



EX LIBRIS







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation





HON. JOHN G. WOOLLEY
U. S. Presidential Prohibition Candidate, 1902.

green

TEMPERANCE
PROGRESS
IN THE CENTURY

BY
JOHN G. WOOLLEY, M.A.
" AND
WILLIAM E. JOHNSON



LONDON, TORONTO, PHILADELPHIA
THE LINSOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY
1903

HV 5020
.W7

REESE

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the Year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Three, by the Bradley-Garretson Co., Limited, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Entered, according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the Year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Three, by the Bradley-Garretson Co., Limited, in the Office of the Minister of Agriculture.

All Rights Reserved.

ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
John G. Woolley	<i>Frontispiece</i>
William IV. (1765-1837)	30
John Bright (1811-1889)	31
The Beecher Family	42
John Wesley (1703-1791)	43
Jean Talon	52
François De Laval De Montmorency	53
Officers of the World's W. C. T. U., 1898	62
Woman's Temple, Chicago, U. S. A.	62
Miss Jessie E. Ackerman	63
Miss Annie Adams Gordon	63
Horace Greeley (1811-1872)	72
Wendell Phillips (1811-1884)	72
Cardinal Taschereau	73
D'Alton McCarthy	73
General Neal Dow	94
Father Mathew	95
Sir Oliver Mowat	102
Sir Leonard Tilley	103
Mrs. Mary H. Hunt	124
Mrs. Mary T. Burt	124
Mrs. Caroline Brown Buell	125
Miss Amanda Way, P. G. C. T.	125
John P. St. John	146
Joshua Levering	147
Mrs. Eliza J. Thompson	210
"Mother Stewart"	210

	PAGE
The Late Mrs. Mary Torrans Lathrap	211
Miss Eva Marshall Shontz	211
Mrs. Ella Alexander Boole, M. A.	214
Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens	214
The Rev. Henrietta G. Moore	215
The Late Mary A. Woodbridge	215
Lady Henry Somerset	224
Frances E. Willard (1839-1898)	225
James Black	234
Green Clay Smith (1830-1895)	235
Clinton B. Fisk (1828-1890)	238
John Bidwell	239
Hon. J. C. Aikins	248
Adam Crooks, LL.D.	249
Hon. Geo. A. Cox	256
The Late Principal Grant, D.D. (1835-1902)	257
Hon. R. W. Scott, K. C.	260
Hon. Geo. E. Foster	260
Mrs. Annie Orchard Rutherford	261
The Late Mrs. Letitia Youmans	261
John J. MacLaren, K.C.	266
Rev. W. A. Mackay, D.D.	267
Hon. Hugh John Macdonald	270
Hon. G. W. Ross, LL.D.	271
Rev. A. Carman, D.D.	274
Hon. S. H. Blake, K. C.	275
John B. Gough (1817-1886)	296
William Loyd Garrison (1805-1879)	297
Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone (1809-1898)	300
Lord Salisbury	301
The Duke of Wellington (1769-1852)	424
Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain	425

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

ALCOHOL AMONG THE ANCIENTS.

PAGE

Origin of the Term Alcohol.—Drink in Ancient Egypt.— Attitude of Ancient Chinese Teachers and Emperors.— Origin of Drink Customs in Ancient India.—Religion Rescues the People.—Rise and Fall of Rome.—Ancient Greek Writers Denounce Drink.—Origin of Mohammed's Prohibition.—Persia.—Bible Wine.—Ancient Britain. . .	1
--	---

CHAPTER II.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC HOUSE.

The Open House of the Druids.—Wine Introduced by the Romans.—Influence of the Clergy.—The Anglo-Saxon Guild.—Contributions of the Danes and Normans to Drinking Customs.—Henry VII. and Country Fairs.— Clubs of Elizabeth's Time.—Drink Epidemic of the Eighteenth Century.—Gin Act.—Social Conditions at the Close of the Century.....	20
--	----

CHAPTER III.

DRINK IN THE NORTH AMERICAN COLONIES.

In the Days of Governor Winthrop.—The Wine Trade with Spain.—Troubles with the Indians.—Early Penn- sylvania and William Penn.—Drink in the New Haven	vii
---	-----

	PAGE
Colony.—The Dutch.—Spirits Prohibited in Virginia, Delaware and Georgia.—The Advent of Cider Drinking.—Rum and the Slave Trade.—Drink at Public and Religious Functions.—Drink in the Early Colleges.—Drink in Early Industries.—Early Canada.—Prohibition Practiced by the Jesuits.—The Military's Struggle for Rum.—Results of Talon's Order.....	82

CHAPTER IV.

EARLY TEMPERANCE AGITATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

Drink Troubles in the Revolutionary War.—The "Whisky Rebellion."—Washington, Adams, Franklin and Wesley.—Benezet's Pamphlet.—The Work of Benjamin Rush.—The Labors of Lyman Beecher.—Sporadic Temperance Movements.—Dr. Clark's Society.—Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance.....	54
---	----

CHAPTER V.

EARLY MORAL SUASION CAMPAIGNS.

The First Total Abstinence Society.—Agitation of Justin Edwards.—Formation of the American Temperance Society.—Nathaniel Hewitt's Crusade.—Forces to be Overcome.—"Putnam and the Wolf."—The Congressional Temperance Society.—Attorney General Wirt's Opinion.—First of the National Conventions.—The American Temperance Union.—"Deacon Giles' Distillery."—Declaration of Seven Presidents.....	69
--	----

CHAPTER VI.

THE WASHINGTONIAN AND KINDRED SOCIETIES.

The Early Baltimore Beginnings.—Reformation of John H. W. Hawkins.—Martha Washingtonian Societies Formed.—The Career of John B. Gough.—The Visit of	
---	--

CONTENTS.

ix

	PAGE
Father Mathew.—The Work of Dr. John Marsh.—Decline of the American Temperance Union.....	87

CHAPTER VII.

FRATERNAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.

Reasons for their Formation.—Sons of Temperance.—Daughters of Temperance and other Affiliated Societies.—Templars of Honour and Temperance.—The Rechabites.—Good Samaritans.—Good Templars.—The Rupture over Slavery.—Royal Templars of Temperance.—Sons of Jonadab.....	99
--	----

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ANTE-BELLUM PROHIBITION MOVEMENT.

The Trade Recognised as Immoral.—Gerrit Smith.—Justin Edwards' Pamphlet.—Preliminary Skirmishes in the Legislatures.—Chief Justice Taney's Decision.—Early Local Option Campaigns.—Gen. James Appleton's Report to the Maine Legislature.—Campaigns of Neal Dow.—Early Results of the Prohibition in Maine.—The Ohio Constitution.—Prohibition Campaigns in Many States.—The Historic New York Campaign.—Greeley.—Beecher.—Raymond.—Delavan.—Governor Myron H. Clark.—Effect of the Civil War.....	115
--	-----

CHAPTER IX.

POST-BELLUM STATE CAMPAIGNS.

Situation after the War.—The National Temperance Society.—The Campaigns in Massachusetts.—Campaigns for Restrictive and Civil Damage Laws.—Origin of the Constitutional Amendment Idea.—Adoption in Kansas.—Amendment Campaigns in Other States.—Senator Blair's Move for National Prohibition.—The United States Brewers' Association Formed.—The End of Hor-	
--	--

	PAGE
ace Greeley.—The Raster Resolution.—Exposures of Liquor Methods in the Nebraska Campaign.—Advanced Stand of the U. S. Supreme Court.....	142

CHAPTER X.

HIGH LICENSE.

Origin of the Plan.—The Nebraska Law.—Its Adoption in Other States.—Immediate Results.—Liquor Dealers Begin to Advocate High License.—Endorsements of “the Trade.”—Results of the Policy.—Investigations of the New York Voice.—The Lesson of High License..	177
--	-----

CHAPTER XI.

THE W. C. T. U. AND OTHER POST-BELLUM TEMPERANCE
SOCIETIES.

Litigation Under the Ohio Adair Law.—Mother Stewart’s Springfield Address.—Speeches of Dr. Dio Lewis.—The “Affair” at Hillsboro, O.—Mother Thompson Chosen Leader.—Other Ohio Campaigns.—The Work of the Crusade.—The National Convention of 1874.—Mrs. Jen- nie F. Willing.—The Work of Frances Willard.—The Mission of Mary Clement Leavitt.—Successes of Mary H. Hunt.—The Reform Clubs.—Work of Dr. Reynolds.	201
--	-----

CHAPTER XII.

THE PROHIBITION PARTY AND THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE.

Early Agitation and Discussion.—Action of the I. O. G. T. —Early Organizations in Illinois, and Michigan.—First Nominating Convention.—First National Convention at Chicago.—Black and Russel Nominated.—Single Issue of 1880.—The Home Protection Party.—John P. St. John and the Campaign of 1884.—The Free Silver Troubles of 1892.—The Division at Pittsburg.—The National Party. —Mr. Woolley’s Campaign of 1900.—Origin of the Anti- Saloon League Movement.—Its Growth and Objects....	228
---	-----

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XIII.

TEMPERANCE IN CANADA BEFORE CONFEDERATION.

PAGE

The Agitation of 1828.—The Halifax Convention of 1834.—Crusade of the Victoria Society.—Introduction of Fraternal Societies.—Campaign of Father Chiniquy.—Local Option and Restrictive Campaigns in the Provinces.—Campaigns of the Canadian Prohibitory Liquor Law League.—The Canadian Temperance Alliance.—The Dunkin Act..... 248

CHAPTER XIV.

TEMPERANCE IN CANADA SINCE CONFEDERATION.

Petitions to the Dominion Parliament.—Report of Senator Vidal.—The First Parliamentary Commission.—Prohibition for the Northwest Territories.—Organization of the Dominion Alliance.—The Canada Temperance (Scott) Act.—Confusion of Provincial and Dominion Authority.—The Commission of 1890.—Provincial and Dominion Plebiscite Campaigns.—The Government's Strange Attitude.—Prohibition in Manitoba and Prince Edward Island.—Review of Present Laws.—Consumption of Liquor in Canada..... 254

CHAPTER XV.

TEMPERANCE IN EUROPE.

Beginnings of Agitation in Great Britain.—Results of the Beer Act.—The "Seven Men of Preston."—Forerunner of the British Temperance League.—Hostility to the Reform.—The Career of Father Mathew.—British Temperance Societies.—The French Anti-Alcohol Union.—Germany.—Holland.—Belgium.—Denmark.—Switzerland.—Austria..... 278

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XVI.

TEMPERANCE IN AUSTRALASIA.

	PAGE
Conditions Early in the Century.—Early Efforts of Walker and Backhouse.—A “Father Mathew” Wave.—Local Option Campaigns in New South Wales.—Legislation in Victoria.—Local Option in Queensland.—Australia’s Consumption of Liquor.—Beginnings of Reform in New Zealand.—The Work of Sir William Fox.—The Present Situation.....	310

CHAPTER XVII.

THE GOTHENBURG SYSTEM.

Conditions in Sweden Early in the Century.—The Work of Peter Wieselgren.—Results of the Law of 1835.—The Law of 1855.—Origin of the <i>Bolag</i> or Gothenburg System.—Beer as an Antidote for Spirits.—Effect on the Consumption of Liquor.—Urban and Rural Sweden Compared.—Growth of Pauperism.—Increase of Drunkenness and Tremens in Gothenburg.—Early Liquor Legislation in Norway.—Results of the Law of 1845.—Results of the Samlag System—Drunkenness in Christiania.—Puzzle of the Profits.....	321
---	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE DISPENSARY SYSTEM.

The Dispensary System in South Carolina.—The Lords Proprietors of South Carolina Passed a Dispensary Act in 1711.—An Unusually Drastic Law Passed before the Civil War.—Special Acts Passed by Different Localities.—In 1891 Prohibition Enforced in Five Counties and more than Sixty Towns and Villages.—Mr. Childs’ Prohibition Bill.—Representative E. C. Roper Champions the Bill.—The Bill Amended by Senator John Gary

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Evans.—Went into Effect July 1, 1893.—Further Temperance Safeguards Adopted in 1895.—Profits of the Dispensary by the Administration.—Legal Sales of Liquor under the Dispensary.—Illicit Liquor Shops (“ Blind Tigers ”) in South Carolina.—Police Arrests in Charleston.—The Dispensary System Disappointing.—The State Dispensary a Failure in South Dakota.—The Dispensary in Russia.—Finland and the Gothenburg System.—Herr Edv. Bjorkenheim Speaks Unfavorably of the System in Finland.—Other Temperance Efforts in Russia.—Russian Minister of Finance Reports on the Liquor Question.....	339

CHAPTER XIX.

TEMPERANCE AND MEDICINE.

The Phlogiston Theory of Alcohol.—Investigations of Prof. Stahl.—Lavoisier Eliminates Phlogiston.—The Brunonian System.—Moral Suasion Ideas of Early Medical Temperance Reformers.—Influence of Drs. Grindrod and Carpenter.—The Jeffries and Dunlop Declarations.—Researches of Benjamin Ward Richardson.—Investigations of Von Liebig.—Alcohol and Digestion.—The Study of Inebriety as a Disease.....	355
--	-----

CHAPTER XX.

TEMPERANCE AND LIFE INSURANCE.

Early Attitude of Life Insurance Companies.—The Revolt of Robert Warner.—Organization of The United Kingdom Total Abstinence Association.—Success and Extension of the Plan.—Researches of Meikle and McClintock.....	379
---	-----

CHAPTER XXI.

TEMPERANCE AND INDUSTRY.

Early American Efforts to Free Industry from Drink.—Rapid Changes and Marked Successes.—Early Labor	
---	--

	PAGE
Conditions in England.—Investigations of Carroll D. Wright.—Attitude of Canadian Business Men.—Advanced Attitude of Labor Organizations.....	387

CHAPTER XXII.

TEMPERANCE IN MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Military Troubles with Drink in Revolutionary Times.—Beginnings of the Spirit Ration.—Attack on the Ration by Secretary Eaton.—Abolished by President Jackson.—Influence of Gen. Cass.—The Civil War.—The Prohibition Orders of President Hayes.—Beginnings of the Beer Canteen.—Military Opposition.—Liquor Abolished from the Navy.—General Miles' Stand.—Final Overthrow of the Canteen in the U. S. Army.—The Duke of Wellington's Order.—Origin and Growth of the British Army Temperance Association.—Good Results.—Recent Canteen Changes in the French Army.—Regulations in Canada.—The Russian Commission.—Attitude as to Liquor in Other Armies.....	406
--	-----

CHAPTER XXIII.

CIVILIZATION AS THE APOSTLE OF VICE.

Work of the Trader in Africa.—Temperance Efforts of King Radama I.—Attitude of the Khedive of Egypt.—The British Commission of 1884.—Protests of African Chiefs.—The United Committee.—The Agitation on the Continent.—The Brussels Convention of 1889.—The Struggle in India.—Hawaiian Opposition to Drink.—Introduction of Liquor into the Philippines.—Senator Lodge's "Twentieth Century Resolution."—Drink Among the Indians.....	433
--	-----

CHAPTER XXIV.

TEMPERANCE AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

Early Attitude of the Quakers.—Recent Deliverances.—	
--	--

CONTENTS.

XV

	PAGE
The "Rules" of Wesley.—Lowering of the Wesley Standard.—Agitation of James Axley.—Later Rapid Advance of the Church.—Advance in the Presbyterian Church.—Attitude of the Catholic Church.—The Pope's Letter to Archbishop Ireland.—Bishop Watterson's Order.—Advance in Other American Churches.—Tardy Advance in England.....	447

APPENDICES.

Horror of Drink Among the Egyptians.—Son of Hindu Nobleman Loses Caste through Wine.—Greek Legend Regarding the Origin of Wine.—A Latin Drinking Song of the Middle Ages.—Clubs with Outrageous Names Established by Drunkards in England.—Oliver Goldsmith's Denunciation of Ale-Houses.—Monastic Laws against Drink.—Excessive Drinking in New England.—Thomas Jefferson Advocates Establishment of a Brewery.—Pledge of the American Temperance Society.—Benjamin F. Butler Introduces a Strong Temperance Resolution.—Founders of the Washingtonian Movement.—Father Mathew's Pledge.—John B. Gough Pronounces Himself a thorough Prohibitionist.—Father Mathew Declares Himself in Favor of Prohibition.—Most Worthy Templars of the Supreme Temple.—Presiding Officers of the Grand Lodge of New York.—Presiding Officers of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge and the International Supreme Lodge.—Present Officers of the International Supreme Lodge.—Presiding Officers of the Seceding Organizations during the Ten Years of its Existence.—Number of Members and Subordinate Lodges under Jurisdiction of Grand Lodges for Year ending 1899.—John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln Speak against the Liquor Traffic.—Extracts from Appleton's Report on the Effect of the License Laws.—The Governor of Maine Pronounces the Maine Liquor Law a Success.—The Republican Convention at Topeka, 1882; Resolves in Favor of Prohibition.—Mr. W. H. Hardy the "Father of High License" declares

High License a Failure.—Susan B. Anthony's Early Efforts as a Temperance Worker.—Convention of the National W. C. T. U.—Presiding Officers of the National W. C. T. U.—Countries where the W. C. T. U. has been Planted and Present National President of Each.—Convention of the World's W. C. T. U.—Present officers of the World's W. C. T. U.—Temperance Instructions in Schools.—Prohibition Party Votes for President.—Counties in Canada where Scott Act is Still in Force.—History of the Plebiscite in the Dominion.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Letter on the Plebiscite.—The Origin of The Word Teetotaler.—Alcoholic Liquors Consumed in the United Kingdom during the Century.—International Conference against the Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors.—Prohibition Efforts in South Dakota.—Works Dealing with Temperance in the Army.—Consumption of Liquor in the United States during the Century.—Principal Provisions of the Ontario Liquor Act of 1902.	471
---	-----



TEMPERANCE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

CHAPTER I.

ALCOHOL AMONG THE ANCIENTS.

Wine hath the strength of fire when to man
It entereth in ; and like Boreas
Or Notus, rolling up the Libyan sea
In mighty waves till all the depths lie bare,—
So doth it ever-set the minds of men.

—ERASTOTHENES.

WHENEVER the original of any peculiarly far-reaching depravity is enshrouded in mystery, it seems to be customary among Christians to charge it to the account of the Arabs. In this way, the origin of the word "alcohol" is ascribed to them. Probably alcohol is the Chaldaic *cohol* (Hebrew *kaal*) with the Arabic intensifier *al*, and signifies *the pure spirit*.* So high an authority as Samuel Hopwood credits this theory of the origin of the word. Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* expresses the opinion that the Arabs first "invented and named the alembic for the purpose of distillation." This much, however, is well established: the

* Edouard Fournier, *Melanges*, Vol. III, p. 517.

word was first used among the Arabians to signify a powder with which Jewish and Syrian ladies used to dye their hair, and did not have its present signification until a comparatively late period.

Egypt.—Graven on the tombs of ancient Egypt are found what are probably the earliest references to the debauchery of drink. Until recent years our knowledge of the ancient drink customs of those people has been in the main contributed by such writers as Herodotus and Pliny. But of late a wealth of information has been uncovered by Professor Rawlinson and other investigators. In the tombs of Beni-Hassan, at least 5,000 years old, are found numerous carvings illustrating the drink customs of those ancient days. Pictures also have been found showing wine-presses in operation, the methods of cultivating and gathering grapes, men being carried home on the heads of their slaves after a feast, and women suffering from intemperance in wine. According to Bunsen, the cultivation of grapes and wine-making were well known to the Egyptians in 3229 B.C., and according to Lepsius in 3426 B.C. The *Dictionary of Classified Dates* (Little) says that in the Sixth Dynasty, 3566 B.C., both wine and beer were drunk in Egypt and that the former was an important product.

Twelve hundred years B.C., female conspirators against Rameses III. were condemned, according to Rawlinson, to the servitude of keeping a beer-house, that being considered sufficient punishment for ladies of good breeding and refinement. Dr. W. L. Brown, in his address on *Inebriety Among the Ancients* produces copies of pictures believed to be older than those of Beni-Hassan. One inscription tells of "the gathering of the grapes on the country estate of

Ptah-hotep" in the days of the Pyramid building.* In 1889, the explorer Flinders Petrie found wine jars in the ruins of the city of Khu-en-Aten known on the maps as Tel-el-Amarna. Herodotus tells us that in the part of the country "sown with corn they use wine made of barley [probably a malt drink], for they have no vines in that country." In another connection he describes the advantages of priests living in another region. He says: "Sacred food is cooked for them, and a great quantity of beef and geese is allowed each of them every day, and wine from the grape is given them."

Like other ancient peoples, the Egyptians did homage to a god of drink, Bes. But the identification of Bes is not always clear. Both Plutarch and Herodotus confuse him not only with Osiris, the Egyptian divinity, but also with Bacchus. Plutarch, in his *Morals*, speaks of "Isis and Osiris," detailing the relation of wine to religious rites among the ancient Egyptians at some length.† The *Book of the Dead* shows that for many centuries "cakes and ale" as well as wine were offered in libations to nearly every prominent divinity in Egypt. Many of these rites, as shown by the researches of Rawlinson, were of the most bestial character.

China.—With very few exceptions, the Chinese Emperors and Chinese teachers from the earliest times have taken a remarkably advanced position against the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and, as a result of their historic position in this regard, the Chinese now maintain a high standard as to the vice of drunkenness. As early as 2285 B.C.

* See Appendix A., Chap. I.

† See Appendix B, Chap. I.

the Emperor banished a man who invented an alcoholic beverage made from rice. According to Mencius, Yao the Great, who flourished in 2200 B.C., was a total abstainer. "Yao hated the pleasant wine." It is also on record that during the reign of Yao and Chun virtue pervaded the land and crime was unknown. We are told in the *Shoo-King*, a work begun by Confucius and perfected by Mencius, that in the year 2187 B.C. matters were not in such a satisfactory state: "T'ae-K'ang occupied the throne like a personator of the dead. By idleness and dissipation he extinguished his virtue, till the black-haired people all began to waver in their allegiance." The troubles which beset a pair of royal astronomers during the reign of Chung-K'ang (2154 or 2127 B.C.) well illustrates the ancient Chinese view of such offences. The following account is given in *Shoo-King*, Book IV., Ch. II.: "He and Ho had neglected the duties of their office, and were sunk in wine in their private cities, and the Prince of Yin received the imperial charge to go and punish them." He and Ho were Ministers of the Board of Astronomy, but through their licentious indulgence unfitted themselves for their duties, and, in consequence, the people, dependent on them for knowledge of the times and seasons, received no light and guidance. An eclipse came on them unawares, and the astronomers were too much intoxicated to notice it. The Prince Yin assembled his troops and thus addressed them:

"Ah, ye, all my troops, these are the well-counselled instructions of the sage founder of our dynasty, clearly verified in their power to give security and stability to the state. The former kings were carefully attentive

to the warnings of Heaven, and their ministers observed the regular laws of their offices. All the officers, moreover, watchfully did their duty to assist the government, and the sovereign became entirely intelligent. Now here are He and Ho. They have entirely subverted their virtue, and are sunk and lost in wine. They have violated the duties of their office and left their posts. They have been the first to allow the regulations of Heaven to get into disorder, putting far from them their proper business. On the first day of the last month of autumn the sun and moon did meet harmoniously at Fang. The blind musicians beat their drums; the inferior officers and common people bustled and ran about. He and Ho, however, as if they were mere personators of the dead in their offices, heard nothing and knew nothing; so stupidly went they astray from their duty in the matter of heavenly appearances, and rendering themselves liable to death appointed by the former kings. The statutes of government say, when they anticipate the time, let them be put to death without mercy; when they are behind the time, let them be put to death."

Kia, the tyrant and voluptuary, who ruled about 1770 B.C., was another of China's bad monarchs. To gratify his favourite concubine, he provided her "with a splendid palace, and, in the park that surrounded it, a lake of wine at which three thousand men drank at the sound of a drum, while the trees hung with dried meats, and hills of flesh were piled up."

In *She-King*, the book of ancient odes, we get further glimpses of the habits of the people. Regarding the ways of the settlers in Pin under King-leuz (1496-1325 B. C.) we are told :

"In the tenth [month] they reap the rice,
And make the spirits for the spring,
For the benefit of the bushy eyebrows."

The thought more freely expressed is that spirits distilled from rice cut in the tenth month will be ready for use in the spring and are for the benefit of the aged. In another poem * the custom of drinking healths is referred to:

“In the tenth month they sweep their stack-sites,
The two bottles of wine are enjoyed,
And they say, ‘Let us kill our lambs and sheep,
And go to the wall of our prince,
There raise the cup of rhinoceros horn,
And wish him long life, that he may live forever.”

The Emperor Chow, 1122 B.C., made another bad record, “being lost and maddened in wine.” And the historians tell us that his bad example was pretty generally followed by his people.

In the Tang dynasty (620-907 B. C.) the “golden age of literature,” Le Tai-Pils, the greatest poet of his time, generally tuned his lyre to notes on the pleasures of wine and beauty.

To a Chinaman there is no greater immorality than to be unfilial. Mencius, the great teacher and disciple of Confucius, lays down five sins as “unfilial.” The second of these is “gambling, and chess-playing and being fond of wine, without attending to the nourishment of his parents.”

Near the beginning of the Han dynasty (202 B.C.) an edict was published imposing a fine of four ounces of silver upon persons found guilty of meeting and drinking in companies of more than three members. Ninety-eight years B. C. a system was

* *She-King*, Part I., Book XV., Ode I.

adopted in China under which intoxicating liquors were made and sold only by the government under close restrictions. Four hundred years later, stringent laws were enacted against liquor sellers. In the year 459 A.D. the Emperor of the Northern Wei dynasty issued an edict declaring that all liquor makers, liquor sellers and liquor drinkers should be beheaded. In 781 A.D. a very curious law was enacted. All liquor shops were divided into three classes, all of each class were required to pay a monthly tax to the government, and then all people were forbidden either to buy or drink. In 1160 A.D. it was decreed that all officers who were found guilty of drinking intoxicating liquors should be beheaded. In the year 1279 A.D. the Mongol Emperor issued an edict condemning all liquor dealers to banishment and slavery, confiscating their property, and providing that the government should take charge of their children.

India.—Ancient India presents the strange spectacle of a country led into the debauchery of drink by religion and rescued therefrom by the same power.

For our knowledge of the drink practices of the ancient Indo-Aryan tribes, we are mainly dependent upon the *Rig-Veda*, the sacred books, the remnants of which were collected about 400 years B.C. The dates of their authorship, however, are unknown. The last is said to have been written about 1200 years B.C., while the dates assigned earlier ones run all the way from 2000 to 4000 B.C. It is made up largely of hymns for use by the priests in their ceremonies. Their gods, particularly Indra, were extravagantly fond of *soma rasa*, a wine made from the soma plant. The liquor being poured upon the

altar fires was drunk by the gods. Vishnu, Mitra, Maruts, Aryaman, Sakra and other deities were called upon in the soma ceremonies, but Indra was the god most easily influenced with wine.* He was not capable of any great or heroic act unless intoxicated. It is too much to expect of a people behaviour higher than that of their gods. In their offerings of soma, the people and priests used an increasing proportion of the offering themselves. When the meal was prepared, the eating place was strewn with sacred grass where the gods were invited to take seats and drink their fill. A portion of the food and drink was poured on the sacred fires while the family devoured the remainder. It is recorded that the great Sukracharya became so drunk that he murdered his beloved pupil Kutch. Durga Devi, it is said, when engaged in a war with the demon Mahishashura, thus addressed the adversary: "Go on roaring, thou fool, while I finish my drinking."

About the sixth century B.C. the greatest of Hindu lawgivers, Manu, issued the famous edict against the habit of drinking. This was the beginning of the Indo-Aryan revolution as to the use of intoxicating drink:

"With the drinker of *madhoo* let no one eat, no one join in sacrifice, no one read. With such a wretch let no one be allied in marriage. Let him be abject and excluded from all society and all social privileges; cast forth as a vagabond on the earth. Branded with indelible ignominy, he shall be deserted by his own parents, and treated with by none." †

* See Appendix C, Chap. I.

† *Dharma Shastra*, Vol. IX.

In addition, the physical penalty was incurred by the drinker that he should be made to swallow molten lead, and have the mark of a bottle branded on his forehead. In case the offender was a *Dwija* (Brahmin) one of the prescribed punishments was to drink boiling urine. Later, laws were added assigning the *soondiks* (wine sellers) to a very low place socially, and forbidding the *dwijas* to have anything to do with them. But this prohibition only included the first three castes of Hindus.* The aborigines and the lower classes of Aryans continued to drink their *sura* (the drink of the lower classes), and drink it to this day.

Almost contemporary with Manu was Siddartha Gautama, the founder of Buddhism, one of the cardinal principles of which was abstinence from intoxicating liquors. In the World's Parliament of Religions, H. Dharmapala, of Ceylon, a representative of a reformed school of Buddhism, said:

“The highest morality is inculcated in the system of Buddha. Drink, opium and all that tend to destroy the composure of the mind are discountenanced. Buddha said, ‘Man already dark with ignorance should not add thereto by the imbibition of alcoholic drinks.’ One of the vows taken by the Buddhist monks and by the laity runs thus: ‘I take the vow to abstain from intoxicating drinks because they hinder progress and virtue.’ The *Dhammika Sutta* says: ‘The householder that delights in the law should not indulge in intoxicating drinks, should not cause others to drink, and should not sanction the acts of those who drink, knowing that it results in insanity. The ignorant commit sins in consequence of drunkenness and also make others

* See Appendix D, Chap. I.

drink. You should avoid this. It is the cause of demerit, insanity and ignorance—though it be pleasing to the ignorant.’ The dangers of modern life originate chiefly from drink and brutality, and in Buddhist countries the law, based upon teachings of Buddhism, prohibits the manufacture, sale and use of liquor, and prevents the slaughter of animals for food. The inscription of Asoka, and the histories of Ceylon, Burmah and other Buddhist countries, prove this.”

This was a powerful support to the law of Manu. In later centuries, with the decline of Buddhism, came the revival of Brahmanism and the advent of the Jain faith, as strictly a total abstinence religion as that of Gautama. Then came Mohammed and legal prohibition. Sultan Allah-ud-din prohibited the drinking or sale of wines, and made great efforts to enforce the law, constructed special wells for prisons, and abolished the heavy taxes which the state had heretofore received from the business.* In these three religious influences lay the regeneration of ancient India from the evils of drink.

Rome and Greece.—Two striking facts stand out in the history of Rome. First, the foundations of that wonderful civilisation were laid on a basis of a most hostile attitude, both sentimental and legal, toward the use of intoxicating liquors. Second, the collapse of that great civilisation came with a reversal of that attitude. The light of Rome went out in bacchanalian revels such as the world has never seen. Drink and lust, the Twins in the zodiac of national decay, received both social recognition and the approval of the law.

* *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, Vol. XXXIX.

According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Romulus himself was the author of a law which permitted a husband to kill his wife for drinking wine or for committing adultery. As far back as 700 B.C. we are told that Mecenius slew his wife with a club for taking a drink of wine and was acquitted of the crime of murder by Romulus. In all the earlier history of Rome women were forbidden to drink wine under severe penalties. Men were forbidden to drink until thirty years of age.

During these heroic times, except on special occasions, libations to the gods were made only in milk, a practice which was enacted into law by Numa, the successor of Romulus. But as the centuries wore away these stringent rules relaxed. As early as 319 B.C. Papivius, when about to engage in a decisive battle with the Samnites, made a vow that if successful he would offer to Jupiter a "small cup of wine." *

Later, in closer trade relations with Greece, came large importations of Greek wines. The production of native wines grew also with the changing attitude toward the subject. Cato in 220 B.C. set himself against the growing luxury of the people by refusing to partake of any better wines than were served to the soldiers under his command. Varro tells us that when Lucullus returned from his successful campaign in Asia, he issued 60,000 gallons of Greek wine to his troops. When Hortensius, the rival of Cicero, died, he left to his heirs 10,000 casks of Chian wine. At about the same time, 50 B.C., Cæsar gave a banquet at which Falarnian, Chian, Lesbian and Mamertine wines were served.

* Eddy, *Alcohol in History*, p. 111.

Drunkenness did not become common until toward the close of the Commonwealth, but from the time of Pliny, the beginning of the Christian era, the national degeneracy increased in speed. Even in Pliny's time, the drunkenness of both men and women had become notorious. Drinking wagers at feasts became common. Men drank hemlock that the thought of death by poison might frighten them into deeper potations of wine as an antidote. They took emetics in order that they might return to drink. They took hot baths from which they were taken out half dead. Men and women at table vied with each other in outraging every sense of decency.

Almost incredible stories are told of the drinking capacity of these Roman debauchees. Tiberius Claudius knighted Novellius Torquatus, giving him the title of Tricongius (three-gallon knight) in honour of his drinking three *congi** of wine at one time. Tergilla, who once challenged Marcus Cicero, a son of the great orator, to a drinking bout, boasted of a capacity of two *congi*; and Emperor Maximian is said to have been eight and a half feet tall and capable of drinking six *congi* of wine at a sitting.

The great feast of the Saturnalia was extended from one day to seven by Caligula and Claudius. Wines were furnished at public expense. The people gave themselves over to riot and debauchery. "The whole city," says Tacitus, "seemed to be inflamed with frantic rage, and at the same time intoxicated with drunken pleasures." The troops of Vitellius, after a battle, spent three days in drunkenness and debauchery before burying their dead.

According to Pliny there were 195 kinds of wine

* The Roman *congius* (gallon) is about six pints.

in use, but only about eighty were common. Both Horace and Juvenal sang the praise of wine. Distillation was entirely unknown in Rome. None of the writers mention spirits, while describing wines in their minutest detail. The ruins of Pompeii and Herculaneum show no evidence whatever of distillation, while wine cellars with their *amphora* have been unearthed after two thousand years. The drink that swallowed up this mighty empire in a deluge of drunkenness was the "pure, harmless, healthful wine" that is now recommended by certain savants in America and Europe.

The Romans imported drink practices as one of the arts of Greek civilisation. They even borrowed Bacchus, not having any god whose quality was such as to preside over such matters. Bacchus became known as the Roman drink deity, while the Greek did him homage under the name of Dionysus. Greek tradition credits Dionsysus with having invented wine,* but ancient writers often attribute it to other divinities. At any rate the earliest Greek writers have much to say regarding drink. Most of the old heroes had vineyards. Homer frequently refers to wine drinking.

The Roman law, that men should not drink wine till after reaching the age of thirty, was doubtless of Grecian origin. Four hundred years B.C. Plato held, in the second book of his *Laws*, that men should not drink wine until that age had been reached. Then they should drink sparingly until forty, when they could sit at large banquets and invoke the gods, especially Dionysus. Later, he recommended wine as an antidote for old age. Pittacus, one of the seven

* See Appendix E, Chap. I.

wise men of Greece, showed himself worthy of his fame when he recommended abstinence to Periander of Priene, "so that it may not be discovered what sort of a person you really are, and that you are not what you pretend to be" (612 B.C.). Most of the Greek poets and sages refer to wine, but many of them recognise its power for evil. Euripides says that drinking is "the sire of blows and violence." According to Sthenelus (400 B. C.) "wine can bring e'en the wise to acts of folly." Eupolis (446 B. C.) wrote:

"He who first invented wine,
Made poor man a greater sinner."

Similar sentiments were expressed by Panyssis, Epicharmus, Antiphanes, Critias, Pytheas, Eubulus, Alexis, Diphilus, Callimachus and others. The greatest minds of ancient Greece were almost unanimous in their warnings against wine. Demosthenes was a total abstainer. Pytheas compares the great orator with Denades to the latter's disadvantage. Demosthenes was a "water-drinker, and devoted his nights to contemplation," while Denades was "a debauchee, and is drunk every day, and comes like a great pot-bellied fellow, as he is, into our assemblies." Æschylus represents the Greeks as prone to get drunk and break drinking cups and other utensils over each other's heads, while Aristophanes tells us that the Greek women pawned their clothes in order to procure wine, and made pass-keys to their husbands' wine cellars.

Alexander the Great, of Macedon, drank himself to death in a series of carousals about 330 B.C.

Arabia.—Strabo informs us that the Arab farmers made palm wine which was much used, but little else of the earlier drink customs is known.* It is reasonably clear that the origin of the prohibition of drink among the Mohammedans had a military rather than a religious basis. Sieur de Ryer, in his life of the Prophet, attached to his translation of the Koran, says that in the fourth year of the Hegira, when Mohammed's army was engaged against some neighbouring tribes, his soldiers were prone to bibulous excess and gambling; and that because some of his principal men, while in their cups, quarrelled and nearly came to blows; the Prophet forbade the use of wine and games of chance under any circumstances whatever. The fifth chapter of the Koran records the injunction mentioned by Sieur de Ryer in these words:

“ Oh, true believers, surely wine and lots, and images and divining arrows are an abomination of the work of Satan; therefore avoid them that you may prosper. Satan seeketh to sow dissension and hatred amongst you by means of wine and lots, and to divert you from remembering God, and from prayer; will ye not therefore abstain from them? ”

Persia.—The Persians were accustomed to the use of liquors from the earliest times. They were wont to debate matters of the highest moment when heated with wine. The followers of Zoroaster, like the ancient Brahmins, offered *homa* (wine) in sacrifice to their gods. Spiegel's translation of the Zend-Avesta gives songs in praise of the *homa*, and among the utensils of the priests was the *homa* cup.

* See Appendix F. Chap. I.

Plutarch, however, suggests that these offerings were made to the evil gods to avert their wrath. It seems clear, at any rate, that drunkenness was supposed to be the work of Ahriman, the god of darkness, and that *homa* was used wholly for sacrificial purposes, and not for producing intoxication,* and therefore not forbidden. The epitaph of Xerxes, the grandson of Cyrus, contains this: "He was able to drink more than any man in his dominions."

Other Ancients.—There is much dispute regarding drink customs among the people of Israel. We know that the hero of the flood became drunken and entailed servitude upon his son. In Moab and Ammon, the offspring of incest and wine, the great law of heredity was exemplified. The dispute lies mainly in the real meaning of the words translated into the English Bible as "wine." The original Hebrew words so translated are mainly *yayin* and *tirosk*. The former is almost always spoken of with disapproval, while the *tirosk* is almost always commended. In one case, both *yayin* and *tirosk* are condemned (Hosea iv. 2), which adds somewhat to the confusion and uncertainty as to what is actually meant in different connections by the word "wine."

That drunkenness was common, is abundantly attested by the powerful indictments of Solomon and Isaiah against the use of drink. The vigorous words of Isaiah, before the Babylonian captivity, are big with meaning:

"Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink: that continue until night till wine inflame them. And the harp, and the

* See Appendix G, Chap. I.

viol, the tabret and pipe, and wine, are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operations of his hands. Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they have not knowledge; and their honoured men are famished, and their multitudes dried up with thirst. Therefore Hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure; and their glory and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it" (Isaiah v. 11-13).

Amos complains that the tribes of Judah frequent heathen banquets and drink their strong wines (Amos xi. 6-12). Daniel describes the great feast of Belshazzar, the Babylonian king. We are told in Judges of the drunken Philistines, who, while engaged in a sacrifice to Dagon, brought out for their diversion Samson, who pulled down the house on their heads. Josephus says: "They brought him to their feast, that they might insult him in their cups."

The Druids used liquor in their rites; and in northern Europe, the followers of Odin drank from the skulls of their enemies. Tacitus relates that the ancient Teutons commonly drank a liquor prepared from barley and wheat. Their diet was simple, consisting of wild fruits, venison and curdled milk. But their drink customs were less simple. Concerning these, he said:

"They, being armed, proceed to business; but as often to parties of conviviality, where they spend whole days and nights in drinking, without any disgrace being attached to it. At these feasts, when the guests are intoxicated, frequent quarrels arise, which not only terminate in abuse, but in blood. The subjects of de-

bate at these feasts are the reconciliation of enemies, forming family alliances, the election of chiefs, and, lastly, peace and war. The German thinks the soul is never more open to sincerity nor the heart more alive to deeds of heroism, than under the influence of the bottle; for then, being naturally free from artifice and disguise, they open the inmost recesses of their minds; and the opinions which are thus broached they again canvass the next day."

We have little information of the drink practices of Britain at the beginning of the Christian era. Diodorus says that the people avoided the luxuries of wealth, and adds, "Their ordinary drink was water. Upon extraordinary occasions they drank a kind of fermented liquor made of barley, honey or apples, and when intoxicated never failed to quarrel, like the ancient Thracians." Pliny speaks of various liquors similar to beer being known to the inhabitants of the west of Europe. French * is of the opinion that wine was not known in Britain before the Roman conquest. The earliest intoxicant was *metheglin*, a sort of mead. Cider and ale followed the introduction of agriculture. The Druids of ancient Britain contained an order of people called the *Brughnibhs* who kept open house. In Ireland, the *Bruigh* kept a similar resort. These neighbourhood clubs developed into the Saxon *eala-hus* or *win-hus*, in which the drink feature rose into prominence.

But the Britons were apt pupils in the use of wine. As early as 81 A.D., Emperor Domitian, in order to check the growth of intemperance, ordered the de-

* *Nineteen Centuries of Drink in England.* p. 2.

struction of half the vineyards, and commanded that no more be planted without the imperial licence. Here began the battle by regulation against the ravages of alcohol among the Anglo-Saxon people.

CHAPTER II.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC HOUSE.

Though I look old, yet I am strong and lusty ;
For in my youth I never did apply
Hot and rebellious liquors in my blood,
Nor did not with unbashful forehead woo
The means of weakness and debility ;
Therefore my age is as a lusty winter,
Frosty, but kindly.

—*As You Like it*, Act II., Scene 3.

ALCOHOLIC excesses among the ancients largely took the form of libations to the gods and feasts of a religious, social nature, or in honour of a victory at arms. Indulgence in drink was occasional, or periodical. A debauch now and then was the rule, rather than the day by day tippling common to the civilisation of our age. But in the course of time the priests drank more and more of the offerings, while the portion devoted to the gods proportionately diminished. From the priests, bibulous practices in connection with festal celebrations spread among the people and the orgies of the gods became the excesses of the populace.

We are now to consider the evolution of the modern institution known as the "saloon" in America, and the "public house" in Great Britain, the germ of which is found in the customs and practices of Anglo-Saxon times.

In the time of the Druids, before and during the Roman period of English history, the *Brughnibhs*

and *Beatachs* kept houses for dispensing hospitality, very much like the *chaoultries* of India and the caravansaries of the East. In Ireland, the *Bruigh*, a person designated by the prince of the territory, performed similar functions; his master provided lands, stock and stabling with which to accommodate the traveller. Beds, food and backgammon boards were among the indispensables of the establishment.*

In the three hundred years of the Roman occupation, the aboriginal character received a deep impress of Latin civilisation. Wine was introduced. The quaint signboards of Rome were first hung out in front of places of public hospitality; signboards that are now a more striking feature of England than of Italy. The practice of toasting and drinking the health was introduced in the Roman period,† and all centred more or less around the public house inaugurated by the *Brughnibhs*.

At first the natives did not take kindly to the alcoholic feature of civilisation, and, moreover, the Romans made some effort to protect the "child races" from their own worst enemy. The order of the Emperor Domitian, that one-half of the vineyards be destroyed and not replanted without a royal licence, has been referred to. Similar steps were taken from time to time, until Probus became Emperor in 276 A.D. He reversed the national policy and permitted all provinces to plant vines and make wine without limit. The aversion of the natives to the new order of things is abundantly shown. Queen Boadicea, addressing her soldiers (61 A.D.), plainly, if indirectly, referred to the intemperance of the invaders when she said: "To us, every herb and root

* French, *Nineteen Centuries of Drink*, p. 5.

† See Appendix A. Chap. II.

are food, every juice our oil, and water is our wine." Two centuries later, when Emperor Bonosus committed suicide after the defeat of Banffshire, the soldiers scoffing said: "There hangs a tankard and not a man."

But this opposition died out in course of years, and Rome sowed the dragon's teeth of appetite, the harvest of which the world is reaping even now. Early in the Saxon period, the seeds of Roman example began to ripen into a rank growth of excess. Here first appears the English court fool, in the *scop*, a literary professional who cracked jokes and composed poetry for the drunken chiefs assembled at the mead bench. The first epic poem in the English language, the story of Beowulf and Hrothgar, has as its setting a drunkard carouse in a "great mead hall," where Hrothgar is described as one of the "beer-drunken heroes of the ale-wassail."

Clergymen became the successors of the *Brugh-nibhs* in keeping the open house, and the house did not improve in better hands.* The ale-house appeared, and soon rivalled the tavern in demoralising power. As early as the ninth century, both began to suffer in public estimation. Even before the death of Ecgbright, conditions became such that priests were enjoined to keep away from both ale-houses and taverns. The condition of the clergy as to drinking practices is eloquently shown in the decree of the Synod held by St. David in the year 569, A.D. The decree is also interesting as the only legislative relic of the British church upon the subject of drink.† The first four canons of the decree read:

* See Appendix B, Chap. II.

† See Appendix C, Chap. II.

(1) Priests about to minister in the temple of God and drinking wine or strong drink through negligence, and not ignorance, must do penance three days. If they have been warned, and despise, then forty days.

(2) Those who get drunk through ignorance must do penance fifteen days; if through negligence, forty days; if through contempt, three quarantians.

(3) He who forces another to get drunk out of hospitality must do penance as if he had got drunk himself.

(4) But he who out of hatred or wickedness, in order to mock at others, forces them to get drunk, if he has not already sufficiently done penance, must do penance as a murderer of souls.

Further evidence of the drinking practices of the clergy and monks of these times is by no means scarce.

The yuletide festivals reached a high stage of low development in this period, beginning in an attempt to engraft a Christian ceremonial upon the Celtic festival connected with sun worship. The net result was a strange mixture of religious rites and bibulous conviviality.

Around the *eala-hus*, the *win-hus* and the tavern, there developed the Anglo-Saxon guild. The members of these social confederations were each required to bring a certain amount of malt or honey to their meetings. Delinquencies in this respect were punished with a fine sufficiently heavy to stimulate the memory. These guilds have left their mark upon the public house in giving it a certain respectability as a social club.

Pin drinking, the famous restrictive measure of Archbishop Dunstan, actually developed into an inducement to drinking, and the church wake degen-

enerated into a debauch. These were among the fruits of Anglo-Saxon supremacy.

Toward the close of the eleventh century came the Danish invasion. At this time the early German custom of drinking in honour of the gods was in high favour among the Danes,* and they gave additional impetus to drinking customs. They introduced the German custom of Hock Day.†

During the Norman period, there was a revival of wine drinking. The Normans were great traders and brought wines in abundance from the coast of France and Spain. *Clarre*, *hippocras* and *garhiofilac*, all vinous drinks, were introduced by the Normans and became popular. Vineyards began to be more generally attached to religious houses. Convivial meetings in low inns and revels of the Norman nobles are often mentioned by the historians of the period, although Sir Walter Scott repels aspersions on the character of the gentry. Pin drinking became more of a challenge to excess than a deterrent, as originally designed, and eventually invoked the displeasure of ecclesiastical authority.

In the beginning of the thirteenth century, malt drinks were discouraged in favour of light wines, but the fourteenth century had not closed before the public sentiment reversed the policy. In the fifteenth century the plan of holding "church ales" as a means to raise money to pay the preacher became common. Ale, in its rivalry with wine, advanced in public favour, and got a grip on the British appetite which holds like a dead hand until now. The "church ale" had much to do with the result. Two hundred years later high ecclesiastics thundered

* See Appendix D. Chap. II.

† See Appendix E. Chap. II.

against "church ales," but it was then too late; the mischief had been done.

Late in the fifteenth century, Henry VII. enacted a number of laws which form the beginning of the English policy of hindering the liquor business by legal indorsement on the basis of revenue.* Henry VIII., "who meddled with everything from religion to beer barrels," was particularly interested in such legislation. His laws were in the main confined to taxation and such petty regulations as forbidding brewers to put hops in their beer. It was in his time that the practice, still prevalent, of transacting business over drink in ale-houses became common, and that ardent spirits began to come into common use in England. These spirits under the name *usquebaugh* were introduced by Irish settlers in Pembroke-shire.

The seventeenth century fairs took on an alcoholic flavour. At those held by the Corporation of Cambridge, an official known as the Lord of the Tap, arrayed in red livery, with a string over his shoulder on which were suspended spigots and faucets, entered all booths where ale was sold to see if the liquor offered was fit for visitors to drink.†

During the reign of Elizabeth, the current acts of Parliament plainly showed the apprehension of those in authority over the increasing dissipation of the people. In this reign, the right to sell liquor was held to be a prerogative of the crown. It followed naturally that power was given to favoured ones to issue licences, while the Queen herself embarked in the business of exporting liquors for profit. But

* See Appendix F. Chap. II.

† Daniel, *Merrie England in Ye Olden Time*, Vol. II. p. 12.

while the Queen and the laws of her Parliament encouraged the export of malt liquors, the general tenor of her laws was in the direction of discouraging home consumption; at least they were intended so to operate.*

The modern club is a contribution of the Elizabethan era. It differed from the Anglo-Saxon guild in that its membership was confined to the select classes and supported a well-appointed establishment instead of holding meetings at stated intervals to which each person brought his appointed quantum of victuals and drink. The Mermaid was the first of a long series of London clubs† and included in its membership such well-known names as Shakespeare, Raleigh, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher. During the reign of the Stuarts and Hanovers, the ale-house and the tavern reached the complexion of the present public house of Great Britain and the saloon of America. It became "the poor man's club." It was the place where politicians met to discuss measures and men, where business men repaired to negotiate or conclude their bargains, where toilet conveniences were freely provided, and where social and political "influence" began to take the form of treating.

During all this time a strange jumble of liquor laws followed upon the growing appreciation of the public ill-fare. All were designed to alleviate the evil, but the net result was to fasten the legalised public house upon the people. Severe laws were passed against drunkenness.‡ Church wakes were

* See Appendix G, Chap. II.

† See Appendix H, Chap. II.

‡ Drunkenness was first recognised as a crime in English law during the reign of Edward VI.

forbidden, but distilleries were permitted, and even encouraged. As early as 1632, Decker informs us in his *English Villainies*, "a whole street is in some places a continuous ale-house, not a shop to be seen between red lattice and red lattice." About the same time the Lord Keeper of Coventry said of them:

"I account ale-houses and tipping houses the greatest pests in the kingdom. I give it you in charge to take a course that none be permitted unless they be licenced; and for the licenced ale-houses, let them be but few and in fit places; if they be in private corners and ill places, they become the den of thieves—they are the public stages of drunkenness and disorder. Let care be taken in the choice of ale-house keepers, that it be not appointed to the livelihood of a large family. In many places they swarm by default of the justices of the peace."

By the middle of the eighteenth century, gin drinking became epidemic. Lecky says:

"Small as is the place which this fact occupies in English history, it was probably, if we consider all the consequences that flowed from it, the most momentous in that of the eighteenth century—incomparably more so than any event in the purely political annals of the country. The average of British spirits distilled, which is said to have been only 527,000 gallons in 1684, had risen in 1727 to 3,601,000. Physicians declared that in excessive gin drinking a new and terrible course of mortality had been opened for the poor. The grand jury of Middlesex declared that much the greater part of the poverty, the murders, the robberies of London, might be traced to this single cause. Retailers of gin were accustomed to hang out painted boards announcing that their customers could be made drunk for a penny, dead drunk for two pence and have straw for



nothing; and cellars strewn with straw were accordingly provided into which those who had become insensible were dragged, and where they remained until they had become sufficiently recovered to renew their orgies."*

In 1725, when the population of London was 700,000, there were 6,187 places where ardent spirits were sold, and this included only the Metropolis without the City of London and Southwark.

In 1736 alarm at the social conditions resulted in the famous Gin Act of Parliament, a law very similar to the high licence laws in the United States at the present time. This step resulted in such disturbance that the statute was greatly modified in 1743. While this legislation was pending the country was aroused, and England had the first real temperance agitation in its history. Dr. Lees, in his *Prize Essay*, gives extracts from speeches in Parliament on the subject. Among the most significant of these addresses was one delivered by Lord Lonsdale, when the project to modify the law was up for discussion. His Lordship said:

"In every part of this great metropolis, whoever shall pass along the streets, will find wretchedness stretched upon the pavement, insensible and motionless, and only removed by the charity of passengers from the danger of being crushed by carriages or trampled by horses, or strangled with filth in the common sewers; and others, less helpless perhaps, but more dangerous, who have drunk too much to fear punishment, but not enough to hinder them from provoking it. . . . No man can pass a single hour in public places without meeting such objects, or hearing such expres-

* *England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. I, p. 479.

sions as disgrace human nature,—such as cannot be looked upon without horror, or heard without indignation, and which there is no possibility of removing or preventing, whilst this hateful liquor is publicly sold. . . . These liquors not only infatuate the mind, but poison the body; they not only fill our streets with madmen and our prisons with criminals, but our hospitals with cripples. . . . Nor does the use of spirits, my lords, impoverish the public only by lessening the number of useful and laborious hands, but by cutting off those recruits by which its natural and inevitable losses are to be supplied. The use of distilled liquors impairs the fecundity of the human race and hinders the increase which Providence has ordained for the support of the world. Those women who riot in this poisonous debauchery are quickly disabled from bearing children, or, what is still more destructive to general happiness, produce children diseased from their birth, and who, therefore, are an additional burden, and must be supported through a miserable life by that labor which they cannot share, and must be protected by that community of which they cannot contribute to the defence.”

Contemporary writers have much to say regarding the prevalent debauchery of the times. “Methodism, drinking and gambling are all on the increase,” said the sarcastic Walpole. James Quin, the greatest tragedian of his times, was an inebriate. After being engaged at Drury Lane, he got into a drunken brawl and committed depredations that forced him to leave the country. Richard Savage, while in a drunken carouse, murdered a man and came near being hanged for it. Percy Fitzgerald, in his life of George IV., quotes the following from a letter written by Sir Gilbert Elliott to his wife:

“How the men of business and the great orators of the House of Commons contrive to reconcile it with their exertions, I cannot conceive. Men of all ages drink abominably. Fox [a Prime Minister] drinks what I should call a great deal, though he is not reckoned to do so by his companions; Sheridan [M. P. dramatist and friend of the Prince of Wales, afterward George IV.] excessively; and Gray [Viscount Howick] more than any of them. But it is in a much more gentlemanly way than our Scotch drunkards, and is always accompanied with a lively clever conversation on subjects of importance. Pitt [Prime Minister], I am told, drinks as much as anybody.”

Charles James Fox, according to Sheridan, was accustomed to enter his seat in Parliament drunk after an all night's debauch. In his *Early History of Fox*, Mr. Trevelyan gives this account of the social customs of this sorry time:

“These were the days when the Duke of Grafton, the Premier, lived openly with Miss Nancy Parsons. Rigby the Paymaster of the Forces, had only one merit. that he drank fair. He used brandy as the rest of the world used small beer. Lord Waymouth, grandson of Lord Carteret, had more than his grandfather's capacity for liquor, and a fair portion of his abilities. He constantly boozed till daylight, even when a Secretary of State. His occasional speeches were extolled by his admirers as preternaturally sagacious, and his severest critics admitted them to be pithy.”


John Ashton, in his *Old Times*, quotes from the London *Times* of October 4, 1797:

“In the city of London . . . there are at present 5,204 licenced public houses, and it is calculated that



WILLIAM IV.
(1765-1837)





JOHN BRIGHT
(1811-1889)

the beer, and spirits, which are consumed in these only is little short of three millions sterling a year. It has been lately discovered that clubs of apprentice boys are harboured in public houses, for the purpose of supporting their brethren who have run away from their masters, and of indulging themselves early in scenes of lewdness, and drunkenness, which they generally do, by pilfering their masters property, and disposing of it at the old iron shops. In a recent publication, the consumption of ale and porter, annually, in the Metropolis and its environs, is stated to be 1,132,147 barrels, equal to 36,625,145 gallons, making 158,400,580 pots at 3½d.—£2,311,466, 15s. 10d. And by another calculation, the average consumption of gin and compounds, in public houses, previous to the stoppage of the distillery, about 3,000,000 gallons, £975,000. Total, £3,286,496, 15s. 10d.

During the dark days just preceding the passing of the century, when there was revolution at home and rebellion abroad, when the richest colonies the world has ever known went apart by themselves, and when, like the coils about Laocoön and his sons, the ale-house * and tavern had Britain helpless in the gutter, attempts at better things practically ceased. What little restrictive legislation there was on the statute books was in the main ignored.

* See Appendix I, Chap. II.

CHAPTER III.

DRINK IN THE NORTH AMERICAN COLONIES.

IN the beginning of the colonisation of America the vines of European debauchery were transplanted into American soil and diligently cultivated by the fathers, to set the children's teeth on edge in future years.

Every ship that sailed for the new world brought an abundance of liquors, in many cases drink being the chief feature of the cargo. The ship "Arabella," which brought Governor Winthrop to Massachusetts Bay in the year 1629, had among its supplies:

"42 tuns of beer,
14 tuns of water,
1 hogshead of vinegar,
2 hogsheads of cider and
4 pumps for water and beer."

The result of having three times as much beer as water aboard for drinking purposes had a natural result. Even this quantity of malt liquors did not prevent repeated and prolonged attacks upon the ship's supply of "hot waters," for on March 3, 1630, Governor Winthrop wrote in his famous diary regarding the trip: "We observed as a common fault with our own grown people that they gave themselves to drink hot waters very immoderately." Notwith-

standing the influence of Governor Winthrop * the evil flourished, almost from the start, and the first crop had scarce been harvested when it became necessary to inflict strange punishments upon those found guilty of becoming drunk. Fines were inflicted, the stocks set up and the scarlet letter introduced. As early as the year 1633, Governor Winthrop found occasion to record: "Robert Cole, having been oft punished for drunkenness, was now ordered to wear a red D about his neck for a year."

But from the first beer was encouraged, partly as an antidote for "hot waters," partly on account of the expense of wine and partly because the people liked it. In 1637, the first brewery in the colony, and probably the first on American soil, was set up. Captain Sedgwick was the first brewer, and, four years later, John Appleton became the first maltster. This encouragement of the consumption of beer even took the form of legislation. In 1649, the colonial authorities decreed that: "Every victualler, ordinary keeper, or taverner shall always keep provided with good and wholesome beer for the entertainment of strangers, who, for want thereof, are necessitated to much needless expense in wine."

Extortion in the matter of drink prices invariably excited the ire of the pilgrim fathers as well as the pioneers of Massachusetts. We read among the court orders of Plymouth Colony under date of June 5, 1638:

"Mr. Stephen Hopkins is presented for selling beere for 2d. a quart, not worth 1d. a quart.

"Witnesse, KENELME WINSLOW.

"Item, for selling wine at such excessive rates, to

* See Apper.dix A, Chap. III.

the oppressing and impoverishing of the colony. Kenelme Winslow and John Winslow, witnesses.*

The growth of beer drinking almost supplanted the beverage use of water in the early days. Wood, in his *New England Prospects*, written in those times, says of the New England water:

“I dare not prefer it before good Beere as some have done, but any man could choose it before Bad Beere, Wheay or Buttermilk.”

In 1629, Higginson, the famous Salem preacher, boasted:

“Whereas, my stomach could only digest and did require such drink as was both strong and stale, I can and oftentimes do drink New England water very well.”

In the seventeenth century, Boston's trade with Spain and the Canary Islands did much toward stimulating the consumption of wine in the colony. Spain wanted fish, which New England had in abundance. So Boston sent ships laden with casks and fish. Spain returned the casks filled with wines. The trade was fostered by the authorities. In 1642, the office of “gauger of casks” was created to insure the proper size. Four years later, inspectors began to be appointed to search these same casks for worm holes, for the reason that the coopers were becoming dishonest, and it was desired to avoid offending the Spanish wine growers and so injuring trade. Wine became the drink of the more polite classes. In 1647, when the ministers and elders met at Cambridge, the General Court passed this vote:

* *Plymouth Colonial Records*, Vol. I., p. 87.

“The Corte thinke it convenient that order be given to the Auditor to send twelve gallons of sack and six gallons of white wine, as a small testimony of the Corte’s respect, to the Reverend assembly at Cambridge.”

While bitter experience had made the colonists fiercely intolerant of selling liquor to Indians, yet a line of reform argument well known to-day so far prevailed, that on November 3, 1644, the general court decreed:

“The Corte apprehending that it is not fit to deprive the Indians of any lawful comfort which God alloweth to all men by the use of wine, do order that it shall be lawful for all such as are or shall be allowed licence to retail wines, to sell also to Indians so much as may be fit for their needful use and refreshing.” *

This experiment was abandoned thirteen years later.

These unfortunate beginnings soon began to yield their fruit. As early as 1637, the Massachusetts Colony enacted a law in which the following statement was made in the preamble:

“That much drunkenness, waste of good creatures of God, mispence of precious time, and other disorders, have frequently fallen out in the inns and common victualing houses, within this jurisdiction, whereby God is much dishonored, the profession of religion is reproached, and the welfare of the commonwealth greatly impaired and the true use of such houses (being the necessary releefs of travelers), subverted,” etc.

This, and other similar laws, were put in force under the special direction of the managers of the

* *Massachusetts Colony Records*, Vol. II., p. 258.

colony in England and sent to Massachusetts Bay in 1629.*

The very first record of the Court proceedings of Plymouth Colony after civil government had been established was, "John Holmes censured for drunkenness to sitt in stocks and twenty shillings fine." And from that time, down through the history of the colony, the same records are streaked with entries of punishment for drunkenness.

The other colonies fared little, if any, better. Pennsylvania began brewing beer as early as 1683 under the direction of William Penn. But beer did not come so rapidly into general use, owing to the difficulty of keeping it in that warmer climate. Dr. John Watson gives us an account of the early practices of the settlers at Buckingham and Solebury:

"This [rum drinking] being countenanced by general opinion, and brought into general practice as far as their limited abilities would admit, bottles of rum were handed about at vendues, and mixed and stewed spirits were repeatedly given to those who attended funerals. . . . At births many good women were collected; wine and cordial waters were esteemed suitable to the occasion for the guests, but besides these, rum, either buttered or made into hot-tiff, was believed to be essentially necessary to the lying-in woman. The tender infant must be straightly rolled around the waist with a linen swathe, and loaded with clothes till he could hardly breathe; and when unwell or fretful, was dosed with spirit and water stewed with spicery. . . . As money was scarce, and labourers few, and business often to be done required many hands, friends and neighbours were commonly invited to raisings of houses and barns, grubbing, chopping and rolling logs.

* See Appendix B, Chap. III.

. . . Rum and a dinner were provided on these occasions. . . . Rum was drunk in proportion to the hurry of business, and long intervals of rest employed in merry and sometimes angry conversation." *

Early in the seventeenth century the authorities of New Haven Colony found it necessary to begin whipping, putting in stocks, fining and otherwise punishing people who drank too much of the liquors which they had authorised to be sold. On December 4, 1639, two drunken servants were punished: one put in stocks and the other whipped. Six weeks later another servant was fined five pounds for "being druncke on the Lord's day." From that time on the records abound in similar punishments. In 1645, the first tavern was licenced, and shortly afterwards two young men were presented for drinking "sacke in a cellar out of the bung with a tobacco pipe." Then the tavern-keeper's son and some friends became drunk, and were arrested and fined for the "sinne"; and a friend of the Governor was overcome by drink on a visit to a Dutch vessel in the harbour, but he was let off with a fine instead of whipping, on the ground, the Governor said, that he was "not given to drunkenness"; that this was "not an appointed meeting for drinking"; and that he was guilty of an "act" only. Next the Governor's "neager" got drunk, but that was held also to be an accident.

In 1644 the Long Island Dutch became so addicted to the use of malt liquors that James, Duke of York and Albany, took measures to restrict their use.

* *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania*, Vol. I., p. 296.

In 1676 the colony of Virginia began to have serious trouble with ardent spirits. Beer was not much used, owing to the warm climate, which made it difficult to keep. In that year the manufacture and sale of ardent spirits were prohibited, but the law was soon allowed to fall into disuse.

A few years prior to 1663 the soldiers of Delaware Colony became intoxicated and committed grievous outrages on both settlers and Indians. Just before these events the director of the colony had taken away some of the palisades of the fort to burn in his brewery. The result was that when D'Hinoyossa arrived at Altona, soon after, he prohibited distilling and brewing in the colony, even for domestic use.*

Georgia had fewer troubles in its early days than the other colonies, owing to the vigorous stand taken by Governor Oglethorp. Upon his arrival he at once forbade the manufacture and sale of intoxicants and upheld the law during the whole time that he remained in authority.

In the middle of the seventeenth century malt liquors began to give way to cider in popular use. This was brought about largely through the cheapness of apples and the fact that the facilities of New England brewers were not such as enabled them to produce beer of good quality. For a hundred years cider was the leading intoxicant in the New England colonies, but beer was its chief rival.

About the year 1750 rum became king of New England. It was early introduced in all the colonies, but its use did not assume regnant proportions in the North until long after it had come to power in the

* Hazard, *Annals of Pennsylvania*.

South. Traders had imported an increasing amount of molasses, as rum could be more economically made in the cooler climate. The product was thence sent to the Gold Coast of Africa to be exchanged for slaves, and lay the mine for the catastrophe of misery and blood of 1861-5. In 1734 Rhode Island sent eighteen vessels to Africa laden with rum, to return with slaves for cargo. This was continued for more than thirty years. During that period this traffic yielded Great Britain an annual revenue of 40,000 pounds. Massachusetts was well abreast of Rhode Island in this trade in human ills and human beings, and each consumed a rapidly increasing amount of molasses spirit.* In 1746 there were three rum distilleries in New York and six three years later. In the height of the slave trade Newport had thirty rum distilleries. At the close of the eighteenth century, Boston had the same number. For several years before the Revolution 600,000 gallons of New England rum were annually exported in the slave trade.

From the year 1750 till the beginning of the temperance agitation in the early part of the subsequent century, was a period of sad debauchery in American history. The mother was goaded or stupefied heavily with intoxicants while in labour. The babe was given liquor, too, for its medicine. The wedding was celebrated in a bibulous frolic. The feast of Christmas-tide was alcoholic as a rule. The barn-raising, huskings, plantings, and most of the rural festivities were accompanied by the freest indulgence. The workman took his pay in liquor. The town meeting was an occasion for a common debauch. College commencements were accompanied with great drunken-

* See Appendix C, Chap. III.

ness. Alcoholic drinks supplied a leading feature of the funeral. It was a common thing for towns to supply liquors at public expense for the burial of paupers.

A most distinguished authority thus describes the funeral practices of these times: *

“It is recorded in the Probate office that in 1687, at the funeral of Mrs. Mary Norton, widow of the celebrated John Norton, one of the ministers of the First Church in Boston, fifty-one and one-half gallons of the best Malaga wine was consumed by the mourners; in 1685, at the funeral of Rev. Thomas Corbett, there were consumed one barrel of wine and two barrels of cider, and ‘as it was cold’ there were ‘some spice and ginger for the cider.’ Towns provided intoxicating drinks at the funerals of their paupers. In Salem, in 1728, at the funeral of a pauper, a gallon of wine and a gallon of cider are charged as ‘incidentals;’ the next year, six gallons of wine on a similar occasion. In Lynn, in 1711, the town furnished one-half a barrel of cider for the widow Despaw’s funeral. Affairs came to such a pass, that, in 1742, the General Court of Massachusetts forbade the use of wine and rum at funerals.”

Another authority gives the mortuary expenses of David Porter, who was drowned at Hartford in 1678: †

	£	s.
“By a pint of liquor for those who dived for him	0	1
By a quart of liquor for those who brought him home	0	2

* Theodore Parker, *Speeches, Addresses and Sermons*, Vol. I., p. 397.

† Earle, *Customs in Old New England*, p. 370.

	£	s.
By two quarts of wine and one gallon of cider to jury of inquest	0	5
By 8 gallons and 3 quarts wine for funeral..	1	15
By barrel of cider for funeral	0	16
1 coffin	0	12
Winding sheet	0	18”

As might be expected, the personal habits of the clergy were not of the best in such a period. The weekly meetings were occasions of much drinking, and excessive indulgence was a common accompaniment of ordinations. The Rev. Lyman Beecher thus describes an ordination at Plymouth, Connecticut, as late as the year 1810:

“At this ordination, the preparation for our creature comforts . . . besides food, was a broad sideboard covered with decanters and bottles and sugar and pitchers or water. There we found all kinds of liquors then in vogue. The drinking was apparently universal. This preparation was made by the society as a matter of course. When the consociation arrived they always took something to drink around, also before public services and always on their return. As they could not all drink at once, they were obliged to stand and wait as people do when they go to mill. . . . When they had all done drinking and taken pipes and tobacco, in less than fifteen minutes there was such a smoke you could not see. The noise, I cannot describe; it was the maximum of hilarity. They told their stories and were at the height of jocose talk.”

A contemporary of Mr. Beecher gives a similar account of such functions:

“At freemen’s meetings, at associational, ordination, and other clerical gatherings, a rich display of decan-

ters with strong liquors (usually furnished by some generous parishoner) covered the sideboard and were resorted to by all without any sense of wrong-doing; though not in all cases without results which were the subject of much private conversation." *

A quarter of a century before the time described above, we have the record of the expenses attendant upon the ordination services of the Rev. Joseph McKean, at Beverly, Massachusetts, in 1785. The following is the bill of the tavern-keeper:


	£	s.	d.
" 30 Bowles of Punch before the people went to meeting	3	0	0
80 people eating in the morning at 16d... ..	6	0	0
10 bottles of wine before they went to meeting	1	10	0
68 dinners at 3s.....	10	4	0
44 bowles of punch while at dinner.....	4	8	0
18 bottles of wine.....	2	14	0
8 bowles of brandy.....	1	2	0
Cherry rum	1	10	0
6 people drank tea	0	0	9."

The manner of keeping Christmas on the Mohawk, in 1769, is thus described by the Rev. S. Kirkland:


"They generally assemble for read'g prayers, or Divine service—but after, they eat, drink and make merry. They allow of no work or servile labor on ye day and ye follow'g—their servants are free—but drink'g, swear'g, fight'g, and frolick'g are not only allowed, but seem to be essential to ye joy of ye day."

Mr. Eddy has this to record of the drinking practices current in early religious functions:

* Marsh, *Temperance Recollections*, p. 9.



THE BEECHER FAMILY.



Permission of Eaton & Mains.

John Wesley

Founder of Methodism, and an ardent temperance advocate.

(1703-1791)

“ Nearly everybody drank, and the chief items in the expenses of town officials, religious conventions or associations, ordinations of ministers, raising the frames of church edifices, or dedicating the completed churches, were generally for liquors furnished and consumed. ‘ Two barrels of New England rum,’ were among the articles which the parish Committee of North Carver, Mass., was ordered to procure for the use of the visitors invited to assist in raising the frame of their new Meeting House. ‘ Eight barrels of Rum,’ are among items of a bill in the writer’s possession, for extensive alterations, repairs and enlargement of a church edifice in Boston, in 1792; and the following items are in the expenses of the auditing committee who examined the accounts of a church treasurer, at the close of a long term of service:

		..	£	s.	d.
“ “ 1794, Oct.	14.	3	Bowles Punch.....	0	12 0
		2	Bottles Wine.....	0	8 0
	19.	5	Bowles Punch.....	1	0 0
		2	Bottles Wine.....	0	8 0
	24.	3	Bowles Punch.....	0	12 0
		2	Bottles Wine.....	0	8 0
			Brandy.....	0	2 2 ’”

Outside of the sorry example set by religious leaders in the way of drinking excesses, probably no influence was more powerful in promoting these same practices among the people than the indulgences common in educational institutions on festive and other occasions. The early records of Harvard University show that malt was accepted in payment of tuition fees, and that a “ rundlet of sack ” was good for a year’s schooling. The appeal of President Deemster of that institution is recorded, in which he asks the court to encourage “ Sister Bradish in her present calling of baking of bread and brewing and selling

penny beer without which she cannot continue to bake." The commencement season was an occasion for much drinking.*

As early as 1760, it was the custom for every Harvard senior to bring with him a bottle of wine on that day. Thirty-seven years before that, a committee of the commonwealth appointed to investigate the institution reported:

"Although there is a considerable number of virtuous and studious youths in the college, yet there has been a practice of several immoralities, particularly stealing, lying, swearing, idleness, picking of locks, and the frequent use of strong drink."

A distinguished Harvard professor thus describes a commencement in early days†:

"The entire common, then an unenclosed dust plain, was completely covered on Commencement day and night preceding and following it, with drinking stands, dancing booths, mountebank shows, and gambling tables; and I have never heard such a horrid din, tumult, and jargon of oath, shout, scream, fiddle, quarrelling, and drunkenness as on those two nights."

Col. T. W. Higginson is quoted in *Harvard's Better Self* as giving the following observations regarding a commencement within his recollection:

"I can remember when the senior class assembled annually around Liberty Tree on Class Day, and ladled out bowls of punch for every passer-by; till every Cambridge boy saw a dozen men in various stages of inebriation about the village yard."

* See Appendix D, Chap. III.

† Peabody, *Harvard Reminiscences*, p. 59.

Another famous Harvard man, Josiah Quincy, thus describes a commencement season of but seventy years ago:

“Caleb Cushing came in, and gave us for a toast, ‘The bonds of friendship, which always tighten when they are wet.’ When we had all drunk our skins full, we marched round to all the professors’ houses, danced round the Rebellion and Liberty Trees, and then returned to the hall. A great many of the class were half-seas over.”

The beginnings of Dartmouth were likewise clouded with drinking practices. On the first commencement, held on Aug. 28, 1771, Governor Wentworth, who gave the college its charter, came from Portsmouth with sixty “gents,” an ox, a barrel of rum and a silver punch bowl* which he gave to President Wheelock. Arrangements for the reception of the visitors were incomplete. Mrs. Wheelock was “sick in bed” and the President’s cook was “drunk.” The result was that the visitors “stuck up their noses.” About the same time, the board of trustees met and presented to Aaron Storrs, Mr. Wheelock’s bookkeeper, two acres of land on which to build an inn, and President Wheelock signed the application to the Court of Quarter Sessions for the liquor licence for the same.

The early drinking customs of Yale were of a similar character. As early as 1732, the college authorities instituted lengthy regulations providing for the supply of good liquors in the commons, the quality having become so poor. John Marsh gives his experiences at Yale early in the century just brought to a close:

* This punch bowl is still in the possession of the college.

