

THE VANGUARD.

MARCH-APRIL, 1894.

MORE ABOUT THE ONTARIO PLEBISCITE.

Last month we published details of the voting in the Ontario plebiscite of January 1st last. Our statement showed the total number of men and women respectively voting for and against prohibition, with the majorities in each case. We herewith add a table showing (1) total number of men voting, (2) total number of men's names on the voters' lists, (3) total number of women voting, (4) total number of women on voters' lists, (5) the number of ballots deposited, but rejected in the count because of being unmarked, wrongly marked or spoiled. This table, along with that published last month, will give our readers all the information to be found in the official report. The number of spoiled ballots should, of course, in a great many cases, be added to the number of votes cast, as they were marked by persons who intended to vote but did not know how to do so properly.

	Total men's votes polled	Total men on voters' list.	T't'l women's votes polled	T't'l wom'n on voters' list.	Spoiled ballots.
<i>Counties—</i>					
Brant.....	2,573	4,794	177	510	81
Bruce.....	9,708	15,002	325	846	317
Carleton.....	4,109	7,752	110	417	124
Dufferin.....	3,466	6,019	133	355	54
Elgin.....	5,360	9,601	208	800	274
Essex.....	6,226	10,134	218	611	178
Frontenac.....	3,871	6,733	79	307	119
Grey.....	10,092	18,396	362	1,066	383
Haldimand.....	3,880	5,783	150	467	160
Halton.....	3,056	5,695	165	553	126
Hastings.....	6,479	11,642	246	716	223
Huron.....	11,068	16,793	450	1,214	414
Kent.....	7,749	12,389	272	854	281
Lambton.....	8,847	15,125	376	1,002	300
Lanark.....	4,062	8,376	216	719	179
Leeds and Grenville....	8,106	13,220	415	1,221	314
Lennox and Addington.	4,170	6,815	199	575	159
Lincoln.....	3,787	5,393	152	526	138
Middlesex.....	9,805	16,309	460	1,385	430
Norfolk.....	4,379	7,994	232	702	149
Northumberland and Durham.....	9,608	15,131	490	1,385	430
Ontario.....	7,346	10,732	407	1,009	198
Oxford.....	8,153	12,619	560	1,208	312
Peel.....	3,936	6,305	194	542	144
Perth.....	6,395	9,851	211	627	178
Peterborough.....	3,475	6,580	119	440	119
Prescott and Russell...	4,640	8,681	95	355	61
Prince Edward.....	3,399	5,588	152	463	141
Renfrew.....	4,845	9,729	139	379	119
Simcoe.....	10,356	20,728	429	1,360	464
Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry.....	9,275	16,578	419	1,255	306
Victoria.....	4,549	8,777	192	616	144
Waterloo.....	7,329	12,255	436	1,012	235
Welland.....	4,470	6,916	243	796	162
Wellington.....	7,137	12,090	393	1,071	220
Wentworth.....	4,314	7,117	211	768	158
York.....	7,455	9,052	481	1,391	545
Haliburton (pro'v's'l co.)	577	1,454	2	31	16
Total.....	228,082	384,148	10,118	29,554	8,355

Districts—	Total men's votes polled	Total men on voters' list.	T't'l women's votes polled	T't'l wom'n on voters' list.	Spoiled ballots.
Muskoka.....	1,925	4,266	59	203	90
Manitoulin.....	582	1,118	21	41	16
Thunder Bay.....	798	1,811	37	97	59
Rainy River.....	560	1,397	6	28	31
Parry Sound.....	1,855	3,630	65	171	56
Nipissing.....	1,112	3,059	35	106	18
Algoma.....	1,255	2,975	28	132	50
Total.....	8,087	18,256	251	778	320
<i>Cities—</i>					
Belleville.....	1,367	2,875	179	446	29
Brantford.....	2,168	3,325	231	503	111
Guelph.....	1,557	2,790	148	367	96
Hamilton.....	6,701	10,911	592	1,514	504
Kingston.....	2,131	3,921	231	604	143
London.....	4,249	7,616	383	1,066	225
Ottawa.....	5,121	10,544	332	1,055	115
St. Catharines.....	970	2,055	100	462	37
St. Thomas.....	1,446	3,131	108	353	96
Stratford.....	1,146	2,760	94	323	45
Toronto.....	20,086	42,163	1,287	5,006	1,213
Windsor.....	1,322	3,064	130	399	120
Total.....	48,264	95,155	3,815	12,098	2,734
<i>Separated Towns—</i>					
Aylmer.....	374	58	50	116	
Chatham.....	1,387	2,349	155	446	96
Perth.....	267	669	35	169	10
Prescott.....	395	735	25	127	21
St. Mary's.....	542	904	90	192	
Trenton.....	336	1,029	45	135	9
Toronto Junction.....	732	1,364	39	202	45
<i>Separated Township—</i>					
Peele Island.....	115	175	5	16	8
Total.....	4,148	7,810	444	1,403	189
Combined totals.....	288,581	515,369	14,628	43,833	11,598

HIGH LICENSE.

In the first number of *THE VANGUARD* Mr. A. G. Wolfenbarger, of Nebraska, discussed at some length the respective merits of the high license and prohibition methods of dealing with the liquor traffic. His article furnished a great deal of valuable evidence relating to his own state and to the working there of high license.

This method of dealing with the liquor traffic has the support of a great many earnest friends of the temperance cause, who believe that it will be found an important agency in curtailing the traffic and therefore mitigating the evils of intemperance. It is, on the other hand, opposed by equally earnest friends of the cause, who believe that the system will tend to strengthen the hold of the liquor traffic upon the community, thus making it more permanent without materially lessening its evil results. They also object to it because of conscientious opposition to the idea of licensing or in any way legally recognizing the liquor traffic as to be under any circumstances permitted.

The friends of high license argue that it lessens the number of bar-rooms, and places those remaining in the hands of a better class of persons. They also argue that the system imposes upon the traffic a number of severe restrictions, and that the liquor sellers submitting to these and paying heavily for the privilege of selling will be likely to make special effort to suppress illicit sale of liquor. They thus expect the law to largely restrict both legalized and illicit liquor selling.

It is a common practice with temperance reformers to denounce all license laws as bad. They declare such laws to be sinful, and they oppose them as a matter of principle. There is at first sight an apparent reasonableness in this position that may be to some extent misleading. Nearly

all license laws have really in view two objects:—(1) the restriction of the liquor traffic; (2) the raising of revenue. Different licensing acts contain numbers of clauses dealing with each of these matters, but all united in the one act. The principle of raising revenue from what degrades the community is utterly bad. In the absence of total prohibition, legislation restricting the liquor traffic is good. It is, therefore, unwise to denounce indiscriminately all legislation short of prohibition, such a course tending in many cases to create prejudice against really useful measures; that is, measures purely restrictive or prohibitive in their character.

It is manifest that all the prohibitory or restrictive features of license laws, including even such numerical restrictions as high license laws are said to impose, could be obtained by enactments which had in them no revenue-raising provisions. All that high license laws secure of restriction they could secure without high license. It is therefore absurd to argue in favor of a high license fee, because that fee is provided for in a law that otherwise is rigidly restrictive towards the liquor traffic. Moreover the high license principle, even where restriction results from its operation, is vicious, inasmuch as it does not condemn, but rather sanctions, the selling it prevents. That selling is provided for and may be carried on wherever dealers are willing to pay for the privilege, or can do business to such an extent as to make it profitable. The same restriction indirectly secured by a high license fee could be as readily secured by a direct enactment, which would have the advantage of being more honest and more certain in operation. It must be borne in mind, therefore, that the magnitude of the license fee actually paid has no right to be credited with any of the improvement that may have temporarily been found in any locality as the result of a law in which the high license principle is embodied.

Just as the good done by the restrictive features of a low license law is not due to the lowness of the license, so the good done from stringent restrictions in a high license law is not to be credited to the largeness of the license fee.

Notwithstanding the fact that high license laws have generally some very restrictive features, and that the high license feature may have some restrictive results, it is safe to say that these laws have been nearly everywhere disappointing in their operation. Indeed, it may be shown that the magnitude of the license fee, although temporarily restrictive in its effect, actually leads to increased liquor selling, and results in evil.

Under high license there is usually at first a smaller number of licenses issued than there would be if a lower fee was charged. The higher fee, however, requiring a larger investment in the liquor business, leads to more energy and effort in pushing that business. Moreover, the licenses are likely to be held by men of larger means. The traffic has more capital in it and behind it. Bar-rooms are made more attractive and seductive. More liquor is sold in them. More drink-selling always means more drink appetite developed. There is a greater demand for liquor. The increased demand is followed by an increased supply. More licenses are issued. The liquor traffic grows greater and more productive of evil than it would have been under a lower license fee. It must be remembered that it is the attractive bar, not the low groggery, that leads most young men astray. Higher license means more seductive bar-rooms. Further, under high license the liquor traffic yields a larger revenue. This gives it a firmer hold upon the community and makes it more difficult to get rid of. Strong supporters of the liquor traffic argue for high license as a means of retarding and preventing total prohibition.

When any other results have been attained under high

license they have been attained, as has been shown, by other kinds of legislation which were put into operation along with the high license system. Sometimes prohibitory measures have been incorporated in statutes providing for high license, and such measures have done good, but the good was in no sense the result of the high license. For example, if a law were passed fixing a high license fee and closing bars at 8 o'clock every evening, the early closing, if enforced, would do good, but the high license would not be the cause of that good, which might be even greater if the law simply closed the bar early without raising the fee.

High license, therefore, almost always brings about four results :

1. An increase in the attractiveness and the ruin-working character of the liquor traffic.
2. An increase in the consumption of strong drink.
3. An increase in drunkenness and its attendant evils.
4. A positive keeping back of the prohibition movement.

The article referred to in the November VANGUARD gave important information relating to the history of the high license movement and the attitude towards it of the liquor traffic. The fact that this traffic advocates high license is in itself a practical demonstration of the fact that high license aids the traffic on the lines already indicated.

Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls, in their valuable publications, the *Cyclopædia of Temperance*, the *Political Prohibitionist* and *The Voice*, have laid before the public an array of statistics showing that the favor of the liquor traffic for the system under consideration is well founded. The statistics are so important and conclusive that we cannot do better than reproduce them to a great extent for the benefit of our readers, and we are, therefore, under obligation to the source named for nearly all the remaining part of this article.

In 1888 there was published a table compiled from the reports of the United States Internal Revenue Commissioner for the year ending June 30, 1887, comparing the liquor traffic in the representative high license, low license and prohibition States. This table showed \$2.11 per capita of liquor revenue collected in the high license States, \$1.72 per capita collected in the low license States and 34 cents per capita collected in the prohibition States. This indicated a volume of liquor traffic in the high license States in 1887 considerably in excess of the volume in the low license States, and seven times greater than in the prohibition States. Although the law has materially changed in several of the States since this comparison was made, the facts are still valuable as showing the failure of high license to curb the liquor traffic. Below we give the detailed comparison, with its accompanying summary and explanatory statement:

VOLUME OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN THE HIGH LICENSE,
LOW LICENSE AND PROHIBITION STATES.

