347
1885.....	91,950	33,307	4,391
1886.....	91,866	33,010	4,468
1887.....	91,800	32,755	4,578
1888.....	91,790	32,573	4,613

1889 .....	91,808	32,306	4,704
1890 .....	91,699	32,087	4,793
1893 .....	91,306	31,316	4,850
1894 .....	91,076	31,075	4,892

The figures in the following table include the "additional" licenses granted to beer-dealers for retail purposes :—

FOR CONSUMPTION OFF THE PREMISES.

	Beer.	Beer and Wine.
1882.....	19,365	951
1883.....	18,851	1,147
1884.....	17,709	1,222
1885.....	17,298	1,237
1886.....	17,129	1,253
1887.....	17,042	1,298
1888.....	17,052	1,340
1889.....	16,823	1,654
1890.....	16,810	1,763
1893.....	16,725	1,995
1894.....	16,706	2,041

A general view of the present proportions of the drink trade, and also a comparison with its extent in 1882 and 1893, may be gathered from the following table. This table includes all licenses issued for the sale of intoxicating liquors except those to *dealers* to vend spirits, wine and beer in wholesale quantities. The licenses omitted from the summary are :—

1. For dealers in strong beer to sell in quantities not less than four and a-half gallons, etc.
2. For dealers in spirits to sell not less than two gallons.
3. For dealers in foreign wine not licensed to retail beer or spirits.

A great number of the *dealers* in spirits and beer take out the "additional licenses" to sell in smaller quantities.

Under these circumstances they appear in the following table under the respective headings. Occasional licenses are also omitted:—

## "ON" LICENSES.

	1882.	1893.	1894.
Publicans .....	92,493	91,306	91,076
Beer .....	34,520	31,316	31,075
Beer and Wine .....	4,082	4,850	4,892
Wine .....	829	398	392
Cider and Perry .....	72	47	49

## "OFF" LICENSES.

Beer (including additional licenses) .....	19,365	16,725	16,706
Beer and Wine .....	951	1,995	2,041
Table Beer .....	278	119	113

## THE GROCERY AND BOTTLE TRADE.

*England.*

Dealers in Spirits, to sell not less than one quart bottle (additional license) .....	6,023	7,176	7,294
---	-------	-------	-------

*England and Ireland.*

Retailers of Wine ("off" license) .....	3,742	4,329	4,464
---	-------	-------	-------

*Ireland.*

Grocers: Retailers of Spirits	490	667	695
-------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

*Scotland.*

Grocers selling Wine ("off" license) .....	3,310	3,467	3,449
Grocers: Retailers of Spirits	4,048	3,850	3,807

## MISCELLANEOUS.

Sweets .....	3,213	2,025	1,951
Passenger Boats .....	379	423	434

	173,795	168,693	168,438
--	---------	---------	---------

It will be a pleasure to many to observe from the above figures that there has been during the year a diminution of

230 publican or full licenses, and that, taking the "on" licenses, to sell beer, beer and wine, or wine solely, there has been a decrease of 205 of these licenses as compared with those of the previous year.

Upon a further examination of the above summary, it will be seen that the traffic is not inactive, but is extending its operations in other directions. The development of what is known as the "domestic trade" in spirits and wine will be seen from the following figures extracted from the above table :—

	1892.	1893.	1894.
Dealers in spirits, to sell not less than one quart bottle.....	6,023	7,176	7,294
Retailers of wine, not to be consumed on the premises.....	3,742	4,329	4,464
	<u>9,765</u>	<u>11,505</u>	<u>11,758</u>

In connection with the question of "compensation," and the uncertain tenure of licenses in view of stricter magisterial supervision, the following comparative figures have points of curious interest. It appears that whilst the number of publican or full licenses is decreasing, yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer is receiving more money in licensing fees from those that remain. This is accounted for by the increased value of public-house property, in consequence of the policy of restriction, and the increased business done by those that remain, as a result of the destruction of some of their number. The license fees of publicans are paid upon the rateable value of the property licensed.

PUBLICAN OR FULL LICENSES—UNITED KINGDOM.