“I entered Yale in September, 1800, having mastered the four Evangelists, six books of Virgil, and four Orations of Cicero. . . . A political revolution had occurred in the country. Thomas Jefferson, the Democratic candidate, had attained to the Presidency ; and party politics raged with a violence since unknown. Every boy was a patriot, ready to fly to arms. The colleges, with few exceptions, were strongly enlisted, under President Dwight, in behalf of Washington, Adams, and what were considered constitutional and fundamental principles ; and it was resolved, when the fourth of July should return, to have a celebration of independence worthy of the day and worthy of Yale. At the dinner in College Hall, a barrel of wine was elevated on the table, and none were expected to leave the hall until, amid shouts, and songs, and harangues of all descriptions, the barrel was emptied. The result was *Io Bacche*, the triumph of Bacchus. But for that, I should have escaped the common maxim in days gone by, that there was no man to be found who had not been drunk at least once in his life. The sensation has not been forgotten. As I went out of the hall I saw the buildings moving around, and discharged the contents of my rebellious stomach.”

The colonial farmers well reflected the drinking customs of the colleges and the clergy. While the gentry used wine, rural drinkers resorted to numerous mixtures, mostly more or less compounds of rum and cider. Punches varied all the way from a mildly intoxicating brew to a fierce alcoholic mixture, largely of rum and brandy. Flip was a common drink, as was black-strap, a villainous compound of rum and molasses. The same may be said of toddy and egg-nog, both intoxicants in the ratio of the taste of the compounder. These drinks constituted the motive power of most farming functions. They

were not confined to festivities. They were a staple alike at the seedtime and the harvest.

At the first annual meeting of the famous temperance organisation started by Dr. Billy J. Clark, in Moreau, Saratoga County, N. Y., in 1808, Capt. Isaac B. Payn, an extensive farmer and lumber dealer, gave his experiences of farming with rum, which is an excellent description of the rural situation of his time. He said:

“During a series of years past, before signing the temperance pledge, I have uniformly made it a rule, annually to purchase a hogshead of rum for the years consumption among the labourers on the farm. . . . Sometimes, before the year came around, the hogshead would be emptied of its contents, and require a few gallons more for necessary use. At other times, the year would come around and find a few gallons in the hogshead; so that on an average, a hogshead of rum each year has been consumed in my business concerns, to say nothing of the wines, cordials and other liquors consumed by the family, their parties, and visiting friends.

“After signing the temperance pledge a year ago, instead of a hogshead, I purchased a five-gallon keg of rum, for my whole business concerns, both farming and lumber. And my reason for doing this was, because my business required a few excellent labourers, not one of whose help I could obtain without some kind of liquor.”

“All the labouring men drank ardent spirits in their work,” said Dr. Marsh, “nor was it then, more than it had been for an hundred years, been viewed as inconsistent with Christian experience or Christian character.”

Senator Blair states that in 1792 there were 2579

distilleries in the United States; while in 1810 there were 14,191, and the population had not doubled. The deplorable situation in the early part of the nineteenth century in the States cannot better be summed up than by quoting from a statement compiled by Samuel Dexter, LL.D., after his term as Secretary of War had expired in 1814:*

“The quantity of ardent spirits consumed in the country surpasses belief. By the Marshal’s return to the Secretary’s office, in 1810, of domestic manufactures in the United States, it is ascertained that 25,499,382 gallons of ardent spirits were distilled in the year, of which 133,823 gallons were exported, leaving 25,365,559 gallons to be consumed at home. Considering the caution with which the accounts of property are returned to government, through fear of taxation; considering, also, the quantities distilled in private families, of which no account may have been rendered, there is a high probability that millions might be added to the account rendered by the marshals. Let it stand, however, as it is, and add to it 8,000,000 gallons of distilled spirits in the same year imported, and the quantity for home consumption amounts to 33,365,559 gallons. . . .

“Next take the estimate of the number of persons who drink up this flood. The population of the States by the census of 1810 was 7,239,903. From this number deduct slaves, said not to be permitted to drink it, 1,191,365; and children who drink little or none, at least 1,670,000; and others who, through disrelish, delicacy, or principle, drink little or none, at least 1,000,000 more, and the remaining number have a quantity of ardent spirits to consume of nearly ten gallons to each person. . . .

* This statement, signed by Mr. Dexter, was published and circulated by the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, in its early days.

“The solemn fact is, more than four times as much spirit is consumed on the farm now as was used on the same farm, by the same conductors of it, twenty years ago. The pocket flask has grown into a case bottle, and the keg into a barrel. This fact is not affirmed on light evidence. The consequence is found to be that the bloated countenance and the tottering frame is becoming a frequent spectacle among the yeomen of the country, once regarded, even to a proverb. the healthiest, the hardiest, the happiest class of the country.”

Canada in Early Days.—The work which rum, beer and cider did for New England was done by brandy in the early days of Canadian colonial history. The wise men of the time said, that owing to the rigours of the climate, brandy was the only liquor of sufficient power to supply the necessary bodily heat. Hence, it came about that beer and cider were comparatively little used, and rum was not much drunk until later years, when the Dutch traders of New York began supplying the people through the trading posts of Niagara and Fort Frontenac.

The Jesuits entered the territory, and were in full possession and authority for some time prior to the organisation of the colonial government. During this time, the situation was kept well in hand, and brandy sellers received but little comfort. Selling to the Indians was an offence which was not tolerated by the followers of Loyola. When a trader was found guilty of this offence, he was led to the door of the church after the sermon; there he was forced to kneel on the pavement partly stripped and hold a penitential torch in his hand while the priest laid on the flagellations.

In addition, general regulations were made against

drunkenness among both natives and whites. In the summer of 1648, at Sillery, occurred what was probably the first temperance meeting on American soil. The speech was delivered by a converted Algonquin chief. After mass, the drum beat, and the Indians gathered. The chief addressed the braves, proclaimed an edict against drunkenness, and exhorted his people to abstain from all intoxicating liquors.

The fight against selling brandy to the natives was carried on under the direction of François de Laval, the first Bishop of Quebec. The prelate finally made selling liquor punishable by excommunication, "because, being intoxicated to excess, and depriving themselves of reason, they fell into mortal sin." Moreover, the offence was made a *cas reservé*, in which the right of absolution rested only in the Bishop himself. For years no Frenchman "dared to give a glass of brandy to an Algonquin or Huron."*

But the organisation of the French "carpet-bag" government brought with it a multitude of evils. Apparently the worst men in the kingdom of France swarmed into Canada. The soldiers of the garrison were given the privilege of trading with the natives as a part compensation for their services, and as the principal article of trade among the soldiers, as among the traders, was liquor, this practice brought the military in constant friction with the priests, who persistently fought the sale of spirits among the natives.

The whole matter was finally appealed to the King, who was exceedingly loth to interfere with the liquor

* *Colonial History of New York*, Vol. IX., p. 29. See also Parkman, *The Old Régime in Canada*, Vol. II., p. 125.

traffic, because it paid a good revenue into the royal treasury. He was also disposed to show respect to the clergy in view of their wide influence. The matter was referred, first to the Sorbonne, and then to an "assembly of the chief merchants and people in the Chateau St. Louis," a large majority of whom (being traders) were in favour of unrestricted trade.

In the meantime other developments helped to overthrow the prohibition policy of Bishop Laval. The Dutch traders were coming up from the South and by means of their rum were capturing the trade from the Frenchmen. In consequence thereof, trade at two Canadian posts fell off from 52,000 pounds peltries to 25,000 and 35,000 pounds. This turned the scale. The King decided against the bishops, and Talon, Intendant of Canada, in 1666, removed the restrictions on the sale of brandy.

The trouble had centred mainly around the old mission of Michilimackinac, founded by Father Marquette. It was from this mission that Father Etienne Carheil wrote a letter of forty-five pages, Aug. 30, 1702, in which he said:

"Our missions are reduced to such extremity that we can no longer maintain them against the infinity of disorder, brutality, violence, injustice, impiety, insolence, scorn and insult, that the deplorable and infamous traffic in brandy has spread universally among the Indians of these parts. . . . In the despair in which we are plunged, nothing remains for us but to abandon them to the brandy sellers as a domain of drunkenness and debauchery. . . . All our Indian villages are so many taverns for drunkenness and Sodoms of iniquity, which we shall be forced to leave to the just wrath and vengeance of God."

He insisted that the garrisons had but four occupations:

1. To keep open liquor shops for crowds of drunken Indians.

2. To peddle brandy under orders of the commandant who shared the profit.

3. To gamble day and night.

4. To turn the forts into a place "which I am ashamed to call by its right name."

The victory of the brandy sellers in the decision of Talon was mischievous to the utmost and was followed by long years of shame. The results came thick and fast. Parkman tells of the conditions but a few years after Talon's order:

"All the rascals and idlers in the country,' said a Frenchman, visiting Canada about 1670-90, 'are attracted into the business of tavern-keeping. They never dream of tilling the soil; but, on the contrary, they deter other inhabitants from it, and end with ruining them. I knew seigniories where there were but twenty houses, and more than half of them dram shops. At Three Rivers there are twenty-five houses, and liquor may be had at eighteen or twenty of them. Villemarie [Montreal] and Quebec are on the same footing.' "

Charlevoix, who visited Canada in 1705, wrote in one of his published letters: "Husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters were frequently seen in the streets of Montreal in a state of intoxication, worrying one another with their teeth like so many enraged wolves."

The military authorities, angered at these charges of the clergy, declared them to be exaggerations of the real conditions and made counter charges against



JEAN TALON

Intendant of New France. An opponent of the liquor traffic in the early days of the Colony.





FRANCOIS DE LAVAL DE MONTMORENCY
(1622-1708)

First Roman Catholic Bishop of Quebec. Endeavored to prohibit the liquor traffic with the redmen in the early days of Canada.

the priesthood. A letter written by Count Frontenac, soon after Talon's order, indicates the nature of the claim of the military. The Count declared that the "exaggerated charges" easily convince people "who do not know the interested motives which have led them [the Jesuits] to harp continually on one string for more than forty years. . . . They have long wished to have the fur trade entirely to themselves, and to keep out of sight the trade which they are carrying on there now." But making due allowance for utterances emanating from the heat of the controversy, apparently disinterested testimony is mostly on the side of the Bishop and priests. At any rate, two things are undisputed: (1) That the years following the order of Talon formed a period of dissipation never before nor since equalled in the history of Canada; and (2) that the final breaking down of the regulations against selling liquor to the Indians was brought about through the direct influence of the military authorities and against the furious opposition of the clergy.

Such was the problem which confronted the temperance pioneers of the century: a mighty task, to be sure, but the magnitude of the undertaking appeared merely to whet appetite and inflame ardour for better things.

CHAPTER IV.

EARLY TEMPERANCE AGITATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

DURING the struggle of the Revolutionary War, the foreign trade of the colonies was almost entirely cut off. This stopped the supply of material for rum from the West Indies, as well as the imports of wine from Spain, and resulted in the establishment of distilleries all over the land. The waste of grain resulting therefrom at one time threatened to cause a famine. Washington denounced, in severe terms, the general dissipation which followed. Here and there a clergyman spoke out against the waste of grain as well as against the moral degradation resulting. The danger of a bread famine even attracted the attention of Congress. In February, 1777, that body, sitting in Philadelphia, unanimously passed the following resolution:

Resolved: That it be recommended to the several Legislatures in the United States immediately to pass laws the most effective for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain, by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived if not quickly prevented."

Pennsylvania and New Jersey adopted rigorous measures, but the attempts met with such opposition that failure resulted.

But during the turmoil of the making of the Re-

public there was developing a powerful undercurrent of unrest at the inroads of alcohol, which made its appearance in many forms. It is true that after the strife subsided there swept over the young nation an epidemic of dissipation that caused gloomy forbodings. It is true, too, that Alexander Hamilton's drastic revenue tax on alcoholic liquors, of March, 1791, created so much opposition in western Pennsylvania that 14,000 troops were despatched to suppress the insurrection, which melted away, however, before the soldiers arrived. Yet there was an occasional cry from the platform and pulpit that the hour had come for better things.

As far back as 1761, the elder John Adams had fulminated against the houses licenced to sell intoxicants at Braintree, Massachusetts. The Quakers and the Methodist parsons were wont to protest at the drinking practices of the times. In 1774 a Friend, Anthony Benezet, published a pamphlet entitled *The Mighty Destroyer Displayed, in Some Account of the Dreadful Havoc Made by the Mistaken Use, as Well as the Abuse of Distilled Spirituous Liquors*. Benezet advised against the use of any drink "which is liable to steal away a man's senses and render him foolish, irascible, uncontrollable, and dangerous."

In that same year John Wesley sharply promulgated the same views and repeated similar injunctions thereafter at frequent intervals. He enjoined upon his followers abstinence from distilled liquors and forbade the selling thereof by members of his societies, declaring that dramsellers were "poisoners-general" who "drive men to Hell like sheep." Benjamin Franklin, years before, when a printer's ap-

prentice in London, found that all his companions drank five pints of porter each in the day and some of them six. He argued with them that "bread contained more materials of strength than beer, and that it was only the corn in the beer that produced the strength in the liquor." *

But these sporadic utterances of courageous men were destined to find a champion worthy of their cause. Eleven years after Benezet's pamphlet, Dr. Benjamin Rush sounded the first note of the temperance reform of the century to follow. In 1785 Dr. Rush published the first edition of his famous essay on *The Effect of Ardent Spirits on the Human Mind and Body*. The exalted character of the man, his great learning and the unwavering tone of his utterances, came with startling effect, and commanded the attention of the best thought in the land. The pamphlet was printed in newspapers and magazines both in America and England. It was republished in 1789, 1794, 1804, 1811, and even later for thirty years.

Dr. Rush was built on a Quaker, Methodist and Scotch foundation. He was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. In 1774, when a member of the Provincial Assembly of Pennsylvania, he introduced the first resolution in favour of the Independence of the Colonies. On the 23d of June, 1776, he was appointed chairman of the committee on Independence of the Continental Congress. He was one of the prophets of Independence as well as of the temperance reform. Later, he was intimately associated with the Armies of Independence—first as Surgeon-General of the Navy of Pennsylvania, and

* French, *Nineteen Centuries of Drink*, p. 278.

later as Physician-General of the entire Continental forces. In 1777 he published a pamphlet, *Directions for Preserving the Health of Soldiers in the American Army Engaged in the War of the Revolution*. This dealt, in part, with the effect of alcohol on the human system, and has been considered as a prelude to the famous deliverance of 1785.

In 1788 Rush laid his temperance cause at the door of the church with the same ardor that he displayed in the cause of Independence. In that year he published an address to ministers of the gospel on *Morals*. In this he detailed the "mischievous effects of spirituous liquors," and vigorously called on the clergy to "preach against, not the abuse of them, but their use altogether," except "in sickness," in which cases, he declared, "they are better applied to the outside than to the inside of the body." In the same year he addressed the Philadelphia Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, pleading with them to pass such resolutions as would stop the use of spirits. Dr. Rush's reasons for appealing to the churches are well set forth in one of his numerous letters written to religious leaders:

"Much less rum will be used this year than last in the adjoining states of New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland. From the influence of the Quakers and Methodists in checking this evil, I am disposed to believe that the business must be effected finally by religion alone. Human reason has been employed in vain, and the conduct of New England in Congress has furnished us with a melancholy proof that we have nothing to hope from the influence of law in making men wise and sober. Let these considerations lead us to address the heads and governing bodies of all the

churches in America on the subject. I have borne a testimony (by particular desire) at a Methodist Conference against the use of ardent spirits and I hope with effect. I have likewise written to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Maryland, to set an association on foot against them in his society. I have repeatedly insisted upon a public testimony being published against them by the Presbyterian Synod of this city, and have suggested to our good Bishop White the necessity of the Episcopal Church not standing neutral in this interesting business. Go thou, my friend, and in your circle of influence and acquaintance, 'do likewise.'"

In 1790 a volume of *Sermons on Intemperance* was issued anonymously from Philadelphia, the authorship of which is attributed to Rush, internal evidence showing that they were written by a physician. As late as the year 1811 we find Dr. Rush before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church at Philadelphia, pleading his cause and presenting the preachers with a thousand copies of his treatise. Rush there secured the appointment of a committee composed of the Rev. Doctors Miller, Romeyn, Milledoler, Gardiner Spring, Richards and others, instructed to "devise measures which, when sanctioned by the General Assembly, may have an influence in preventing some of the numerous and threatening mischiefs which are experienced throughout the country." In the following year the report of this committee was adopted. It urged all the ministers of the church throughout the United States to "deliver public discourses on the sin and mischief of intemperate drinking." The preachers were also enjoined to "pointedly and solemnly warn their hearers, and especially members of the church, not only against actual intemperance, but against all

those habits and indulgences which may have a tendency to produce it." The church sessions were urged to purge the church of a sin so enormous in its mischiefs.

This practically closed the work of Dr. Rush in the temperance reform. For a quarter of a century his voice had been clear and constant, pleading for better things. Where a lesser light would have been derided, his ability and sincerity demanded and enforced respect. For years the pamphlets of Rush were the standard works on the subject and continued to be printed and circulated long after his death. The American Tract Society printed and circulated 175,000 copies of the *Inquiry* alone.

But the mantle of this Elijah was destined to fall on most worthy shoulders. Almost simultaneously with Dr. Rush's appearance before the General Assembly at Philadelphia, the Rev. Lyman Beecher came to the front of the movement in Connecticut. In the year 1811 the General Association of Connecticut had appointed a committee for a purpose similar to that of the Pennsylvania gathering. In the following year the committee reported that the evil was tremendous and was steadily increasing, but they were unable to recommend any practical measures. Beecher had recently settled in Litchfield, having come from East Hampton, Long Island. He promptly arose and moved that the committee be discharged and a new one appointed. This was done and Beecher was made its chairman. Almost immediately the committee reported, recommending entire abstinence from all spirituous liquors on the part of both families and individuals.

In the meantime another flame had started nearby.

The Consociation of Fairfield County published, in 1812, an appeal against the drinking usages of society.* This appeal is important, for the reason that it is the earliest distinct utterance in favour of entire total abstinence from all intoxicants. Among other things the appeal said:

“The remedy we suggest, particularly to those whose appetite is strong and increasing, is a total abstinence from the use of ALL intoxicating liquors. This may be deemed a harsh remedy, but the nature of the disease absolutely requires it.”

About the same time the Associated Churches of Massachusetts and Connecticut took up the subject and appointed committees to “co-operate with those of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.”

Lyman Beecher, the strong man of this agitation in Connecticut, was a direct disciple of Dr. Rush. To give the story of his espousal of the temperance cause in his own words:

“There were some Indians in my parish of the Montauk tribe though not belonging to my congregation. They had missionaries among them. . . . I was acquainted with a number of the pious ones, about a dozen, at first. They made baskets and brooms and such things, but they were a wretched set on the whole, just like other tribes running out by being cheated and abused. My spirit was greatly stirred by the treatment of these Indians by some unprincipled persons; especially their selling them rum.

* This appeal was prepared by Rev. Roswell R. Swan of Norwall, and Rev. Heman Humphrey, President of Amherst College.

“ There was a grogseller in our neighborhood who drank himself and corrupted others. He always kept his jug under his bed to drink in the night until he was choked off by death. He would go down with his barrel of whisky to the Indians and get them tipsy, and bring them in debt; he would get all their corn and bring it back to his wagon; in fact, he stripped them. Then, in winter, they must go twenty miles to buy their own corn and pack it home on their shoulders or starve. Oh, it was horrible. It burned and burned in my mind, and I swore a deep oath to God that it should not be so. . . . I talked to my deacons about it, and with my people, and raised public feeling. I read Rush on intemperance, and the *Christian Observer* contained accounts of efforts in London, to repress immorality, drunkenness and Sabbath-breaking. All this fermented my mind, and while I was in East Hampton, I blocked out and preached a sermon that I afterward re-wrote and published, on *The Reformation of Morals*.*

This was the beginning of the work of Lyman Beecher in New England, which culminated in his *Six Sermons on Intemperance*, which were preached in 1826, published in 1827, and ran through five editions in twelve months. The *Six Sermons* succeeded the pamphlets of Dr. Rush as the standard temperance publications of the times.

“ Temperance preachers ” were now becoming less and less uncommon. The Rev. Heman Humphrey, D.D., later President of Amherst College, was a fellow-preacher at Fairfield with Beecher, shared the latter’s views on temperance and preached a series of sermons on the subject. The Rev. Nathaniel S. Prime preached a temperance sermon before the Presbytery of Long Island as early as November

* Beecher, *Autobiography*, Vol. I., p. 176

5, 1811. At the request of the Presbytery the sermon was published, and that body adopted a resolution against the offering of spirits or wine as a mark of hospitality. The Rev. Calvin Chapin, D.D., located at Rocky Hill, Connecticut, proclaimed the principles of total abstinence as the only and effective cure of intemperance as early as 1812. The Rev. Roswell R. Swan, of Norwalk, Connecticut, was also an ardent teacher of the principles of temperance.

In 1812 the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States concluded with an appeal to the ministers of the gospel to put forth every effort for the suppression of intemperance.

The Rev. Mason L. Weens, who was rector of Washington's parish, and also his biographer, wrote a pamphlet in 1812, which has this title: "*A drunkard's looking-glass reflecting a faithful likeness of the drunkard in sundry very interesting attitudes; with living representatives of the many strange capers which he cuts up in the different stages of his disease. At first, when he has had a drop in his eye; second, when he is half slewed; third, when he is getting a little on the staggers or so; fourth, and fifth, etc., until he is quite capsized or snug under the table with the dogs, and can stick to the floor without holding on.*" Some conception of the general standard of temperance sentiment at this time may be seen from the "Golden Receipts" against drunkenness which he gives in this pamphlet. "First, drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake; also cider, beer, ale, etc.; second, never fight duels; nine times in ten the memory of the murdered drives the murderer to the bottle. Third, never marry but for love; hatred is repellent and the husband saunters to the tavern.



OFFICERS OF THE WORLD'S W. C. T. U. IN 1898.


AGNES E. SLACK, F. E. W.,
Secretary.

LADY HENRY SOMERSET,
Vice-President.

FRANCES E. WILLARD, LL. D.,
President.

ANNA A. GORDON,
Assistant Secretary.

MARY E. SANDERSON,
Treasurer.



WOMAN'S TEMPLE, CHICAGO, U.S.A.

Value of ground and building, two and a quarter millions
of dollars.



MISS JESSIE E. ACKERMAN.

The World's W.C.T.U. missionary. The second greatest woman in America. Has twice travelled around the world. Covered 150,000 miles, visited 510 cities. Delivered nearly 1600 addresses and lectures. Filled pulpits and visited saloons by the hundred. Induced 22,000 men to sign the pledge. Has been presented to kings, queens, sultans and princes.



MISS ANNA ADAMS GORDON.

Born in Boston, Mass, in 1853. Had an excellent seminary training, supplemented by a good musical education. Subsequently became Miss Willard's private secretary, superintending her immense correspondence, and accompanying her on her travels. Has written several helpful temperance works, and is an effective speaker to young people.

Fourth, provide against old bachelorism; a good wife is the second best comfort in the universe. Fifth, never stand surety for a sum that would embarrass you . . . for debts and dues have filled the world with sots. Sixth, a hot cup of coffee in the morning is a good cure for dram craving."

Another pamphlet which was printed and widely circulated before the Beecher sermons was an address by the Rev. Ebenezer Porter, which he delivered to his congregation at Washington, Connecticut, as early as 1806. Four years later *The Panoplist*, edited by Jeremiah Evarts, father of the late William M. Evarts, began habitually to call attention to the evils of the drinking customs. *The Panoplist* may be recorded as the first paper in America which made a specialty of attacking the drinking practices of the age. Later, Mr. Evarts was one of the organisers of the Massachusetts Temperance Society, and also of the American National Temperance Society.

As might be expected, the efforts of these early temperance prophets crystallised here and there into organisations designed to promote the cause of temperance. Connecticut is entitled to the credit of organising the first of these societies. In July, 1789, two hundred of the leading farmers of Litchfield County formed an association to discourage the use of spirituous liquors, and determined not to use any distilled liquors in their farming operations during the ensuing year.

In 1805 the paper-makers of Philadelphia "associated themselves together for the purpose of improving their art, and ameliorating the condition of worthy unfortunate journeymen and their families." They soon found that the excessive use of strong drink was almost the only cause of misery and pov-

erty which they had occasion to relieve, and they thereupon sought to restrict the evil. With this end in view, they decided to "use every possible endeavour to restrain and prohibit the use of ardent spirits in their respective mills." While this was not organised as a temperance society, it developed into one, in effect.

In March, 1808, Dr. Billy J. Clark, of Moreau, N.Y., developed the idea of a temperance society of his own. Discussing the matter with his pastor, the Rev. Lebbeus Armstrong, he declared that "We shall become a community of drunkards in this town, unless something is done to arrest the progress of intemperance." As a result of this conference, the Temperance Society of Moreau and Northumberland was organised on April 30th of the same year. A constitution was adopted, which was signed by forty-three members. As this society was the first to continue in existence for any considerable length of time, some of the provisions of its constitution are interesting:

"Article IV. No member shall drink rum, gin, whisky, wine or any distilled spirits, or composition of the same, or any of them, except by advice of a physician, or in case of actual disease; also, excepting wine at public dinners, under penalty of twenty-five cents; providing this article shall not infringe on any religious ordinance.

"Sec. 2. No member shall be intoxicated under penalty of fifty cents.

"Sec. 3. No member shall offer any of said liquors to any other member, or urge any other person to drink thereof, under penalty of twenty-five cents for each offence.

"Article XI. It shall be the duty of each member

to accuse any other member of a breach of any regulation contained in Article IV, and the mode of the accusative process shall be regulated by a by-law."

For fourteen years Dr. Clark's temperance society continued in existence, holding quarterly and annual meetings in a country schoolhouse. And it is recorded that a female never attended one of them.*

In 1809 a society similar to Clark's was organised in Greenfield, Saratoga County.

In 1812 a very moderate society was formed at Bath, Maine, whose members subscribed to this pledge:

"We will be, at all times, sparing and cautious in the use of spirituous liquors at home; in social visits decline them as far as possible; avoid them totally in retailing stores, and, in general, set our faces against the intemperate use of them; conceiving, as we do, that except in a very few cases, as of medical use, spirituous liquors are the bane of mortals, and a drain of wealth, piety and happiness."

In the following year the Rev. Irenæus Prime, a pastor at Cambridge, Washington County, N.Y., organised the farmers of his congregation into a temperance society. Mr. Prime, the year previous, had been preaching in Saratoga County, and doubtless had come in contact with the work inaugurated by Dr. Clark.

Dr. Rush's committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church at Philadelphia, in 1811, bore visible fruit in New England. The committee visited New England, where they interested the Con-

* Armstrong, *History of the Temperance Reformation*, pp. 18-28.

gregational and Presbyterian Alliance in the temperance cause. Prominent in these circles was the Hon. Samuel Dexter, a distinguished lawyer, who had declared that he would pay all the taxes in Boston and Massachusetts, if he could but have the profit of the moneys spent for liquor. Through the influence, on February 5, 1813, the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance was formed with Mr. Dexter as President. The society "did little but observe an anniversary, and have a sermon preached, after which the preacher and hearers would repair to tables richly laden with wine, and was therefore without efficacy in rooting out the evil." * Dr. A. P. Peabody, in an article in the *Cambridge Tribune*, about fifteen years ago, thus speaks of this society:

"It had among its members the foremost men in church and state, including the Chief Justice of the Commonwealth, the President of Harvard College, Hon. Nathan Dane, and other persons of like standing and character. The members of this society were probably, without exception, perfectly temperate men, most of them opposed to the use of distilled spirits, but, perhaps, none of them scrupulous as to the moderate use of wine. They soon experienced the truth of the adage, 'do that you may know.' One of the original members told the writer of this article, that at the earlier meetings, held at private houses, the then usual display of decanters appeared on the sideboard, and was not suffered to remain a mere show; that when a meeting was to take place at his house, he took care to have his sideboard generously replenished; that the incongruity of such indulgence with the work in hand struck him at the last moment, and induced him to lock up his decanters; and that the members, taking kind and graceful

* Marsh, *Temperance Recollections*, p. 12.

notice of his procedure, resolved informally, but unanimously, to drink no more at their meetings. This society, while it held the foreground, directed its efforts mainly against the use of distilled spirits, and, it must be admitted, in favor of light wines and home made fermented liquors. We well remember a receipt for making currant wine printed on the last leaf of one of their widely-circulated annual addresses."

This society was, however, of much aid in organising state, county, and local societies, which a few years later led to the formation of a national organisation, the *American Temperance Society*, organised in 1826. In 1833 the Massachusetts society changed the style of its organisation and became the Massachusetts Temperance Society, in which form it still exists. Thus, at least one temperance organisation which had its inspiration from Dr. Rush has come down to our own times.

In the year 1818 a society was organised in Darby, Delaware County, N.Y., "to check and discourage the use of ardent spirits." In the same year a society was formed at Hector, in the same state, whose members subscribed to the following pledge:

"We solemnly pledge ourselves to each other, that we will not drink any kind of distilled liquors ourselves, nor countenance their being drunk at our houses by our families or others (except when they are necessary to restore health), nor give them to those employed by us to labour on any occasion."

Up to the year 1826 the temperance reform was sporadic. The enemy was entrenched in the appetites of the people through thousands of years of open indulgence, and to expel it was no mean undertaking.

Yet scattering and incoherent as was much of the effort of these early pioneers, it voiced a growing appreciation of the enormous evils of intemperance. More than this, it started in motion the waves of opposition to the liquor business which swelled into a flood of sentiment—only to subside in the crisis of the Civil War.



CHAPTER V.

EARLY MORAL SUASION CAMPAIGNS IN THE UNITED STATES.

PREVIOUS to the year 1826 the temperance reform had been urged mainly by individuals. Here and there the sentiment had crystallised into some form of organisation, but no general, organised, concerted campaign had been attempted. Up to this time there had been little or no outcry against any form of intoxicants save ardent spirits. In fact, agitation had scarcely any higher demand than for the moderate use of even this species of liquor. But the popular attention had been attracted, and, with the year in question, the horizon was cleared for better things.

It is of interest, in tracing the evolution of the temperance reformer of to-day, to note the steps taken in his development from the "moderation" advocate of the early century, to the party Prohibitionist of 1900. The temperance reformer of 1810 simply sounded the alarm against the immoderate use of ardent spirits as the great evil of the times. A few years later he took another step, saying, "Let ardent spirits wholly alone," and appeared to think that he had spoken the final word. He was as yet a stranger to the doctrine of "total abstinence" and really encouraged the use of beer and wines as harmless substitutes for distilled liquors.* When the moral sua-

* See Appendix A, Chap. v.

sion campaign was well on we find him declaring that too much beer was hurtful, and the step was then a short one to total abstinence from all intoxicants. It was well in the forties when the reformers set up a general demand for the total destruction of the whole business of making drunkards; and when they did, conservatism stood aghast. But there was one further step to be taken: the union of the temperance reformers into a political body for the accomplishment of the end desired. All this has been accomplished in the century with which we have to deal.

The first total abstinence society, which formed at Hector, N.Y., in 1818, had its beginning, strange to say, in a bar-room. Several deacons and elders attended the preliminary gathering. The tavern-keeper himself desired to become a member, and was permitted to do so on condition that he agree to sell liquor to no one but travellers.*

Eight years later, the Rev. Joel Jewell was invited to join the society and consented to do so if wine was included in the pledge. The society thereupon decided to have two pledges, one for total abstainers and the other on the old plan of abstinence from distilled spirits. In January, 1827, Mr. Jewell was elected Secretary, and, in keeping his books, prefixed the letters "O.P." (old plan) before the latter class, and letter "T" before the total abstainers. Within two years the members were all "T's," and had begun referring to themselves as "T-totallers." Dr. Carroll produces abundant evidence in substantiation of this statement, thus proving that America has a valid claim to originating the first total abstinence

* Carroll, *Total Abstinence During the Century; One Hundred Years of Temperance*, p. 129.

society, being some five years ahead of the abstainers of Preston, England.

Just prior to the year 1826 the discussion of the liquor evil was taken up with renewed vigour. Dr. Justin Edwards, of Andover, wrote a series of tracts against the practice of using liquor at funerals, and also the famous *Well-Conducted Farm* pamphlet, which had a wide circulation. Then came a volume of temperance sermons from the Rev. Eliphalet Nott, President of Union College and a man of high scholastic reputation. The Rev. Joshua Leavitt, of Stratford, Connecticut, contributed a series of articles to the *Christian Spectator*, in the interest of total abstinence. On January 1, 1826, the Rev. Calvin Chapin began a similar series in the *Connecticut Observer*, in opposition to the policy of attempting to cure the evils of intemperance by doctoring the tipple.

On the tenth of January of that year, through the influence of Dr. Edwards, a few friends met in Boston to consider the question, "What shall be done to banish intemperance from the United States?" This meeting was practically an adjournment of a similar meeting held in the preceding year at Andover. It was resolved to form an American Temperance Society. A committee was appointed to draft a constitution, and the gentlemen again gathered on February 13, when the constitution was adopted and the society formally organised. The officers chosen were: Hon. Marcus Morton, President; Hon. Samuel Hubbard, Vice-President; William Ropes, Treasurer; John Tappan, Auditor. An Executive Committee consisting of the Rev. Leonard Woods, D.D., the Rev. Justin Edwards, John Tappan, George Odiorne and S. V. S. Wilder

was chosen, and the first American national temperance organisation was launched, modest in its dimensions and demands, but big with potential influence upon events to come. The platform was merely "Total Abstinence from Ardent Spirits." Straightway, the Rev. Nathaniel Hewitt set out on a preliminary five months' pilgrimage for the new society, and the organised conflict against intemperance was thus begun.

The selection of Hewitt was a most happy one. He went about as a firebrand kindling flames in every direction. Says Dr. Marsh of his work: "When I first heard Dr. Nathaniel Hewitt on this subject I was amazed at his boldness. Every stone was the weight of a talent, and it was of no consequence with him who was hit. The first sermon was preached in Dr. Spring's pulpit, and it was like rolling a ball among ten-pins. Several of the first men of the city went home and emptied their bottles."

Six weeks after Dr. Hewitt began his crusade, the first weekly paper devoted to the cause of temperance was founded in Boston. It was called the *National Philanthropist*, and was edited by the Rev. William Collier. Its motto was "Temperate Drinking is the Downhill Road to Intemperance." This publication was followed, in 1829, by the establishment of the *Journal of Humanity* by the society at Andover, edited by the Rev. Edward W. Hooker. These two papers were subsequently moved to New York, where they were combined and continued under the name of the latter. It was in this year that the *Six Sermons* of the Rev. Lyman Beecher were preached at Litchfield, but they did not begin to attract attention till 1827. They were not even known to the promoters



HORACE GREELEY.
(1811-1872)



WENDELL, PHILLIPS.
(1811-1884)





CARDINAL TASCHEREAU.



D'ALTON MCCARTHY.

Introduced the McCarthy Act to House of Commons, 1893.

of the American Temperance Society till months after the organisation was formed. The formation of this society was not, therefore, inspired by these sermons, as has been generally understood.

The forces to be overcome were enormous. At the time of the organisation of the American Temperance Society, it was estimated that there were 60,000 drink establishments and 20,000 distilleries in the United States. New York had 1,129 distilleries; two for every gristmill. But in spite of this, so great was the interest aroused by Hewitt and the other agitators, that when Dr. Edwards went to Boston, in January, 1827, to raise money for the needs of the society, \$3,500 was subscribed for the purpose at his first meeting. Within a few days \$8,000 had been raised, and Hewitt entered the service of the society for three years. At the end of the first year (1828) the society was able to report the organisation of thirteen branches in Maine, twenty-three in Massachusetts, two in Rhode Island, thirty-two in Connecticut, six in New Jersey, two in North Carolina, seventy-eight in New York, five in Virginia, one in Kentucky, one in Delaware, one in Maryland, two in Indiana, one in Ohio, making a total of two hundred and twenty-two in the Union, beside state societies in New Hampshire, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Illinois. Thirty thousand heads of families had pledged themselves to abstain from ardent spirits. To Ohio probably belongs the honour of organising the first ladies' society. *The Christian Observer* of January 17, 1829, mentions such an organisation having been formed in the latter part of the preceding year.*

* See Appendix B, Chap. V.

The year 1829 also meant much to the temperance cause. In that year the Connecticut Society was organised and put in charge of the Rev. John Marsh. One of the first things Marsh did was to go to Pomfret, the place where Israel Putnam killed the wolf, and deliver his remarkable address, *Putnam and the Wolf*. The wolf's den was hard by, and before him sat the descendants of the popular hero. Marsh characterised the distiller as the wolf destroying defenceless sheep. So great was the sensation of the address that an enterprising Yankee bookseller published it, together with a picture of Putnam dragging the wolf out of his hole, and sold 150,000 copies.* Later, *Putnam and the Wolf* became one of the permanent documents of the American Tract Society, and again and again before his death did the temperance forces have occasion to rise up and call the venerable John Marsh blessed.

The same year saw the organisation of the New York Society, chiefly through the influence of Edward C. Delavan, a wealthy man who afterward became a power in the general reform. Delavan was but thirty-six years old at this time. He had just signalised his conversion to temperance by emptying his well-stocked wine cellar.

The progress of the reform up to the year 1830 may be seen from the following statement:

“At the close of the year 1829, there had been formed on the plan of abstinence, and reported, more than one thousand societies, embracing more than one hundred thousand members. Eleven of them were state societies. Of those known to the committee sixty-two were in Maine, forty-six in New Hampshire, fifty-

* Marsh, *Temperance Recollections*, p. 22.

six in Vermont, one hundred and sixty-nine in Massachusetts, three in Rhode Island, one hundred and thirty-three in Connecticut, three hundred in New York, twenty-one in New Jersey, fifty-three in Pennsylvania, one in Delaware, six in Maryland, fifty-two in Virginia, fifteen in North Carolina, fourteen in Georgia, eight in Alabama, thirty in Ohio, nine in Kentucky, five in Tennessee, four in Mississippi, thirteen in Indiana, one in Illinois, three in Michigan, and one in Missouri. Societies were also formed in Upper and Lower Canada, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

“More than fifty distilleries had been stopped; more than four hundred merchants had renounced the traffic, and more than twelve hundred drunkards had ceased to use the drunkard’s drink. Persons who a few years before were vagabonds about the streets, were now sober, respectable men, providing comfortably by their labour for their wives and children.” *

In 1830 a prize of \$250 was offered by some benevolent person for the best essay on the following subject: “Is it consistent with the profession of the Christian religion for persons to use, as an article of luxury or living, distilled liquors, or to traffic in them, and is it consistent with duty for the churches of Christ to admit those as members who continue to do this?” There were forty manuscripts submitted. Rev. Moses Stuart, of Andover, was awarded the prize. There were two others on the same subject; one by the Rev. Austin Dickenson, of New York, and one by the Rev. Joseph Harvey, of Connecticut, which were also published.

About the same time the *Temperance Tales* of L. M. Sargent, a rich young graduate of Harvard, were published, and attracted wide attention. Then re-

* *Reports of the American Temperance Society*, p. 28.

searches into crime and pauperism first began to be systematically made, the results of which were used with profound effect.

It was in this same year that John G. Whittier and Gerrit Smith first became prominently known as advocates of temperance, and allied themselves with the movement. Dr. Edwards had made the public statement that many reformed drunkards who had joined the various societies had relapsed into intemperance without having violated their pledges, "having become intoxicated on other than distilled liquors." This statement was challenged, and resulted in investigations. Smith, who lived at Petersboro, New York, stated that "numerous reformed drunkards had gone back by means of cider." Others reported lapses by wine, and others by beer. The basis of all these drinks was found to be alcohol, generated in fermentation and not distillation; and hence the conclusion was, that if men would have the reform progress, and their children saved, the pledge must embrace all intoxicating drinks. It was a strong case for total abstinence. At the same time a circular letter was addressed to a large number of educated men, such as college professors and clergymen, making enquiries on this subject. The responses showed a powerful feeling in favor of abstinence from all intoxicating beverages. One of the strongest utterances in reply to the circular came from Professor Hitchcock, of Amherst College:

"I have watched the reformation of some dozen of inebriates, and have been compelled to witness the relapse of many who had run well for a time. And I say, without fear of contradiction, that the greatest

obstacle to the reformation of drunkards is the habitual use of wine, beer, cider and cordials by the respectable members of the community; as in very many, I believe in most cases, intemperate habits are formed, and the love of alcoholic drinks induced, by the habitual use of these lighter beverages. I rejoice to say that a very great majority of the several hundred clergymen of my acquaintance are decided friends of the temperance cause, and both by preaching and practice inculcate total abstinence from all that can intoxicate as a beverage."

During the year 1831 there developed a movement, of little value in itself, but which added vastly to the prestige of the whole movement. Early in January, Dr. Edwards visited Washington and addressed both Houses of Congress on the subject of Temperance. Later in the year the Rev. John Marsh followed, procured the use of the Hall of Representatives for a rally. General Lewis Cass, Secretary of War, presided. Walter Lowry, the Secretary of the Senate, acted as Secretary of the meeting. The proceedings were opened with prayer by the Chaplain of the House, and closed with prayer by the Chaplain of the Senate. Senator Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, Senator Bates, of Massachusetts, and Senator Grundy, of Tennessee, were the principal speakers. President John Quincy Adams occupied a seat of honour. When the speaking was over Daniel Webster, then Senator from Massachusetts, arose from the rear of the hall and offered an appropriate resolution. The gathering proved to be a step toward the organisation of the Congressional Temperance Society, which was formed some months later. Just prior to this meeting United States Attorney-General William Wirt wrote his

famous letter on intemperance to Dr. Marsh to be read at a meeting at Baltimore. The letter was dated Baltimore, November 28, and read, in part:

“ I have been for more than forty years a close observer of life and manners in various parts of the United States, and I know not the evil that will bear a moment’s comparison with intemperance. It is no exaggeration to say, as has often been said, that this single cause has produced more vice, crime, poverty, and wretchedness in every form, domestic and social, than all other ills that scourge us combined. In truth, it is scarcely possible to meet with misery in any shape, in this country, which will not be found on examination to have proceeded, directly or indirectly, from the excessive use of ardent spirits. Want is one of the immediate consequences. The sad spectacle of destitute and starving families, and the ignorant, half-naked, vicious children, ought never to be presented in a country like this, where the demand for labour is constant, the field unlimited, the sources of supply inexhaustible, and where there are none to make us afraid ; and it would never be presented, or very rarely indeed, were it not for the desolation brought upon families by the general use of this deadly poison. It paralyses the arm, the brain, the heart. All the best affections, all the energies of the mind, wither under its influence. The man becomes a maniac, and is locked up in a hospital, or imbrues his hands in the blood of his wife and children, and is sent to the gallows or doomed to the penitentiary ; or, if he escapes these consequences, he becomes a walking pestilence on the earth, miserable in himself, and loathsome to all who behold him. If some fatal plague of a contagious character were imported into our country, and had commenced its ravages in our cities, we should see the most prompt and vigorous measures at once adopted to repress and extinguish it ; but what are the most fearful plagues that ever carried death and havoc in their train through the eastern

countries, compared with this? They are occasional; this is perennial. They are confined to climate and place; this malady is of all climates, and all times and places. They kill the body at once; this consumes both body and soul by a lingering and fearful death, involving the dearest connections in the vortex of ruin."

Attorney-General Wirt, moreover, was the first distinguished legal authority to render an opinion that, under some circumstances, at least, the traffic in alcoholics was a public nuisance. In 1832 the country was visited by cholera, and Washington was threatened. Medical authorities had publicly announced that indulgence in ardent spirits rendered the system more receptive to the disease. Mr. Wirt gave his official opinion to the Washington Board of Health that the selling of ardent spirits was a nuisance, during the prevalence of the plague. On this basis the Board of Health issued the following order:

Resolved: That the vending of ardent spirits, in whatever quantity, is considered a nuisance, and, as such, is hereby directed to be discontinued for a period of 90 days from this date.

"By order of the Board of Health,

"JAMES LARNARD, Sec'y."

In the early part of 1832 the physicians of Boston signed a paper which was used with great effect by the temperance workers. The following statement was presented to all of the eighty doctors of the city, and was promptly signed by seventy-five of the number:

"The subscribers, Physicians of Boston, having been requested by the directors of the Boston Society for the Promotion of Temperance, to express their opinions

in regard to the effect of ardent spirits, hereby declare it to be their opinion that men in health are NEVER benefited by the use of ardent spirits,—that, on the contrary, the use of them is a frequent cause of disease and death, and often renders such diseases as arise from other causes more difficult to cure, and more fatal in their termination.”

Prior to the first National Convention, which was held in 1833, there had been realised a growing need of closer relationship and a greater degree of concerted action on the part of the temperance forces of the country. The American Temperance Society had sent its agents out to lecture, administer pledges, and form societies, each largely independent of any other organisation. There had not even been a uniformity in the nature of the pledges; some exacting abstinence from ardent spirits, and others total abstinence from all drinks. It was this feeling that led the Executive Committee to issue its call for a National Convention to be held in Philadelphia on May 24, 1833. But prior to the issuing of this call, February 26th had been designated as a day for simultaneous meetings in the interest of temperance all over the country, and the Convention call urged that the various societies select delegates at the February gatherings for the May Convention. The call for the Convention contained no reference to anything beyond abstinence from the use of ardent spirits. Its words were:

“*Resolved*: That it is expedient that delegates from Temperance Societies and friends of Temperance in every part of the United States be invited to meet in Convention, to consider the best means of extending, by a general diffusion of information, and the exertion

of a kind and persuasive moral influence, the principle of abstinence from the use of ardent spirits throughout the country."

Four hundred and forty delegates came to the Convention. Some thirty resolutions of various sorts touching upon different phases of the drink customs were adopted as a result of the discussions. The most important of these—a distinct advance beyond any general step yet taken—was as follows:

"That in our judgment it is the duty of all men to abstain from the use of ardent spirits, and from the traffic in it.

"That in the opinion of this Convention, the traffic in ardent spirits as a drink, and the use of it as such, are MORALLY WRONG, and ought to be abandoned throughout the world.

"That the vital interests and complete success of the temperance cause demand that in all the efforts of the friends of the cause against the use of ardent spirits, NO SUBSTITUTE EXCEPT PURE WATER BE RECOMMENDED AS A DRINK."

The report of the Convention showed that there were in existence six thousand societies, and that state organisations existed in most of the states. Five thousand drunkards had been reclaimed, five thousand merchants had given up the traffic, ardent spirits had been cast out from the army, two thousand distilleries had been closed, and seven hundred sailing vessels had begun making their voyages without their usual supply of liquor aboard. The time now seemed ripe for a closer organisation. Accordingly, the Convention resolved upon the formation of a federation of the officers of all state organisations into the United States Temperance Union, the

object of which was, "by the diffusion of information, and the exertion of kind moral influence, to promote the cause of temperance throughout the United States." A committee was appointed to carry out the plan and perfect the new organisation, but for some reason the committee did nothing for more than three years. The society then changed its name to "The American Temperance Union," and entered upon a wide career of usefulness, taking up largely the work of the American Temperance Society, and, in a measure, occupying its place.

But the gatherings of February 26 had other results aside from the appointment of delegates to the National Convention. Through the efforts of General Lewis Cass and others, a meeting was held on that date in the Senate Chamber, at Washington, for the purpose of organising a Congressional Temperance Society. At this meeting the following basis of union was adopted:

"We, members of Congress, and others, recognizing the principle of abstinence from the use of ardent spirits, and from the traffic in it, as the basis of our union, do hereby agree to form ourselves into a society."

General Cass was chosen the first President of the new society.* On March 15, following, a similar organisation was formed in the Legislature of Massachusetts, with the Governor of the state as President.

The second National Convention, held at Saratoga Springs, was preceded by two lively events in Massachusetts and New York, in which the fighting quality of the reformers was put to severe tests. During the year Dr. George B. Cheever, of Salem, Massa-

* See Appendix C. Chap. V.

chusetts, published an imaginary dream entitled *Deacon Giles' Distillery*, probably the most effective document that had appeared up to that time. In the allegorical tale, Deacon Amos Giles operated a distillery. His men having left his employ, an assortment of imps applied for the vacant places, on condition that they be allowed to work nights. They laboured with furious speed and branded each barrel with an invisible inscription which became visible when the barrel was tapped. The inscriptions were of the following nature :

“ Who hath woe?—Enquire at Deacon Giles' Distillery.

“ Who hath redness of eyes?—Enquire at Deacon Giles' Distillery.”

There chanced to be a Deacon Story, in Salem, a relative of whom had been drowned in a whisky vat, who sold Bibles at his distillery, and who had a son sorely addicted to drink—all incidents mentioned in the dream. Story brought suit for libel and succeeded in having the young preacher sent to jail for a short time. The women of Salem, however, sympathised with Cheever, carpeted his cell and fed him with sumptuous dinners. There was a great commotion over the affair and copies of the article sold at a tremendous rate. Nothing daunted, Cheever followed this article with another—*Deacon Jones' Brewery; or, the Distiller Turned Brewer*. Here the demons were represented as dancing around the brewery cauldrons making beer, casting in the most noxious and poisonous drugs. The deacon did not relish the publicity which he had received from his first libel suit, and paid no attention to the later deliverance. The people did, however, and the two pamphlets had an enormous sale.

About the same time, E. C. Delavan, chairman of the Executive Committee of the New York State Temperance Society, had published an article in the *American Temperance Intelligencer*, in which he accused the brewers of Albany of using water for malting which was drawn from a pond in which were thrown all of the offal and dead animals of the city; that the pond communicated with a creek in which the refuse of a slaughter-house was dumped. This statement, widely circulated, created another commotion, and eight Albany brewers brought suit for damages, demanding forty thousand dollars each; three hundred and twenty thousand dollars in all. Delavan was held in forty thousand dollars bail. Five years later one of the cases was tried, resulting in Delavan's favor, and the others were dismissed.

About this time Bishop Hopkins of the Episcopal Church in Vermont, afterward prominent as a defender of slavery, published his book, *The Triumph of Temperance the Triumph of Infidelity*. He argued that all wines mentioned in the Bible were intoxicating liquors, and that the temperance leaders were doing the work of infidels in agitating abstinence therefrom. Delavan and Dr. Edwards took up the cudgels on the other side and administered a chastisement which was very gratifying to their followers.

In the meantime numerous societies had been adopting the total abstinence pledge. In February, 1836, the New York State Society adopted total abstinence, which precipitated a general discussion of this phase of the question. This discussion led to the calling of the second National Convention which was held at Saratoga Springs in August. Total abstinence was there supported by such men as Edward

C. Delavan, Dr. Justin Edwards, the Rev. Lyman Beecher, Chancellor Walworth, and was adopted with but little opposition. From that time on, the moral suasion temperance movement was firmly settled on the basis of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors.

This Convention, just before adjournment, set in motion the project of 1833 for the American Temperance Union. Mr. Delavan contributed ten thousand dollars to organise its work. Headquarters were established at Philadelphia, a monthly publication, the *Journal of the American Temperance Union*, was started, and the Rev. John Marsh was put in charge. This movement virtually swallowed up the American Temperance Society, which had now outlived its usefulness. It had stood merely for abstinence from ardent spirits; the Union stood for total abstinence, and on this platform the battles of the future were to be waged.

For a dozen years the Union, with Dr. Marsh at its helm, promoted temperance enterprises of various sorts. It sent out appeals to Presidents, Senators, Legislators, ministers, professors of colleges, magistrates, and used their testimonies with telling effect. Perhaps no document of the series had a greater influence than the simple declaration which had been signed by seven Presidents of the United States: *

“Being satisfied from observation and experience, as well as from medical testimony, that ardent spirits, as a drink, is not only needless but hurtful; and that entire disuse of it would tend to promote the health, the virtue and the happiness of the community: We hereby express our conviction, that should the citizens

* *Permanent Temperance Documents*, Vol. III., Appendix to Thirteenth Annual Report, A. T. U. President Fillmore afterwards added his name to this document.

of the United States, and especially all young men, discontinue the use of it, they would not only promote their own personal benefit, but the good of the country and the world.

“ JAMES MADISON,
 “ JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
 “ ANDREW JACKSON,
 “ MARTIN VAN BUREN,
 “ JOHN TYLER,
 “ JAMES K. POLK,
 “ ZACHARY TAYLOR,
 “ MILLARD FILLMORE.”

Even as the American Temperance Society was swallowed up by the American Temperance Union, so the Union was later destined to be absorbed by the various movements which it had set on foot and otherwise aided. The campaigns for temperance legislation were set in motion, and to these the Union devoted much of its energies. Local option laws, Sunday closing, and kindred statutes were promoted. Activities of this sort were multiplied rapidly after the Massachusetts Fifteen Gallon Law of 1838, and the campaign of its repeal in 1840. This activity quickly developed into the state campaigns for state prohibition which preceded the Civil War and which will be dealt with in another connection. Other influences had arisen to carry on the work of moral suasion, and the mission of the American Temperance Union was finished.

CHAPTER VI.

THE WASHINGTONIAN AND KINDRED MOVEMENTS.

ON the night of April 2, 1840, twenty chronic drinkers sat in the bar of Chase's Tavern on Liberty Street, in the city of Baltimore, engaged in their usual nightly convivialities.* In another part of the same city, the Rev. Mathew Hale Smith was delivering a lecture on the subject of temperance. In a spirit of jest, a committee of two was chosen to attend the lecture and report. They did so, and rendered a favourable account of what they had heard. The report precipitated a discussion of much warmth. The tavern-keeper, with an eye to business, denounced the temperance advocates as "hypocrites and fools." To this one of the toppers retorted, "Of course, it is to your interest to cry them down;" whereupon the discussion waxed warmer and warmer.

The debate was continued from night to night until April 5, when six of the company decided to quit liquor and form a total abstinence society. They adopted "Washingtonian" as the name of their organisation and the famous Washingtonian movement was thus begun. The pledge then signed, which has generally been used in Washingtonian societies, reads:

"We whose names are annexed, desirous of forming a society for our mutual benefit, and to guard against

* See Appendix A, Chap. VI.

a pernicious practice which is injurious to our health, standing and families, do pledge ourselves as gentlemen, that we will not drink any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider."

The names of the original signers were: William K. Mitchell, tailor; John T. Hoss, carpenter; David Anderson, blacksmith; George Steers, wheelwright; James McCurly, coachmaker; and Archibald Campbell, silverplater.* Each member was given an office in the new society, which voted to meet every evening in a carpenter shop. It was made a rule of the organisation that each member was to attend all meetings and "bring a man with him." Meetings were at first held every night, and later, weekly. The shop soon became too small, and a schoolhouse was secured. The sessions were conducted mainly as experience meetings. Each member told his experiences and urged others to sign the pledge. By the first of December, some three hundred had joined, two-thirds of whom had been drunkards of long standing. One of the early members was John H. W. Hawkins, who was induced to leave off drink by the tears and pleadings of his twelve-year-old daughter, Hannah. Hawkins was a man of much native ability and soon developed into a speaker of wonderful power. It was his eloquence which added fire and life to the movement more than that of any other man. His recital of the story of his conversion was most pathetic, and little Hannah became the heroine of the new movement. Later, Dr. John Marsh wrote his pamphlet, *Hannah Hawkins, the Reformed Drunk-*

* See Appendix B, Chap. VI.

ard's Daughter, which went through twenty editions within a few years.

For the first year, outside of the vicinity of Baltimore, the movement attracted but little attention. The American Temperance Union did not hear of it until about the middle of December, when an account reached New York of Hawkins' address before the Legislature of Annapolis. This led the society to extend an invitation to Hawkins and his followers to come to New York, and resulted in a series of great rallies in the spring of 1841. The meetings were advertised as gatherings of reformed drunkards, to be addressed by the same. On the first night thirty or forty signed the pledge, and in the two weeks' series two thousand five hundred drunkards had pledged themselves to give up drink.

Then came the first anniversary of the founding of the society. Six thousand men marched in the street procession at Baltimore on that memorable fifth of April, 1841. A short time afterwards a series of meetings was held in Faneuil Hall, Boston, in which Hawkins was the chief speaker. His first address in Boston is still preserved. He began thus:

“When I compare the past with the present,—my days of intemperance with my present days of peace and sobriety—my past degradation with my present position in this hall,—the Cradle of Liberty—I am overwhelmed. It seems to me holy ground. I never expected to see this hall. I had heard of it in boyhood. It was here that Otis and the elder Adams argued the principles of Independence, and we now meet here to declare ourselves free and independent; to make a second declaration—not quite as lengthy as the old one, but it promises life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our forefathers pledged their lives and fortunes

and sacred honor; we, too, will pledge our honor, our life; but our fortunes have gone for rum. Poor though we drunkards are, and miserable, even in the gutter, we will pledge our lives to maintain sobriety."

What added much to the strength of the Washingtonian movement was the organisation of the women into the Martha Washington societies early in 1841. The first organisation was effected in a church at the corner of Chrystie and Delancey Streets, New York, on May 12 of that year, through the efforts of William A. Wisdom and John W. Oliver. The objects were indicated in the constitution:

"Whereas, the use of all intoxicating drinks has caused, and is causing, incalculable evils to individuals and families, and has a tendency to prostrate all means adapted to the moral, social and eternal happiness of the whole human family; we, the undersigned ladies of the city of New York, feeling ourselves especially called upon, not only to refrain from the use of all intoxicating drinks, but, by our influence and example, to induce others to do the same, do therefore form ourselves into an association."

These auxiliaries, as well as societies of juniors, were formed far and wide in connection with the societies of the men, and for a time gave promise of adding permanency to the movement. For four years it continued to sweep the country. It is commonly computed that at least one hundred thousand common drunkards were reclaimed in the crusade and at least three times as many common tipplers became total abstainers. In 1846 there were not less than five million teetotallers in the country, members of some ten thousand total abstinence societies. The movement even reached the halls of Congress. The old

Congressional Temperance Society was reorganised on a total abstinence basis, and no longer appeared "with a bottle of champagne in one hand and a temperance pledge in the other."

Just as the Washingtonian movement reached its full height another prophet of the same school came into public notice in the person of J. B. Gough. This hero of the temperance reformation was born in Kent, England, in 1817, and came to the United States at the age of twelve. He lived on a farm in Oneida County, New York, for two years, and then entered the employment of the Methodist Book Concern in New York City, to act as errand boy and learn the trade of bookbinding. His mother and his sister Mary came from England and joined him here in 1833. The three lived together for the most part in the most extreme and miserable poverty, for a year, and then the mother died. The brother and sister parted, to pursue their occupations (she as a straw bonnet maker and he as a bookbinder) separately.

After this Gough drifted into bad company and dissipation. He says in his autobiography: "I possessed a tolerably good voice and sang pretty well, having also the faculty of imitation rather strongly developed; and being well stocked with amusing stories, I got introduced into the society of thoughtless and dissipated young men, to whom my talents made me welcome." He now began to drink, and rapidly went from bad to worse. At this time he began to frequent theatres constantly. He had an instinctive love of acting, which the austere religious surroundings of his earlier years had repressed, but which now broke forth into a passion. He sought employment as a comic singer at several New York theatres, and occasionally was accepted, and won considerable applause.

In 1839 he went to reside and pursue his trade in Newburyport, Massachusetts, and there married. He neglected his wife for the tavern, and let his business go to ruin through his dissipation. He and his wife were reduced to hunger, rags, and contempt. "I drank," he says, "the whole day, to the complete ruin of my prospects in life. So entirely did I give myself up to the bottle that those of my companions who fancied that they still possessed some claim to respectability gradually withdrew from my company." A year or two later he joined a travelling show as a comic singer, and drifted into Worcester, Massachusetts, where his wife and child died. He tried to stifle his grief in rum, and "soon," he says, "it was whispered from one to another until the whole town became aware of it, that my wife and child were lying dead and that I was drunk!"

As he was staggering along the streets half intoxicated, one Sunday evening in the autumn of 1842, some one tapped him on the shoulder. He could scarcely believe his senses when he saw on the stranger's face a kind look for the shabby, trembling drunkard that he was. The stranger was Joel Stratton, a Quaker. He persuaded Gough to go to a temperance meeting and sign the total abstinence pledge. From this time Gough was a new man. He kept the pledge, though it cost him a terrible mental and physical struggle. After attending several temperance meetings at the place where he had reformed, he was invited to tell his experience. In his first speech he exhibited such extraordinary power that he sprang with one bound into fame. He was invited to speak in neighbouring towns and school-houses. Then invitations began to pour in from all parts of Massachusetts and from other New England states. In the first year he spoke three hundred and eighty-six times. Then the temperance leaders

invited him to speak in the Broadway Tabernacle in New York. With that speech his fame became national.

Dr. John Marsh, who arranged many of Gough's meetings, thus tells of the first great meeting in Boston:

“On the steamer Mr. Gough made an address, for which he was well rewarded by the numerous passengers. On the Common, by eleven o'clock, from twenty to thirty thousand were gathered from all parts of the state; nine thousand five hundred came by the Eastern railroad. At twelve an immense procession of military and temperance societies started from the state house, Governor Briggs leading the way in a barouche with four white horses, passing down the Mall through two long rows of beautiful children, under the direction of Deacon Grant, and around the principal streets, magnificently decorated with flags and banners, and lined with crowds of spectators, who, with jovial voices and waving handkerchiefs, cheered us. Riding with the Governor, W. K. Mitchell and Mr. Gough, I had a fine opportunity of seeing the whole.”

For many years Gough was a mighty force in the personal, as distinguished from the political, side of the temperance reform. When he had reached his thirty-fourth year he had travelled over seventy-four thousand miles in the temperance cause, and under his fervid appeals more than a hundred and seventy thousand persons had signed the total abstinence pledge.


In 1853 he visited England, where he lectured for two years. He returned thither in 1857 for three years' work. From that time until his death in 1886 he continued his work for temperance, though less actively than during the first seventeen years of his ministry.

Gough's power lay in his wonderful instinctive dramatic skill, in his appeal to the emotions, in his ability to command laughter or tears at will, rather than in the substance of what he said. His speeches abounded in the narration of thrilling and pathetic scenes. His description of the boy rescued from the burning house, of the sister supporting the head of her degraded brother and weeping over him, of the pale wife showing the bruise on her scarred neck, the murder of "Nancy," the portrayal of "little Nell," and above all, his terrific presentation of delirium tremens, a veritable nightmare of horrors, are all matters of history and tradition.

His oratorical power is thus described by the Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis :

"Without the polished scholarship of Edward Everett, without the elegant grace and charm of Wendell Phillips, without the universal genius of Beecher, this reformer brought to his task a certain inborn, impulsive, magnetic, all-enkindling eloquence, that defies analysis, yet for platform work has certainly never been surpassed, perhaps never equalled. Once in a century it is given to a great actor like Irving to put some play of Shakespeare on the stage ninety nights in succession. But Gough entered Exeter Hall in London and for ninety successive nights, with ever-changing lecture, crowded that vast amphitheatre to the streets with merchants, bankers, scholars, with outcasts and drunkards. His voice was a noble instrument of many keys ; his eyes were large and liquid, overflowing with kindness, sympathy, and good humour ; he had a dramatic delivery and power of imitation that were all of the brightest order ; with unrivalled skill he poured forth anecdotes, witticisms, pathetic stories and arguments, also, that were merciless in their logic and all-convincing in their conclusions."

After Gough had pursued his ministry for several years, a man of similar powers (of whom more will



GENERAL NEAL DOW

U. S. Presidential Prohibition Candidate, 1880.





FATHER MATTHEW.

be said in Chapter XV.) came from across the ocean to play an important part in the Washingtonian movement. In 1849, Father Theobald Mathew, a Capuchin friar, who had raised a temperance revolution in Ireland, came to America. On his voyage he had administered the pledge to one hundred and seventy-five of the four hundred steerage passengers on the ship. He was received in the harbour by the Mayor and Council of New York, together with a delegation of some two hundred and fifty temperance leaders. A triumphal tour through New England followed, in which he was officially received by Governor Briggs, of Massachusetts, and received honours wherever he went. In his great Faneuil Hall rally three thousand took the pledge.* Four thousand more took the pledge at one Sunday meeting at the Cathedral. In all, something like one hundred thousand pledges were administered in the tour of the Eastern states.

At Washington he was invited to a seat within the bar of the House of Representatives, but Representative Lumpkin of Georgia objected to the resolution of extending the invitation because Mathew had once signed an address with Mr. O'Connell, urging the Irish of America to use their influence against slavery. This protest was answered by three remarkable tributes to the simple priest spoken on the floor of the House. Henry Clay, slowly rising to his feet, said:

“I think, sir, that that resolution is an homage to humanity, to philanthropy and to virtue; that it is a merited tribute to a man who has achieved a great social revolution—a revolution in which there has been no

* See Appendix C, Chap. VI.

bloodshed, no desolation inflicted, no tears of widows and orphans extracted; and one of the greatest which have been achieved by any of the benefactors of mankind."

Said General Cass:

"This is but a complimentary notice to a distinguished man just arrived among us, and well does he merit it. He is a stranger to us personally, but he has won a world-wide renown. He comes among us on a mission of benevolence, not unlike Howard, whose name and deeds rank high in the annals of philanthropy, and who sought to carry hope and comfort into the darkest cells, and to alleviate the moral and physical condition of their unhappy tenants. He comes to break the bonds of the captive, and to set the prisoner free, to redeem the lost, to confirm the wavering, and to aid in saving all from the temptation, and dangers of intemperance. It is a noble mission, and nobly is he fulfilling it."

Following General Cass, General Houston said:

"Father Mathew goes not with a torch of discord, but with a bond of peace, reformation and redemption to an unfortunate class in the community. I, sir, am a disciple; I needed the discipline of reformation, and I embraced it; and would that I could enforce the example upon every American heart that influences or is influenced by filial affection, conjugal love, or parental tenderness. Yes, sir, there is love, purity and fidelity inscribed upon the banner which he bears. It has nothing to do with abolition or with nullification, sir. Away with your paltry objections to men who come bearing the binnacle above turbid waters, which unfortunately roll at the foot of this mighty Republic."

The Southern tour of Father Mathew extended as far as New Orleans, but its success did not meet the

expectations of his friends. The slavery question was being bitterly discussed, and Mathew's well-known views on that subject aroused the hostility of the advocates of slavery, who sought to draw him into discussions and to embarrass his work. Besides, the health of the visitor was in a precarious condition. He arose from a sick-bed to come to America, and, in his weakened condition, was ill prepared to endure the strain put upon him. After spending a year in America he returned to Ireland, where he soon died.

During the ten years following 1840 the movement was practically given over to pledge signing, and other phases of the movement were temporarily lost to sight. It was purely a "revival" campaign in which emotional features predominated. Little attention was given to the political or economic side of the problem. In fact, many of the Washingtonians actually opposed any action against the saloon business. Mr. William K. Mitchell, the first of the original six to sign the pledge, and all through the movement one of the most prominent leaders, was one of these. He urged that if everybody refrained from drinking there would be no one to buy liquor, and that the problem would thus settle itself. He would have no pledge against selling liquor, and liquor dealers were admitted to his societies if they only became abstainers. Hawkins, however, took a more radical stand, favoring the prohibition of the traffic by law. Gough and Father Mathew, while almost wholly ignoring the legal phase of the question, also favoured prohibition.*

One result of the movement was to shatter the temperance organisations already in the field. The American Temperance Union, early and always,

* See Appendix D, Chap. VI.

encouraged the work of the pledge-signing campaigners. As a matter of fact, it was the Union, through Dr. John Marsh, that introduced most of the Washingtonian leaders to the public, and that largely managed their campaigns. It was Dr. Marsh who discovered Hawkins, brought him to New York and sent him on his way doing good. It was he who heard that young Gough was speaking in the New England schoolhouses, sent for him, introduced him to the public, and managed most of his greatest campaigns. It was he, again, who was chiefly influential in bringing Father Mathew to America, who largely managed his campaign here. The student of these times cannot but give that genial Connecticut preacher much credit for the success of the Washingtonians, but he did it at the cost of his own organisation. The American Temperance Union was swallowed up in the movement. But other influences were at work which were to crystallise the mass of total abstainers into compact organised forces and to continue on broader lines the reform so auspiciously set on foot.

CHAPTER VII.

FRATERNAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.

As soon as the Washingtonian movement began to assume formidable proportions need was felt for some sort of organised assistance for the multitudes of reformed men who had taken the pledge. For want of such encouragement and help many had relapsed into their old habits of drinking; many in despair had abandoned all hope and plunged into more reckless habits than before. This need was met by sundry fraternal temperance societies.

The Sons of Temperance.—The first of these organisations in America was the society of the Sons of Temperance, which enjoyed a period of remarkable success up to the time of the Civil War. The initial meeting was held in response to the following call:*

“SONS OF TEMPERANCE.

“NEW YORK DIVISION, No. 1.

“SIR: You are invited to attend a select meeting at Teetotallers Hall, No. 71 Division Street, on Thursday evening, September 29, 1842, at half-past seven o'clock.

“The object of the meeting is to organize a beneficial society based on total abstinence, bearing the above title.

* *Centennial Temperance Volume*, p. 547.

It is proposed to make the initiation fee at first \$1, and dues six and one-fourth cents a week; in case of sickness a member to be entitled to \$4 a week, and in case of death \$30 to be appropriated for funeral expenses.

“A constitution will be submitted on the above evening, and, if the principles adopted meet your approbation, you are invited to become a member of the Division.

“The enclosed ticket will procure your admittance.

“ John W. Oliver,	Daniel H. Sands,
“ James Bale,	George McKibbin,
“ Ephraim L. Snow,	Isaac J. Oliver.
“ J. MacKellar,	William H. Weaver,
“ Thomas Swenarton,	G. Young Johnson.”

Though the meeting was held on the date mentioned, the organisation was not formally completed until the following evening, an adjournment having been taken for that purpose. All the signers of the call, save Weaver and Johnson, appear as signers of the original constitution. In addition, eight more names appear, making an original membership of sixteen.

The old records of the organisation declare its objects to be “to shield its members from the evils of intemperance; to afford mutual assistance in case of sickness; and to elevate their characters as men.” The pledge adopted at the original meeting has never been changed, though the forms and ceremonies of the order have been revised and altered from time to time. The pledge is as follows:

I will neither make, buy, sell, nor use as a beverage any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider.

Seven of the eight who signed the original call,

and who also signed the original constitution, were chosen officers of the society. The two men who were more than any others responsible for the early success of the movement, were Daniel H. Sands, a reformed tippler, and John W. Oliver, a reformed drunkard. Sands was one of the original signers; he was chairman of the first meeting; he was elected the first Most Worthy Patriarch of the first lodge; he was chosen the first Grand Worthy Patriarch. Oliver followed close behind in the line of promotion. Little stress was laid upon the secret forms, but such as they had were modelled somewhat after the ceremonies of the Odd Fellows and the Masonic order.

The first decade of the existence of the Sons of Temperance was a series of triumphs for the order. At the close of 1845, three years after its first establishment, it numbered fourteen Grand Divisions, six hundred and forty subordinate Divisions and forty thousand members. At the close of the next year, 1846, the membership reached one hundred thousand, an increase of sixty thousand in a single year.

One of the strong men who came to the organisation in its early days was Gen. S. F. Cary. It was largely through his influence that the radical stand of the society on the subject of prohibition was taken in 1852. The National Division of that year made this deliverance:*

“1. That as members of society and as citizens we have the right, and it is our duty to exercise it, to suppress by all legitimate and honorable means the manufacture of, and traffic in intoxicating liquors.

“2. That in becoming Sons of Temperance we give

* Carroll, *One Hundred Years of Temperance*, p. 496.

up none of our moral rights, and are exempt from none of our duties as citizens.

“3. That we desire, will have, and will enforce laws in our respective localities for the suppression of the man-destroying, God-dishonoring business.”

The policy outlined in these resolutions has never been receded from to this day.

In 1866 women were permitted to become “Daughters of Temperance.”*

In the year 1845 the organisation was at the zenith of its prosperity. In 1850 it had thirty-five Grand Divisions, five thousand five hundred and sixty-three subordinates, and two hundred and thirty-two thousand two hundred and thirty-three members. But disaster came in the issues of the Civil War. The entire order was practically swept out of existence in the seceding states, and was decimated in the North. Since the war, however, its losses have been somewhat retrieved.

The Sons of Temperance National Relief Society is conducted as a business enterprise. The admission fee is small and the assessments are equitably graded. An insurance of from \$100 to \$2,000 is given.

The Loyal Crusaders, the children’s organisation, is new in all respects. It is an open society with a simple ritual, with banners, badges and attractive ceremonies. Each subordinate Division is required to have a Superintendent of Young People’s Work, whose duty it is to organise a company of Loyal Crusaders. This branch of the work is rapidly pushing itself to the front.

* A separate organisation called the “Daughters of Temperance” was formed in 1843. A misunderstanding soon resulted in the organisation of the Original Daughters. Both societies flourished for a time, but became extinct when the Sons admitted women into full membership.



SIR OLIVER MOWAT

Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. For over twenty-three years
Premier of Ontario.





SIR LEONARD TILLEY
(1818-1898)

Late Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick. One of the Fathers of Confederation, and a consistent and prominent Prohibitionist.

The organisation now has five National Divisions; one for North America, one for Great Britain and Ireland, two for Australia, and one for New Zealand. In the course of its history nearly four million members have been admitted to its rolls. Its present membership in North America is 34,614, of whom 14,292 are in the United States.

In the beginning of 1847 the order was introduced into New Brunswick through the influence of G. W. P. Campbell, of St. Stephens, and within six months there were seven Divisions organized, with eight hundred members. The year before, M. W. P. White had opened a Division at Montreal, but it languished until the fall of 1847, when it was revived and began to flourish. In the same year, on the 17th of November, a Division was instituted at Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, by the Rev. Mr. Ashby. Other places soon followed this example, and, within four months, there were in the province ten Divisions and six hundred members. The organisation was planted in England in the same year, although an ineffectual attempt to do so had been made two years previously. Flourishing Divisions exist in various parts of Australia. These were originally instituted in 1863-4 by Dr. William Hobbs, under a commission granted by the Grand Division of Nova Scotia.

Neal Dow, Rutherford B. Hayes, Bishop W. F. Malleliu, Rev. Dr. T. L. Cuyler, John N. Stearns, Louis Wagner and Hiram Price are among the many prominent statesmen and public men who have been active in the order in the United States; and Sir Leonard Tilley, George W. Ross, George E. Foster and E. J. Davis, in Canada.

Templars of Honour and Temperance.—The Temples of Honour were formed within the Sons of Tem-

perance to satisfy those who desired a more elaborate ritual than that afforded by the original organisation. They were regarded as constituting a higher degree of the first society. The first, instituted in June, 1845 took the name "Marshall Fraternity of Temperance." In the following December its name was changed to the present one. There were then but forty-five members. The following pledge was adopted:

"I will not make, buy, sell, or use as a beverage, any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider, or any other alcoholic beverage, whether enumerated or not; but will use all honorable means to prevent their manufacture or use, or the traffic therein, and this pledge I will keep and maintain inviolate until the end of life."