High License States. (\$300 to \$1,000.)	Population, 1888.*	No. U. S. Special Tax permits is- sued to sell liquors.	Total U. S. rev- enue from liquors.
Illinois	3,437,810	12,966	\$23,213,673 00
Massachusetts	2,005,763	8,216	2,010,647 24
Michigan	2,078,658	7,068	634,905 53
Missouri	3,125,000	7,408	4,543,415 01
Nebraska†	1,600,000	3,627	2,305,492 80
Texas	2,705,967	3,889	146,228 84
West Virginia	786,500	841	306,577 09
Total	15,739,698	44,015	\$33,160,939 51

*Estimated in the "World Almanac.

†Including the Territory of Dakota.

Low License States. (Less than \$200.)			
Colorado	410,000	2,361	\$196,863 69
Delaware 	150,000	709	59,310 12
Indiana	2,400,000	6,030	4,004,036 05
Kentucky	1,940,585	4,028	10,895,551 13
Louisiana	1,000,000	4,987	242,110 83
Maryland§	1,336,931	6,627	1,873,596 90
Nevada¶	265,500	1,024	61,671 81
New Jersey	1,330,000	8,441	1,927,042 53
New York	5,709,969	35,870	9,668,753 58
Pennsylvania	5,074,527	21,779	4,840,992 32
Total	19,617,512	91,856	\$33,769,928 96

Prohibition States.			
Iowa	1,824,840	3,978	\$1,740,267 63
Kansas	1,600,000	2,247	75,637 55
Maine	660,139	1,030	20,000 06
New Hampshire	378,000	1,435	357,303 08
Rhode Island	310,000	1,246	102,175 98
Vermont	336,000	507	12,955 16
Arkansas (a)	1,200,000	595	60,971 76
Florida (a)	375,000	326	10,735 42
Georgia (a)	2,041,669	1,725	263,764 68
Tennessee (a)	1,700,000	1,640	866,742 33
Total	10,425,668	14,739	\$3,510,573 65

‡ Including the Territory of Wyoming.

|| Including two counties of Virginia and two of Maryland.

§ Including the District of Columbia.

¶ Including the Territory of Utah.

(a) Almost entirely under prohibition by local option.

SUMMARY OF THE TABLE.

	No. of population to one special tax permit.	Liquor revenue per capita.
High license States.....	358	\$2.11
Low license States.....	214	1.72
Prohibition States.....	708	.34

The figures in the above table were arrived at without taking into account the large areas of prohibition in several of the high license States and the comparatively small areas of license in the nearly prohibition States of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia and Tennessee. It must be remembered, too, that a permit issued to sell liquor in a prohibition State may be a permit to sell for the excepted lawful mechanical and medicinal purposes, and does not necessarily represent an illegal liquor dealer. It may represent merely an attempt to sell liquor, the holder of the permit being in jail for his attempted violation of the prohibitory law.

This table shows that while there were 40 per cent. fewer liquor dealers on the basis of population in the high license than in the low license States, yet the strength of the liquor traffic in the high license States, as shown by its contribution to the Federal revenue, was 23 per cent. greater than in the low license States.

Since the making of the above comparison the Internal Revenue Department has so changed its method of reporting that a similar comparison at the present time is practically impossible. The facts for high license, low license and prohibition States are now often lumped together and reported as from a single "collection district," which makes it impossible to give the facts for the separate States. We have, however, the sales of beer reported

annually from each separate State since 1887. These reported sales indicate that since the date of the above comparison high license has in no wise restricted the volume of the liquor traffic. On the contrary, the reports show an increase in the sale of beer in the principal representative high license States of over 66 per cent. since 1887.

These States, with the license fees charged by them, are as follows :

States.	License fee for saloons.
Illinois.....	\$500
Massachusetts.....	\$1,000 to \$2,000
Michigan.....	\$500
Minnesota.....	\$1,000
Missouri.....	\$500 to \$1,000
Nebraska.....	\$1,000
Pennsylvania.....	\$500 to \$1,000. Changed from low license in 1888.

The aggregate quantities of beer sold in these seven States are as follows :

Year.	Barrels of beer.
1887.....	7,182,459
1888.....	7,903,437
1889.....	8,003,748
1890.....	8,592,194
1891.....	9,871,328
1892.....	10,376,673
1893.....	11,534,915

HIGH LICENSE AND CRIME.

The records go to show that high license is as ineffective in lessening drunkenness and crime as it is in lessening the

volume of the liquor consumed. This fact was clearly evidenced in a comparison made by *The Voice* in its issue of October 17, 1889, and the facts brought out at that time have never been contradicted or refuted. In a comparison of the police reports for 1888 of 41 high license cities of the United States with 38 representative low license cities it was shown that the arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in the 41 high license cities were 1 for every 39 of population, while similar arrests in the 38 low license cities numbered 1 for every 39.7 of population. This showing against high license was still further increased when the arrests for drunkenness and disorder were compared with the total number of arrests. In the 41 high license cities, with an annual average license fee of \$665 for each saloon, it was found that 56.4 per cent. of the total arrests were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. On the other hand, in the 38 low license cities, with an average annual license fee of \$122 for each saloon, but 52.9 per cent. of the total arrests were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, a decrease of three and one-half per cent. as compared with the high license cities. At the same time it was shown that the low license cities contained nearly three times as many saloons in proportion to population (having 1 for every 144 inhabitants) as the high license cities, which averaged a saloon to every 387 of population. The figures for all the cities were treated exactly alike, and the fact that the total population of each class of cities was almost exactly the same—being 4,775,000 for the 41 high license cities and 4,857,000 for the 38 low license cities—still further shows the fairness of the comparison and increases the value of the facts brought out.

In 1891 the same journal made a still more extended comparison of the police statistics of 102 cities of the

United States. The figures of arrests were for the police year 1890, and they included reports from :

Twenty cities having an annual saloon license of \$1,000 and over ;

Twenty-six cities having an annual saloon license between \$500 and \$900, inclusive ;

Sixteen cities having an annual saloon license between \$250 and \$423, inclusive ; and

Forty cities having an annual saloon license of \$200 and under.

Almost substantially the same conclusions were shown as in the previous comparison.

The 20 cities with license fees averaging \$1,050 had an average population of 66,420 each, with one saloon to every 773 of population, one arrest to every 16.3 of population, while 62.9 per cent. of the total arrests were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

The 26 cities, with license fees averaging \$525 each and an average population of 136,047, had one saloon to every 321 of population, one arrest for every 22.9 of population, 52 per cent. of the total arrests being for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

The 16 cities, with an average license fee of \$245 and an average population of 79,618, had one saloon to every 155 of population, one arrest to every 19.5 of population, 53.1 per cent. of the total arrests being for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

The 40 cities, having an average license fee of \$132 and an average population of 100,316, had one saloon to every 182 of population, one arrest to every 16.2 of population, 52.1 per cent. of the total arrests being for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

In this comparison the high license cities, with an average license fee of over \$1,000 had lacking one-tenth of one per cent. as many arrests in proportion to population as the cities having the lowest license fees, while the proportion of arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in the highest license cities exceeded by over 10 per cent. the proportion of the same arrests in the lowest license cities, cities with medium license fees surpassing in lack of criminality both the other classes. This comparison was printed in detail in *The Voice* of May 7, 1891, and the facts brought out have never been combatted.

The same striking failure to reduce drunkenness and crime is shown in the police statistics for a series of years in particular cities that have changed from low license to high license. Chicago is a typical example of this class. In 1880 Chicago had 3,245 saloons paying a license fee of \$52 each. It was then a city of 503,000 population, having a total of 28,480 arrests. In 1884 Chicago raised all saloon license fees to \$500 each. Chicago's population increased from 503,000 in 1880 to 1,438,000 in 1892, or 186 per cent. During the same period her total arrests increased from 28,480 to 89,833, an increase of 215 per cent. From 1882, under low license, to 1892, the last year of high license for which we have the police statistics, arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in Chicago increased from 18,045 to 51,578, an increase of 185 per cent. Had high license been the restrictive measure claimed by its friends the increase of arrests for drunkenness and disorder should, it would seem, have shown some decrease instead of more than keeping even with the growth of the population. Below we give in detail the police statistics of Chicago, with the number of saloons and the annual saloon license fee, from 1880 to 1892, inclusive :

YEAR.	Saloon License Fee.	Number of Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Arrests for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct.	Barrels of Beer sold.
1880..					
1881..	\$52	3,245	28,480		
1882..	52	3,504	31,713		
1883..	52	3,759	32,800		
1884..	103	3,747	37,187	18,045	
1885..	\$150-\$500	3,365	39,437	21,416	
1886..	150-500	3,487	40,998	23,080	743,458
1887..	\$500	3,700	44,261	25,407	809,410
1888..	500	3,944	46,505	26,067	873,995
1889..	500	3,984	50,432	27,632	1,172,827
1890..	500	4,185	48,119	31,164	1,366,769
1891..	500	5,628	62,232	27,536	1,490,850
1892..	500	5,600	70,550	37,063	1,673,685
1893..	500	6,935	89,833	41,463	2,034,696
	500	6,802	51,578	2,634,860
				2,761,714

HIGH LICENSE FAILURES IN OTHER CITIES.

Statistics of a similar nature may be given almost indefinitely.

In 1878 Rockford, Ill., had 23 saloons paying an annual license fee of \$250 each, with 150 arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. In 1886 the same city had 26 saloons paying an annual license fee of \$600 each, with 305 arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

In 1885 Los Angeles, Cal., saloons paid an annual license of \$120 each and there were 702 arrests for drunkenness. In 1888 the license fee was \$600, with 1,428 arrests for drunkenness.

In 1883 Joliet, Ill., saloons paid \$50 license, and there

were 271 arrests for drunkenness. In 1888 the license was \$1,000, and there were 965 arrests for drunkenness.

In 1885 Lowell, Mass., saloons paid \$50 to \$300 for license, and arrests for drunkenness numbered 1,683. In 1888 the license fee was \$150 to \$600, and arrests for drunkenness numbered 3,041.

In 1885 Salem, Mass., was under \$150 license, and arrests for drunkenness were 706.* In 1888 Salem was under \$750 license, and arrests for drunkenness were 1,162.

In 1885 Detroit, Mich., was under \$300 license, and had 3,593 arrests for drunkenness. In 1888 Detroit was under \$500 license, and had 3,815 arrests for drunkenness.