	Number of Licenses.	Total of License Fee.
1882.....	92,493	£1,442,461
1893.....	91,306	1,482,907
1894.....	91,075	1,524,439

## THE UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE ANNUAL MEETING.

The most important annual gathering in connection with the prohibition movement in Great Britain is the yearly meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance. It was held at Manchester on Tuesday, October 23rd, and, as usual, was attended by an immense number of representative advocates of the prohibition reform.

The annual report of the Executive Committee was a document of much interest, giving an exhaustive report of the work done and progress made during the past year. After setting out in detail the history of the Liquor Traffic Local Control Bill, to which the Government is pledged, but which was not reached during the recent parliamentary session, the report says:—

Your committee, therefore, conclude that there is neither proof nor probability that there has been, or that there is, bad faith on the part of the Government in their relations with the temperance party. Your committee can discern nothing likely to induce the Government to desire to betray the temperance party, but much to lead them to keep faith with it. And, while your committee are convinced, for the reasons previously adduced, that there has been undue and hurtful delay on the part of the Government in submitting their measure to Parliament, they do not hold the Government to be solely or even chiefly responsible for that delay. The persistent obstruction—sometimes open, but oftener disguised—is the main cause of the disappointment of the legitimate hopes and expectations of temperance reformers.

The electoral action policy of the Alliance is laid down in the following paragraphs:—

The temperance men in the various constituencies must demand from those of their representatives who are pledged

to vote for the Veto, that they give not merely a nominal, but a real and thoroughgoing support to the Government Liquor Traffic (Local Control) Bill. Besides, in making preparations for the general election, the party must be on the alert when candidates are being selected, to ensure that only such are adopted as are heartily in favor of the Government measure. Indeed, in the opinion of your committee, an excellent test of the good faith of the party managers in any constituency with respect to the temperance question is their attitude on the question of the selection of persons engaged directly in the liquor trade as Parliamentary candidates.

Furthur, as a general election cannot be far distant, and may be near at hand, and as it is most important that a greatly increased majority for the Veto should then be returned, it is expedient that the Temperance party should forthwith take advantage of such possibilities of improvement in its Parliamentary position as the present electoral situation offers

For instance, advantage ought at once to be taken of the state of matters disclosed by the following facts. A large number of the seats of members of Parliament who are hostile to the Veto are held by very small majorities. Thus, of British seats, 54 are held by opponents of the Veto whose majorities are each under 300. In fact these 54 seats are held by an aggregate majority of only 7,753, and the average majority is only 143. Of these there are 37 seats held by opponents of the measure, all of whose majorities are under 200. The aggregate number of votes by which these seats are held is only 3,694, or an average of 100 each. Then of these 37 seats there are 17 held by an aggregate majority of only 866, or an average of 51 votes. In each of these cases a small number of votes taken from each of those opposed to the Veto and given to those who support it would secure a gain of 108 votes on a division in the House of Commons.

Now, in view of these facts, it is impossible for persons acquainted with the resources and opportunities of the temperance party to doubt that it would be possible for them, at the next general election, if they would but do their best, to bring about so great a change in the voting power of the Temperance party in the House of Commons as to make the enactment of the Veto Bill not only certain but immediate.

The report contains interesting paragraphs relating to the plebiscite movement in the Dominion of Canada, the work in other parts of the world, and a good deal of other valuable information. It was adopted by the General Council of the Alliance on motion of Sir Wilfrid Lawson,

President. Other important resolutions adopted by the Council were as follows:—

That, while viewing with much satisfaction the progress of temperance sentiment in the nation, and claiming as a tribute to the success of the agitation promoted by the Alliance the numerous proposals which are being made to lessen the enormous evils of the drink traffic, this Council emphatically reaffirms its conviction, that no effect whatsoever to regulate the traffic can succeed in rendering it innocuous or even tolerable to a wise and understanding people; and therefore demands that the inhabitants of districts shall, for their own protection, have the local power to veto the issue of all licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors by a direct vote.

That this Council profoundly regrets the delay which has occurred in submitting the Government Liquor Traffic (Local Control) Bill to the judgment of the Legislature, and expresses the opinion that it has now become absolutely imperative that the Government should give this measure their earliest attention in the next session of Parliament, and press it with persistent determination to a successful issue.