The society grew rapidly, and in a few years was planted in nearly every state in the Union. It was especially strong in the South, but, like the parent organisation, nearly went to pieces on the issues of the war between the states. Although it has increased since peace was declared, it has scarcely made up the ground lost in that strife. It now has fifteen Grand Temples and subordinate Temples in nearly every state, besides Temples in New Brunswick, Sweden and England. At the fifty-fourth annual session of the Supreme Council held in New York City, August, 1900, thirty-three hundred and twenty-four members in regular standing were reported.*

The Temples of Honour were somewhat more progressive than the parent organisation, and first took a stand for the suppression of the liquor traffic by law,

* See Appendix A, Chap. VII.

having adopted as their motto : " Prohibition by the Strong Arm of the Law, maintained and upheld by Public Sentiment."

Cadets of Temperance.—In May, 1845, the Juvenile Sons of Temperance was organised in Lehigh County, Pennsylvania; an organisation that was imitated in other localities. In the next year, at Germantown, these organisations were amalgamated under the name, " Cadets of Temperance," and a general effort was made to extend the societies. In two years they had spread into twenty-two states. These societies still exist in a somewhat irregular fashion. Some are under the care of the Sons of Temperance, others of the Temples of Honour, and some are independent. The following is their pledge:

" I do here, in the presence of these members, solemnly promise that I will never make, buy, sell, or use as a beverage, any spirituous or malt liquors, wine, cider, or other intoxicating drinks."

The Rechabites.—The Independent Order of Rechabites is the oldest and probably the wealthiest temperance society in the world. Its strength is largely confined to Great Britain, where it was organised, at Salford, in 1835. It was introduced into America in 1842, the first organisation being effected in New York City. Like other similar organisations, it enjoyed great prosperity in this country up to the time of the Civil War, at one time having one hundred thousand members. While the order still flourishes in Great Britain, there are now but about three thousand members in the United States, being mainly confined to the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio,

Michigan and the District of Columbia. The annual income of the whole organisation now amounts to about \$1,000,000. Its annual disbursements in benefits, are about \$750,000, and it has accumulated funds amounting to \$5,250,000. Its pledge reads:

“ I hereby declare that I will abstain from all intoxicating liquors, including wine and cider, and I will not give nor offer them to others, except in religious ordinances, or when prescribed in good faith by a medical practitioner; I will not engage in the traffic of them, and, in all suitable ways will discountenance the use, manufacture and sale of them, and to the utmost of my power I will endeavor to spread the principles of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors.”

At present its total membership is about 250,000.*

The Good Samaritans.—In February, 1847, the Independent Order of Good Samaritans and also the Daughters of Samaria were organized in New York City as practically one institution. Within a year coloured people were received as members. The organisation has always refused to meddle in politics and has emphasised the reclamation of drunkards, no matter how often or to what depth they may have fallen. Before the war it was in a prosperous condition, but since that time it has declined. In 1876 it had a membership of some fourteen thousand people, but is now nearly obsolete. Its pledge read:

“ I do furthermore promise that I will neither make, buy, sell, or use as a beverage, any spirituous or malt liquors, wine, or cider; that I will discountenance the use and traffic in alcoholic drinks of every kind; that

* The order also extends to Australia, New Zealand, India, Malta, Denmark, Cape Colony, British Columbia, many of the East Indian Islands, and the Gold Coast of Africa.

I will use all moral and honorable means within my power to put a stop to the practice of legalizing the same; and will, as far as practicable, seek to reclaim the inebriate from the error of his ways."

The Independent Order of Good Templars.—The last of the important fraternal temperance organisations to be formed before the Civil War was the Independent Order of Good Templars. The organisation had a peculiarly obscure origin. In the year 1851 there existed in Oriskoma Falls, Oneida county, New York, an organization known as the "Good Templars," of which Westley Bailey, of Utica, was at the head.* The organisation consisted of two Lodges in Utica, and eleven in the county. There was no Grand Lodge. The membership was made up mainly of young men, among the most active of whom was Levrett E. Coon, of Utica. The records of Lodge No. 1 were destroyed by fire. Early in 1852 Coon removed to Syracuse, and there organised Excelsior Lodge, Number 14. This Lodge was organised as subordinate to a Grand Lodge which did not yet exist, but which was expected to organise at a Convention to be held in Utica the following July. At this Convention the Syracuse Lodge was represented by Coon and T. S. Truair. A dispute arose between Coon and Bailey, in which the Convention sided with Bailey. Coon and Truair thereupon withdrew. A few years later a temperance Convention was held at Syracuse, at which Nathaniel Curtis, a veteran of the Washingtonian movement, was the principal speaker. Coon sought out Curtis, interested him in his Good Templar Lodge, and invited him to his room, where he initiated Curtis, and conferred upon

* This organisation was formed in 1850 and was first known as "the Knights of Jericho."

him the necessary authority and instructions for starting a Lodge at Ithaca. This was on July 15. A few days later Coon, as Grand Chief Templar, instituted a Lodge at Fayetteville.

Mr. Coon next induced Excelsior Lodge to secede from the Utica organisation, adopt the name "Independent Order of Good Templars" and become Lodge Number 1. The motto was also changed from "Friendship, Hope and Charity," to "Faith, Hope and Charity." The Lodge formed by Curtis at Ithaca, and the Fayetteville Lodge, fell in with the new order of things and on August 17, a Convention, composed of delegates from these three Lodges, met at Syracuse to form a Grand Lodge. At this Convention Mr. Curtis made a strong speech and was chosen Grand Worthy Chief Templar. Mr. Coon was made Past Grand Worthy Chief Templar.*

A few months later Coon removed to Canada and disappeared from sight, but Curtis threw himself into the work of organising Lodges with such vigour that at the time of the meeting of the Grand Lodge held in Syracuse on November 9 of the same year, twelve Lodges were in healthy operation. The original Good Templar Lodges in Oneida county dropped out of sight, and thus was founded the organisation as it now stands. To the enthusiasm and energy of Curtis was due much of its success during the next ten years. Other influential and active co-workers with Curtis were Garey Chambers, the Rev. H. P. Barnes, Dr. S. C. Miles and the Rev. D. W. Bristol. The latter was the author of the first ritual for the initiatory, and also for the higher degrees.

* Pierce, *History of the Good Templars*, p. 37, also Turnbull, *History of the I. O. G. T.*

Until 1855 the organisation attracted little attention. Lodges had been quietly planted in New York, Pennsylvania, Canada, Iowa, Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Illinois and Ohio. It was widely scattered and had but a modest membership. Until then, the Grand Lodge of New York was the recognised head of the young order. In May, 1855, representatives of the Grand Lodges of the states mentioned, met and organised the Right Worthy Grand Lodge, which has since been the supreme governing body of the order throughout the world, with the exception of the period of division mentioned below. In 1893 its name was changed to "The International Supreme Lodge." *

Up to the time of the war the growth of the order was healthy but slow, compared with that of the Sons of Temperance. In 1860 the membership was reported as 98,959. During the years of the strife between the states little progress was made, but the organisation suffered little in comparison with the older fraternal societies for the reason that its membership was almost wholly in the Northern states.

In the ten years following the Civil War the organisation had an astonishing growth. By 1875 it had spread nearly all over the civilised world, had a membership of some 200,000 in Great Britain and a total membership of about 735,000. But about this time an internal quarrel was developed which resulted in disaster. The Grand Lodges in the Southern states were accustomed to refuse charters to coloured men, and the Southern subordinate Lodges were wont to blackball such candidates when offered

* See Appendix C, Chap. VII.

for membership. The Right Worthy Grand Lodge, while recognising the right of coloured Lodges to hold charters and of coloured men to become members on the same standard as white men, held that the various Grand Lodges were the sole judges of the persons to whom they could issue charters, and that they had no power to coerce the Southern brethren. The British Lodges held the opposite view, and the misunderstanding resulted in the withdrawal of the British delegates from the Right Worthy Grand Lodge held in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1876. The seceding delegates from Great Britain, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, with two from Indiana and one each from Ohio and Iowa, at once met in another room and organised another Right Worthy Grand Lodge.* The work of the seceding organisation was mainly confined to the continent of Europe, though it had numerous Lodges in Canada, Asia, Africa, Australia and a few in the United States. At the time of this separation it was estimated that 2,900,804 persons had been initiated into the order, of which number 290,000 had been hard drinkers. Largely through the efforts of the late John B. Finch, then prominent in the councils of the order, the breach between the two factions was healed and the divisions united at Saratoga Springs, New York, in 1887.†

The Good Templar order differs from most of its predecessors in the fact that it is strictly a temperance organisation without any insurance or other benefits of similar character. It adopted the following radical platform in 1859, which it has retained to the present time:

* See Appendix D, Chap. VII.

† See Appendix E, Chap. VII.

1st. Total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors as a beverage.

2d. No licence, in any form or under any circumstances, for the sale of such liquors, to be used as a beverage.

3d. The absolute prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for such purposes—prohibition by the will of the people, expressed in due form of law, with the penalties deserved for a crime of such enormity.

4th. The creation of a healthy public opinion upon the subject, by the active dissemination of truth in all the modes known to an enlightened philanthropy.

5th. The election of good, honest men to administer the laws.

6th. Persistence in efforts to save individuals and communities from so direful a scourge, against all forms of opposition and difficulty, until our success is complete and universal.

It was largely through the inspiration of Good Templar leaders that the national Prohibition party was organised in the States.

Various other organisations have sprung up around the Good Templars. The Juvenile Templars was early organised to meet the needs of the youth. Their pledge exacted abstinence from tobacco and profanity as well as liquors. The organisation is still at work in connection with the elder society.

The British-American Order of Good Templars was an offshoot from the Canadian Grand Lodge of Good Templars in 1858. Eight years later the word "American" was dropped, and the organisation spread extensively throughout British dominions. In 1876 it was consolidated with various other enterprises; the Free Templars of St. John in Scotland; the Independent Order of Free Templars in England and the United Templar Order in Great Britain,

Ireland and South Africa. These organisations were united to form the United Temperance Association.*

In January, 1859, an organisation known as the Dashaways was formed in San Francisco, California, so called from a resolution of the founders to dash away the intoxicating bowl. The organisation spread through California and Oregon, but has disappeared. Another lively but short-lived organisation was formed in Chicago in 1860, called the Flying Artillery. This spread over Illinois, but soon disappeared.

An organisation known as the Sons of the Soil was formed for coloured men in Virginia, in 1865. It had a large membership for a time. A similar organisation, but for coloured children, known as the Vanguard of Freedom, was organised in 1868, and soon spread over the South. The Knights of Jericho also operated in the South for some years.

The Friends of Temperance was organised in Pittsburg, Virginia, in 1865, for the purpose of picking up the scattered tents of the Sons of Temperance that had been abandoned during the war. In twelve years they had a membership of twenty thousand white persons, but the order is now about obsolete.

The United Friends of Temperance, organised at Chattanooga, Tennessee, in 1871, became very strong in Virginia and North Carolina in a few years, but soon disappeared.

The Royal Templars of Temperance.—In the year 1869 there were twelve Lodges of Good Templars, two Divisions of the Sons of Temperance and one Temple of Honour, at work in Buffalo, the combined membership numbering some twelve hundred. About two thousand saloons of the city were wholly

* See Appendix E.

ignoring the Sunday closing law, whereupon these organisations united in an effort to enforce the statute. A committee composed of one representative from each of these societies was entrusted with the undertaking. Money was collected and a test case brought in the Courts. The trial Justice reserved his decision until a later time. He has not yet rendered it.

Cyrus K. Porter, a member of the committee, had previously drafted a ritual and basis of organisation for a fraternal temperance society. The committee formed a new society, the Royal Templars of Temperance, upon this basis. Its purpose was wholly educational, designed to educate the public sentiment up to a point where it would cease to tolerate Justices of the prevailing Buffalo Standard. It did not engage in reformatory work, but the membership was confined to workers in the cause. In 1877 the organisation was disbanded, and a new one organised on the basis of a plan of beneficiary work. This society began its existence with ten members, seven men and three women. In 1885 the Canadian membership was separated into an Independent Beneficiary Jurisdiction. The organisation in the States now has Grand Councils in New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Kentucky, New England, New Jersey and Ohio. The pledge reads:

“I promise that I will not make, buy, sell, use, or give to others as a beverage, any spirituous, fermented, or distilled liquors, wines or cider, or frequent places where such liquors are kept for sale; but will discountenance their manufacture, use and sale in the community, in all proper ways.”

The present membership is 22,718.

The Sons of Jonadab.—This fraternal temperance order was established in Washington, D. C., September 13, 1867, by a coterie of men who had had bitter experiences with drink. Like the Rechabites, they found the inspiration for the undertaking in the thirty-fourth chapter of Jeremiah:

“I set before the sons of the house of the Rechabites pots full of wine, and cups, and I said unto them, drink ye wine.

“But they said, we will drink no wine; for Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father, commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sons forever.

“Thus have we obeyed the voice of Jonadab, our father, in all that he charged us, to drink no wine all our days. we, our wives, our sons, nor our daughters.”

The organisation now comprises eight councils, of which six are located at Washington, one at Baltimore and one at Harper's Ferry. The membership is nearly five hundred. This society furnishes insurance to its members. The pledge is:

“I, ——, hereby declare that I will forever abstain from the use of all intoxicating liquors, and will not give nor offer them to others, except in religious ceremonies, or when prescribed in good faith by a medical practitioner. I will not engage in the traffic of the same, and in all suitable ways will discountenance their use, manufacture and sale, and to the utmost of my power will endeavor to spread the principles of abstinence from all intoxicating liquors. To which I pledge my most sacred honor.”

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ANTE-BELLUM PROHIBITION MOVEMENT.

THOUGH the appeal to the individual to abstain from intoxicating liquor was the most prominent element of the temperance reform during its early years, yet denunciation of the traffic in liquor played a not inconsiderable part almost from the beginning. Lyman Beecher in his *Six Sermons*, in 1826, declared that the reformer should not end with exhortation to personal temperance, but should endeavour to stop the commerce, which was a mighty cause of intemperance. The means of stopping this traffic, said Dr. Beecher were, first, the action of an aroused public opinion, and, second, legal enactment. He said :

“In our views, and in our practice as a nation, there is something fundamentally wrong ; and the remedy, like the evil, must be found in the correct application of general principles. It must be a universal and national remedy. What, then, is this universal, natural, and national remedy for intemperance ? It is the banishment of strong drinks from the list of lawful articles of commerce, by a correct and efficient public sentiment, such as has turned slavery out of half our land, and will yet expel it from the world. . . .

“That the traffic in these liquors is wrong, and should be abandoned as a great national evil, is evident from the following consideration : 1. It employs a multitude of men and a vast amount of capital to no useful purpose. The medicinal use of ardent spirits is allowed ; for this, however, the apothecary can furnish an ade-

quate supply ; but, considered as an article of commerce for ordinary use, it adds nothing to animal or social enjoyment, to muscular power, to intellectual vigour, or moral feeling. . . . 2. The amount of suffering and mortality inseparable from the commerce in these liquors, renders it an unlawful article of trade. . . . 3. It seems to be a manifest violation of the command, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' and of various other evangelical precepts. . . . Love will not burn a neighbour's house, or poison his food, or blast his reputation, or destroy his soul. But the commerce in strong drink does all this inevitably and often. Property, reputation, health, life, and salvation, fall before it. . . . It is scarcely a palliation of this evil, that no man is destroyed maliciously, or with any direct intent to kill. . . . He who deliberately assists his neighbour to destroy his life, is not guiltless, because his neighbour is a free agent, and is also guilty ; and he is accessory to the crime, though twenty other persons might have been ready to commit the same sin if he had not done it. . . ."

Proceeding then to the remedies for national intemperance, he discusses education, association, reform in commercial customs, church action, etc., and concludes thus :

"When all these preliminary steps have been taken, petitions may be addressed to the Legislatures of the states, and to Congress, by all denominations, each under its own proper name, praying for the legislative interference to protect the health and morals of the nation. This will call to the subject the attention of the ablest men in the nation, and enable them to touch some of the springs of general action with compendious energy. They can reach the causes of disastrous action when the public sentiment will bear them out in it, and can introduce principles which, like the great laws of nature, will with silent simplicity reform and purify the land."

Again, Mr. J. Kittredge at the second annual meeting of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance, in 1829, said :

“ How can it [the vice of intemperance] be destroyed? I answer : In no way but by starvation. . . . There is nothing but a drought—an universal and everlasting drought—of spirituous liquors that can dry it up. . . . And, sir, I believe that every one who supplies the fountain is a partaker of the guilt ; and that every distiller and vendor and purchaser of ardent spirits is accessory to the crime of drunkenness. It is an unhallowed traffic, and, like the traffic in human blood, should receive the unqualified reprobation of the Christian world. . . . The vending of ardent spirits cannot be carried on without guilt.”

The idea that the liquor traffic was morally wrong and that it should be the main object of the reformer's attack, quickly gained prominence, and early in the thirties it had a large and influential following. Lyman Beecher again voiced the growing opinion in an address to the young men of Boston in 1832. “ The dealers in this liquid poison,” he said, “ may be compared to men who should advertise for sale consumptions, and fevers, and rheumatisms, and palsies, and apoplexies. But would our public authorities permit such a traffic? No! The public voice would be heard at once, for the punishment of such enemies of our race; and the rulers that would not take vengeance would be execrated and removed. But now the men who deal out this slow poison are licensed by law ; and they talk about their constitutional rights, and plead that they are pursuing their lawful callings.” *

It was in the same year that Attorney-General Wirt delivered his famous opinion, affirming

* *Fifth Report of the American Temperance Society*, p. 24.

that the retailing of ardent spirits was a nuisance under certain conditions. Then came the Pastoral Association, the General Association of Massachusetts and the General Association of Connecticut and Maine, embracing more than five hundred evangelical ministers, with this resolution:

Resolved: That in the judgment of this Association, the traffic in ardent spirits as a drink is an immorality, and ought to be viewed and treated as such throughout the world.*

In the following year the Grand Jury of the city and county of New York made a return declaring that if the liquor traffic were brought to an end, "three-fourths of the crime and pauperism of the city would be prevented," and added: "It is our solemn impression that the time has now arrived when our public authorities should no longer sanction the evil complained of by granting licences for the purpose of vending ardent spirit; thereby legalising the traffic, at the expense of our moral, intellectual and physical power."

At the annual meeting of the American Temperance Society, in May, 1833, Gerrit Smith delivered a powerful address against the legalising of the liquor business, the keynote of which was in this utterance:

"We of this age look upon the slave-trade as fit only for pirates; and why so? Mainly because the laws declared it a piracy. But for this how small comparatively would be our abhorrence of this trade. Now, the people of this country look with a partial eye on the rum traffic. But, let the laws brand it, and our children will look upon it with an abhorrence rivaling that with which we regard the slave-trade."

* *Fifth Report of the American Temperance Society*, p. 112.

Dr. Justin Edwards followed this with a carefully prepared argument to prove the intrinsic immorality of licence laws, which was printed with the annual report of the American Temperance Society for the current year. During the fall, winter and spring of 1833-34, almost every state temperance society laid special stress upon this phase of the question, all denouncing the traffic as an immorality.

The speech of Smith and the pamphlet of Edwards received influential endorsement. The Rev. Dr. Francis Wayland, President of Brown University, wrote: "I think the prohibition of the liquor traffic in ardent spirits a fit subject for legislative enactment, and I believe that the most happy results would flow from such prohibition." The Rev. Wilber Fisk, President of the Wesleyan University, wrote: "The arguments in opposition to the licence system are unanswerable." Attorney-General George Sullivan, of New Hampshire, wrote: "If the legislature of a state permit by a law a traffic which produces poverty with all its sufferings; which corrupts the morals, and destroys the health and lives of thousands of the community, they defeat the great and important end for which government was established." The Rev. Heman Humphrey, President of Amherst College, wrote: "It is as plain to me as the sun in a clear summer sky, that the licence laws of our country constitute one of the main pillars on which the stupendous fabric of intemperance now rests." Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, United States Senator from New Jersey, wrote: "The ground taken in your report is, beyond all serious controversy, among the clearest and soundest of right reason; that the laws which authorise the traffic in ardent spirits as a drink by licencing men to pursue

it, are morally wrong." "The argument appears to me irresistible," wrote David Dagget, Chief Justice of the State of Connecticut. "I am decidedly of the opinion that all laws for licencing and regulating the sale of ardent spirits ought to be instantly repealed," wrote ex-Governor John Cotton Smith, of Connecticut.

By this time the movement was clearly upon the basis that the liquor traffic was immoral, and the step was but short to the conclusion that the laws licencing an immoral traffic must likewise be immoral. Hence, from this time on, outside of the work of fraternal societies, temperance work was more and more directed against the legalisation of this immoral traffic.

In the meantime a man had arisen who attempted to make a concrete application of the abstract truth. In 1832, General James Appleton, of Ipswich, Massachusetts, prepared and presented to the Legislature of his state a petition asking for a law prohibiting sales of liquor in less quantities than thirty gallons. Though he pushed his petition with voice and pen, it came to nothing, and Appleton removed to Portland, Maine, in the following year. His efforts in his native state, however, were destined to bear fruit. The earnest and wide-spread discussion on the new basis resulted in action by several state Legislatures in 1838. On February 21, of that year, four hundred men met in Boston, organised a state temperance association on a total abstinence basis, and memorialised the Legislature in a remarkable petition, beginning with these words:

"Is it right to licence man to mar the image of God in his brother man? Right to give him authority to 'sell insanity' and deal out sure destruction? If it is

right, why should any man be forbidden to do it? If not right, why should any man be permitted? Why forbid all but 'men of sober life and conversation' to do this, if it is right? Why allow 'men of sober life and conversation' to do it if it is wrong? . . . Can that which always works private evil conduce to public good? Can that which is bad for all the parts be good for the whole? Can evil be converted into good by multiplication? Can wrong be legislated into right?"

About the same time committees of the Legislatures of Massachusetts and Tennessee reported in favour of entirely prohibiting the retailing of ardent spirits for beverage purposes, and a committee of the Connecticut Legislature recommended a local option law. The Tennessee Legislature passed a prohibitory law for sales of less than one gallon; Massachusetts forbade the sale of spirits in less quantities than fifteen gallons; Connecticut abolished the licence laws, but provided for the sale of liquors, including wine and beer, under severe restrictions, in quantities of five gallons and upward, while Maine lacked but one vote of passing a law making the minimum sale twenty-eight gallons.* Rhode Island and New Hampshire passed local option laws. Congress also abolished the two liquor stalls which had been usually conducted in the basement of the Capitol building. Both Houses concurred in the following joint standing rule, that "no spirituous liquors shall be offered for sale, or exhibited within the Capitol, or on the grounds adjacent thereto."

Thus ended the initial skirmish of the temperance forces in the Legislatures of the states, but the first hand to hand conflict was destined to be fought

* Mississippi passed a "one gallon" law in 1839.



out in the state of Maine. Before the battle was fought, however, an important advance was made against the liquor power in the Supreme Court of the United States. The liquor dealers demanded the right to sell; the laws of most of the states made it a criminal offence to sell without a licence, and even then under grievous restrictions. They accordingly appealed their case to the Supreme Court of the United States, in which they affirmed the unconstitutionality of the prohibitory features of the licence laws. The liquor sellers employed Daniel Webster and Rufus Choate, who ranked as the ablest constitutional lawyers of the time, to prosecute their appeal. The first argument was held in the January term, 1845. Mr. Webster argued the general proposition that "the right to import implied the right to sell," while Mr. Choate confined his argument to the claim that the licence laws under consideration interfered with the existing commercial treaties with France. The argument for the validity of the law was made by Asabel Huntington, of Salem. Three suits of the same character were argued at the same time, viz: *Thurlow vs. the State of Massachusetts*; *Fletcher vs. the State of Rhode Island*, and *Pierce vs. the State of New Hampshire*. No decision being reached, the whole subject was re-argued at the January term, 1847, when a final decision was rendered. The appellants were then represented by Mr. Webster and others, while each state was represented by distinguished counsel. Seven of the nine Justices sat in the case: Chief Justice Taney, Associates McLean, Catron, Daniel, Woodbury, Grier and Nelson. All rendered written opinions save Nelson, who merely concurred. Said Chief Justice Taney:

"Every state, therefore, may regulate its own internal

traffic, according to its own judgment, and upon its own views of the interest and well-being of its citizens, I am not aware that these principles have ever been questioned. . . . Although a state is bound to receive and permit the sale by the importer of any article of merchandise which Congress authorizes to be imported, it is not to furnish a market for it, nor to abstain from the passage of any law which it may deem necessary or advisable to guard the health and morals of its citizens, although such law may discourage importation, or diminish the profits of the importer or lessen the revenue to the general government.

“And if any state deems the retail and internal traffic in ardent spirits injurious to its citizens, and calculated to produce idleness, vice and debauchery, I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent it from regulating and restraining the traffic, or from prohibiting it altogether, if it thinks proper.”

Said Justice Grier :

“It is not necessary for the purpose of justifying the state legislation now under consideration, to array the appalling statistics of misery, pauperism and crime which have their origin in the use or abuse of ardent spirits. The police power, which is exclusively in the states, is alone competent to the correction of these great evils, and all measures of restraint or prohibition necessary to effect the purpose are within the scope of that authority. There is no conflict of power, or of legislation as between the states and the United States, each acting within its sphere, and for the public good ; and if loss of revenue should accrue to the United States from a diminished consumption of ardent spirits, she will be a gainer a thousand fold in the health and happiness of the people.”

Justice Woodbury made this trenchant observation :

“The power to forbid things is surely as extensive, and rests upon as broad principles of public security and sound morals, as that to exclude persons. And yet who does not know that slaves have been prohibited admittance by many of our states, whether coming from their neighbours abroad? And which of them cannot forbid their soil from being polluted by incendiaries and felons from any quarter?”

By that decision the right of any state to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes was established for all time to come. It was hailed with delight by the temperance people all over the country, and public meetings were held in the principal cities for rejoicing. The impression that the decision of the Court would be otherwise had had a disastrous effect in many local elections; some two hundred known localities having reversed their prohibitory policy.

During the forties local option contests were fought with almost savage fury. Vermont nearly drove the saloon out of its borders. Many New Hampshire towns elected no-licence Excise Boards. In Rhode Island for two years every town save three voted for no-licence. Nearly all of Massachusetts was without licenced saloons. In Connecticut three-fourths of the towns were under a no-licence régime till 1846, when the law was repealed by the Legislature. In Pennsylvania, eighteen counties were under the no-licence rule, as were about one-half the towns of Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin. This was also the case with many towns in New Jersey, with every county in Iowa, save Keokuk, and with numerous localities in New York and Ohio. Michigan even made it unconstitutional to grant a licence.*

* See Appendix A, Chap. VIII.



MRS. MARY T. BURTT.

Born at Cincinnati, Ohio. Had rare educational advantages. Stirred by the Crusade movement, she took the state lead in W. C. T. U. work. Queenly in presence, courtly in speech, and dignified and inspiring in public, she is well fitted to lead the 20,000 noble women of the Empire State.



MRS. MARY H. HUNTT.

Supt of the World's and National Dept. of Scientific Temperance. Came from distinguished ancestors. Has made the law on scientific temperance in all the States save three. Foreign countries note her work, and invite her aid. She publishes the "School Physiology Journal."





MRS. CAROLINE BROWN BUELL.

Born in Marlboro', Mass., and educated at public and private schools. Joined the Prohibition party in 1871, and has since written and spoken in support of its principles. Has a national reputation as an organizer and as a codifier of W.C.T.U. laws. Is indefatigable in her efforts and wields a marvellous power.



MISS AMANDA WAY, P.G.C.T.

Born in Winchester, Ind., 1828. Educated in common schools and Randolph Seminary. Licensed by M. E. Church to preach, in 1871, but subsequently joined the Friends. Was strong anti-slavery and is an equally staunch prohibitionist. Has lectured from ocean to ocean, and is the heroine of many great victories.

The agitation for advanced legislation upon the liquor question took definite form in 1837, when General James Appleton, of Portland, Maine, as chairman of a legislative committee, to whom the matter had been referred, presented to the Legislature an elaborate report urging the abrogation of the licence laws, which he claimed to be the support and life of the traffic. He urged the entire prohibition of the sale of all intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, comparing such prohibition to laws forbidding the sale of unwholesome meats, or ordering the removal of anything which endangers the health and life of the citizen, which threatens to subvert civil rights or overthrow the government. While the document, which was tabled, was apparently in advance of public sentiment, yet the clearness and force with which it was written and the conciseness of its logic made the utterance a key-note for a new school in American statecraft. It attracted attention and commanded respect.*

The principle was fortunate in having for one of its first apostles a vigorous young Quaker, Neal Dow, who fought out the issue in the following years with the ardour, enthusiasm and faith of the old Hebrew prophets. He first attempted to secure prohibition for the state, and failed. That was two years after Appleton presented his famous report to the Legislature. Defeat seemed merely to arouse him to more determined action. In 1842, he had gathered around him a number of the veterans of the Washingtonian movement, and carried the local option contest in Portland by some four hundred majority. The victory was a fruitless one, as the city officers were in league with the liquor dealers and refused to enforce

* See Appendix B, Chap. VIII.

the law. He at once presented the matter to the Legislature along the lines laid down in the report of General Appleton. In the session of 1844 he succeeded in getting his bill through the House, but failed in the Senate. During the winter of 1845-6 he travelled extensively in the interest of his measure campaigning for the election of members of the Legislature who were favourable to the proposed law. In July, 1846, he appeared before the Legislature with a petition signed by forty thousand citizens endorsing the measure, and the bill was passed.* But unfortunately no machinery was provided for its enforcement, and in consequence the attempt proved to be abortive. Another campaign by Mr. Dow followed, and an improved law was passed in 1849, only to be vetoed by Governor Dana. The state government was then Democratic in all its branches. In the following August (1850) he presented a new bill, but it failed of passage by a tie in the Senate. He and his friends thereupon went out among the people on another campaign and "cleared out the state house with ballots." He was on hand as soon as the succeeding Legislature had assembled and his measure was again passed. On June 3, 1851, Governor John Hubbard signed the bill and it became a law.

But the champions of the Maine law saw breakers ahead, unless suitable men should be elected to enforce the measure in the larger cities. Accordingly, they secured the election of Mr. Dow as Mayor of Portland. As most of the larger cities looked to Portland for an example in the enforcement of the new measure, so most of them followed the example of the chief municipality. Mayor Dow gave the dealers six days in which to ship their liquor out of

* The vote in the House was 81 to 42 ; in the Senate, 23 to 5.

the state. Most of them did so, but some two thousand dollars' worth which remained was seized and destroyed. In his first quarterly report the Mayor said:

“At the time of its passage there were supposed to be in the city from two hundred to three hundred shops and other places where intoxicating liquors were openly sold to all comers. At the present time there are no places where such liquors are sold openly, and only a few where they are sold at all, and that with great caution and secrecy, and only to those who are personally known to the keepers, and who can be relied upon not to betray them to the authorities.

“The results of the law so far have been more salutary and decisive than the most ardent friends had reason to anticipate.”

About the same time the Marshal of Augusta, the capital city, reported:

“Augusta had four wholesale stores, business worth two hundred thousand dollars a year; retail shops twenty-five. The city was exempted from the new law for sixty days by dispensation of the Mayor. During the sixty days, one dealer made a profit of about nine hundred dollars. As soon as the sixty days were out, three of the wholesale dealers sent off their liquors to New York, and ultimately to California. The remaining firm persisted in selling, until one thousand dollars worth of liquors were seized. Liquor may be sold at the principal hotels, but stealthily. The police used to be called up one hundred nights in a year. Since the passage of this law they have not been summoned once.”

The Mayor of Bangor, in his message to the City Council, April 22, 1851, reported that the occupants of the House of Correction for the year preceding

the law were 12,206, while for the year following the enactment of the law they were but 9,192, and the prosecutions dropped from one hundred and one, to fifty-eight in the same time. "On the first of July," he said, "when I gave notice that I should enforce the liquor law one hundred and eight persons were selling liquor openly; twenty of them have left the city, and are carrying on their trade in Massachusetts. Of the remaining eighty-eight not one sells openly."

The effect of the law on the commitments to the penitentiary was remarkable, as the following table shows:

Commitments for two years preceding repeal....	65
Commitments two years of licence, following repeal	121
Commitments two years following re-adoption of the law	89

In 1851, the Democratic party of the state, which was in power, made the proposed law a political issue and threw its political strength in its favour, During the succeeding years the liquor element in the party secured control, and four years later repudiated the law and repealed it. A political revolution followed which was far-reaching in its effects. The temperance men left the party and went over to the opposition. In 1858 the law was reinstated and the Democratic party was overwhelmingly defeated. Since then some fifty amendments have been made to the law, all designed to strengthen its provisions. In 1884, a prohibitory amendment was added to the constitution of the state by a vote of nearly three to one.*

* The vote stood : for the amendment 70,783 ; against the amendment, 23,911.

These stirring events in Maine gave a remarkable impetus to the demand for legal prohibition over the country, a demand that found its utterance in drastic legal measures proposed in the Legislatures of most of the states. The campaigns of moral suasion and pledge-signing were almost forgotten for the time being, in the efforts to abate the legalised institution which, by creating the annual supply of drunkards, made such campaigns necessary. The Maine law was the chief topic of discussion in all gatherings in which the temperance reform was considered. At the Fourth National Temperance Convention held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on August 20, 1850, the new method of combating the evils of intemperance was discussed for nearly half a day, after which the following resolution was unanimously passed:

Resolved: That the principle assumed and carried out in the Maine law, that spirituous and intoxicating liquors kept for sale, as a beverage, should be destroyed by the state, as a public evil, meets the approbation of this Convention as consonant with the destruction of the implements of gambling and counterfeiting, of poisonous foods, infectious hides, and weapons of war in the hands of an enemy; that if the liquor destroyed is private property, it is only so as are the implements of the counterfeiter, dangerous and deadly to the best interests of the community; that its destruction is no waste of the bounties of Providence, more than the destruction of noxious weeds, while its very destruction enriches the state exceeding the amount for which it could have been sold. It tends to put an end to all subterfuges, frauds and secret sales, and to the demand for it in the community. It makes the state a perfect asylum for the inebriate. It is a solemn manifestation to the world of

the vile and worthless nature of the article destroyed, and an unmistakable token to the vendor of the end to which a righteous public sentiment will ultimately bring his business. For these and other reasons the Convention gave it their hearty approbation, and they do strongly recommend to all the friends of temperance to cherish it as the sure and the only triumph of their cause, and continually to urge its adoption upon every Legislature."

The unanimous passage of this vigorous resolution, after a deliberate and full discussion, resulted in a complete re-alignment of the temperance forces of the nation. The individual was no longer to be taken to task for availing himself of the opportunities for degradation established by the state; from this time on the state was to be held accountable for its policy of participation in the debauching of the individual for a share of the profits. In 1847 the Legislature of Delaware had passed a prohibitory law, which provided for a plebiscite, but on account of this reference to the people, it was declared unconstitutional. In 1848 the Legislature of New Hampshire submitted to the people the question of the expediency of a prohibitory law. Though the vote was light, yet three-fourths of the votes were in favour of the proposal. The Legislature responded by promptly enacting such a law. This was unsatisfactory, and a more stringent one was enacted in 1855. It is from the latter date, therefore, that the state records the beginning of its prohibitory policy. In 1849 the Legislature of Wisconsin passed a law forbidding any one to engage in the traffic until he had given bonds to pay all damages which the

community or individuals might sustain from the business.*

In the year 1851 the state of Ohio adopted a new Constitution containing the following provision: "The Legislature shall not pass any act authorising the grant of licence for the sale of ardent spirits or other intoxicating liquor." During the same year other states strengthened their liquor laws. Iowa forbade all retailing of liquor to be drunk on the premises, while Vermont prohibited entirely all traffic in spirits for beverage purposes.

During the year 1852 there was a general assault on the liquor business in the Legislatures. On March 22 the territory of Minnesota passed a prohibitory law, which was later declared to be unconstitutional for the reason that it was referred to the people. On January 21 a committee, with Dr. Lyman Beecher as chairman, presented to the Legislature of Massachusetts a petition signed by one hundred and thirty thousand citizens asking for the adoption of the Maine law. The response was prompt. The desired law was passed and received the Governor's signature on May 22, and went into effect sixty days later. On January 28 a similar committee visited the Legislature of New York with a petition having three hundred thousand signatures, but the desired law was not passed. Rhode Island also passed a prohibitory law during the year.

In 1853 Michigan passed a prohibitory law and submitted it to the people. It was ratified by a majority of twenty thousand. An attempt was made to pass the law in Wisconsin, but it was lost by a single vote in the Legislature. The Indiana Legislature passed a prohibitory law with a provision that

* See Appendix C, Chap. VIII.

it be submitted to the people, a provision which the Supreme Court decided to be unconstitutional. In the following year Connecticut passed a prohibitory law. *

The year 1854 was characterised by a political storm brewing in New York which was preliminary to the remarkable legislative contests of 1855, a memorable year in the temperance reform of the century. The people were exasperated by the shabby treatment accorded their three hundred thousand petitioners of 1852. In March, 1854, the prohibitionists secured the passage of the prohibitory law by a large majority, but Gov. Horatio Seymour vetoed it on the last day of the month. Straightway the contending factions entered upon a furious contest for the fall election. Governor Seymour, who sought re-election, was of course, the champion of the liquor interests, while the temperance element rallied to the support of Myron H. Clark, the author of the proposed prohibitory law which Governor Seymour had vetoed. Henry J. Raymond, of the *New York Times*, was the temperance candidate for Lieutenant-Governor. In this memorable conflict the prohibition forces were fortunate in having strong men of the day on their side. Among these were E. C. Delavan, the wealthy Albany merchant, who largely furnished the funds with which to scatter broadcast over the state an enormous quantity of prohibition literature, particularly copies of the *Prohibitionist*. The *New York Independent*, edited by Henry Ward Beecher, the *New York Times*, edited by Henry J. Raymond, and the *New York Tribune*, edited by Horace Greeley, were powerful factors in the great fight. The *Tribune* was espe-

* See Appendix D. Chap. VIII.

cially potent, since its various editions had a circulation amounting to two hundred thousand, mostly within the state.

The campaign was led by such men as Mr. Greeley, William E. Dodge, the Rev. John Marsh, Henry Ward Beecher, Anson G. Phelps, James Harper, Theodore L. Cuyler, E. C. Delavan, Dr. E. H. Chapin, Chancellor Walworth and others. In an address in Broadway Tabernacle on May 12, Mr. Beecher uttered these stirring words:

“It was agreed on all hands that there never had been in any community a greater evil than the scourge of intemperance. It included all other crime. It epitomised Hell on earth. A community did not do its duty unless it took measures not merely to attack every considerable evil but to cut it up by the roots. It was not shaking the axe at the root of the trees that cleared up the land. We must dig out the stumps, and every root, till the plough should go through it smoothly. All agitation should have a cutting edge. We have tried it with a light edge and we did not succeed. At last we thought we had got something that would succeed, and our enemies thought so too. . . . We proposed a law which aimed to strike at the root of this evil. It said it was a crime to sell intoxicating liquors, with some unimportant exceptions. It aimed to make liquor selling just like any other crime, so that if a man should be caught selling liquor it would put a stigma upon him, just as it did if he were caught riding away on his neighbour's horse. . . . We proposed to take principles that had long been established—good old Anglo-Saxon principles—principles that were known in England before our fathers came over. We proposed to take good, substantial, recognised, early approved and often proved principles, and apply them to this crime, just as we did to any other crime.”

Day after day the editorial columns of the *Tribune* flamed with utterances of Mr. Greeley. A sample of Greeley's logic is the following from an editorial of the issue of April 3:

"It is better to prevent crime than to punish it; to keep the vagrant from becoming a thief than to send him to state prison for stealing; to teach than to hang; to remove snares and temptation from the feet of the frail and unwary, than to leave them unwarned to fall into the pit, and then to cudgel him for not keeping out.

"They who are compelled to bear the burden of crime and pauperism have a legitimate interest in and right of surveillance over the causes of crime and pauperism. That is no liberty which makes A. B. free to make fifty dollars out of the ruin by dissipation and drunkenness of C. D. and then oblige E. F., G. H., and I. J. to pay five hundred or a thousand dollars to support said drunkard and his family in the poor house. The very moment the state established poor laws, and compelled the thrifty to contribute to the support of the destitute, it armed the former with the right of investigating and counteracting the causes of pauperism; nay, more; it laid itself under a moral obligation to do likewise.

"Ample experience proves that the evil of intemperance cannot be overcome by any regulation of the traffic in intoxicating drinks, nor by any efforts of seeking only to restrict the use of such beverages within certain limits. For if alcohol be essentially a poison, hurtful to the human constitution, whether imbibed in large or small quantities, whether it composed four per cent. or forty of the liquid containing it, then there can be no such thing as a moderate and legitimate consumption of alcoholic beverages by persons in health, any more than there can be moderate and innocent gambling, lewdness or stealing. Laws forbidding the sale of intoxicating beverages stand on exactly the same footing, and are justified by the same consideration with those

which interdict the keeping of gambling houses and dens of infamy.”

The New York *Times* of October 10, in demanding the passage of the prohibitory law, said:

“Even where a prohibitory law does not accomplish everything which its advocates desire, it does enough to commend it to the favour and support of all who have the well-being of society at heart. In spite of evasions, to which every law is subject; in spite of lax execution and a half-faced friendship on the part of those whose duty it is to carry it into effect; in spite of all the difficulties by which so sweeping and so novel a law must necessarily be embarrassed, wherever it has had a fair trial, the prohibitory law has prevented crime, diminished pauperism, emptied jails and poorhouses, added to the number of pupils in the public school, promoted individual happiness, relieved the humble homes of the poor from their greatest terror and their direst curse, and stayed in some degree, at all events, the tide of desolation which seems to be sweeping away everything dear to individuals and of value to society. . . . Are not such results as these deserving of weight in shaping opinions and deciding action on this great subject?”

The election resulted in favour of Mr. Clark by a majority of three hundred and nine votes.* On The first of January, 1855, the new Governor was inaugurated, and on the following day the contest for the enactment of the Maine law was commenced. On that day the new Governor sent a message to the Legislature largely dealing with the question of prohibition. The Governor's recommendations were at

* See Appendix E, Chap. VIII.

once reported to a select joint committee of six of the Senate and the Assembly, and on January 16 the Assembly committee made its report in a powerful argument for the proposed law. After a bitter contest it finally passed the Legislature on April 3, and went into effect July 4.*

As the latter date approached, mass meetings were held in various places through the state to celebrate the victory and to urge the civil authorities to execute the law faithfully. A meeting held in the Broadway Tabernacle in New York City resolved as follows :

“ *Resolved*, That we hail the coming Fourth of July as the most glorious day for our city and country since the Fourth of July, 1776 ; that then we proclaimed emancipation from a foreign tyranny, which had taxed us without representation, burdened us with standing armies, wasted our substance, and prevented our growth and prosperity ; now we proclaim emancipation from an internal tyranny, which has beggared families, slaughtered fathers and sons, and corrupted the morals of the people ; and we shall welcome its approach with hearts of gratitude and thanksgiving.

“ *Resolved*, That in the approaching struggle for the removal of ‘ Intemperance, Pauperism, and Crime,’ we call upon the Hon. Fernando Wood, Mayor of the City of New York, to stand forth as the protector of the people, and swayed not by men whose only cry is, ‘ By this craft we have our wealth,’ winking at no sly subterfuges or studied evasions, yielding to no legal adviser whose opinions express but the will of the oppressor, but with a manly front and a bold determination to carry out the will of the Legislature, planting himself on the law under the Constitution, and using all the powers of his office for its perfect and fearless enforcement. In such a course we pledge him our entire support.”

* See Appendix F., Chap. VIII.

A meeting in Brooklyn declared :

“The integrity of our manhood, the safety of our youth, the innocence and purity of our children, the elevation of our social condition in the lessening among us of pauperism and crime, demand that we should not rest and cease to labour with the passage of the law, but that we should still work as earnestly for its enforcement as we have for its enactment.”

After the law, thus heralded, went into force, its good effects were immediately visible. The Mayor of Rochester reported :

Whole number of arrests during 30 days before the law went into effect.....	304
Whole number during 30 days after.....	91
Number sent to the Workhouse during the former period.....	48
Number sent to the Workhouse during latter period.....	12

The criminal statistics of the other places point in the same direction. In the following table the number of arrests and commitments, exclusive of those for drunkenness, from July 6 to December 31, 1854, are compared with those during the same part of 1855.*

	1854.	1855.
Committed to Cayuga County Jail.....	85	59
“ “ Onandago “ “	138	103
“ “ Seneca “ “	75	28
“ “ Ontario “ “	89	45
“ “ Albany Watch House	1974	1278
Arrested by police of Syracuse	778	515
“ “ Auburn	104	50
“ “ Rochester	1552	740
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	4795	2818

* Twentieth Annual Report (1856) of the American Temperance Union, p. 14.

This state of affairs did not prevail throughout the entire state, for in several places the law was not enforced. "In the city of New York," said Governor Clark to the Legislature in January, 1856, "and others of our large towns it has, through the connivance of magistrates and executive officers sworn to sustain the laws, been flagrantly disregarded, on the pretence principally of its unconstitutionality." The Governor said, however :

"Notwithstanding it has been subjected to an opposition more persistent, unscrupulous and defiant than is often incurred by an act of legislation ; and though legal and magisterial influence, often acting unofficially and extra-judicially, have combined to render it inoperative, to forestall the decision of the Courts, wrest the statute from its obvious meaning, and create a general distrust in, if not hostility to, all legislative restrictions of the traffic in intoxicating liquors—it has still, outside of our large cities, been generally obeyed."

By the end of the year 1855 prohibitory laws were in force in the following states: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, and Nebraska. Such laws had also been introduced into many other states, and had been passed by the Legislatures, but prevented from going into effect in Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota.

But scarcely had these splendid results been achieved when they began to melt away. The year 1856 was almost as full of gloom for the Prohibitionists as the preceding year had been full of encouragement. In 1856 victory was turned into defeat in four states. The prohibitory law of Maine, which for four years had been increasing the state's prosperity and lessening its crime, was repealed. Its opponents, to

make political capital, made an attack upon some confiscated liquor in the hands of the city government of Portland, of which Neal Dow was the head. In the vigorous defence which the officers opposed to this assault a man was killed. The Mayor and his officers were declared, after an official investigation, to have done their simple duty ; but the liquor men made great use of the event. The repeal of the law was a severe blow to the temperance people, for they could not foresee its re-enactment two years later.

In Pennsylvania the prohibitory law was likewise repealed, though the part forbidding the traffic on Sundays was retained.

In New York the Supreme Court on March 25, 1856, by a vote of five to three decided the prohibitory law unconstitutional. It held that the act, since it deprived of its value all intoxicating liquor held as property in the state, was a violation of the provision of the state Constitution directing that no person shall be "deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." The Legislature, said the Court, had the power to forbid the manufacture of liquor in the future, or the sale of liquor acquired in the future ; but it had not the power to make of no value liquor held as property before the law was enacted. In not distinguishing between liquor in the one and in the other situation, the Legislature had made its act void.

In Indiana also, in this gloomy year 1856, the prohibitory law was stricken down by the judicial verdict of unconstitutionality. Delaware repealed her law in the following year. Her example was followed in the next year by Nebraska, in the next decade by Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and in the seventies by Connecticut and Michigan. Iowa kept her law, albeit greatly weakened by an amendment made in 1858, until 1894, when she virtually,

(though not technically) repealed it. Of the thirteen ante-bellum prohibition states only three remain as such to-day; Maine, reinstated in 1858; New Hampshire, and Vermont.

Below is a table of ante-bellum prohibition laws, showing the dates of passage and of repeal, with (in most cases) the name of the party responsible for such action, and also the manner of invalidation other than by repeal.

STATE.	PROHIBITORY LAW PASSED.		PROHIBITORY LAW REPEALED.		OTHER FACTS.
	Year	Party.	Year	Party.	
Maine.....	1840	Democratic.....			A
Delaware.....	1847	Whig.....			B
New Hampshire.	1849	Democratic.....			C
Michigan.....	1850	Democratic.....			D
Maine.....	1851	Democratic.....	1856	Democratic.	
Ohio.....	1851	Whig.....			D
Illinois.....	1851	Democratic.....	1853	Democratic.	
Minnesota.....	1852	Democratic.....			G
Massachusetts..	1852	Fusion; Dem. & Free Soll.....	1868	Republican.	
Rhode Island..	1852	Fusion; Dem. & Free Soll.....	1863	Republican.	
Vermont.....	1852	Whig.....			E
Michigan.....	1853	Democratic.....			C
Indiana.....	1853	Democratic.....			C
Connecticut....	1854	Whig.....	1872	Republican.	
New York.....	1854	Democratic.....			F
Iowa.....	1855	Democratic.....			K
Indiana.....	1855	Rep. & Knownothing.			B (1853)
Illinois.....	1855	Whig.....			G
Pennsylvania ..	1855	Whig.....	1866	Democratic.	
Nebraska.....	1855	Democratic.....	1856		
New York.....	1855	Whig and Fusion....	1858		B (1856)
Michigan.....	1855	Republican.....	1875	Republican.	
New Hampshire.	1855	American.....			E
Delaware.....	1855	American.....	1857	American.	
Wisconsin.....	1855	Democratic.....			F
Maine.....	1858	Republican.....			E

- A. Ineffective; no penalties attached.
 B. Declared unconstitutional by the courts.
 C. Imperfect and ineffective.
 D. Constitution forbidding the granting of licence.
 E. Still in force.
 F. Vetoed by the Governor.

- G. Legislature submitted law, but it was rejected by the people.
- H. In 1857 the law was amended to exempt beer, wine and cider from the prohibitions.
- K. In 1858 fermented liquors were exempted from the prohibitions. In 1894 the law was virtually repealed by the "mulct" amendment.

The reverses of 1856-8 were especially damaging because they came at a time when it was impossible to repair them. The anti-slavery sentiment was growing. The agitation for abolition was being fiercely pressed, and the arguments of the abolitionists sunk deep into the national conscience. The temperance people were appealed to to lend a hand for humanity's sake, and they did so. There was scarcely a prohibitionist to be found who was not also an abolitionist. The temperance hosts took up the issue of slavery, and for a time, in the clash and smoke and roar of the Civil War, the temperance reform was almost forgotten.

CHAPTER IX.

POST-BELLUM STATE CAMPAIGNS.

WHEN the war between the states was finished there was but little left of the organized temperance movement which had developed into such formidable proportions in the decade previous to 1860. All else save the issues of the strife had been laid aside for the time. Churches and families, as well as the fraternal temperance organizations, had been rent in twain. The prohibitory laws of the various states were neglected. They had been undermined in a number of ways. Their enforcement had been relaxed, the rumsellers had stealthily secured the adoption of various amendments designed to weaken and vitiate them. Some of them had been repealed altogether. While the prohibitionists were at the front fighting out the differences of North and South, the liquor sellers were at home sucking out the vitality of the nation, and poisoning its laws.

During those dark days the American Temperance Union kept alive the spirit of hostility to the saloon as best it could, but little attention could be attracted save on such lines as furnishing temperance literature to the soldiers. Most of the temperance publications were discontinued, and when the Union held its last annual convention in 1865, the outlook was anything but cheerful. It was felt that a campaign of edu-

cation was necessary, and in this feeling the National Temperance Society and Publication House had its origin. The Union dissolved, merging itself into the new organization. William E. Dodge was its first president, and continued in that office for eighteen years.* From that time to the inauguration of the constitutional amendment campaigns beginning in 1880, the temperance and prohibition agitation centered mainly about this society. On March 26, 1866, the same year that the society began active operations, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that a federal tax receipt for the retailing of liquors did not operate as a licence or right to sell in defiance of state laws. This decision cleared away a great obstacle to state prohibitory legislation, and settled a much mooted question. During these years the temperance sentiment of the nation was kept alive by such men as R. C. Pitman, of Massachusetts, Theodore L. Cuyler, William E. Dodge, Mark Hopkins, Wendell Phillips, Dr. A. A. Miner, J. N. Stearns, Dr. James B. Dunn, Henry Wilson, and A. M. Powell.

Massachusetts was the chief battle ground during the decade of the seventies, and in the conflict there was developed the necessity for prohibition by organic law, which led to the constitutional amendment campaigns which followed. In 1867 an attempt was made in the Legislature to repeal the prohibitory law which had been in force since 1852, but it was defeated through the efforts of Henry Wilson, Dr. Miner, Judge Pitman and others. Said Mr. Wilson:

“Upon the statute books of Massachusetts is a law forbidding the sale of liquors as a beverage; she is now

* See Appendix A, Chap. IX.

asked to licence, regulate, protect and make respectable the sale of that which causes vice, extinguishes the reason, and is the arch-abomination of our natures. I meet this demand for a licence law to sell liquor in Massachusetts with a prompt, peremptory and emphatic No! I would as soon vote to repeal the constitutional amendment that made slavery forever impossible in America, as I would to repeal the prohibitory law and establish a licence law in this state. The present law may fail; it may not be executed; it may be stricken from the statute book. But whatever may come, in God's name spare Massachusetts from a licence law. Spare us the guilt and shame of authorising by a Massachusetts law any man to put the bottle to the lips of his neighbour."*

In 1868 the law was repealed, but in 1869 it was re-enacted against fierce opposition. In the following year, however, the liquor advocates succeeded in seriously weakening its provisions by the passage of an amendment exempting malt liquors, and permitting druggists to sell liquor under a municipal licence. This was passed by a majority of one. The next year towns and cities were given local option as to malt liquors, and some thirty out of one hundred and eighty-nine towns took advantage of the new law to permit the sale of beer. The local option law was repealed in 1873. In 1875 the whole prohibitory law was repealed, and a licence law substituted. Two years later an almost successful attempt was made to restore prohibition. A bill for improving the local option law was passed in 1877, but was vetoed by Governor Rice.

During this period but little prohibitory legislation was attempted in other states, but the decade

* Dorchester, *The Liquor Problem*, p. 501.

was characterised by a continuous struggle between the friends and enemies of the liquor business in the various Legislatures as to measures looking to the restriction of the sale of liquors. Local option laws, civil damage laws, license laws and various palliative measures were passed by the Legislature from year to year only to be repealed at similar intervals. No one could foresee what the liquor law of his state was likely to be during the year to come. In some states local option laws were passed only to be vetoed by the Governor. Some of the States changed their liquor laws two or three times during the decade. In 1871 one hundred thousand people petitioned for a local option law in Pennsylvania, and a bill passed the Senate, but failed in the House. The next year local option was granted by cities and counties. In 1873 an attempt to repeal the law was bitterly fought and failed. In the same year the Constitutional Convention adopted a prohibitory clause by a vote of 56 to 16, but a few months later, when the clause came up for a second reading it was defeated by a vote of 60 to 44. In 1874 the law of 1872 gave way to a civil damage licence law. Minnesota prohibited the sale of liquor along the line of the Northern railway during its construction. In 1872 Connecticut repealed her prohibitory law and substituted a form of local option, giving the Selectmen the power to licence, and giving the people the power to instruct the Selectmen whether to do so or not. In the following year this law was strengthened. In 1873 Governor Dix vetoed a local option law which had been passed by the New York Legislature, but approved a civil damage bill after it had been so amended so as to be worthless. In 1873 Michigan defeated an attempt to repeal her prohibition of li-

cence, and the next year defeated an attempt to enact a licence law.

During the decade the liquor question took up much time in the Legislatures of Illinois, Missouri, Wisconsin, California, Indiana, New Jersey, Maryland, Oregon, Iowa, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Ohio and Rhode Island. Local option laws were passed, vetoed, repealed, strengthened and weakened. Confusion reigned.* Civil damage laws, by which the liquor dealer was made legally responsible for the injuries arising from his business, were much in favor during these years.

The fruitless contentions in the Legislatures developed an unrest among the friends of temperance and a feeling of the need of prohibitory clauses in the organic law of the states.

The first definite proposal to this end seems to have been made by William H. Armstrong in 1856. He proposed such a scheme to the Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance of Central New York, of which he was Grand Worthy Patriarch. In the following year the Division unanimously endorsed the idea, and endorsed it at three subsequent sessions.

The first practical step, however, was taken in 1860, when a joint resolution was introduced into the Senate of New York, proposing a constitutional amendment of the kind in question. The Legislature adopted the proposal, but the law of New York required the endorsement of the subsequent Legislature, and the project was lost in the exciting events of the Civil War. In 1878 Mr. B. F. Wright and Mrs. J. Ellen Foster began agitating

* See Appendix B, Chap. IX.



JOHN P. ST. JOHN

U. S. Presidential Prohibition Candidate, 1884.





JOSHUA LEVERING
U. S. Presidential Prohibition Candidate, 1896.

the plan in Iowa and Kansas. In October of that year the Grand Lodge of Good Templars, which met at Fort Scott, appointed a committee to draft a petition to the Kansas Legislature asking for the submission of such an amendment to the Constitution of that state. The agitation thus begun resulted in the submission of the amendment on the following year. Much general interest was aroused, and after a heated controversy the amendment was adopted by the people, by a vote of 92,302 to 84,304. The amendment provided that the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors should be forever prohibited in the state, except for medical, scientific and mechanical purposes. In 1881 a stringent law was enacted by the Legislature to carry out the provisions of the amendment.

Thus were the campaigns for constitutional amendments inaugurated, and for ten years proposals for the submission of prohibitory amendments of similar character were fought over and over in the Legislatures of most of the states where temperance sentiment was strongly developed. The results in Kansas were unexpectedly cheering. The law was enforced during the first year by Gov. John P. St. John, one of the strongest advocates of the new policy in the state. Most of the leading public men, especially of the Republican party, were in sympathy with the movement, and that political organisation made the enforcement of the law a party issue.*

One of the strong defenders of the new policy was United States Senator John J. Ingalls, who wrote characteristically regarding its workings in his state:

“The sale of bitters, elixirs, and other decoctions

* See Appendix C, Chap. IX.

containing alcohol has undoubtedly increased. Malaria, indigestion, and other disorders have developed in localities previously considered salubrious, and there is probably no town of one thousand inhabitants and upwards where a bibulous inquirer, if properly vouched for, cannot find, at his hotel, or the club, or in the cellar of a friend, a bottle of beer or a gallon of whisky. But the habit of drink is dying out. Temptation being removed from the young and infirm, they have been fortified and redeemed. The liquor seller, being proscribed, is an outlaw, and his vocation is disreputable. Drinking being stigmatized, is out of fashion, and the consumption of intoxicants has enormously decreased. Intelligent and conservative observers estimate the reduction at ninety per cent.; it cannot be less than seventy-five. . . . Observation of the results of licence, both in this country and in Great Britain, leads irresistibly to the conclusion that it is not successful as a means of overcoming the evils of intemperance. Nothing can be said in favour of the saloon, whether licenced or unlicenced. To raise a revenue by authorising the sale of that which debases and pauperises the people is both unprofitable and immoral, and therefore indefensible. . . .

“From comparing the results in Kansas with those existing elsewhere, the conclusion is irresistibly in favour of prohibition. It can be efficiently and successfully enforced. It does not retard the growth nor injure the resources of the people. Its operations practically cease with the closing of the saloons, leaving personal liberty unimpaired. It exonerates the state from complicity and participation in the most formidable agencies of its own undoing.”

The success of the new undertaking in Kansas inspired the temperance forces of other states to similar attempts. On the other hand, the liquor dealers, hard pressed, were driven to the most desperate

resorts in order to protect their occupation. Iowa was the first state to follow the example of Kansas by adopting a prohibitory amendment to the Constitution. This was done in 1882, but the Supreme Court of the state declared the amendment void because of a technical defect in the proceedings for its adoption. The succeeding Legislature, however, enacted a prohibitory statute which was sustained by the courts.

Contemporary with the agitation in Kansas was the unsuccessful attempt to secure constitutional prohibition in Wisconsin. In 1878 fifteen thousand citizens petitioned for the submission of a constitutional amendment by the Legislature. In 1879 there were forty thousand petitioners. In 1880 there were one hundred thousand petitioners. In 1881 there was still a greater number. A proposal for an amendment passed the House by a vote of 51 to 39, not the necessary two-thirds. In 1881, in Pennsylvania, a similar measure passed the House, but failed in the Senate. In the same year the lower house of Michigan passed a prohibitory amendment by a vote of 63 to 33. The Senate voted 21 to 10 in its favour, which was less than the necessary two-thirds. The measure was again defeated in 1883. It was submitted in 1887 and rejected by the people. In 1881 West Virginia lacked but four votes of passing such a measure. In 1883 it passed the House, and was defeated in the Senate. It was submitted in 1888, but voted down by the people. In 1881 a like measure passed the House of the Texas Legislature, but failed in the Senate. In 1883 it was again defeated. It was submitted in 1887, and rejected by the people. In 1881 a like measure passed the House of the Arkansas Legislature by a

vote of 66 to 17, but was defeated in the Senate. In Indiana amendments must pass two succeeding Legislatures. A prohibitory amendment passed the Legislature in 1882, and in 1883 was adopted by the House but defeated in the Senate. In 1882 the House of the Connecticut Legislature passed a like measure, but it was defeated in the Senate. In 1883 it was defeated in the House. It was finally submitted in 1889, and defeated at the polls. An unsuccessful attempt was made to induce the Ohio Legislature to submit a prohibitory amendment in 1882, but in the following year two amendments were submitted, one providing for licence and one for prohibition. The licence amendment was defeated by a vote of 92,268 to 192,117. The prohibitory amendment received 323,189 votes for, and 240,975 against, but since it had not received a majority of all votes cast at the election, was lost. In 1882 a prohibitory amendment was voted upon by the Illinois Legislature with the following result: in the House, 66 yeas, 51 nays; in the Senate, 16 yeas, 21 nays. A like measure was defeated in the Legislature of Nebraska in 1882 and again in 1883. It was passed in 1890, and defeated at the polls. Of this more will be said further on. In 1882 a like measure was passed by the Missouri House, but defeated in the Senate. The same process was repeated in 1883. In the year 1883, the proposal for a prohibitory amendment was defeated by the Legislatures of New York, Minnesota, New Jersey, Vermont and Massachusetts. It passed the House in New Jersey, but was killed in the Senate. It was defeated in Vermont by a complication over cider. It was submitted in Massachusetts in 1889, but failed at the polls.

Below is given a tabulation of the popular vote on the proposed amendments to the state Constitutions, with the name of the political party in the ascendancy in the states at the time the votes were taken:

VOTES ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

State.	Year.	For.	Against.	Party in Power.
Kansas	1880	91,874	84,037	Republican.
Iowa (a)	1882	155,436	125,677	Republican.
Ohio	1883	323,189	240,975	Democratic.
Maine	1884	70,783	23,811	Republican.
Rhode Island	1886	15,113	9,330	Republican.
Michigan	1887	178,636	184,231	Republican.
Texas	1887	129,270	220,627	Democratic.
Tennessee	1887	117,504	145,197	Democratic.
Oregon	1887	19,973	27,958	Republican.
West Virginia	1888	41,668	76,555	Democratic.
New Hampshire	1889	25,786	30,976	Republican.
Massachusetts	1889	85,242	131,062	Republican.
Pennsylvania	1889	296,617	484,644	Republican.
Rhode Island (b)	1889	28,315	9,956	Republican.
South Dakota	1889	39,509	33,456	Republican.
North Dakota	1889	18,552	17,393	Republican.
Washington	1889	19,546	31,489	Republican.
Connecticut	1889	23,379	49,974	Republican.
Nebraska	1890	82,296	111,728	Republican.
South Dakota (b)	1896	31,901	24,910	Fusion ; Democratic and Populist.

(a) Declared invalid by the courts, but its place was taken by statutory prohibition.

(b) On the question of repealing prohibition.

During this period repeated attempts were made to induce Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to the whole people designed to prohibit the manufacture, sale and importation of all intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, but these attempts invariably failed. Henry W. Blair, Representative from New Hampshire, introduced the first of these proposals in the lower house, December 27, 1876. In the Forty-Ninth Congress, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor reported favorably on a

joint resolution to submit an amendment providing for absolute prohibition so far as distilled spirits were concerned, such prohibition to go into effect after the year 1900. The measure proposed to leave the matter of fermented liquors to the states. In the Fiftieth Congress Mr. Blair introduced a joint resolution to submit a proposal for the absolute prohibition of intoxicating liquors of all sorts. It was the "pernicious activity" of Mr. Blair, afterwards United States Senator, which provoked the bitter resentment of the liquor interests and led to his political downfall.

A reference to the foregoing table shows that almost invariably these amendments were defeated when submitted to popular vote, and it was not until the Nebraska struggle was well under way that the real reasons for this fact were fully understood. After the first two campaigns, those of Kansas and Iowa, the temperance people invariably found the machinery of the dominant party arrayed against their proposal. They found, to their astonishment, that in nearly every case the leading political papers were hostile to them, even in numerous cases where they had formerly been friendly to the measure. They found numerous broken down clergymen coming to the front, always from distant places, preaching what they called the "Pauline doctrine" of temperance, and urging the unbiblical character of prohibition. They found the columns of the newspapers flooded with distorted, bogus telegrams, counterfeit statistics about the alleged failure of prohibition, always from some distant place, until they were sick at heart. The professional politicians were invariably "retained" by the liquor interests. Fraud, intimidation and bribery have characterised each of

these campaigns since 1883. But the agitation in favour of amendments continued until the year 1890, the agitators little dreaming of the stupendous forces for corruption with which they had to deal.

The policy of wholesale corruption began in 1860, with the organisation of the United States Brewers' Association for the purpose of influencing Congressional legislation in the interest of the liquor dealers in general, and the brewing interest in particular. The first demand of the organisation was for a reduction of the tax on beer. A committee was sent to Washington for the purpose of urging the demand. So successful was this first effort that at the brewers' convention held in Cincinnati, October 28, 1863, Mr. F. Laur, of the agitation committee, reported "satisfactory interviews with the Congressional Committee on Ways and Means" and also the "reduction of the tax on beer from one dollar to sixty cents a barrel."

At the brewers' convention held in Baltimore, in 1865, the organised liquor men were honoured by the presence of Internal Revenue Commissioner, David A. Wells, who took part in the proceedings, and said:

"I came to hear and not to speak. At the same time, I can assure the meeting that it is the desire of the government to be thoroughly informed of the requirements of the trade, and I will give information on all questions in order to bring about a cordial understanding between the government and the trade in general."

The next time that the Association conspicuously showed its power in national politics was in the Presidential campaign of 1872. Horace Greeley, one of the leaders of the ante-bellum prohibitory

campaigns, had been nominated for President by the Democrats and Liberal Republicans at Cincinnati. The twelfth brewers' convention met in New York on June 5 and 6, and promptly took up the gauntlet thrown down by Greeley. In his address to the convention President Clausen said:

“The Presidential election which takes place this fall may change the aspect of that party [the Democratic party]. At the Cincinnati Convention they have placed at the head of their ticket a man [Horace Greeley] whose antecedents will warrant him a pliant tool in the hands of the temperance party, and none of you gentlemen can support him. It is necessary for you to make an issue at this election throughout the entire country, and, although I have belonged to the Democratic party ever since I have had a vote, I would sooner vote for the Republican ticket than cast my ballot for such a candidate.”

Among the resolutions passed by the body were the following:

“*Resolved*, That we regard the invitation to vote for a temperance fanatic as an insult; as his election, no matter for what office and on what party issue, would be claimed by the temperance men as a victory of their own, and encourage them to further encroachments upon our rights.

“*Resolved*, That sooner than pass our votes for any of these apostles of bigotry and intolerance, we will waive all political predilections; as we do not believe that men who regard us as ‘criminals,’ and who would be glad to destroy by their prohibitory and local option laws the hard-earned fruits of our labor for years, can be proper and honest guardians of our political privileges.”

Another feature of this convention was the appearance of Mr. C. A. Bates as the official representative of the government, who made an address on the first day of the proceedings. He said:

“I am here for the purpose of learning your wants and views concerning that branch of the public service [Internal Revenue]. Congress has given you an Internal Revenue law, milder in its provisions, less burdensome than any law, affecting an equally great interest. Yes, you have begun well. Let us take no backward step. I say us, for I am with you. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is with you. Every patriotic citizen is with you, if you hold to your course.”

In the national Republican convention of this year the following resolution was inserted in the party platform:

“The Republican party proposes to respect the rights reserved by the people to themselves as carefully as the powers delegated by them to the state and to the federal governments. It disapproves of a resort to unconstitutional laws for the purpose of removing evils by interference with the rights not surrendered by the people to either state or national governments.”

During the campaign Mr. Herman Raster, the author of the resolution, wrote as follows as to its meaning: “It was adopted by the platform committee with the full and explicit understanding that its purpose was the discountenancing of all so-called temperance and Sunday laws.”

It was in this campaign that all hope of securing advanced national legislation through the Republican party ceased. For several years some of the state organisations of the party, particularly in Maine

and Kansas, supported the prohibitory laws of their own states, but pressure from the national leaders weakened this disposition from year to year, until in recent years the policy of the party, even in those two states, has been to ignore or nullify the liquor laws so far as may safely be done.

Following the success of the brewers' organisation, the National Protective Association and the National Retail Liquor Dealers' Association were formed to look after the interests of the trade in general, and with no particular reference to the brewers. The work of the former was mainly in the constitutional amendment campaigns of the eighties. After the triumph of the prohibitory amendment of 1880, in Kansas, the organised liquor interests adopted the policy of throwing their entire strength into any state where an amendment was pending. Thus in conducting a campaign the prohibitionists of a single state were forced into a conflict with the liquor power of the entire nation.

The underground methods of the liquor organisations in these campaigns were successfully exposed by a series of decoy letters sent out during the Nebraska amendment campaign of 1890. The first of the series was the following letter, which was addressed to prominent liquor dealers, who had had an important part in the management of previous campaigns in their own states:

“ JOHNSON'S PALE ALE.

“ LINCOLN, NEB., March 5, 1890.

“ DEAR SIR: There is a prohibition amendment pending in this state, and I would like to have your advice, as a member of the trade. You have had experi-

ence in fighting prohibition in your state, and you know what the best plans are.

“Please tell us frankly what you think we should lay the most stress on in Nebraska, for accomplishing the best results for the liquor trade. It is my opinion that if the Nebraska dealers will take up high licence and show its advantages as a revenue measure, and a plan for regulating the traffic, etc., they will get the support of the best people, and even some preachers. What do you think of this?”

“What effectiveness is there in using anti-prohibition documents? What class of documents are best? Do you know of any documents that will have weight against prohibition among the religious people?”

“How should campaign funds be distributed for the best results? Is it worth while to hire speakers or to engage in debates with the prohibitionists? I think myself that the trade will accomplish more by spending the bulk of its funds among newspapers, and for quiet work with men of influence, especially politicians. Give me your best plan for working through political machinery, and especially how to silence the pulpit and the press.

“Hoping for an early reply, believe me,

“Yours truly,

“WM. E. JOHNSON.”

One of the most important of the replies received was the following from Harry P. Crowell, the politician who managed the liquor dealers' campaign in Pennsylvania during the amendment contest of 1889 in that state:

“CROWELL & GLASS COLD STORAGE Co.,

“Nos. 50, 52, AND 54 N. DELAWARE AVE.,

“Nos. 51, 53, AND 55 N. WATER ST.,

“PHILADELPHIA, 3-8, 1890.

“WM. E. JOHNSON, Esq.:

“DEAR SIR: Yours of the 3d, also several similar

ones to our brewers sent to me by them for answer, received. I was the secretary and manager of the anti-prohibition fight last year, and when the fight was over, and our victory so great, I destroyed all our documents, and resigned from the Association and am devoting all my time to the above business. Now, to answer yours.

“ I always was a high-licence man, and think it the only thing to prevent prohibition. My idea from experience is: Favor the passage of a high licence bill, with as many restrictions as possible, to make the vendor live up to the law, or lose his licence; also, a large penalty and imprisonment for violation, and never be allowed a licence in the state again. That will get you, as it did us, the support of the best people, preachers and politicians.

“ To use anti-prohibition documents is good, but should be used with great judgment. The best documents for your work are published by the National Protective Association, Louisville, Ky. It is the Whiskey Pool Trust arrangement and work, who will send you a sample copy of all their work, if you apply for it. Some are for religious people, some for farmers, etc.

“ The best results, or way to distribute campaign funds, is to arrange with the local leaders to look after their district and workers. In some localities speakers are good, but we used very few, and did very little of it. If you get the politicians on both sides they influence the papers, and they and the papers can win any fight, and it is the cheapest and best way. The politicians have all the window books, and, in fact, all the machinery and data required, while the other side have not, and can only do great work in places where only a few people reside.

“ Make your fight on the grounds of high licence and revenue. Argue that prohibition does not prohibit. If you are going to have a fight, if you was to come here I would give you, I think, in three hours more than I could write in a week, and tell you and show you some of our

documents, form of collecting funds, and spending, and winning the fight.

“Yours truly,

“HARRY P. CROWELL.

“(Confidential.)”

In pursuance of the suggestion in the last paragraph of the letter Col. R. S. Cheves was detailed by the *New York Voice* to interview Mr. Crowell. * Mr. Cheves did this very adroitly. Crowell believed that he was talking to a friend of Mr. Johnson retained to help fight the amendment in Nebraska. Describing the methods employed by the liquor men in defeating the amendment in Pennsylvania, Mr. Crowell said:

“How did we begin the work? Well, I'll tell you. In the first place, we knew for the last three years that this fight was coming on, consequently we prepared for it.

“The first meeting of the liquor men was called to convene in Harrisburg, which was a failure. The second meeting was held in Philadelphia, and was a success, for at that meeting a state executive committee was selected, and I was made secretary, with power to act and arrange for the fight. At that meeting plans were also adopted by which money could be raised. In the first place, we assessed the sales of all beer per annum at ten cents per barrel. We levied an assessment of \$1,000 on all large hotels like the Continental, and they paid it like little men, and from \$25 to \$50 on all the smaller retail shops. Besides, each brewer was required to solicit money from all kindred interests—that is, every man in trade with whom they had dealings—those engaged in

* The entire correspondence in this connection was published in the *New York Voice* during the months of March, April, and May, 1890. The Crowell interview was printed on the issue of April 3.

making barrels, those from whom we bought our horses, and wagons, and grain, and machinery, etc., were solicited to contribute to the campaign fund, and if such persons failed after a reasonable time to do so, a notice was forwarded intimating that a prompt compliance would save trouble and a possible boycott, thus forcing hundreds to help us who did it reluctantly. By this plan we raised over \$200,000, which was expended by the state committee. Besides, local committees in every community raised and expended large sums during the campaign and on election day. Appeals for money were made to the trade throughout the country, and large sums were contributed by the Brewers' Association and the National Protective Association."

"How did you dispose of this immense amount of money?"

"Besides the current expenses, we paid it out to the newspapers, politicians, and some for literature, and some for public speakers."

"How did you manage to enlist politicians on your side? Did you offer them money?"