In 1885 Grand Rapids, Mich., saloons paid \$300 license, and arrests for drunkenness were 510. In 1888 the saloons paid \$510 license, and arrests for drunkenness had increased to 722.

In 1886 Minneapolis saloons paid \$500 license, and there were 350 of them, with 1,839 arrests for drunkenness. In 1889 the license fee was \$1,000, with 244 saloons, and 2,558 arrests for drunkenness.

In 1887 St. Paul, Minn., saloons paid a license fee of \$100 each; there were 700 saloons in the city, and 2,494 arrests for drunkenness. In 1889 the license fee was \$1,000, with 386 saloons and 2,394 arrests for drunkenness.

In Winona, Minn., in 1887 the license fee was \$100, with 107 saloons and 183 arrests for drunkenness. In 1889 the license fee was \$1,000, with 39 saloons and 241 arrests for drunkenness.

As we have given above a striking table from the experience of the western city of Chicago, we may add the following figures for the eastern city of Boston and the southern city of Atlanta :

High License.

337

Boston, Mass.

Year.	License fee.	Arrests for Drunkenness.
1886.....	\$250	16,179
1887.....	350	19,141
1888.....	400	23,044
1889.....	1,000	24,991

Atlanta, Ga.

Year.	Law.	Arrests for Drunkenness.
1887.....	Prohibition	674
1888.....	\$1,000 license.	1,519

ANOTHER PERIL.

High license debauches and perverts the public conscience by accustoming people to the toleration of evil, when the evil is willing to pay liberally for the privilege of toleration. It is an appalling fact that in high license communities there is a growing tendency to deal with other iniquities on the same evil plan of making them legal for the sake of a license fee. Omaha, struck with the high license idea, actually licenses prostitution. On the first day of each month the wretched women who live by this awful sin go regularly to the police court and pay what is called a "fine." They are then allowed to carry on their nefarious business unmolested by law for a month, when they go up and pay again. The fines go to the school fund. In 1888, Omaha thus collected \$10,330, besides \$8,178 added, called "costs." Other high license cities do the same. The gambling evil is often treated the same way. The public grow greedy for money paid by those who are glad to pay it for permission to do wrong. Licenses are freely issued, and the curse of wrong-doing is always made greater where the infamous license idea is adopted and developed.

CANADA'S DRINK BILL FOR 1893.

The Tables of Trade and Navigation for the year ending June 30th, 1893, have been issued, and in them are found full statements of the quantities of imported alcoholic liquors entered for consumption in that year, and of the duties collected thereon. Omitting fusel oil, methylated spirits, elixirs and tinctures, perfumes and other toilet preparations not used for beverage purposes, we find the following to be the totals of the quantities and amounts of the said liquors and duties :

KIND OF LIQUOR.	GALLONS.	DUTY.
Ale, beer and porter . . .	329,653	\$ 68,947 97
Spirits of wine	280	596 07
Absinthe	576	1,225 11
Brandy	194,319	412,939 57
Cordials	14,931	31,730 17
Gin	413,381	874,440 09
Rum	82,287	174,868 86
Whiskey	201,907	427,340 82
All spirits N.O.P.	2,811	5,964 56
Wines of all kinds	495,239	358,368 01
Totals		\$2,356,421 23

On page 239 of the VANGUARD for January, 1894, will be found a statement showing the aggregate national revenue from liquors manufactured in Canada for the year under consideration to be \$5,156,816

Adding to this the duty on imported liquors we find that the total revenue derived by the Dominion Government from the liquor traffic in the year named was . . \$7,513,237

A statement of the liquor revenue collected in the year ending June 30th, 1892, will be found in detail on pages 5 and 6 of the VANGUARD for November last. It amounted to \$7,119,327

If we take, as was done before, the moderate figures submitted by the Finance Minister in 1883 as a fair estimate of the cost to the consumers of the different kinds of liquor we shall obtain the following as a statement of our direct national expenditure on intoxicating drinks in the fiscal year 1892-3.

GALLONS.	COST TO CONSUMER.
2,731,896 Canadian spirits at \$5	\$13,659,480
910,492 Imported spirits at \$6	5,462,952
17,157,879 Canadian malt liquor at 60 cents.	10,294,727
329,653 Imported malt liquor at \$3	968,959
495,239 Imported wines at \$5	2,476,195
<hr/> 21,625,159 Total	<hr/> \$32,862,313

A comparison of the figures for the year 1893 with those for 1892 is made in subjoined table :

Year.	Liquor consumed. Gals.	Outlay on Liquor.	Revenue collected.
1891-2..	21,256,922	\$31,774,805	\$7,119,327
1892-3..	21,625,159	32,862,313	7,513,237
Increase,	368,237	<hr/> \$1,087,508	<hr/> \$793,910

GREAT BRITAIN'S DRINK BILL.

Rev. Dawson Burns, D.D., has for a good while laid annually before the people of Great Britain, generally in the form of a letter to the London Times, a full statement of the amount of liquor entered for consumption in the United Kingdom and also a careful estimate of the cost of the same to the consumers. The statement for 1893 was published last month and is herewith submitted. It shows an encouraging decrease in the consumption of spirits and wine and a slight increase in the expenditure on beer. Those who wish to make a further comparison will find the figures of the consumption for 1892 on page 130 of THE VANGUARD for December, 1893.

In addition to the figures submitted and his deductions therefrom, Dr. Burns offers some remarks about the facts thereby evidenced, and also some interesting observations on the present position of the temperance and prohibition movement in Great Britain. It has, therefore, been deemed wise to reproduce his interesting article in full. It is as follows:—

In continuance of preceding annual statements I beg to lay before your readers the figures relating to the Annual Drink Bill for 1893. The quantities are taken from the trade and navigation accounts, and the estimated cost is based on data that have not been questioned:

Liquors consumed (1893).	Quantities consumed.	Retail cost.	Cost of liquors consumed in 1892.
British spirits (20s. per gallon).....	29,857,987	£29,857,987	£31,355,267
Foreign and colonial spirits (2s. per gallon)	7,869,836	9,443,803	9,776,627
Total spirits.....	37,727,823	39,301,790	41,131,894
Beer (1s. 6d. per gallon)	1,137,396,600	85,304,745	85,073,358
Wine (18s. per gallon).	14,164,771	12,748,294	13,161,010
British wines, cider, etc. (estimated).....	15,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
.....		£138,854,829	£140,866,262

There was an increased expenditure on beer of £231,387; but the decrease on British spirits was £1,497,280, and on foreign and colonial spirits £332,824, a total decrease on spirits of £1,830,104. There was also a decrease on wine of £412,716. The decrease on spirits and wine was thus £2,242,820, and, subtracting the increase on beer, the net decrease was £2,011,433, or a little less than 1½ per cent. on the expenditure of 1892.

As the population of the United Kingdom was estimated for the middle of 1893 at 38,429,992, the expenditure per head on intoxicating liquors was £3 12s. 3d., or £18 1s. 3d. for each family of five persons. But as many millions of persons, including children, take no intoxicating liquors, the average expenditure of consumers of such drinks was very much higher than £3 12s. 3d. The average expenditure per head was £3 13s. 11d. in 1892, £3 15s. in 1891, and £3 14s. 4d. in 1890.

The official returns enable us to estimate the consumption of each kind of liquor, in each of the three kingdoms, with the quantities and cost per head. This is done for 1893 in the following tables. In regard to spirits it may be assumed that the quantities charged duty in each king-

dom represent as nearly as possible the amounts consumed in each. Beer is transported from one country to another, but it may be assumed as regards Scotland that the quantity sent into it is about equal to that sent out of it ; but as to Ireland a very large quantity is made and pays duty which is sent to other parts of the United Kingdom. The tables, therefore, put one-half to the consumption of Ireland, and one-half to that of England. Of the wine consumed 80 per cent. is retained for England and 10 per cent. each for Scotland and Ireland.

Table 1.

	England.		Scotland.		Ireland.		United Kingdom.
	Quantities.	Per head	Quantities	Per head	Quantities.	Per head	
British spirits (gals)..	19,583,076	·66	6,105,419	1·49	4,169,492	·90	·78
Foreign and Colonial spirits (gals)..	6,498,958	·22	725,417	·18	645,461	·14	·20
Total spirits.	26,082,034	·83	6,830,836	1·67	4,814,953	1·04	·98
Beer (barrels)†..	28,765,522	·97	1,499,130	·37	1,329,698	·29	·82
Wine (gals)*.	11,331,817	·38	1,416,477	·34	1,416,477	·31	·37
British Wines, Cider, etc., (gals)..	14,000,000	·47	500,000	·12	500,000	·11	·39

†This is composed of 27,435,824 barrels paying duty in England, and 1,329,698 barrels paying duty in Ireland.

*This is 80 per cent. of the wine charged duty for consumption.

§The total quantities, having been already stated, are not here repeated, but the proportions per head are added.

Table 2.

	England.		Scotland.	
	Total cost.	Cost per head.	Total cost.	Cost per head.
British spirits	£ 19,583,076	£ s. d. 0 13 2	£ 6,105,419	£ s. d. 1 9 11
Foreign and colonial Spirits.....	7,798,750	0 5 3	870,500	0 4 3
Beer.	27,381,826	0 18 5	6,975,919	1 14 2
wine	77,666,909	2 12 3	4,047,651	0 19 9
British Wines	10,198,656	0 6 10	1,274,829	0 6 3
cider, etc..	1,400,000	0 0 11	50,000	0 0 3
	£116,647,391	3 18 5	£12,348,399	3 0 5
	Ireland.		United Kingdom.	
	Total cost.	Cost per head.	C't per h'd.	
British spirits.....	£ 4,169,492	£ s. d. 0 18 1	£ s. d. 0 15 6½	
Foreign & colonial spirits	774,553	0 3 4	0 4 11	
Beer.....	4,944,045	1 1 5	1 0 5½	
Wine.....	3,590,185	0 15 7	2 4 5	
British wines, cider, etc.	1,274,829	0 5 6	0 6 7½	
	50,000	0 0 3	0 0 9	
	£9,859,059	2 2 9	3 12 3	

As between the three kingdoms the expenditure per head on intoxicating liquors is highest in England, Scotland being second and Ireland third, the figures being £3 18s. 5d., £3 0s. 5d. and £2 2s. 9d.; but as between the kinds of liquors the expenditure is very unequal. Beer takes £2 12s. 3d. from each inhabitant of England, of Scotland 19s. 9d., and of Ireland 15s. 7d. With regard to ardent spirits it is different, England paying 18s. 5d. per head, Scotland £1 14s. 2d., and Ireland £1 1s. 5d. There

are no means of learning what proportion of the inhabitants of each kingdom at and over the age of 20 entirely abstain, and which country contains the largest proportion of the hardest drinkers.