That this Council earnestly requests the friends of the Alliance in every constituency to take prompt measures for impressing their Parliamentary representatives with the essential importance, not only of voting for the Government's Liquor Traffic (Local Control) Bill when again brought in, but more especially of bringing the utmost pressure to bear upon the Government to introduce and press forward the measure immediately on the reassembling of Parliament.

The great public meeting held at night in the Board of Trade Hall was characterized by intense earnestness and enthusiasm. Canon Wilberforce presided, being supported by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P., Mr. T. Ellis, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., Mr. R. A. Allison, M.P., Mr. T. Snape, M.P., Mr. J. Herbert Roberts, M.P., Mr. T. Whittaker, M.P., Mr. Charles Diamond, M.P., Mr. J. O'Connor Power, Mr. J. Tomkinson, Canon Hicks, Mr. J. H. Raper, Mr. Alderman Crossfield, Mr. W. J. Crossley, the Rev. C. Aked, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. Charles Thompson, Dr. F. R. Lees, Mr. J. Malins, Rev. Dr. Randles, Mr. E. Pearson, Mr. James Whyte (secretary), and others. Letters of apology were announced from a number of gentlemen who

were unable to be present, including Mr. Bryce, M.P., President of the Board of Trade, Sir John T. Hibbert, M.P., Secretary to the Treasurer, and Mr. Samuel Pope, Q.C.

A number of very able speeches were delivered. The following resolutions were adopted :—

That this meeting declares its strong conviction that it is neither just nor politic for the state to protect or sanction any traffic or system which causes crime, suffering, and waste of national resources ; and is of opinion that no legislation is so urgently needed as a measure providing the public with efficient means of protection from the liquor traffic ; nor is there any for which the opinion of the country is so ripe and well prepared.

That this meeting regards with much satisfaction the great progress in sound temperance opinion and sentiment which during recent years has been made in all branches of the Christian Church ; and that this meeting, being profoundly convinced of the fitness and power of the various Christian organizations to legitimately influence the Legislature in all matters which especially concern the moral and social well-being of the people, earnestly entreats these organizations to bring their great power to bear on both Houses of Parliament in support of the Government Liquor Traffic (Local Control) Bill.

---

## BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY ACTION IN 1894.

The annual report of the Executive Committee of the United Kingdom Alliance contains an interesting summary of the measures proposed at the recent parliamentary session which had relation to the liquor traffic, and the disposition of them by the Houses of Parliament. It is as follows :—

The following Bills have been before the Houses of Parliament during the session of 1894 :

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

- 1.—The Liquor Traffic (Local Control) Bill was not actually introduced this session, though the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave notice of it at the first sitting, and kept the notice on the paper, with the exception of two or three days, till near the end of the session.
- 2.—The Liquor Traffic Local Veto (England) Bill, to enable localities by a direct veto to prevent the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, brought in on the 16th of March by Sir Wilfred Lawson, Mr. Allison, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Benn, Mr. Billson, Mr. Crosfield, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Snape and Mr. Whittaker. Dropped August 1st.
- 3.—The Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill, to enable owners and occupiers in burghs, wards of burghs, parishes and districts in Scotland to prevent the common sale of intoxicating liquors, or otherwise to have effectual control over the drink traffic within such areas. Brought in on the 16th of March by Mr. John Wilson (Govan), Sir

C. Cameron, Sir Leonard Lyell, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Dr. Clark, Mr. Birrell and Mr. Angus Sutherland. Dropped August 3rd.

4.—Intoxicating Liquors Local Veto (Ireland) Bill, to enable the ratepayers of any locality to veto the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors in Ireland. Brought in on the 16th of March by Mr. Wm. Johnston, Mr. Jeremiah Jordon, Lord Arthur Hill, Mr. Pinkerton, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Diamond and Mr. Wolff. Withdrawn June 20th.

5.—The Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Wales) Bill, to enable owners and occupiers in Wales to have effectual control over the liquor traffic. Brought in on the 16th of March by Mr. Bowen Rowlands, Q.C., Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Rowland Jones, Mr. Abel Thomas, Mr. Lloyd Morgan and Mr. Burnie. Dropped July 27th.