"Yes; we would go to the leaders—both Republican and Democrats—and say: This is not a party fight and you cannot afford to be against us. If you do we will remember you at the next general election, but if you help us we will pay you liberally for your support.

"Such state leaders as Bill Leeds, Charlie Porter, who is chairman of the city Republican committee; Cooper, and Dave Martin, and others, and a lot of Democratic leaders, we paid \$500 apiece, and \$200 apiece to local leaders, and \$5 apiece to men who worked and manned the polls on the day of election.

"Did I pay Quay * any money? Yes; for three years he bled us, and our contributions to him came very near beating us at the polls. It was reported that we contributed money to defeat Cleveland, and the Democrats got

* United States Senator Quay.

hold of it, and a plan was on foot to have all the Democratic vote cast for the amendment as a punishment to the Republican brewers of the state, and it would have succeeded if I had not found it out in time and 'fixed' the boys, but it cost us a big pile of money to do so. We had all the workers on our side, and the machines of both old parties were with us. We paid the county commissioners of this county to let us have the poll-lists exclusively for our use, with the understanding that we were not to return the list until after the election. So the Prohibitionists, with no window books, no money, no organisation, had no show whatever against us."

"Mr. Crowell, how did you manage to get the newspapers pretty much all on your side?"

"Why, we bought them by paying down so much cash. I visited the editors in person or had some good men do so, and arranged to pay each paper for its support a certain amount of money. Throughout the state we paid weekly papers from \$50 to \$500 to publish such matter as we might furnish, either news or editorial, but the city daily papers we had to pay from \$1,000 to \$4,000, which latter amount was paid to the *Times* of this city. Other papers we could not buy straight out, consequently we had to pay from 30 to 60 cents per line for all matter published for us, according to the circulation and ability of the paper. We paid the *Ledger* 40 cents per line, and the *Record* we paid 60 cents per line, though it did some good work for us for nothing. It was understood with most all of the papers that we would furnish the matter, and so we employed a man to write for us and prepare articles for publication, which would be furnished to the papers to be printed as news or editorial matter, as we might direct. The most effective matter we could get up in the influencing of votes was that prohibition did not prohibit, and the revenue, taxation, and how prohibition would hurt farmers. We would have these articles printed in different papers, and then buy thousands of copies of the paper and send

them to the farmers. If you work the farmers on the tax question you can catch them every time.

"How did I get the names of the farmers? Why, I got the poll-book in each town and hired some man who was well posted to select the names of every farmer and send them to me, and it was here we got in our best work; for with the politicians, the papers and the farmers, you can always win. C. C. Turner, secretary of the liquor dealers' publishing house at Louisville, will mail you a list of the farmers in Nebraska. He is a bright fellow, and can do you much good in some ways; but don't let him try to manage the newspapers for you."

"How did you manage, Mr. Crowell, to get so many ministers on your side?"

"Oh, that is the easiest thing out. No, I did not go to the preachers as I did to the politicians, but I always found out a good man in the church who could work the preacher with but little trouble, for half of the preachers are cowards. Then I hired, for so much a name, some old broken-down newspaper man or politician to go around with a petition and get the names of ministers and lawyers, which we published with fine effect. We talked high licence all the time. Never try to defend the saloon; if so, you lose the influence of church members and ministers; but talk about the revenue, cider, taxation, and especially prohibition don't prohibit, and clamor for high licence. I had thousands of badges printed with high licence, and gave them out to poll workers on election day and it had fine effect.

"Yes, we understood and agreed to the passage of the high licence law before the amendment was submitted, so that we could use it as a means to defeat prohibition. And it was that, and that alone, that saved us. With all our money and political backing we could not have defeated the amendment on any other plan than high licence."

"Mr. Crowell, has high licence, which has reduced

the number of saloons, reduced to any extent the consumption of liquor?"

"No, sir; on the contrary, the consumption of liquor has increased. The sale of beer in the city has increased 20 per cent. the last year, and gradually increased every year since the adoption of the Brooks law. While the number of licenced saloons have been reduced under high licence, unlawful drinking places have increased. At first the officers made an effort to enforce the law, but now it is a farce and no effort on the part of the authorities to suppress illegal sales is being made. Yet I honestly believe that high licence is the only practical way in dealing with the traffic. I am sure it will help the business, make it more respectable by putting it in the hands of a better class of men.

"Yes, we had a few speakers, but as a rule they were no good. I think it throwing money and time away on them, for all who go out to hear our speakers are generally on our side to start with. Yes, we had Kate Field, and paid her \$250 and expenses per day, but she is no good—money wasted. We also had Rev. Sikes and Mr. Tomlinson, of Topeka, but they are not worth fooling with. Let the speakers go. Get up good literature of your own, and send it especially to the farmers. Make a plea for high licence and the battle is yours—that is, if you have the papers and politicians with you, and you can get them if you have the money.

"No, you need not go to Quay. He tries to be on both sides. It was reported during our campaign that he would vote for the amendment. Our committee investigated the report. Quay denied it, and satisfied us that it was false. But all of Quay's strongest personal friends and supporters were with us beyond doubt, and, it was understood, with his approval. It was for that influence we contributed so liberally to his support for three years.

"I never want to go through such another fight. It almost killed me, besides my business suffered greatly, for I was nearly three years with the burden of the fight

on my shoulders, and for it all I was paid only \$5,000, and some of the trade kicked about that."

Colonel Cheves' interview was corroborated in an unexpected manner. * Almost simultaneously with the publication of the interview, Messrs. Moore & Sinnott, Philadelphia liquor dealers, brought suit against Crowell for moneys alleged to have been advanced by them to pay certain newspapers for "advertising." The following statement of the case appeared in the issue of the Philadelphia *Times* for April 5, 1890:

"It appears that in the organised effort to defeat prohibition the Liquor Dealers' League and the State Brewers' Association united. Just before the election the funds ran out and the joint committee of the two liquor organisations, which was appointed to arrange for such a contingency, called on Moore & Sinnott and stated that there was \$38,000 lacking to properly carry on the campaign. Of this amount \$20,000 was owing to the newspapers for advertising, \$13,000 to window-book men engaged to work the polls, and \$500 cash retainer to Lewis C. Cassidy on account of the \$20,000 promised him for his work in the campaign.

"Moore & Sinnott advanced the \$38,000 on the understanding that the Brewers' Association was to pay back 60 per cent. of the loan, and the liquor dealers 40 per cent. in two weeks. The liquor dealers paid back their 40 per cent. according to their contract, but the Brewers' Association, instigated, it is said, by Harry P. Crowell, have refused to return to Moore & Sinnott one cent of their share of the loan advanced to protect their business."

On May, 3, 1890, the plaintiffs filed in the Common Pleas Court No. 4, a statement of the sums

* See Appendix D, Chap. IX.

paid by them to the different newspapers, on account of which they had brought suit. The list, which by no means included all that had been paid, but only what had been advanced by this firm, was as follows:

May 20, Delaware County Citizen.....	\$ 500.00
May 25, Philadelphia Inquirer	1,504.52
June 7, Catholic Standard.....	175.00
June 15, Catholic Standard.....	150.00
June 15, Commercial List.....	187.00
June 17, Philadelphia Record.....	300.00
June 17, Evening Bulletin.....	500.00
June 17, Philadelphia Inquirer.....	776.00
June 17, Evening Star.....	225.00
June 20, Philadelphia Ledger (various bills).	145.30
June 24, Evening Bulletin.....	250.00
June 27, North American	2,942.20
June 27, Philadelphia Inquirer.....	208.10
June 27, Philadelphia Times	3,516.30
July 2, Evening Telegraph.....	400.00
July 2, Evening Bulletin.....	500.00
July 8, Philadelphia Record.....	2,182.00
July 15, Detective Services.....	300.00
July 15, Extra work for city papers.....	575.00
July 15, Schuylkill Navy.....	280.00
Total	\$15,616.42

The numerous replies to the Johnson letter were startling, and very instructive. Dave Martin, who managed the Republican wing of the liquor dealers' campaign in Pennsylvania, wrote:

"My advice to you would be to see the president of the Liquor Dealers' Association of the United States, as the Association will be able to furnish you documents to be distributed among the farmers and also the religious people. As far as the politics are concerned, I would

advise you to take one for each party for each voting district, and by no means have any public discussions between advocates of prohibition and anti-prohibition."

Mr. F. W. Brede, secretary of the Michigan Brewers' and Maltsters' Association, offered this advice and information:

"The effect of using anti-prohibition documents is good. I enclose you herewith some papers that we used in our campaign, and would further say that we did not carry on a road-wagon campaign, but sent out agents all over the state to silently organize our forces, and made them understand the situation, also furnished all necessary money—quite a large amount—to defray expenses. We established a literary bureau, which furnished copy for about 40 or 50 county papers, with reading matter against prohibition. It was not known, though, that we issued such patent papers, but, nevertheless, money makes the mare go."

George Moerlein, of the Christian Moerlein Brewing Company of Cincinnati, made this statement:

"Our campaign against prohibition was conducted in a very quiet manner, and a greater part of the funds was paid to the newspapers for strong and convincing arguments against prohibition."

Henry Goodwin, of the firm of H. Goodwin & Co., wholesale dealers in wines and liquors of Aberdeen, South Dakota, wrote as follows about the campaign in that state:

"The best way to reach the people in agricultural states is with literature through the mail. The *Farm Herald*, published at Louisville, Ky., gave us valuable assistance; also the *Dakota Catholic*, published at Sioux

Falls. The latter being a church organ and disinterested, has great weight, and made thousands of votes for us. . . . To advocate high licence is well. The people like the idea of having the liquor men pay their taxes. . . . Buying up newspapers is one of the best ways to reach the popular mind. We tried it with good results. Also getting prominent politicians to help is good. . . . Gentlemen, I pity you! You have a big job on hand, but if you organise and pull together strongly and wisely, you will succeed. First of all, organise a State Liquor Dealers' Association. Divide the state into districts and let certain parties attend to them. Have good workers at the polls in every county. Every county should have an organisation, too, working under the state organisation; also a paid secretary who will attend to matters promptly. For instance, three years ago, the question of local option was voted on in Dakota—licence was defeated in this county by 500 majority. Two years ago it was voted on again, and with organisation we carried licence by 1,000 majority. We had workers at every polling place in the county, and paid them well. . . . A few years ago, I had a large and lucrative business in Dakota. Could have sold my realty for \$10,000. To-day it is worth perhaps \$2,000, if saleable at all. Business gone, and in a few weeks shall have to go to another state to hunt a location and begin business anew."

Robert Ogden, of the firm of McClellan & Ogden, of Dallas, Texas, one of the committee appointed to raise funds for the liquor fight in the Texas campaign against the amendment, offered this advice:

"In the first place make it a political fight. This is the only way to attain success. Have it a war of right against wrong, of liberty against oppression; bring it this way before the people; plead with them that their rights and liberties are being wrested from them. Do

this and the farming element will stay with you. Don't make it a whiskey fight, or a fight of whiskey against religion; it is not that. Keep the saloon element in the background as much as possible. They can do quiet work and on election day they can turn out and do the voting. . . . I am a high licence man. I believe it makes a better class of saloons, and does away with many deadfalls and elevates the business. It is also better for the wholesale dealer, as it makes his risks safer. I, however, do not advise to preach high licence (let others do that) as you are not fighting on that ground, but on the common ground that sumptuary laws are unjust, and if this passes there is no telling what the fanatics will do next."

S. M. Patterson, of the Pennsylvania State Brewers' Association, gave his experience:

"I had charge of three large counties during the prohibition fight of last year. . . . I took sole charge, paid all bills for insertion of articles in papers, secured the men to distribute tickets, paid the poll men, after the victory was won, in full—and gave them each from five to ten dollars. I had two in each voting precinct—and personally selected them. . . . I held no public meetings—I worked quietly among the farmers and young men in towns, villages and boroughs. I selected articles that would aid me and had them put in the county newspapers at from five to six cents a line."

Emanuel Furth, attorney for the Pennsylvania State Liquor League, wrote:

"My experience has taught me that the public advocacy of high licence, together with legislation regulating and restricting the traffic, produces the best results."

A. L. Collins, Secretary of the Scranton Brewing Co., wrote:

“In the first place, I would advise you to get control of the press as far as possible. You will find that money spent with them will produce greater results than spent in any other way.”

Casey Bros., wholesale liquor dealers of Scranton, wrote:

“We had a few speakers from Iowa tell how prohibition had ruined such and such a state, but during all this time we were getting all the money we could together, and about one week before election we opened up the strings, we got the newspapers, we got politicians of both parties with us and we looked after the election boards. There is the point, be sure and have a majority of your men on the election boards.”

Jesse B. Eddy, the wholesale liquor dealer of Providence, gave the following advice:

“Secure politicians and wire-pullers to talk against it in every town, dwelling on the expense, increase of taxes, kitchen bar-rooms, attic slums and cellar dives, and the increase of drunkenness caused by prohibition. . . . Go in for a local option licence law. Make \$500 to \$700 retail, and \$700 to \$1,000 wholesale is plenty high enough. Surround the business with all the restrictions to make the business respectable.”

J. S. Bowler, of the firm of Bowler Bros., leading liquor dealers of Worcester, Mass., gave the following graphic advice:

“Subsidise the press all you can, and get them to talk up high licence, also get them to agitate the question that farmers will not be allowed to make cider or light wine. This cider clause helped us more than anything else, because we got the farmers' vote, and you get a farmer's vote every time you touch his pocket. We would advise you not to hold any public meetings, as

those very good prohibitionists won't attend them, and you will have the hall filled with a gang of loafers, which will make you look like state's prison birds, and the papers will come out the next day with—'A man is known by the company he keeps.' ”

Similar advice was tendered by numerous liquor dealers of Texas, Ohio, Michigan, Massachusetts, South Dakota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and other states, all showing a volume of corruption in the campaigns almost beyond belief. In the *New York Times* of May 5, 1889, the charge was made that the New York brewers had been forced to contribute one hundred thousand dollars to the Pennsylvania anti-prohibition campaign fund.

Dark as is the history of this period, yet out of the corruption of the times a distinct advance was made in the attitude of the United States Supreme Court in reference to the traffic. The passing of the constitutional amendments naturally raised new questions of law, calling for interpretation from the judicial department of the government. The most vigorous attempts were made by the liquor men to overturn, or at least to modify the radical decision of Chief Justice Taney rendered forty years before. The attempt not only failed, but led to still more radical utterances from the Supreme Court. Indications of the final attitude of the court were given in the case of *Bartemeyer vs. Iowa*, when the Court said that “so far as such a right [to sell intoxicants] exists, it is not one of the rights growing out of citizenship of the United States.”

A still more advanced attitude was taken in the case of *Stone vs. Mississippi* in 1889. In 1867 the state of Mississippi had granted a charter to a lottery

company for a period of twenty-five years. Two years later the Constitution was adopted with a provision prohibiting lotteries. The lottery people held that, under Section 10, Article 1, of the Constitution of the United States, which forbids a state to pass laws impairing existing contracts, the clause in the state Constitution was invalid, at least so far as the existing lottery was concerned. To this contention the Court said, the opinion being delivered by Chief Justice Waite: *

“ No Legislature can bargain away the public health and the public morals. The people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants. The supervision of both these subjects of government power is continuing in their nature, and they are to be dealt with as the special exigencies of the moment may require. Government is organised with a view to their preservation, and cannot divest itself of the power to provide for them. For this purpose the largest legislative discretion is allowed and the discretion cannot be parted with any more than the power itself.”

In the famous case of *Beer Company vs. Massachusetts*, decided in 1877, the principle that no compensation could be claimed on account of prohibitory laws was first outlined. In 1828 the Boston Beer Company was granted a perpetual charter by the Massachusetts Legislature to brew beer. The company claimed that the prohibitory law of 1869 was invalid for the reason that it destroyed, or rendered useless, their property without compensation. Justice Bradley, rendering the decision, said : †

“ If the public safety or the public morals require the

* 101 *U. S. Reports*, p. 815.

† 97 *U. S. Reports*, p. 32.

discontinuance of the manufacturing or traffic, the hand of the Legislature cannot be stayed from providing for its discontinuance, by any incidental inconvenience which individuals or corporations may suffer. All rights are held subject to the police power of the state.

In 1887 a desperate attempt was made to break the force of the utterance of Justice Bradley in the Beer Company case. Two Kansas cases were selected, *Mugler vs. Kansas*, and *Kansas vs. Ziebold*. Both were brewers whose business had been destroyed by the operations of the prohibitory laws. United States Senator George G. Vest appeared for Mugler, and Joseph H. Choate (now United States Ambassador to England) appeared for Ziebold. The former received a fee of \$10,000, the latter a fee of \$6,000. The contention was that the Legislature could not destroy a man's property without due compensation. In the decision rendered December 5, 1887, Justice Harlan said:

“There is no justification for holding that the state, under the guise of merely police regulations, is here aiming to deprive the citizen of his constitutional rights; for we cannot shut out of view the fact, within the knowledge of all, that the public health, the public morals and the public safety may be endangered by the general use of intoxicating drinks; nor the fact, established by statistics accessible to every one, that the disorder, pauperism and crime prevalent in the country are in some degree at least traceable to this evil. . . .

“The principle that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, was embodied, in substance, in the Constitution of nearly all, if not all, of the several states at the time of the adoption of the fourteenth amendment thereto, and it has never been regarded as incompatible with the prin-

ciple, equally vital, because essential to the peace and safety of society, that all property in this country is held under the implied obligation that the owners' use of it shall not be injurious to the community. . . .

“The power which the states unquestionably have of prohibiting such use by individuals of their property as will be prejudicial to the health, the morals or the safety of the public is not, and—consistently with the existence and safety of organised society—cannot be burdened with the condition that the state must compensate such individual owners for pecuniary losses they sustain by reason of their not being permitted by a noxious use of their property to inflict injury upon the community. The exercise of the police power by the destruction of property which is itself a public nuisance, or the prohibition of its use in a particular way, whereby its value becomes depreciated, is very different from taking property for public use, or from depriving a person of property without due process of law. In the one case, a nuisance only is abated; in the other, an unoffending property is taken away from an innocent owner.”*

Later, in the case of *Kidd vs. Pearson*, the powers of the state were still further recognised by the decision that the manufacture of liquor, though intended exclusively for sale in another state, might be suppressed.

This was quickly followed by the crowning decision of the series in the case of *Crowley vs. Christensen*, in which answer was made to the personal-liberty argument of the friends of the rum-sellers. The decision was doubly important for the reason that all of the nine justices concurred, and for the further reason that Justice Field, who delivered the opinion, was of them all the one whose decisions had hitherto been the most unfavorable to the prohibi-

* 123 *U. S. Reports*, p. 623.

tionists' position. In his decision Justice Field said : *

“ It is undoubtedly true that it is the right of every citizen of the United States to pursue any lawful trade or business, under such restrictions as are imposed upon all persons of the same age, sex and condition. But the possession and enjoyment of all rights are subject to such reasonable conditions as may be deemed by the governing authority of the country essential to the safety, health, peace and good order and morals of the community. Even liberty, the greatest of all rights, is not unrestricted licence to act according to one's own will. It is only freedom from restraint under conditions essential to the equal enjoyment of the same rights by others. It is then liberty regulated by law. The right to acquire, enjoy and dispose of property is declared in the Constitutions of several states to be one of the inalienable rights of man. But this declaration is not held to preclude the Legislature of any state from passing laws respecting the acquisition, enjoyment and disposition of property. What contracts respecting its acquisition and disposition shall be valid, and what void or voidable ; when they shall be in writing, and when orally ; and by what instruments they may be conveyed or mortgaged are subjects of constant legislation. And as to the enjoyment of property, the rule is general that it must be accompanied by such limitations as will not impair the equal enjoyment to others of their property. *Sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas* is a maxim of universal application.

“ For the pursuit of any lawful trade or business, the law imposes similar conditions. Regulations respecting them are almost infinite, varying with the nature of the business. Some occupations by their noise in their pursuit, some by the odors they engender, and some by the dangers accompanying them, require regulations as to

* 137 U. S. Reports, p. 86.

the locality in which they shall be conducted. Some by the dangerous character of the articles used, manufactured or sold, require, also, special qualifications in the parties to use, manufacture or sell them. All this is but common knowledge, and would hardly be mentioned were it not for the position often taken and vehemently pressed, that there is something wrong in principle and objectionable in similar restrictions when applied to the selling by retail, in small quantities, of spirituous and intoxicating liquors. It is urged that, as the liquors are used as a beverage, and the injury following them, if taken in excess, is voluntarily inflicted, and is confined to the party offending, their sale should be without restrictions, the contention being that what a man shall drink, equally with what he shall eat, is not properly matter for legislation. . . .

“There is in this question an assumption of fact which does not exist, that when liquors are taken in excess the injuries are confined to the party offending. The injury, it is true, first falls upon him in his health, which the habit undermines; in his morals, which it weakens; and in the self-abasement which it creates. But, as it leads to neglect of business and waste of property and general demoralisation, it affects those who are immediately connected with and dependent upon him. By the general concurrence of every civilised and Christian community, there are few sources of crime and misery equal to the dram shop, where intoxicating liquors in small quantities, to be drunk at the time, are sold indiscriminately to all parties applying. The statistics of every state show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor saloons than any other source. The sale of such liquor in this way has therefore been, at all times, by the courts of every state, proper subject of legislative regulation. Not only may a licence be exacted from the keeper of the saloon before a single glass of his liquor can be disposed of, but restrictions may be imposed as to the class of persons

to whom they may be sold, and the hours of the day and the days of the week on which the saloons may be opened. The sale in that form may be absolutely prohibited. It is a question of public expediency and public morality, and not federal law. The police power of the state is fully competent to regulate the business—to mitigate its evils or suppress it entirely. There is no inherent right in a citizen to thus sell intoxicating liquor by retail; it is not a privilege of a citizen of a state or a citizen of the United States. As it is a business attended with great danger to the community, it may, as already said, be entirely prohibited, or be permitted under such conditions as will limit to the utmost its evils."

The epoch closed, therefore, with the highest court in the nation putting the brand of Cain upon the whole business, and virtually declaring it to be a nuisance which the police power of any state could suppress at any time that it saw fit.

CHAPTER X.

HIGH LICENCE.

THE policy of high licence has had a strange history. It was originally proposed by the temperance reformers as a step toward prohibition. It proved to be the most powerful weapon ever devised for combating the very policy it was designed to advance. Within a few years from the enactment of the first high licence law, the framers of the law, the men who assisted in securing its adoption, and most of the temperance leaders were busy denouncing it, while its original opponents were busy urging its merits as a "temperance" measure.

Before the war high licence had few advocates. The proposal that the government be supported by the revenue of the liquor traffic did not become popular until the campaigns for prohibitory constitutional amendments. High licence was likewise rare in practice. Though the town of Athens, Georgia, (the same which was subsequently the second to adopt the dispensary system) charged a licence fee of \$500 in 1832, this was a rare case. During the memorable prohibition campaign of 1855 in New York the licence fee of the largest city in the state was \$10, and up to the year 1880 a licence fee of \$200 was considered high.

The Slocumb law, passed in 1881 by the legislature of Nebraska, which fixed the minimum fee at \$500 in cities and towns having a population of less

than 10,000, and at \$1,000 in cities of a larger population, was therefore an innovation which attracted wide attention. Two years later, in February, 1883, the Downing law was passed in Missouri, fixing the licence fee at a minimum of \$550 and a maximum of \$1,000. In June of the same year (1883) Illinois enacted a similar law, making the minimum licence fee \$500 for a full licence, and \$150 for a wine and beer licence. Within a few years several states adopted the same policy; Massachusetts with a minimum fee of \$1,300 per year; Minnesota with a minimum of \$500 for towns and \$1,000 for cities; Pennsylvania with a minimum of \$500; Utah with a minimum of \$500 and a maximum of \$1,200 per year; and several Southern states with fees of \$500 and upward.

All of these laws contained clauses designed to restrict the business in numerous ways. As a rule the saloon-keeper was required to give bond to conduct his business according to law, and to pay any damages accruing to individuals from the business. Closing on Sunday and after certain hours at night was required; screens were generally forbidden. Saloons were prohibited within certain distances of schools and churches. The written consent of a majority of the property-holders within a certain distance was required. The sale of liquor to minors and drunkards was forbidden. Music and games in the saloons were prohibited. Some states forbade wine rooms, female bartenders, selling on credit, and even chairs in the bar-rooms.

The framers of the original Nebraska law were John B. Finch, H. W. Hardy, Mayor of Lincoln, and Mr. Slocumb, who introduced it and led the fight for its adoption in the Legislature. The Downing

law of Missouri was mainly pressed by John A. Brooks, later candidate for Vice-President on the National Prohibition ticket. The Harper law of Illinois had for one of its most ardent friends Samuel W. Packard, of Chicago. The results of the high-licence policy were so plainly disastrous to the cause of temperance that within six years all of these men were found opposing the policy as ardently as they had at first advocated it.

The leading advantages claimed for the plan were:—

1. That it would reduce the number of saloons.
2. That it would tend to put the traffic on a higher basis by putting it in the hands of a better class of men.
3. That the high fee demanded would render the enforcement of the law easy because the licenced dealers would have too much at stake to ignore the restrictions, and because they would also ferret out unlicenced dive-keepers and assist in bringing them to justice.
4. That the law, by diminishing the number of dealers, would tend to take the subject out of politics.

5. That it would force up the price of liquor and so reduce consumption.

The test of practice did not realise these claims. The reduction of the number of saloons which usually followed the adoption of high licence was often only temporary. The business quickly adjusted itself to the new conditions. Attractions were added to the saloons. The free lunch now made its appearance. Old barrels and kegs gave way to mahogany and cut glass. More capital and more business ability were employed. The dram shop came out

of the dark alley and established itself on the choice street corner along with the bank. The price of drinks was raised, but customers were now attracted who could pay the increased price. The increase in price shifted the burden of increased taxation from the saloon-keeper to the general drinking public.

The petty restrictions imposed by the law were ignored. Jurors could not be made to understand why it was proper to sell liquor five minutes before twelve at night and unlawful and wicked to sell it ten minutes later. Police officials could not understand why they should persistently annoy a business the revenue of which paid their salaries. Prosecuting officials were half-hearted in prosecuting a man for merely conducting his business at the wrong time of day. Through his policy of ignoring petty restrictions of law, the saloon-keeper found himself in a glass house and could not throw stones at a "speak-easy" in the alley. On the contrary, he was forced to become the actual ally of the "blind pig." Their interests became common. Instead of taking the liquor business out of politics, the new system, through the high revenue which it paid and the petty restrictions which it imposed, brought the liquor dealers into closer connection with officials. Having more capital at stake the saloon-keepers were compelled to go into politics deeper and deeper in order to protect their greater financial interests. Further, the high fees wooed to sleep the conscience of the average taxpayer.

The net result was that the consumption of liquor increased, although the effect of the law, in general, was to diminish the number of saloons in proportion to population; the increased drinking had its natural result in increased crime; and

the business attained a power in politics which it had never before enjoyed. When these facts became established, late in the eighties, the liquor dealers and the prohibitionists changed places in their attitude toward the high-licence policy. After the year 1890, there was scarcely a liquor dealer of any prominence in the states where prohibition sentiment was strong who was not enthusiastically praising the virtues of the high-licence policy, and urging its adoption on his neighbours of other states; There was scarce an advanced temperance man left to defend it.*

Under date of January 7, 1888, Peter E. Iler, president of the Willow Springs distillery, of Omaha, Nebraska, one of the largest in the West, thus replied to an inquiry regarding the effect of high licence in that state:

“GENTLEMEN: Your letter of the 31st ult., in regard to prohibition, is at hand, and carefully noted. I would answer your questions as you put them as follows:

“1. High licence has not hurt our business, but, on the contrary, has been a great benefit to it, as well as to the people generally.

“2. I believe somewhat, as you say the Cincinnati *Volksblatt* says, that high licence acts as a bar against prohibition. It is especially so in this state, as the tax from the licence goes towards supporting the schools, thereby relieving the citizens and farmers of just so much tax that they would otherwise have to pay, and is therefore especially beneficial to the poor and labouring classes. It also gives the business more of a tone and legal standing, and places it in the hands of a better class of people.

“3. I do not think that high licence lessens the quan-

* See Appendix A, Chap. X.

tity of liquor used, but places it in fewer and better hands, with better regularity.

“4. As to the trade repealing the high-licence law, if the question was left to it, I do not think, so far as my acquaintance is concerned, that it would do so. I have an extensive acquaintance through this state, and I believe if it were put to a vote of the liquor-dealers and saloon-men whether it should be high licence, no licence, or low licence, that they would almost unanimously be for high licence. Those objecting would be a class without responsibility or character, who never pay for anything if they can help it, and simply start in business for a few months with the view of beating every one they can, and, of course, naturally such a class would not want this law. I cannot see how any one who has anything at stake can help but favor high licence and enforcing the law strictly.

“5. I would be in favor of high licence, rather than trust to the non-enforcement of the law under prohibition. If you undertake to do your business without protection, you are blackmailed by one-horse attorneys, which in the end amounts to many times the cost of a licence every year, even if the licence be very high. We have had a great deal of business in the state of Iowa, both before it was prohibition and since, and we can say positively that there is very little satisfaction in doing business in that state now. Ever so often the goods are seized, and it causes a great deal of delay and trouble to get them released; and then there is a fear of not getting money for the goods, and all the forms we have to go through make it very annoying business. It is like running a railroad under ground. You don't know where you are going, or what is ahead. In all my experience of ten years in Ohio before the temperance movement and twenty years' experience here previous to high licence, and since, I believe that high licence is one of the grandest laws for the liquor trade, and for men interested as well as people at large, there is. The only objection we have here is that the regulations are not

more strictly enforced than they are. I do not believe we would have any prohibition people in our state if our high-licence law was more rigidly enforced.

“I enclose you herewith a copy of our state law regulating the liquor business, which will give you an idea of the kind of law we have. Anything I can do for you at any time, please command me.

“Yours truly,

“PETER E. ILER (Prest.)”

About the same time J. M. Atherton, then head of the wholesale liquor firm of the J. A. Atherton Company in Louisville, Kentucky, and since 1886 president of the National Protective Association, began his championship of high licence. Under date of March 2, 1889, he wrote the following letter which was widely published throughout the country:

“E. A. FOX, Esq., Eaton Rapids, Mich.:

“DEAR SIR: Your letter has been on my desk for some time without reply, because of my absence most of the time from the city. The two most EFFECTIVE WEAPONS WITH WHICH TO FIGHT PROHIBITION ARE HIGH LICENCE AND LOCAL OPTION. The difficulty is that the remedy is almost as bad as the disease. High licence is a vague, indefinite term, and is variously construed in different localities. I think \$500 entirely too high, and a very unjust tax upon the liquor trade. Two hundred and fifty dollars is as much tax as the ordinary retail liquor dealer can afford to pay and sell anything like old whisky and pure liquors, however cheaply he may buy them. The true policy for the trade to pursue is to advocate as high a licence as they can in justice to themselves afford to pay, because the money thus raised tends to relieve all owners of property from taxation and keeps the treasuries of the towns and cities pretty well filled. THIS CATCHES THE ORDINARY TAX-PAYER, who cares less for the sentimental opposition to

our business than he does for taxes on his own property. The point is to prevent the gross imposition in the way of excessive and exorbitant taxation, under the name of high licence. Local option is local prohibition, but the experience is that there is always enough licence counties mixed in with the no-licence counties to practically supply the latter with all the liquor they need.

“ I think local option is less objectionable in its practical operations than the extreme high licence. Sooner or later the trade may be able to defeat the local option features, but until prohibition is destroyed, or its political efforts broken, I REPEAT THAT OUR BEST WEAPONS TO FIGHT WITH ARE HIGH LICENCE AND LOCAL OPTION BY TOWNSHIPS. If local option can be defeated without encouraging prohibition, it should be done. These are my views in a general way. Of course, each locality and state has its peculiarities, and must modify its views to such existing conditions, but I think the suggestions I have herein given you are sound.

“ You will please pardon me for the neglect or discourtesy in delaying this reply, but my absence from the city most of the time is the reason. Would be glad to give you any information or give any suggestions at any time. With kind regards,

“ Yours truly,

“ J. M. ATHERTON.”

While the high-licence bills were before the legislatures of New York and New Jersey, Metz & Brother, the leading brewers of Omaha, wrote as follows:

“ High licence has been of no injury to our business. In our state we think it bars out prohibition. We are positively certain that were it not for our present high-licence law, Nebraska to-day would have prohibition. Please understand that our high-licence law is also a local-option law. In our opinion high licence does not lessen the consumption of liquor. If left to us,

we (the liquor dealers) would never repeal this law. There are a great many difficulties at first for the brewers and the liquor dealers to get a high-licence law in working order, but after a year or two you will certainly find it to your advantage over prohibition. We at first made a bitter fight against its enforcement, but since it is well enforced we would not do without it."

On January 6, of the same year, Henry H. Shufeldt & Co., the well known distillery firm of Chicago, wrote:

" 'Has high licence been any hurt to your business?' We think not. It weeds out the irresponsible retailer, injuring at first those wholesale dealers who have been selling them, but eventually placing the retailing in more responsible hands, thus making collections better among the wholesalers and thus benefiting the distiller. It may carry down some of the weaker wholesalers who need but little adversity to destroy them, but it eventually places the whole line from the retailer to the distiller on a safe footing. We believe that high licence is the only remedy for prohibition, but coupled with high licence should be discretionary power in issuing licences and just regulations regarding the selling to drunkards, minors, etc. Remove the disreputable elements from the business and the majority of the people will be satisfied. . . . We think the trade in any state should favor high licence and just restrictions, and that it is the only solvent of the question." *

The liquor press also began to advocate the new policy which had been cast off by the temperance leaders. Said *Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular*, (January 25, 1889) :

"As matters now stand, it is absolutely necessary for the entire trade to organise and get to work. Wake up, especially those who are already known as very gener-

* See also letters in Chapter IX.

ously permitting others to do the work. This time it is business; so, each and every one lay aside any petty trade jealousies you may have; the enemy is strong, and to vanquish him requires good work, strong work and work altogether, with your battle cry, 'High Licence against Prohibition.' Some dealers may not realise this condition of affairs in the trade, but will very soon find out that, though the trade cannot now defeat prohibition, HIGH LICENCE CAN, as it will receive the support of a large majority of the press throughout the state, and the almost unanimous support of all fair-minded, sensible, practical men."

The *Washington Sentinel* (March 3, 1888), edited by Louis Schade, the liquor trade's representative in Washington, explained how the consumer paid the tax:

"Who pays the licence? OF COURSE THE CONSUMER! For the big and rich marble palace tavern-keeper, it [high licence] is a sort of additional revenue. He can easily charge five cents more for whisky. That gives him for every one hundred drinks sold \$5, while his daily licence at the rate of \$500 is but \$1.66, and of \$1,000 but \$3.32. Of course, no whisky drinker will object to pay five cents more for a drink under high licence. That explains why not a few of the tavern-keepers favor high licence."

It was according to this same theory that James G. Blaine argued in his famous letter to the *Philadelphia Press* (Nov. 22, 1882), in which he declared that "the tax on spirits oppresses no one. It is paid by the consumer."

The *Freie Presse* (April 29, 1889), the German liquor paper of Chicago, gave the following reasons why it was desirable for the trade to urge the high-licence policy:

“The Chicago *Tribune* has advocated, with the determination and zeal which mark it, the cause of local option and high licence since Iowa and Kansas went prohibition. To some German Republicans who took exception to this, Mr. Medill explained that the only way in which the adoption of prohibition laws in all of the Northwestern states, with the possible exception of Wisconsin, could be hindered was to leave it to localities to decide whether there would be ‘licence’ or ‘no licence.’ Local option and high licence were the only barriers against the prohibition craze, and the good results of high licence will soon lessen the number of those states which have come out against the granting of licences. How accurately Mr. Medill calculated the effect of high licence on Anglo-Americans, the vote by which the prohibition amendment was defeated in Massachusetts shows. It was the great argument of the friends of personal liberty there that prohibition would stop the sale of liquor, while the licence taxes would bring in a heavy income to the community that impose them. That took with the voters, and prohibition was beaten by an immense vote. We believe now that it is owing to the far-sightedness of Mr. Medill and the energetic position of the *Tribune* that Illinois has escaped a paper prohibition, and the city treasury of Chicago has received about \$2,000,000 a year from the saloons. This is sometimes severe on the saloon-keepers, but it is insurance against prohibition.”

One of the most stalwart advocates of the Raines high-licence law adopted by New York state was the *Wine and Spirit Gazette* of New York. It outlined (Feb. 19, 1896), the theory of high licence, from a liquor advocate’s standpoint, in these words:

“The principal advantage, however, in diverting half of the tax to be collected from the liquor traffic into the state treasury is the strength and stability which such an argument promises to give to the new liquor law.

A new Legislature is not likely to 'monkey' with the law under which the liquor traffic is made to bear a substantial share of the public burdens. Future lawmakers will think twice before disturbing the liquor industry again, no matter how strong the inclination may be to meddle with the subject."

The theory that the law would enforce itself automatically by virtue of the dealers having so much at stake, owing to the high fee demanded as licence, failed to be substantiated in practice. The *Omaha Bee*, one of the strongest advocates of high licence in the country, made this admission (Dec. 10, 1888) regarding the effect of the law in Omaha:

"No one can deny that the licence system, as now existing in our city, has been a source of corruption and irregularity. It has had a demoralising effect upon members of the city council and the city clerk. It has exacted political support from low dives and bummers; it has compelled orderly liquor dealers to support with money and influence the very worst element of the city, and has used the liquor men to do the dirty work at the primaries and elections."

Regarding the effect of the Harper high-licence law in Chicago, the *Chicago Daily News* said editorially, after the law had been in effect five years:

"We have had high licence in Illinois for five years, and while it is a success as a revenue measure, it is an undisguised failure as a temperance measure. It in no way checks the consumption of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, nor does it in the least degree lessen the evils of crime from such use. . . . The dives and dens, the barrel houses and thieves' resorts, are as bad and as frequent in this city to-day, after five years of high licence, as they ever were. Call high licence what it is, an easy way to raise a revenue from vice, but let there be an end of endorsing it as a temperance or reform measure."

During the winter of 1893-4 the grand jury, at Springfield, Illinois, indicted 110 saloon-keepers of that city for violations of the high-licence law. During the same winter the grand jury at Galesburg indicted every saloon-keeper of that city save three, for keeping open on Sunday. A little later the Chicago correspondent of the Boston *Transcript* gave the following account of the workings of high licence in the former city:

“A man can buy liquor all over Chicago at any hour of the day or night, Sunday included, provided he has the price.

“Few saloons close at 12, the rule now being to keep open from January 1 until January 1. A drunken man is never refused liquor. If a mother or wife seeks to recover money lost by a wayward son or husband, she is referred to a regular ‘agent,’ who makes the best settlement he can with the real sufferer.

“The town is filled with pickpockets, thieves, burglars and murderers, there being at the present time twenty-two murderers in the Cook County Jail. And if criminals are allowed much longer the scope they enjoy, the indications are that before long there will be twice that number behind the bars. Vice is daily on the increase, and the police force appears to be afflicted with paralysis.

“The men interested in carrying on this wickedness seem to have no fear. They disregard the law and the police with impunity. They appear to be confident of their power and their security. Men who have worn the penitentiary stripes for crimes are foremost in this business. Convicted thieves run elaborate saloons and gambling-houses; safe-blowers own gorgeous rum-palaces. The man who sins apparently has the best of it. To be an ex-convict seems to be the foundation for an established business, and apparently this kind of place has police protection.

“Another Chicago disgrace is, that at least eight of

the aldermen in the city council are proprietors of gambling-houses and disreputable saloons. A corrupt gang of officials protect all the evil resorts, and are becoming so bold with their boodle acts that the men who collect the corruption fund can be picked out by almost any one in touch with city affairs."

During the month of April, 1901, two Chicago saloon-keepers who had been arrested for selling liquor on Sunday in defiance of the high-licence law, were discharged by the trial justice, who decided that the Sunday closing feature of the Harper high-licence law had become obsolete from disuse.

Regarding the workings of the Brooks high-licence law of Pennsylvania, the *Pittsburg Commercial Gazette* (Dec. 13, 1888) said:

"The magnitude of the illegal liquor traffic is really astonishing. There is scarcely an alley or side street in any of the wards of the lower part of the city, as well as on the South side, that does not contain from one to twenty groggeries where beer and whisky are sold in defiance of the law. To publish a complete list of these 'saloons' would require several columns of an ordinary sized newspaper. A legalised seller when asked yesterday if he was aware of the violations going on, said: 'Yes, certainly I am, but what am I going to do about it? I paid the county \$500 to protect my business, but yet I see men selling all around me without a licence. I can't inform on them because such a course would injure my trade. The people who sympathise with the law-breakers would not patronise me if I made a fuss over the unjustness of my having to pay for what others are doing without paying.'"

About the same time Mr. A. Wishart, agent of the Pittsburg Law and Order League, made a report stating that there were seven hundred "speak-easies" in that city.

Regarding the operations of the same law in Philadelphia, the Committee of Fifty * reported :

“ Under the old law, selling without a licence was not infrequent, but the easy access to legalised establishments, every hour of the week, prevented such selling from becoming very profitable. After the introduction of the high-licence law, the ‘speakeasy’ became a regular institution in Philadelphia. At the present time (1897) liquor is sold without licence at the ‘speakeasies,’ or ‘kitchen bars’ proper, at chartered and unchartered clubs, at houses of ill-fame, and by some druggists. Only an approximate estimate of the extent to which the law is violated can be given. The United States special taxes paid do not furnish a clue. Apparently little effort is made to collect revenue except from those who hold a city licence, from prominent clubs, the ‘speakeasy’ keeper who is brought into court for violating the law, and from druggists. A thorough examination of the internal revenue records confirms this. A policeman having intimate acquaintance with all parts of the city, questioned as to the number of ‘speakeasies,’ replied unhesitatingly, ‘There are at least six thousand.’ While this statement must be regarded as exaggerated, it is beyond doubt that the illegal places exceed by not a little the number of licenced retailers.”

In 1896, Mr. D. C. Gibboney, secretary of the Philadelphia Law and Order League informed one of the writers of this volume that there were then “about a thousand” unlicenced liquor establishments in the city. The *New York Voice* of July 23, 1896, published a list of one thousand and twelve persons in Philadelphia who held a federal tax receipt for selling liquor at retail, but who paid no city licence.

* A self-constituted body, organised in 1893, to study the liquor problem.

The effect of the \$250 licence in New York was no more satisfactory in respect to elevating the character of the trade than the higher licence in Western states. In the *Wine and Spirit Gazette*, of September 14, 1894, we are told:

“Out of 400 saloon-keepers who plead guilty to a violation of the Sunday liquor law in the Court of Special Sessions on August 31, 358 were members of the Wine, Liquor and Beer-Dealers’ Association. Out of 59 saloon-keepers indicted for violating the law who appeared last month in the Court of General Sessions before Recorder Goff to plead, 50 were members of the Wine, Liquor and Beer-Dealers’ Association. . . . The president of the Association [New York Central Liquor Dealers’ Association] is authority for the statement that the action of the association was not voluntary, but that the association was forced to adopt the Sunday-closing resolution for FEAR OF HAVING NINE-TENTHS OF ITS MEMBERS SENT TO THE PENITENTIARY BY THE COURTS.”

The resolution referred to was one adopted by the Association formally agreeing to obey the law after September 1, 1894.

During the spring of 1897 the *New York Voice* (April 22, 1897), compiled a list of persons on Manhattan Island, New York City, who held federal tax receipts to sell liquor, and who had no local licence. The list comprised more than four thousand names. Under the laws of New York, druggists who compounded liquors were obliged to take out a druggist’s licence. This list did not include any druggists. By comparing the list obtained in this way with similar ones from prohibition states, the following facts were developed:

1. The list was more than four times as large as the entire list of liquor dealers for the whole state of Maine, including druggists.

2. It was nearly twice as large as the list for the whole of Kansas including druggists.

3. It was eight times as large as the list for the state of North Dakota.

4. It was four times as large as the list for South Dakota.

5. It was more than fifty times as large as the list for Alaska and the Indian Territory combined.

6. It was seven times as large as the list for Vermont.

7. It was about one hundred more than the list for the entire prohibition territory of the United States, save local option states.

In Missouri similar results followed the enactment of the Downing high licence law, with a fee amounting to \$550. The *Republic*, of St. Louis (May 2, 1889), gave this account of its workings:

“Every effort but one which has been made in three years past to prevent saloons, by preventing a legal petition, has failed. It is not at all improbable that half the saloons open in this city to-day are licenced on insufficient petitions. Saloons are frequently opened and run for several weeks, and, in some instances, for several months, with neither petitions nor licence. A saloon-keeper is usually given the same liberty in the matter of the payment of his licence tax that is given a merchant in the payment of merchants' tax, notwithstanding the fact that the high licence of \$550 is supposed to be a regulatory tax, imposed to prevent the multiplicity of saloons as much as to raise a revenue from them.”

Still more severe were the strictures of the Committee of Fifty regarding the enforcement of the high-licence law in St. Louis:

“As to the enforcement of the few police restrictions upon the sale of liquor in this city (St. Louis), the

simple fact is that little if any effort is made to enforce them, and they are not enforced. There is not a saloon in St. Louis which is closed on Sunday, except at the will of the proprietor. The prohibition to sell to minors without the written consent of their parents is a dead letter. There is an immense 'can' trade carried on by the saloons; and there is no part of the city where, and no hour of the day or evening when, little children mostly girls, may not be seen going to and from dram-shops with pails of beer. Some of them are scarcely more than babes. And many saloons sell to young boys, across the counter, by the drink. The prohibition against games and other amusements is flagrantly disregarded."

So far as enforcement was concerned, the Iowa "mulct law" was no improvement upon the high-licence laws of sister states. The result of investigations of the Committee of Fifty was given in these words:

"Very little attention is paid to the police regulations contained in the seventeenth section, in towns like Davenport and Burlington, where the saloons are open on Sunday and at hours of night as before, and where there are back doors and other accompaniments of the business forbidden by law. It is not even strictly enforced in Des Moines."

The Iowa *State Register*, one of the strongest advocates of the new law, made this statement regarding its workings in the capital of the state:

"Down in Whitechapel, which should be renamed McVicarnell, there are eighteen brothels selling liquor during all hours of the days and nights, including Sundays, under the protection of Mayor McVicar and the police, without paying the mulct penalty tax. Those brothels have each procured a revenue licence to sell liquors from the national government, but Mayor

McVicar and the police protect and sustain them in selling liquors in violation of the laws of Iowa and the ordinances of Des Moines.”

Similar results developed in Ohio, Massachusetts, Minnesota and other states. It was found invariably that in high-licence cities, after some years of trial, there was substantially the same or a greater rate of drunkenness and crime as prevailed in low-licence cities with numerous saloons. In 1889 comparisons were made between 38 low-licence cities and 41 high-licence cities as to the arrests for drunkenness. It was found that in 1888 in the 41 high-licence cities there was one arrest for every 39 people; in the 38 low-licence cities, one arrest for every 39.7 people. Moreover, in the 41 high-licence cities, with an annual average licence fee of \$665 for each saloon, it was found that 56.4 per cent. of all the arrests were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. On the other hand, in the 38 low-licence cities, with an annual licence fee of \$122 for each saloon, but 52.9 per cent. of all the arrests were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. At the same time it was shown that the low-licence cities contained nearly three times as many saloons in proportion to population (having 1 for every 144 inhabitants) as the high-licence cities (which averaged 1 for every 387 of population). The fact that the two classes of cities were almost exactly equal in population, the 41 high-licence cities having 4,755,000 and the 38 low-licence cities 4,857,000 inhabitants, shows the fairness of the comparison and increases the value of the facts.

In 1891 the *New York Voice* made a comparison of the statistics for 1890 of 102 cities in the United States, for the purpose of throwing more light on the

question of high licence. The results are shown in the following table.

Number of cities.	Amount of Licence Fee.	Average Population.	Ratio of Saloons to Population.	Ratio of Arrests to Population.	Ratio of Arrests for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct to Total Arrests.
20	\$1,000 and over.	66,420	1 to 773	1 to 16.3	62.9 to 100
26	\$500 to \$1,000	136,047	1 to 321	1 to 22.9	52 to 100
16	\$200 to \$500	79,618	1 to 155	1 to 19.5	53.1 to 100
40	\$200 and under.	100,316	1 to 182	1 to 16.2	52.1 to 100

These figures show that in the cities with the highest licence fee there were as many arrests in proportion to population, lacking 1-10th of 1 per cent. as in the cities having the lowest licence fees, while the proportion of arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in the former class of cities exceeded by over 10 per cent. the proportion of the same arrests in the latter class. Cities with medium licence fees had less criminality than either of the other classes.

In the issue of the *Voice* of April 5, 1894, the results of another investigation of the same character was printed covering the experience of 77 leading cities. A still worse showing was made for the high-licence policy.

In 1896 another investigation was made in the same manner, covering the preceding year's record of 46 high-licence cities and 49 low-licence cities. The results of this investigation are given below.

The 46 cities classed as high-licence cities had licence fees ranging from \$500 to \$2,000; the 49 classed as low-licence cities had fees ranging from \$30 to \$450. *

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS IN 95 CITIES—1895.

CITIES.	Licence Fee.	Estimated Population.	Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Arrests Largely Due to Drink.	PER 10,000 POPULATION.		
						Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Drunks, Etc.
High Licence								
Pittsfield, Mass....	\$2,000	21,000	17	1,218	955	8.1	592	455
Fall River, Mass....	1,800	90,000	85	3,859	2,857	9.4	429	317
N. Adams, Mass....	1,800	20,000	19	^a 963	^a 762	9.5	481	381
Ottumwa, Iowa....	1,800	18,000	18	1,500	525	10.0	833	292
Moberly, Mo.....	1,600	12,000	7	700	309	5.8	583	258
New Bedford, Mass.	1,500	55,000	55	2,193	1,551	10.0	399	282
Salem, Mass.....	1,500	34,000	34	1,461	1,145	10.0	490	337
Springfield, Mass..	1,500	52,000	39	2,194	1,460	5.8	422	281
Worcester, Mass....	1,500	100,000	84	3,973	3,040	8.4	397	304
Boston, Mass.....	1,300	497,000	694	42,534	29,563	13.9	856	597
Milford, Mass.....	1,300	9,000	8	322	239	8.9	358	321
Northampton, Mass	1,300	16,800	14	434	382	8.3	258	227
Woburn, Mass.....	1,300	14,500	14	906	743	9.7	625	512
Beatrice, Neb.....	1,200	14,000	9	299	239	6.4	214	206
Des Moines, Iowa..	1,200	70,000	60	4,271	1,697	8.6	610	242
Allegheny, Pa.....	1,000	120,000	161	2,873	2,017	13.4	239	168
Duluth, Minn.....	1,000	65,000	105	2,096	1,114	16.2	322	171
Elgin, Ill.....	1,000	23,000	30	437	222	13.0	190	97
Galesburg, Ill.....	1,000	21,000	26	466	348	12.4	222	166
Kearney, Neb.....	1,000	8,000	7	695	55	8.8	869	69
Minneapolis, Minn..	1,000	200,000	266	5,648	2,409	13.3	282	120
Omaha, Neb.....	1,000	140,000	213	6,189	1,747	15.2	442	135
Philadelphia, Pa...	1,000	1,250,000	1,677	60,347	30,854	13.4	483	247
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	1,000	272,000	442	^b 13,762	^b 8,956	16.3	506	329
Rockford, Ill.....	1,000	33,000	38	1,021	430	11.5	309	130
St. Paul, Minn.....	1,000	183,700	309	4,571	2,334	23.1	342	175
Winona, Minn.....	1,000	22,000	42	845	475	19.1	384	216
Sloux City, Iowa....	900	38,000	58	1,400	1,234	15.3	368	325
St. Louis, Mo.....	650	603,837	1,992	24,793	10,061	33.0	411	167
Burlington, Iowa..	600	30,000	72	1,437	898	24.0	479	299
Adrian, Mich.....	525	10,000	22	73	63	22.0	73	63
Allentown, Pa.....	500	35,000	66	319	220	18.9	91	63
Alton, Mo.....	500	16,000	51	290	117	31.9	181	73
Bradford, Pa.....	500	16,000	19	1,554	774	11.9	971	484
Carbondale, Pa....	500	15,000	24	157	153	16.0	105	102
Chicago, Ill.....	500	1,600,000	6,871	83,464	48,631	26.3	522	304
Harrisburg, Pa....	500	50,000	1,573	482	33.2	315	96
Lancaster, Pa.....	500	40,000	93	601	421	29.5	150	105
Marinette, Wis.....	500	16,000	42	191	73	47.9	119	46
Ottawa, Ill.....	500	11,000	42	167	146	56.3	152	133

a. Ten months only. b. Year ending Jan. 3, 1895.

* Waldron, *Prohibition Handbook*, p. 81.

198 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS IN 95 CITIES—1895 (continued).

CITIES.	Licence Fee,	Estimated Population.	Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Arrests Largely Due to Drink.	PER 10,000 POPULATION.		
						Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Drinks, Etc.
High Licence.								
Peoria, Ill.	500	62,082	182	1,957	697	29.5	315	112
Pittston, Pa.	500	14,000	67	176	108	47.0	119	77
Reading, Pa.	500	18,000	450	1,092	974	56.3	136	122
Rock Island, Ill. ...	500	22,000	69	413	116	31.4	488	53
Springfield, Ill.	500	35,000	120	3,229	1,525	34.3	923	436
York, Pa.	500	25,000	90	253	214	12.0	101	86
Low Licence.								
Stamford, Conn.	\$ 450	13,000	40	627	334	30.8	482	257
Elkhart, Ind.	350	15,000	23	341	236	15.3	227	157
Springfield, Ohio.	275	37,000	141	1,763	693	38.1	477	187
Canton, Ohio.	250	39,000	100	1,152	681	25.6	236	172
Cincinnati, Ohio.	250	340,000	2,100	16,356	4,769	61.8	481	140
Dayton, Ohio.	250	79,331	475	4,695	442	59.9	952	56
Ironton, Ohio.	250	13,000	35	766	396	29.9	589	305
Ithaca, N. Y.	250	15,000	30	355	263	20.0	237	175
Marion, Ohio.	250	11,000	42	136	122	38.2	124	111
Masillon, Ohio.	250	15,000	63	58	29	42.0	39	19
New York, N. Y.	250	1,919,845	8,082	112,997	60,732	42.1	589	316
Portsmouth, Va.	250	16,000	36	1,166	617	22.5	726	386
Richmond, Ind.	250	22,000	49	c 720	c 380	32.3	327	173
Toledo, Ohio.	250	125,000	750	3,675	953	30.0	294	76
West Chester, Pa.	250	10,000	10	d 176	d 143	10.0	176	143
Youngstown, Ohio.	250	42,000	183	2,983	1,702	43.6	710	405
Michigan City, Ind.	225	14,000	44	190	85	31.4	136	61
Fort Wayne, Ind.	204	45,000	150	1,156	578	33.3	257	128
Albany, N. Y.	200	100,000	662	3,173	1,656	66.2	317	166
Appleton, Wis.	200	18,000	62	789	286	34.4	438	159
Brooklyn, N. Y.	206	1,275,000	4,287	44,917	30,003	33.6	352	235
Greenbay, Wis.	200	20,000	191	465	373	95.5	233	187
La Crosse, Wis.	200	30,000	160	805	700	53.3	268	233
Madison, Wis.	200	16,000	76	439	181	47.5	274	113
South Bend, Ind.	200	35,000	90	1,000	464	25.7	287	133
Watertown, Wis.	200	10,000	60	115	40	60.0	115	40
Braddock, Pa.	150	18,000	39	1,283	939	21.7	713	522
Mt. Carmel, Pa.	150	13,000	69	200	110	53.1	154	85
Pottstown, Pa.	150	17,000	17	211	137	10.0	125	81
Shamokin, Pa.	150	18,000	72	192	172	40.0	107	96
S. Bethlehem, Pa.	150	14,000	42	214	174	30.0	151	124
Oswego, N. Y.	125	25,000	123	676	416	49.2	270	162
Auburn, N. Y.	100	28,000	150	984	608	53.6	352	216
La Fayette, Ind.	100	25,000	85	1,768	920	34.0	707	368
Logansport, Ind.	100	18,000	50	676	327	27.8	376	187
Newburg, N. Y.	90	23,000	176	697	443	76.5	303	193
Yonkers, N. Y.	85	38,000	146	1,487	714	38.4	389	188
Binghamton, N. Y.	80	50,000	105	1,462	778	21.0	292	156
Corning, N. Y.	75	12,000	50	357	195	41.7	298	163
Hornellsville, N. Y.	75	13,000	60	596	401	46.2	458	308
Hudson, N. Y.	75	10,000	101	424	228	101.0	424	228
Schenectady, N. Y.	75	27,000	178	958	484	65.9	355	161

c. Year ending April 30, 1895. d. Eight months only.

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS IN 95 CITIES—1895 (*concluded*).

CITIES.	Licence Fee,	Estimated Population,	Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Arrests Largely Due to Drink.	PER 10,000 POPULATOIN.		
						Saloons,	Total Arrests.	Drunks, Etc.
Low Licence.								
Watertown, N. Y....	75	22,000	20	447	186	9.1	203	55
Utica, N. Y.	65	50,000	500	1,807	915	100.0	361	183
Amsterdam, N. Y...	60	20,000	145	497	276	72.5	249	138
Jeffersonville, Ind..	50	12,000	40	360	288	33.3	300	240
New Albany, Ind..	50	27,000	96	1,614	355	35.6	598	132
Glens Falls, N. Y..	40	12,000	91	340	272	75.8	283	227
Lansingburgh, N.Y.	30	13,000	74	266	144	56.9	205	111
Summary.								
Forty-six High Licence Cities	\$2,000 to \$500	5,929,919	14,434	288,907	163,395	24.3	487	275
Forty-nine Low Licence Cities	\$450 to \$30	4,780,176	19,270	208,537	116,288	40.3	438	243
Totals, 95 Cities..		10,710,095	33,704	497,444	279,683	71.5	464	261

Like all the preceding investigations of this sort, this last showed plainly and unmistakably that high licence did not diminish the criminality due to intemperance. Though according to the summary there were nearly twice as many saloons, in proportion to the population, in the low-licence as in the high-licence cities, yet the 46 high-licence cities averaged for the year 275 arrests due to drink per 10,000 inhabitants, the 49 low-licence cities 243 such arrests per 10,000 inhabitants. As to the total number of arrests per 10,000 people the high-licence cities were similarly in excess.

Later statistics bearing upon the effects of high licence were published in Bulletin No. 30 of the Department of Labor at Washington, issued in September, 1900. These statistics make possible the following comparison between 69 high-licence cities,

12 low-licence cities, 9 prohibition cities and 1 dispensary city (Charleston, South Carolina):

LIQUOR POLICY.	Average population (Census of 1900.)	Average number of Licensed Saloons.	Average of ar- rests attributable to drink. ¹	Average of total Arrests.	Per 1,000 In- habitants.			Percentage of Deaths from Al- coholism.
					Number of Saloons.	Drink Arrests.	Total Arrests.	
High Licence.....	50,270	141	1,383	2,556	2.82	27.6	51.1	.31
Low Licence.....	48,709	155	2,009	3,936	3.16	41.0	80.3	.23
Dispensary.....	55,807	1,605	3,261	28.6	58.2	.26
Prohibition.....	49,891	1,032	1,816	19.8	35.6	.12

¹ Includes "disorderly conduct," "drunkenness," "disturbing the peace," and "assault and battery."

The lesson in high licence, costly as it was, was a wholesome one. It showed the reformers, as nothing else could have done, that the only remedy for the evils of the saloon was no saloon; that so long as the liquor traffic was tolerated in any form its evils would continue unabated; that the policy of the temperance reform must be—no compromise.

CHAPTER XI.

THE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION, AND OTHER POST-BELLUM TEMPERANCE MOVEMENTS.

IN the temperance movements before the Civil War, woman took little or no part. While she was the greatest sufferer from the evils of intemperance—chiefly the intemperance of others—she bore her affliction in silence and patience. The Pauline injunction, that women “keep silence,” was observed in the world of reform as well as “in the churches.” The woman who had views, who expressed opinions, and who was reputed to have a strong mind, was a person to be avoided. Thinking was considered outside of woman's sphere of activity; it was generally recognised, together with making speeches and getting drunk, as a monopoly of the sterner sex. The organisation of temperance societies, and temperance agitation in general, were likewise considered beyond the boundaries of woman's sphere.* The *ante-bellum* temperance fraternal societies did not admit women to full membership; their auxiliary societies for women were formed largely for social purposes. This was true even after the Civil War.

But early in the seventies, a series of incidents occurred which resulted in arousing the women of the nation to take a hand in the reform. In the

* See Appendix A, Chapter XI.

year 1870 the old Adair liquor law of 1854 was so amended by the Ohio Legislature as to permit women to sue saloon-keepers for damages arising from the sale of liquor to inebriate husbands. On the evening of January 22, 1872, Mrs. E. D. Stewart (afterward famous as "Mother Stewart") delivered a lecture at Allen's Hall, Springfield, on the subject of temperance. At the close of the address, Mr. C. M. Nichols, editor of the *Springfield Republic*, suggested that the ladies present pledge themselves to urge the wives of drunkards to sue saloon-keepers under this law. The response was favourable. Two days later Mrs. Stewart opened the campaign in a local justice court, where a woman with two ragged children was prosecuting a saloon-keeper for wrecking her husband's life by selling him liquor. At her attorney's request, Mrs. Stewart addressed the jury and a verdict of one hundred dollars was secured. These events attracted attention throughout the state, and were the beginning of much trouble for the saloon-keepers.

In December, 1872, Mrs. Stewart was invited to deliver a lecture in the little town of Osborn. At the close of the meeting the women, with the assistance of the Rev. Mr. Cummings, pastor of the local Presbyterian church, organised a *Woman's League*. Mrs. A. B. Lee was chosen president, and Mrs. Hargrave secretary. To Osborn belongs, therefore, the credit for the first of the organizations which afterwards merged in the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union*.

On December 14, 1873, Dr. Dio Lewis spoke at Fredonia, New York, and told of his mother and her friends praying against the liquor traffic which was destroying their homes. Incited by the address, the

women of the town formed a society of a hundred and twenty-seven members, and chose Mrs. Judge Barker president and leader. The saloon-keepers were appealed to, but the appeal was not successful, and the work was abandoned. A similar incident occurred in Jamestown, New York, on December 17, where a praying band of sixty-two women visited all the saloons. The saloons did not close.

On the evening of December 23, Dr. Lewis lectured on temperance at Hillsboro, Ohio. There he told the same story of his mother's prayers and made the same appeal to the women. Seventy-five of them, after some deliberation, chose a committee of three to write an appeal to the rum sellers, to be prepared by the following morning. These three were Mrs. Eliza J. Thompson, wife of Judge Thompson and daughter of ex-Governor Trimble, of Ohio; Mrs. P. J. Evans and Mrs. E. L. Girard. At the morning meeting, the seventy-five women signed the following compact and seventy-five men pledged their moral and pecuniary support:

"We, the ladies whose names are hereto appended, agree and resolve with God's help we will stand by each other in this work, and persevere therein until it is accomplished, and see to it, as far as our influence goes, that the traffic shall never be revived."

The story of that memorable meeting is best told by Mother Thompson:

"Few comments were made at our house upon this new line of policy until after breakfast the next morning [the morning of the meeting], when, just as we had gathered about the hearthstone, my daughter Mary said very gently, 'Mother, will you go to the meeting this morning?' Hesitatingly I replied: 'I don't know yet what I shall do.' My husband fully appreciating the

responsibility of the moment, said: 'Children, let us leave your mother alone; for you know where she goes with all vexed questions,' and, pointing to the old family Bible, left the room. The awful responsibility of the step that I must needs take was wonderfully relieved by the thought of the 'cloudy pillar' and 'parted waters' of the past; hence, with confidence, I was about turning my eye of faith 'up to the hills' from whence had come my help, when, in response to a gentle tap at the door, I met my dear Mary, who, with her Bible in hand and tearful eye, said: 'Mother, I opened to the 146th Psalm, and I believe it is for you.' She withdrew and I sat down to read the wonderful message from God. As I read what I had so often read before, the Spirit so strangely 'took of the things of God,' and showed me new meaning. I no longer hesitated, but, in the strength thus imparted, started to the scene of action.

"Upon entering the church, I was startled to find myself chosen their leader. The old Bible was taken down from the desk, and the 146th Psalm read. Mrs. General McDowell, by request, led in prayer, and, although she had never before heard her own voice in a public prayer, on this occasion 'the tongue of fire' sat upon her, and all were deeply affected. Mrs. Cowden, our Methodist minister's wife, was then requested to sing to a familiar air,

" 'Give to the winds thy fears,
 Hope and be undismayed;
 God hears thy sighs and counts thy tears:
 He will lift up thy head.'

"And whilst thus engaged, the women (seventy-five in number) fell in line, two and two, and proceeded first to the drug stores and then to the hotels and saloons."

This first sally was partly successful; two druggists signed the pledge and another sued the women for ten thousand dollars' damages for disturbing his business.

The next day Dr. Lewis spoke in Washington, Ohio, and a similar campaign was begun there. On the Monday following, the first saloon-keeper surrendered, telling the women to take his stock and do with it what they chose. All of the liquors were poured into the gutters in the presence of a thousand men, women and children. In the eight days of the campaign in Washington, all of the eleven saloons were closed and the three drug stores agreed to sell on prescriptions only. Thus the great crusade was inaugurated. The uprising of the women spread to other towns and cities with remarkable rapidity. At Waynesburg, all of the saloons were closed for the first time in seventy-six years. At Xenia, twenty-five of the forty-seven saloons closed their doors. Similar results were achieved in many places. In some towns, the women were assaulted, mobbed and hooted. Saloon-keepers hired brass bands to follow them and drown their voices. In Cincinnati forty-three women, led by Mrs. S. K. Leavitt, were arrested for "obstructing the sidewalk." In Cleveland the liquor dealers organised mobs to assault the crusaders, but soon regretted their action. A thousand business men not only rallied to protect the women, but also sought evidence of violations of the law by liquor dealers, which was presented to the grand jury. The result was that nine hundred indictments were secured against the liquor dealers.

The spirit of the crusade quickly swept across the borders of the state. The women of Indiana, led by such heroic women as Aurette Hoyt and Mrs. Governor Wallace, entered heartily into the work. The prayer bands in Illinois developed the immortal Frances E. Willard. Elizabeth Comstock and Mary T. Lathrap were the product of the crusade in Michi-

gan. Pennsylvania brought to the front Mrs. Annie Wittenmyer; Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Iowa, New York, Nebraska, California, Oregon and Maryland entered heartily into the campaigns. At Fort Scott, Kansas, a saloon-keeper advertised a "free lunch." The praying band brought a crowd of twenty-one hungry, ragged children of drunkards to the feast.

Frances Willard has thus described the spirit and methods of the crusaders:

"That women should thus dare was a wonder, after they had so long endured, while the manner of their doing left us who looked on, bewildered between laughter and tears. Woman-like, they took their knitting, their zephyr work or their embroidery, and simply swarmed into the drink-shops, seated themselves, and watched the proceedings. Usually they came in a long procession from their rendezvous at some church where they had held morning prayer-meeting; entered the saloon with kind faces, and the sweet songs of church and home upon their lips, while some Madonna-like leader with the Gospel in her looks, took her stand beside the bar, and gently asked if she might read God's word and offer prayer.

"Women gave of their best during the two months of that wonderful uprising. All other engagements were laid aside; elegant women of society walked beside quiet women of home, school and shop, in the strange processions that soon lined the chief streets, not only of nearly every town and village in the state that was its birthplace, but of leading cities there and elsewhere; and voices trained in Paris and Berlin sang "Rock of Ages, cleft for me," in the malodorous air of liquor-rooms and beer-halls. Meanwhile, where were the men who patronised these places? Thousands of them signed the pledge these women brought, and accepted their invitation to go back with them to the churches, whose doors, for once, stood open all day long; others slunk out of sight, and a few cursed the

women openly ; but even of these it might be said, that those who came to curse remained to pray. Soon the saloonkeepers surrendered in large numbers, the statement being made by a well-known observer that the liquor traffic was temporarily driven out of two hundred and fifty towns and villages in Ohio and the adjoining states, to which the temperance crusade extended. There are photographs extant representing the stirring scenes when, amid the ringing of church-bells, the contents of every barrel, cask and bottle in a saloon were sent gurgling into the gutter, the owner insisting that women's hands alone should do this work, perhaps with some dim thought in his muddled head of the poetic justice due to the Nemesis he thus invoked. And so it came about that soft and often jeweled hands grasped axe and hammer, while the whole town assembled to rejoice in this new fashion of exorcising the evil spirits."

The praying bands were purely local affairs. In many places the only organisation consisted in choosing a leader. The women soon felt the need of better organisation to perpetuate and direct the work. The result was that several state conferences were held in the spring of 1874, some of which organised state leagues or unions. In August of the same year, the plan of a national organisation of women was discussed at the first National Sunday-school Assembly, held at Chautauqua, New York. The following circular, which was sent broadcast over the country, tells the results of the discussion :

"WOMAN'S NATIONAL TEMPERANCE LEAGUE.

"During the session of the National Sunday-School Assembly at Chautauqua Lake, several large and enthusiastic temperance meetings were held. Many of the most earnest workers in the woman's temperance movement from different parts of the Union and different denominations of Christians were present, and the con-

viction was general that a more favourable opportunity would not soon be presented for taking the preliminary steps towards organising a national league to make permanent the grand work of the last few months.

“After much deliberation and prayer, a committee on organisation was appointed, consisting of one lady from each state, to interest temperance workers in this effort. A national convention was appointed to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, during the month of November, the exact date to be fixed by the committee on organisation. The chairman and secretary of the Chautauqua meeting were authorised to issue a circular letter, asking the Woman’s Temperance Leagues to hold conventions for the purpose of electing one woman from each congressional district as a delegate to the national convention.

“It is hardly necessary to remind those who have worked so nobly in the grand temperance uprising that in union and organisation are its success and permanence, and the consequent redemption of this land from the curse of intemperance. In the name of our Master—in behalf of the thousands of women who suffer from this terrible evil—we call upon all to unite in an earnest, continued effort to hold the ground already won, and to move onward together to a complete victory over the foe we fight.

“The ladies already elected members of the committee on organisation are Mrs. Dr. Ganse, Philadelphia; Mrs. E. J. Knowles, Newark, N. J.; Mrs. Mattie McClellan Brown, Alliance, O.; Mrs. Dr. Steele, Appleton, Wis.; Mrs. W. D. Barnett, Hiawatha, Kan.; Mrs. Aretta Hoyt, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mrs. Ingham Stanton, Le Roy, N. Y.; Mrs. Frances Crooks, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Emma Janes, Oakland, Cal.

“JENNIE F. WILLING, Chairman.

“EMILY HUNTINGTON MILLER,

“Secretary of the Chautauqua Meeting.”

The convention provided for by this circular

met in Cleveland, November 18–20, 1874.* Mrs. Willing was chosen president of the convention. A society was organised, to be known as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. "There was," says Miss Willard, the chief historian as well as leader of the Union, "some debate about inserting the word 'Christian' in the name of our society, the point being made that to leave it out would broaden and thus benefit the platform; but then, as always since, the convention said by its deeds: "We are not here to seek a large following, but to do what we think right."

The object of the new organisation, as Miss Willard says, was "to preserve the fruits of the crusade victory—indeed it may justly be called the sober second thought of that unparalleled uprising." At this first convention, she says, "something divine was in the air—a breath of the new dispensation. Introductions were at a discount—we shook hands all round, and have been comrades ever since. . . . Very few could make a speech at that early period—we gave speechlets instead, off-hand talks of from five to fifteen minutes. The daily prayer meetings were times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. There was no waiting; everything was fresh, tender and spontaneous." The spirit of the convention is shown in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That, recognising that our cause is, and will be, combated by mighty, determined and relentless forces we will, trusting in Him who is the Prince of Peace, meet argument with argument, misjudgment with patience, denunciation with kindness, and all our difficulties and dangers with prayer."

The first officers of the W. C. T. U., chosen at this

* See Appendix B, Chap. XI.

Cleveland convention were: Mrs. Annie Wittenmyer, of Philadelphia, president; Frances E. Willard, of Chicago, corresponding secretary; Mrs. Mary C. Johnson, of Brooklyn, recording secretary, and Mrs. Mary A. Ingham, of Cleveland, treasurer.* Among the other prominent women present were Mrs. J. Ellen Foster of Iowa, Mrs. Mary T. Lathrop of Michigan, Mrs. Governor Wallace of Indiana, Mother Stewart and Mother Thompson of Ohio.

When the woman's crusade began in Ohio, in the winter of 1873-4, Frances E. Willard was dean of the Woman's College and professor of æsthetics in Northwestern University, in Evanston, Illinois. She had grown up in a devout Methodist home, and temperance was with her as much a matter of course as religion. The reports of the crusade awoke her intense interest, and when the agitation reached Chicago (of which Evanston is a suburb) and the women there began to hold meetings, she was invited to address several of them. She already had more than a local reputation for her addresses on literary, educational, and religious subjects. She soon became well known as an advocate of temperance.

In the summer of 1874 she resigned her position in Northwestern University, and, though her services were much sought for in other quarters, took leave entirely of her profession to devote herself to the work of the new woman's temperance society of Chicago, of which she was made president. At her suggestion the little band adopted as its motto, "For God and Home and Native Land," later adopted by the Illinois Union and in 1876 by the national body.

At first Miss Willard's position was pathetic. "Many a time," she says in her autobiography, "I

* See Appendix C, Chap. XI.



MRS. ELIZA J. THOMPSON.

"Mother Thompson" of the white ribboners around the world. Also known as the "Crusade Mother." Of Virginian ancestry. Daughter of an Ohio governor and wife of a distinguished judge. Was a power in the Crusade movement, and helped to lay the foundation of the W. C. T. U.



"MOTHER STEWART."

Leader of the first great Woman's Crusade. Born in Piquette town, Ohio, 1816. Acquired a sound education under difficulties. Always in the front in patriotic, philanthropic and Christian work. When the war broke out, her husband and sons fought, and she nursed the "boys in blue," who lovingly called her "Mother Stewart."





THE LATE MRS. MARY TORRANS LATHRAP.

"The Daniel Webster of the Temperance Reform." Born in Concord, Jackson Co., Mich., 1838. Died in Jackson, 1895. After finishing her education, taught for some years. Licensed to preach in 1872. Became a mighty power in prohibition work. Her words were logical, brave and inspiring.



MISS EVA MARSHALL SHONTZ.