It is very certain that, if all classes in the community were consulted, there is but one class that would defend the expenditure of so much money annually upon articles that are not necessary, and that produce results of the most injurious character. No other kind of articles costs so much to the consumer, and no other kind so contributes to the physical, mental, moral and spiritual degradation of the community. They are called intoxicating, because taken in comparatively small quantities they produce the symptoms known as intoxication, but it is a huge mistake to imagine that such symptoms must be apparent before injury is inflicted on the consumers, and through them on society. The official returns of drunkenness are sometimes adduced to show how small the drunkenness of the country is compared with the amount of drink consumed; but those who adduce these figures know that they offer nothing like a full account of the worst stages of intoxication, while they take no account of inferior stages of the vice, or of the vice in its more incipient forms.

In extolling the sobriety of our own age as compared with the more general drunkenness of past times much is often made of the absence from the tables of polite society of the hard drinking which once disgraced it. The reform is very pleasing, but does not necessarily imply a corresponding diminution in the quantity of alcoholic liquors consumed, and of their effect upon the human organism. The committee of the British Medical Association reported upon 4,234 cases of males above 25 years of age at the time of death, and of these 27.3 per cent. were stated to be "careless drinkers," 15.6 "free drinkers," and 16.3

"habitual drunkards," a total of 59.2 per cent. of deaths among persons who could not be classed as "abstainers" or "temperate." It would be rash to infer that of the males living above 25 years of age the proportion of the non-temperate is equally large, but the side-light thus cast on our social condition is a very strong light, and calculated to suppress any peculiar exultation over the high state of virtue to which we have attained in this respect.

One of the most discouraging signs is the opposition of the leaders of one great political party to any legislation that would serve to discourage drinking and diminish its social evils. The cry that teetotallers are fanatics and propose unreasonable measures does not avail here. For first, the teetotallers as a body have proposed nothing at all; secondly, proposals made by different associations have taken into account the necessity of a strong public opinion; and thirdly, when the "moderate" measures, so loudly called for, have been proposed, the "moderate" people have been immoderately disinclined to support them. In the House of Lords, where the influence of the Conservative leaders is paramount, neither the bill of the Bishop of Chester nor that of the Bishop of London received the courtesy of a second reading.

What makes the situation the more intolerable is the absence of any proof that, in their non possumus attitude, the leaders of the Opposition are representing the wishes of their own political allies. That the drink question is essentially a local one even the Opposition leaders admit, but they wish to clog the local reference by conditions that would make it of no effect. Mr. Disraeli showed that there was one who could discern the point to which a blunt obstinacy was exposing his party. Is there no one among the leaders or rank and file of the great Conservative party that can rescue it from its present subjection to

the liquor interest? Is there no man of influence so wise and so bold as to say, "This is a people's question, and we ought not to let it be said that we did our utmost to prevent its settlement by the people themselves?" If both parties in the State would patriotically unite in a great effort against the nation's curse, the drink bill might be reduced in less than a single decade to less than one-half of its present amount, with the result of proportionately diminishing the greatest impediments to national progress and strengthening every element of national prosperity.

ti
kin
me
san
dru
Ab
wh

NOTABLE OPINIONS ON BIBLE WINES.

A great deal of controversy has been carried on over the question of the nature and effects of the drinks spoken of in the Holy Scriptures under the name of wine.

One class of scholars holds that the name "Wine" invariably represented an intoxicating liquor, and that the evils represented as resulting from it and the warnings concerning it have simply reference to excesses in its use.

Others hold that in the Bible are mentioned two kinds of wine, one unfermented, non-intoxicating, which is recommended and praised; the other fermented, intoxicating, which is forbidden and denounced. These different opinions are respectively set out in the two following statements, the paragraphs of the first of which are taken from an article by Rev. Howard Crosby, and those making up the second being taken from a work by Dr. John Ellis. They are simply given here as clear strong statements of the different theories.

1.—THE ONE-WINE THEORY.

"No one in reading the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, without prejudice, would imagine that there were two kinds of wine, intoxicating and the non-intoxicating, mentioned in the Holy Book. He would find that the same word for wine is used for that which Noah drank to drunkenness, and that which Melchizedek brought forth to Abraham; for that which is called a "mocker," and that which was used as a drink-offering at God's altar; for that

which inflames man and that which makes glad man's heart; for that which figures God's wrath and man's wickedness, and that which figures our Lord's salvation." * * * "In the New Testament he would find the same thing. The same word in Greek is used for that which Jesus drank and made and that whose excess is deprecated. In neither Testament is the slightest hint given that there was a difference in these drinks. * * * "Wine is grape juice fermented. Grape juice left to itself will ferment. To prevent fermentation and keep it sweet there is need of elaborate restrictive processes, and they are these that Pliny and Columella refer to, but no where do these and other ancient authors refer to these preserved juices as the wine of commerce and the country. They are extraordinary productions, while wine, intoxicating wine, is the only thing known by the name to the ancient poets and essayists."

"In all the poets of Greece and Rome, such as Anacreon and Horace, we find wine constantly mentioned as an intoxicating drink, if taken to excess. No one in reading these classics would ever suspect there were two kinds of wine, the intoxicating and the unintoxicating. We cannot prove a negative by quotations. We declare that no ancient author hints even at two kinds of wine, the intoxicating and unintoxicating, as the ordinary wine drunk by the people, and it is for the two-wine advocates to prove their position by a single honest quotation."

"The two-wine theory is a modern affair. It began in our own century with a few excellent men who longed to meet the intemperance of the day with a new argument, and who said that the ordinary interpretation of the word "wine" in the Bible was an obstacle to the theory and practice of total abstinence. They honestly thought that they detected a difference in terms and expressions, both

in the Hebrew and the Greek, on which they could base their theory."

"We hazard nothing in saying that the present scholarship of the world repudiates the story in toto. Etymologically, historically and scientifically, the theory is condemned by every scholar who has given his thought and study to it in late years."

"We have examined scores of books that advocate the theory and have yet to find the first evidence of its truth. It is purely an invention, honestly prompted in minds to which the wish was father to the thought, and naturally grasped by the earnest advocates of total abstinence."

2.—THE TWO-WINE THEORY.

"The careful reader of his Bible cannot but notice that there are two kinds of wine spoken of; one which is good and useful, of which we may partake freely, for it is purely from the fruit of the vine—'A good gift of God;' a 'Wine which cheereth God and man,' 'Wine that maketh glad the heart of man,' of which we are told to 'drink abundantly.' The other kind of wine is manifestly of a totally different character, for it is compared to 'the poison of serpents,' 'the poison of dragons' and 'the cruel venom of asps.' On this wine we are told not even to look, for it causes woe, sorrows, contentions, babbling, wounds without cause and redness of eyes. 'It biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder.'"

"In the Word we read of 'the new wine found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it.' 'They gathered wine and summer fruits very much.' And we read of 'presses bursting with new wine.' Surely these are not fermented wines."

"Horace, born 65 B. C. says that there is no wine sweeter to drink than Lesbian, and that it was perfectly harmless and would not produce intoxication. Aristotle,

born 384 B. C., says the wine of Arcadia was so thick that it was necessary to scrape it from the skin bottles in which it was contained, and to dissolve the scrapings in water. Columella and other writers who were cotemporary with the apostles, inform us that 'in Italy and Greece it was common to boil their wines' (Dr. Nott). There are various processes by which wines can be kept without fermentation which were well known and practiced by the ancients."

"Again, we should remember that the wines of Palestine are very sweet wines, which do not so readily ferment as wines containing less saccharine matter. Then the climate during the vintage season is very hot, and vinous fermentation will not take place at a temperature above seventy-five degrees, but instead we have the acetous and putrefactive processes, following speedily when the fresh grape juice is exposed to the air, so that in that climate it requires far greater skill and knowledge to manufacture and preserve fermented wine than to preserve the wine unfermented by the processes named above.

"The Rev. Dr. Herrick Johnson, after referring to the testimony of Plato, Columella, Pliny, Aristotle, Horace, Homer, Plutarch and Anthon in his Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, and Moses Stuart, and the testimony of the Sacred Scriptures, concludes as follows: There were, therefore, two kinds of wine in ancient use. The one was sweet, pleasant, refreshing, unfermented; the other was exciting, inflaming, intoxicating. Each was called wine. How natural now to say of the one, 'A blessing is in it—it maketh glad the heart.' How natural to say of the other, 'Deceit is in it—it bringeth woe and sorrow.' There is no difficulty now in the reconciliation of Scripture with Scripture."

Those of our readers who wish to study out this subject for themselves will find it discussed at length by various

theologians and other scientists. Mr. Stearns, the secretary of the N. T. Society of New York, has compiled from the arguments of eminent writers the subjoined series of quotations favoring the two-wine theory. This able summary of strong testimony will be of service to those who have not time to read up the arguments of the many authors who have taken part in the discussion of this question :

Sweet wine—that it will not intoxicate.—Aristotle.

Many of the wines of the ancients were not alcoholic.—F. R. Lees, Ph.D.

Sweet wine is that which has not yet fermented.—Chambers' Cyclopaedia.

The Greeks called it amethyston—a wine which would not intoxicate.—Columella.

Sweet wine is that which has not yet worked or fermented.—Rees' Cyclopaedia.

Red wine, but unfermented, was used at the Passover.—Very Rev. Barnett Clarke, A. M.

At the time of Christ the Israelites used both fermented and unfermented wines.—Axel Gustafson.

A wine which would not intoxicate, without spirit, and which of itself would not intoxicate.—Pliny.

The Hebrew terms translated wine refer occasionally to an unfermented liquor.—Prof. H. B. Hackett.

"The fruit of the vine" may be legitimately fermented or unfermented.—William B. Sprague, D. D.

My belief is strong that our Saviour never made or drank intoxicating wine.—Hon. E. C. Delavan.

Unfermented beverages existed and were a common drink among the ancients.—Wm. Patton, D. D.

The wine was sometimes preserved in its unfermented state and drunk as must.—Dr. Wm. Smith's Dictionary.

I have myself imported unfermented grape-juice from the East for the use of my family.—Norman Kerr, M. D., F.R.S.

Wine means primarily the juice, and often, as I believe, the unfermented juice of the grape.—Archdeacon F. W. Farrar.

We find that wine anciently was the mere expressed juice of the grape, without fermentation.—Clarke's Commentary.

The pen of inspiration only commends as good the pure and unintoxicating blood of the grape.—Chancellor R. H. Walworth.

The wines of the Bible were unintoxicating and alcoholic, the former were approved and the latter denounced.—J. A. Swaney, D.D.

You make plain the fact that there are two kinds of wine spoken of in the Bible—fermented and unfermented. Jacob Ide, D.D.

Modern Turks carry the unfermented wine always with them on long journeys.—Sir Edward Barry, on Wines of the Ancients, 1775.