6.—The Beer Adulteration Bill, for the better securing the purity of beer. Brought in on the 16th of March by Mr. Round, Col. Kenyon-Slaney, Mr. Fellowes and Mr. Griffith-Boscawen. Dropped June 13th.

7.—Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, including the Irish Sunday Closing Act. Brought in by Sir John Hibbert. Royal assent August 14th.

8.—The Finance Bill. Royal assent August 31st.

9.—Grocers' Certificates (Scotland) Abolition Bill, to abolish dealers' or grocers' certificates in Scotland. Brought in March 20th by Sir John Leng, Mr. John Wilson (Govan), Mr. Crombie and Mr. Dalziel. Dropped August 9th.

10.—Grocers' Licenses Abolition Bill, to abolish the retail sale of spirits, wines and beer by shopkeepers. Brought in on the 5th of April by Mr. David A. Thomas, Mr. Lloyd George, Major Jones, Mr. Alfred Thomas, Mr.

T. P. Whittaker and Mr. John Wilson (Durham). Dropped July 27th.

11.—Hop Substitutes Bill, to regulate and restrict the use of hop substitutes. Brought in March 29th by Mr. Brookfield, Mr. Channing, Sir Edmund Lechmere, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Ranken, Col. Warde, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen and Mr. Gobson. Dropped July 4th.

12.—Intoxicating Liquors (Licenses) Bill, to amend the law relating to licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors. Brought in on the 16th of March by Sir Henry Roscoe, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Crosfield, Mr. Leake, Mr. Mather and Mr. Roundell. Dropped May 30th.

13.—The Licensing Laws Amendment Bill (the Church of England Bill). Brought in on the 1st of May by Mr. Tritton, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Henry Hobhouse and Sir William Houldsworth. Dropped August 22nd.

14.—Parliamentary Electors Bill, to consolidate, simplify and amend the law relating to parliamentary elections. The Bill contains a clause to stop the sale of liquor on election days. Brought in on the 16th of March by Mr. George Howell, Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Pikersgill, Mr. James Stewart, Mr. C. Fenwick, Mr. Stewart Watson, Dr. Hunter, Mr. Bowen Bowlands and Mr. Warmington. Withdrawn May 23rd.

15.—Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill, to amend the Act passed three or four years ago. It gives power to send to an inebriate home for twelve months a parent, who is an habitual drunkard, convicted of cruelty to a child. Brought in on the 16th of March by Sir Richard Webster, Mr. Byrne and Mr. C. Cohen. Royal assent July 20th.

16.—On the 21st of March Sir Charles Cameron brought in his Hours of Closing (Scotland) Bill, which was dropped on the 18th of July. On the back were, besides his own

name, those of Mr. J. Wilson (Govan), Mr. Hunter, Sir John Leng and Mr. Beith.

17.—Sale of intoxicating Liquors Bill, to amend the law relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors. Brought in on the 21st of March by Mr. Courtney, Mr. Bolitho, Sir Thos. Lea, Sir Mark Stewart, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Col. Bridgeman and Mr. Alexander Cross. Dropped June 6th.

18.—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, to amend the law relating to the sale of intoxicating liquor on Saturdays and Sundays, and for other purposes connected therewith. Brought in on the 16th of March by Sir Thomas Lea, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. Jordan, Col. Saunderson, Mr. J. F. K. O'Brien, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Pinkerton, Mr. O'Neale, Mr. Diamond, Mr. Arnold Foster, Mr. Webb, Mr. W. Kenny and Mr. Kennedy. Kept on the notice paper till the end of the session.

19.—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sundays Bill, Introduced on the 24th of April by Mr. James Stevenson, Mr. Perks, Mr. C. Wilson, Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Snape and Mr. Woods. Dropped June 25th.

20.—Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881, Amendment Bill. Brought in on the 11th of April by Mr. Herbert Roberts, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Mr. Alfred Thomas and Mr. Bowen Rowlands. Dropped August 1st.

21.—On the 25th of May the Wine and Beerhouse Amendment Act was introduced by Mr. Herbert Lewis, Mr. Courtney, Colonel Bridgeman, Mr. Crosfield, Mr. Snape and Mr. Herbert Roberts, to give the licensing authority discretionary power over all off-licenses. It was kept on the order book till the session closed.