Dramatic reader and prohibition lecturer. Born in Iowa in 1864. Educated in public schools and Monmouth College. Subsequently graduated from National School of Oratory, Pa. In her selections and original addresses she is a powerful advocate of the home against the saloon.

went without my noonday lunch down town because I had no money with which to buy, and many a mile did I walk because I had not the requisite nickel for street-car riding."

But more encouraging prospects soon arose. In the autumn of 1874 she was sent as a delegate to the first convention of the Illinois W. C. T. U., which was called by Mrs. J. F. Willing at Bloomington. There Miss Willard was made secretary of the State Union. In November of the same year, as has been said, she was made the first corresponding secretary of the national organisation. Thus began the career of her, whose energy, whose marvellous inventiveness and fertility of plan, whose magnetism and ability to inspire courage and zeal in others, whose broad mind, whose "sweet reasonableness," whose generous soul capable of the blithest gaiety and humour, and of the most profound love, devotion, and sympathy, have formed the greatest single influence in the history of the W. C. T. U., and have given to the world one of its greatest characters.

Eighteen States were represented at the first convention. During the following year six new State organisations were added and scores of local Unions. This growth continued at a rapid rate. Miss Willard's personal influence contributed largely to it. In 1880 she and her secretary, Anna Gordon, visited all of the Southern states, introducing a knowledge of the organisation, its spirit and purposes. In 1883, she visited every state in the Union, and most of the provinces of Canada, holding conventions and arousing great enthusiasm.

To-day the W. C. T. U. is organised not only in every State and Territory of the United States, including Hawaii, but in every quarter of the globe.

It has an organisation in fifty nations and a membership of about half a million. It is the largest society composed of and conducted by women which has ever existed.

As it grew in size, its work grew in extent and diversity. The leader in this development was Miss Willard. At the national convention of 1879, held at Indianapolis, she was elected to the presidency of the Union, which she held until her death in 1898. She was chosen on the issue of a broader policy for the society. The principal subject upon which she differed from the conservative party which had controlled the Union during its first five years, was her advocacy of woman's suffrage, and of this more will be said presently. But she also introduced new and better methods of organization and new plans for the society's work.

At her recommendation the work was divided into six divisions: Preventive, Educational, Evangelistic, Social, Legal, and Organisation. This classification was introduced at Boston in 1880, and has been ever since adhered to. The division of Preventive work to-day includes the department of Health and Heredity, with its sub-department of Sanitation and Domestic Science, and the department of Non-Alcoholic Medication. The Educational division includes the following departments: Scientific Temperance Instruction, Physical Education, Sunday School, Temperance Literature, Presenting the Cause to Influential Bodies, Temperance and Labour, Parliamentary Usage, W. C. T. U. Institutes, Press, Anti-Narcotics, School Savings Banks, Kindergarten, and Medal Contests. The Evangelistic departments are the following: Evangelistic and Almshouse, Unfermented Sacramental Wine, Proportionate and Systematic



Giving, Penal and Reformatory Work, Work among Railroad Employees, Work among Soldiers and Sailors, Work among Lumbermen, Work among Miners, Sabbath Observance, Mercy, Purity, Rescue Work, and Purity in Literature and Art. The Social departments are these: Social meetings and Red Letter Days, Flower Mission, and Fairs and Open Air Meetings. The Legal departments: Legislation, Christian Citizenship, Franchise, and Peace and International Arbitration. Finally, the organisation division includes the general Department of Organisation, and three departments for work among foreign-speaking people, coloured people, and Indians.

Each of these thirty-nine departments is under the control of a national superintendent, an arrangement due largely to Miss Willard. At the convention of 1880 the system of standing committees theretofore prevailing, was abandoned, on the principle, as Miss Willard says, that "if Noah had appointed a committee the ark would still be on the stocks."

The evolution of the present comprehensive system of the Union's work is thus described by Miss Willard:

"The crusade showed them the drinking man, and they began upon him directly, to get him to sign the pledge and seek 'the Lord behind the pledge.' The crusade showed them the selling man, and they prayed over him and persuaded him to give up his bad business. . . . But oftentimes the drinking man went back to his cups, and the selling man fell from his grace. . . . Upon this the women, still with their concrete ways of thinking, said: 'To be sure, we must train our boys, and not ours only, but everybody's. What institution reaches all? The public school.' To the inane excuse of the seller that he might as well do

it since somebody would, the quick and practical reply was : ‘ To be sure ; but suppose the people could be persuaded not to let anybody sell? . . . ’ So they began with petitions to municipalities, to Legislatures, and to Congress, laboriously gathering up, doubtless, not fewer than ten million names. . . . Meanwhile it was inevitable that their motherly hearts should devise other methods for the protection of their homes. Knowing the terrors and the blessings of inheritance, they set about the systematic study of heredity, founding a journal for that purpose. Learning the relations of diet to the drink habit, they arranged to study hygienics also ; desiring children to know that the Bible is on the side of total abstinence, they induced the International Sunday-school Convention to prepare a plan for lessons on this subject ; perceiving the limitless power of the press, they did their best to subsidise it by sending out their bulletins of temperance facts and news items, thick as the leaves of Vallambrosa, and incorporated a publishing company of women.”

During the first year of the W. C. T. U., a monthly paper, called the *Woman's Temperance Union*, was established. It was edited at first by Mrs. Willing, with Mrs. Johnson and Miss Willard as corresponding editors, and published by Mrs. Wittenmyer.

The *Union* continued as the national organ until 1882, when it was removed to Chicago and combined with the *Signal*, a paper which had been founded by Mrs. T. B. Carse in 1880, as the organ of the Illinois W. C. T. U. The *Union Signal* has since that time been the national organ. Its first editor was Mrs. Mary B. Willard. Its present editor (1902) is Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, president of the National W. C. T. U.; Miss Margaret A. Sudduth is its managing editor. Forty-four other periodicals are now pub-



MRS. ELIA ALEXANDER BOOLE, M.A.

Born in Van Wert, O., in 1838. Graduated from Wooster University, and was subsequently Professor of Languages and Higher Mathematics. Later took the platform on behalf of advanced temperance reform. Is clear, forcible and logical, and does grand work for the cause.



MRS. L. M. N. STEVENS.

Born in Dover, Maine, in 1844. Good college education. A staunch advocate of prohibition by law. For nearly quarter of a century has led in many lines of moral and charitable reform. She is an all-round personality, and her influence, though quiet, is far-reaching.





THE REV. HENRIETTA G. MOORE.

Born in Newark, Ohio, U.S. Educated at public and private schools. A teacher at 15; grammar school principal later. Subsequently became a most successful organizer and lecturer in temperance reform. In 1895 ran on straight prohibition ticket, and was elected by splendid majority to the Board of Education.



THE LATE MARY A. WOODBRIDGE.

Born in Nantucket in 1830. Prominent temperance reformer. One time editor of "The Amendment Herald"—wielded a forceful pen, was a strong, logical and inspiring speaker, and had executive ability of the highest order. Her death was a great loss. Her biography is rich in helpfulness.

lished by the W. C. T. U. in various parts of the world.

As early as the summer of 1875, Miss Willard determined to "speak for woman's ballot as a weapon of protection to her home and tempted loved ones from the tyranny of drink." At the Illinois State convention at Dixon in that year she offered this resolution: "*Resolved*, That since woman is the greatest sufferer from the rum curse, she ought to have power to close the dram-shop door over against her home." She recalled later the quiet emphasis of the presiding officer as she said, "What will you do with this woman suffrage resolution;" the decisive tones of the treasurer as she said, "I move we lay it on the table;" . . . the painful heartbeats of suspense, and the joyful surprise when no one seconded the motion; then the debate, when a brave voice . . . broke the stillness with 'I move it be adopted.'" The latter motion was carried.

At the national convention, held in Newark, New Jersey, in 1876, she again presented her argument on this subject, in spite of the remonstrance of conservative friends. After her speech the chairwoman of the meeting, Mrs. Allen Butler, said: "I wish it clearly understood that the speaker represents herself and not the W. C. T. U., for we do not propose to trail our skirts through the mire of politics;" and as Miss Willard left the hall the national president said regretfully to her: "You might have been a leader, but now you'll be only a scout."

It was only three years later when Miss Willard was made the commander-in-chief of the woman's army; and in 1880, at Boston, the national convention endorsed woman's suffrage. In her address to

this convention Miss Willard spoke not only for herself, but for the Union, when she said:

“A horde of ignorant voters, committed to the rum power, fastens the dram-shop like a leech on our communities; but let the republic take notice that our Unions are training an army to offset this horde, one which will be the only army of voters specifically educated to their duty which has ever yet come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty. For slowly but surely the reflex of this mighty reform, born in church and nurtured at the crusade altars, is educating women to the level of two most solemn and ominous ideas: 1st. That they ought to vote; 2d. That they ought to vote against the grog-shops.”

At the next convention, held in Washington, the Department of Franchise was added to the national organisation, whose duty it should be to furnish advice, instruction, and assistance” to States which might desire them, in inaugurating measures for securing and using woman’s ballot in the interest of temperance.” Here also that veteran champion of the social, legal, and political rights of woman, Susan B. Anthony, was present as a visitor, and was introduced to the convention.

The attitude toward woman’s suffrage thus indicated has been ever since that time one of the cardinal principles of the W. C. T. U. The Department of Franchise to-day is one of the most important, and its duty is no longer merely “to furnish advice, etc., to States that so desire,” but “to secure in whole or in part the ballot for women as a weapon of protection for their homes from the liquor traffic and its attendant evils, and finally to obtain the right of women to vote on equal terms with men;” and to work toward these ends “in each State, district,

county and local Union." The espousal and declaration of the same principle by the Prohibition party was one of the chief reasons for the cordial friendship of the Union toward that party.

This friendship did not begin with the Presidential campaign of 1876, nor yet with that of 1880. In the latter year the name of the Republican candidate, Mr. Garfield, was cheered whenever mentioned in the W. C. T. U. national convention, and the Union stood solidly for him, although Neal Dow was in the field as the Prohibition candidate. They believed Garfield was the friend of temperance and prohibition. They were quickly disappointed; they found that he was a better friend to his own and his party's political advancement. Miss Willard was one of a delegation which waited upon him in 1881, and the surprise and grief which his constrained and cold manner of receiving them gave her was the beginning of a train of thought which led her within a year to revolutionise her own and the Union's policy with respect to political parties.

In August, 1881, Miss Willard met Dr. A. J. Jutkins and Col. George Bain of Kentucky, and John B. Finch of Nebraska, later the chairman of the National committee of the Prohibition party, at a temperance convocation at Lake Bluff, Illinois. With these men she joined in founding a new political party, the Home Protection party, whose cornerstone was the demand for "the constitutional and statutory prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages in the State and nation." Its executive committee consisted of Miss Willard, Dr. Jutkins, and Mr. R. W. Nelson, the young editor of a Prohibition paper of Chicago called the *Liberator*.

At the next national convention of the W. C. T. U.

Miss Willard determined not merely herself to support the principle of a political party specially devoted and pledged to prohibition, but to urge the Union to take the same attitude officially. This had already been done by the Illinois State Union. Miss Willard in her address to the national convention (Washington, 1881) urged the endorsement of the Home Protection party by the National Union.

“ Here, then, at the nation’s capital [she said] let us declare our allegiance ; here let us turn our faces toward the beckoning future ; here, where the liquor traffic pours in, each year, its revenue of gold, stained with the blood of our dearest and best, let us set up our Home Protection standard in the name of the Lord.”

The Washington convention was not willing to follow its leader. But in the next year (1882), at Louisville, Kentucky, Miss Willard renewed her appeal, and the convention now almost unanimously adopted the following resolution :

Resolved, That we rejoice in the day that gives recognition to our prohibition principles by political partisans and we will endeavour to influence the best men in all communities to commit themselves to that party, by whatever name called, that shall give to them the best embodiment of prohibition principles, and will most surely protect our homes.”

A few months before this action was taken (in 1882) a joint convention of the Home Protection party and the Prohibition Reform party, had met in Farwell Hall, in Chicago, and had merged the two organisations into one, under the name of “ the Prohibition Home Protection party,” with Gideon T. Stewart as its national chairman. This, then, was the

party designated but not named in the resolution quoted.

At the national convention of 1883, in Detroit, Miss Willard said:

“Oh, friends, God hath not left Himself without a witness. There is still a party in the land to be helped onward to success by women. There is one now despised for the single reason that it lacks majorities and commands no high positions as the rewards of skilful leadership or wily caucusing, but which declares as its cardinal doctrine, that a government is impotent indeed which cannot protect the lowliest home within its borders from the aggressions of the vilest saloon that would destroy that home. It declares all other issues trifling when compared with this, and insists that the ‘home guards’ shall be armed with the ballot as a home protection weapon. Here, then, let us invest our loyalty, our faith and works, our songs and prayers. To-day that party is Endymion, the unknown youth, but the friendship of Diana, the clear-eyed queen of heaven, shall make for it friends, everywhere, until it becomes regnant, and the two reign side by side.”

The convention reaffirmed, substantially, its political declaration of the previous year.

At this convention, however, an effort was begun to induce other political parties, besides the Prohibition Home Protection party, to declare for prohibition. A memorial to this effect, to be presented to all the nominating conventions of the following year, was adopted. This memorial was presented by Miss Willard to four political conventions in 1884. First it was submitted to the Greenback convention, which responded, indeed, but only with a colourless statement that “for the purpose of testing the sense of the people” the party favoured submitting to the people an amendment to the Constitution relative to the liquor traffic. At the Republican convention, the

committee on resolutions received the ladies, Miss Willard, Mrs. Mary B. Willard and Miss Helen L. Hood, with a lack of courtesy and consideration amounting to rudeness. Senator Blair, while introducing them, was interrupted by a motion to fix the time to be allowed the petitioners. He proposed half an hour, which was greeted by cries of no, and the committee gave them fifteen minutes. Miss Willard made her appeal and withdrew, and the committee and the convention ignored the memorial. The same procedure, except the appearance of Miss Willard before the platform committee, occurred in the Democratic convention.

Then Miss Willard went to the Prohibition Home Protection party's convention at Pittsburg. She herself presented her memorial, which was instantly adopted by the convention with cheers. The Kansas delegation asked her to second on their behalf the nomination of Mr. St. John for President, which she did in a brilliant speech. She was made a member of the committee on resolutions and helped to draw up the platform described in its proper place in Chapter XII.

The national convention of the W. C. T. U. held in this same year (1884) at St. Louis, declared:

"As we now know which national party gives us the desired embodiment of the principles for which our ten years' labor has been expended, we will continue to lend our influence to the national political organization which declares in its platform for national prohibition and home protection."

This resolution was reaffirmed in 1885. In 1886 an amendment to the constitution of the W. C. T. U. offered by Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, to the effect that the Union should be "non-sectarian in religion, and non-partisan in political work," was rejected. Cordial

endorsement of the Prohibition party was repeated at every subsequent national convention until 1896, an attitude which caused Mrs. J. Ellen Foster and a few others who opposed it, to secede from the society in 1889, and to form a separate society called "the Non-Partisan W. C. T. U."

In 1896, for the first time, the Prohibition party omitted a declaration for woman's suffrage from its platform. This omission was a contributing cause of the withdrawal of a section of the party and their organisation into the national party, later called "the Liberty party," which declared for woman suffrage. This event was the beginning of a period of greatly diminished cordiality for the Prohibition party on the part of the W. C. T. U. At the national convention of 1896, held in St. Louis, the question of the political attitude of the Union was earnestly debated. The traditional resolution of friendship to the party which upheld prohibition and woman suffrage would have committed the Union to the National party. The endorsement of a party which stood for prohibition alone appeared to be an abandonment of a cardinal principle. This dilemma was avoided by adopting the following resolution:

Resolved, That we reaffirm our well-considered utterances of the past, in which we pledge our sympathy to any political party, by whatsoever name called, that furnishes in its platform the best embodiment of our principles—absolute prohibition of the manufacture and sale of liquor, and the protection of our homes by the enfranchisement of women.

Resolved, That this resolution refers only to the future."

In the convention of 1897 no resolution was passed on the subject, but Miss Willard said:

“ I have moved, seconded, and unanimously adopted in my inner consciousness the resolution which I now read:

“ *Resolved*, That my prayers and influence are with the Prohibition party and the Liberal party, which as I honestly and earnestly believe represent the best element in politics, and that I send them a respectful and sisterly request to form again as one party instead of two, and to include woman’s suffrage as a plank in their platform, and to adopt as their name, ‘ the Home Protection party.’ ”

Miss Willard died in New York City on February 17, 1898. The convention held in the autumn of that year in St. Paul, Minnesota, passed the following resolution: “ Resolved that we pledge our moral influence and support to that party, by whatever name called, which shall serve as the best embodiment of the prohibition of the liquor traffic.” The two following national conventions took no action regarding the party question, though that of 1900 resolved: “ We wish here to express our grateful appreciation to all churches and organisations, to men and women of all classes, creeds and conditions who have in any way helped to establish this righteous principle.” At the convention of 1901, in Fort Worth, Texas, the following resolution was moved:

“ Realizing that the Prohibition party is the only political organisation in America which stands for the protection of the home against the liquor traffic, we declare ourselves in full sympathy with it and offer our hearty co-operation.”

This was withdrawn on account of great opposition, and the following was passed instead: “ We desire to express our gratitude to the men who at the ballot

box represent the principles we are working to see incorporated in the government.”

While the W. C. T. U. was flourishing in the United States, as related above, it was also being planted in many other parts of the world as well. The spirit of the crusade of 1873-4 in the United States spread to Great Britain. In Dundee, Scotland, nine hundred wives, mothers, and sisters petitioned the magistrate to reduce the number of public houses. They were successful. Other towns followed the example of Dundee, and on April 21, 1876, a convention representing women's temperance societies in many parts of the kingdom assembled in Newcastle-on-Tyne, and, following the example of the American women, organised the British Women's Temperance Association. The convention was called by Mrs. Margaret Parker, who had visited America and had seen the W. C. T. U. there. The first W. C. T. U. of Canada was formed in 1874 at Owen Sound by Mrs. R. J. Boyle. Others soon followed, Mrs. Letitia Youmans being the principal pioneer.

An attempt was made in 1876 to organize an International W. C. T. U. to embrace the organisations of the United States, Canada and Britain, but it did not prosper. Miss Willard made a second beginning in 1883. She recommended to the national convention of that year the appointment of a committee to report plans for a World's W. C. T. U. The committee was composed of the officers of the National W. C. T. U. They sent Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt on her famous round-the-world organising tour. Mrs. Leavitt planted the Union in Hawaii, New Zealand, Australia, Japan, Korea, China, Siam, the Straits Settlement, India, Ceylon, Madagascar, Mauritius, Africa, Madeira, Continental Europe and South America.*

The Unions founded by Mrs. Leavitt were organised into the World's W. C. T. U., of which the officers of the National Union of the United States formed the directing and moving force. These have sent out, following Mrs. Leavitt, seven other round-the-world missionaries:—Miss Jessie Ackerman in 1887, who worked especially in Australia, with distinguished success; Miss Alice Palmer in 1892, who worked especially in South Africa; Mary Allen West in the same year, whose special field was Japan; Miss Clara Parrish in 1896, who worked in the same field; Mrs. J. K. Barney, in 1897, who carried onward the work of Mrs. Leavitt and Miss Ackerman in Australasia; Mrs. E. W. Andrews, and Dr. Kate Bushnell.

The British Women's Temperance Association remained a separate society, a part from the World's W. C. T. U., until 1891. Then the latter organisation held its first convention in Boston, U. S. A. The British women were represented there by Lady Henry Somerset, and their society became a member of the larger one. Miss Willard had been president of the World's Union since its beginning. At the Boston convention she was continued in that office. Lady Henry Somerset is the present president.*

The projects and achievements of the W. C. T. U. are too numerous and too diverse to be described here. We may only mention a few of the more important.

One of the most important branches of the society's work in the United States is the department of Scientific Temperance Instruction. This since its organisation in 1882 has been in charge of Mrs. Mary H. Hunt. Laws, making instruction in temperance compulsory in the public schools, have been passed since that time by every state in the union and by

* See Appendix D, Chap. XI.



LADY HENRY SOMERSET

President National British Woman's Temperance Association ;
Vice-President World's W.C.T.U., 1898. England's most
brilliant woman writer and speaker on Temperance,





FRANCES E. WILLARD, L.L.D.
(1839-1898)

Late President World's W.C.T.U. "The best beloved woman in America."

the national government for the territories—a monument to the zeal and ability of Mrs. Hunt.*

In many other matters of legislation the W. C. T. U. has exerted a strong influence. In many states the local option laws had been strengthened through its influence. As a result of its efforts the age of consent in the laws regarding assaults on women has been raised in several cases. It was largely the labour of the Union which secured the passage of the Congressional act of 1901 abolishing the sale of liquor in the army.

Finally we may mention the great Polyglot Petition.† This petition was conceived by Miss Willard in the eighties. It reads as follows, in part :

“We, your petitioners, although belonging to the physically weaker sex, are strong of heart to love our homes, our native land and the world’s family of nations. We know that when the brain of man is clear, his heart is kind, his home is happy, his country prosperous, and the world grows friendly. But we know that alcoholic stimulants and opium, which craze and crowd the brain, make misery for men and all the world, and most of all for us and for our children. . . . We, therefore, come to you with the united voices of representative women from every civilized nation under the sun beseeching you to strip away the safeguard and sanctions of the law from the drink traffic and the opium trade, and to protect our homes by the total prohibition of this twofold curse of civilization throughout all the territory over which your government extends.”

This petition was translated into fifty languages and received seven million signatures and attestations. It has been presented to the President of the United States, the Governor-General of Canada, and to

* See Appendix E, Chap. XI.

† See Appendix F, Chap. XI.

Queen Victoria. It is intended to be presented to the rulers of every civilized country.

THE REFORM CLUBS.

In the seventies and early eighties occurred a revival of the spirit which had animated the Washingtonian movement before the war; a campaign for the reforming of drunkards, led by reformed drunkards, swept over the country. The leaders of this movement—all, curiously enough, from the state of Maine—were Francis Murphy, J. K. Osgood, and Dr. Henry A. Reynolds.

Francis Murphy was a drunkard, who lived in Portland, Maine. From a semi-respectable hotel-keeper he had degenerated into the drunken proprietor of a low "blind pig." While in jail in 1870, he resolved to reform, and after his release he began to preach temperance. His first speech was made in Portland on April 3, 1871. Then he spoke at many places in New England. On November 5, 1874, at the invitation of Frances E. Willard, he began a series of thirty-two lectures in Chicago. From that time his name was famous throughout the country and his influence was wide.

J. K. Osgood was a business man of Gardiner, Maine, who had made shipwreck of his business and his home through intemperance. In 1871 he abandoned his bad habits and with a number of old companions formed the Gardiner Temperance Reform Club. He was soon invited to form similar clubs elsewhere in New England. He formed about forty in Massachusetts.

Dr. Henry A. Reynolds was a young man of Bangor, Maine, who had received an excellent education and possessed unusual ability, but who had become notorious as a drunkard. In 1874 he was con-

verted by one of the praying bands of women which were described earlier in the chapter. He at once began to work for the reclaiming of other drunkards and to organise reform clubs. His good education made him very successful as a speaker. Invited to work in Massachusetts by Mary L. Ward, secretary of the W. C. T. U. at Salem, he formed large clubs at Salem, Marblehead, Peabody, Linn, Lawrence and Gloucester. The members of his clubs wore red ribbons as a badge.* A society known as the National Temperance Association was formed at Old Orchard, Maine, in 1876. Of this society Dr. Reynolds was made president; ex-Governor Perham, of Maine; Mrs. Wittenmyer, of Philadelphia, and Francis Murphy, vice-presidents.

The revival of pledge-signing, energetic while it lasted, had spent its force in the early eighties. It was crowded out by efforts to abolish the liquor traffic by legislation, statutory or constitutional. The endeavour to cure drunkenness resigned the field to the effort to prevent it.†

* See Appendix G, Chap. XI.

† See Appendix H., Chap. XI.

CHAPTER XII.

THE PROHIBITION PARTY AND THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE.

EARLY in the sixties, as has been related in a former chapter, the liquor interests of the United States made their power felt in politics, especially through the action of the United States Brewers' Association. From that time the two great political parties dared not risk defeat by antagonising those interests; or if temperance sentiment wrested anti-liquor legislation from them, they lost no time in placating the liquor dealers by neglecting to enforce the law. It thus became apparent to the reformers that a new party was necessary, independent of the support of the liquor traffic, and one whose chief corner-stone should be the destruction of that traffic.

The first step toward the formation of such a party was taken in February, 1867, at the Pennsylvania State Temperance Convention in the city of Harrisburg. That convention adopted the following resolution:

Resolved: That while we do not wish to enter the arena of political or party strife, yet believing the ballot to be the freeman's weapon, and that temperance has its political as well as moral aspects, and when it becomes necessary the one mode of advocacy has equal claims with the other, we think it proper to declare that if the adversaries of temperance shall continue to receive the aid and countenance of present political parties, we shall not hesitate to break our political bands and seek redress through the ballot-box."

Two similar resolutions adopted in the same year

are worth noticing. On June 17, 1867, the Grand Lodge of Good Templars of Pennsylvania made this declaration:

“Resolved: That as the Beer-Brewers’ Congress of the United States, at their session in Chicago, and the Liquor League of Philadelphia, have declared that they ‘will sustain no candidate of whatever party, in any election, who is in any way disposed toward the total abstinence cause,’ we do accept the issue thus made, and declare that we will not vote for men who countenance the liquor traffic, or degrade their official positions by the use of intoxicating liquors.”

And during the following month the National Temperance Convention at Cleveland, Ohio, took the following action:

“Resolved: That temperance, having its political as well as moral aspects and duties, demands the persistent use of the ballot for its promotion, and we exhort the friends of temperance by every practical method, in their several localities, to secure righteous political action for the advancement of the cause.”

The next step was the formation of state prohibition parties. In 1867 such a party was organised in Illinois, called the Prohibition Party, and one was also formed in Michigan, called the Temperance Political Party. In 1869 another was formed in Ohio. It held a nominating convention at the town of Mansfield on July 24 of that year. This was the first Prohibition Party nominating convention, for the parties of Illinois and Michigan had done nothing further than to organise.

The next step was the organisation of a National Prohibition Party. The Right Worthy Grand Lodge

of Good Templars at Richmond, Indiana, had adopted the following resolution on May 28, 1868:

“*Whereas*, We are convinced of the absolute necessity of political action in order to the uniform and ultimate success of the temperance reform; and

“*Whereas*, It is evident that neither of the now existing parties will formally adopt our principles; therefore

“*Resolved*: That we recommend to the temperance people of the country the organisation of a national political party, whose platform and principles shall contain prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage.”

And on May 27, 1869, the Right Worthy Grand Lodge at Oswego, New York, had declared:

“That we esteem the present as an auspicious period in the history of our political affairs for the inauguration of this movement, and therefore recommend the calling of a national convention for the purpose at an early day.”

Accordingly a committee had been appointed to summon the proposed convention. It was composed of Rev. John Russell, of Detroit; Prof. Daniel Wilkins, of Bloomington, Illinois; J. A. Spencer, of Cleveland, Ohio; John N. Stearns, of New York City, and James Black, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. This committee had issued the following call:

“*To the Friends of Temperance, Law and Order in the United States:*

“The moral, social and political evils of intemperance and the non-enforcement of the liquor laws are so fearful and prominent, and the causes thereof are so entrenched and protected by government authority and

party interest, that the suppression of these evils calls upon the friends of temperance; and the duties connected with the home, religion, and public peace demand that old political ties and associations shall be sundered, and a distinct political party, with prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks as the most prominent feature, should be organised.

“The distinctive political issues that have for years past interested the American people are now comparatively unimportant, or fully settled, and in this aspect the time is auspicious for a decided and practical effort to overcome the dread power of the liquor trade.

“The undersigned do therefore earnestly invite all friends of temperance and the enforcement of the law, and favourable to distinct political action for the promotion of the same, to meet in general mass convention in the city of Chicago, on Wednesday, the 1st day of September, 1869, at 11 o'clock A. M., for the purpose of organising for distinct political action for temperance.

“All churches, Sunday schools and temperance societies of all names, are requested to send delegates, and all persons favourable to this movement are invited to meet at the time and place above stated.” *

On the day appointed five hundred delegates met in Farwell Hall in Chicago. John Russell was made temporary chairman and James Black permanent chairman. J. A. Spencer was chosen secretary. Gerrit Smith made the opening speech. “The Anti-Dramshop party” was first proposed as the name of the new organisation, but it was rejected in favour of “the National Prohibition party.” The essential part of the convention’s declaration of principles was as follows :

“That the traffic in intoxicating beverages is a dishonour to Christian civilisation, inimical to the best interests of society, a political wrong of unequalled en-

* See Appendix A, Chap. XII.

ormity, subversive of the ordinary objects of government, not capable of being regulated or restrained by any system of licence whatever, but imperatively demanding for its suppression effective legal Prohibition, both by state and national legislation.

“That in view of this, and inasmuch as the existing political parties either oppose or ignore this great and paramount question, and absolutely refuse to do anything toward the suppression of the rum traffic, which is robbing the nation of its brightest intellects, destroying internal prosperity and rapidly undermining its very foundations, we are driven by an imperative sense of duty to sever our connection with these political parties and organise ourselves into a National Prohibition party, having for its primary object the entire suppression of the traffic in intoxicating drinks.”

“That while we adopt the name of “the National Prohibition party,” as expressive of our primary object, and while we denounce all repudiation of the public debt, and pledge fidelity to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the federal Constitution, we deem it not expedient at present to give prominence to other issues.”

The convention entrusted the management of the party's business to the following committee: John Russell, chairman; Gideon T. Stewart, of Norwalk, Ohio, secretary; Col. R. S. Davidson, of St. Paul, Minnesota; J. M. May, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin; D. R. Pershing, of Warsaw, Indiana; Rev. H. Green, of Marshalltown, Iowa; C. B. Hull, of Chicago; John T. Ustick, of Missouri; James F. Stewart, of San Francisco; Rev. William Goodell, of Bozrahville, Connecticut; James Black, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania; O. K. Harris, of Washington; Prof. W. C. Thomas, of Junction City, Kansas; Joshua Nye, of Maine; Rev. William Hosmer, of Auburn, New

York; and S. B. Ransom, of Jersey City, New Jersey.

The first nominating convention of the national party was held on February 22, 1872, in Columbus, Ohio. A very elaborate platform was adopted. Besides the prohibition of the liquor traffic, it declared for an honest civil service; for a better system of compensation for public officers; for the election of President, Vice-President, and Senators by direct vote; for a sound national currency; for new legislation regarding transportation and telegraphic communication; for the extension of the public school system; for female suffrage; for better laws regarding immigration and naturalisation; and against monopoly.

The declaration on the issue for which the party had been formed was as follows :

“That the traffic in intoxicating beverages is a dishonour to Christian civilisation, a political wrong of unequalled enormity subversive of ordinary objects of government, not capable of being regulated or restrained by any system of licence whatever, and imperatively demands, for its suppression, effective legal prohibition, both by state and national legislation.

“That there can be no greater peril to a nation than the existing party competition for the liquor vote. That experience shows that any party not opposed to the traffic, that will engage in this competition, will court the favour of criminal classes, will barter away the public morals, the purity of the ballot, and every object of the government, for party success.”

James Black and John Russell were nominated for President and Vice-President, respectively. In the election which followed many votes were diverted from the Prohibition party to the Democratic, since the latter had nominated for Presi-

dent Horace Greeley, whose pronounced anti-saloon views were well known. Moreover, the Prohibitionists did not wage a very vigorous campaign. Their ticket received 5,607 votes.

The next national convention was held in 1876 at Cleveland, Ohio. Only about a hundred delegates attended. The convention changed the name of the party to "the National Prohibition Reform party." The platform adopted favoured female suffrage, direct elections, and most of the reforms of the previous platform. In addition, it declared for reform in the administration of public lands, reduction of postal rates, the suppression of polygamy and lotteries, better observance of the Sabbath, compulsory education, the use of the Bible in public schools, international arbitration, prison reform, and government monopoly of paper money. The party's programme regarding the liquor traffic was formulated in the following language :

"The legal prohibition in the District of Columbia, the territories, and in every other place subject to the laws of Congress, of the importation, exportation, manufacture and traffic of all alcoholic beverages, as high crimes against society ; an amendment of the national constitution to render these prohibitory measures universal and permanent, and the adoption of treaty stipulations with foreign powers to prevent the importation and exportation of all alcoholic beverages."

Green Clay Smith, of Kentucky, and Gideon T. Stewart, of Ohio, were chosen as the candidates of the party. The campaign, like the preceding one, was not energetic, but the Prohibition vote was increased to 9,731. In the following year the Prohibition votes cast in state elections amounted to 43,000.



JAMES BLACK
U. S. Presidential Prohibition Candidate, 1872.





GREEN CLAY SMITH
(1830-1885)

U. S. Presidential Prohibition Candidate, 1876.

The national convention of 1880, also held at Cleveland, was far from encouraging. Only a hundred and forty-two delegates were present, representing twelve states. The platform adopted was, for the first time, framed practically upon the single issue of prohibition, though it contained this declaration in the eleventh section: "We also demand, as a right, that women, having the privilege of citizens in other respects, be clothed with the ballot for their protection and as a rightful means for the proper settlement of the liquor question." The platform began with an exhaustive discussion of the evils of the liquor traffic. The consumption of alcoholic liquor, it said, is

"not only needless but hurtful, necessarily tending to form intemperate habits, increasing greatly the number, severity, and fatal termination of diseases, weakening and deranging the intellect, polluting the affections, hardening the heart, and corrupting the morals, depriving many of reason and still more of its healthful exercises, and annually bringing down large numbers to untimely graves."

Of the traffic in such liquors the platform said :

"*First.* The legalised importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating drinks ministers to their use, and teaches the erroneous and destructive sentiment that such use is right, thus tending to produce and perpetuate the above-mentioned evils.

"*Second.* To the home it is an enemy—proving itself to be a disturber and destroyer of its peace, prosperity, and happiness; taking from it the earnings of the husband; depriving the dependent wife and children of essential food, clothing, and education; bringing into it profanity, abuse, and violence; setting at naught the vows of the marriage altar; breaking up

the family and sundering the children from the parents, and thus destroying one of the most beneficent institutions of our Creator, and removing the sure foundation of good government, national prosperity and welfare.

“*Third.* To the community it is equally an enemy—producing vice, demoralization, and wickedness, its places of sale being resorts of gaming, lewdness, and debauchery, and the hiding-place of those who prey upon society; counteracting the efficacy of religious effort, and of all means of intellectual elevation, moral purity, social happiness, and the eternal good of mankind, without rendering any counteracting or compensating benefits; being in its influences and effect evil and only evil, and that continually.

“*Fourth.* To the State it is equally an enemy—legislative inquiries, judicial investigations, and official reports of all penal, reformatory and dependent institutions showing that the manufacture and sale of such beverages is the promoting cause of intemperance, crime, and pauperism, and of demands upon public and private charity, imposing the larger part of taxation, paralysing thrift, industry, manufactures, and commercial life, which, but for it, would be necessary; disturbing the peace of streets and highways; filling prisons and poor-houses; corrupting politics, legislation, and the execution of the laws; shortening lives; diminishing health, industry, and productive power in manufactures and art. . . .”

“The entire separation of the general government from the drink traffic, and its prohibition in the District of Columbia, territories, and in all places and ways over which, under the Constitution, Congress has control,” was therefore demanded. And this result, the platform argued at some length, could not be achieved through either of the great political parties. The Republican party was arraigned because

during its twenty years of control in the federal government it had done nothing toward remedying the evils caused by the liquor traffic, in spite of many opportunities. "Its history further shows," said the platform, "that not in a single instance has an original prohibitory law passed by any state that was controlled by it, while in four states so governed the laws found on its advent in power have been repealed." The Democratic party was also arraigned as having "allied itself with liquor traffickers," and as having, in its platform of 1876, "declared against prohibition and just laws in restraint of the trade in drink by saying it was opposed to what it was pleased to call 'all sumptuary laws.'"

The candidates elected for President and Vice-President, respectively, were Neal Dow, of Maine, and Rev. H. A. Thompson, president of Otterbein University. In the November election they received 10,366 votes. It is probable that the vote would have been larger but for a fraudulent announcement, made through the news agencies by some political trickster on the eve of the election, to the effect that Mr. Dow had withdrawn his candidacy.

The formation of the Home Protection party in 1881 and the union with it of the Prohibition Reform party in 1882, have been related in Chapter XI. The first Presidential nominating convention of the new Prohibition Home Protection party met in Pittsburg on July 23, 1884. Four hundred and sixty-five delegates assembled here. The name of the party was changed back to "the Prohibition party."

The platform adopted at this convention declared briefly in favour of a few reforms in monetary legislation and civil service, and also for woman suffrage.

On the last subject its language was, in part, as follows:

“That the activity and co-operation of the women of America for the promotion of temperance has, in all the history of the past, been a strength and encouragement, which we gratefully acknowledge and record. . . . That we believe in the civil and political equality of the sexes, and that the ballot in the hand of woman is a right for her protection, and would prove a powerful ally for the abolition of the drink saloon, the execution of law, the promotion of reform in civil affairs, and the removal of corruption in public life.”

John P. St. John of Kansas was nominated for President and William Daniel of Maryland for Vice-President. John B. Finch, a brilliant temperance reformer, who proved to be an equally brilliant executive officer, was made chairman of the national committee of the party. An extremely bitter campaign followed, resulting in an enormous increase in the vote. Early in the campaign the national committee of the Republican party made an unsuccessful attempt to bribe Mr. St. John to withdraw from the contest. The Democrats openly opposed prohibition, while the Republicans dodged the issue by declaring that it was a matter of state legislation, not of national. It was in that campaign that the Funk & Wagnall's Company of New York City began the publication of the *Voice*, which has since that time been, with its successor, the *New Voice*, the leading paper of the prohibition reform. The Prohibition vote of 1884 was 150,626.

At the national convention of the party held at Indianapolis on May 30, 1888, a thousand and twenty-nine delegates assembled. General Clinton B. Fisk was nominated for President and John A.



CLINTON B. FISK
(1828-1890)

U. S. Presidential Prohibition Candidate, 1888.





JOHN BIDWELL,
U. S. Presidential Prohibition Candidate, 1892.

Brooks, of Missouri, for Vice-President. But the platform was practically a single issue platform, Its essential declarations were the following :

“ That while there are important reforms that are demanded for purity of administration and the welfare of the people, their importance sinks into insignificance when compared with the reform of the drink traffic, which annually wastes \$800,000,000 of the wealth created by toil and thrift, and drags down thousands of families from comfort to poverty ; which fills jails, penitentiaries, insane asylums, hospitals, and institutions for dependency ; which destroys the health, saps industry, and causes loss of life and property to thousands in the land ; lowers intellectual and physical vigor, dulls the cunning hand of the artisan, is the chief cause of bankruptcy, insolvency and loss in trade, and by its corrupting power endangers the perpetuity of free institutions.

“ That Congress should exercise its undoubted power, and prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages in the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, in all places over which the government has exclusive jurisdiction ; that hereafter no state shall be admitted into the Union until its Constitution shall expressly prohibit polygamy and the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages.”

At this convention the prohibition planks of the platform were as follows :

“ 1. That the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation and sale of alcoholic beverages should be made public crimes, and prohibited as such.

“ That such prohibition must be secured through amendments of our national and state Constitutions, enforced by adequate laws adequately supported by administrative authority ; and to this end the organization of the Prohibition party is imperatively demanded in state and nation.

“3. That any form of licence, or taxation, or regulation of the liquor traffic is contrary to good government; that any party which supports regulation, licence, or taxation, enters into alliance with such traffic and becomes the actual foe of the state’s welfare; and that we arraign the Republican and Democratic parties for their persistent attitude in favour of the licence iniquity, whereby they oppose the demand of the people for prohibition, and, through open complicity with the liquor crime, defeat the enforcement of law.”

While the platform contained deliverances on various other subjects, the thirteenth plank declared the liquor traffic to be the “dominant issue,” and invited to “full party fellowship” all who agreed with the party in its attitude toward that issue.” This was the first national campaign, which was led by Samuel Dickie as chairman of the national committee. During the campaign Senator M. S. Quay and J. S. Clarkson, of the Republican national committee, bought a number of sheets of the mailing list of the *Voice*, purloined by an employee, and used them for the circulation of Republican campaign literature. Another incident, showing the violence of the contest, was the charge made by the New York *Tribune* that the Prohibitionists were supplied with campaign funds by the Democrats. Chairman Dickie promptly offered five thousand dollars for proof of the accusation which would convince a committee composed of Republicans of its truth. The *Tribune* dropped the subject. The result of the campaign was 249,945 votes for the Prohibition party.

At the next national convention, held on June 30, 1892, in Cincinnati, much contention appeared regarding the reforms other than prohibition which the

party should demand. Western delegates asked for declarations in favour of the free coinage of silver and other economic measures, to which Eastern delegates were strongly opposed. Further, there was a difference of opinion between Northern and Southern delegates as to female suffrage, which the latter opposed. The platform adopted, like that of 1888, besides declaring for prohibition as "the dominant issue," contained declarations in favour of numerous reforms, such as the suppression of monopoly, the restriction of immigration, stricter laws on the observance of the Sabbath, and female suffrage. The free coinage of silver was not endorsed. The main issue was formulated as follows :

"The liquor traffic is a foe to civilisation, the arch enemy of popular government, and a public nuisance. It is the citadel of the forces that corrupt politics promote poverty and crime, degrade the nation's home-life, thwart the will of the people, and deliver our country into the hands of rapacious class interests. All laws that under the guise of regulation legalise and protect this traffic, or make the government share its ill-gotten gains, are 'vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy.'"

The candidates nominated by this convention, General John Bidwell, of California, and Dr. James B. Cranfil, of Texas, received 270,710 votes.

When the next national convention met on May 27, 1896, in Pittsburg, the free silver propaganda had made such progress in the Western states that the Western delegates insisted on a declaration favouring the monetary measure in question. The Eastern delegates opposed such a declaration. They took their stand, however, not as much on opposition to free silver as on the principle that the party should

confine its declaration to the single issue of prohibition. The delegates of the other side closed with them on this point also, holding that the party should make a declaration on all the questions of the day. The issue was thus joined between the "narrow gauge" section and the "broad gauge" section. The contest was very bitter. It ended in the adoption of a single issue policy. Even woman suffrage, which had been advocated in every previous platform, was excluded from that of 1896, though the convention declared in a separate resolution that "the right of suffrage ought not to be abridged on account of sex." The platform of 1896 was the shortest which the party has ever adopted. This admirable document is reproduced entire below :

"We, the members of the Prohibition party, in national convention assembled, renewing our declaration of allegiance to Almighty God as the rightful ruler of the universe, lay down the following as our declaration of political purpose.

"The Prohibition party, in national convention assembled, declares its firm conviction that the manufacture, exportation, importation, and the sale of alcoholic beverages has produced such social, commercial, industrial, and political wrongs, and is now so threatening the perpetuity of all our social and political institutions, that the suppression of the same by a national party organised therefor, is the greatest object to be accomplished by the voters of our country, and is of such importance that it, of right, ought to control the political actions of all our patriotic citizens until such suppression is accomplished.

"The urgency of this course demands the union without further delay of all citizens who desire the prohibition of the liquor traffic; therefore be it

Resolved: That we favour the legal prohibition by

state and national legislation of the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic beverages. That we declare our purpose to organise and unite all the friends of prohibition into one party, and in order to accomplish this end we deem it right to leave every prohibitionist the freedom of his own convictions upon all other political questions, and trust our representatives to take such action upon other political questions as the changes occasioned by prohibition and the welfare of the whole people shall demand."

Upon the adoption of this declaration the broad-gauge delegates withdrew and formed the National party, based on a broad-gauge platform. They nominated Charles E. Bentley, of Nebraska, for President, and James H. Southgate, of North Carolina, for Vice-President. The declaration of the Democratic party for free silver drew the votes of many free silver Prohibitionists to their ticket. The candidates of the National party polled 13,757 votes. The regular Prohibition convention nominated as its candidates Joshua Levering, of Baltimore, and Hale Johnson, of Illinois, who polled 132,871 votes.

The single-issue policy was continued by the party in 1900. The convention of that year, held on June 26, in Chicago adopted a platform which though devoted to only one issue was the longest ever adopted by the party, being long enough to fill about seven pages of this book. After declaring that "the national interest could be promoted in no other way so surely and wisely," as by "forbidding the manufacture, sale, exportation, importation, and transportation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes," it stated the necessity of a party in power whose chief policy was this reform, in order to its success. It then said:

“ We insist that such a party, agreed upon this principle and policy, having sober leadership, without any obligation for success to the saloon vote and to those demoralising political combinations of men and money now allied therewith and suppliant thereto, could successfully cope with all other and lesser problems of government, in legislative halls and in the executive chair, and that it is useless for any party to make declarations in its platform as to any questions concerning which there may be serious differences of opinion in its own membership, and as to which, because of such differences, the party could legislate only on a basis of mutual concessions when coming into power.”

It then arraigned with unique thoroughness the Republican administration in control at Washington, calling attention to its nullification of the anti-canteen law; to the example of its chief officer, President McKinley, “ as a wine-drinker at public banquets and as a wine-serving host in the White House ”; and to its attitude toward the liquor traffic in the new island possessions of the United States, as a result of which the policy of expansion was “ bearing so rapidly its first fruits of drunkenness, insanity, and crime under the hothouse sun of the tropics.” Another unique feature of this platform was its call to the churches. After quoting the declarations of several denominations against support of political parties which uphold the liquor traffic, it said:

“ We declare ourselves justified in expecting that Christian voters everywhere shall cease their complicity with the liquor curse by refusing to uphold a liquor party, and shall unite themselves with the only party which upholds the prohibition policy, and which for nearly thirty years has been the faithful defender of the church, the state, the home, and the school, against the saloon, its expanders and perpetuators, their actual and persistent foes.”

It then closed with the following sentence:

“We declare that there are but two real parties, to-day, concerning the liquor traffic—perpetuationists and Prohibitionists; and that patriotism, Christianity, and every interest of genuine and of pure democracy, besides the loyal demands of our common humanity, require the speedy union, in one solid phalanx at the ballot-box, of all who oppose the liquor traffic’s perpetuation, and who covet endurance for this republic.”

This convention nominated John G. Woolley, of Chicago, for President, and Henry B. Metcalf, of Rhode Island, for Vice-President. Oliver W. Stewart, of Illinois, was now chairman of the national committee, having succeeded Samuel Dickie in 1899. The party showed remarkable vigour after the schism of 1896, and its campaign attracted much attention. The candidates traveled through the country on a campaign train—the first in the history of the party—making speeches in every part of the Union. Mr. Woolley traveled twenty-three thousand miles and made nearly five hundred speeches. Most of the broad gauge men of 1896 returned to the Prohibition party, but some supported the Union Reform party, the successor of the National party. Their candidate for President, Mr. Ellis, received 5,690 votes. The Prohibitionists cast 209,936 votes.*

Related to the Prohibition party in its purpose of attacking intemperance through political means, but radically different in its policy of using the two great political parties, instead of an independent third party, is the Anti-Saloon League. The history of this organisation begins in the winter of 1887–88, when a Local Option League was formed in Oberlin, Ohio, for the purpose of securing certain amendments to

* See Appendix B, Chap. XII.

the temperance legislation of the state. This league, under the direction of Dr. Howard H. Russell, pastor of a church in Berea, Ohio, was successful in its enterprise, and in consequence its promoters were encouraged to organise a state league on the same basis. Dr. Russell was soon afterward called away to a pastorate in Kansas, and later in Chicago, and during his absence the society languished. Dr. Russell returned in 1893, and under his guidance it was revived and reorganised on September 3, under the name "Ohio Anti-Saloon League." Another state society, the Christian Temperance Alliance, which had been organised by Dr. A. J. Kynett, D.D., of the Church Extension Society of the Methodist Church, was, during the same year, merged into the Anti-Saloon League.

In the meantime in June, 1893, another Anti-Saloon League had been formed, independently of the Ohio society, at Washington, D.C. In December, 1895, upon the invitation of this league and as the result of a conference between Dr. Kynett and Archbishop Ireland, a convention was held in Washington, at which a national organisation was formed,—the American Anti-Saloon League. Ex-Congressman Hiram Price* was made President and Dr. Russell national superintendent. This organisation has grown rapidly and is now organised in nearly every state. It maintains an office at the national capital, under the direction of Mr. E. C. Dinwiddie, assistant national superintendent. It has been very influential in promoting state and national legislation for the restriction of the liquor traffic. Its purposes are thus officially stated :

* Mr. Price died on May 30, 1901, and was succeeded by Rev. L. B. Wilson.

“The object of the League is the suppression of the saloon. In a locality where the saloon has been closed by law, it is likewise the suppression of the illegal sale of liquor in that locality. The League further seeks to secure the repeal of laws which favour and facilitate the existence of saloons in the state, and as rapidly as public sentiment will warrant, to secure the enactment of laws which will promote saloon suppression. The League recognises, as a fundamental principle, the fact that whether laws are passed, or enforced after they have been enacted, is a question of local and general public sentiment upon the question. The first work of the League is to tone up public sentiment, and the continued work of the organisation is to keep the public demand upon the question at a pitch of effectiveness. The Anti-Saloon League is a public-sentiment building society.”

CHAPTER XIII.


TEMPERANCE IN CANADA BEFORE CONFEDERATION.

THE problem of intemperance in Canada has claimed attention from the very beginning of the white man's domination. The first temperance reformers there were the Roman Catholic clergy, whose efforts were made largely on behalf of the Indians. The policy which they advocated, of prohibiting the sale of liquor to Indians, was, after many lessons, generally adopted by the provinces, and is the law of the Dominion to-day. An equal interest in the welfare of the white population, as respects temperance, did not arise until well into the nineteenth century.*

The general temperance agitation in Canada may be dated from a temperance sermon preached by the

* A curious, and of course isolated, exception to this statement is found in the charter granted by Charles I. in 1630 for the government of the fishermen of Newfoundland. This charter contains the following provision (quoted by W. Frazer in *Newfoundland to Manitoba*, p. 19):

“That no person do set up any tavern for selling wine, beer, or strong waters, cyder or tobacco to entertain the fishermen; because it is found that by such means they are debauched, neglecting their labour, and poor ill-governed men not only spend most part of their shares before they come home, upon which the life and maintainance of their wives and children depend, but are likewise hurtful in divers other ways, as by neglecting and making themselves unfit for their labour, by purloining and stealing from their owners, and making unlawful shifts to supply their disorders, which disorders they frequently follow since these occasions have presented themselves.”



HON. J. C. AIKINS

A Vice-President of the Ontario Prohibition Alliance and of the
Dominion Alliance.





ADAM CROOKS, LL.D.
(1827-1885)

First Minister of Education for Ontario.
Originator of the Ontario "Liquor License Act."

Reverend J. S. Christmas on June 6, 1828, in St. Andrew's Church, Montreal. Almost from that very day temperance societies began to spring up in many parts of the Dominion. On June 9, through the efforts of Mr. Christmas, the Provincial society of Lower Canada (Quebec) was organised on the basis of moderation in drinking. In the autumn of the same year Mr. Christmas assisted in the formation of a temperance society at Brockville, Ontario. On August 31, through the efforts of Dr. Edwards, of the American Temperance Society, the St. John Temperance Society was formed in New Brunswick, with the Reverend R. G. Gray, D.D., as president, and Dr. George Burns as vice-president. On April 25, 1829, a temperance society was formed at Beaver River, Nova Scotia, which still exists, and about the same time another was formed at Pictou. Still another was organised in Quebec on March 23, 1832, but it was dissolved owing to an epidemic of cholera, in which the belief prevailed widely that brandy was a preventive against the disease. This organisation of societies continued at such a rapid rate that in 1834 temperance conventions held in Montreal and Halifax respectively reported that there were 4,250 abstainers from spirits in Lower Canada (Quebec) and 14,000 in Nova Scotia.

The agitation represented by the societies which have been mentioned aimed almost entirely at abstinence from spirits. A start toward total abstinence was made on May 25, 1832, when a part of the St. John Temperance Society seceded and formed the St. John Abstinence Society. Next, a temperance convention held at Halifax in 1834 urged all temperance societies to adopt the principle of total abstinence. This recommendation was followed during

the ensuing year by thirty of the one hundred societies. Subsequent conventions repeated the recommendation, and the proportion of total abstinence societies rapidly increased.

In 1842 the Victoria Society began a crusade for the reform of drunkards similar to the Washingtonian movement in the United States. During the first year about three thousand converts were made.

A lodge of the Sons of Temperance was organised at St. Stephens, New Brunswick, by Mr. Alexander Campbell, in 1847, and was instituted by Mr. P. Lahe, Division Grand Worthy Patriarch of Maine. Other lodges were soon formed in New Brunswick, and within two years a Grand Lodge was established, with Mr. Campbell as Grand Worthy Patriarch, which had twenty-eight subordinate Divisions and about thirteen hundred members. During the same period a Division was established in Brockville, Ontario, and in Prince Edward Island.

The Good Templars society was planted in Canada in 1853 by the Reverend J. M. Peebles. He established a lodge at Merrickville, Ontario, on October 25, and one at Easton's Corners a few days later. These lodges are still in existence, and are probably the oldest Good Templar lodges in the world at the present day. Within one year the number of lodges of Good Templary in Ontario increased to fifty-four.

In addition to the secret societies just named, the Royal Templars, the Cadets of Temperance, the Rechabites, and the Daughters of Temperance were introduced into the Dominion before 1850.

During the years 1848-1849 a crusade of pledge-signing was carried on by Father Chiniquy, which resembled Father Mathew's crusade in Ireland. During that short space of time Father Chiniquy's

converts numbered some two hundred thousand, most of them French Catholics.

In 1850 the reform passed from the stage of personal temperance to that of legislative action. The Legislature of Lower Canada (now Quebec) placed the local licencing power in the hands of the Churchwarden, the Senior Magistrate and the Senior Militia Officer, thus providing a sort of local option. In Upper Canada (now Ontario) the same power was given to three tavern inspectors, to be chosen by the people. In both provinces various regulations were imposed on the sale of liquor, and liquor sellers were made liable in damages to the relatives of persons killed while intoxicated. In the province of Nova Scotia a sort of local option already existed, and in 1851 public sentiment in ten of the seventeen counties compelled licences to be refused. In New Brunswick the Honourable (now Sir) L. S. Tilley secured the passage by the legislature of a law imposing severe restrictions on the sale of wine and spirits. This law went into effect on June 1, 1853.

A vigorous agitation now began for complete prohibition. The Canadian Prohibitory Liquor Law League was formed in 1853, and through its efforts a petition, signed by seventy thousand persons, was presented to the United Parliament of Upper and Lower Canada asking for a law like that prevailing in Maine. The project was almost successful in 1854. A prohibition bill was introduced by Mr. Fenton of Sherbrooke, Quebec. It passed the second reading by a vote of 90 to 6. On the third reading greater opposition appeared, and before the vote was reached the bill was withdrawn. A complete prohibitory law has never since that time (except in 1858) come so near passage, either by the

United Parliament of Upper and Lower Canada or by the Dominion Parliament, its successor since 1867.

In the temperance history of Canada, as of the United States, the year 1855 was remarkable. The Canadian League again introduced its bill into the United Parliament. It was passed by the lower house but rejected by the upper. Similar proceedings occurred in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. The battle royal of the year took place in New Brunswick. Led by Mr. Tilley, their provincial secretary, the Prohibitionists secured the passage of "An Act to Prevent the Importation, Manufacture and Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors." The bill went through the lower house by a vote of 22 to 18, passed the upper house by a vote of 10 to 7, received the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Manners Sutton, and finally, on November 21, received the sanction of the Queen. It went into effect on January 1, 1856. Unfortunately the prohibitionists did not guard their position. Their opponents secured control of the Legislature in 1856, and repealed the law only six months after it went into effect.

For the next half-dozen years most of the Canadian law-making bodies continued to be the scene of a struggle between the enemies and the friends of prohibition. The latter, though they failed of their full demands, yet secured, as a rule, some additional restriction on the liquor traffic. In 1858 a prohibition bill introduced into the United Parliament of Upper and Lower Canada by the Honourable Malcolm Cameron was passed by the lower house but rejected in the upper by a majority of four. At the same session, however, local option as to the liquor business

was granted to municipalities, and five of these availed themselves of the privilege to prohibit the traffic. In the same year the sale of liquor to minors and inebriates was prohibited in Nova Scotia. Meanwhile, prohibition agitation also continued outside the legislative chambers. A noteworthy event in this agitation was a declaration in favour of prohibition signed by 151 protestant clergymen of Nova Scotia.

In 1862 a temperance society was formed among the members of the United Parliament, with the Honourable Malcolm Cameron as president. On March 31, 1863, the Canadian Temperance Alliance was formed, for the promotion of temperance legislation. Through the efforts of these two societies an improved local option measure was enacted in 1863 by the United Parliament. This law, introduced by Mr. Christopher Dunkin, provided that on the petition of thirty ratepayers every municipal council in Quebec or Ontario (the law of course applied to these provinces only) should order an election on the question of local prohibition. This law also made liquor dealers responsible for damage caused by the intoxication of their customers.

The Dunkin Act was the culmination of temperance legislation in Canada prior to 1867. With all its weaknesses and defects, it marks a long advance in the reform, and since its passage to the present time the liquor traffic, in the provinces affected by the act, has been compelled to fight continuously for its life.

CHAPTER XIV.

TEMPERANCE IN CANADA SINCE CONFEDERATION.

IN 1867 the British Parliament, by the British North America Act, united the provinces of Quebec (formerly Lower Canada), Ontario (formerly Upper Canada), New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia into the Dominion of Canada under a federal system of government. All the remaining provinces of British North America, except Newfoundland, have since become members of this government—British Columbia in 1869, Manitoba in 1871, Prince Edward Island in 1873.

After the formation of the confederacy, existing laws regarding the liquor traffic remained in force within their respective provinces. But temperance reformers were at first uncertain whether further legislation should be sought in the Dominion Parliament or in the provincial legislatures. This uncertainty lasted till 1873. Meanwhile, in 1871, Newfoundland adopted a stringent local option law, under which Porte de Grave and Bay de Verde immediately adopted prohibition, the latter locality by a unanimous vote.

In 1873 the temperance people of the Dominion had decided to concentrate their efforts on the Dominion Parliament. The Parliament was flooded with petitions from every corner of the Dominion asking for a prohibitory law. Among them was a peti-

tion voted unanimously by the Ontario legislative assembly. A committee was appointed by the House of Commons to consider the matter. Prominent among its members was the Hon. George W. Ross, who acted as chairman of the most important sub-committee. On the basis of statements made by numerous county attorneys, magistrates, constables, judges, inspectors of lunatic asylums, hospitals, and poorhouses, the committee reported that in Ontario (to which it confined its attention) four-fifths of the crime committed was due to liquor. The work of Mr. Ross in the lower house of Parliament was duplicated by Senator A. Vidal in the upper house. A Senate committee, of which Mr. Vidal was chairman, said in its report: "The traffic in intoxicating liquor is detrimental to all the true interests of the Dominion, mercilessly slaying every year hundreds of her most promising citizens, plunging thousands into misery and want, and converting her intelligent and industrious sons, who should be her glory and her strength, into feeble inebriates, her burden and her shame."

These reports resulted in no legislation in 1873, and in 1874 numerous petitions were again presented in Parliament. The number of petitioners amounted to 349,224. Mr. Ross and Senator Vidal made strong efforts to secure favourable legislation. They were confronted by the assertion that prohibition was a failure in the United States. In order to determine the truth of this assertion a commission was appointed by Parliament to investigate the subject and to report at the next session. This commission consisted of two men, the Rev. J. W. Manning, a Past Grand Worthy President of the Sons of Temperance and a prohibitionist, and Col. F. Davis, an anti-prohibitionist. They visited all of the states of the


Union where prohibitory legislation was in force, and made a thorough investigation. The result was that Colonel Davis was converted to a belief in prohibition, and concurred with his colleague in reporting to Parliament that prohibition was desirable from every point of view. The report of the commission, which occupied 198 closely printed pages, made a profound impression. The lower house, by a vote of 72 to 9, passed a resolution concluding as follows:

“That having regard to the beneficial effect of legislation in those states of the American Union, where the same is fully carried out, this House is of the opinion that the most effectual remedy for the evils of intemperance would be to prohibit the manufacture, importation, and sale of all intoxicating liquors.”

The Senate passed a similar resolution by a vote of 25 to 17.

But aside from passing a law entirely prohibiting the sale or transit of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in the Northwest Territories, nothing was done during the current session toward applying this “most effectual remedy.” This strange action, or inaction, is explained by the fact that both the Liberal and the Conservative parties were divided on the question of prohibition. In communities favourable to prohibition the local organisation of both parties stood for that policy. In localities where the pro-liquor sentiment was strong both parties were opposed to prohibition. Therefore neither party could take any aggressive attitude regarding prohibition without danger of defeat.

At the session of Parliament of which we are speaking the Liberal party, which held the majority, was led by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, an avowed



HON. GEO. A. COX

A Vice-President of the Ontario Prohibition Alliance.





THE LATE PRINCIPAL, GRANT, D. D.
(1835-1902)

prohibitionist. Yet even such a leader refused to commit his party to prohibitory legislation. The situation was complicated by the fact that even some temperance leaders were unwilling that prohibition become a party issue, fearing that such a course would bring into their ranks politicians who would advocate the principle for political reasons, and that thus the temperance question would become a political football.

On February 16, 1876, the Dominion Alliance for the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic was formed at Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion, with Senator Vidal as president. The Alliance was designed to be a sort of federation of all the existing temperance societies, the chief purpose of which should be to urge Parliament to enact prohibitory laws. It accomplished nothing until 1878, when the Secretary of State, Mr. R. W. Scott, in behalf of the government, proposed a compromise measure. He proposed to extend the principle of the Dunkin Act (which was in force only in Ontario and Quebec) to the whole Dominion. His bill provided that twenty-five per cent. of the qualified electors of any county or city might force an election on the question of the prohibition of the retail sale of intoxicants, and that prohibition should be declared if a majority so voted. This bill was passed and was signed by the Governor-General on May 10, 1878. It is known as the Canada Temperance Act, and also as the Scott Act.

The prohibitionists, though not satisfied with this law, went heartily to work to make the most of it. The earliest localities to take advantage of it were York county, New Brunswick, which adopted prohibition by a vote of 1,826 to 214 on December 28, 1878, and Fredericton, New Brunswick, where the



vote, taken on October 31 of the same year, was 404 to 202. Within seven years, through the operation of the Scott Act, prohibition was in force throughout the whole of Prince Edward Island, one-fourth of Quebec, about one half of Ontario, and several counties in Manitoba. But in the enforcement of the law there arose extraordinary difficulties. In the first place its operation was delayed by a long course of litigation regarding its constitutionality. This litigation, in which Mr. J. J. Maclaren was the chief defender of the law, terminated in the Judicial Committee of the British Privy Council, the supreme court of the British Empire for such matters, which declared it valid. In the second place, it was not clear from the language of the act whether it was to be enforced by Dominion or by provincial authorities, and while each of these two sets of authorities waited for the other to act, the liquor sellers in many places continued their business. To remedy these conditions several provincial Legislatures adopted local option laws of their own, more or less drastic. These did not improve the situation, because as a rule both laws were badly enforced. Many of the localities became disgusted with prohibition under these circumstances and returned to the licence policy.

Under the Scott Act prohibition has been submitted to popular vote in 9 cities and 73 counties. It is now (June 1, 1901) in force in 1 city and 27 counties.* It has been

Carried five times and is still in force.	in 1	district
Carried four times and is still in force.	" 1	"
Carried twice and still in force	in 4	districts
Carried once and is still in force.	" 22	"

Total number of districts where prohi-

* See Appendix A. Chap. XIV.

bition is still in force under the
Scott Act..... 28

It has been—

Defeated the first time submitted and has not been submitted again.....in	17	districts
Carried at the first election and de- feated at the second..... “	30	“
Carried twice and lost twice..... “	1	district
Carried once and lost twice..... “	1	“
Carried twice and lost once..... “	3	districts
Lost twice and never carried “	1	district
Carried four times and rejected twice... “	1	“

Total number of districts where pro-
hibition has been voted upon un-
der the Scott Act and is not now
in force..... 54

Experience with the Scott Act convinced the pro-
hibitionists that the only final solution of the ques-
tion lay in national prohibition. Accordingly they
took little interest in the attempt to amend the exist-
ing law. Recourse to provincial legislation for com-
plete prohibition was not sought, not only be-
cause provincial prohibition was regarded as less
effective than national, but also because the con-
stitutional power of the province to enact such
laws was doubted. That the doctrine of national
prohibition had a powerful following is proved by
this resolution, passed by the lower house of the
Dominion Parliament in 1854 by a vote of 122 to
40. (The italics indicate an amendment added to
the resolution as first introduced):

“That the right and most effectual remedy for the
suppression of the evils of intemperance is to be found
in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting
the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating

liquors for beverage purposes. And this House is prepared, *so soon as public sentiment will sustain stringent measures*, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada."

During the latter part of the eighties the public sentiment in favour of prohibition began to express itself again, as in 1873-1874 in petitions to the Dominion Parliament. To such an extent was this means of agitation employed that in 1888 the business of Parliament was blocked for days by the reading of petitions. In 1889 the question of prohibition was forced to a vote. The result was unfavourable to prohibition, but the public sentiment for the reform was so strong, and increased so rapidly, that soon the Government was forced to reckon with it. In June, 1891, a prohibition resolution was moved in the Federal Parliament by Mr. Jamieson, (Conservative), and seconded by Mr. D. C. Fraser (Liberal). This the Government dared neither to oppose nor to support. It therefore proposed to investigate the subject and defer action until the investigation should be completed. Its spokesman for this course was the Hon. George E. Foster, Minister of Finance, who had formerly been known as a pronounced prohibitionist, and who had never confessed a change of sentiment in that respect. On this occasion Mr. Foster, amid applause, declared that his faith in the righteousness and the feasibility of prohibition was stronger than ever before, and that "no better thing could be done in this country than to exchange \$7,500,000 of revenue . . . for a country blessed with the sobriety and peace and consequent plenty" which he believed would come "from a well ordered and well enforced prohibitory law."

But instead of such a law he proposed that the House pass a resolution beginning as follows:

“That in the opinion of this House it is desirable without delay to obtain for the information and consideration of Parliament, by means of a Royal Commission, the fullest and most reliable data possible respecting [the effects of the liquor traffic, etc., etc.]”

The solicitude expressed in the resolution for the securing of information “without delay” is ludicrous in the light of the fact that the commission devoted four years to its investigations before reporting. The methods employed by the commission, furthermore, were not such as are calculated to produce the “most reliable data possible.” The commission consisted of one prohibitionist,—the Rev. Dr. J. McLeod of Fredericton, New Brunswick; and four anti-prohibitionists,—Sir Joseph Hickson of Montreal, Ex-Mayor Clarke of Toronto, Mr. Gigault, and Judge McDonald.

Its usual method of investigation was to visit a city, prepare a list of witnesses, proceed to hear those hostile to prohibition first, and then adjourn for “want of time.” In Toronto the commission was provided with a list of three hundred clergymen as witnesses. Out of the list two who were known to oppose prohibition were selected and heard, whereupon the commission suddenly adjourned. The newspapers protested and a petition was signed by many citizens, headed by Mayor Robert J. Fleming, demanding that the commission return and finish its business. Under this pressure the commission returned. After four years of similar research the majority of the commission recommended a restrictive law, the minority of one a prohibitory law. The revelations published by the body fill seven large volumes, but the partisan spirit manifested in its

proceedings necessarily casts some doubt upon their value. The principal achievement of this commission was to delay the temperance reform and gain time for the liquor men and their political allies.

But though the long drawn out existence of the Royal Commission, by enabling the party leaders at Ottawa to evade the demands of the prohibitionists by saying, "Let us wait for the commission's report," had suspended temperance agitation in the federal government, it had by no means suspended such agitation altogether. It had merely shifted the scene of the reform to the provincial parliaments. In Manitoba, on July 23, 1892, the provincial parliament in response to numerous petitions from the people ordered a plebiscite on the question of prohibition. The result was a surprise to the friends as well as the enemies of temperance. The people declared for prohibition by a vote of almost three to one. Instead of responding to this demand with such a prohibitory law as lay in its power, the Legislature petitioned the Dominion Parliament to enact complete prohibition for the entire country. The plebiscite in Manitoba was closely followed by plebiscite in three other provinces, which resulted similarly. The results of the whole series are shown in the following table :

PROVINCIAL PLEBISCITES ON PROHIBITION.

PROVINCES.	DATE.	VOTES POLLED.		Majority for	Proportion of Votes Polled to Names on Lists.
		For	Against.		
Manitoba.....	July 23, 1892..	18,637	7,115	11,522	55.18
P. E. Island.....	Dec. 13, 1893..	10,585	3,331	7,254	57.83
Nova Scotia.....	Mar. 15, 1894.	43,756	12,355	31,401	50.49
Ontario.....	Jan. 1, 1894..	192,489	110,720	81,769	55.21



HON. R. W. SCOTT, K.C.

Father of the Canada Temperance Act of 1875—
„The Scott Act.”



HON. GEO. E. FOSTER

Ex-Finance Minister of Canada. One of the pioneer
Prohibitionists in Canada.





MRS. ANNIE ORCHARD RUTHERFORD.

President of Dominion W. C. T. U. Born in Galt, Ont. Educated at the public schools and Hamilton Ladies' College. Is an excellent musician, and entered temperance work under Mrs. Youmans in 1881. Was elected Rec. Secy. Ont. W. C. T. U. 1881. Vice-Pres. of same 1894-5. Elected Dom. Pres. 1895.



THE LATE MRS. LETITIA YOUMANS.

The great Canadian Prohibition orator. Born near Cobourg, Ont., 1827. Taught for years in leading ladies' academies. From 1868 to 1888 she wielded a strong influence against the liquor traffic by her public addresses. Was an earnest, logical and convincing speaker, and her autobiography, "Campaign Echoes," is a work of much value.

In the province of New Brunswick no plebiscite was ordered, but the Legislature by a unanimous vote adopted a memorial urging the Dominion Parliament to enact a law of total prohibition.

The occurrence of this series of plebiscites, and the failure of any Legislature to pass a prohibition measure in obedience to them "are facts which need some explanation. To understand them several elements of what was a complex situation must be observed. In the first place, though the plebiscites were affairs of the various separate provinces, the purpose of many who took part in them was national rather than provincial. The national House of Commons, as stated above, had declared itself ready to pass prohibitory laws as soon as public sentiment would "support stringent measures." The purpose of many who voted in the plebiscites under consideration was to demonstrate to the national Parliament that the country was ready for prohibition.

The second element in the situation (strangely and yet naturally coupled with the first) was the desire of the political leaders in each province to put off the question by every possible means. Which ever party was in power, its chiefs wished to avoid decisive action. A plebiscite furnished a very convenient way to gain a year's delay. When a prohibitory measure was advocated in the Legislature, the leaders said, with great show of sincerity, "very well, but first let us take a popular vote, and be sure that the law is wanted." After all possible time had been consumed in taking the vote with the result of a sweeping demand for prohibition, the politicians had found some means of further delay. This procedure has been so often repeated in the history of Canada that

it has grown monotonous. Some more recent instances will be mentioned below.

Thirdly, there was still great doubt as to the power of the provincial parliaments to enact the legislation called for by the people. The Constitution (the British North America Act of the British Parliament) was not clear as to the respective powers of the central government and of the provinces in the premises. This fact furnished a very useful excuse for delay to the political leaders. In 1894 a test case which, it was supposed, would decide the question was brought in the Dominion courts. The Ottawa Judges bid fair to rival the Royal Commission in their despatch. And while the case dragged on, it gave still another pretext for delay to the politicians, who said to the impatient prohibitionists: "Only wait till the Privy Council decides our case; then we shall know our ground."

This case was entitled, "The Attorney General for Ontario *versus* the Attorney General for the Dominion." It did not reach the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council until 1896. That court decided in the spring of that year that the entire prohibition of the manufacture, sale, and importation of liquor lay within the competence of the Dominion Parliament, and in its competence alone. The provinces, it was held, had no power to prohibit the manufacture or importation of liquor; though they had the power to restrict the traffic in liquor by licence fees or by regulations, and might even prohibit the traffic, provided they dealt with the subject as one "of a merely local nature."

This decision still left some doubt as to the provincial competence. It was clear that the provinces could not prohibit the manufacture or importation of

liquor, and that they could restrict the sale; but what was the meaning of the court regarding the prohibition of the sale? It was, said some, merely that the province could enact local option laws; others said that it gave the provincial Legislatures power to prohibit the sale of liquor throughout their respective territories, so long as they did not interfere with inter-provincial commerce. This question was not decided until the Privy Council in 1901 rendered the great decision presently to be mentioned. The decision of 1896, however, made one thing perfectly clear: the Dominion could enact complete prohibition and the provinces could not. The prohibitionists, therefore, rallied all their forces to secure the enactment of national prohibition.

Since the fall of the Mackenzie Government in 1878 the supremacy of the Conservative party at Ottawa had been uninterrupted, but its position had weakened, largely because of its timid policy regarding the liquor traffic. Under these circumstances the Liberal party had decided to adopt a vigorous prohibition policy. Through a convention in 1893, it had promised, if returned to power, to order a plebiscite of the whole Dominion on the question of prohibition, and through the utterances of its leaders it was pledged to enact prohibitory laws if the plebiscite so ordered.* Upon this issue the Liberal party was returned to power in 1896, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier became the head of the new Government.

After a year's delay the Government redeemed the first part of its pledge by ordering the plebiscite to be taken on September 29, 1898. The campaign of the prohibitionists was directed by the Dominion Al-


* See Appendix B, Chap. XIV.

liance, of which the venerable Senator Vidal was president. The principal managers of the campaign were Mr. F. S. Spence, corresponding secretary, and Mr. J. J. Maclaren, chairman of the executive committee. Among the campaign speakers for the Prohibitionists were the Hon. Sydney A. Fisher, minister of agriculture, and the Hon. George E. Foster, an active leader in the Conservative party. These men went upon a speaking tour side by side, a fact which shows the non-partisan character of the campaign. During the last few days preceding the vote it has been estimated that two thousand prohibition meetings were held each evening throughout the Dominion. The vote by provinces was as follows:

RESULTS OF THE PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE OF
SEPTEMBER 29, 1896.