All fermented liquors, of which grain is the basis, are leaven, and therefore strictly prohibited on the Passover.—Rabbi Isaac Lesser.

The Passover cup, therefore, contained pure, unfermented juice of the grape, that which is in reality the fruit of the vine.—Rev. A. S. Wells.

As wine was a common beverage in that land of vineyards, in its unfermented state our Lord most likely drank it.—John J. Owen, D. D.

In the Holy Land they do not commonly use fermented wines. The best wines are preserved sweet and unfermented.—Dr. S. M. Isaacs.

Your discriminations are just; they denote that there were two kinds of wine, and the Hebrew Scriptures justify this view.—Professor Seixas.

The wine Christ made corresponded to the wine of nature, and was unfermented and unintoxicating.—Abraham Coles, M.D., LL.D.

The wine of Judea was the pure juice of the grape without any mixture of alcohol, and commonly weak and harmless.—Albert Barnes, D.D.

You have the whole ground, and, in time, the whole Christian world will be obliged to adopt your views.—Prof. Geo. Bush to E. C. Delavan.

It is quite clear that in ancient times the word wine was used in reference to the unfermented juice of the grape.—R. B. Grindrod, M.D., author of *Bacchus*.

To me it seems that the purity and consistency of the Saviour's example in the matter of abstinence from fermented wine is perfect.—Felix R. Brunot.

I have no doubt whatever that the cup our Lord blessed when He instituted the Holy Supper was a cup of unfermented wine.—Dr. Close, Dean of Carlisle.

Unfermented wine is always mentioned with favor in the Scriptures; intoxicating wines are never spoken of approvingly in the Bible.—Richard Eddy, D.D.

We who use port wine in the observance of the Lord's Supper may be right; they who use the unfermented juice of the grape cannot be wrong.—Archbishop of York.

Facts show that the ancients not only preserved their wine unfermented, but regarded it as of a higher flavor and finer quality than fermented wine.—Prof. Moses Stuart.

That unintoxicating wine existed from remote antiquity, and was held in high estimation by the wise and good, there can be no reasonable doubt.—Eliphalet Nott, D. D.

I believe it is blasphemous to charge the Lord Jesus Christ with making, recommending to others, and Himself drinking intoxicating wines or liquors.—A. S. Cowles, D.D.

It (grape-juice) ordinarily has not a particle of intoxicating quality, being freely used by both Mohammedan and Christian.—Rev. Henry Horner, Missionary in Constantinople.

They allude to totally different kinds of wine—the one not intoxicating and harmless, and the other intoxicating and pregnant with the seeds of sin and sorrow.—J. B. Dunn, D.D.

The wines of Greece and Rome, like those of Palestine, were of both kinds, fermented and unfermented; and, according to Pliny, were of almost endless variety.—Geo. Duffield, D.D.

One look at the bloated body of a drunkard is enough to convince me that Christ at Cana of Galilee never made that kind of wine which so blights the body and destroys a soul.—Geo. W. Bain.

The unfermented juice of the grape and sap of the palm-tree are common and delightful beverages in India, Persia, Palestine and other adjacent districts.—Captain C. Stuart, of the Madras Army.

Twelve texts denounce wine as poisonous and venomous, nine expressly prohibit it in certain cases, and five totally prohibit it without any reference to circumstances at all.—William Ritchie, D.D.

It is pretty late in the nineteenth century to try to prove by all the old Hebrew and Greek lexicons that there is no difference between the "cup of the Lord and the cup of the devil."—Rev. J. C. Long.

All the Jews with whom I have ever been acquainted use unintoxicating wine at the Passover—a wine made in

this country expressly for the occasion, and generally by themselves.—Mr. A. C. Isaacs.

I think it is beyond dispute among the scholars of the first rank that at the Passover the wine used was non-intoxicating, and that our Lord instituted the Holy Supper with such wine.—Joseph Cook.

It is beyond dispute among scholars of the first rank that at the Passover the wine used was non-intoxicating, and that our Lord instituted the Holy Supper with such wine.—Encyclopedia Britannica.

There is good and conclusive evidence that there were two kinds of wine—fermented and unfermented. This truth is well maintained in the writings of the advocates of temperance.—Rev. J. G. D. Stearns.

Yayin and oinos simply meant the liquid that comes from pressing the grape. There is no evidence of any further idea associated with it. It was not fermenting fluid, but grape-juice.—Tayler Lewis, D.D.

The Moslems of Palestine make no fermented wine. They boil the juice down to preserve it, and they claim to have received this custom from the ancients.—Dr. Thompson, 45 years a missionary in the Holy Land.

This is the wine we see on the nights of the Passover, because it is free from fermentation, as we are strictly prohibited, not only from eating leavened bread, but from drinking fermented liquors.—Judge M. M. Noah.

So far as the Scriptures go they are in favor of a non-alcoholic wine. * * * I can no longer refrain from joining with those who demand the removal of intoxicating wine from the table of the Lord.—Wm. Reid, D.D.

There is evidence that the Jews did not use fermented wine in their Passover and other festivals, but, on the contrary, as they adhered religiously to unleavened bread they adhered also to unfermented wine.—A. A. Miner, D.D.

The evidence is conclusive to me that the element upon the Passover-table in the "upper room" was the unfermented juice of the grape, that which from the beginning of the world has had "a blessing in it."—A. B. Rich, D.D.

The distinction between good and bad wine, between the natural and the fermented "blood of the grape," is a clear distinction in which the ancient Jewish and Christian abstainers acted as well as the later Mohammedans.—F. R. Lees, Ph.D.

The juice of grapes exists in two totally different states—the one unfermented and the other fermented. The unfermented juice has been preserved for years by various processes described by ancient writers and practiced at this day.—John Ellis, M.D.

The wine that did not intoxicate and was not used to intoxicate, or sought to intoxicate, was good—a blessing was in it. The wine that did intoxicate, and was sought for that purpose, was bad; it was pronounced a woe and a curse.—Prof. Tayler Lewis.

Thus there were two essentially different kinds of wine known to and used by the ancients. I desire to carry the argument no further. I am satisfied with having proved that both fermented and unfermented wines have always existed.—Norman Kerr, M.D.

In wine-producing countries unfermented wine can be made any day in the year. I travelled with a few bottles of it in my carriage over 2,000 miles, and upon opening

Notable Opinions on Bible Wines.

one of the bottles in Paris I found it the same as when first put up.—Hon. E. C. Delavan.

Within the pale of the Oriental churches, where Christianity was earliest established, and has, in many respects, been preserved in greatest purity, we find proofs of the long-established use of unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper.—Rev. Leon C. Field, D.D.

There are two kinds of wine used, and these were used by the ancients as well as by the moderns; the one is unfermented and perfectly harmless, while the other is fermented, producing intoxication and its consequent pernicious effects.—Rev. D. M. McClellan.

The theory that all ancient and Bible wines were alcoholic, and hence intoxicating, is a great stumbling-block in the way of teaching the principles of total abstinence to Christian converts from heathenism.—Rev. Charles Hartwell, 30 years missionary in China.

There are two kinds of wine made from grape-juice; the one unfermented, containing the nourishment found in the grape; the other fermented, having its nourishment destroyed by fermentation.—J. Mackenzie, M.D., Fellow of Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh.

Christ turned water into wine. What kind of wine? "Good wine." Yes, but intoxicating wine is bad wine, and unintoxicating wine is good wine, so that the wine at the marriage at Cana must surely have been unfermented and unintoxicating.—Norman Kerr, M.D., F.R.S.

Can the same thing, in the same state, be good and bad, a symbol of wrath and a symbol of mercy; a thing to be sought after and a thing to be avoided? Certainly not. And is the Bible, then, inconsistent with itself? No, certainly.—Eliphalet Nott, D.D., President of Union College.

I know what the Scripture means by "wine." It means sometimes quite literally the grape-cluster, the fruit of the vine. It means sometimes the unfermented juice, and sometimes, and perhaps most frequently, the fermented juice of the grape.—Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.

Whatever the learned doctors may say I believe in the two-wine theory of the Scriptures. Wine is commended and wine is condemned. The same generic word is used in both cases. The evidence is very clear that in the wine used by Christ in the Lord's Supper there was not a drop of alcohol.—A. C. Dixon, D.D.

The unfermented wine is lifted by the Saviour into a symbol of His atoning work and made a sacrament for His people forever. While fermented wine is left under the curse of God as a mocker and deceiver, full of all stings and fangs, giving only sorrow in this life and despair in the life to come.—C. H. Fowler, D.D.

Fermented, intoxicating wine is not the "fruit of the vine." Pure and unfermented and uncorrupted grape-juice, this is the "fruit of the vine." * * * Wine might be fermented or unfermented. * * * It was an open and impious transgression to introduce a fermented, intoxicating liquor at the Passover.—Rev. J. M. Van Buren.

Two essentially different kinds of wine have always been known and used in the West and East, and their essential difference consisted in this, that the one was fermented and intoxicating, the other was unfermented and un-intoxicating, and both kinds have always been known by the same name—that of wine.—Rev. S. D. Scammell.

All who know of the wines then used will understand the unfermented juice of the grape. The present wines of Jerusalem and Lebanon, as we tasted them, were commonly

boiled and sweet, without intoxicating qualities, such as we here get in liquors called wines. Those were esteemed the best wines which were least strong.—Wm. M. Jacobus, D.D.

The distinction in quality between the good and the bad wine is as clear as that between good and bad men, or good and bad wives, or good and bad spirits; for one is the constant subject of warning, designated poison literally, analogically and figuratively, while the other is commended as refreshing and innocent, which no alcoholic wine is.—F. R. Lees, Ph.D.

It appears manifest that this diversity of expression in Scripture proves beyond all reasonable doubt a difference of character between these wines. The conclusion seems irresistible that it is an innocent, unintoxicating wine which the Spirit of God in His Word commends; while it is a deleterious, inebriating wine which He condemns.—Wm. Ritchie, D.D.

The most esteemed and highly-valued wines of the ancients were totally different from what we now call wines, that they had nothing in common but the name, that they were unfermented and unintoxicating—as utterly incapable of producing intoxication as the milk which the infant draws from the mother's breast.—The Venerable Archdeacon Jeffreys.

When we compare the two assertions, "Wine is a mocker," and "Wine maketh glad the heart of man," it is scarcely possible to believe that the word "wine" means the same identical thing in both sentences. The juice of the grape is wholesome and nutritive. It is a cordial and a tonic, but after fermentation it loses its nutritious qualities and is indeed a "mocker."—Canon Hopkins.

There is a wine of some sort spoken of very frequently in the Bible with express disapprobation. And there is

also a wine spoken of very frequently, with express approbation. The wines of such different qualities and presented in such frightful contrast, were one and the same article, in one and the same state, would seem, even though history had been silent, quite incredible.—Eliphalet Nott, D.D.