22.—Old Age Provident Pensions Bill, to provide pensions in old age to the provident poor. Brought in by

Col. Palmer, Mr. Barlley, Mr. Hayes Fisher and Sir Frederick Seager Hunt. The Bill excludes from its benefits those who have been convicted of drunkenness within ten years. The adjourned debate on the second reading was down the last time for June 21st, and the Bill then dropped.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

23.—A Bill to Amend the Licensing Laws. Brought in by the Bishop of London. Rejected on second reading.

24.—A Bill to Amend the Licensing Act of 1872. Brought in by Lord Norton, and read a first time, then dropped.

25.—Bill for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children ; to consolidate the Acts passed for this purpose. Brought in by the Lord Chancellor. Passed both Houses, and had the royal assent on August 17th. This Act by clause 11 provides powers as to habitual drunkards as follows:—

***Power as to Habitual Drunkards.***

11.—Where it appears to the court by or before which any person is convicted of the offence of cruelty within the meaning of this Act, or of any of the offences mentioned in the schedule to this Act, that that person is the parent of the child in respect of whom the offence was committed, or is living with the parent of the child, and is an habitual drunkard within the meaning of the Inebriates Acts, 1879 and 1888, the Court, in lieu of sentencing such person to imprisonment, may, if it think fit, make an order for his detention for any period named in the order not exceeding twelve months in a retreat under the said Acts, the licensee of which is willing to receive him, and the said order shall have the like effect, and copies thereof shall be sent to the local authority and Secretary of State in like manner as if it were an application duly made by such

person and duly attested by two justices under the said Acts ; and the Court may order an officer of the court or constable to remove such person to the retreat, and on his reception the said Acts shall have effect as if he had been admitted in pursuance of an application so made and attested as aforesaid, provided that—

- (a) An order for the detention of a person in a retreat shall not be made under this section unless that person, having had such notice as the Court deems sufficient of the intention to allege habitual drunkenness, consents to the order being made ; and
- (b) If the wife or husband of such person, being present at the hearing of the charge, objects to the order being made, the Court shall, before making the order, take into consideration any representation made to it by the wife or husband ; and
- (c) Before making the order the Court shall, to such extent as it may deem reasonably sufficient, be satisfied that provision will be made for defraying the expenses of such person during detention in a retreat.

This Act repeals the Prevention of Cruelty to and Protection of Children Act, 1889, and the Cruelty to Children (Amendment) Act, which received the royal assent on the 20th of July of this present year.

The Parliamentary Session commencing so late as March 12th, very much diminished the chances of private members proceeding with their Bills ; the opportunities of private members were further materially curtailed by the Government absorbing all the time of the House from the 31st of May to the end of the session.

After the first reading Sir Wilfred Lawson put down the Liquor Traffic Local Veto (England) Bill for second reading on the 9th of May ; Mr. John Wilson (Govan) the Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill for the same date ; Mr. Wm. Johnston the Intoxicating Liquors Local Veto (Ireland) Bill for May 30th ; and Mr. Bowen Rowlands the Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Wales) Bill for April 11th ; but the exigencies of the Government were such that they absorbed so much time that none of the above dates were available.

## THE VANGUARD.

---

With the present number the second volume of THE VANGUARD will be completed.

Our journal has met with very warm approval; strong commendatory statements concerning it have been made by leading journals and active friends of the temperance cause.

It has not, however, met with such financial support as would warrant its being carried on on the present plan. One reason suggested for this has been that the price, two dollars per year, as been so large as to prevent its being subscribed for by many persons who would otherwise desire to receive it regularly.

After having been published for a year it is thought that THE VANGUARD might be reduced in size without materially affecting its value, inasmuch as the volumes already issued and available contain a vast amount of information, the result of many years' experience, which information it is not needful to repeat at present. In view of these facts we have decided to issue THE VANGUARD for 1895 in the same form as before, but making each number smaller, and to reduce the subscription price.

Subscribers who are still paid up in advance to any extent will therefore have the remaining period of their paid subscription time doubled, so that they will receive the full amount of literature and information anticipated.

On this changed plan we hope for a large increase in our subscription list, and we respectfully appeal to those who appreciate the work we are doing for their earnest co-operation in the attainment of that result.