PROVINCES.	For Prohibition.	Against Prohibition.	Total Votes Polled.	Total Voters on Lists.	Percentage of Votes Polled to number on Lists.
Ontario.....	154,498	115,284	269,782	576,781	46.77
Quebec.....	23,436	122,760	151,196	335,678	45.04
Nova Scotia.....	34,678	5,370	40,048	101,502	39.46
New Brunswick.....	26,919	9,575	36,494	90,003	40.55
Manitoba.....	12,419	2,978	15,397	49,262	31.26
Columbia.....	5,731	4,756	10,487	35,537	29.51
P. E. Island.....	9,461	1,146	10,607	23,388	45.35
Territories.....	6,238	2,824	9,062	24,275	37.33
Totals.....	278,380	264,638	543,018	1,236,429	43.92

The vote was overwhelmingly in favour of prohibition outside of Quebec, but the heavily adverse vote in that province made the total majority small. The vote in Quebec was the result of political conditions in which the influence of the Catholic clergy and the personal status of Sir Wilfrid Laurier were the im-



JOHN J. MACLAREN, K.C.
Chairman of the Executive of the Dominion Alliance.





REV. W. A. MACKAY, D. D.
President Dominion Alliance for the total suppression of
Liquor Traffic.

portant factors. The parish priests, who were virtually the absolute rulers of public opinion in their respective districts, were generally strong advocates of temperance; but they did not favour national prohibition, preferring to secure the natural end through religious influence, or at most through local prohibition. Moreover, because of a recent defeat of the clergy in a contest regarding the school system, many of them had resolved to hold aloof from political struggles in the future. Cardinal Taschereau, who from his support of all past temperance measures proposed to Parliament might have been expected to cast his influence now in favour of prohibition, died on the eve of the plebiscite. The personal factor in the situation was the extraordinary popularity of the Premier with the clannish French-Canadians. It was known that they would vote almost unanimously in whatever way he desired. Sir Wilfrid uniformly declared that he did not wish to influence the will of the people, and remained neutral in the campaign. But a few days before the vote some of his friends circulated throughout the province of Quebec the statement that a majority for prohibition would result in the political overthrow of Sir Wilfrid, and that the Premier was desirous that his friends should vote against the measure. Sir Wilfrid disavowed this statement, but the disavowal did not reach the people, and the appeal was abundantly successful. Various irregularities in certain of the voting districts also helped to swell the majority against prohibition.

On November 3, 1898, a large delegation from the Dominion Alliance, with the Rev. Dr. Carman, superintendent of the Methodist Church in Canada, as chairman, waited upon the Premier at Ottawa to inquire as to the purpose of the Government and to urge

that the expressed will of the people be put into effect. Sir Wilfrid did not respond until March, 1899. His reply, which was sent to Secretary Spence of the Alliance, argued that the number of votes for prohibition in the plebiscite, though a majority of the number of the votes cast, represented only twenty-three per cent. of the total electorate, and that therefore to enact a prohibitory law would be to force upon the people a measure which the great majority opposed.*

The displeasure of the Prohibitionists at this act of the Premier was expressed at the annual meeting of the Dominion Council of the Alliance, held during the same month, in these resolutions:

“That in view of the majority for prohibition in the whole Dominion, and the large vote and great majority recorded in favour of prohibition in six provinces and the North-West Territories, the least measure of immediate legislation that could be looked upon as reasonable for the Government to offer, would be such as would secure the entire prohibition of the liquor traffic in and into these provinces and territories, notwithstanding any temporary delay in the application of such a law to the province of Quebec on account of the adverse vote in that province.

“That such legislation ought to be enacted by the Dominion Parliament, which alone can prohibit the sending of intoxicating liquor into prohibition provinces from places in which prohibition is not in operation.

“That failure to enact at least this measure of prohibition must be considered inexcusable disregard and defiance of the strong moral sentiment of the electorate, so emphatically expressed in the plebiscite.

“That prohibitionists ought to oppose any government, any party or any candidate that will refuse to recognize and respond to the demand of the people, to at least the extent of such legislation.”

* See Appendix C, Chap. XIV.

In pursuance of this declaration the Alliance began to organise leagues of voters pledged to the following obligation:

“We, the undersigned, promise that at the next general election for the Dominion Parliament, we will vote only for such candidates as will agree to do all in their power, if elected, to obtain the immediate enactment of such legislation as will secure the total prohibition of the liquor traffic in AT LEAST those provinces and territories that gave majorities for prohibition in the plebiscite.

“This pledge to be null and void unless 25,000 signatures to it are secured.”

In the House of Commons, in 1899, a resolution in favour of enacting total prohibition was introduced by Mr. T. B. Flint and debated for twelve hours, but never came to a vote. In February, 1900, Mr. Flint introduced a similar resolution, which was debated from time to time until July 3. The House then resolved that “such a prohibitory law should not be enacted at the present time.” This resolution, however, was, by a vote of 65 to 64, amended to the following effect:

“But inasmuch as it is desirable that legislation be enacted, having in view the further restriction of the liquor traffic, it is, therefore, expedient, in the opinion of this House, that the Canada Temperance Act be enlarged in its scope and the provisions for its administration be perfected.”

Despairing of inducing the Dominion Government to redeem its promise the Prohibitionists turned their attention to the provincial Legislatures. The most they could do there would be to prohibit only the sale of drink within the boundaries of single provinces, and it was even doubtful whether they

could constitutionally do this ; but they determined to try. In Manitoba the Conservative party espoused their cause. It made prohibition an issue in the election in 1899 by adopting the following resolution :

“ That a measure be adopted to give effect to the will of the people regarding the prohibition of the liquor traffic, which measure shall go so far in the direction of prohibition as the powers of the province will allow.”

The Conservatives won the election, and their leader, the Hon. H. J. MacDonald, became the head of the new Government. In February, 1900, a delegation of prohibitionists waited upon the Premier to urge him to carry out the party's pledge. Mr. MacDonald promptly replied that a bill providing for the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors, to the full extent of the provincial competence, would be introduced at the coming session of the Legislature. He frankly asked the assistance of the people in carrying out its provisions and declared that the Government was prepared to stand or fall by its prohibition programme. When the Legislature assembled, the Government introduced a bill for prohibiting the retail and the wholesale sale for the delivery of liquor in the province. To guard against exceeding the powers of the province by interfering with commerce not purely provincial the bill provided as follows :

“ While this act is intended to prohibit, and shall prohibit, transactions in liquor which take place wholly within the province of Manitoba, except under a licence [druggist's licence] or, as otherwise specially provided by this act, and restrict the consumption of liquor within the limits of the province of Manitoba, it shall not affect *bona fide* transactions in liquor between a



HON. HUGH JOHN MACDONALD
Ex-Premier of Manitoba, and author of the Manitoba Liquor Act.





HON. G. W. ROSS, LL. D.
Premier of Ontario; formerly Most Worthy Patriarch of the
Sons of Temperance of North America.

person in the province of Manitoba and a person in another province or in a foreign country; and the provisions of this act shall be construed accordingly."

After a bitter fight with the liquor interests the bill was passed and was signed by the Lieutenant-Governor on July 5, 1900. Before it should go into effect the Government submitted the question of its constitutionality to the courts, and the Legislature decreed, by an amendment, that the act, pending the decision of this question, should remain inoperative, until put in force by the proclamation of the Government.

On February 23, 1901, the provincial Court of King's Bench decided that in some respects the law went beyond the competence of the Legislature. From this decision the Government of Manitoba appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This supreme court of the British Empire, in November, 1901, reversed the decision of the provincial court, deciding that the act was entirely within the power of the province to enact. It held that all the act did, from a constitutional point of view, was, as its preamble said, "to suppress the liquor traffic in Manitoba;" that, to be sure, "unless the act became a dead letter, it must interfere with the revenue of the Dominion, with licensed trades in the province of Manitoba [meaning trades licensed by the Dominion], and indirectly at least with business operations beyond the limits of the province;" yet (says the official report of the decision) "all objections on that score were, in their Lordship's opinion, removed by the judgment of the Board in the case of 'The Attorney-General for Ontario *versus* the Attorney-General for the Dominion,'" the judgment, namely, that

“matters which were of a local or private nature ‘from a provincial point of view’ . . . were not excluded from the category of ‘matters of a merely local or private nature’ because legislation dealing with them . . . might or must have an effect outside the limits of the province and might or must interfere with the sources of Dominion revenue and the industrial pursuits of persons licenced under Dominion statutes to carry on particular trades.”

The Manitoba prohibitory act having thus been upheld by the Privy Council, nothing remained but for the provincial Cabinet to direct by proclamation that it go into effect. But now strange rumours arose that the Cabinet did not intend to do this. Mr. MacDonald was no longer the Premier; his place had been taken by Mr. R. P. Roblin, a member of the same party. It was said that Mr. Roblin did not feel bound to keep the promises made by his predecessor, and that he would refuse to put the act in force. Then it was said he would not refuse absolutely, but would submit the law to the voters through a referendum.

On January 16, 1902, a great deputation, representing the Dominion Alliance and the Ministerial Association of Winnipeg waited on the Premier to demand that he put the law in force. His reply was read at a great public meeting that night in Winnipeg. It was as follows:

“After carefully considering the statements made to-day by members of the Ministerial Association and the Dominion Alliance, the government, after consulting with their supporters in caucus, still believe it desirable that a referendum should be held, such referendum deciding the fate of the act, the government pledging to the strict enforcement of the act if so brought into force by the referendum.”

The assembly received this letter with indignation. The Hon. Colin H. Campbell, the Attorney-General of the province, was to have addressed the meeting, but when this fact was announced cries of objection were heard from all sides, and by an overwhelming vote the meeting refused to hear any representative of the faithless Government. The following resolution was then passed:

Be it resolved, that we recommend to the temperance people of this province that they ignore this referendum and abstain from polling their votes thereon. . . .

Resolved, that this Alliance, having lost confidence in the sincerity of the Government to enforce the liquor act, therefore, we have declared against the so-called referendum.

Mr. Roblin's referendum was taken on April 2, 1902, and was overwhelmingly defeated, as the friends of prohibition urged the electors to repudiate the referendum, in accordance with the resolution above quoted.


A prohibitory law similar to that of Manitoba was passed in 1900 by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island. It was introduced by the Government, which was controlled by the Liberal party and headed by Mr. Farquharson. This law went into effect on June 5, 1901. The question of its validity was submitted to the judiciary, and on January 14, 1902, the Supreme Court of the province declared it constitutional.

The decision of the Privy Council that the Manitoba act was valid incited the prohibitionists of Ontario to great activity. On January 3, 1902, a deputation representing the General Conference of the Methodist Church and also the Dominion Alliance visited the Premier, the Hon. George W. Ross. They

reminded him that the province had voted in favour of prohibition twice within eight years, that the former Premier, Sir Oliver Mowat, had promised to support the most stringent prohibition bill which the decision of the Privy Council would allow, that Mr. Ross had himself several times made the same promise, and that thus the Government party (the Liberal) was pledged to pass a law similar to that of Manitoba. Prominent in this deputation were the Rev. Dr. Carman, the Rev. J. Brethour, the Rev. Dr. Mackay, Dr. MacLaren, and Mr. Atwell. A flood of petitions during the rest of the month seconded their representations. On the other hand, a delegation of eight hundred liquor manufacturers and sellers called at the Parliament buildings to protest against the proposed law.

The removal by the Privy Council of the most serviceable excuse for delay left the Government nothing to do but to introduce a prohibition bill. This Mr. Ross did on February 12. His bill provided for the same measures, substantially, as those of the Manitoba act; but before it should go into effect a referendum was to be taken, and in this referendum a majority vote should make the measure law, provided the number of votes constituting such majority should equal or exceed half of the total vote cast at the preceding election.

These unusual conditions prejudicial to the bill's becoming law raised an indignant protest from the prohibitionists. They denied that there was any need of further popular voting on the question, after the two plebiscites of recent years; but if there was to be such voting they demanded that it be fairly conducted, and that the question be decided by a simple majority vote, like any other question submitted to a



REV. A. CARMAN, D. D.
General Superintendent of the Methodist Church.





HON. S. H. BLAKE, K. C.

One of Ontario's most prominent Christian and Temperance
Workers.

referendum. Dr. Carman said that he had a decided objection to going to the polls with the ballot boxes stuffed with two hundred thousand votes before he got there. The Premier replied that the law would be very difficult to enforce in any case, and that the Government simply desired to be sure of the support of a substantial public sentiment in order that it might not be a fiasco. He said that if the temperance people could not get the special majority required by the bill, they did not deserve to be successful.

The Ross bill became law in March, 1902. The referendum for which it provides will be taken on December 4, 1902. If the vote in favour of prohibition amounts to 213,489 or more, and exceeds the vote to the contrary, provincial prohibition will go into effect in Ontario on May 1, 1904.

Turning now to a general view of the liquor laws at present in force in Canada, we may divide these laws into four classes:

1. *Prohibitory Laws.*—These include, besides the Prince Edward Island just mentioned, Dominion laws prohibiting liquor selling in unorganised territories, except under special permits and in any part of the Dominion on parliamentary election days, and entirely prohibiting the sale of liquor to Indians.

2. *Local Option Laws.*—Besides the Dominion local option law—the Scott Act—provincial local option laws are in force in every province but one. These various laws result in local prohibition throughout a large part of the Dominion. Sixteen of the 18 counties of Nova Scotia, 9 of the 14 counties of New Brunswick, 603 of the 993 municipalities (not including large cities) of Quebec, and the greater part of Manitoba, are under local prohibition.

3. *Laws Regarding the Granting of Licences.*—

For the granting of a licence most of the provinces require the consent of a majority of the electors within a certain district. Nova Scotia requires the consent of two-thirds of the electors, which must be annually renewed. British Columbia requires, in rural districts, the consent of two-thirds of the resident property owners and of two-thirds of the wives of such property owners.

4. *Laws Restricting the Sale of Licenced Dealers.*—The sale of liquor to habitual drunkards, minors, etc., is prohibited under severe penalties in most provinces upon notice from a relative. Most of the provinces also allow civil damages to relatives of persons injured while intoxicated. In Nova Scotia saloons must close at 9 P. M., in New Brunswick at 10 P. M., in Quebec at 11 P. M., or earlier if so ordered by the local license commissioners.

These four classes of laws form a body of liquor legislation which, though not ideal, is among the most stringent in existence. Its operation, together with that of a growing public sentiment against drinking, has caused the decrease in the consumption of liquor shown in the following table:

CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR IN CANADA SINCE THE CONFEDERATION.

YEAR.	SPIRITS.		MALT LIQUOR.		WINE.
	Gallons.	Gals. per Capita.	Gallons.	Gals. per Capita.	Gallons per Capita.
1868.....	¹ 3,772,719	7,685,309
1869.....	¹ 2,809,501	1.124	7,609,148	2.290	0.115
1870.....	3,810,930	1.434	7,290,540	2.163	0.195
1871.....	4,219,245	1.578	8,457,096	2.490	0.259
1872.....	3,808,291	1.732	9,557,328	2.774	0.257
1873.....	3,730,337	1.682	11,060,521	3.188	0.239
1874.....	4,566,508	1.994	10,771,519	3.012	0.288
1875.....	3,303,298	1.394	11,584,226	3.091	0.149
1876.....	3,441,125	1.204	9,319,190	2.454	0.177
1877.....	2,942,337	0.975	9,115,258	2.322	0.096
1878.....	3,007,870	0.960	8,578,075	2.169	0.096

¹ Total quantity manufactured.

CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR IN CANADA SINCE THE CONFEDERATION. (Continued).

YEAR.	SPIRITS.		MALT LIQUOR.		WINE.
	Gallons.	Gals. per Capita.	Gals.	Gals. per Capita.	Gallons per Capita.
1879.....	3,646,255	1.131	8,848,208	2,209	0.104
1880.....	2,290,367	0.715	9,201,213	2,248	0.077
1881.....	3,214,543	0.922	9,981,176	2,293	0.099
1882.....	3,552,818	1.009	12,036,979	2,747	0.120
1883.....	3,848,787	1.090	12,757,444	2,882	0.135
1884.....	3,608,021	0.998	13,098,700	2,924	0.117
1885.....	4,274,722	1.126	12,071,752	2,639	0.109
1886.....	2,412,818	0.711	13,282,261	2,839	0.110
1887.....	2,664,935	0.746	14,786,285	3,084	0.095
1888.....	2,326,327	0.645	15,944,002	3,247	0.094
1889.....	2,960,447	0.776	16,363,349	3,263	0.097
1890.....	3,521,194	0.883	17,196,115	3,360	0.104
1891.....	2,687,664	0.745	18,069,183	3,790	0.111
1892.....	2,545,935	0.701	16,946,245	3,516	0.101
1893.....	2,731,896	0.740	17,175,356	3,485	0.094
1894.....	2,749,109	0.742	18,299,636	3,722	0.089
1895.....	2,509,019	0.666	17,628,815	3,471	0.090
1896.....	2,332,859	0.623	18,014,714	3,528	0.070
1897.....	2,779,946	0.723	17,888,239	3,469	0.084
1898.....	1,874,479	0.536	19,871,738	3,808	0.082
1899.....	2,404,599	0.661	21,101,873	3,995	0.086
1900.....	2,523,576	0.701	23,309,172	4,364	0.085

Though the consumption of beer is shown by this table to have increased, the consumption of other liquors has decreased largely, that of spirits very heavily. The result is that the *per capita* amount of pure alcohol consumed in Canada during approximately this same period has suffered a constant and very large reduction, as appears in the following table :

1871-75	0.79 gallons
1876-80	0.60 gallons
1881-85	0.66 gallons
1886-90	0.58 gallons
1891-95	0.55 gallons
1896-98	0.52 gallons

CHAPTER XV.

TEMPERANCE IN EUROPE.

THE progress of the temperance reform in the Scandinavian peninsula and in the Russian Empire will be related in Chapters XVII. and XVIII. respectively. We shall now consider its progress in the other principal countries of Europe, giving most attention to Great Britain.

GREAT BRITAIN.

When George IV. came to the throne of England public morality was at a low ebb. The British citizen was not perceptibly disturbed when his king proceeded to practise every infamy known to the slums of London. The people followed the royal example. They had emerged from the terrible Napoleonic wars only to seek new disasters in drunkenness and debauchery. It was this period of degradation which gave birth to the temperance reform in Great Britain.

It began almost simultaneously in Ireland and Scotland, in September, 1829. In the early part of that year Dr. Beecher's *Six Sermons on Temperance* were circulated in pamphlet form in the north of Ireland, preparing the soil for the seed presently to

be sown. About this time Dr. John Edgar, a young minister in Belfast, wrote an article urging the necessity of a general reform in drinking customs, and offered it to the *Belfast Guardian*. This journal rejected it on the ground that "none but an insane person could advocate such a cause." The article was accepted and published by the *Belfast News Letter*. Dr. Edgar soon succeeded in interesting other clergymen in his project, and on September 24, 1829, he, with five friends—the Rev. Dr. Morgan, the Rev. Messrs. Thomas Hincks, John Wilson, and Thomas Houston, and Mr. Alexander S. Mayne—signed the following pledge: "We resolve to abstain from the use of distilled spirits, and to promote temperance."

It was high time that some such action should be taken. Dr. Houston thus describes the conditions of intemperance prevailing even among the religious leaders of the people:

"A minister was expected to share with the people in their potations of strong drink in families and in all social gatherings; to refuse to do so would have, to some extent, exposed him to unfavourable remark and weakened his influence. For a minister to be occasionally overcome by intoxicating liquor was never thought of as inconsistent with ministerial character, or as deserving of public censure. . . . At almost every sacramental occasion intoxicating liquor was freely indulged in. Baptisms were administered in connection with the free use of spirituous liquor; and communions were often concluded with a drunken feast. . . . In a district of County Down with which I was acquainted almost all the ministers in a circuit of adjoining parishes, at the same time, were either known drunkards or as freely indulging in drinking habits. In some instances two or three ministers of the same congregation in succession followed this evil practice,

some of whom were deposed and others removed by a premature death."

The temperance movement of Belfast prospered and spread to other parts of northern Ireland. Dr. Houston says of its early progress:

"Chiefly owing to the exposures which were made of the enormous evils of the drink system, it served to awaken the Christian conscience and to excite to philanthropic effort. Dr. Edgar, from his warm-hearted benevolence, his rough, stirring eloquence, genuine Irish humour, and above all his earnest devotedness, was himself a host, and had the power of attracting around him a considerable number of persons of like spirit—of self-denying, intrepid workers. By holding frequent public meetings, by speeches and lectures, and by scattering broadcast great numbers of temperance publications, the cause was advanced and much good was done. Yet the actual abandonment of drinking throughout the community was slow."

This last-mentioned fact is not to be wondered at, since some of the reformers opposed total abstinence with a vigour and determination equal to their zeal for temperance.

In the same month which saw the formation of the Belfast society, September, 1829, Mr. John Dunlop of Greenock, Scotland, delivered in Glasgow a lecture on *The Extent and Remedy of National Intemperance*. Moved to grief and alarm by the prevalence of drunkenness in Scotland, he had studied this subject for some time. He presented the condition of his country as regarded intemperance as follows:

"I learn from respectable tradesmen and work people that more than three-fourths of our labouring male population are either tinctured with, wedded to, or lost

in this vice. . . . In the workshop, in the washing-green, in the kitchen, in the parlour, on the street, at the market, and in the church, hopeless inebriation glares us in the face, assails our nostrils, and saddens our hearts. . . . It is now allowed that the subject of intemperance has become in this country one of deep importance. Two features in it which did not formerly prevail, seem to mark the present period as one of unexampled alarm and danger. I mean the hitherto unknown triumphs of this desolating vice among women and children. On the contemplation of this scene philanthropy would willingly cast a veil. And if we are to sit still and fold our hands over the destruction of our country, surely our natural feelings will be best consulted by stopping our ears to the appalling tale of the degradation of the most virtuous and innocent portion of the human race. But such a line of conduct becomes us neither as men nor as Christians. Nay, let us not retreat from the spectacle, and wrap our future prospects in a shroud; but open our eyes, and penetrate the breadth and length and dimensions of female and infant profligacy, though our hearts should break in the attempt. Better to know that the mothers and daughters of the land, forsaking the exalted aims inseparable from female dignity and worth, have surrendered their hearts and best affections to a wide-reaching and atrocious gratification; and that the sparkling eye of childhood is quenched in loathsome debauch and its ruby lip defiled with shameful vomiting; that the precious hopes of after generations are already ripe for the grave before they have attained the precincts of pupilage; if by so forcing our feelings we shall save but a very few from the abyss into which all seem fearfully plunging."

Mr. Dunlop's study of the question had led him to a firm faith in the American method of combating intemperance,—viz., abstinence and association. He presented this remedy to his Glasgow audience in the

following interesting language. The words *abstinence* and *abandonment*, as he used them, referred to spirits alone :

“ The happy results that have lately followed [temperance agitation in America] are by our transatlantic friends chiefly referred to the resolute and uncompromising principle of utter abstinence by a portion of the population, which is justly looked upon as the *sine qua non* and basis of all successful effort on this question. The principle of the American societies may therefore be shortly stated as utter, immediate, sudden and complete abandonment, combined with association to a certain extent in all ranks of society. This will undoubtedly appear to every man who begins the consideration of this most interesting subject as a startling difficulty. . . . We must not, however, permit our preconceived opinions to outweigh the testimony of authenticated fact; for it is demonstrated from the records of the American societies that this principle adopted by a few and aided in its progress by an associated chain of institutions, has nearly slain the gigantic evil that threatened to bury the whole nation in literal family and individual destruction.

“ It is astonishing how successful this procedure has proved in America, and we have been assured by a clergyman of that nation that the promise to abstinence, once given, has always been faithfully kept; the point of honour in a solemn engagement, with so many co-obligants and witnesses, acting powerfully with those who might be unmoved by scriptural considerations; the adoption of a course of utter abstinence also removing a mass of temptation which would have remained latent, but irresistible, had the moderate use been retained.”

In accordance with these views, Mr. Dunlop endeavoured to start the national reform by forming a society in Glasgow on the basis of abstinence from

spirits; but it was urged by his friends there that this very dubious experiment ought first to be tried in a smaller place. Mr. Dunlop therefore returned to Greenock and founded the Greenock Temperance Society. There was a great deal of debate as to whether the pledge should be one of total abstinence or of abstinence from spirits only. Mr. Dunlop favoured the latter plan, and it was the one adopted.

Within a year from the formation of the Greenock society similar ones were formed in Edinburgh and Glasgow. By that time the reform was fully under way, and everywhere the national conscience was aroused to action against the national curse.

The temperance reform of England sprang from that of Scotland. Mr. Henry Forbes of Bradford, while visiting Glasgow, soon after the formation of the temperance society there, attended one of its meetings and signed the pledge. Returning home he formed on February 2, 1830, the Bradford Temperance Society, the first of its kind in England. The second was that of Warrington, Lancashire, formed on April 4, 1830. Within the year there were similar societies in Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, York, and London. In 1831, the Bradford society sent out a lecturer, the Rev. J. Jackson, to spread the reform in neighbouring places. He spoke at Preston, Lancashire, among other places, and his work there led to the formation of the Preston Temperance Society, the precursor of a greater movement presently to be described. The London Temperance Society was formed in 1830 by Mr. William Collins of Glasgow. From the first it had distinguished supporters;—the Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield), the Dean of Chichester, Admiral Keats, Sir M. J. Tierney, M.D., Major-General Fisher, Sir

John Webb, etc.; and commanded respect and attention. Soon its name was changed to "the British and Foreign Temperance Society," with Bishop Blomfield as its president, and its activity was greatly enlarged.

As was the case in America, so the early reformers in England made spirits, or gin, the scapegoat for all the evils of intemperance. This naturally led to the allied principle of substituting beer for spirits. This principle received legislative support in one of the first laws passed in the reign of William IV., namely, the famous Beer Act, an act "to permit the general sale of beer and cider by retail in England." The act provided that any householder might retail malt liquors upon payment of a licence fee of two guineas, or cider upon payment of one guinea, but fixed the fee for licence to vend wine and spirits at twenty pounds. This policy cost England dear. Within a year more than thirty thousand beer houses sprung up in England and Wales. Within ten years the quantity of malt used for brewing increased 28 per cent. over the amount so used during the preceding decade, and the consumption of spirits, contrary to expectation, did not decrease, but, on the contrary, increased 32 per cent. Such were the fruits of attempting to cure intemperance by increasing the use of beer. But a new school of reformers was now rising, which was to show England the folly of partial abstinence.

For the most part, the adherents of the reform movement we have been considering looked upon the principle of total abstinence with impatience or disgust. The total abstinence reform had an entirely different origin. In 1832 a grocer of Preston, in Lancashire, named Joseph Livesey, induced six of his

friends to join him in a total abstinence pledge. These were the "Seven Men of Preston," the originators of the total abstinence reform in Great Britain.* For a year these men were active in securing new signatures to their pledge and, in 1832, they induced the local temperance society to adopt, as an alternative to its pledge merely of temperance, the following total abstinence pledge:

"We . . . voluntarily agree to abstain for one year from ale, porter, wine, and ardent spirits, and all other intoxicating liquors, except for medicine or in religious ordinance."

Before the close of the year 998 names were affixed to this pledge. The Preston society thereupon began to extend its propaganda to neighbouring towns, sending out speakers and distributing tracts. Among its early speakers were Livesey, James Teare, J. Howarth, G. Stead, the Swindlehurst brothers, and Richard (commonly called Dicky) Turner.† A periodical was also established by Livesey in 1832. It was called the *Preston Temperance Advocate*, and was the first total abstinence paper in England.‡

The methods of the Preston reformers are thus described by Mr. Livesey:

"Preston was soon recognised as the Jerusalem of teetotalism, from which the word went forth in every direction. During the race week in 1833 seven of us projected a missionary tour to the chief towns in Lancashire, in order to establish societies, or to bring existing societies up to that point. We took a horse and cart, supplied with 9,500 tracts, and we had a very neat

* See Appendix A, Chap. XV.

† See Appendix B, Chap. XV.

‡ See Appendix C, Chap. XV.

small white flag containing a temperance motto. We started on Monday morning, 8th July, and visited Blackburn, Haslingden, Oldham, Ashton, Stockport, Manchester, and Bolton, besides halting at intermediate villages as we passed through them. We divided our party so that we could hold two meetings each night, some in buildings and some in the open air. . . . Temperance tours continued to be taken, sometimes by individuals and sometimes in companies, to various parts of the country.”

The cause of total abstinence needed brave supporters to survive the opposition which it met. One of its pioneers thus describes a typical meeting of the early days: *

“The chairman on the occasion was Squire Dawson, a proper man and a Christian gentleman, living in Lancashire. The meeting had scarcely commenced when a man’s legs came through the ceiling over the pit, and down tumbled the plaster; he had missed his footing in the dark. Presently an old paint pot was suspended through the hole made, and paint dropped from it on to the people below, and they could not get from under it, because of the crowded state of the pit. The squire, with his gold spectacles on his nose, and with much suavity and persuasion, exhorted the people for the credit of the town to listen to Mr. Livesey. A dusty stuffed imitation of a fish was hurled at the squire’s head; he was hit across the nose, his sight dimmed by dust, and his spectacles disordered; then at this point some one got to the main gas tap and left us in darkness; then we had imitation thunder and lightning. Yet Mr. Livesey managed to give his lecture.”

The same writer thus describes the hostility to the reform:

“The Established Church treated us with silent con-
* Mr. Thomas Whittaker

tempt. The Nonconforming churches, in the drinking business, where anything but Nonconformists ; and the Wesleyans, in many cases, stepped out of the way to hit us, and, as is well known, treated our petitions and memorials to conference with scant courtesy indeed ; and, so far as conference power went, the doors of their chapels, and even school-rooms, were closed against us. In Nonconforming and Wesleyan churches, as well as in the Establishment, the drink power was in the ascendant, and it was not an uncommon thing then (and we knew it) for leading men in these various churches to be largely interested in the liquor trade, and in some cases to own and supply with drink some of the worst houses in their several localities."

But the Preston reformers were able to hold their own against these odds. They were strong, rugged Britons, to whom opposition was only an incentive. Livesey was a man of tireless energy. Besides managing his business, he conducted a night school, edited the *Temperance Advocate*, organised temperance campaigns, and made speeches in all parts of England. Chief among his disciples was Thomas Whittaker. Whittaker's youth had been eventful. His love of athletic sport, especially wrestling, had resulted in his crippling his shoulder. He had eloped with a factory girl, who proved to be an admirable wife. When he met Livesey he had lost his employment through drink. At one of Livesey's meetings he was persuaded to reform. He was then twenty-three years old. After making a few speeches in the neighbourhood, this rough Lancashire lad started without purse or scrip on a total abstinence campaign as representative of the British Society for the Promotion of Temperance. Thus began the career of one of the stoutest champions of temperance, whose work for the succeeding half century forms a most im-

portant part of the history of the reform.* Another of these young men of Lancaster was Frederick Richard Lees. In a public discussion at Leeds on June 4, 1836, when just twenty-one years of age, he attracted attention by his eloquence in behalf of total abstinence as against partial abstinence. His name is now a household word among friends of the reform. Another was Ralph Barnes Grindrod, whose book, entitled *Bacchus*, laid the foundation of temperance literature in England and is now one of the classics of the reform. Almost to a man these early prophets of total abstinence were young fellows—for the most part in their twenties. They were of humble origin, rude in manner, slow of speech; consequently they were despised, buffeted, and derided. But, though ostracised by society, scorned by their companions, repudiated by the church, they opened the way for the great reform to follow.

Through the efforts of the Preston reformers numerous temperance societies in the north of England soon adopted the total abstinence pledge as an alternative to their temperance pledge, in some cases abandoning the latter altogether. In September, 1835, representatives of these societies, in convention at Manchester, formed the British Association for the Promotion of Temperance—the same society which is now known as the British Temperance League. A weekly periodical, the *Star of Temperance*, was established at that time as the organ of the association.

Mr. Livesey, perceiving in the fondness of the people for beer and ale, and in the defence of those liquors by many temperance reformers, the greatest

* Whittaker's son, Thomas Whittaker, Jr., is now a member of Parliament and one of the foremost workers in his father's cause.

† See Appendix D, Chap. XV.

obstacle to the progress of temperance, directed his chief efforts against the use and prescription of those liquors. With this purpose he prepared his famous lecture on *Malt*, which he delivered in many parts of England, and which was published in many editions and had a circulation of about 100,000 copies. He went up to London in 1834 to testify before a Parliamentary committee which had been appointed, on the motion of Mr. James Silk Buckingham, to enquire into the extent, causes, and consequences of intemperance in Great Britain. This committee, we may remark in passing, was important in the history of the temperance cause, for though it led to no legislation of any consequence, its report and the evidence accompanying it furnished a mine of valuable information for the use of the reformers. Of these Mr. Buckingham, chairman of the committee, was for twenty years following one of the ablest advocates of temperance. Mr. Livesey testified before the committee: "We have ten times more drunkenness in Preston from the consumption of beer than either wine or spirits." While in London he delivered his lecture on *Malt* in a schoolroom in Providence Row, Finsbury Square. He made a few converts, who practised total abstinence, but made no attempt at organisation for a year. The British and Foreign Temperance Society refused to sanction total abstinence. In September, 1835, the British Teetotal Temperance Society was formed, with Mr. James Silk Buckingham as its first president. In the following year its name was changed to "the New British and Foreign Temperance Society." It quickly became a power for good, and has remained so to this day, being now known as the National Temperance League. The old British and Foreign Temperance

Society continued its stubborn opposition to the total abstinence pledge, and, like most of the societies which took this course, continued to decline. In 1849 it ceased to exist.

In other parts of England, as well as in London and in the north, the transition from moderation to total abstinence proceeded with great rapidity. It was in many places opposed, as in London, by the first temperance societies, some of the most prominent members of which, Dr. Dawson Burns tells us, were brewers. Some societies refused to allow the teetotal pledge to be used even as an alternative to the moderation pledge, and a secession of the teetotalers often followed. By the year 1839 there were few societies which had not adopted total abstinence. The same transition occurred in Scotland, with the aid of Mr. Dunlop, who had become a convert. It likewise occurred in Ireland, though having more opposition there, as has been said, its progress was slower. But all opposition was soon to be swept away like dust before the whirlwind of Father Mathew's crusade.

Father Mathew, a young Capuchin Friar, was a director of the House of Industry in Cork. One of his colleagues, William Martin, a Quaker and an ardent teetotaler, by frequent urging succeeded in interesting the priest in total abstinence, and, on April 10, 1838, at a public meeting in his own school-room Father Mathew signed the total abstinence pledge, saying: "Here goes, in the name of God." Sixty other persons present followed his example, but none of them dreamed of the portentous events soon to follow. Though some of the priest's friends of the upper class regarded his act as a sign of weakness and error, the common people regarded it with enthusiastic approval. The school-room soon became

too small for Father Mathew's meetings, and they were removed to the large auditorium of the Horse Bazaar. Here they continued until the middle of the year 1839. Extraordinary confusion prevails among the authorities as to the number of persons who took the pledge in this period. The lowest number stated is 5,000. In any case, however great the priest's success in those meetings at Cork, it was merely the prelude to the greater crusade which opened in December, 1839.

At that time Father Mathew held a series of meetings in Limerick, at the invitation of the Mayor, O. H. Fitzgerald. The influx of people to these meetings was so vast that barns, cellars, and churches were turned into dormitories for their accommodation. The number of pledges administered by the devoted priest has been estimated at from 100,000 to 150,000. During the same month he visited Waterford, where he administered 80,000 pledges, and Clonmel, where the number was 30,000. During that wonderful month nearly a quarter of a million people in the south of Ireland became total abstainers. On through the years 1840--1843 Father Mathew journeyed over Ireland in a continuous triumphal procession. The scenes of Limerick were paralleled again and again.

Father Mathew was violently opposed, among his opponents being a bishop of his church. He was advised and coaxed by his friends to desist. He was threatened. He was slandered. It was said that he was growing rich from the sale of medals, whereas as a matter of fact he contributed so heavily to the cause that he became bankrupt. But by none of these obstacles was he deterred. His ministry in Ireland alone, not counting his short trips to England and

Scotland and his journey through America in 1849-1850, resulted in the pledging of three million people to total abstinence.

The effects of this wonderful crusade were described as follows, in 1843, by the Rev. William Wight, M.A. :

With respect to Ireland,—in visiting that country some time since, opportunity was afforded for personal investigation of the effects of the temperance movement. On inspecting prisons in Dublin, I was informed one was closed and for sale ; in another I saw upwards of one hundred cells vacant ; and in other jails, a similar state of things. At the police station, the men admitted they had not half the employment they formerly had. The elections were going on at the time, and on calling at the committee room to ascertain, if possible, what number of public houses had been closed through this powerful principle, it was stated to be from six hundred to eight hundred. A friend who had visited Dublin prior to this movement, had led me to expect swarms of paupers would be besetting the steps of every respectable person's house ; but on going over this fine city, little or nothing of the kind was visible. I was further informed that the magistrates had been obliged to appoint two days in the week instead of one for the savings' banks, the deposits of the working classes coming in so rapidly : and it is now as common in Ireland to meet a poor man with a decent coat on his back, as formerly it was rare ; and from present appearances, drunkenness and its evils will shortly, in that island, be confined to the Protestant portion of the community. In Waterford, it is estimated there are upwards of one hundred thousand pounds worth of value in clothes and furniture in the cottages of the working classes above what there was two years back. At the great national banquet which took place in Dublin, Lord Morpeth, after giving the

particulars of the returns of outrages in the constabulary office, by which it appeared that since 1836 they had diminished one-third, proceeded to remark that of the heaviest offences, such as homicides, outrages upon the person, assaults with attempts to murder, aggravated assaults, cutting and maiming, there were, in

1837.....	12,096
1838.....	11,058
1839.....	1,097
1840.....	173

and the present expense to government for the prison establishments in Ireland is most materially diminished."

The effect of the crusade is also traced in the statistics of the consumption of liquor and of the number of public houses in Ireland, as shown in the following table:

Year.	Consumption of Spirits.	Public- houses.
1838.....	12,296,342.....	21,326
1839.....	10,815,709.....	20,303
1840.....	7,401,051.....	16,109
1841.....	6,485,443.....	14,162
1842.....	5,290,650.....	13,063
1843.....	5,546,483.....	13,018

The consumption of liquor has never been so great as in 1838, and the public houses in Ireland have never recovered the numbers which they reached before 1840.

The memory of Father Mathew's work has furnished the inspiration for the total abstinence movement which has spread through the Roman Catholic world during the latter years of the nineteenth century—the movement which has been directed in America by the Catholic Total Abstinence Association.

During Father Mathew's crusade in the South of Ireland an episode had occurred in the history of the reform in England which, though not very important, attracted much attention at the time. This was the controversy about the long and short pledge. The question at issue was, should the members of the temperance societies pledge themselves simply to abstain (the short pledge) or should they promise neither to use liquor themselves nor to give or offer it to others (the long pledge)? It was a question of hospitality and courtesy. Many temperance people (John Dunlop among them) said that the abstainer was under no obligation to deprive his guests of wine if their opinions did not agree with his. In the North of England those who held that the temperance man should make his example emphatic by banishing liquor from his house as well as abstaining from it, usually carried the day for the long pledge. But in the South of England, especially in London, the question caused dispute and division. It was debated at the annual meeting of the New British and Foreign Temperance Society in 1839, and the majority voted to use only the long pledge. The minority then seceded and formed a new society, the British and Foreign Society for the Suppression of Intemperance. The two organisations worked separately until 1842, when they re-united under the name of "the National Temperance Society," based upon the principle of the short pledge. This society, in 1856, became the National Temperance League, under which name it still flourishes.

The temperance workers of England were greatly aided and encouraged in 1843 by a visit of Father Mathew. His way was marked, as in Ireland, by

thousands of converts. In London he pledged 70,000 to abstinence.

In 1845, England's immortal critic, historian, and essayist, Thomas De Quincey, wrote his famous essay on the *Temperance Movement*, in which he showed an appreciation of the character and value of that movement which was highly gratifying to those devoted to it. "The most remarkable instance," said De Quincey, "of a combined movement in society which history, perhaps, will be summoned to notice, is that which in our own days has applied itself to the abatement of intemperance." His conception of the important part to be played by the movement in the development of civilisation he expressed as follows:

"The greatest era by far of human expansion is opening upon us. Two vast movements are hurrying into action by velocities continually accelerated...the great revolutionary movement from political causes, concurring with the great physical movement in locomotion and social intercourse, from the gigantic (though still infant) powers of steam. No such Titan resources for modifying each other were ever before dreamed of by nations: and the next hundred years will have changed the face of the world. At the opening of such a crisis, had no third movement arisen of resistance to intemperate habits, there would have been ground for despondency as to the amelioration of the human race; but, as the case stands, the new principle of resistance nationally to bad habits has arisen almost concurrently with the new powers of national intercourse; and henceforward, by a change equally sudden and unlooked for, that new machinery, which would else most surely have multiplied the ruins of intoxication, has become the strongest agency for hastening its extirpation."

The World's Temperance Convention, held in London in 1846, was a memorable event. America was represented by Dr. Lyman Beecher, Dr. Mussey, Dr. Patton, Dr. John Marsh, William Lloyd Garrison, and Frederick Douglas. During the next decade John B. Gough made two visits to England, to the great benefit of the cause.

The temperance reform of Great Britain has continued, for the most part, as it began,—a movement which aims, through agitation, lectures, instruction of the young, societies, conventions, etc., to extend personal temperance. While the reformers of Canada and the United States emphasise the importance of abolishing or restricting the liquor traffic by law, in England the appeal to the individual is still regarded as the Alpha and Omega of temperance. Societies both national and local in scope, with this end in view, have not only held their own, but multiplied. There are to-day very many such, including one in every religious denomination. There is a group of temperance people, however, who seek primarily the legislative repression of the chief source of intemperance. There is likewise a political branch of the history of temperance in Britain. To this we now turn.

In 1851, Nathaniel Card, a kind-hearted Quaker of Manchester, zealous for the advancement of temperance and conscious that the methods then prevailing in England were not adequate to the task, wrote to Neal Dow in America for an account of the Maine law, the news of which had reached him. The answer which he received made him determine to begin an agitation for prohibitory laws in Great Britain. On the 1st of June, 1853, he and some of his friends met in Manchester and formed the United Kingdom Al-



JOHN B. GOUGH
(1817-1886)





WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON
(1805-1879)

liance, whose object was to be "the total and immediate legislative suppression of the traffic in all intoxicating liquors as beverages." This society, soon afterwards adopted as its platform the following principles:

"1. That it is neither right nor politic for the state to afford legal protection and sanction to any traffic or system that tends to increase crime or waste the national resources, to corrupt the social habits, to destroy the health and lives of the people.

"2. That the traffic in intoxicating liquors, as common beverages, is inimical to the true interests of individuals, and destructive to the order and welfare of society, and ought therefore to be prohibited.

"3. That the history and results of all past legislation in regard to the liquor traffic abundantly prove that it is impossible satisfactorily to limit a system so essentially mischievous in its tendencies.

"4. That no considerations of private gain or public revenue can justify the upholding of a system so utterly wrong in principle, suicidal in policy, and disastrous in results as the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

"5. That the legislative prohibition of the liquor traffic is perfectly compatible with rational liberty and with all the claims of justice and legitimate commerce.

"6. That the legislative suppression of the liquor traffic would be highly conducive to the development of a progressive civilisation.

"7. That, rising above class, sectarian or party considerations, all good citizens should combine to procure an enactment prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages, as affording most efficient aid in removing the appalling evil of intemperance."

The United Kingdom Alliance has been, since its beginning to the present time, the centre of prohibition agitation in England. What it is to England the Irish Temperance League is to Ireland and the

Scottish Permissive Bill and Temperance Association to Scotland. While the Scottish Temperance League is also an advocate of prohibition, its political work is not especially emphasised.

The first president of the Alliance was Sir Walter C. Trevelyan. His attractive character and his princely liberality will be long remembered. He held the presidency until his death in 1879, when he was followed by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, who held the office nearly as long as Sir Walter.

In 1857 the Alliance adopted as its policy, which it has since retained, the advocacy of a "permissive bill," or "local veto bill," which shall give to localities the power of prohibiting the liquor traffic within their respective limits. An opportunity for presenting this bill in Parliament did not present itself until 1864. Then Mr. (now Sir) Wilfrid Lawson, member for Carlisle, introduced it, and continued to do so annually for a number of years. Progress toward the enactment of the bill into law was slow, but Mr. Lawson and the Alliance persisted, as they still persist.

In 1879, Sir Wilfrid Lawson introduced, instead of the permissive bill, the following resolution:

"That, inasmuch as the ancient and avowed object of licencing the sale of intoxicating liquors is to supply a supposed public want, without detriment to the public welfare, this House is of opinion that a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected, namely the inhabitants themselves, who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system, by some efficient measure of local option."

This resolution was lost at that session and at the

first session of 1880. But Parliament was soon after dissolved, and the new Parliament, on June 18, 1880, adopted it by a vote of 229 to 203. The Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, said that he favoured its principle, but should not vote for it, because he was not yet prepared to follow up the resolution with legislation. Although Mr. Gladstone's readiness to defer the question of prohibition to other issues which he considered more important, may not command approval, yet he showed here a frank honesty by which some of the present Canadian party leaders might profit. Mr. John Bright, who was a member of Mr. Gladstone's cabinet, nevertheless voted in favour of the resolution, as did thirteen of his fellow Ministers, only four voting with the Premier.

In 1881 Sir Wilfrid secured the adoption, by a vote of 196 to 154, of this resolution:


“ That in the opinion of this House the resolution passed by this House on the 18th day of June, 1880 which affirms the justice of local communities being entrusted with the power to protect themselves from the operations of the liquor traffic, ought without delay to be embodied by the Government in a bill giving effect to the said resolution.”

Mr. Gladstone again opposed the resolution, and it led to no legislation. The same is true of the following resolution adopted on April 27, 1883, by a vote of 263 to 176:

“ That in view of the great and grievous evils which the nation suffers from the liquor traffic, this House is of opinion that the power of removing the cause of these evils by some efficient measure of local option, as recommended by the resolutions of this House of

June 18, 1880, and of June 14, 1881, should be entrusted to the local communities at the earliest practicable opportunity."

In 1884, still another step in the same direction was taken; the speech from the throne promised local option legislation. The temperance reformers now thought that their aim was practically accomplished. Sir Wilfrid Lawson thought it was unnecessary for him to introduce any bill or resolution; he simply waited confidently for the Ministry to introduce a bill. His expectation was sadly disappointed. The Ministry did nothing, and in the following year came the defeat of the Liberal party and the appointment of a Tory government, headed by Lord Salisbury, which meant the domination of a party devoted to the interests of the publican. The sincerity of the Tory friendship for the liquor interests was proved in 1888 by the introduction, as part of the new local government system, of a provision that when publicans were refused a renewal of their licenses by the magistrates they should be compensated at public expense. Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Gladstone, and the Liberal minority made a no less determined and brilliant opposition to this scheme in Parliament than the Alliance and other temperance bodies made outside, and the Government withdrew the measure. It was again submitted, however, in a modified form, in 1890. The Liberals renewed their opposition, exposing the Conservatives' design of making their friends the liquor men safe while they had the power. Said Mr. W. S. Caine, of the Opposition: "No valid precedent for compensating publicans can be brought forward," [a statement which many judicial decisions had corroborated] "and therefore the Government is endeavouring to make a precedent." He



RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE
(1820-1898)

England's Grand Old Reformer.





LORD SALISBURY.

added: "If compensation be once established, the difficulties of the temperance people will be increased ten-fold; and a solid wall of two hundred million sovereigns" [the estimated valuation of the liquor industry in Britain] "will be built across a path which is now clear and unobstructed." Mr. Gladstone said that the establishment of the principle of compensation would "throw back for perhaps an indefinite period the cause . . . in the great future triumph of which we have undoubting confidence." Under this assault, the Conservative majority shrank from 73 to 4, and the measure was again withdrawn.

The Liberal party was now fully committed to temperance reform, by its history as well as by its declarations. It proceeded to act upon this principle after the election of 1892 had again restored it to power. Early in the session of 1893 the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir William Harcourt, introduced for the Government a local control bill which was on the whole satisfactory to Sir Wilfrid and his allies. They were rejoicing in their long-delayed victory, when it was suddenly snatched away. The bill was read a first time, but the all-absorbing Irish question then intervened, and it never reached the second reading. Again in 1895 Sir William Harcourt introduced a similar bill, which met the same fate as the first.

The next year, 1896, found the Conservatives again in power. The temperance people were generally discouraged, though Sir Wilfrid, with characteristic good humour, said that there was no need of abandoning hope; that they had converted one party to their policy, and that they should now proceed to convert the other. The new Salisbury Government made

a feint toward temperance reform by appointing a Royal Commission on the liquor question. This body consumed three years before reporting. Then it divided. The section more favourable to temperance, headed by Lord Peel, recommended a compromise, providing for a certain measure of compensation. Their recommendation caused an unfortunate division among temperance people, some of whom were inclined to accept the compromise. Among these were many leading members of the Alliance, notably Mr. Whittaker and Mr. Price-Hughes. Probably the majority, however, and also the majority of the Good Templars, will take no half-way measures. Sir Wilfrid Lawson stands with these.

At present the South African problem monopolises all attention in British politics, the Liberal party seems to be hopelessly disabled, and the outlook for prohibitory legislation is decidedly gloomy.

Although the struggle for the programme of the United Kingdom Alliance has thus been unsuccessful hitherto, Parliament has nevertheless enacted not a few laws regarding the liquor traffic, some good and some bad. In 1853 the Forbes-Mackenzie act was passed ordering all drinking places in Scotland to be closed on Sundays, and in some other slight respects restricting the traffic there. In 1854 some restrictions were imposed on Sunday selling in England. In 1860 and 1861 the Gladstone Ministry caused some laws of a contrary character to be passed. In accordance with a recent treaty with Napoleon III., the duties on wine and spirits from France were lowered, an increase in the number of licenses was effected, and several restrictions on the sale of liquor were removed. A period of increased drunkenness, something like that following the Beer Act of 1830,

was the result. In 1877 Sunday closing was decreed for Ireland, with the exception of five of the chief towns. Sunday closing was ordered in Wales in 1881. In 1883 a law was enacted forbidding the payment of wages in public houses. Several laws regarding the sale of liquor to children have been enacted. The last, which went into effect on January 1, 1902, forbids the sale of intoxicating liquor to children under fourteen years of age for consumption either on or off the premises, excepting in corked or sealed bottles of not less than a pint; and also forbids, under the same penalties, the employment of such children, by parents or otherwise, to purchase such liquors.

The national consumption of liquor for the greater part of the last sixty years is shown in the following table:

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS IN GREAT BRITAIN

YEAR ENDING MARCH 31.	SPIRITS. (Gals.)	WINE. (Gals.)	BEER. (Gals.)	TEA. (Lbs.)
1842.....	0.82	0.18	* 20.0	1.38
1845.....	0.96	0.24	* 20.0	1.59
1850.....	1.04	0.23	* 21.0	1.86
1855.....	0.96	0.23	2.28
1860.....	0.93	0.23	23.8	2.67
1865.....	0.93	0.40	29.8	3.29
1870.....	0.99	0.49	30.2	3.81
1875.....	1.26	0.53	33.3	4.44
1880.....	1.07	0.45	27.0	4.57
1885.....	0.96	0.38	27.1	5.06
1890.....	1.02	0.40	30.0	5.17
1891.....	1.03	0.39	30.1	5.36
1892.....	1.03	0.38	29.8	5.43
1893.....	0.98	0.37	29.6	5.41
1894.....	0.97	0.36	29.5	5.52
1895.....	1.00	0.37	29.7	5.67
1896.....	1.02	0.40	30.9	5.77
1897.....	1.03	0.40	31.4	5.81
1900.....	1.12	0.39	37.7	

* Estimated.

It appears from these statistics that the consumption of beer and wine has shown a tendency to in-

crease, while that of spirits has remained about the same. That all the earnest and devoted work done by the temperance reformers has so little to show as the result, in the consumption of liquor, is not encouraging. It seems to point, however, to a fact which it is important to know,—the inadequacy of the appeal for personal sobriety, so far as social results are concerned, while the liquor traffic is allowed to flourish with virtual freedom. None of the splendid work which we have mentioned in this chapter has been in vain, however, and none of it could well have been dispensed with. For if it had done nothing else, it would have been invaluable, as Dr. Dawson Burns points out, “in restraining that augmented intemperance which, but for it, would have certainly resulted from the tendency of evil habits and sensuous indulgences to multiply themselves.” But besides doing this, it has performed the necessary task of creating and spreading the public sentiment on which the measures which will achieve that reformation must rest.

FRANCE.

Before 1895 much interest had been taken by French scientists in the effects of alcohol, and as a result many physicians opposed its use as a beverage on hygienic grounds. But there was no general interest in temperance. The French Temperance Society, founded in 1872, existed only as a name. In 1895, however, the International Temperance Congress held at Basle* resulted in the formation of the French Anti-Alcohol Union, whose object was the promotion of abstinence from distilled liquors. Dr. Legrain, the eminent alienist, was chiefly instrumental in

* See Appendix F, Chap. XV.

the foundation of this society. Eight hundred federated societies have now been formed. Since 1895 ten thousand temperance meetings have been held in France, many temperance publications have been issued, and temperance restaurants have been established. As further results of the movement (the success of which is largely due to the labours of Dr. Legrain) railway companies have begun to promote abstinence among their employees, and the use of spirits in the army has been abolished. Some advance has also been made toward total abstinence. The Blue Cross Society, the Prosperity Society, the Good Templars, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the French section of the Anti-Alcoholic League are now working for the promotion of total abstinence.

GERMANY.

In 1835 Robert Baird went from America to Germany and published there a German translation of his *History of the Temperance Societies in America*. He distributed thirty thousand copies, and traveled over the north of Germany delivering addresses. Between 1837 and 1845, under his direction, there occurred a great popular rising against intemperance, that immemorial besetting sin of the Germans. In northern Germany 875 societies for abstinence from spirits were established, with 300,000 members, and the government revenues from spirits were much diminished. In Silesia half a million men and women abandoned the use of spirits. Bands of Hope were formed, with 30,000 members, and sixteen temperance papers were established. This early reformation practically came to an end in the political disturbances of 1848. Few of its societies, and only

one of its papers, still exist. There has recently been something of a revival, however. In 1883 the German Society Against the Abuse of Alcoholic Drink was formed. It was composed for the most part of scientists, and has diffused much valuable information. In 1883 the Good Templars also established themselves in Germany, and they now have two Grand Lodges and 10,000 members there. The Blue Cross Society has 7,458 German members, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has been introduced into the country. There is one German total abstinence society—the German Union Against Alcohol, founded in 1891 by Dr. William Bode.

HOLLAND.

The temperance reform began in Holland, as elsewhere, as a propaganda against distilled liquors. This was the basis of the Society for Abstinence from Strong Drink, formed in 1842, and of the League of the Cross, formed soon after. These societies still exist; the former as a total abstinence society, and the latter as an advocate of both total and partial abstinence. The earliest total abstinence society was organized in 1862 by Dr. Adama von Schletema, that prophet of temperance who for half a century gave Holland no rest upon this subject. In 1875 a society was formed which supported moderation and opposed total abstinence. In 1880 was formed the National Christian Total Abstinence Society, which was soon split up by dissension into three smaller organisations. The government in 1880 adopted a law for the gradual reduction of the liquor traffic. Thousands of shops have been closed under this law, but the reduction has now ceased and public opinion seems to favour, not prohibition, but local option or the Goth-

enburg system. The government grants about four thousand dollars yearly in aid of the temperance cause, and provides temperance instruction in the public schools.

BELGIUM.

Before 1879, though a few individuals, such as the benevolent Ducpeticum and Friar Orban, raised their voices for temperance in Belgium, there was no organised effort there. In that year the Belgian Association Against the Abuse of Alcoholic Beverages was formed. Under its auspices the International Congress was held at Brussels in 1880. The society then changed its name to "the Patriotic League Against Intemperance." While it worked merely against the abuse of alcohol, some of its branches advocated entire abstinence from spirits. Late in the eighties total abstinence was planted in Belgium with the establishment there of a branch of the Swiss Blue Cross Society. This society has not met with much success. The Belgian government, like the Dutch, aids the cause of temperance by annual appropriations.

DENMARK.

Temperance agitation in Denmark began in 1879. A number of temperance societies were then formed, which were united in the Danish Temperance Society. This organisation now has about 52,000 members and is in a prosperous condition. A Danish branch of the order of Good Templars was established in 1880. In 1892 it split upon the question of abstinence from beer. The government restricts the liquor business in some minor respects,

and makes an annual grant of three thousand dollars to the temperance cause.

SWITZERLAND.

A temperance society aiming at moderation only was organised at Vaud in 1838, and the example was followed in various places. Again in the seventies numerous moderation societies arose, including the Society Against Drunkenness of Geneva. All of these met with indifferent success. Aggressive endeavour did not begin till 1887, when Pastor Louis Lucian Rochat put the Blue Cross propaganda in motion at Geneva. This is a religious movement for the reclaiming of drunkards and the propagation of total abstinence. It has spread into all parts of Europe, chiefly among Protestants, but also to some extent among Catholics. The Society Against Alcohol organised in 1890 as a Swiss society, has become the International Society Against the Use of Alcohol. Its most prominent Swiss member is Dr. August Forel, whose work has attracted great attention in Europe and America. In 1892 Pastor Rochat founded the Anti-Alcoholic League for scientific instruction among the educated classes. The Swiss government gives pecuniary aid to the temperance cause.

AUSTRIA.

The temperance reform in Austria has hardly begun. There are two temperance societies: the Austrian Society for Checking Inebriety, directed against the abuse of spirits, founded in 1884 by the Chevalier Max de Proskowetz, F.R.G.S., and a total abstinence society of 170 members, formed in 1899. A

number of young physicians, prominent among whom is Dr. Poech, are well known as opponents of the use of alcohol. It is believed that the International Congress held in Vienna in 1901 will advance the cause in Austria.*

* See Appendix G, Chap. XV.

CHAPTER XVI.

TEMPERANCE IN AUSTRALASIA.

THE first English visitors to Australia were pirates and the first settlers convicts. Besides these inauspicious circumstances, the infant civilisation had to contend with drinking customs of the worst sort. In New South Wales the convicts were driven to fresh crime both by the tyranny of the overseers and by the fact that they were paid in spirits for extra work. Spirits formed the principal part of the cargoes received there, and "it became the interest of every civil and military officer in the colony that the settlers, free and bond, should drink as much spirits as possible." When it was decided to reward convicts for meritorious services, Andrew Thompson, the first beneficiary, was given permission to start a brewery "in consideration of his useful and humane conduct in saving the lives and much of the property of sufferers by repeated floods of the Hakesbury, as well as of his general demeanor." The first brick church was consecrated on Christmas Day, 1806, by the Rev. Samuel Marsden as pastor, and in the first issue of the *Sidney Gazette*, shortly afterward, the pastor advertised a reward of a gallon of spirits for the hide of every native sheep-dog caught. The first hospital was built by three citizens of the colony in return for a monopoly in rum granted by the Government for a term of years, and the institution passed into history as the Rum Hospital. The first arch-

deaconary of the colonial Church was bestowed upon a former wine merchant. In 1837 every ninth house in Hobart Town (the chief town of Van Diemen's Land) and every sixth house in Sydney was a liquor shop. Moreover, for more than twenty years, spirits formed the ordinary currency of New South Wales. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that crime flourished and that two-thirds of the children born in the colonies in the early days were illegitimate.

The first organised temperance work of Australasia was begun in Van Diemen's Land (now Tasmania) about 1832 by Mr. George Washington Walker, a Quaker minister, assisted by Mr. James Backhouse. The former, on October 2, 1833, wrote to England on behalf of the temperance society of Van Diemen's Land for £50 worth of temperance literature, stating that temperance societies had been formed in Launcheston, Campbellston, Ross, Bothwell and Hamilton. In the same month the Rev. Mr. Crooks, influenced by some temperance tracts distributed by Mr. George Bell, of Scotland, formed the New South Wales Temperance Society, which soon included a hundred members. This society quickly attained to great influence. Within five years it numbered among its active members the Governor of the province, Sir George Gipps, the Chief Justice, the Attorney-General, and other dignitaries of the colony. Mr. Walker and Mr. Backhouse, on January 13, 1868, established the Australian Temperance Society at Perth.

The first total abstinence societies were founded in 1838 by the Rev. John Saunders and Mr. Rowe. Another was founded at Adelaide in 1839 by Mr. George Cole. Its members within a year numbered

140. South Australia thus began its temperance reform with total abstinence, dispensing with the usual preparation of a propaganda for moderation in drinking. In 1844 some Irish Catholic priests conducted a Father Mathews crusade, in which ten thousand signed the total abstinence pledge. By that time all the temperance societies of Australia had either adopted total abstinence or ceased to exist, and the reform was practically on a total abstinence basis.

The first important demand for legislation in the interest of temperance was made in New South Wales in 1854, when petitions bearing the names of fourteen thousand citizens were presented to the Legislature asking for the enactment of a Maine law. These petitions were supported by influential men, among them Chief Justice Sir Alfred Stephens, who personally appeared before a committee of the Colonial Parliament to urge compliance with them. In Van Diemen's Land, during the same year, occurred a similar agitation for a Maine law. In 1857 the Victoria Temperance League was formed for the purpose of advocating "abstinence for the individual and prohibition for society," and also the New South Wales Alliance for the Suppression of Intemperance, with the same purpose.

The radical attitude thus assumed by the early Australian reformers was soon relaxed, and, since the fifties, the history of temperance legislation has been the history of restriction or local option of various kinds. The New South Wales Political Association for the Suppression of Intemperance, formed in 1870, tried to secure the passage of a bill modeled after the English Permissive Bill. Its effort was unsuccessful and the association was discouraged. Ten years afterward the agitation for local option

was renewed, and resulted, in 1881, in the passage of Sir Henry Parkes' licencing reform bill. This law took the power to issue licences from the justices of the peace and entrusted it to licencing boards, provided various regulations for the business, such as the requirement that bars must be closed on Sunday, and gave the people local option as to new licences. This law did not affect wine licences, grocers' licences, and hotel licences. Since its passage it has furnished a subject of contention in many elections. Many minor amendments have been made to it, favourable sometimes to temperance and sometimes to the publican. There is a tendency now among temperance reformers to abandon local option entirely and to go back to the principle announced by the Victoria Temperance League in 1857. In 1891 the Grand Lodge of the Good Templars, in session at Sydney, decided that "in the future the name and machinery of the order should be employed only in the interest of those Parliamentary candidates who were pledged to absolute prohibition."

The temperance question has come into especial prominence in New South Wales within the last year through the investigation by a committee of the Legislature into the system of contracts between the manufacturers and the retailers of liquor known as "tying." The report of the committee, published in the latter part of 1901, shows that this system embraces 90 per cent. of the hotels (saloons) in Sydney and its suburbs; that before permitted to open his place or take over one already opened the hotel keeper is required by the brewer who backs him to give (1) a promissory note payable on demand, for the full amount of the indebtedness, (2) a transfer of his licence signed in blank for the brewer to fill up

when wanted, (3) authority in blank for the solicitor of the brewer to appear on behalf of the licensee and consent to a transfer of his licence, (4) power of attorney for the brewer and his agents to fill all blanks in the form of transfer of licence and other documents, (5) a bond to forfeit a sum of money in case the lease or licence is transferred without consent in writing by the brewer, (6) a bond binding the licensee to buy all of his liquors, of whatever character, from the brewer (7) an assignment of his lease, (8) a bill of sale of his stock and fixtures.

This astounding revelation has created a great stir in "the trade" and it is seen at last who and what the retail liquor business is. The report concludes in these words: "Your committee, in the course of their investigations, incidentally touched upon phases of the liquor traffic which satisfied it that a radical amendment of the licencing law is imperative, and that with the advantage of more time at its disposal, and wider radius, a royal commission would render incalculable service in laying down solid foundations for liquor law reform."

The situation is made especially interesting by the fact that the provincial Government has just come into possession of a large tract of city property on which are situated thirty-six licenced hotels, so that action cannot be avoided nor responsibility shifted.

In 1871 the Legislature of Victoria enacted a law giving power to municipal bodies or to two-thirds of the ratepayers of a district to prevent the granting of new licences. By an amendment made to this law in 1876 the power to refuse new licences was granted to a majority of the voters of a district. In 1882 the Victoria Alliance was organised, and, through its agitation, a still further advance was made. Sir

Graham Berry's licensing reform bill, passed in 1885, enabled the people of the district to reduce the number of retail liquor licences (except wine licences) to a certain number, to be determined as follows: One licence was allowed for every 250 inhabitants until the number of licences should be 1,000; thereafter one licence was allowed for every 500 inhabitants. All licences in excess of the number so determined might be revoked, and compensation was provided for the publicans whose bars should be closed. Under this law 173 public houses were closed by the year 1900 at a cost of about \$700,000.

The local option campaign in South Australia began in 1884 and was conducted by the South Australian Alliance. The result was the Licenced Victuallers Act of 1891. This act provided local option as to the granting of new licences and the reduction of the number of licences already granted. For licences revoked publicans were granted a compensation to be fixed by arbitration and paid out of government funds. The last provision is to expire in 1906, after which no compensation will be paid. This fact has prevented the reduction of licences until the period of compensation shall have expired.

The principal liquor law of Queensland is that introduced by Sir Samuel Griffiths as Premier and passed in 1895. Unlike the other laws we have mentioned, it provided for complete local option. Two-thirds of the voters of a locality may prohibit the sale of liquor there, except in clubs, and a majority may reduce the number of bars to a certain maximum.

West Australia provides no local option except as to new licences.

All the colonies require bars to be closed on Sun-

day and at an early hour on other days, and all prohibit the sale of liquor to children.

The consumption of liquor in Australia during the period when the local option agitation was most active is shown (in terms of money value) in the following table:

		Per head.
1881	£3,975,460 ..	£5 4 5
1887	4,614,585 ..	4 10 3
1888	4,777,168 ..	4 9 9
1889	4,667,390 ..	4 8 2
1890	4,909,500 ..	4 5 8
1891	5,275,170 ..	4 12 3
1892	4,775,359 ..	4 0 10
1893	4,168,753 ..	3 8 11
1894	4,061,924 ..	3 5 8
1895	3,993,321 ..	3 3 2
1896	4,109,296 ..	3 3 10
1897	4,102,160 ..	3 2 7
1898	4,243,269 ..	3 4 2
1899	4,403,913 ..	3 5 5
1900	4,744,224 ..	3 9 8

The consumption has been greatly reduced since the beginning of the period, but for the last four years has steadily increased. Much has been done, but much remains to be done.

At present a large element of the public sentiment of Australia is favourable to the control of the liquor traffic through some form of state control—state monopoly or Gothenburg system. But this appears to be only the froth of the reform, only a transitory stage of an awakening sense of the evil to be remedied. The more thoughtful of the temperance people favour prohibition. The most prominent of these is Canon Francis Bertie Boyce of St. Paul's, Sydney. Throughout the country the fact is frankly owned by

all parties that something must be done about the liquor traffic, and this state of feeling is certainly a hopeful sign.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union is doing a wonderful work in Australia, has the profound respect of the government, gets grants of land and money for its special work and is a power in both church and state. It is devotedly loyal to the society in the States, to which it owes its origin, and if Mary Clement Leavitt, who planted the organisation in Australia, had done nothing in her own land she would have made history and immortality in these colonies.

The union of the Australian colonies into the Commonwealth in 1901 has furnished a new field for the efforts of the reformers. In view of this fact a conference of representatives of the various Alliances held in Melbourne on May 15, 1901, took steps toward the formation of a confederated society for the advancement of temperance measures in the new Australian Parliament.

The beginnings of the temperance reform in New Zealand were somewhat violent. On September 2, 1835, a temperance meeting was held in the Wesleyan Mission chapel at Mangungu, on the Hokianga River. It was attended by both whites and natives and was conducted by the Rev. William White and his wife. The meeting resolved to prevent the further importation of rum into the district and also to stave in the casks already there. This resolution was carried out with the approval and assistance of Captain M'Donnell, the British resident. On May 11, 1836, the New Zealand Temperance Society was formed at Kororarika Bay. The temperance propaganda received the hearty support of the native chiefs, who

were loud in their expressions of contempt for missionaries who used *kakena te waperu* (stinking water), the name applied by the natives to intoxicants. One of these chiefs, named Tohu, at a meeting in Mangungu in 1836 declared for total abstinence and the exclusion from the district not only of spirits but of wine, porter, and all other liquors. Total abstinence found no Caucasian support until 1842, when Mr. John Harding, undismayed by the breaking up of a meeting at his house by a mob of publicans, persevered and formed a total abstinence society at Port Nicholson. Similar societies were soon formed at Auckland, New Plymouth, and other places.

This early agitation was followed but tardily by temperance legislation. In 1871 a local option bill was introduced in the Legislature and received the support of the Premier, Sir William Fox, but was not passed. Sir William made another effort to the same end in 1877, which was likewise unsuccessful. Finally in 1881 he secured the passage of a law providing for a species of local option. The power to grant or refuse licences was vested in a licencing committee of five in every district. This body was elective and so represented the public opinion of the locality to a certain extent.

The present licence law was passed in 1893 under the Ballance Ministry. It provides that at every Parliamentary election, that is, every third year, the question of the licence policy shall be presented to the voters in each county. The vote is taken in separate ballot boxes, and each elector may vote for any two of the following three propositions:

“I vote that the number of publicans’ licences continue as at present.

“I vote that the number of publicans’ licences be reduced.

“I vote that the no publicans’ licences be granted.”

A prohibitionist, by erasing the first proposition upon his voting-paper, may vote for reduction of the number of licences, and also for the refusal to grant any. If three-fifths of those voting cast the same kind of a ballot, prohibition becomes the rule. But if reduction carries by a bare majority, there is at once a diminution not exceeding twenty-five per cent. of the licences. Many prohibitionists are bitterly resentful at the requirement of the law of a three-fifths vote, holding it to be a discrimination against the friends of morality. But the plan has the advantage that if prohibition is elected, a very large public sentiment is assured for its enforcement. Moreover, prohibition once in force, a three-fifths vote is required for its repeal.

The county of Clutha in the Scotch region in the South Island has adopted Prohibition, and with the most pronounced results for good, although there is a lack of earnestness on the part of the general government, which controls the police in regard to enforcement. Crime in Clutha has diminished almost to the point of disappearance, and great prosperity is evident throughout the country. The railroad station is now being greatly enlarged for the second time since the adoption of the policy, to accommodate the greatly increased traffic in wholesome and honourable merchandise.

The prohibition movement of New Zealand since its birth has gone forward in the hearts and brains and hands of a very remarkable group of men and women. The pioneer champion was the Rev. Leonard W. Isitt, a Wesleyan preacher in a suburb of Christ-

church. He was from the first associated with a group of tremendous fighters, prominent among them Frank W. Isitt, another Wesleyan preacher, who is now secretary of the New Zealand Alliance and editor of its organ, the *Prohibitionist*. These two rare men have gone up and down the colony in the name of political righteousness, with distinguished ability and great success. Among the other members of the group may be mentioned the Hon. Tom Taylor, the Hon. A. R. Atkinon, Mr. A. S. Adams, Mr. John Jago, Mrs. A. R. Atkinson, President of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mrs. J. Field, and Mrs. Newton.

To-day the interest in prohibition is more determined than ever before, though doubtless less effervescent. The *Prohibitionist*, published fortnightly at Christchurch, has a wide circulation, and is a terror to publicans and publicans' friends. The non-conformist ministry is practically a unit for political prohibition, and one does not need to be a prophet to see that dark days are coming for the liquor traffic, in these islands. The last three triennial votes on prohibition resulted as follows:

	For Prohibition.	Against Prohibition.
1894	58,000	100,000
1896	98,312	139,580
1899	120,932	143,177

Every election has thus been a step nearer prohibition. Preparations are now under way for a determined effort to make the election of 1902 cap the climax and bring the victory, and there is good reason to look for the success of the effort.*

* Further information regarding temperance in Australasia may be found in the following works: Samuel Sydney, *The Three Colonies of Australia*; Burns, *Temperance History*; Collins, *Temperance in all Nations*; Boyce, *The Drink Problem in Australia*.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE GOTHENBURG SYSTEM.

THE Gothenburg system of regulating the liquor traffic, named after the Swedish city which furnished the first notable example of its use, has received much attention and discussion during the past twenty years. It consists of letting all the liquor licences of a city to a "disinterested corporation," which is intended to operate the business for the public benefit, and to retain for itself only a modest profit of five or six per cent., the balance being divided among semi-public enterprises of various sorts or devoted to the relief of the poor. The system has been in operation in Scandinavia for a number of years; it has been introduced into Finland, and a propaganda for its adoption is being urged in Great Britain.

It was not until about four hundred years ago that alcohol began to be extensively used in Scandinavia for beverage purposes. Prior to that time it was mainly used in the manufacture of gunpowder. Two years after the discovery of America by Columbus, the local magistrates forbade the manufacture of alcohol except for the purpose of making powder. During the four centuries which followed, various plans were resorted to to check the evils of the traffic in spirits for beverage purposes. For the most part these plans provided for the sale of liquor in some form or other and did not check the development of a national appetite for alcoholic drink. During the fifty years preceding 1829 licence had been the general policy of Sweden, and the habits of the people had fallen to a deplorable depth. In that year there

were 173,214 licenced distilleries in Sweden, the chief product of which was *branvin*, a brandy distilled from potatoes. The degradation of the Swedish people at this period has been written again and again. Dr. Sigfried Wieselgren, Director-General of His Majesty's Prisons, and son of the famous Dean of Gothenburg, writes of these times:

"The very marrow of the nation was sapped. Moral and physical degradation; insanity, poverty, and crime; family ties broken up; brutal habits;—all those grim legions that ever range themselves under the banner of intemperance, took possession of the land. It was bleeding at every pore."

And of this same period the great Swedish scientist Professor Huss, wrote:

"In a country where the amount of crime increases, where the prisons are filled with criminals, a gangrene, which eats at the deepest and noblest roots of the social system, must of necessity exist. This gangrene in our country is *branvin*, and the legislation which not only permits, but actually encourages its manufacture."

Every neighbourhood had several distilleries, and the farmers took turns in giving "still parties," where the whole neighbourhood would assemble for a week of drunkenness. Even the clergy operated stills. Fortunately, drunkenness was mainly confined to the male population. The women became accustomed to operating the farms while their husbands lay drunk.

In those days a young clergyman, Peter Wieselgren, later the Dean of Gothenburg, had charge of a small parish in the South of Sweden. Impressed with the enormity of the evil, he drew up a temperance pledge and signed it himself. That was the beginning of the temperance agitation which swept over the country during the two following decades.

The young preacher at once began a local canvass for more signers of the pledge which he had taken. So great was his energy, eloquence and earnestness, that soon almost the whole parish were members of his temperance society. From this beginning Peter Wieselgren became to the total abstinence movement in Sweden what Father Mathew had been to Ireland. Thousands of people flocked to take the pledge wherever he went, and a revolution in national customs as to drink followed.