My final conclusion is this, viz.: That whenever the Scriptures speak of wine as a comfort, a blessing, or a libation of God, and rank it with such articles as corn and oil, they mean—they can mean—only such wine as contained no alcohol that could have a mischievous tendency; that wherein they denounce it, prohibit it, they can mean only alcoholic or intoxicating wine.—Prof. Moses Stuart, D. D.

If people desired to go back literally and absolutely to the days of the institution of the Sacrament it would be a most difficult thing, if not impossible, to prove that the particular cup which their Master took in His hand in that solemn crisis of His life when He instituted the Holy Eucharist was fermented at all. There was abundant testimony to prove it was not.—Canon Wilberforce in London Spectator.

The writer has satisfied himself, by careful research, that in our Saviour's time the Jews, at least the high ritualists among them, extended the prohibition of leaven to the principle of fermentation in every form; and that it was customary at the Passover festival for the master of the household to press the contents of "the cup" from clusters of grapes preserved for this special purpose.—A. P. Peabody, D.D.

The Jews do not, in their feasts for sacred purposes, including the marriage feast, ever use any kind of fermented drinks. In their oblations and libations, both private and public, they employ the fruit of the vine—that is, fresh grapes—unfermented grape-juice and raisins as the symbol of benediction. Fermentation is to them always a symbol

of corruption, as in nature and science it is in itself decay, rottenness.—Dr. S. M. Isaacs.

That the Bible speaks of two kinds of wine there can be no doubt. It pronounces one of them a blessing and the other a curse. It teaches us to touch one of them, but not to touch the other. It employs one as the symbol of divine mercy, and the other as a symbol of divine wrath. It speaks of one as good and the other as bad. Now, it cannot be that the same beverage is meant by these opposite appellations.—Rev. Wm. M. Thayer.

When on the south coast of Italy last Christmas I inquired particularly about the wines in common use and found that those esteemed the best were sweet and unintoxicating. The boiled juice of the grape is in common use in Sicily. The Calabrians keep their intoxicating and unintoxicating wines in separate apartments. The bottles were generally marked. From inquiries I found that unfermented wines were esteemed the most.—Captain Treat, in 1845.

As to this argument from scholarship it is sufficient to say there are many and eminent authorities, inferior to none and superior to most in scholarship, who do unhesitatingly affirm the existence and use of unfermented wine in Bible lands and times. They have as complete access to the evidence in the case, and are as competent judges of its validity and bearing as either of the authors we have quoted, or as any of the authorities whom they have cited.—Leon C. Field, D.D.

“Moses Stuart’s Scripture View of the Wine Question” was the ablest contribution thirty years ago to the claim about unfermented wine. It still holds its place unanswered and unassailable. By his side stands Dr. Nott, head of Union College, with the snows of ninety winters on his brow. Around them gather scores of scholars and divines on both sides of the Atlantic. We do not claim

too much when we say that the weight of scholarly authority is on our side.—Hon. Wendell Phillips.

Altogether there are about a hundred and thirty warnings and admonitions in Scripture against intoxicating drinks, while there are not over twenty instances of distinct approval of wine, under all its names, in the whole Bible. And these passages, as far as the evidence is explicit, show the wine commended to be of an unintoxicating quality. All the other cases in which the word wine occurs are doubtful or neutral in this question, since they contain no proof either on the one side or on the other.—Wm. Reid, D.D.

In all the passages where good wine is named there is no lisp of warning, no intimations of danger, no hint of disapprobation, but always of decided approval. How bold and strongly marked is the contrast. The one the cause of intoxication, of violence and of woes; the other the occasion of comfort and peace. The one the cause of irreligion and of self-destruction; the other the devout offering of piety on the altar of God. The one the symbol of divine wrath; the other the symbol of spiritual blessings. The one the emblem of eternal damnation; the other the emblem of eternal salvation.—Wm. Patton, D.D.

It is sufficient here to state, for the satisfaction of the reader not acquainted with the original languages of the Old and New Testaments, or the history of discussions on the subject, that there is a broad, unmistakable and radical distinction recognized in the Hebrew text between fermented wines and drinks that intoxicate and the "new wine" and unfermented juice of the grape that does not, but is nutritious. The latter is not condemned, but called a blessing, as in Isaiah lxxv. 8. The former is disallowed and denounced when a judgment of them is expressed. The Scriptures never confound them, or use the names designating them as synonymous.—Geo. Duffield, D. D.

HON. NEAL DOW.

Many able pens have been busied during the past two months in writing sketches of the great father of American prohibitory law, who celebrated his ninetieth birthday on March 20th. We do not propose to add to this great array of well-earned commendation, but we subjoin a few letters that will be of special interest to Canadian readers. They were mainly written at the suggestion of Lady Henry Somerset and Miss Francis E. Willard, and show forcibly the good done by this great man and the hold he has upon the affection of the leaders of moral reform :—

[From Sir WILFRID LAWSON, Bart., M.P., President of the United Kingdom Alliance.]

Very few reformers have been so staunch, steady and unflinching in proclaiming the truth as Neal Dow has been. He got hold of the truth which one of our medical papers declared the other day that it had arrived at, viz. : "That the cause of drunkenness is DRINK." Basing himself in this truth for the generations he has worked for the overthrow of drink. Of course the numerous people who love to "tinker at symptoms" rather than strike at causes have slighted and despised his efforts, but yet his policy is stronger to-day than it has ever been. Let us hope and trust that he may live to see it virtually triumphant on both sides of the Atlantic. At any rate, on his coming birthday we can show how gratefully we appreciate his labors and honor his devotion to the cause of justice, progress and humanity.

Brayton, Carlisle.

WILFRID LAWSON.

[From Mr. W. S. CAINE, M.P.]

LONDON, England.

A few lines, indeed, expressive of my appreciation of Neal Dow and his work in the world—a few reams would not do it. His line is gone out through all the earth, and his words to the end of the world! I won't begin, lest I should never stop. All that I can say is that there is no speech nor language where his voice has not been heard.

W. S. CAINE.

[From Rev. CANON BASIL WILBERFORCE, M.A., Deanery, Southampton.]

How is it possible to express in a few sentences my appreciation of the noble, courageous, persevering work of General Neal Dow? Most reformers are willing sheets of paper circulating widely the truths with which they have been impressed; General Neal Dow is a block of type, and he has imprinted on the human race the eternal truth:

Hereditary bondsmen, know ye not

Who would be free himself must strike the blow?

When I was his guest at Portland I was deeply impressed by his gentle courtesy, his luminous intellect and his elevated moral sense. The world is the better that he has lived.

CANON BASIL WILBERFORCE.

[From Rev. J. IDRISYN JONES, of Welshpool, author of "The Slain by Drink in Liverpool."]

To General Neal Dow, on attaining his 90th birthday.

No longer young in years or deeds

Art thou, O dear and honor'd friend;

For Time's great bell is tolling out

Its ninetieth stroke; still thy brave heart

Beats on as if in manhood's prime;

Its moral pulse unweaken'd by departing days,
By length of years, it may be, gracious Heaven
Vouchsafes to stamp its own approval on thy work.
For in the fray against all human wrongs
Thou foughtest most against earth's crowning woe.
Thy native State, the oft-remembered Maine,
Has by thy magic wand cast off her chains ;
For through thy all-persistent voice she grasp'd
The law which makes her ever FREE.
Strong drink now owns thee Conqueror there ;
While other lands have felt the distant shock,
And wait the day of conquest for themselves.
Still may thy strong bow abide in strength
To help the armies of the living God ;
And when at last thine eyes shall gently close,
May the sheaves of good in brighter worlds be seen.

J. IDRISYN JONES.

[From "MOTHER STEWART," who was one of the chief
crusade leaders in Ohio in 1874.]

It is eminently befitting that we and ye join hands
across the seas in homage and congratulation to our
"Grandest Old Man" as he sits in his home to-day enjoy-
ing the consciousness of a long life full of noble warfare,
in which he never, except of joy, caused a tear to be shed.

I trust that the result of the demonstration in Exeter
Hall, and of the hundreds of similar associations in our
land, may be a spring-tide wave of enthusiasm for prohibi-
tion that shall sweep over both continents and stimulate
all our hosts to emulate the example of our peerless pro-
hibition.

[From Mrs. YOUNG, hon. president of the Dominion Woman's Christian Temperance Union.]

You do well to commemorate the birth^day of the veteran of the United States, who was the first to place on an earthly statute-book the prohibitory law of Heaven. Hon. Neal Dow's work has not only permeated his own country—it has inspired our Dominion with intense enthusiasm to strike for liberty against the greatest despot of our age—a legalized liquor traffic. It seems fitting now that the Republic and the Dominion should form an alliance with the Motherland to dethrone the great usurper. Canada is evidently on the eve of a grand emancipation. Never did the day of deliverance seem so near as at the present. Hon. Neal Dow's work has done much to hasten this glorious era.

[From Mr. J. N. STEARNS, ex-president and now cor. secretary and publication agent of the United States National Temperance Society.]

NEW YORK CITY.

The world takes off its hat to Neal Dow as he reaches his ninetieth mile-post. It is exceedingly appropriate that the hosts of temperance the world over should stand in review as he marches past. Here is health and long life to this valiant champion of cold water. Let total abstainers rejoice and prohibition exult on this anniversary occasion. We have a living embodiment of our principles before us. Our principles are true and righteous altogether. It was the drink that produced the woe, misery and mischief about him. He fought the traffic in intoxicating drink with all the impetuosity of his nature. He traversed the State of Maine from one end to the other, and sowed it "knee deep" with temperance literature until the sentiment was crystalized into law. There is no short cut to

prohibition. It comes from an enlightened conviction of the people that the "entire suppression of the traffic would be of an infinite advantage to the nation and an incalculable blessing to the people. All honor to the "grand old man from Maine."

J. N. STEARNS.

[From Hon. JOHN P. ST. JOHN, prohibition Presidential candidate.]

OLATHE, Kansas.

All saloon licenses are unconstitutional, unpatriotic, ungodly and barbarous, and the courts of last resorts will before very long so declare—and thus prohibition will triumph, the saloon will go down and out forever, our homes will rejoice and be glad. May God hasten the day! And no one will be entitled to greater credit for this result than our brave old leader, Neal Dow.

JOHN P. ST. JOHN,
Prohibition Presidential Candidate.

[From Mr. E. J. WHEELER, editor of the New York Voice.]

NEW YORK CITY.

In the contest for prohibition forty years and more ago, it is a significant fact that the saloon, as a political power, was hardly mentioned or seemingly recognized. Because of the vast moral and industrial evils imposed by the liquor traffic, such leaders as Neal Dow, Abraham Lincoln, Horace Greeley, Henry W. Raymond, Henry Ward Beecher, Dr. John Pierpont, James Gordon Bennett, Lucy Stone and William Lloyd Garrison were sweeping the nation into line for prohibition, and had fourteen States redeemed from the legalized dramshop when the more urgent, though no greater, issue of African slavery forced all other issues to the rear.