Naturally, the crusade resulted in legislation hostile to the national enemy. In 1835 a law was passed practically forbidding domestic distillation. This had the primary effect of closing up most of the rural stills in the country. It had a secondary effect of even greater significance. There were no railroads in the country and the means of transportation were but little developed. Consequently *branvin* could not easily be shipped into the interior districts, and partial prohibition was the outcome. In brief, here is the result of the law of 1835 and of Peter Wieselgren's magnificent campaign of pledge-signing:

Distilleries in 1829.....	173,124
Distilleries in 1853.....	33,342
Per capita consumption of <i>branvin</i> in 1829	
(litres *)	46.
Per capita consumption of <i>branvin</i> in 1856	
(litres)	20

During these years Wieselgren's crusade suffered no decline and further legislation resulted in 1855, consisting of a local option law similar to the laws in force in many of the states of America. The option, however, applied only to the rural districts

* A Swedish litre equals 61·026 cubic inches, 1·0567 United States quarts.

and not to towns and cities. The law further provided for the establishment of companies (*bolags*) for the monopoly of spirits in towns and cities where the people desired them. The new law went into effect in January, 1855. Large districts adopted the prohibition clause of the local option law, with the following result:

Licenced distilleries in Sweden, 1853.....	33,342
Licenced distilleries in Sweden, 1855.....	3,481
<i>Kans</i> * of <i>branvin</i> produced, 1853.....	36,000,000
<i>Kans</i> of <i>branvin</i> produced, 1855.....	9,436,000

At the end of another year the people had practically driven the sale of spirits out of rural Sweden. There remained 493 saloons of all sorts; of these 411 held old-time privileged licences which expired only with the death of the holder, leaving only 82 remaining by the will of the people. The effect of this policy of rural prohibition during the year appears from the following table:

	Percentage of Pop. of Sweden.	Cases of Drunkenness.
Rural Sweden (under prohibition).	88	1,339
Urban Sweden (under licence)	12	10,507

In other words, rural Sweden, where drunkenness had raged the worst, now under prohibition, with more than seven times the population of the urban districts, had furnished but about one-seventh of the drunkenness.

This tremendous revolution in Sweden took place years before the Gothenburg *bolag* was established. It is necessary to call special attention to this fact, owing to the persistent tendency of the advocates of the

* A Swedish *Kan* equals about half of a United States gallon.

Gothenburg system to credit to it the whole temperance reformation in Sweden. So far as the retail sale of spirits is concerned, rural Sweden has lost no ground since its redemption in the fifties. On the contrary it has gained ground. In the fiscal year of 1897-8, there were 2,391 rural communes in the country. There were only 146 licences in force. These, together with 90 privileged licences expiring with the death of the holder, made a total of 236 licences. If each of these licences represented a separate commune (which they do not), then there would be a minimum number of 2,055 communes in rural Sweden where the sale of spirits was prohibited.

We now turn to the history of the liquor traffic in the cities since 1855. Five years before the passage of the act of 1855, a *branvin bolag* was established at Falun, upon the plan afterward called the Gothenburg system. A few years later, Jonkoping and Upsala established similar companies. But it was not until October 1, 1865, ten years after the enabling act was passed, that the famous Gothenburg *bolag* began business. The agitation for the establishment of a *bolag* for the *branvin* monopoly in Gothenburg was conducted mainly by the Gothenburg *Handlestiding*, edited by Herr A. S. Hedlund. At Hedlund's suggestion a committee was appointed to investigate the causes of poverty in Gothenburg. The result was a report alleging that poverty in Gothenburg was caused mainly by the excessive use of *branvin*. The committee urged the organisation of a *bolag* of philanthropists who should conduct the business in an orderly, respectable fashion, without any motive of personal profit. The proposal was urged expressly as a reform in the manner of conducting public houses. By refusing credit, by selling

only pure liquors, by keeping the bars closed at unseasonable hours, by eliminating the element of personal profit, and by having the shops managed by salaried employees, it was hoped that the evils of the traffic might be lessened.

It was also proposed that the system be so framed as to encourage the use of wine and malt liquor instead of spirits. Previous to 1855 the liquor evil in Sweden had been confined almost wholly to *branvin*, other liquors being comparatively unknown. At that time there had arisen in Scandinavia a species of reformer who advocated the use of beer and ale as a substitute for ardent spirits. Several breweries had been established in consequence, as a temperance measure. With the same purpose in view the Gothenburg reformers allowed the managers of the *bolag* shops to carry on the retail of malt liquors as a side industry, on their own account. Whatever may be said of the results of the system in other respects this policy met with enormous success in promoting the use of beer, as appears from the following table:

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF SPIRITS AND BEER IN SWEDEN.

YEAR.	SPIRITS. (Litres.)	BEER. (Litres.)	YEAR.	SPIRITS. (Litres.)	BEER. (Litres.)
1829.....	46.0	1883.....	6.8	16.8
1850.....	22.0	1884.....	8.0	20.8
1856-60.....	9.5	1885.....	8.4	20.3
1861-65.....	10.6	11.1	1886.....	7.8	22.1
1866-70.....	8.8	10.7	1887.....	7.0	22.7
1871.....	10.5	12.1	1888.....	7.5	27.2
1872.....	10.9	15.2	1889.....	6.2	23.2
1873.....	11.8	16.3	1890.....	7.0	27.4
1874.....	13.5	15.1	1891.....	6.6	30.9
1875.....	12.4	16.5	1892.....	6.5	30.8
1876.....	12.4	15.9	1893.....	6.7	31.6
1877.....	10.6	17.0	1894.....	6.9	33.0
1878.....	10.5	20.5	1895.....	6.9	35.5
1879.....	8.8	16.5	1896.....	7.2	42.4
1880.....	8.1	16.3	1897.....	7.5
1881.....	8.8	18.3	1898.....	8.0
1882.....	8.0	15.8	1899.....	8.6

The above table is of little value in determining the effect of the Gothenburg system upon the consumption of liquors in Sweden, unless the study is pursued further. The *bolag* at Gothenburg did not begin business until October, 1865. Prior to that time, Peter Wieselgren's propaganda, together with the local prohibitory laws, had reduced the per capita consumption to less than one-fourth of what it was in 1829. During the ten years following 1865 no more cities adopted the *bolag* system. It was not until 1877 that it was adopted in Stockholm. It was only well in the eighties that the *bolag* system became the usual policy in the towns and cities. Reference to the table shows that, since 1880, the per capita consumption of spirits has been almost at a standstill, while the per capita consumption of beer is two and a half times what it was when the *bolag* system became the recognized policy of the urban centres.

Unfortunately, the statistics of Sweden do not enable us to determine the proportionate consumption of liquors in the country districts and in the cities. It appears, however, that in the localities where the *bolag* has been established, there has been a tendency to increase the number of licences, while in the rural districts the reverse has been the policy. So far as this sort of testimony goes, it seems to show in the cities an increase, in the country a decrease in the demand for liquors, the net result being that there is little change from year to year in the per capita use of alcoholic liquors. The table below illustrates this tendency. It gives, first, the record of licences issued in all the cities, towns and *köpingar* where the *bolag* has secured a foothold. In this class of places there has been a steady increase in the number of licences issued, while the population per licence has remained

328 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

about stationary. Secondly, it gives a similar record of the country districts, where the *bolag* has not secured a foothold. It will be observed that not only has there been a heavy reduction in the number of licences issued, but the population per licence shows a heavy increase.

RECORD OF LICENCES USED FOR A SERIES OF YEARS IN SWEDEN

YEAR.	CITIES AND KOPINGAR.*					YEAR.	RURAL DISTRICTS.			
	Privileged Licences	Sold at Auction	Assigned to Bolag.	Total Licences.	Population to each Licence.		Privileged Licences.	Sold at Auction.	Total Licences.	Population to each Licence.
1891-92...	12	42	811	865	1,073	1891-92...	109	63	172	22,526
1892-93...	12	46	786	844	1,111	1892-93...	107	63	170	22,758
1893-94...	12	43	813	868	1,096	1893-94...	101	57	158	24,066
1894-95...	10	40	824	874	1,115	1894-95...	96	55	151	25,817
1895-96...	9	29	833	871	1,144	1895-96...	95	60	155	25,387
1896-97...	9	28	540	877	1,164	1896-97...	92	60	152	25,933
1897-98...	9	26	544	879	1,198	1897-98...	90	56	146	27,128

* Country villages.

The original purpose of the *bolag* system was to diminish pauperism, a large portion of which the Gothenburg committee had charged to the use of *branvin*. The statistics of pauperism indicate the proportion between the rural and urban districts. In the table given below the number of paupers from each of the two classes of districts is given for a series of years. These figures show that pauperism did not acquire a serious aspect until after the system had been adopted. It also appears that there has been an actual decrease in pauperism in the rural districts where prohibition was the policy, since the Gothenburg policy was generally adopted in 1880, and a sufficiently large increase in the *bolag* cities, in the same period, to cause a serious increase in the total.

TOTAL PAUPERS SUPPORTED IN SWEDEN.

YEAR.	Paupers.	Ratio of Paupers to Population.	Proportion of paupers to population in rural districts.	Proportion of paupers to population, in towns.
1810.....	80,861	3.40	3.09	5.42
1815.....	86,009	3.49	3.23	5.15
1820.....	87,712	3.39	3.09	5.94
1825.....	107,904	3.89	3.64	5.82
1830.....	117,852	4.08	3.82	6.42
1835.....	121,318	4.01	3.73	6.51
1840.....	94,194	3.00	2.79	4.90
1845.....	98,158	2.96	2.73	5.05
1850.....	123,813	3.56	3.37	5.06
1855.....	143,051	3.93	3.83	5.02
1860.....	132,982	3.45	3.34	4.29
1865.....	147,788	3.59	3.33	5.48
1870.....	204,378	4.90	4.62	6.80
1875.....	193,793	4.42	4.05	6.64
1880.....	219,532	4.81	4.39	7.14
1885.....	221,911	4.74	4.33	6.67
1890.....	241,113	5.04	4.44	7.60
1895.....	256,595	5.22	4.34	8.67
1896.....	252,480	5.09	4.27	8.24
1897.....	246,562	4.92	4.16	7.79

In Gothenburg, where the *bolag* has been in operation since 1865, and has been carried out with greater fidelity to the theory of the plan than in any other city, the results as to pauperism have been of a still more serious character. The following table gives the complete record of pauperism in Gothenburg since the *bolag* system was adopted. The paupers per population have enormously increased, while the cost of maintenance per capita has nearly doubled:

RECORD OF PAUPERISM IN GOTHENBURG.

YEAR.	Total Paupers.	Paupers per 1000 populat'n.	Expense of Pauperism (kroner).*	Expense per inhabitant (kroner).
1866.....	2,323	69	181,401	3.83
1867.....	3,479	72	181,666	3.79
1868.....	4,179	83	273,614	5.42
1869.....	4,441	84	258,581	4.92
1870.....	4,723	87	269,519	5.00
1871.....	4,475	82	254,767	4.44
1872.....	4,523	81	252,553	4.51

* A Swedish krona is equal to about 27 United States cents.

330 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

RECORD OF PAUPERISM IN GOTHENBURG. (Continued).

YEARR.	Total Pau- pers.	Paupers per 1000 population	Expense of Pauperism (kroner).	Expense per inhabitant (kroner).
1873.....	4,765	84	268,481	4.71
1874.....	5,353	92	295,631	5.07
1875.....	5,669	94	334,629	5.57
1876.....	5,701	92	330,748	5.37
1877.....	5,783	91	343,370	5.49
1878.....	6,094	92	353,544	5.45
1879.....	6,158	92	377,270	5.64
1880.....	6,607	97	404,770	5.91
1881.....	7,134	99	429,067	6.01
1882.....	7,317	100	449,063	6.19
1883.....	7,373	94	450,450	5.92
1884.....	7,424	92	459,617	5.67
1885.....	7,584	90	472,748	5.58
1886.....	7,977	91	468,960	5.39
1887.....	8,184	89	466,564	5.10
1888.....	11,444	122	545,170	5.77
1889.....	10,708	109	611,091	6.25
1890.....	10,631	104	633,961	6.24
1891.....	11,900	115	672,224	6.45
1892.....	12,323	116	710,897	6.68
1893.....	12,183	114	732,736	6.84
1894.....	11,965	109	740,079	6.87
1895.....	12,511	111	774,005	6.86
1896.....	12,469	108	773,761	6.70
1897.....	12,350	105	774,041	6.59
1898.....	12,211	102	795,202	6.62

The effect of the *bolag* system as a temperance measure is shown by the following statistics of drunkenness in Gothenburg. In 1874 the *bolag* secured control of all the licences in the city. Since that year there has been no improvement.

DRUNKENNESS IN GOTHENBURG.

YEAR.	Registered Population.	Convictions for drunkenness.	Cases of drunk'ness per 1,000 Population.
1851.....	29,357	1,502	51
1852.....	30,418	2,043	67
1853.....	31,570	2,432	77
1854.....	31,727	2,303	72
1855 a.....	32,800	3,431	105
1856.....	33,421	2,658	80
1864.....	42,433	2,161	51
1865 b.....	45,750	2,070	45
1866.....	47,332	1,424	30

DRUNKENNESS IN GOTHENBURG. *Continued.*

YEAR.	Registered Population.	Convictions for Drunkenness.	Cases of Drunkenness per 1,000 Population.
1867.....	47,898	1,375	29
1868.....	50,438	1,320	26
1869.....	52 526	1,445	28
1870.....	53,822	1,416	26
1871.....	55,110	1,531	28
1872.....	55,986	1,581	28
1873.....	56,909	1,827	32
1874 c.....	58,307	2,234	38
1875.....	59,986	2,490	42
1876.....	61,505	2,410	39
1877.....	63,391	2,542	40
1878.....	65,697	2,114	32
1879.....	66,844	2,059	31
1880.....	68,447	2,101	31
1881.....	71,533	2,282	32
1882.....	72,555	2,096	29
1883.....	77,653	2,364	30
1884.....	80,811	2,375	29
1885.....	84,450	2,475	29
1886.....	88,230	2,776	31
1887.....	91,396	2,921	32
1888.....	94,370	2,922	31
1889.....	97,677	3,282	34
1890.....	101,502	4,010	40
1891.....	104,215	4,624	44
1892.....	106,356	4 563	42
1893.....	106,959	4,066	38
1894.....	108,528	3,665	34
1895.....	112,670	3,516	31
1896.....	115,521	4,040	35
1897.....	117,534	5,234	44
1898.....	120,151	6,546	54
1899.....	6,650	54

a Local option law for rural districts passed.

b Bolag formed and police ceased arresting for drunkenness " on commission " on Jan. 1.

c Bolag secured control of all licenses.

And while drunkenness has not decreased, some of its incidents have grown worse, as appears from the following table:

GROWTH OF DELIRIUM TREMENS IN GOTHENBURG.

YEAR.	Cases of Delirium Tremens.	Cases per 1000 populat'n.	YEAR.	Cases of Delirium Tremens.	Cases per 1000 populat'n.
1888.....	59	0.60	1894.....	163	1.50
1889.....	80	0.82	1895.....	152	1.35
1890.....	102	1.00	1896.....	205	1.77
1891.....	113	1.08	1897.....	189	1.60
1892.....	129	1.21	1898.....	235	1.96
1894.....	152	1.40			

The history of liquor legislation in Norway has been similar to that of Sweden in many respects. Up to the year 1814 partial prohibition very largely prevailed. Then followed sixteen years in which the liquor traffic was given free rein. From 1838 to 1845 was a period in which various prohibitory measures were enacted. In 1845 local option was given to the rural districts. In 1871 an act was passed, authorising towns and cities to organise companies (*samlags*) with power to take over the monopoly of the spirit traffic. In 1894 the licencing of private parties in cities was abandoned and the people were required by a new law to choose between prohibition and the *samlag* plan. At the present time the rural districts, so far as the liquor business is concerned, are governed by the law of 1845, the urban districts by that of 1894.

The fifteen years of free distillation, following the departure of the Danes in 1814, produced a season of national drunkenness which rivalled that of early Sweden. But the problem was more promptly grappled with by the law-making power, hence the evil never secured such a firm hold on the people as it did in the sister nation. After the enactment of the local option law of 1845, the people rapidly took advantage of its provisions to drive the traffic out of their districts. So general did this policy become that, at the present time, prohibition rules in every rural district save 15. As to the 59 towns and cities, in 31, with a total population of 133,000 inhabitants, the people have voted out the *samlag* and elected prohibition. In 28, with a population of 338,000, the *samlag* system prevails. Among these is Christiania, with 210,000 inhabitants, and Skein with 10,000 inhabitants.

The official statistics of Norway permit a more satisfactory examination of the real effect of the *samlag* upon the consumption of liquor than those of Sweden. In the first place, we know the number of distilleries in Norway for a period of years. From this it appears that hostile and prohibitory legislation, together with temperance agitation, closed 9,700 distilleries in the country before the introduction of the *samlag*. Since the *samlag* was established, only four have been closed.

DECREASE IN NORWEGIAN DISTILLERIES.

Year.	Number of Braendevin Distilleries.
1833.....	9,727
1840.....	1,387
1850.....	40
1865.....	27
1899.....	23

In the next place, we have the following statistics of the consumption of liquor:

PER CAPITA OF CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS IN NORWAY.

YEAR.	SPIRITS. (Litres.)	Prop'rtion of total spirits sold by sam- lags (litres.)	BEER. (Litres.)	Wine. (Litres.)	Total Pure Alcohol. (Litres.)
1833.....	16.0	8.5
1836-40.....	0.43
1841-45.....	0.52
1849.....	10.0	5.5
1849-50.....	5.4
1851-55.....	6.3	* 12.0	0.67	3.6
1856-60.....	5.5	0.44	3.2
1861-65.....	4.4	† 12.0	0.45	2.7
1866-70.....	4.8	0.60	2.9
1871.....	5.3	12.3	0.91	3.6
1872.....	4.5	13.0	0.91	3.6
1873.....	5.3	16.1	0.91	3.6
1874.....	6.6	19.0	0.91	3.6
1875.....	6.5	23.2	0.91	3.6
1876.....	6.7	8.3	21.1	0.89	3.3
1877.....	6.0	14.8	21.4	0.89	3.3
1878.....	4.5	22.2	20.7	0.89	3.3
1879.....	3.3	24.5	20.1	0.89	3.3
1880.....	3.9	21.0	15.3	0.89	3.3
1881.....	3.0	30.1	16.1	0.87	2.4
1882.....	3.8	25.5	16.2	0.87	2.4

334 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS IN NORWAY.

(Continued.)

YEAR.	Spirits. (Litres.)	Prop'rtion of total spirits sold by sam- lags (litres.)	BEER (Litres.)	Wine. (Litres.)	Total Pure Alcohol (Litres.)
1883.....	3.3	34.1	17.7	0.87	2.4
1884.....	3.5	34.1	16.9	0.87	2.4
1885.....	3.5	32.1	17.1	0.87	2.4
1886.....	3.0	41.4	13.5	0.88	2.2
1887.....	2.8	43.2	13.3	0.88	2.2
1888.....	3.1	40.1	15.5	0.88	2.2
1889.....	3.2	41.8	15.5	0.88	2.2
1890.....	3.1	49.1	18.8	1.11	2.2
1891.....	3.7	42.9	21.7	1.50	2.08
1892.....	3.2	51.3	20.6	1.11	2.05
1893.....	3.5	45.6	20.8	0.88	2.6
1894.....	3.8	39.7	19.8	1.12	2.7
1895.....	3.5	41.2	17.7	1.44	2.5
1896.....	2.3	56.4	16.2	2.38	2.1
1897.....	2.2	60.5	17.8	2.60	2.2
1898.....	2.6	56.1	21.6	2.75	2.5
1899.....	2.8	23.2

* Average for the period 1851-55.

† Average for the period 1861-65.

The reduction of the consumption of spirits from 16 litres in 1833 to 10 litres in 1843, and the continued reduction down to 1871, are of course to be credited to prohibitory laws, local and general, and to temperance agitation; not to the *samlag* system, which was not yet in existence. But the reduction has continued ever since 1871. Is any of the credit for this reduction due to the *samlag*? The question is answered by the following table, showing, for a recent period of years the total yearly consumption of spirits, the amount sold by all the *samlags*, and the *samlag* sales in the five largest cities. From this table it appears (1) that the annual consumption of spirits in Norway has decreased more than 2,000,000 litres in four years, and (2) that at the same time, the annual sales of all *samlags* have actually increased

and the sales in the five largest *samlag* cities have enormously increased. This proves that the decrease in the consumption of spirits has taken place wholly in the prohibition districts, and not in the *samlag* cities. Further, the decreased consumption in the prohibition districts has been so heavy as to overcome the large increase in the *samlag* cities and cause an annual decrease in the total consumption. The persistence of some of the advocates of the *samlag* system in crediting the remarkable annual reduction in Norway's consumption of spirits to that system and at the same time arguing that prohibition is a failure is on the showing of these facts an absurdity.

NORWAY'S CONSUMPTION OF SPIRITS.

YEAR.	Total consumption of Spirits in Norway. (Litres.)	Sales by all Samlags. (Litres.)	Samlag Sales in Five Largest Cities. (Litres.)
1894.....	7,682,000	3,025,434	1,352,215
1895.....	7,111,000	2,931,244	1,315,606
1896.....	4,827,000	2,720,073	1,125,861
1897.....	4,637,000	2,805,970	1,594,714
1898.....	5,566,000	3,120,801	2,107,396

The crime record of Christiania since the inauguration of the company system has been anything but satisfactory. Below are some statistics of the police department for each year since 1875. This record shows that there was a steady decrease in drunkenness *until the year following the introduction of the samlag system*. Since then there has been a continuous and startling increase; the rate of convictions per 1,000 inhabitants in 1898 being more than double what it was in the year following the introduction of the *samlag*.

336 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

CHRISTIANIA'S RECORD OF DRUNKENNESS.

YEAR.	Convictions for Drunkenness.	Drunkenness in connection with other offense.	Total Drink Convictions.	Drink convictions per 1,000 inhabitants.
1876.....	5,427	3,452	8,690	
1877.....	7,318	2,063	10,281	125
1878.....	5,785	2,560	8,345	74
1879.....	4,863	2,208	7,071	
1880.....	4,880	1,814	6,694	
1881.....	4,330	1,682	6,012	
1882.....	4,176	1,376	5,552	45
1883.....	4,429	1,490	5,919	
1884.....	4,297	1,644	5,941	
1885*.....	4,927	1,547	6,474	49
1886.....	3,425	1,218	4,643	34
1887.....	3,834	1,251	5,085	37
1888.....	5,616	1,689	7,305	53
1889.....	5,902	2,000	7,902	55
1890.....	7,843	2,253	10,096	66
1891.....	9,063	2,539	11,602	74
1892.....	9,127	2,369	11,496	71
1893.....	9,266	3,610	12,876	73
1894.....	9,345	3,266	12,611	72
1895.....	7,523	3,368	10,891	59
1896.....	11,573	3,412	14,985	78
1897.....	13,064	3,862	16,926	83
1898.....	11,525	3,979	15,504	70

* Samlag began operations on July 1.

But these figures do not completely represent the extent of drunkenness in Norway's capital. The report of the *samlag* for the year 1898 shows that 62,289 persons, an average of 171 per day, were refused a drink at the *samlag* shops for the following reasons:

Because ALREADY DRUNK.....	40,361
Because so near drunk that another drink would complete the operation.....	20,228
Because the applicant was a minor.....	1,178
Because the applicant was poor.....	376
For other reasons.....	156
Total.....	62,289

And besides these *samlag* shops, there were 29 private liquor sellers, each of whom paid 10,000 kroner

per year licence, and who were not so particular as to report cases where drinks were refused. Furthermore, there were nearly two thousand beer, wine and old privileged licences where no reports of this sort were made.

The *bolag* system in Sweden developed two conspicuous weaknesses; the better class of people, save in rare cases, would not take any hand in the *bolag* liquor business, and the licences and companies had a tendency to drift into the hands of politicians and old-time saloon-keepers. The other weakness of the Swedish system lies in the fact that the bulk of the profits go to the relief of the taxpayer, which acts as an inducement for its retention. The Norwegian legislators attempted to steer clear of this disadvantage by providing that the profits should go to charity and charitable institutions. The result has been that Norway has been overrun with alleged charitable institutions. This became an unbearable nuisance, and the Storting has enacted that after the year 1900 the bulk of the profits shall go into the national treasury. What disposition is finally to be made of the profits has not yet been determined.

The two systems differ in another important respect. The Swedish plan is to serve food with drinks, provide reading matter, and make the establishment an agreeable place to spend a leisure hour. The Norwegian plan provides no food and no furniture, and compels customers to leave as soon as they have swallowed their dram. From a temperance standpoint, strange to say, the results of the Norwegian plan are less discouraging than those of the Swedish plan.

In the local option elections in both Norway and Sweden, the issue has been almost invariably between the liquor element upholding the *samlag* and the

organised temperance societies demanding prohibition. Herr Edward Wavrinsky, Past Right Worthy Grand Templar of the Good Templars of Sweden, and member of the Swedish Diet, states that of the three hundred thousand organised total abstainers of Sweden, he does not believe that a single one has ever had a hand in the organisation of a *bolag*.*

* For further information on the Gothenburg system see E. Willerding, *Memoranda on the Liquor and Licencing Laws of Sweden* (1893); Wieselgren, *More about the Gothenburg System* (1893); John Graham Brooks, *Brandy and Socialism*, in the *Forum*, vol. xiv.; the Fifth Special Report of the United States Commissioner of Labor; and the *New Voice*, March 22 to May 10, inclusive, 1900.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE DISPENSARY SYSTEM.

THERE have been in the past two notable instances of the monopoly of the liquor trade by the state, namely, in England under Elizabeth and in Sweden under Gustavus IV. In these two cases the state had little or nothing to do with the actual sale of liquor, but simply granted the privileges of the trade to court favorites.

At the present time the system of state monopoly is in force in some parts of the United States, in Russia and in Switzerland. In the last-named country the monopoly (established in 1887) is confined to the wholesale trade in spirits, the government making no sales of less than 40 gallons. Since it is intended as a fiscal and hygienic measure, and has no relation to temperance, we shall not speak of it further, but shall confine ourselves to the American and Russian systems.

THE DISPENSARY IN THE UNITED STATES.

On June 28, 1711, the Lords Proprietors of the colony of South Carolina passed an act which may be regarded as an early precursor of the present South Carolina dispensary law. Besides requiring the permission of the colonial authorities as a condition for

the sale of liquor and imposing many restrictions such as now prevail under high licence systems, the law required tavern-keepers to give bond and forbade the sale of liquor for consumption at the place of sale. The act was prefaced by the following preamble:

“Whereas, The unlimited number of taverns, tap-houses and owners and masters thereof, have and will encourage all such vices as are usually the production of drunkenness and idleness.”

Ever since that time, colonial and state authorities have been constantly active in attempts to control the liquor business. Just before the Civil War, an unusually drastic law was passed, but owing to that war it lapsed. During the Reconstruction period following the war, the “carpet bag” government of the South was seen at its worst in South Carolina. The commonwealth government was given over to the thievery and corruption of the negro party. It was not until 1876 that the white population, organised in the Democratic party, by fraud and violence, which it has frankly acknowledged, gained the upper hand, which it has retained to this day. Not until then did the real reconstruction of the state begin. During the period of 1876–90 the control of affairs was held by the old time oligarchy, which represented the wealth, the social standing and the education of the state. Under this régime, a large number of special acts was passed for different localities. The Southern practice of giving any community any sort of law which is petitioned for by an apparent majority of its influential members was followed in liquor as well as in other legislation. During the three years following 1879 special acts placed

twenty-seven towns under prohibition. In 1883, prohibition was applied to Barnwell and Iconee counties, but a little later was withdrawn. In the period 1882-84 special prohibition acts were passed for seventeen towns. In the latter year, a special act was passed for Shiloh, putting the licence fee at twenty thousand dollars a year. Fifteen more towns were given prohibition in the years 1885-87, six in 1888, ten in 1889. In 1890, prohibition was extended to Marlboro county and to sixteen more towns. Local prohibition laws were granted and repealed at each session of the Legislature in response to the demands of the localities interested. By 1891 prohibition was in force in five counties as well as in more than sixty towns and villages. Meantime, in 1880, a general law had been passed which forbade the issuing of licences outside of the incorporated towns and villages, but left the latter free to fix their own licence fees after paying the county one hundred dollars for each licence. The independence of the cities in this matter naturally made the liquor question a prominent factor in municipal politics. The taxpayer spoke loudly at the polls and, in many cases the license fees exacted were as high as five hundred and even one thousand dollars. In the year 1882 a general local option law had been passed for the towns and cities but this law was not free from modification by special acts. Out of this tangle of legislation was born the dispensary.

During the latter part of the eighties, the prohibitionists, under the leadership of Mr. L. D. Childs, began an agitation for a general prohibitory law for the state. In 1889, Mr. Childs introduced into the Legislature, of which he was a member, a bill for the absolute prohibition of the traffic in intoxicants for

beverage purposes. The bill was defeated by eight votes. In the following year Mr. Childs again pressed the measure. It was passed by the House but was defeated in the Senate. Mr. Childs and his friends next induced the Democratic state executive committee to take a vote at the primaries of the Democratic party on the question of prohibition. As there is practically but one political party in the state, which determines all political questions within its organisation, the proposed vote amounted to a plebiscite of the whole people of the state. The voters declared in favour of prohibition by almost ten thousand majority out of a total vote of about seventy thousand. Of the thirty-five counties in the state, twenty-seven declared for prohibition. At the election, the whole power of the liquor fraternity was directed toward the defeat of Mr. Childs in his race for re-election to the Legislature. They succeeded. Mr. Childs, however, though not re-elected, presented his prohibition bill to the lower house of the Legislature through Representative E. C. Roper. Late in the session (1892) the bill passed the House by a vote of 57 to 37, and its passage by the Senate was assured.

But here a new political complication arose. Within the Democratic party a faction had developed known as the Reform party, led by Mr. Benjamin R. Tillman. This faction captured the Legislature of 1892, and Mr. Tillman was elected Governor. The legislature of the year, therefore, is distinctly chargeable to the Reformers. Now, although the Reform party was largely supported in the rural districts, and accordingly contained a large temperance element, it had also received strong support from the liquor dealers. The Reform leaders therefore were confronted with this dilemma: if they passed the pro-

hibition bill, they would give mortal offence to their liquor supporters; if they voted it down, they would lose the support of the prohibitionists. In this crisis, Mr. T. J. Grant, editor of the *Register*, at the city of Columbia, got the ear of Governor Tillman and proposed the dispensary system, an experiment which had been in operation at Athens, Georgia, for several years, being the result of a compromise there between the friends and foes of prohibition. Senator John Gary Evans was called into consultation and the plan was adopted. There was not enough time to introduce the measure in the regular way, so Mr. Evans moved to amend the Roper bill by striking out all but the enacting clause and adding the dispensary provisions. For two days and one night the Senate fought over the amendment, but the leaders, backed by Governor Tillman, finally forced its passage through the Senate and its adoption by the House. It was signed by the Governor on December 24, 1892, and went into effect on July 1, 1893.

The act as it now stands, provides for a state board of directors consisting of five members, one of whom retires annually. The members of this board are elected by the General Assembly. The board, subject to the approval of the Senate, appoints a state commissioner, who under the direction of the board has immediate control of the business. A central state dispensary is established by the law for wholesale distribution of liquor to the local (retail) dispensaries. The men in charge of the latter are chosen by the state board, and receive a salary. The profits of the central dispensary are devoted to the school fund; those of each local dispensary are divided between the municipality in which it is situated and the county. A bewildering system of restrictions is imposed on the retail busi-

ness, many of them copied from those commonly incident to high licence. The distinguishing restrictions in the South Carolina system are (1) that purchasers are required to make written application for what they buy, and (2) that the liquor is to be sold in bottles and must not be drunk on the premises.

This system has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court in all its essential provisions. It has also been more firmly entrenched by the following article of the state Constitution, adopted in 1895, which makes the re-establishment of the ordinary saloon in the state impossible without an amendment to the Constitution :

“In the exercise of the police power the General Assembly shall have the right to prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors as beverages within the state. The General Assembly may licence persons or corporations to manufacture and sell and retail alcoholic liquors or beverages within the state under such rules and restrictions as it deems proper; or the General Assembly may prohibit the manufacture and sale and retail of alcoholic liquors and beverages within the state, and may authorise and empower state, county and municipal officers, all or either, under the authority and in the name of the state, to buy in any market and retail within the state liquors and beverages in such packages and quantities, under such rules and regulations as it deems expedient: *Provided*: That no licence shall be granted to sell alcoholic liquors in less quantities than one-half pint, or to sell them between sundown and sunrise, or to sell them to be drunk on the premises: *and provided, further*: That the General Assembly shall not delegate to any municipal corporation the power to issue licence to sell the same.”

Since the adoption of the dispensary system the liquor question has become more deeply entangled in politics than ever. In both local and state affairs

for several years past the principal issue has been between the retention of the dispensary and the establishment of prohibition. In the state election on this issue in 1898 the advocates of the dispensary won by a majority of 5,000, the total vote being 70,000. The state election held in 1900 had approximately the same result. In Charleston the municipal bone of contention has been whether or not municipal officers should be elected who would do all in their power to protect the illicit liquor sellers of the city.

A bill was introduced in the Legislature in the session of 1901-2 for permitting municipalities to vote periodically on the question of dispensary or no dispensary in the locality. It was pressed in both houses, but was defeated by the partisans of the dispensary.

A most unfortunate development in dispensary politics has been the growing tendency in the state to measure the success of the dispensary by the amount of the profits turned over to the treasury—which means, of course, the amount of liquor sold. Each administration has paraded its growing profits before the people as a reason for endorsement and approval. The following table shows the profits of the dispensary under the various managements since its beginning:

PROFITS OF THE DISPENSARY BY ADMINISTRATION.

ADMINISTRATION.	Months.	Net Profits.	Average Monthly Profit (net)
Tillman-Traxler.....	19	\$125,328.40	\$ 6,596.23
Evans-Nixon.....	14	313,974.08	22,426.72
State Board, Dec. 31, 1898..	83	853,219.95	25,855.15
State Board, 1899.....	12	414,181.84	34,515.15
State Board, 1900.....	11a	474,178.46	43,107.98
State Board, 1901.....	12	545,248.12	45,437.34

a. Eleven months. Fiscal year changed to end Nov. 30.

346 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

This table shows that the monthly profits of the business have increased nearly seven-fold since the beginning. While a portion of this increase is due to increased business efficiency, much of it is due to the increased consumption of liquor, as the following table of sales indicates:

LEGAL SALES OF LIQUOR UNDER THE DISPENSARY.

YEAR.	Sales to County Dispensaries.	Sales by County Dispensers.
1894a.....	\$ 573,539.01	
1895b.....	1,076,963.65	
1896.....	1,305,340.00	
1897.....	1,125,874.00	\$1,252,280.08
1898.....	1,225,808.00	1,358,969.42
1899.....	1,513,777.77	1,788,425.80
1900 c.....	1,755,924.22	2,421,840.22

a Nine months ending April 21.

b Eleven months.

c Eleven months. Fiscal year changed to end Nov. 30.

The increased consumption simply marks a better adjustment of drinking customs to the new conditions. As an example of this adjustment may be mentioned the substitution of bottle-drinking for treating. Convivial friends now, instead of "setting up" the drinks in turn, "chip in" and buy one or more bottles, the contents of which they proceed to drink in front of the dispensary or in a neighbouring alley.

The dispensary and the illicit liquor shops (called "blind tigers") were at first enemies. The latter smuggled their supplies from beyond the state borders or from "moonshine" stills in the mountains. The dispensary opposed its rival by opening beer dispensaries, which were conducted with much latitude, and by putting on the market a whisky known as "eighty proof," which sold at a lower price than even the "moonshine" product. This "eighty

proof" whisky was merely a mixture of whisky and water in the proportion of eighty to twenty. The dispensary was thus fighting its rival (1) by conducting competing "blind tigers" and (2) by selling adulterated whisky. In a short time, however, the illicit sellers discovered that it would be to their business and political advantage to buy their supplies from the dispensaries; while the dispensary keepers found that they could enlarge their trade by cultivating closer relations with the illicit sellers. An understanding was therefore reached that the "blind tigers" should supply themselves exclusively from the dispensaries and that the latter should in turn protect the former, so far as possible, from the vengeance of the law. Dispensaries have now degenerated into mere supply stations for the "blind tigers." They do but a small amount, comparatively, of the retail business. In February, 1902, the records of the United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the district of South Carolina showed that there were in the state four hundred and four retail liquor dealers. There were then a hundred and four local dispensaries in the state, leaving a clear three hundred illicit sellers. But these were only a fraction of the real number of "blind tigers;" the Collector himself told one of the authors that there were a thousand in Charleston alone. Nevertheless, in spite of this enormous illicit retail trade, practically all the liquor consumed in the state comes from the dispensaries. In Columbia and Charleston the local dispensaries are usually situated in a settlement of numerous "blind tigers," which can thus replenish their stock at frequent intervals and avoid the risk of keeping a large stock on hand. The local dispensaries close promptly on time at night and remain closed on

Sunday; the real retail dispensaries, the "blind tigers," are open at all hours and on all days.

The statistics of crime in Charleston, the largest city of the state, are both favourable and unfavourable to the dispensary. The number of arrests for crimes attributed to intoxication and of arrests in general has been smaller since the adoption of the system than during the five preceding years. The number of arrests, however, both of the special class mentioned and of all classes, seems to be steadily increasing.

POLICE ARRESTS IN CHARLESTON.

YEAR.	Sales to Dispensaries in Charleston.	Arrests for drink offenses. c	Total arrests.
1888.....		1,501	3,210
1889.....		1,725	3,452
1890.....		1,673	3,285
1891.....		1,845	3,301
1892.....		1,634	3,473
1893.....		1,160	2,992
1894.....	\$ 56,477.00 a	1,148	3,600
1895.....		865	3,206
1896.....	200,285.00	910	2,808
1897.....	145,789.39		2,694
1898.....	165,407.63	1,085	2,776
1899.....	185,726.45	1,433	3,261
1900.....	175,716.58 b		

a. Five districts only.

b. Eleven months ending Nov. 30.

c. Includes offenses classified by the police as "drunks," "drunk and disorderly," "disorderly," and all kinds of "assault."

During the period covered by the above table the population of Charleston has been practically at a standstill. The census of 1890 reported it as 54,955, that of 1900 as 55,807.

The hope that reputable men would be secured to conduct the dispensaries has been disappointed. They have fallen in a great measure into the hands of professional politicians of low character. Among these officials defalcations have been frequent. A favourite device for defrauding the government, for

which the character of the business offers special facilities, is to appropriate the stock in trade or pocket a goodly part of the proceeds of the business and account for the shortage by an opportunely arranged fire or robbery. In 1897 the state board reported three "fires," with a total loss of \$6,478.98, and "worthless accounts" amounting to \$1,769.65. Further, the board placed \$16,006.33 of "ex-dispensers' shortages" to "profit and loss." In 1898 there were three "fires," seven "robberies," one of which was a raid committed by United States soldiers, and one "shortage." During 1889 there was one "fire" and seven "robberies," two of which were committed by squads of United States troops. In the year 1900 there was one "fire" and nine robberies. In 1901 there were eight "robberies."

By its alliance with the illicit trade, by giving employment and doing other favors to local politicians, and by divers other means well known in the dark woods of politics, the dispensary has built up a political organisation with a power hitherto unparalleled in the Southern states. It has been able to control elections and dictate public policy to an extent beyond the power of the old time liquor trade. It has strangled every attempt at the establishment of state prohibition. Instead of being a stepping-stone toward prohibition, as many hoped it would be, the dispensary seems to have postponed the hour of state prohibition for a quarter of a century.

Local dispensaries, without any central control such as exist in South Carolina, have been established recently in Charlotte, Fayetteville, and several other places in North Carolina, and also in a few towns in Georgia and Alabama. A state dispensary was established in South Dakota in 1898, but two

years later it was abolished by the vote of a great majority of the people.*

THE DISPENSARY IN RUSSIA.

The temperance reform of the Russian Empire took its rise in Finland. Prior to 1864 there were some twenty thousand spirit-kettles at work in Finland—among a population of less than two million. The consumption of spirits amounted to twenty litres per capita. Temperance agitation began in 1864. As an immediate result the peasants renounced domestic distillation. Since then distillation has been carried on under state control. In 1877, total abstinence societies began to be formed. They progressed rapidly, and in 1884 they united under the name of *Raittinden Ystavat* (friends of temperance) with a membership of some ten thousand.

A year prior to the formation of this society, the government of Finland passed an act allowing municipalities to adopt the Gothenburg system, and granting local option to the country districts. Under this law, the people have practically driven the spirit traffic out of rural Finland. In a report made to the World's Temperance Congress, held in London in 1900, Mr. Matti Helenius, of Helsingfors, stated that of the 422 parishes, representing a population of nearly two million, all had voted out the traffic save nine. Ever since its existence, the *Raittinden Ystavat*, with the temperance element, have waged war in the Finnish Parliament against the state monopoly and also against the Gothenburg system in the municipalities. At the International Congress for the Prevention of the Abuse of Alcohol, held at Christiana, Norway, in September, 1890, Herr Edv. Bjorkenheim, the representative from Finland, declared:

* See Appendix A, Chap. XVIII.

“The experiences of Finland with the Gothenburg system do not run in a favourable direction, and it is evident that there is a strong current of opinion against it in the country. Especially is this the case in the temperance circles, that is among persons who, provided the system would answer its professed object—to further the interest of temperance and morals—would be the very first to hail it as a valued friend and ally. . . .

“Temperance sentiment in Finland is unanimously and decidedly against the Gothenburg system; and should this system, as it is now organised, have a future in our country, then in the constitution of the various companies it must be laid down—

“(1) That their net profits without deductions be paid over to the state exchequer;

“(2) That their operations be put under strong and special public control; and

“(3) That every allusion to their presumed furtherance of moral and temperance progress be suppressed.”

The temperance propaganda by the aggressive Finns and the outlawry of the traffic in the rural districts have worked a revolution in the drinking customs of the people. The per capita consumption of spirits has been reduced to about one-tenth of what it was prior to 1864. The municipalities in which the Gothenburg system has been adopted have not been equally fortunate. In 1891–5 the per capita consumption in these towns was estimated at 1.84 litres, and in 1900, it had risen to 2.2.

While temperance agitation in Russia has been mainly carried on in Finland or by Finnish people in other provinces, something has been done elsewhere and by others. In 1836 some Lutheran pastors commenced a temperance propaganda in several of the Baltic provinces. Their pledge, which required abstinence from brandy, was signed by

many. But the reform did not thrive, largely because the government refused to permit the formation of temperance societies, an attitude in which it persisted until 1887. In 1889 the Synod of the Greek Church, held at St. Petersburg, appealed to all Russian priests to preach and work against the vice of drunkenness. From that time, the temperance reform, begun in the provinces of Finland and Esthonia, began to spread over the Empire and even into Siberia.

But the heavy profits of the Finnish monopoly combined with the Gothenburg system attracted the attention of Russian legislators. In January, 1895, the government of Russia assumed a monopoly of the traffic in spirits in four of the Eastern provinces. It proved a financial success, and in the latter part of 1896 the policy was adopted for the whole Empire. The monopoly is now being introduced into other provinces as rapidly as the business can be organised. It is authoritatively stated that in the establishment of this monopoly "two objects have been kept in view throughout; firstly, to obtain for the benefit of the state the largest possible amount of revenue from this trade; and, secondly, to diminish drunkenness." This monopoly is confined to *vodka*, a distilled spirit, the popular beverage of the masses, and does not extend to beer and wine. The distillation of spirits remains in the hands of private parties, but is under government direction as regards output and even as to prices. The retail trade consists of—(1) Sales at the government dispensaries, where no liquor is drunk on the premises, and (2) sales at restaurants (*traktirs*) and various other private establishments, which sell for the government on commission.

It is as yet too early to analyse the results of the Russian system. It closely resembles the South Carolina plan, with the important additional feature of the allocation of a portion of the profits to the support of tea houses, amusements and counter attractions to the drinking places. The number of drinking places has been greatly reduced. At first there was an apparent reduction in the consumption of spirits, but in a recent report of the Russian Minister of Finance the statement is made that the people are becoming accustomed to the new régime and that the consumption tends to revert to the former figures. Referring to the financial achievements of the new plan, the Minister says:

“To estimate the financial results of the reform, we may base our calculations upon the experience gained during the years 1895--7 in the Eastern provinces. In 1893, the year before the reform, the amount of excise duty in these four provinces had been 11,600,000 roubles, and the revenue from the licence duty 754,000 roubles, or a total of 12,354,000 roubles. If we take this last figure as the annual average of the revenue from drink, the triennial period 1895--7 should have given the provinces in the East an income in round numbers of about 37,000,000 roubles. At the same time we must consider that the application of the new system has brought with it under the head of control of indirect taxes an increase of disbursements of about 694,000 roubles for the three years, and that this sum must be put to the debit of the monopoly. In consequence, in order that the passage from the old system to the new administration might be effected without injury to the exchequer, it was necessary that the income from the drink revenue should reach for the three years 1895--7, taken together, a total of 37,700,000 roubles. As a matter of fact, the revenue under the head of licences, and as the net result of the

work of the monopoly, making deduction for all expenses of purchase, of rectification and of sale generally (except the allowance to the local distillers), amounted in 1895 to 16,844,000 roubles; in 1896 to 19,018,000 roubles, and in 1897 to 20,237,000 roubles; making a total of 56,099,000 roubles.

“Thus after the establishment of the monopoly the drink revenue in the East, from the commencement of the first triennial period, exceeded by 18,500,000 roubles the income that could have been obtained under the excise system.”

The minister states also, in a general way, that drunkenness and crime have been reduced under the monopoly. It appears that the Russian custom of extending credit to drinkers and of exchanging liquors for agricultural produce and clothes has been dispensed with where the government control has been put in force. But as has been the experience in Scandinavia and in South Carolina, it has been found difficult to secure the proper persons to take charge of the liquor shops. In the spring of 1901, the Russian Minister of Finance issued a circular to the excise officers calling attention to the unreliable character of those employed in the dispensaries, from which the business suffers and by which the success of the trade is greatly hindered. As a remedy, the Minister advises the payment of better salaries and an endeavour to attract women into the business. People who have known the character of the average European bar-maid will readily see how the proposed venture will stimulate the sale of liquor, but will scarcely comprehend how it will serve to promote temperance and morality.*

* See Appendix B, Chap. XVIII.

CHAPTER XIX.

TEMPERANCE AND MEDICINE.

THE theories of the chemist of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries regarding the composition of alcohol appear ludicrous to the modern student. The chemist of to-day says that alcohol is composed of carbon, 52.67 per cent.; hydrogen, 12.90 per cent.; and oxygen, 34.43 per cent.—a combination for which his formula is C_2H_6O .

In the seventeenth century, the greatest chemist of his time Jean J. Becher, evolved the notion that a certain principle was common to all combustible materials, which principle was given up in the process of combustion. This common element he called *phlogiston*. For more than a hundred years this theory was fundamental to all chemical teaching. The eighteenth century also had its greatest chemist in George Ernest Stahl, professor of medicine, anatomy, and chemistry in the University of Halle, and physician to the King of Prussia. Herr Stahl perfected and developed the theory of Becher. Chemists of those times are said to have demonstrated the nature of alcohol by setting fire to a glass of spirit of wine and inverting over it a cucurbit (a globe-shaped glass vessel), into which the flames would ascend. They would then point to the vapour which formed in the cucurbit and condensed into dripping water, and assert that spirit of wine was made up from the two elements, fire and water.*

* Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson, *On Alcohol* (Cantor Lectures), p. 41.

Shortly before the French revolution, fifty years after the death of Stahl, Antoine L. Lavoisier, the French chemist, overthrew this theory, and eliminated *phlogiston* from the chemical vocabulary. The downfall of the phlogistic theory of chemistry was celebrated in Paris by a funeral ceremony, in which a woman, robed as a priestess, committed the doctrine to the flames, while a choir chanted a solemn requiem.*

Thus, in the latter part of the eighteenth century the chemical composition of alcohol was regarded from the same scientific point of view as it is to-day. The theories and practice of the medical profession, regarding alcohol, however, were vastly different a hundred years ago from what they are at the present time. This change is, indeed, only a part of the general improvement of medical science and practice; for in his exploration of the dark continent of physical affliction the physician has progressed immeasurable distances from the point where he stood when he bled George Washington to death in 1799.

Pliny tells us that Roman physicians placed great reliance on the efficacy of burnt hairs from the tail of a dog as a remedy for the bite of that animal. Two conditions must be observed in applying the cure: (1) the hairs must be taken from the dog which had inflicted the wound, and (2) they must be swallowed with a bumper of good wine. On the

* Von Liebig, *Letters on Chemistry*, Letter III., p. 25.

Professor Alexander Johnston, in his article on Washington in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, says of his last illness: "Washington's disorder was an œdematous affection of the windpipe, contracted by careless exposure during a ride in a snowstorm, and aggravated by neglect afterwards, and by such contemporary remedies as excessive bleeding, gargles of 'molasses, vinegar and butter, tea,' which almost suffocated him, and a blister of cantharides on the throat."

eve of the nineteenth century the capillary element of this remedy seems to have fallen into disuse, although not only popular opinion but the most authoritative scientific doctrine prescribed that the alcoholic element should enter into the treatment of dog bites and of almost every other known malady. But if the former element had still survived to keep the latter company, it would not have been out of harmony with much of the medical practice of the time.

In 1780, Dr. John Brown of Scotland published his *Elementa Medicinæ*, embodying therein the system of medicine—known as the Brunonian system—which ruled a great part of the medical profession for some unhappy decades following. According to this system, all diseases were of two classes, sthenic and asthenic. Of the former, the cause was too much excitement and the remedy was to debilitate ; of the latter, the cause was insufficient excitement and the remedy was to stimulate, usually with wine or spirits. Doctor Brown died, in 1788, of apoplexy caused by a large dose of opium which he had taken in accordance with his system.

The Brunonian system might well have been called the alcoholic system. Alcoholic liquors were prescribed not merely for the sthenic diseases, for, as Doctor Richardson says, “when the fury of the phlogistic attack had been subdued and the sick man by bleeding, tartar emetic, and purgatives, had been reduced to death’s door, then it was the thing to bring him up again by gently pouring in wine or other stimulants with an improved dietary.” *

The universal use of alcoholic drink as medicine which prevailed until the nineteenth century was

*Address on *The Medical Profession and Alcohol*.

more than half gone, was deplorable for two reasons: first, it planted and spread to an incalculable degree the habit of drinking; second, it represented a universal and constant reliance on a drug which was not suited to effect any of the cures desired (with a very few exceptions), but was on the contrary, highly deleterious. It was the former reason which first influenced the medical profession to modify its practice in this respect. It required more time for the profession, through patient and laborious physiological and chemical research, to discover its mistake as to the therapeutic value of alcohol.

Physicians who were zealous advocates of temperance, and even of total abstinence from the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage, were not wanting in the eighteenth century, and in the early nineteenth. Such were, in England, Dr. George Cheyne, Dr. Robert James, Dr. Erasmus Darwin, father of the great scientist, Dr. John Armstrong, Dr. Thomas Beddoes, Dr. Thomas Trotter, Dr. T. Forster, and Sir Anthony Carlisle. Such were, in Holland, Dr. Hermann Boerhave; in Switzerland, Dr. Albrecht von Haller; in America, Dr. Benjamin Rush. But the principle asserted by these men, in general, was that liquor should not be freely used as a beverage, rather than that it should not be freely used as a medicine.

The great tide of temperance reform which swept America and England in the first half of the nineteenth century carried the medical profession forward with it. Said Lyman Beecher in 1826:

“To the physicians of the land I would cry for help in this attempt to stay the march of ruin. Beloved men, possessing our confidence by your skill, and our hearts by your assiduities in seasons of alarm and dis-

tress, combine, I beseech you, and exert, systematically and vigorously, the mighty power you possess on this subject over the national understanding and will. Beware of planting the seeds of intemperance in the course of your professional labours, and become our guardian angels to conduct us in the paths of health and of virtue."

The call was heard and obeyed. In America we find the physicians of the thirties decidedly in advance of the contemporaries of Rush regarding the medicinal use of alcohol. The great extent to which this use created evil habits led the physicians of the golden period of the reformation to ask whether there was really any necessity for the general employment of strong drink as medicine. Many of them declared that there was no such necessity.

Thus, the western section of the New Hampshire Medical Society adopted this resolution on May 3, 1827:

"That we disapprove of the former practice of physicians, which is too much adopted by some of the present day, of prescribing ardent spirits, either in their simple state or medicated with bitters, etc., to patients in chronic affections and in the stage of convalescence of most diseases; as the operation tends to confirm or reproduce the primary complaint, and what is not less, to create an habitual desire for their continuance, till the subjects of this ill-advised practice become the slaves of intemperance."

The general body of the same society on June 6, 1827, adopted the following:

"That in the opinion of this society the use of distilled spirit is never necessary, and generally hurtful

to persons in health, and that it affords no protection against contagious diseases, but on the contrary promotes a disposition to such diseases. . . .

“That we consider that distilled spirit is not essentially necessary to the treatment of a single disease, and that it might be safely removed from the shelves of the physician and apothecary.”

The Massachusetts Medical Society passed this resolution on June 6, 1829:

“*Resolved*, First, that in the opinion of this society the constant use of ardent spirits is not a source of strength and vigour, but that it is generally productive of weakness and disease.

“*Resolved*, Secondly, that this society agree to discourage the use of ardent spirits as much as lies in their power; and for that purpose to discontinue the employment of spirituous preparations of medicine whenever they can find substitutes.”

Among the physicians prominent in the temperance reform reflected in these resolutions were Dr. Reuben Dimond Mussey, Dr. Charles Alfred Lee, Dr. John Torrey, Dr. Billy Clark, Dr. John Ware, Dr. Charles Jewett, Dr. Bradford, and Dr. Flint.

It will be observed that the dominant note of these resolutions is the desire to limit the use of alcohol in the interest, not of sound therapeutics, but of temperance. Faint indications, however, were at this time or soon afterwards visible of a movement toward the doctrine which now prevails, that there is almost no place for alcohol in the prevention or treatment of disease. Dr. Ralph Barnes Grindrod, in his prize essay entitled *Bacchus* (which we mentioned in Chapter XV.), makes the following observations and quotations regarding “the popular notion that intoxicating liquors impart to the human system a power to resist noxious influences . . . such as extremes in heat and cold, local stagnations and exhalations, and

in particular such disorders as are supposed to be connected with or conveyed by some peculiar state of the atmosphere”:

“Medical men have expressed various opinions on this subject, and strong recommendations to the use of spirituous liquors, under these circumstances, have not unfrequently been published. It is a fortunate circumstance, however, that investigation and experiments have shown the utter fallacy of these views. A few opinions of this nature are now submitted to the consideration of the reader. Fifteen physicians in the city of New York unite in the following testimony: ‘From observation derived from hospital, as well as private practice, we are convinced that alcoholic drinks do not operate as a preventive of epidemic diseases, but on the contrary, that they are often an exciting cause. A large proportion of the adult subjects of epidemic diseases, are intemperate, and among these is disease likely to be fatal.’ And again: ‘The tone of the nervous system being impaired by the (frequent moderate) use of intoxicating liquors, the constitution thus becomes more susceptible to the impression of all noxious agents.’ . . . Dr. Harris, in an official report to the Secretary of the American Navy, states it as his opinion that the moderate use of spirituous liquors has destroyed many who were never drunk, and that no fact is more satisfactorily established, than that those who use them freely are the most exposed to the attacks of epidemic diseases. . . . Dr. Mussey corroborates the same views: ‘To a place among preventives of diseases, spirituous drinks can present but the most feeble claims. If under occasional drinking during the period of alcoholic excitement, a temporary resistance may be given to those morbid influences which bring acute disease, be it occasional or epidemic, that excitement, by the immutable laws of vital action, is necessarily followed by a state of relaxation, depression, or collapse, in which the power of resistance is weakened,

and this, too, in proportion to the previous excitement. In order, therefore, to obtain from alcoholic stimulus anything like a protective influence against the exciting causes of disease, the exposure to those causes must be periodical, precisely corresponding with the stage of artificial excitation. If, however, such accuracy of adjustment between the vital powers of vital resistance artificially excited, and the unhealthy agencies which tend to produce disease be wholly impracticable, then the danger must be increased by resorting under any circumstances to spirit as a preservative; and if not, other articles would do as well.’”

In the belief that the use of alcohol can be largely dispensed with the physicians of the thirties and forties are, as we have said, considerably in advance of earlier physicians; but those who held that its use could be dispensed with not only largely but almost totally were few. And this remained true until the researches of such men as Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson had furnished a scientific as well as a moral basis for the belief.

One of the exceptions to this rule is furnished by Dr. Charles Jewett of Massachusetts. In an article written in 1846 he records the following reply to a friend who thought the state ought to licence apothecaries to sell alcoholic drinks for medical purposes, in order that it might be easily procured when there was pressing need of it for medicinal use:

“You are supposing a case which does not often occur. . . . The term of time for which human life has been lengthened by alcoholic stimulants, contrasted with that by which it has been shortened, may perhaps compare as one minute to a century; and in our efforts to remove the cause which has taken the life of at least every tenth man in our country, for the last fifty years, it is hardly worth while to embarrass our

operations with a laboured effort to provide for so rare a case as the one you have supposed."

The dialogue then continued thus:

"Mr. B. You talk of the cases being rare where the use of alcoholic liquor is demanded as a medical agent. Why, sir, there are but few days during the three hundred and sixty-five that our physician does not post some of his patrons off to procure rum, brandy, or wine for his patients.

"Dr. J. Then he is sadly behind the times in his profession, or he is willing, for the sake of popularity, to minister to depraved appetites, or to subscribe to or endorse erroneous opinions. . . . The old notion of dealing out for every feeble patient, convalescent from fever or other disease, a little colombo or gentian root, a handful of camomile, and a little orange peel, as a tonic, and ordering 'a pint of good West India rum' or 'pure Holland gin,' wherewith to extract their virtues, and perhaps make a drunkard of the patient, is a mere relic of barbarism.

"Mr. B. But, sir, do you deny that there are cases where the internal use of alcoholic stimulants is necessary?

"Dr. J. Certainly not; although such cases are by no means of frequent occurrence. What I deny is, that there is any such necessity for their use as should lead to the licencing of any particular establishment for their sale any more than for the sale of gamboge or blue vitriol; and I deny the right of any physician, in country practice at least, to order the article and post his patrons off to a grog-shop to obtain it. All that is really necessary he should provide; and that he may do, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, from a fountain not more extensive than a four-ounce vial."*

When the strong resolutions against alcohol

* Miscellaneous writings of Charles Jewett, M.D. (1849), p. 190.

which have been quoted were adopted by the American medical societies above-mentioned in 1827 and 1829, the profession in Great Britain had hardly begun to be aware of the question there discussed; for the temperance reform came to the British medical profession, as to British society, a little later than in America. Thus, John Dunlop, in his essay on *National Intemperance*, published in 1829, quotes "an eminent physician" who, with great pride in the progress made by his profession, contrasts the use of wine in fever cases in 1829 and fifty years before. The difference consists, not in the abandonment of wine in such cases, but in the reduction of the dose from "at least a pint of wine a day" to "considerably less than a pint." In one disease, however, he is satisfied that this remedy may be totally discarded, namely, hysteria. "Females affected with hysteria," he says, "with scarcely an exception, consume three, four or five glasses of wine in the day, their inconsiderate fathers, husbands, or brothers ever pressing them to take wine. When I prescribe regimen for such patients, I generally inhibit the use of wine, and this promotes their recovery more than ammonia, valerian, asafoetida, or any of those remedies which are thought to act powerfully on the nerves, and which certainly do act powerfully on the first pair."

But when the temperance reform began, soon after, many physicians became prominent in it. Among them were the following: in England Sir John Webb, M. D.; Sir James MacGregor, M. D.; Sir Mathew Tierney, M. D.; Sir John Richardson, M. D.; Dr. Conquest; Dr. Pidduck; Dr. Beaumont; Dr. Oxley; Dr. Grindrod; Mr. Higginbotham, F. R. S., of Nottingham, who went so far as to abolish alcohol entirely from his medicine chest; Dr. Frede-

ric Richard Lees, the illustrious scholar and reformer of Leeds, who for many useful years laboured most brilliantly and effectively, in magazine articles, in the newspaper press, in pamphlets and monographs, in debate, and on the lecture platform, for the advancement of the reform on both its scientific and its popular side; and Dr. W. B. Carpenter, whose prize essay, *The Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors in Health and Disease*, published in 1849, had a wide circulation in England and America and did powerful service to the reform: in Scotland Dr. Ritchie, Dr. Ferrier, Dr. Menzies, Professor Miller, and Dr. Burn: in Ireland Drs. Cheyne, Harvey, Adams, Bevan, and Pope.

These physicians were known, for the most part, as advocates of temperance in or total abstinence from the beverage use of alcohol, or of limiting its medical use in the interest of temperance. The value of alcohol as a medicine had been, it is true, questioned on purely scientific grounds to a slight extent. Dr. Grindrod tells us that, before 1840, the virtue of alcohol as an antidote against infectious diseases had been questioned in England, as in America. But in England, as in America, a general opposition to alcohol as a medicine, on purely medical grounds, can scarcely be said to have existed before the century was two-thirds gone.

The three famous temperance declarations of the medical profession of Great Britain belong to this earlier period of the reform—two of them in time and all of them in spirit. The first of these declarations was drawn up in 1839 by Dr. Julius Jeffries, F. R. S. It characterised the belief that the habitual use of some portion of alcoholic drink, as of

wine, beer or spirit, is beneficial for health, and even necessary to those subjected to habitual labour" as "altogether erroneous"—"an opinion handed down from rude and ignorant times." This declaration was signed by seventy-nine physicians of London, among them Dr. W. F. Chambers, Sir James Clark, Richard Quain, professor of anatomy in the University of London; Dr. B. Travers, F.R.S., surgeon extraordinary to the Queen, and others of similar calibre.

The second declaration was drawn up in 1847 by John Dunlop and was signed by two thousand physicians. It was as follows:

"1. That a very large portion of human misery, including poverty, disease, and crime, is induced by the use of alcoholic or fermented liquors as beverages.

"2. That the most perfect health is compatible with total abstinence from all such intoxicating beverages, whether in the form of ardent spirits, or as wine, beer, ale, porter, cider, etc.

"3. That persons accustomed to such drinks may, with perfect safety, discontinue them entirely, either at once, or gradually, after a short time.

"4. That total and universal abstinence from alcoholic liquors and intoxicating beverages of all sorts would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality, and the happiness of the human race."

The third declaration was drawn up in 1871 by Doctor Parkes and signed by three hundred London physicians, among whom were Dr. George Burrows, president of the Royal College of Physicians, and Dr. George Busk, president of the Royal College of Surgeons. It read in part as follows:

"As it is believed that the inconsiderate prescription

of large quantities of alcoholic liquids by medical men for their patients has given rise, in many instances, to the formation of intemperate habits, the undersigned, while unable to abandon the use of alcohol in the treatment of several cases of disease, are yet of the opinion that no practitioner should prescribe it without the sense of grave responsibility. They believe that alcohol, in whatever form, should be prescribed with as much care as any powerful drug, and that the directions for its use should be so framed as not to be interpreted as a sanction for excess or necessarily for the continuance of its use when the occasion is past."

But the salutary movement marked by these three declarations did not include the whole profession; a large part remained uninfluenced by it. Worse still, there was a reaction about the middle of the century toward the general medical use of stimulants. Dr. Robert Bentley Todd was the leader of this reaction. Revolting against the prevailing practice of treating many diseases, according to the Brunonian theory, by depression, he went to the other extreme, holding virtually that all diseases were asthenic and should be treated with stimulants. Dr. Todd was a celebrated physiologist and his influence was wide. Accordingly, during the fifties, the idea that alcohol was the general cure for all human disorders still had wide acceptance.

The man who played the most prominent part in the repudiation by the profession of this pernicious system of medicine, and in the establishment of the doctrines regarding the medical use of alcohol which now prevail, was Dr. Benjamin Ward Richardson. This great physician was born in Leicestershire in 1828 and received his degree in 1854 at the University of St. Andrews. He was made a member of the

Royal College of Physicians in 1856. About this time he gained the Astley Cooper prize for a treatise on the coagulation of the blood and the Fothergillian prize for a treatise on diseases of the fœtus. In the next decade he originated two important anæsthetic processes, and became famous for many other contributions to medical science. During the latter years of this decade he became especially interested in alcohol, and began a long course of investigation on the subject. In the winter of 1874-75, at the invitation of the Society of Arts, he delivered the six Cantor lectures in Edinburgh. He chose for his theme, *Alcohol*, and gave to the world the results of his years of research on that subject. From that time Dr. Richardson quickly developed into the most powerful champion of medical temperance that the reform has yet produced. The *Six Cantor Lectures* became to the scientific side of the temperance reform what Dr. Beecher's *Six Sermons* had been to the moral side. He laboured constantly, with his tongue and his pen to spread the truth. His many articles and addresses were read or heard with respect and attention by learned scientists; but he strove equally hard to teach the people by simple and popular writings and addresses. He was not only a scholar, but an earnest reformer and philanthropist as well. In an address before the British Medical Temperance Association he said:

“I am by profession a healer of men. I solemnly swore on entering the splendid profession to which I belong . . . that I would consider it a part of my holy duty, as long as I lived, as a capable, rational being, to practise it, to respect, of all things, life; to relieve pain and disease, to alleviate, and to the very height of known skill, according to my gifts, to stave

off death from my fellow-men. Can I, in conscience, in the remembrance of so solemn an obligation, be anything else than a foe to so mortal a threatener as that which slays forty thousand of my countrymen per year, and accompanies the act with all the accessory ferocities and evils attendant on such wholesale destruction?"

But the abandonment of the use of alcohol as a general remedy for disease of which Dr. Richardson set the example—presently followed, and still followed by the profession at large was by no means based on a philanthropic opposition to intemperance. It was a matter of pure scientific knowledge of the physiological effects of alcohol such as had not before existed. As Dr. Richardson remarked in an address in 1879.

“Fifteen years, or at most twenty years ago, the true physiological action of alcohol was a speculative discussion unsupported by any reliable experiment, therefore of the most contradictory order. Now there is so much evidence of its mode of action that dispute gives way to accepted fact. That the ultimate action of alcohol in the animal temperature is to reduce the temperature; that alcohol relaxes organic muscular fibre; that alcohol produces four destructive physiological states of the body; that alcohol reduces oxidation; that alcohol interferes with natural dialysis; that alcohol induces, even taken in small quantities, a series of morbid changes and diseases which were not formerly attributed to it; that alcohol prepares the body for destruction by external shocks and depressions which are thus made more fatal; that alcohol belongs to the same class of chemical substances as chloroform, ether, and the anæsthetic family;—all this is practically now on the accepted record.”

The practical principle which Dr. Richardson drew from his study of alcohol he stated as follows :

“As a therapeutical agent, I have never excluded alcohol from my practice. But this is what I have done for nine years past: I have, whenever I thought I wanted its assistance, prescribed it purely as a chemical medicinal substance, in its pure form, in precise doses, in definite order of time; as I have prescribed amylnitrate, or chloroform, or ether, so I have prescribed alcohol. . . . I could do very well without it, since there are other substances which take its place that are less persistent in their effects, and are not so prone to create a constitutional appetite for themselves; but as a remedial agent of a third or fourth class value, it deserves to be retained in the arcanum of physic.”

What Benjamin Ward Richardson was to England, Dr. Nathan S. Davis was to the United States. Born in Greene, New York, in 1817, Dr. Davis came to Chicago in 1849, where he has since resided. For ten years he occupied a professorship in Rush Medical College. In 1859 he helped to found the Chicago Medical College, in which he was a dean and professor for forty years. He became an honorary member of the British Medical Association, and President of the International Medical Association. As a teacher, a practitioner, an author, an editor, an investigator, a member of many scientific societies, an officer in many institutions, his activities have been manifold. His views on alcohol are embodied in a book entitled, *The Verdict of Science Concerning the Effects of Alcohol on Man*. Dr. Davis was seconded in his efforts to teach the truth regarding this subject by Dr. Ezra M. Hunt of New Jersey, author of a powerful pamphlet entitled, *Alcohol as a Food and Medicine*, which was read

before the International Medical Congress at Philadelphia in 1876 ; and by Dr. William Hargreaves of Philadelphia, author of *Alcohol and Man* and *Alcohol and Science*. Meanwhile the soundness of the principles declared by these physicians of England and America was being demonstrated in a notable way in the London Temperance Hospital. This institution was founded in 1873. It was distinguished from other London hospitals only by the three rules regarding the prescription of alcohol or its compounds. These rules were thus stated and explained in 1880 by the Senior Physician, Dr. James Edmonds :

“ 1. As a beverage or appendage to the meal table alcohol is never used.

“ 2. As a pharmaceutical solvent alcohol has been superseded. A solution of glycerine and water has answered perfectly as a vehicle for every drug that has been required in the form of a tincture. This solution costs about one-fifth as much as the ordinary alcoholic solvent, and tinctures thus made give the true effects of the drug unalloyed by the action of an alcoholic vehicle. The glycerine tinctures are efficient and economical, while they are never taken, surreptitiously or otherwise, as intoxicants.

“ 3. As a medicine, alcohol or its compounds may be prescribed by the physician in charge precisely as any other drug. It is only stipulated that on such occasions the prescriber records the case at the time in a book kept for the purpose, that he states the object for which he prescribes the alcohol, and that, subsequently, he records also the effects which follow.”

The same physician said further regarding these rules:

“ While these are the regulations of the hospital I find that in point of fact, during seven years, alcohol has been prescribed only in one case, at the commence-

ment of the hospital work. In this case half-ounce doses of spirits of wine were administered. My colleague, Dr. Ridge, who was in charge of that case, has since been convinced by fuller experience that the alcohol need not have been prescribed, but at first he was obviously wise in going rather with the balance of professional opinion than otherwise. My other colleague, Dr. Robert Lee, and myself have in no case prescribed any alcohol, and we are both perfectly satisfied with the results."

Of 16,628 "in" cases treated in this hospital during its first twenty-six years alcohol was prescribed in only thirty-one. During this period the average yearly death-rate of the hospital has been a little less than seven per cent., while during the same period that of the other London hospitals furnishing the same kind of service has hovered about ten per cent. This record has proved the correctness of the theory of practically non-alcoholic medication beyond the power of doubt, with the result that the principle has been introduced into other hospitals in various parts of the world.

The value of alcohol as a food has claimed a great deal of attention from physiologists and physicians. The subject first became prominent in scientific discussion in 1842. In that year Baron Justus von Liebig, one of the greatest chemists of his generation, propounded the theory that foods were of two classes ; (1) plastic foods, which aid in building up the structures of the body, and (2) respiratory foods, which aid in producing heat. In the former class nitrogen was a prominent element, in the latter hydro-carbons, which undergo oxidation in the system, and thus aid in supplying heat and force. Von Liebig classified alcohol as a respiratory food, stating that it had "no

element capable of entering into the composition of blood, muscular fibre, or any part which is the seat of vital principle.”*

Baron Von Liebig's theory that alcohol was a heat producing food was based upon the fact that it contained carbon and hydrogen, and on the further fact that its use was followed by an increase of heat on the surface of the body. This theory was disputed in 1850 by Dr. Nathan S. Davis of Chicago. Doctor Davis held that, though an increase of heat and energy was the immediate result of the ingestion of alcohol, yet this effect was only momentary, and that after it had passed, the amount of heat and energy in the body was actually reduced below the normal.† This theory a few years later received the support of Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson.

The doctrine that alcohol produces heat and force was further disputed early in the seventies by the French scientists, Perrin, Lallemand, and Duroy. These men conducted a series of experiments which seemed to establish two facts: (1) that when alcohol was introduced into the system, it was eliminated unchanged in any way, in the different excretions of the body and in the breath; (2) that after alcohol had been taken into the system, none of the derivatives which are formed by the ordinary combustion of alcohol (corresponding to the ashes formed by the combustion of wood, etc.) were to be found anywhere in the body. The conclusion was: “No ashes, no fire.” It was believed that alcohol in the body did not undergo combustion or oxidation. It was therefore declared that alcohol was not only not a plastic

*Von Liebig, *Animal Chemistry*, p. 35.

Alcoholic Liquors in the Practice of Medicine, p. 3.

food, but not even a respiratory food—that is, that it did not perform any of the functions of food whatever.

Some doubt was soon cast on the validity of this conclusion, by a series of experiments conducted soon after by the English scientist, Dr. Austin. This series seemed to prove that, after alcohol had been administered, a certain amount was returned unchanged in the various excretions of the body, yet this amount represented but a fraction of the quantity administered. The conclusion was that the balance must have been consumed in some of the functions of food. This theory was apparently confirmed by the later experiments of Dupré, Thudichum and Schulinus.

In June, 1899, Von Liebig's proposition, disputed by the French scientists above mentioned, that alcohol was productive of heat and force, was re-affirmed by Prof. W. O. Atwater of Wesleyan University in Connecticut. Professor Atwater's investigations were conducted under the auspices of a society for the study of the liquor question known as the Committee of Fifty, of which he was a member. He drew from a long series of elaborate experiments the conclusion that two and a half ounces of alcohol per day introduced into the system were oxidised, with the exception of a small fraction, and that "in the oxidation all the potential energy of alcohol was transformed into heat or muscular energy." While his statement of oxidation was generally accepted, the conclusion that the result was heat and energy was disputed and it has not received wide acceptance. Investigations made in recent years by Professors Koppe, Von Bunge and Kräpelin, of Germany; and

also by Bienfait, Smith, Furer, Aschaffenburg and other continental scientists, appear to have established the fact that oxidation of alcohol does not mean that it contributes anything to the energy of the human system.

The scientific world is not yet fully in agreement regarding the nutritive properties of alcohol. Regarding its effects on the digestive processes as affecting other things taken into the alimentary canal there is a similar difference of opinion. This subject was given great prominence in the scientific world by Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson in the early seventies. As has been said above, Doctor Richardson supported Dr. Nathan Davis in his statement that alcohol reduced energy instead of creating it. But he went further, and asserted that alcohol not only destroyed energy but interfered with the process of digestion.*

The fact (not generally admitted as such) that alcohol in the system reduces the amount of waste matter eliminated, was accounted for by Doctor Richardson on the theory that it obstructed the removal of the effete matter of the tissues—an obstruction which is of course deleterious. This theory was disputed by certain scientists, notably Prof. J. F. W. Johnson, Doctor Anstie, and Doctor Hammond, who declared that alcohol retarded the destruction of sound tissue, and therefore performed a benefit by preventing waste of good material.