The moral and industrial evils of the liquor traffic have increased manifold since then. We have all the reason they then had for relentless war upon this curse. But, in addition, the saloons have in our day become an organized and arrogant political power, with its grip on both old parties, giving orders in legislative and congressional halls, dominating in caucus and primaries, and selling special privileges to corrupt moneyed corporations and trusts.

It is a reign of gin-mill statesmanship, and it is a struggle of far greater import to redeem this nation from the rule of the gin-mill than was the struggle in 1776 to redeem it from the rule of the King of England. Better a thousand times repeal the Declaration of Independence, burn up the Federal Constitution and turn this nation over to England than to turn it over to the gin-mills and the elements that are typified by the gin-mills. Better dismember the Union, State by State, than hand it over to the saloons. The fight which Neal Dow began it is ours to finish.

E. J. WHEELER.

[From Mr. A. G. WOLFENBARGER, member of the United States National Prohibition Committee.]

As our majestic monument of reform, General Neal Dow approaches his ninetieth birthday, he may thank God that his life has not been thrown away in the grandest reform the world has ever reluctantly acknowledged. A wonderful impression has been made on the thought of the world during the past fifty years. Drunkenness has almost disappeared from the pulpit, and liquor-drinking church members are in the minority to-day. The twentieth century will either witness the divorce of the Christian Church from the saloon, or the present church will be swept out

of power by the followers of Christ. The night of political immorality reigns to-day in church and State alike, but the morning cometh.

Reforms fight their way against the windmills of prejudice, superstition and political hatred, and then the world wakes up and quickly embraces the new faith. God grant that this most devilish system of human bondage shall perish soon in this beloved country, already stained with the blood of millions of murdered victims.

Detroit, Mich.

A. G. WOLFENBARGER.

[From Miss JUDGE THOMPSON, of Hellesboro, Ohio, who led the first praying band of the Women Crusade in 1874.]

The significant motto of George Washington used upon watch-seal, carriage-panel, etc., was a sentence from the Latin poet Ovid: "Exitus acta probat" (Actions are tested by results). On the part of the "White Ribbon" women of America, allow me to suggest, as most fitting and deserved, this sentiment for our Prohibition General Neal Dow. May it be engraven upon his crest and worn as a trophy of our gratitude.

[From Mr. JAMES WHYTE, secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance.]

Grosvenor Chambers, 16 Deansgate, Manchester,

February 14th, 1894.

DEAR SISTER WILLARD,—I regard the life of your friend, Neal Dow, as one of the most beneficent and fruitful of

modern lives. He is the father of what Goldwin Smith calls "Prohibitionism," an "ism" which is taking hold of the minds and consciences of the best men and women in Anglo-Saxondom ; which is destined to transform civilization, and to create the conditions necessary for the evolution of a domestic and public life, far purer, stronger and nobler than that of the present era. I don't know whether Neal Dow can properly be described as a great man ; that is, whether he has possessed such mass and momentum of intellect and character as constitute greatness. What is clear enough to me is that for the stupendous work he so boldly undertook he was admirably equipped. He has been pre-eminently a practical man ; not one of those who see visions and dream dreams in their waking hours.

He saw his duty a dead clear thing,
And he went for it there and then.

Of course he was gibed at and jeered at, argued with, railed against, denounced and condemned. Of course his friends frequently failed him at the pinch, and his enemies often seemed to triumph. Of course torrents of lies and malignant misrepresentations were from time to time poured in upon him. Both interest and stupidity assailed him with their combined forces—but he never flinched. Clear-headed, prompt, definite, tenacious, much-enduring, he went on arguing, demonstrating, refuting ; met all gain-sayers with trenchant reasonings and facts that would na' and could na' be disputed. And this, in the sight of all beholders, he has unquestionably achieved. Helped by those he had gathered around him, he has, in a self-governing community, and throughout the lifetime of a generation, maintained a polity which those who deemed themselves the wise and prudent held to be impossible ; and by so doing he has given an object lesson of inestimable value

to all drink-cursed communities. On the whole, I know of no other life which in this generation has affected so many other lives for good.

Yours very sincerely,

JAMES WHYTE.

[From Dr. F. R. LEES, F.S.A., Edin.]

WATFORD, February 16th, 1894.

DEAR LADY HENRY,—On the 20th March I shall (D.V.) be at Liverpool, joining in the same celebration which you so worthily propose in London.

Looking at the amount of practical good realized by the earnest, intelligent and unremitting agitation for suppressing the legalized temptation of the traffic in intoxicants by the Hon. Neal Dow, I know of no man of his century engaged in any sphere of social activity who ought to be more satisfied with the far-reaching results than he. His vast preventive charity transcends every other form of philanthropy, for it is even now operative in thousands of localities—in towns, villages and states—blessing with peace and industry millions of hearts and homes, and making almshouses, hospitals, penitentiaries and prisons needless over a vast extent of territory. The perception of the truth of temperance as the basis of civilization—*mens sana in corpore sano*—needed its application in sanitary law, not less in regard to the living house than to the habitation of brick and stone. It is Neal Dow who has the illustrious honor of having, by his persistent zeal, his keen intelligence, his indomitable courage and his “single eye” to duty, first made his native State an object lesson to all the world; and in my judgment he most truly honors this “Grand Old Man” of Maine, who, by consistent voice and vote, does most to apply Mr. Dow’s social

demonstration to his own parish and his own country. To me personally, as a lieutenant in the same army of philanthropy, General Dow has been an inspiration—an example of constant vigilance. It was in the year 1853, at the World's Temperance Convention in New York, where I represented the British Temperance League, that I first met Mr. Dow, whom the Maine law had made so notable ; and along with him the famous men and women of the anti-slavery party, such as Lloyd Garrison, Gerrit Smith, Wendell Phillips, Lucretia Mott and Frederic Douglass, of whom only the last survives ; but their successful cause is the prophesy of the success of ours. At that convention the speaking and voting of colored persons was disputed, when Neal Dow boldly championed their rights, which, to the best of my power, I seconded ; and we succeeded. That ripened into a friendship never broken—a brotherhood of thought, feeling and work. Since then I have enjoyed many happy days at his hospitable house in Portland, with his amiable family. In America, Great Britain and on the continent I have travelled thousands of miles in his company, and all my intercourse with him has tended only to increase my love for the man, and my admiration of the patriot and the reformer. His simplicity of life, his courtesy and consideration, and his wonderful absorption in his work, proclaim him to be a good as well as a great man.

In five visits I have paid to Maine I have beheld the palpable and ever-increasing signs of social, moral and industrial improvement resulting from prohibition of the drink disturber, varying of course with the rigor or the laxity of the law's enforcement (just as with all law, and with our own license law) under different and sometimes party-corrupting administrative influences ; but also ex-

hibiting a marvellous improvement upon the material, moral and social aspects of my first visit.

On three occasions I had the exquisite pleasure of seeing illicitly-introduced liquors seized by the police and broached, and of hearing them gurgle as they passed into the common sewer, possibly to poison rats instead of what would otherwise have happened—poisoning men and women.

As human nature in the individual, at different periods of life, rises or sinks with our ideals, so with states and communities. Eternal vigilance, perpetual reflection, is the only possible guarantee against decline, either for souls or society. How pitiable and how shocking it is to see the worldly, and sometimes the ecclesiastical press of this country rejoicing over these social relapses. But the lesson of your proposed commemoration is surely obvious. Let the life of this splendid veteran and gallant patriot inspire the youth of Britain with a noble emulation in foresight, energy and confidence in the power of truth, so as to realize, ere the century shall close, the same blessings of a true civilization for old England, which are now so extensively enjoyed in the New England that our patriot ancestors planted in the brave days of old.

Yours truly,

F. R. LEES.

[From Rev. CHAS. GARRETT, late president of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference.]

2 Blackburn Terrace, Liverpool, Feb. 14th, 1894.

To LADY HENRY SOMERSET,—All honor to the man who showed the nation that the drink traffic must be destroyed by the vote of the people.

CHARLES GARRETT.

[From Mr. R. MACKAY, secretary of the Scottish Permissive Bill and Temperance Association.]

112 Bath street, Glasgow, February 19th, 1894.

DEAR LADY SOMERSET,—As advised by Miss Willard I have the pleasure to inform your ladyship that General the Hon. Neal Dow, of Portland, Maine, U.S.A., visited Scotland on three separate occasions as representing the United Kingdom Alliance. He addressed large demonstrations which were crowded with earnest temperance reformers, who applauded his burning words about the liquor traffic being an infinite waste, an unmixed evil. By his exposition of the prohibitory law and its resultant benefits, he whetted the desire for and inspired the hopes of the Scottish prohibitory party in a prohibition act for Scotland. He visited Edinburgh (twice), Glasgow (twice), Dundee (twice), Aberdeen, Perth, Dumfries (twice), Paisley, Greenock, Rothesay, Kilmarnock, Ayr, Inverness, Stirling, Galashiels and Hawick, being received everywhere with the greatest enthusiasm. The arrangements for his meetings in Scotland were undertaken by the Scottish Permissive Bill and Temperance Association.

I had the pleasure in June last year of calling upon the old man in Portland, Maine, upon whom Time's effacing finger hardly appears, and even the tremor of age is scarcely to be seen. He entertains the most kindly recollections of his visits to Scotland and of the friends whose co-operation he so highly appreciated.

I am, dear Lady Somerset, yours sincerely,

R. MACKAY.

[From Miss ANNA A. GORDON, of Boston, Superintendent of Juvenile Work in the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union.]

REIGATE, March 8th, 1894. -

The White Ribbon women in all countries make it a point to teach the half million children in our "Loyal Temperance Legions" that, while the individual ought to enact a "prohibitory law for one," by means of the personal pledge of total abstinence, the State ought to separate itself teetotally from protecting the liquor traffic by license, also from in any wise sharing its ill-gotten gains; and in all these teachings, based upon the laws of nature and of grace, we feel that no single example shines out so conspicuously by reason of the quality and duration of his services as that of "brave Neal Dow."

Yours, for "the little soldiers newly mustered in,"

ANNA A. GORDON.

IOWA MULCT LAW.

The Legislature of Iowa has enacted a measure of a strange character, planned to enable certain localities to permit violation of the State prohibitory law, which prohibitory law still remains in the statutes of the State. This curious piece of legislation is called a "mulct law." Its character may be learned from the following summary of its principal provisions:—

Liquor sellers are to pay an annual tax of \$600 to the county treasurer, which tax is to be a lien upon the real estate where the liquor is sold. This tax is payable semi-annually. Half of the tax is to go to the general county fund and half to the municipality in which the liquor is sold."

Sections 16 and 17 of the act read in part as follows :

"Sec. 16. Nothing in this act contained shall in any way be construed to mean that the business of the sale of intoxicating liquors is in any way legalized, nor is the same to be construed in any manner or form as a license, nor shall the assessment or payment or any tax for the sale of liquors as aforesaid protect the wrongdoer from any penalty now provided by law, except that on conditions hereinafter provided certain penalties may be suspended.

"Sec. 17. In any city of five thousand or more inhabitants the tax hereinbefore specified may be paid quarterly in advance on the first days of January, April, July and October of each year, after a written statement of consent, signed by a majority of the voters residing in said city who voted at the last general election, shall have been filed with

the county auditor. Such payment shall upon the following conditions be a bar to proceedings under the statute prohibiting such business.

“First—The person appearing to pay the tax shall file with the county auditor a certified copy of a resolution regularly adopted by the city council consenting to such sales, and a written statement of consent from all the resident freeholders owning property within fifty feet of the premises where said business is carried on. But in no case shall said business be conducted within three hundred feet of any church or school-house.

“Second—He shall file with the county auditor, to be approved by the clerk of the district court, a bond in the sum of three thousand dollars, conditioned upon the faithful observance of all of the provisions of this act, and for the payment of any and all damages that may result from the sale of intoxicating liquors upon the premises occupied by the obligor. Said bond shall be signed by himself as principal and by two sureties, who shall qualify each in double the amount of the bond, and neither of whom shall be surety on any other like bond.

“Third—Said selling or keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors shall be carried on in a single room, having but one entrance or exit, and that opening upon a public business street. The bar where liquors are furnished shall be in plain view from the street, unobstructed by screens, blinds, painted windows or any other device. There shall be no chairs, benches, nor any other furniture in front of the bar, and only such behind the bar as is necessary for the attendants. A list of names of all persons employed about the place shall be filed with the county auditor, and no person shall be permitted behind the bar except those whose names are listed with the county auditor.”

Here follow clauses prohibiting gambling, music, dancing or other “amusements” in saloons; prohibiting obscene decorations and the employment of females in saloons; prohibiting the sale of liquor before 5 a.m. and after 10 p.m., and prohibiting selling to minors, drunkards or interdicted persons. Sections 18 and 19 read thus:—

“Sec. 18. In order that any city or town of less than five thousand inhabitants may come within the provisions of section 17 of this act, the following additional condition must be complied with:—

“A written statement of consent shall be filed with the county auditor, signed by 65 per cent. of all the legal voters who voted at the last preceding general election (as shown by the poll list of said election, residing within such county and outside of the corporate limits of cities having a population of five thousand or over; but no such statement of consent shall be construed as a bar to proceedings against persons selling intoxicating liquors in incorporated towns situated in townships of which less than a majority of the voters of the township, including the incorporated town, have signed the statement of consent; nor shall it be construed as a bar in any incorporated town in which a majority of the voters do not sign said statement of consent.

“Sec. 19. Whenever any of the conditions of this act shall be violated, or whenever any of the city council or trustees of the incorporated town shall by a majority vote direct it, or whenever there shall be filed with the county auditor a verified petition signed by the majority of the voters of the said city, town or county, as the case may be, as shown by the last general election, requesting it, then and in such case the bar to proceedings as provided in section 17 hereof shall cease to operate as a bar, and persons engaged in the sales of intoxicating liquors as contemplated by this act shall be liable to all the penalties provided for by chapter 6, title 11, of the code, and acts amendatory thereto.”

RECORD OF EVENTS.

ROYAL TEMPLAR MEETINGS.

Important meetings were held in February and March in connection with the work of the growing and aggressive order of Royal Templars of Temperance.

British Columbia Grand Council met at Nanaimo on February 6th. The Grand Councillor was absent, and P. G. C. George Sutherland presented the business. The report of Grand Secretary Hadden showed an increase during the past year in the membership from 366 to 478.

The Grand Council of Manitoba met on February 13th, presided over by Grand Councillor Rev. Alfred Andrews. Grand Secretary F. J. Allan presented a report showing a membership of 1,644, being an increase over the previous year's record of 477. A deputation from the Grand Council waited upon the Local Government and asked for some changes in the existing license laws.

A week later the Ontario Grand Council met, Rev. W. Kettlewell, Grand Councillor, occupied the chair. The meeting was one of unusual interest, and plans for further aggressive work were laid. A deputation asked the Provincial Government for changes in the liquor laws. The report showed a decrease from the membership of the previous year. Most of the old officers were re-elected.

Quebec Grand Council met on March 2nd, with Grand Councillor Sol Cutter presiding. The membership reported was 3,404 in 73 councils.

A good deal of interest centred round the meeting of the Dominion Council, which held its annual session in Hamilton, commencing on Tuesday, March 20th. The report of Dominion Councillor A. M. Featherston told of satisfactory and encouraging progress, giving special prominence to the work done by the Templar Newspaper and Publishing House. The report of General Manager W. W. Buchanan urged strongly the importance of electing independent prohibitionists to the Dominion Parliament and Provincial Legislatures. Grand Secretary J. H. Land submitted a statement showing the aggregate membership of the order in the Dominion last December to have been 31,178. Of this membership 4,784 were enrolled in the Death Benefit Department. The attendance was full and thoroughly representative. The Royal Templars organization is doing a great work for the prohibition cause.

MANITOBA.

Following closely upon the Manitoba Grand Council R. T. of T., a general prohibition convention for the province was held. Nothing was done in the line of permanent organization, but much interesting discussion took place. His honor, Governor Schultz, presided during part of the meeting. A deputation waited upon the Provincial Government and received an assurance that the Government would do all possible to promote all the prohibitory legislation that the courts would warrant them in enacting as soon as the question of jurisdiction was finally settled.

NOVA SCOTIA.

The Nova Scotia plebiscite on March 15th resulted in a magnificent victory for the prohibition cause. The total vote polled has not yet been reported, but enough complete returns have been sent in to show that the province has

declared against the liquor traffic by a vote of nearly three to one.

PARLIAMENTARY.

Following out the instruction given by a great convention held at Toronto in February last, arrangements were made for an interview with the Dominion Government to ask for prohibitory legislation. The deputation arrived at Ottawa on Tuesday, March 27th. An interesting meeting was held at 9.30, presided over by Major E. L. Bond. At 12 o'clock the representatives of the Dominion Government arrived. They were Sir John Thompson, Sir Hibbert Tupper, Hon. Messrs. Bowell, Ives, Costigan, Smith, Daly, Carling, Wood and Wallace. Mrs. Alexander and Messrs. Buchanan, Spence, Paul and Heustis stated the case for the prohibitionists and earnestly urged the Government to take early action to express in law the desire of the people recently declared in different provinces at the polls. They agreed that the Dominion Parliament had long ago declared that prohibition is the only right and effective remedy for the evils of intemperance, and that Parliament will be prepared to legislate on that line as soon as public opinion will sustain such legislation. The plebiscites had given the necessary assurance regarding public sentiment and the time for action had come.

Sir John Thompson, in reply to the deputation, stated that he had listened with much pleasure to the clear statement of the case that had been presented, complimenting in particular Mrs. Alexander for her earnest and forcible address. Then he went on to say that the best way he could show appreciation of the manner in which they had presented their case was to be frank with them, and, therefore, he would say that it was out of the question that any act in connection with prohibition could be put before Parliament this session. They would all understand that

before any measure could be presented to Parliament a most careful and painstaking study of the revenue wants of the country would have to be made. There were other considerations; for instance, with regard to enforcement, the date of the act coming into force, etc. All these matters would have to be carefully considered and studied before a bill could be presented to Parliament. The deputation would, therefore, realize that they could not expect the Government to make a pledge on this question for the present session. With regard to the future, he knew what they would desire him to say, but he must tell them frankly that he could make no pledge. He said that out of respect to them. He could do as some others are said to have done, he could listen to them and give them a pledge and then walk out of it with both arms akimbo; but he would be false to them and false to those whom they represented if he were to do so. Parliament has been going upon certain lines with regard to the task of ascertaining what this great reform involves. A commission has been sitting for the last three years and taking evidence which would not be found very instructive to the members of the deputation, for the obvious reason that they had studied the question half a life-time, and many of them knew more about it than half the witnesses examined. But for the mass of the people of this country the report would be of great value. He did not claim to be so enlightened on the questions involved in the inquiry as to say he would not be instructed by the information contained in the report. As regards the great financial interests involved, if the reform was of the great importance which it was represented to be, measures must be devised for grappling with that difficulty. A remark had been made which seemed to imply impatience in the minds of the deputation at the delay which had taken place. Sir John

was sorry if a day had been lost in the gaining of that information. Such was not the intention in appointing the commission; neither was any political object to be served in referring the question to a royal commission. The inquiry had been exceeding searching. A preliminary report would be laid before Parliament within a few days, and a final report before the end of the session. As to what the report would probably be he could not say, but he agreed with the deputation that it would not be conclusive. Whatever the finding of the commission was Parliament would have to exercise the responsibility of considering the report and acting upon it. In advance of this information, which he confessed he needed, he begged to say with all respect, it would be impossible for him to give a pledge as to what measures in the direction of absolute prohibition would be taken by the present Government. In reference to the French treaty, whether Parliament ratified it or not, there would be no provision adopted which would prevent the adoption of prohibition in this country. There were no obligations in the treaty itself which would restrict or hamper Parliament in that line and if it were necessary to remove any doubt on the subject that would be made perfectly plain when the policy was announced in regard to it. He thanked them again for the honor they had done the Government in waiting upon them. Every possible weight which sympathetic minds could give would be given to the sentiments and arguments which had been expressed.

It will readily be understood that this reply was not at all satisfactory to the deputation, and after the retirement of the hon. gentlemen strongly worded resolutions were adopted expressing regret and disappointment that more satisfactory statements had not been made, and pledging the members present to make special efforts to secure in

the approaching elections the return to Parliament of only such representatives as could be relied upon to favor prohibition independent of party consideration.

THE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE.

Next day after the Government's interview the usual annual meeting of the Legislation Committee of the Dominion Alliance was held in the tower room of the Parliament buildings. There was a large attendance of members of the House of Commons, and also of gentlemen who had remained over from the previous day's gathering. Hon. Mr. Vidal, President of the Dominion Alliance, occupied the chair. After a good deal of discussion it was decided that the following resolution should be forthwith introduced into the House of Commons and pressed to a division:—

“That as speedily as possible the Dominion Parliament should enact a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, excepting for medicinal, sacramental and scientific purposes.”

At a subsequent conference of members of the House of Commons it was agreed that the resolution should be moved in the House by Mr. T. B. Flint, of Yarmouth, and seconded by Dr. W. F. Roome, of Middlesex.