Dr. Richardson's theory that alcohol interfered with digestion was partly confirmed and partly contradicted by the investigations of Professors Chittenden and Mendel, of Yale University, which were

* *On Alcohol*, p. 116.

conducted under the auspices of the Committee of Fifty, above referred to, and the results of which were announced in 1897. These investigations seemed to show that, in purely chemical digestion, alcohol in amounts of from one to two per cent slightly aided digestion ; that in pancreatic digestion, the presence of alcohol resulted in retardation ; and that in salivary digestion, no retardation resulted until the proportion of alcohol reached five per cent. These investigations, however, were made entirely in a bottle, and the investigators plainly stated that the result might be different in the stomach of a living person or animal.

The results of the investigation of another eminent physiologist, Dr. J. H. Kellogg, regarding the effect of alcohol upon gastric digestion, were also made known in 1897. Dr. Kellogg's investigations covered a large number of cases, in which different classes of foods were taken from the stomach at different periods in the digestive process and analyzed. In some cases, alcohol was administered and others not. These experiments seemed to prove beyond a question that the introduction of alcohol into the stomach interfered with the formation of the gastric juices necessary to digestion.

The medical world is thus not yet in agreement regarding the food value of alcohol and regarding its effect on the digestion of other substances. But here the difference in opinion ends. Regarding the effects of alcohol upon the physiological functions other than digestion, especially those of the brain and the nervous system ; regarding its effects upon the strength and soundness of the vital organs ;—on these subjects the profession is practically of one mind.

It is practically unanimous in holding that the introduction of alcohol into the body is deleterious under almost all circumstances; that, as a beverage, alcohol is not only useless but a menace to health, and that as medicine it is to be used only in very rare cases and then not as a qualitatively and quantitatively uncertain ingredient of wine, brandy, whiskey, or beer, but in its pure form and not toxic quantities.

There is scarcely a text-book on physiology, pharmacology, or medicine in use in America or Europe which does not contain this teaching. Among the physicians, other than those already mentioned, well known for their contributions to it or their service in spreading it, the following are prominent: Dr. Sims Woodhead, professor of pathology in the University of Cambridge; Dr. Kræpelin, whose scientific study of alcohol has performed great service for the temperance reform in Germany; and Dr. Forel, who has performed the same service for Switzerland. The following also should be named: Drs. Pembrey, Rolleston, Gower, Payne, Abbot, Ridge, Lane, Horsley, Mac Nichols, Notter, Firth, Verlaguss, Delbruch, Goldberg, Doyen, Legrain, Delipine, Delearde, and Raneletti.

In the dissemination of medical knowledge regarding the effects of alcohol, the British Medical Temperance Association, founded in 1876, has achieved much. Through its work the world is familiar with the researches and opinions of such men as Sir W. W. Gull, Sir James Clark, Sir Andrew Clark, Sir Henry Thompson, and many others. From this society have sprung the American Medical Temper-

ance Association and the Association of German speaking Medical Abstainers in the United States.

The study of inebriety as a disease originated in the Washingtonian movement of 1840 in the United States. The Washingtonian societies of Boston opened a lodging-house to give temporary help to drunkards. In the course of time this Washingtonian Home was converted into an institution for the scientific treatment of inebriety. Another inebriate asylum was established in Binghamton, New York, in 1859, as a result of the labours of Dr. Edward J. Turner, of Maine. This asylum within a few years became the New York State Inebriate Asylum, and a part of the excise revenue of the state was very appropriately devoted to its support. It was demonstrated at this institution that inebriety was a disease and that it could be cured. Numerous asylums of similar character were soon opened in various parts of the United States, Canada, and Europe. In 1870 the managers of the asylums in the United States formed the American Association for the Study and Cure of Inebriety. This association established the *Quarterly Journal of Inebriety*, of which Dr. T. D. Crothers was the first, and is also the present, editor. The most prominent student of inebriety in England has been Dr. Norman Kerr. It was he who established the Dalrymple Inebriate Asylum and later organised the English Society for the Study and Cure of Inebriety. His book, entitled *Inebriety: its Etiology, Pathology, Treatment, and Jurisprudence*, contains the most masterly scientific discussion of the subject ever published.

CHAPTER XX.

TEMPERANCE AND LIFE INSURANCE.

THE theories regarding life and health which govern the action of life insurance companies have a peculiar weight, because those companies have the strongest of motives for ascertaining correct theories on that subject and also because they usually arrive at their conclusions by a process which is infallible. The insurance men of to-day are in agreement with the medical profession as to the effects of the use of alcohol and of abstinence therefrom. The medical men have reached their conclusions by investigation and experiment in individual cases and by scientific reasoning; the insurance men by the simpler method of statistics. Since the statistics used are unimpeachably correct, the endorsement of the medical theories by the insurance men is a valuable confirmation.

In the early part of the nineteenth century there were no vital statistics bearing upon the subject of abstinence from alcoholic liquor. Hence the life insurance companies simply accepted the general notion that such total abstinence was both unsanitary and unscriptural, and those who had parted company with the bowl were regarded as leading a precarious life. Hence life insurance companies

were wont to reject applications for insurance from total abstainers, or to grant them only at rates ten per cent. above the ordinary premiums. In 1840 Mr. Robert Warner, a teetotaler, was denied a policy by a certain insurance company except at the usual advance of ten per cent. Disgusted with this demand, he conceived the plan of a life insurance company of total abstainers only. With the assistance of the Rev. W. R. Baker and Mr. James Ellis, he organized such a company during that very year and named it the United Kingdom Total Abstinence Life Association. Its first officers were himself as president, Mr. Theodore Compton as secretary, and R. D. Thomson, M.D., and J. T. Mitchell, M.R.S.C., as medical officers. The company during its first year wrote 255 policies, none of which matured in that period. In the second year it wrote 320 policies and paid one natural claim. For the first five years its death rate was 7.5 per thousand, while that of the most prosperous of the older companies for the same period was 15 per thousand. In 1847 a General Section was opened for the insurance of moderate drinkers, and the name of the company was changed to "The United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution," the name by which it is now known. In 1855 it paid the first of a series of quinquennial bonuses to its policy-holders and with this event its era of great prosperity began. During the years 1855-1857 it wrote 6,724 policies. It has continued to flourish since that time.

A comparison of the death rate in the total abstinence section (called the Temperance Section) with the death rate in the General Section is furnished by the accompanying table. The Temperance Section is composed of total abstainers, the General Section of

moderate drinkers, for the company insures no excessive drinkers. Hence the table throws light on the comparative virtues of total abstinence and moderation. It shows that for thirty-five years the proportion of actual to expected claims in the General Section have exceeded those in the Temperance Section by more than thirty-five per cent.

DEATH RATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TEMPERANCE AND GENERAL PROVIDENT INSTITUTION.

PERIOD.	Number of years.	Temperance Section.			General Section.		
		Expected claims.	Actual claims.	Percentage actual to expected claims.	Expected claims.	Actual claims.	Percentage actual to expected claims.
1866-70.....	5	549	411	74.9	1,008	944	93.7
1871-75.....	5	723	511	70.7	1,268	1,330	104.9
1876-80.....	5	933	651	69.8	1,485	1,480	99.7
1881-85.....	5	1,179	835	70.8	1,670	1,530	91.6
1886-90.....	5	1,472	1,015	68.9	1,846	1,750	94.8
1891-95.....	5	1,686	1,203	71.4	1,958	1,953	99.7
1896-1900.....	5	1,900	1,402	73.6	2,053	1,863	90.6
Total.....	35	8,542	6,028	*70.5	11,288	10,850	*96.1

* Averages.

This is one of the most convincing refutations of the claims of tipping as against total abstinence—all the more convincing because the figures represent not arguments, but cold facts recorded by an actuary.

The Sceptre Life Association (Limited) of London, organised in 1864 to insure for the most part members of religious bodies, adopted the plan of the pioneer company by insuring total abstainers in a separate section. Since its general section was recruited mainly from the churches, the risks therein were necessarily of the highest order. Yet its death rate, as shown in the following table, places the total abstinence section at a decided advantage.

DEATH RATE OF THE SCEPTRE LIFE ASSOCIATION.

PERIOD.	Number of years.	TEMPERANCE SECTION.			GENERAL SECTION.		
		Expected claims.	Actual claims.	Percentage actual to expected claims.	Expected claims.	Actual claims.	Percentage actual to expected claims.
1884-88.....	5	195	110	56.41	466	368	79.00
1889-93.....	5	312	184	58.97	564	466	82.62
1894-98.....	5	419	228	54.42	628	498	79.30
1899.....	1	94	47	50.00	140	86	61.43
Total.....	16	1,020	569	* 55.78	1,798	1,418	* 78.87

* Averages.

Another company which followed the example of the United Kingdom Provident Institution, with similar results, was the Scottish Temperance Life Association, founded in Edinburgh in 1883. This company writes accident insurance as well as life insurance, and in the former business, as in the latter, keeps abstainers in a section separate from drinkers. The expected and the actual death rate of the two classes of policy-holders for the first fourteen years is shown in the following table:

DEATH RATE OF THE SCOTTISH TEMPERANCE LIFE ASSOCIATION

YEARS.	EXPECTED CLAIMS.		ACTUAL CLAIMS.		RATIO OF ACTUAL TO EXPECTED CLAIMS		Per Cent. of Advantage in Favor of Abstinance
	General Section	Temperance Section.	General Section.	Temperance Section.	General Section.	Temperance Section	
1883-87..	11	43	7	15	62	35	27
1888-92..	40	159	33	79	68	50	18
1893-97..	95	290	67	138	70	48	22
Totals..	155	492	107	232	* 69	* 47	* 22

* Averages.

Still another institution of the same sort is the Australasian Temperance and General Mutual Life

Assurance Society, of Melbourne, which was founded in 1885. Its death rate for five years is given in the following table:

YEAR.	EXPECTED CLAIMS.		ACTUAL CLAIMS.		RATIO OF EXPECTED TO ACTUAL CLAIMS.		PERCENTAGE OF ADVANTAGE IN FAVOR OF ABSTINENCE.
	General Section.	Abstinence Section.	General Section.	Abstinence Section.	General Section.	Abstinence Section.	
1890-91.....	2,425	5,126	2,847	2,950	117.4	57.6	59.8
1891-92.....	2,520	5,564	2,357	4,307	93.6	77.4	16.2
1892-93.....	2,445	5,831	2,129	3,347	87.1	57.4	29.7
1893-94.....	2,421	5,967	1,379	3,557	57.0	59.6	42.6
1894-95.....	2,596	6,458	2,412	2,974	92.9	46.1	46.8
Total.....	12,407	28,946	11,124	17,135	*89.6	*59.2	*30.4

*Averages.

†Against Abstinence.

Other companies which have been organised upon the principle of the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution are the following:

The Abstainers and General Association, Limited, of Birmingham; the Temperance and General Life Assurance Company of Toronto; and the American Temperance Life Insurance Company of New York, which insures total abstainers only. Many other companies have adopted the principle of separate insurance for abstainers, among them the British Empire Mutual Life Assurance Company; the London, Edinburgh, and Glasgow Company; the Victorian Mutual Company; the Whittington Life Assurance Company; the Lancashire and Yorkshire Accident Assurance Company; the Accident Insurance Company of London; the Insurance Department of the New Zealand Government; and the Equitable Life Insurance Company of New York.

A few years ago Mr. James Meikle, F. A. I., F. F. A., of Birmingham, England, investigated the death rate of the total abstainers insured in an English company, during a period of fourteen years. He found that during this time the number of deaths among the total abstainers between twenty-five and thirty-four years of age was 51.7 per cent. of the number called for by the mortality tables of the Institute of Actuaries; that the number of deaths among those between thirty-five and forty-four years of age was 34.4 per cent. of the number called for in those tables; and among those between forty-five and fifty-four years of age the number of deaths was 51.7 per cent. of the expected number. The average rate for all three of these classes of abstainers was 48.1 per cent. of the regular rate determined by the tables. In other words, whereas according to the actuaries' tables 313 persons should have died, only 151 of these abstainers died.

In 1875 the Mutual Life Insurance Company of

New York inserted in the formula for the examination of applicants the question, whether they used alcoholic liquor or not. This supplied a basis for studying the longevity of the total abstainers in the company as compared to that of the drinkers. Such a comparison was made by Mr. Emory McClintock, the actuary of the company, covering the twenty years following 1875. Side by side with the company's loss through the death of drinkers he placed its loss through the death of abstainers during this period, with the results shown in the following table:

		Expected Loss.	Actual Loss.	Percentage of actual to expect- ed loss.
First year.....	Abstainers	\$ 716,388	\$ 568,900	79
	Drinkers.....	978,213	1,040,300	106
Second, third and fourth year.....	Abstainers	2,067,301	1,550,100	76
	Drinkers.....	3,540,940	3,576,650	101
All years after the fourth.....	Abstainers	2,671,890	2,132,050	80
	Drinkers.....	5,310,309	4,852,457	90
Whole period.....	Abstainers	5,455,669	4,251,050	78
	Drinkers	9,829,462	9,469,407	96

At the present time, instead of demanding an additional premium from total abstainers, insurance companies are beginning to make a reduction in favour of this class. A notable example of such reduction was recently furnished by the Sun Life Office, one of the largest English companies. The practice is followed even by companies which have no abstinence section. There is probably not an insurance company in the English-speaking world which will insure a drunkard under any circumstances, and in most cases even the habitual drinker who is not a drunkard is refused. Some companies insure habitual drinkers with the condition that the policy becomes void if the habitual use of liquor becomes excessive. Few companies will insure a saloon-

keeper. This is the case with twenty-seven companies in the United States. The companies which do insure such persons usually make an extra charge of ten per cent.*

In 1893 the New York *Voice* requested all the life insurance companies of the United States to answer the question, "Does your company, in considering applications for insurance, discriminate in any way against habitual users of intoxicating beverages?" Of sixty-six companies which replied two reported that they refused all save total abstainers, two that they insured abstainers in a separate class at a rate lower than the ordinary rate, twenty-five that they rejected habitual drinkers, fifteen that they discriminated strongly against such persons, six that they rejected those who drank habitually and immoderately, two that they insured habitual drinkers with the provision that the policy should be void if the habitual use of liquor became immoderate, two that their agents were instructed not to solicit among habitual drinkers, seven that they limited the amount of alcohol to be used by their policyholder to a certain maximum per day, and four that they took the drinking habits of applicants for policies into consideration, though they did not say how.

For further information upon the subject of this chapter, see the reports of Mr. James Meikle, the actuarial authority of Birmingham; the report of Mr. Emory McClintock, the actuary of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, presented to the Actuarial Society of America in 1895; the report of a committee of the Associated Scottish Life offices, published in 1890; Part II. of the Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Marriages and Deaths in England; the report of the Government Actuary of Victoria, Australia, for 1891; and the New York *Voice*, November 30, 1893.

* See Appendix A Chap. XX.

CHAPTER XXI.

TEMPERANCE AND INDUSTRY.

A CENTURY ago, as has been shown above in Chapter IV., rum was held to be indispensable to industry. The town hall bell was sounded at ten and four each day as the signal for all labourers to take their dram. On the farm, in the mill, the shop, the factory, in the mine, on the sea, everywhere labour must be stimulated to activity by alcohol. This is now as antiquated as the spinning wheel or the hand-loom. Industry to-day regards intoxicating liquor not as a necessity, but as a thing to be avoided; instead of encouraging its use, modern industry not only frowns upon it but absolutely prohibits it to some extent, and prohibits it not only during the hours of labour, but at all hours.

This change in the attitude of industry, like the change in the attitude of the medical profession, began in the popular temperance enthusiasm of the twenties; and it began, not so much with the belief that workmen served their employers better without liquor, as with the desire to repress the spread of intemperance. As early as 1821 we find an appreciation of the support which the use of liquor as an aid to industry gave to intemperance in society. Mr. Henry Warren, addressing the Roxbury (Massachusetts) Auxiliary Society for the Suppression of Intemperance in that year, said:

“Something may be done by inducing those who are in the habit of employing labourers to avoid, when possible, furnishing them with spirituous liquors. It is true, some caution may be required in relation to those who have been long accustomed to them, who have sometimes, by being denied their usual allowance, been driven to the dram-shop and led into greater excesses.

“There are many respectable men employing others under them in the situation of apprentices and otherwise, who not only allow, but by their example instruct them, in the daily use of ardent spirits. It is to be hoped that such will be led to consider their responsibility for the characters of those committed to their charge, and that they will abstain from encouraging them in habits which may lead to their ruin.”

The same speaker gives an early instance of an effort on the part of a manufacturer to abolish drinking among his employees. He observed that “all who used ardent spirits were poor and in debt, while the others were in good circumstances. He contrived to prevent the use of spirits among them; and a sensible reformation took place immediately.”

In 1826 the importance to society of abolishing the drinking practices of industry, and the advantage of this course to industry itself, were expressed by Dr. Lyman Beecher in the following magnificent words:

“Something has been done, and more may be done, by agricultural, commercial and manufacturing establishments, in the exclusion of strong drink as an auxiliary to labour. Every experiment which has been made by capitalists to exclude these liquors and intemperance has succeeded, and greatly to the profit and satisfaction, both of the labourer and his employer. And what is more natural and easy than the extension of

such examples by capitalists, and by voluntary associations in cities, towns and parishes, of mechanics and farmers, whose resolutions and success may from time to time be published, to raise the flagging tone of hope, and assure the land of her own self-preserving powers? Most assuredly it is not too late to achieve a reformation ; our hands are not bound, our feet are not put in fetters, and the nation is not so fully set upon destruction, as that warning and exertion will be in vain. It is not too much to be hoped that the entire business of the nation, by land or sea, shall yet move on without the aid of strong drink, and by the impulse alone of temperate freedmen. This would cut off one of the most fruitful occasions of intemperance, and give to our morals and to our liberties an earthly immortality."

One of the principal indexes of the progress of the temperance reform in its early period was the number of employers who abolished liquor from their business. From all parts of the country came the news of such cases, and it was triumphantly published in the reports of the temperance societies and in the temperance journals. From East Machias, Maine, comes this report in 1828: "One mill has been built without spirits to the workmen and two sea voyages performed without spirits to the sailors." In another town, not named, "fifteen buildings, with a grist mill and a meeting house, had been built without spirits to the workmen, and two glass manufactories wrought without this indulgence." In Hampshire "labourers and reapers were now in use to be hired without a bonus of rum." From Caledonia, Vermont, comes the report in 1829, that "large iron manufactories are carried on without ardent spirits."

The following instances are quoted from the *Boston Recorder*, a temperance journal, for 1829: "A merchant of Boston has just fitted out a vessel, which

sails without ardent spirits on board. He has also sent directions to his farm in the country that none shall be used there." A writer in the *Charleston Courier* states "that one of the most respectable mechanics in the city does not allow any of his journeymen or apprentices to use ardent spirits in any way, or under any circumstances, and the consequence is that he has the most healthy, orderly, and industrious workmen to be found anywhere." A town in Ohio reports: "Eleven frames have been put up in the town this season, and the proprietors have furnished no ardent spirits, except in four instances. No building . . . has ever been raised in the town before this season without the stimulus of strong drink." In North Yarmouth, Maine, "a mill has been erected on Royal's river without the use of spirits, 'and the owners verily believe that when it is completed it will go by water.' The workmen enjoyed perfect health even when working hard about the foundation and labouring in the water." "At the raising of a Baptist meeting house in Moriah, N. Y., no ardent spirits were used." "At Brooklyn, Long Island, a house has been raised without ardent spirits, where 60 persons were required." At Brewer, Maine, "two meeting houses have been raised in this town and one or both of them have been framed without the use of ardent spirits."

From the report of the American Temperance Society for 1829 we learn that at Geneva, New York, "the experiment whether farms can be carried on, buildings erected, and manufactories conducted without supplying labouring men with ardent spirits, has been successfully tried by gentlemen of the first respectability." Hampshire county, Massachusetts, reports to the society: "Our most laborious farmers

have found by experience that the fatigues of harvest as well as the cold of winter are best sustained without the aid of intoxicating drink." Shoreham, Vermont, reports: "In this town more than twenty of our farmers dispensed with ardent spirits altogether during the season of haymaking and harvest." At Montpelier "farmers who have banished spirits from their houses and their fields have found no difficulty in hiring labourers. The appalling impression that labourers cannot be hired without the temptation of rum is found to be only a whim."

So it continued during all the lusty youth of the temperance reformation. The executive committee of the American Temperance Union reported in 1839: "On farms, in manufactories, in our merchant vessels, fishing craft, whalers . . . the demon has scarce a place to nestle." One of the most active workers in the reform, Dr. Charles Jewett, later wrote regarding its progress up to the year 1845: "Baneful social customs gradually gave way under the sharp and incessant fire poured on them from the pulpit, the platform, and the press, until a corrected public sentiment, improved social customs, and laws approximating at least to right and justice, proclaimed that society had undergone a revolution." And of this revolution the reform of industry was a part.

Dr. John Marsh, in his *Temperance Recollections*, published in 1866, compares the state of society at that time with the state prevailing forty years before. He recalls the time "when drinking was universal; when no table was properly spread unless it contained a full supply of intoxicating drink; when no man could be respectable who did not furnish it to his guest; when no man had the liberty of refusing it,

on its being offered him; when no labourer could be found who, for any price, would work without strong drink; no farm, no manufacturing, no mechanical work could be carried forward unless it was furnished; when no sailor would enlist for a voyage without his spirit ration, and no soldier enter the army unless this was secured." After forty years of temperance work he could say, in 1866; "We have driven liquor from our farms, our manufactories, our firesides, our sideboards, our shipping, our navy."

The early reformers of Great Britain, like those of America, paid special attention to banishing drunkenness from the national industries. But in that country the cause of sober industry, as well as that of temperance in general, was rendered peculiarly difficult by the universal prevalence of a complicated system of drinking usages of a ceremonial character. This is made clear by Mr. John Dunlop's essay on *Artificial and Compulsory Drinking Usage in Great Britain and Ireland*, published in 1839. "Most countries have," said Mr. Dunlop, "on the whole only one general motive to use liquor—namely, natural thirst, or desire for it; but in Great Britain there exists a large plurality of motives, derived from etiquette and rule." Mr. Dunlop's essay describes (to quote its title page) "the characteristic and exclusively national convivial laws of British society, with the peculiar compulsory festal customs of ninety-eight trades and occupations in the three kingdoms, comprehending about three hundred different drinking usages."

Thus, apprentices at the beginning of their term, at the anniversary of this event, and at its close, were fined by their fellow-workmen a certain sum, varying from trade to trade. On their first performance

of certain tasks, as when the plumber's apprentice cast his first sheet of lead, or the block cutter's apprentice cut his first printing block, they were again fined. Then for a thousand little mistakes or neglects—for every failure to kindle the fire or to put out the lights at the proper time, etc.—they were again fined by the journeymen. All the other workmen were subject to similar fines on every imaginable occasion—on changing, in a cotton factory, from one pair of wheels to another, on changing from one room to another, on marrying, on remaining at one place in a factory for a year without getting married, on becoming a father, etc., etc.

This body of vicious customs, adding to the motive of simple appetite that of social law, supported by severe social penalties, and multiplying manifold the occasions of drinking, made the task of the reform in Britain immeasurably harder than in America. But in addition to this system, the British reformers had to contend with the same institution as existed in America—the supplying of labourers by their employers with liquor as part payment. Moreover, employers encouraged drinking in other ways. A citizen of Glasgow, writing, in 1852, of his early experience as an apprentice in a printer's establishment, says:

“In the printing offices of Edinburgh at this time, matters were even worse than in Glasgow. The overseers were generally hard drinkers, and it sometimes happened that they were the owners of public houses themselves, which were situated not far from their respective establishments. Here the printers were encouraged to drink, and if they had no money, they had *light*, which is a cant word for *credit*. Much drink was also consumed in the offices, brought from these houses; so that it often occurred that a poor wight,

after paying his score on Saturday night, had very little to take home to his family. The balance was sometimes so small, that they resolved to drink it also."

Those employers who did not positively encourage drunkenness, were utterly negligent in repressing it. To get drunk was the labouring man's right; to interfere with it was considered both unusual and unwarranted. Loss of time, waste of material, bad workmanship,—all arising from the workman's inebriety,—were tolerated as a matter of course.

The monstrous incubus thus resting upon the nation's debauched industry required more labour, more time, and more specialised effort to move it than did the less firmly fastened intemperance prevailing in American industries during the early decades of the century. Nevertheless the British reformers girded themselves to the task. John Dunlop, the valiant pioneer of temperance in Scotland (whose early work was noticed above in Chapter XV.), followed his special study of the drinking usages of British trades with special labour toward their abolition. In 1846 he reported to the World's Temperance Congress in London: "Through the influence of the temperance reformation, some improvement has taken place in these matters; yet a prodigious change is still requisite throughout the length and breadth of the British islands." Mr. Dunlop continued to prosecute his "anti-drink-usage movement," as it has been called, and the declaration condemning these usages to which he secured the signatures of twelve hundred employers of labour, is as famous a monument of his ability as the medical declaration of 1847, to which he secured the signatures of two thousand physicians (see Chapter XIX.). The result of the work thus begun by John Dunlop and carried on by other temperance

workers is that to-day the execrable system of drinking usages of sixty years ago is practically extinct.

To the reformation of the customs of employers, as distinguished from Mr. Dunlop's movement to reform those of the workmen, much energy was likewise directed by temperance workers. They endeavoured to impress upon employers the vast power for good which they could exercise by demanding sobriety from their men. The answers to this appeal did not come pouring in from all sides in a continuous flow of good news, as they had done in America. The British employers moved slowly. Some slight improvement occurred here and there. The Scotch writer quoted above said in 1852:

“Some of the great proprietors of printing houses in Edinburgh have introduced reform into their establishments, by discharging their drunken overseers, etc., and putting sober men in their places. The printing offices of Glasgow have been improved also by the same means, but not to the extent to which amendment may be carried. This reform is what I wish to see not confined to printing offices, but extended to all the work-shops in the kingdom, and by the same instrumentality—namely, the power which is invested in the hands of employers.”

The reformation of industry which he desired is still far from being accomplished. The industrial superiority of America over Britain, about which so much is said now-a-days, if it be a fact, must be largely accounted for by the superior sobriety of American labour.

The abandonment of alcoholic liquor as medicine began, as we stated in Chapter XIX., on humanitarian grounds, but later found a purely scientific basis, which would demand the same practice even if there were no humanitarian question involved. In like manner the disuse of alcohol in industry was

first only a part of the humanitarian movement of the temperance reform. But in recent years the purely commercial consideration of the value of sober workmen has led employers to go further in the direction of temperance reform than they ever went in response to purely philanthropic appeals.

The extensive domination of the industrial world by powerful and intricate machinery is primarily responsible for the change. A bottle of rum in the boot of a teamster involves relatively little public danger; a bottle of rum in the pocket of an engineer is a menace to hundreds of lives. The industrial conditions of to-day require clear heads and steady nerves. But besides the consideration of physical safety, that of mere commercial profit has entered largely into the question of temperance in industry. In commercial diligence and acumen, as well as in machinery, the twentieth century is far in advance of the early nineteenth; and the modern business man, keen in the art of reckoning cost, profit and loss, has learned that temperance among his employees is a good business asset.

This movement of temperance, and even total abstinence, for commercial reasons has appeared in several countries, but it has progressed further in America than elsewhere.

In 1897 Mr. Carroll D. Wright, United States Commissioner of Labour, sent a list of questions to a number of employers with a view to ascertaining their practice relative to the use of intoxicants by their employees. One of the questions asked was, whether the employers in engaging new men gave any consideration to the habits of applicants with respect to the use of liquor. Of 6,976 employers answering this question 5,363 reported that they did take such

habits into consideration, and only 1,613 that they did not.

To the question, what were the rules of the various establishments as to the use of liquor by employees, 7,025 establishments replied. Of these 6,901 reported the number of men they respectively employed, and the total number of employees thus reported was 1,745,923. The policies in force in the establishments reporting, therefore, affected that number of men at least, and several thousands besides, whose exact number was not given. The 1,745,923 men reported were distributed among the chief classes of occupations as follows :

Agriculture	41,355
Manufacturing	1,011,661
Mining and quarrying	174,806
Trade	59,337
Transportation	458,764

The policies of the employers and the numerical strength of each policy are shown in the following table :

	Agricul- ture.	Manufac- tures.	Mining and Quarrying.	Trade.	Trans- portation.	Total.
Establishments requiring that no employees shall use intoxicating liquors when on duty.	42	492	140	14	167	855
Establishments requiring that no employees shall use intoxicating liquors either on or off duty.....	153	218	43	79	203	696
Establishments requiring that no employees in certain occupations shall not use intoxicating liquors when on duty.....	64	364	159	40	65	692
Establishments requiring that employees in certain occupations shall not use intoxicating liquors either on or off duty.....	151	663	290	45	135	1,284
Total establishments making some requirement that employees, or employees in certain occupations, shall not use intoxicating liquors.....	410	1,737	632	178	570	3,527
Establishments making no requirement that employees shall not use intoxicating liquors.....	353	1,907	526	841	138	3,265

If for convenience we call those establishments which prohibit or restrict the use of intoxicants by their employees "restricting," and the others "non-restricting," we may say that of the manufacturing establishments represented in this table the non-restricting outnumber the restricting slightly: of the establishments classed under "trade," the non-restricting exceed the restricting by about two to one. In the other three classes of establishments the restricting are in excess slightly in the agricultural and mining industries, and by about four to one in the transportation industries. Of the total number of establishments reporting more than half are restricting.

The reasons given by the restricting establishments for their policy are tabulated as follows :

Reasons Given.	Agriculture.	Manufactures.	Mining and Quarrying.	Trade.	Transportation.	Total.
Because of personal disgust for drinking men.....	3	3
Because of responsibility of position.....	54	32	107	8	64	555
Because of responsibility of position and to make good example for other employees..	2	12	4	1	1	20
Because of their youth.....	1	1
Because of unreliability of drinking men....	30	71	7	20	6	134
Because of unreliability of drinking men and their disagreeableness to customers.....	2	2	4
Because of unreliability of drinking men and personal disgust for them.....	1	3	4
So we can control them.....	3	3	5	11
For purposes of economy.....	6	6
For the good of employees.....	2	2
To guard against abuse of animals.....	5	5
To guard against accidents.....	48	316	190	16	100	686
To guard against accidents and abuse of animals.....	6	2	8
To guard against accidents and because of personal disgust for drinking men.....	1	1
To guard against accidents and because of responsibility of position.....	2	27	25	1	10	65
To guard against accidents and because of unreliability of drinking men.....	1	6	2	1	10
To guard against accidents and dishonesty..	1	1	2
To guard against accidents and for economy.	5	5

(Continued.)

Reasons Given.	Agricul- ture.	Manufac- tures.	Mining and Quarrying.	Trade.	Trans- portation.	Total
To guard against accidents and to make good example for other employees.....	1	10	6	2	19
To guard against accidents, inefficiency, and poor work.....	5	23	14	1	3	46
To guard against dishonesty.....	10	6	1	5	1	23
To guard against incompetency.....	31	6	3	40
To guard against inefficiency and to make good example for other employees.....	1	4	1	6
To guard against inefficiency and poor work.	10	21	32	2	2	67
To guard against inefficiency, poor work, and abuse of animals.....	2	1	3
To guard against inefficiency, poor work, and dishonesty.....	2	2	1	5
To guard against irregularity in time.....	1	1	2
To guard against irregularity in time and because of unreliability of drinking men..	17	1	18
To guard against irregularity in time, inefficiency, and poor work.....	6	1	3	10
To guard against temptation.....	2	2
To make good example for other employees.	2	22	4	28
To prevent retarding work.....	1	1	1	3
Total.....	208	899	414	70	203	1,794

Similar conditions prevail in Canada. In 1898 one of the writers made inquiry of all the business firms in the Dominion rated in Bradstreet's Commercial Directory at \$100,000 or more as to (1) whether they considered that a saloon in close proximity to their establishments was a detriment to their business, and (2) whether in engaging employees they were accustomed to consider the drinking habits of applicants. Several hundred establishments replied. All but six or eight answered both questions in the affirmative, and stated that they preferred employees who did not drink either on or off duty.

The value of abstinence is especially recognised in the transportation industries. Most of the great steamship companies, including the Anchor Line,

the White Star Line, and the Hamburg-American Line, forbid their employees to use intoxicants while on duty, either afloat or ashore. As to the requirements of railroads, an inquiry of the *New York Voice* in 1896 elicited replies from forty-nine American railroads. Of these, twenty required total abstinence of employees, on or off duty; two declared that they would not employ a man who drank if they were aware of the fact; nineteen gave preference to teetotalers in promotion; and thirty absolutely forbade the frequenting of saloons under penalty of dismissal. Abstinence, on or off duty, and avoidance of saloons is now one of the rules of the American Railway Union. The same principle is recognised in legislation. The statutes, of Michigan require that

“No person shall be employed as engineer, train despatcher, fireman, baggage master, conductor, brakeman, or other servant upon any railroad in any of its operating departments, who uses intoxicating drinks as a beverage.”

In view of the attitude of business men toward temperance among their employees, and in view of the practical character which attaches to their opinions more than to those of any other class of men, their views on questions of temperance in general are of interest. Mr. Wright, in the course of the investigation above mentioned, inquired of employers what means they would suggest to diminish intemperance in the community. Replies were received from 4,914 establishments, the great majority favouring some form of prohibition. These replies are tabulated as follows:

Means Suggested.	Establishments Suggesting Means.					Total.
	Agriculture.	Manufactures.	Mining and Quarrying.	Trade.	Transportation.	
Prohibition.....	207	481	295	49	71	1,103
Do not employ drinking men.....	64	407	106	49	148	769
High licence.....	41	269	69	30	36	445
Education.....	9	102	27	19	23	180
Abolish saloons.....	28	99	21	2	9	159
Education, moral and religious.....	13	81	13	18	11	136
Improve social conditions.....	18	53	33	4	17	125
Government control.....	33	60	15	9	3	120
Enforce existing laws.....	16	72	21	4	1	114
Limit number of saloons.....	1	75	4	5	85
Remove all restrictions.....	17	28	16	10	4	75
Encourage use of light wines and beer....	11	41	3	13	4	72
High licences and do not employ drinking men.....	8	28	7	10	10	63
Local option.....	14	31	12	5	1	63
High revenue tax.....	12	25	13	2	5	57
Prohibit treating.....	3	28	14	6	5	56
Example of employers.....	2	27	11	3	11	54
Close saloons Sundays and early week days.....	5	38	6	2	2	53
Make drunkenness a punishable misdemeanor.....	5	27	12	8	1	53
All (177) other means suggested.....	146	576	188	97	123	1,132
Total.....	653	2,550	886	340	485	4,914

Not only employers of labour, but labourers themselves have made great progress in regard to temperance. The early trades unions of the nineteenth century met in public houses and devoted a large part of their resources to the purchase of liquor. The steam engine makers of England in 1837 adopted the rule that one-third of their weekly contributions should be so spent. To-day many unions refuse to meet in rooms or halls connected with saloons, many are strongly opposed to the use of intoxicating liquor under any circumstances, and the spectacle has even been presented of a trade union declaring for the legal suppression of the liquor traffic.

How far the notion that whisky is a good thing, the saloon a beneficent institution, and attempts to repress the liquor traffic attempts to deprive the

labouring man of means of comfort and aid—how far these ideas prevail among the labouring classes is hard to determine. But certainly they are entertained only in exceptional cases by those labourers who are considered leaders among their fellows. The majority of these men are agreed that intoxicating drink and the places where it is furnished are wholly bad in their results. But they are divided as to the best method of opposing these evils. Some of them antagonize any temperance, and still more any prohibition propaganda, holding that all the reformers' energy should be directed toward the improvement of the conditions of the labouring classes,—the raising of wages, the shortening of hours, etc.,—and that when this is accomplished sobriety will naturally follow. Others hold that direct and special efforts, though in many cases very mild ones, should be made to discourage the use of liquor and the frequenting of saloons by labouring men.

As a representative of the former class we may cite Mr. Samuel Gompers, who has been for many years the president of the American Federation of Labour. Before the National Temperance Congress held in New York in 1890 Mr. Gompers made the following propositions:

“That the only natural and permanent manner in which men become sober, temperate, or total abstainers . . . is through improvement in their habits and customs; that the habits and customs of the people become improved by improvement in their material conditions and surroundings; that high wages and a reasonable number of hours of labour tend more largely to improve the habits and customs of the working people, hence lead to a greater degree of sobriety and regularity of conduct.”

He continued:

“None better know than do the so-called leaders in

the movement for labour reform the curse of liquor and the hindrance it is to the better education and activity in that field of operations; but we view this question as we find it, the result of poor conditions rather than the cause. I do not pretend to say that this rule is invariable, but I am sure it is general. Hence we base our operations upon removing the cause of the evil rather than dallying with the result."

Turning to the other class of labour leaders we find Mr. Charles N. Litchman, former secretary of the Knights of Labour, advocating prohibition in Pennsylvania. We find Mr. P. M. Arthur, former president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, declaring: "Every friend of the working man will vote against the saloon every time he gets a chance, and close it up not only on Sunday, but upon every day of the week." Ralph Beaumont, another leader in the labour movement, acknowledged that the saloon was the great obstacle in the way of the working man.

The Knights of Labour, formerly the most influential labour union in America, at the time of their organisation in 1878 provided by a clause in their constitution that no saloonkeeper, bartender, or person connected in any way with the liquor business should be eligible to membership. This official attitude of the organisation was seconded most emphatically by the personal attitude of Mr. Terence V. Powderly, who was for thirteen years the society's chief officer (master workman). A friend wrote to Mr. Powderly in 1887 remonstrating at his strong opposition to drinking customs. Mr. Powderly replied publicly in the *Journal of United Labour* for July 2, 1887. His answer was a splendid defence of the temperance cause. We can quote only a small part:

“My friend makes the candid admission, in starting out, that in the main I am right, that even the rum-seller will not deny the justice of my position. Having said as much he should have stopped—even then he told me nothing new. I know that I am right; I know that in refusing to even touch a drop of strong drink I was, and am, right. In refusing to treat another to that which I do not believe to be good for myself to drink, I know I am right. In refusing to associate with men who get drunk, I know I am right. In not allowing a rum-seller to gain admittance into the Order of the Knights of Labour, I know that I am right. In advising our Assemblies not to rent halls or meeting-rooms over drinking places, I know that I am right. I have done this from the day my voice was first heard in the council halls of our Order. My position on the question of temperance is right—I am determined to maintain it, and will not alter it one jot or tittle.”

Mr. Powderly resigned his office of Master Workman in 1893, and in the following year the organization lowered the standing which it had maintained since its birth by eliminating from its constitution the clause mentioned above. From that time, the organization has deteriorated in numbers and influence.

In the same year the International Typographical Union at its convention passed a resolution in favour of the “state and national destruction of the liquor traffic.”

The Order of Railroad Conductors and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen forbid their members to engage in the liquor business under penalty of expulsion. The order of Railroad Telegraphers provides in its constitution that “the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage shall be sufficient cause for rejecting any petition for membership. Similar rules govern the Carriage and Waggon Makers’

International Union and the Retail Clerks' National Protective Association of the United States.

Several unions which are not officially committed against the saloon and the use of liquor take that position as a matter of policy, advising their members against intemperance and their local bodies against the use of halls connected with saloons, and having officers who are strong friends of temperance. Such are the Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' International Union, the United Garment Workers of America, the International Seamen's Union (whose official organ declines to publish liquor advertisements), the Switchmen's Union of North America, the Journeymen Tailors of North America, and the United Mine Workers of America.

The societies which have been enumerated above, not including the Knights of Labour, embrace a total membership of 227,617.

Finally, twenty labour Unions of the United States, with a total membership of 179,925, which furnish to their members aid in case of sickness, provide by their constitutions that where sickness or injury is the result of drunkenness the member affected shall not be entitled to such aid. The rules of the Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of the United States provide that in case a member loses his employment through intoxication, no steps shall be taken to reinstate him.

For confirmation of the statements in this chapter, and for further information, see the Twelfth Annual Report of the United States Department of Labour; Webb, *History of Trade Unionism*; Carroll D. Wright, *The Industrial Revolution; Economic Aspects of the Liquor Problem*, published by the Committee of Fifty, New York; the *New York Voice*, September 8 and 15, 1898. Our information about trades unions is largely due to an article on the *Attitude of Trade Unions Toward the Saloon* by Prof. E. W. Bemis, prepared for the Committee of Fifty and published by them as an appendix to their book, *Substitutes for the Saloon*.

CHAPTER XXII.

TEMPERANCE IN MILITARY AFFAIRS.

THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

WHATEVER may be said about war to its advantage, this fact remains: it invariably lets loose the hounds of appetite. Particularly in America, war has been unerringly followed by a period of depression in temperance sentiment, a return to the gutters of intemperate drinking. The French and Indian war was accompanied by drinking orgies unusual even in those bibulous times. The War of the Revolution was followed by a period of fearful excess. Similar periods followed the War of 1812 and the war with Mexico. It is doubtless true that in the year 1855 the sentiment against the saloon in the United States reached its high water mark. But that sentiment was almost wholly overwhelmed in the war between the states. At this writing the people of the United States are suffering a relapse in temperance sentiment as a result of the Spanish and Philippine wars. In England there is a still greater depression in temperance sentiment, owing to the South African trouble.

In 1654 a contingent of 133 men was assigned to the city of New Haven to be raised and equipped for a proposed expedition against the Dutch. Their provisions were to include "6 tunn beare, 3 anchors of liquor." In the French and Indian war the Co-

lonial troops were usually well supplied with liquor, though they were sometimes short of powder. In 1759, when the fall of Quebec was reported in Boston, bonfires were lit on Copp's Hill and Fort Hill, and fifty barrels of tar and thirty gallons of rum were provided at public expense to celebrate the event. But in the same year General Amherst found it necessary, in order to preserve order in the army, to command that every soldier found guilty of intemperance should receive twenty lashes a day until he should disclose the name of the person from whom he had procured the liquor.

In the troublous hours directly preceding the Revolution, the conduct of the King's troops in Boston had much to do with inflaming the Colonists to open hostilities. A distinguished authority tells us:

“Some outrage was complained of every day, and the nights were made hideous by drunken brawls and revels. The regular town-watch were insulted during their rounds, and invaded in their watch houses in the night. Distilled spirits were so cheap that the soldiers could easily command them; and hence scenes of drunkenness and debauchery were constantly exhibited before the people, vastly to the prejudice of the morals of the young. As a remedy for such conduct, the equally demoralising exhibition of whipping was put in practice.”

In the beginning the Continental troops were not wholly free from similar vices. One of the first orders issued by General Washington, when he took command of the troops (dated Cambridge, March 25, 1776), was in part as follows:

“All officers of the Continental Army are enjoined to assist the civil magistrates in the execution of their duty, and to promote peace and good order. They are to

prevent, as much as possible, the soldiers from frequenting tippling houses."

On September 20, following, thirteen years before any War Department had been authorized, Congress adopted a set of rules for the government of the army. These rules provided that drunken officers should be cashiered, and that drunken privates should be subjected to "corporeal punishment." The sutlers were forbidden to "sell any kind of liquors or victuals, or to keep their houses or shops open, for the entertainment of soldiers, after nine at night, or before the beating of the reveilles, or upon Sundays, during divine services, or sermon, on penalty of being dismissed from all future sutlering." It was not until April 30, 1790, that an act of Congress was approved providing for a spirit ration. The words of the act were:

"And be it further enacted: That every non-commissioned officer, private and musician, aforesaid, shall receive daily, the following rations of provisions, or the value thereof: One pound of beef, or three-quarters of a pound of pork, one pound of bread or flour, half a gill of rum, brandy or whisky, or the value thereof, at the contract price where the same becomes due, and at the rate of one quart of salt, two quarts of vinegar, two pounds of soap, and one pound of candles, to every hundred rations."

On March 3, 1799, this ration was modified, leaving out the spirit ration, but authorising the commanding officers not to issue it "excepting in cases of fatigue service or other extraordinary occasions." This modification was doubtless due in some measure to Dr. Rush's pamphlet of 1777, entitled: *Direc-*

tions for Preserving the Health of Soldiers, in which he said :

“What shall I say to the custom of drinking spirituous liquors which prevails so generally in our army? I am aware of the prejudices in favour of it. It requires an arm more powerful than mine—the arm of Hercules—to encounter them. The common apology for the use of rum in our army is that it is necessary to guard against the effects of heat and cold. But I maintain that in no case whatever does rum abate the effects of either upon the constitution. On the contrary, I believe it always increases them. The temporary elevation of spirits in summer, and the temporary generation of warmth in winter, produced by rum, always leaves the body languid and more liable to be affected by heat and cold afterwards. Happy would it be for our soldiers if the evil ended here! The use of rum, by gradually wearing away the powers of the system, lays the foundation of fevers, fluxes, jaundice and the most of diseases which occur in military hospitals. It is a vulgar error to suppose that the fatigue arising from violent exercise of hard labour is relieved by the use of spirituous liquors.”

An utterance like this from one of the foremost medical men of his time, the physician-general of the Revolutionary army, must have made a profound impression on Congress. The reform, however, was short lived. In the spring of 1802, Congress restored the spirit ration, making it a whole gill instead of a half. Two years later the equivalent of the spirit in malt liquors was authorised in the ration “at such posts and garrisons, and at such seasons of the year, as, in the opinion of the President of the United States, may be necessary for the preservation of their health.” This was the law up to the year 1818. The act approved on April 14 of that year

turned the responsibility of continuing the liquor ration over to the President in these words:

“And be it further enacted: That the President may make such alterations in the component parts of rations as a due regard to the health and comfort of the army and economy may require.”

Beginning with the year 1829, three valiant friends of temperance held in succession the war portfolio. These were James H. Eaton, Lewis Cass, and Benjamin F. Butler. In a report dated February 22, 1830, Mr. Eaton made a vigorous attack upon the spirit ration in the army. He asserted that nearly all the desertions during 1829 were caused by drinking. In support of his statements he cited several army officers. Adjutant-General Jones said:

“Ardent spirits should be discontinued in the army, as a part of the daily rations. I know from observation and experience, when in command of the troops, the pernicious effects arising from the practice of regular daily issues of whisky. If the recruit joins the service with an unvitiated taste, which is not infrequently the case, the daily privilege and the uniform example soon induce him to taste, and then to drink his allowance. The habit being acquired, he, too, soon becomes an habitual toper.”

Major-General Gaines said:

“The proceedings of courts-martial are alone sufficient to prove that the crime of intoxication almost always precedes, and is often the immediate cause of desertion. And I am, moreover, convinced that most of the soldiers, who enter the army as sober men, acquire habits of intemperance principally by falling into the

practice of drinking their gill, or half a gill, of whisky every morning. I have known sober recruits who would often throw away their morning allowance, but whose constant intercourse with tipplers would soon induce them to taste a *little*, and, in time, a *little more*, until they became habitual drunkards. I am therefore decidedly of the opinion that the whisky part of the ration does, slowly but surely, lead men into these intemperate and vicious habits, out of which grow desertions and most other crimes."

Under authority of President Jackson, the Secretary's recommendation was immediately followed. The spirit ration was abolished in the following Department order:

"WAR DEPARTMENT, November 30, 1830.

"1. Upon official statements of Generals, Inspectors General and commanders of regiments and companies, confirmed by the reports of the medical staff, representing that the habitual use of ardent spirits by the troops has a pernicious effect upon their health, morals and discipline, it is hereby directed that after the promulgation of this order at the several military posts and stations, the Commissaries will cease to issue ardent spirits as a part of the daily ration of the soldier. An allowance in money in lieu thereof will be made by the Subsistence Department, computing the value of the ration of whisky at the contract price at the place of delivery. This regulation is not to be construed so as to interfere with the act of Congress of the 2nd of March, 1819, regulating the pay of the army when employed on fatigue duty, but all issues on such occasions may be commuted for money at the contract price, at the option of the soldier.

"2. Sutlers are prohibited from selling to any soldier a greater quantity than two gills of ardent spirits a day, and that or any less quantity is to be issued only on the

written permission of his commanding officer, who will exercise a sound discretion in reference thereto.

“3. No liquor shall be sold or issued before noon, and when procured of the sutler the soldier shall pay cash therefor at the time of delivery.

“4. The practice of advancing money and of issuing due bills representing money, by sutlers or others connected with the army, to soldiers, having also been found detrimental to the interests of the service, is hereby prohibited.

“5. Any sutler who shall offend in any of the above particulars, or who shall receive due bills for any article sold by him to the soldiers, shall forfeit his appointment on satisfactory proof thereof being furnished.”

One of the first things that Secretary of War Cass did, after assuming office, was to strengthen this order by substituting coffee in lieu of the money commutation for the spirit ration, and by absolutely prohibiting the sale of spirits to soldiers by sutlers (November 5, 1832). The abolition of the liquor ration by the War Department was confirmed by act of Congress, approved July 5, 1838, with the additional provision that the allowance of coffee should be raised twenty-five per cent. above the amount fixed by the Department.

Secretary of War George W. Crawford continued the policy of his predecessors by an order issued September 21, 1849, forbidding sutlers to sell “ardent spirits, or other intoxicating drinks, under penalty of losing their situations.” Whatever may have been the intent of Congress as to the term “intoxicating drinks” is not known, but to this day the military authorities have almost uniformly insisted that it did not include beer or wine.

The determined attitude of Congress again appeared in the law approved March 19, 1862, naming

the Inspectors-General as a board to prepare a list of articles to be sold by the sutlers. The act contained this clause: "*Provided always*, That no intoxicating liquors shall at any time be contained therein, or the sale of such liquors be in any way authorised by said board." In July of the same year, Congress prohibited the spirit ration in the navy in these words:

"That from and after the first day of September, 1862, the spirit ration in the navy of the United States shall forever cease, and thereafter no distilled spirituous liquors shall be admitted on board of vessels-of-war except as medical stores and upon the order and under the control of the medical officers of such vessels, and to be used only for medical purposes.

"From and after the first day of September next there shall be allowed and paid to each person in the navy now entitled to the spirit ration five cents per day in commutation and lieu thereof, which shall be in addition to the present pay."

In the chaos of the Civil War the law regarding the use of liquor in the army was overlooked more or less by the Union commanders. All else was subordinated to the one object of saving the Union. President Lincoln, though he had formerly lectured for the Sons of Temperance and had taken part in the Washingtonian movement allowed his generals to do as they pleased in this respect. He drew a measure of comfort from the fact that the army of the other side was likewise troubled with drunkenness and had no advantage on that score. So, in the enforcement of the statute against sutlers peddling liquor, each commander was, in a measure, a law unto himself. In 1861, General Butler cleared Fort Monroe of strong drink. General McClellan and General Banks issued prohibitory orders. The for-

mer, in reviewing a court-martial decision, declared that the adoption of total abstinence in the Federal army would be equivalent to an addition of fifty thousand troops to the ranks. Col. E. E. Ellsworth, who was killed early in the struggle, was a strong advocate of temperance, and in his honour, an "Ellsworth pledge" was extensively circulated and signed among the troops after his death. General Hooker enforced the prohibitory law at Cincinnati.

During the first year of the conflict, the War Department refused to allow temperance documents to be sent into the army through official channels. In 1863, this attitude was reversed and a million copies of an address prepared by Mr. E. C. Delavan were sent to the troops through the army post. This address was endorsed by such men as General Winfield Scott and Major-General Dix. The former wrote: "Drinking and drunkenness among the rank and file of our army soon become one and the same thing, and drunkenness destroys subordination, discipline and efficiency."

In the Southern army, General Lee set the example of total abstinence. After General Ewell entered Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, June 26, 1863, he issued an order forbidding the sale of liquor to his troops.

By an act of Congress approved July 28, 1866, the office of sutler was abolished and the Subsistence Department of the army was ordered to furnish the articles formerly supplied by that officer. But on March 30, 1867, Congress passed a joint resolution permitting traders to remain at certain posts. This resolution was re-enacted on July 15, 1870, in the following form:

"The Secretary of War is authorised to permit one or

more trading posts to be established and maintained at any military post on the frontier not in the vicinity of any city or town, when he believes such an establishment is needed for the accommodation of emigrants, freighters, or other citizens. The persons to maintain such establishments shall be appointed by him, and shall be under protection and control as camp followers."

Whether the law which had forbidden the sale of intoxicating liquors in the shops of the sutlers applied to the trading posts authorised by this act was never determined by a court of competent authority. Even if it had so applied, it would not have prevented the sale of beer and wine, since, as was said above, the War Department construed the term "intoxicating liquors" as not including beer and wine. But as a matter of fact, the post commanders ignored the old law and permitted the sale of all sorts of liquor in the trading posts. As a result these posts became saloons, and often saloons of a low character.

It should be remembered that in 1875 the power to make regulations for the government of the army, which had before that time belonged to the Secretary of War, was entrusted to the President by an act of Congress in these words: "The President is hereby authorised . . . to make and publish regulations for the government of the army in accordance with existing laws." This law has remained in force ever since its passage. Under its authority President Hayes in 1881 issued the following order on the recommendation of Brigadier-General (now Lieutenant-General) Miles:

"EXECUTIVE MANSION,
"WASHINGTON, Feb. 22, 1881.

"In view of the well-known fact that the sale of intoxicating liquors in the army of the United States is

the cause of much demoralisation among both officers and men, and that it gives rise to a large proportion of the cases before the general and garrison courts-martial, involving great expense and serious injury to the service . . .

“It is therefore directed that the Secretary of War take suitable steps, as far as practically consistent with vested rights, to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage at the camps, forts and other posts of the army. .

“R. B. HAYES.”

This order produced a healthy effect during the remaining days of Mr. Hayes' administration, but afterwards the old conditions returned to remain for a dozen years.

About the year 1884, Col. Henry A. Morrow, commanding the Twenty-first Infantry, stationed at Sidney, Nebraska, opened a place of recreation for the soldiers at his post which he styled a “canteen.” No liquors were sold for nearly a year, the principal feature of the establishment being games. According to Colonel Morrow, during the following five and a half months, the number of confinements in the guard-house fell off sixty-two per cent. The plan was copied at other posts. In a short time, the sale of beer was introduced at several canteens. On October 25, 1888, the War Department issued an order forbidding the sale of beer in canteens at posts where there was a trader, on the ground that it was an infringement of the latter's rights.

On February 1, 1889, the canteen was formally recognised by the government, in the following order:

“1. Canteens may be established at military posts where there are no post-traders, for supplying the troops,

at moderate prices, with such articles as may be deemed necessary for their use, entertainment and comfort; also for affording them the requisite facilities for gymnastic exercises, billiards and other proper games. The commanding officer may set apart for the purpose of the canteen any suitable rooms that can be spared, such rooms, whenever practicable, to be in the same building with the library or reading rooms.

“2. The sale or use of ardent spirits in canteens is strictly prohibited, but the commanding officer is authorised to permit wines and light beer to be sold therein by the drink on week days, and in a room used for no other purpose, whenever he is satisfied that the giving to the men the opportunity of obtaining such beverages within the post limits has the effect of preventing them from resorting for strong intoxicants to places without such limits, and tends to promote temperance and discipline among them. The practice of what is known as treating should be discouraged under all circumstances.

“3. Gambling, or playing any game for money or other thing of value, is forbidden.

“4. Civilians, other than those employed and resident on the military reservation, are not to be permitted to enter the rooms of the canteen without the authority of the commanding officer. Commanders of canteen posts situated in states (or surrounded by communities) not tolerating the sale of intoxicants will not permit the residents or members thereof to visit the canteen for the purpose of obtaining beer or wine.

“5. Each canteen is to be managed by a suitable officer, not a regimental staff officer, who shall be selected by the post commander and be designated as ‘in charge of the canteen.’ The officer will be assisted by a canteen steward, who may be a retired non-commissioned officer, and by as many other enlisted men, having regard to the strength of the garrison and business of the canteen, as the commanding officer may deem necessary.”

The body of army regulations published soon after-

wards contained the above order. It also contained, in section 351, a provision which, in connection with section 2, of the canteen order, would puzzle a reader unfamiliar with the official meaning of "intoxicating liquors;" the provision, namely, that "the sale of intoxicating liquors at military posts is prohibited." The canteen thus established gradually took the place of the old trading post. In 1895, by General Orders No. 46, the latter became extinct.*

In 1890 the following prohibition was placed upon the canteen by act of Congress:

"No alcoholic liquors, beer or wine shall be sold or supplied to the enlisted men in any canteen or post-trader's store or in any room or building at any garrison or military post, in any state or territory in which the sale of alcoholic liquors, beer or wine is prohibited by law."

From the first this law was almost a dead letter. It was sometimes evaded by selling beer under another name, such as "hop tea." It was often disregarded or openly violated. The numerous scandals arising from this practice increased the opposition to the canteen which arose from its intrinsic character.

The canteen, soon after its introduction, degenerated rapidly into a place having all the vicious characteristics of the ordinary saloon. Opposition to it appeared first within army circles. As early as 1890 the *Army and Navy Journal* began publishing severe criticisms. Two years later, Col. Henry C. Corbin, then Assistant Adjutant-General of the Department of Arizona, now Adjutant-General of the United States Army, had this to say in his report to his superior:

* See Appendix A, Chap. XXII.



“A cause of restlessness is traced to the excess of the exchange, the saloon feature of which is not productive of good and should be done away with without further experiment. The sale of beer, superintended by a commissioned officer and served by non-commissioned officers and soldiers, is not conducive to discipline, nor is it a picture that can be submitted to the people for their approval. The men who drink spend the greater portion of their money for beer. The credit system brings them to the pay-table with little or no money due. This takes all heart out of them and makes them quite ready to ask their discharge and try some other calling.

“The service should of all things teach economy—the feature of the exchange under remark is in direct conflict with the soldier’s savings. Any vocation that fails of substantial results cannot hope to thrive. The argument that the soldier will get drunk elsewhere will not stand the test of reason nor justify the government in approving the scheme herein complained of. Drunkenness should be reduced to a minimum; this cannot be done by open invitation to drink . . . The injury done to the colored and Indian soldier is more marked than to the white. . . . The exchange with an open saloon would be a first-rate thing to recommend for adoption in the army of the enemy.”

During the same year, Gen. O. O. Howard, then in command of the Department of the East, complained of the canteen in his report to the Secretary of War. He said:

“Commanding officers have generally agreed with me that it would be well to abolish the sale of beer entirely and to substitute for it other beverages. There seems a lack of propriety in having a soldier in the uniform of the United States stand behind a counter dealing out beer like a barkeeper in a common resort. The commanding officers without exception object to this. If

there must be barkeepers in the service, they should be hired for the purpose.

“Under the present system soldiers seem to be more generally led to drink and to offenses that go with drinking than under the old sutler and post-trader system. I am strongly convinced by actual experiment that while a few drunks are moderated in their application by strong beer, the remaining soldiers who fall under temptation are worse off, and that military offenses are rather increased in numbers.”

In his report of 1893, Surgeon General George M. Sternberg made an attack upon the canteen. He said:

“Little has been said on the subject of the post exchange during the year, but all the reports concerning it indicate a change of view. Medical opinion, at first generally in favour of the institution as tending to lessen the frequency of intoxication, appears of late to doubt the soundness of their earlier conclusions. Many medical officers now consider that the comparative infrequency of absolute intoxication is offset by the facilities afforded the young men to indulge in beer drinking. They are of the opinion that old men habituated to the use of distilled liquors will not be satisfied with beer, but will get whisky at other places than the post exchange, while young men who would not leave their barracks for intoxicants of any kind are led into bad habits by the ease with which beer may be obtained, and the official sanction given to its use.”

During the Spanish war of 1898, frequent financial scandals and other causes of offence arising in connection with the canteen in the army camps of the South provoked afresh the opposition to the army beer halls. In the midst of the agitation the Secretary of the Navy, John D. Long, issued the following order abolishing the canteen in the navy:

“NAVY DEPARTMENT,
“WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 3, 1899.

“General Order No. 508.

“After mature deliberation the Department has decided that it is for the best interest of the service that the sale or issue to enlisted men of malt or other alcoholic liquors on board ships of the navy or within the limits of naval stations, be prohibited.

“Therefore, after the receipt of this order, commanding officers and commandants are forbidden to allow any malt or other alcoholic liquor to be sold to or issued to enlisted men, either on board ship or within the limits of navy yards, naval stations or marine barracks, except in the medical department.

“JOHN D. LONG,
“Secretary.”

In addition to this action, the action of several officers of the army contributed interest to the discussion. Early in the war, on July 2, 1898, Major-General (now Lieutenant-General) Miles, commanding the army, said in a general order:

“The army is engaged in active service under climatic conditions which it has not before experienced.

“In order that it may perform its most difficult and laborious duties with the least practicable loss from sickness, the utmost care consistent with prompt and effective service must be exercised by all, especially by officers.

“The history of other armies has demonstrated that in a hot climate abstinence from the use of intoxicating drink is essential to continued health and efficiency.

“Commanding officers of all grades and officers of the medical staff will carefully note the effect of the use of

such light beverages—wine and beer—as are permitted to be sold at the post and camp exchanges, and the commanders of all independent commands are enjoined to restrict or to entirely prohibit, the sale of such beverages, if the welfare of the troops or the interest of the service require such action.

“In this most important hour of the nation’s history it is due the government from all those in its service that they should not only render the most earnest efforts for its honour and welfare, but that their full physical and intellectual force should be given to their public duties, uncontaminated by any indulgence that shall dim, stultify, weaken or impair their faculties and strength in any particular.

“Officers of every grade, by example as well as by authority, will contribute to the enforcement of the order.”

On May 27, Major-General Graham issued an order forbidding the sale of any kind of liquor at Camp Alger. After the fall of Santiago Major-General Shafter prohibited the sale of liquor or the opening of saloons in that city. General Ludlow took similar action after the surrender of Havana. These measures, though temporary, furnished useful ammunition to the opponents of the canteen as it then existed.

They continued to agitate the question throughout the year. The result was that early in 1899 Congress passed the following law:

“That no officer or private soldier shall be detailed to sell intoxicating drinks, as a bartender or otherwise, in any post exchange or canteen, nor shall any person be required or allowed to sell liquors in any encampment or fort or on any premises used for military purposes by the United States; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to issue such general orders as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect.”

At this juncture, politics of the baser sort entered upon the scene. The stirring events connected with the Spanish war made a certain large number of promotions in the army. Mr. McKinley's administration in numerous ways had shown a conspicuous friendliness for the liquor interests and in favour of the canteen policy. The result was that numerous army officers, in order to promote favour with their official superiors, suddenly reversed their views on the subject of the canteen. Conspicuous among these were Adjutant-General Corbin and Surgeon-General George M. Sternberg. For fifteen years in public utterances and in official reports these men had denounced the sale of beer in the canteens of the army. As soon as it seemed to their political interest to change their views, the transformation was made with the greatest despatch. The first political move was to show that beer and wine were not "intoxicating liquors" within the meaning of the act of Congress. The point was submitted to Judge Advocate-General Lieber for an opinion. Mr. Lieber promptly returned a written opinion that these drinks were intoxicating and did come within the prohibition of the law. This opinion was suppressed and would not have been made public but for an accident.* The matter was then submitted to Attorney-General Griggs. He helped the administration out of its difficulty by rendering the remarkable opinion that while the law prohibited soldiers from selling liquor in the canteens it did not prohibit civilians from doing so. The words: "nor shall any person be required or allowed to sell such liquors in any encampment," etc., prohibited (as the Attorney-General construed them) the sale of liquor by civil-

* See Appendix B, Chap. XXII.

ians at military posts *outside the canteen*, and did not apply to such sale *within the canteen*. Following this astounding opinion, the War Department merely directed that in the future civilians should be employed as bartenders in the canteens instead of soldiers.


Robbed of the fruit of their victory, the opponents of liquor in the canteen continued the agitation more vigorously than before. Again they were victorious. In 1901, Congress, by a large majority re-enacted its former measure in language which official ingenuity could not twist. The new law said:

“The sale or dealing in beer, wine or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange or canteen or army transport or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States, is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of War is hereby directed to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect.”

An agitation was at once begun by a number of military men and newspapers for discrediting this law and securing its repeal at the next session of Congress. A vigorous opposition, to which General Miles contributed powerfully, appears at this writing (April, 1902) to have completely defeated the plan.

THE BRITISH ARMY.

In the early century, the British mother counted her boy as lost when he enlisted in the King's army. If he was sent to the penitentiary there was still hope for him. Such was the reputation of British army life that the returned soldier, like the released convict, found it almost impossible to secure honest employment. The army was a school for training its men in the accomplishments of Sodom and Gomor-



THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON
(1769-1852)





RT. HON. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN.

rah, especially in the art of hard drinking. In 1836 the Duke of Wellington recognised the necessity for reform in respect to drinking among the troops. In a general order dated March 2, of that year, he stated that he was "convinced that if a system of temperance could be generally established in the army, it would be greatly for the advantage of the efficiency and discipline of the troops, and be the means of preventing most of the crime and irregularities to which the British soldier is addicted," and that he was "desirous that it should be encouraged by every legitimate means."

The movement desired by Wellington was destined to enter the British army by way of India. In 1862 Mr. Gelson Gregson began the formation of temperance organisations in the British army in India under the common name: "Soldiers' Total Abstinence Association." Gregson's work grew, though scowled at by most of the army officers. When General (now Earl) Roberts became Commander-in-Chief of the army of India, in 1888, he recognised the society under the name: "The Army Temperance Association." He also introduced the plan of admitting moredate drinkers as "honorary members." This was one of Roberts's schemes to win favour for the institution with the officers of the army. As a result of the labours of Earl Roberts and of his successor, Sir George White, the Association now includes about one-third of the entire army in India in its membership. It is officially recognised by the government, is supported by an appropriation of ten thousand rupees* per year, and receives many other favours, such as free transportation. Following are the official regulations now governing the Association in India:

* A rupee equals 48½ cents in United States money.

“A separate room shall invariably be allotted in the barracks, for the use of the Army Temperance Association, of sufficient accommodation for the numbers using it. It should be made as comfortable and attractive as possible, and officers commanding corps should arrange that a separate bar for light refreshments be established in it. The room will form a part of the institute and be under the general superintendence of the institute committee, but the management of the bar should be in the hands of a sub-committee of the Army Temperance Association, with one of their numbers as barman, subject to the control and supervision of the commanding officer, before whom the bar accounts should be laid monthly.

“Tea, coffee, sugar, etc., should, as far as possible, be provided by the regimental or battery coffee shop and charged for at cost price. Mineral waters will be supplied from the regimental soda-water factory and charged for at the same prices as the waters sold into the refreshment room. Under no circumstances is a double profit to be made. Whether thus obtained or purchased elsewhere, 15 per cent. of the profits on the sale of the same, or a fixed sum, must be paid monthly from the temperance bar into the general refreshment account of the corps.

“In corps where the number of temperance men is small, and the profits therefore nil, commanding officers should make such grants from other funds, for the benefit of the Army Temperance Association room, as are proportionately just, having regard for other claims and interests, with a view to encouraging the much-desired object of these rooms, viz., temperance in the army.”

The effect of this movement in promoting discipline among the troops has attracted much attention. In an official report in 1898, the following statistics were given of the criminal record of members of the

Association and of those not members, for the preceding year :

YEAR 1898.	Members of Army Temp. Ass'n.	Non- Members.
Number of soldiers included in return.....	18,663	48,842
Convictions by court-martial.....	77	1,777
Convictions by court-martial per 1,000.....	4.12	36.38
Summary punishments for insubordination.....	741	4,509
Summary punishments for insubordination per 1,000.	39.70	92.32
Admissions to hospital	3,891	14,827
Admissions to hospital per 1,000.....	209	302
YEAR 1897.		
Convictions by court-martial per 1,000.....	5.07	34.34
Summary punishments for insubordination per 1,000.	36.52	74.43
Admissions to hospital per 1,000.....	307	380

Through the efforts of Field Marshal Earl Roberts, and his friends, the Association has been planted in the home army and is in a flourishing condition there. For several years the War Office has made an annual appropriation of five hundred pounds for its maintenance, and at a meeting of the Association Council held in London on May 3, 1901, Earl Roberts, who presided, announced that the government had decided to increase the appropriation to seven hundred and fifty pounds, and would still further increase it when the contributions from the public were correspondingly augmented. In 1900 the membership of the Association was about 14,000.

Besides aiding the Army Temperance Association, the British Government has endeavoured to promote temperance by establishing a system of coffee-rooms for the soldiers. The principal regulations on this subject are as follows :

“The coffee room shall be associated with the grocery

shop, but whenever practicable a separate room will be allotted to it, and in any case a partition should be made to divide the two. It will, whenever possible, form an adjunct to the soldiers' recreation room, and is maintained for the supply of refreshments of the following nature: Tea, coffee, cocoa, non-alcoholic drinks, soup, fish, eggs, bacon, cooked and preserved meats, etc. It will be open at such an hour as will enable the men to have refreshments before the morning parade and will be closed half an hour before tattoo."

In addressing the Army Temperance Association in 1899, the Marquis of Lansdowne said:

"I doubt whether the general public know how immensely the character of the army has improved in recent years. This is not an occasion for wearying you with figures, but I will tell you this, and it is an easy statement to remember: That in the last twenty years the number of courts-martial has diminished by one-half, and the number of minor punishments has diminished to about the same extent, and the number of fines for drunkenness has also diminished approximately by one-half. I do not mean to suggest, and I am sure you would not claim, that all this is entirely due to the efforts of your Association. It is due, in great measure to that general improvement, that higher standard which I hope is obtaining in all classes of our community at the present time. But I do think you have a right to claim that you have greatly assisted this improvement in the army, and it is for that reason that I and all who are concerned with the administration of the army cordially wish you success in your efforts and are glad to show whenever we can, by our presence and by our speech, the good will which we feel toward you."

THE FRENCH ARMY.

Before the year 1900 the army rules permitted all

liquors, fermented or spirituous, except absinthe, to be sold at the canteens. The rules for the regulation of the canteens were numerous and drastic. If a case of drunkenness was traced to a canteen, it was closed for a certain period, to be determined by orders of the Colonel. Many Generals and Colonels forbade entirely the sale of spirits in their commands. There was little uniformity of usage in this respect. Alcoholic drinks were not furnished to the French soldier by the government, except on extraordinary occasions of festivity. In the spring of 1900, Dr. Richard, a professor of hygiene, was commissioned by the military authorities to draft new rules on this subject. Dr. Richard proposed to prohibit the sale of alcohol in any form in the canteens. His recommendations were not adopted *in toto*, but in May, 1900, General Gallifet, then Minister of War, followed his advice to the extent of this order to commanding officers:

“To protect the troops placed under their orders against the dangers of alcohol, commanding officers have taken, for some time back, the initiative of various measures concerning the consumption of alcohol in the barracks.

“Some, simply restrictive, have forbidden the canteens to sell alcohol at certain hours; while others have absolutely forbidden its use in the canteens.

“From an hygienic and disciplinary point of view it is necessary to cease those divergencies, and to render uniform the prescriptions relative to the prophylaxy of alcoholism and to extend to the whole army a beneficial act which can no longer remain localised to a certain body of troops.

“Consequently, I have decided to forbid absolutely the sale of alcohol, or any other liquor of which alcohol is the base, or any of those preparations known as

aperitifs (tonics). This prohibition to extend to all canteens, both in the barracks and on the exercise grounds.

“The sale alone is authorised in the canteens of fermented drinks, such as wine, beer, cider, and all common beverages, tea, coffee, milk, chocolate, etc., containing no alcohol.

“I consequently invite you to take the necessary steps in order that these prescriptions, which should be posted up in the canteens, be immediately executed.

“GALLIFET.”

Since the promulgation of this order by Gallifet, his successor, André has ordered that lectures be given to the soldiers, from time to time, by competent authority, on the dangers of alcoholism and the desirability of drinking wine and beer in preference to absinthe and the other bitters and cordials so popular in France. In pursuance of the same policy, and also, probably, in the interest of the wine industry, the French Parliament has voted 317,000 francs for furnishing French wines for the soldiers' tables.

THE ARMY OF CANADA.

In the Dominion of Canada the operation of saloons in connection with the army has never been favoured. The following are the only regulations of the government on the subject:

“*Canteens.*”

“Nothing in the Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Army, so far as they relate to the establishment of canteens, is to be understood as permitting the sale within the limits of camp grounds during the annual training of the militia of Canada, of spirituous (to in-

clude wine) or malt liquors of any kind; their sale within such limits being strictly prohibited.

“Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Camps of Instruction.

“Officers commanding camps of instruction will be held responsible that the above order is carried out, and they together with officers commanding units of active militia, will, in those districts where the law so directs, be liable to prosecution, in respect of any liquor sold in tents or other premises subject to their control, in addition to such penalty as may be inflicted for a breach of military discipline.”

ARMIES IN OTHER NATIONS.

The Russian Government in 1898 appointed a commission for the study of alcoholism. This body has not yet finished its work, but in 1900 it published a preliminary report. It also addressed a letter to the Minister of the Interior requesting “the absolute suppression in the Russian army of the spirit ration both in time of peace and in time of war;” the prohibition of the distribution of liquor to the troops, even by officers at their own expense; and the prohibition of the sale of spirits in the canteens. The commission further urged the government to endeavour to teach its soldiers, through officers, physicians, and chaplains, the dangers attending the use of alcohol.

In the German navy beer canteens are maintained in the sailors' barracks and on ships in commission. The amount of beer supplied to each man is limited. Distilled liquors are not allowed either in the barracks or on ships.

Japan has followed the Western fashion in establishing canteens in its army, where rice wine (*sake*) is furnished the soldiers in strictly limited quantities. Liquor is not provided as a ration in the Chinese army. In the Turkish army, of course, almost no

alcoholic liquor is used and, though the army does not excel as a fighting machine, yet the individual soldier is counted one of the most formidable fighters in the world. One of the greatest feats of arms in history was the defense of Kars by the Turks against the Russians in the Crimean war. Sir Fenwick Williams, Who commanded the defence afterwards said: "Had not the Turkish army at Kars been literally a cold water army I am persuaded they never would have performed the achievement that crowned them with glory." The defeat of the Greek army by the Turks in the war of 1897 was partly due to the fact that the Greeks were better supplied with brandy than with food. In the Mexican army the sale of intoxicating drinks is entirely prohibited, and the prohibition is strictly enforced.*

* See Appendix C, Chap. XXII.

CHAPTER XXIII.

CIVILISATION AS THE APOSTLE OF VICE.

AFRICA.

WHEN the body of David Livingston, after its eight months' journey on the shoulders of his faithful blacks, was delivered to his English friends in Zanzibar and identified by the mark of a lion's claw on the arm, they found these words in his diary—written just before his death in the interior of the dark continent, far from any of his own race: "All I can say in my solitude is, may Heaven's richest blessing come down upon every one—English, American, or Turk—who shall help to heal this open sore of the world." His dying wish is granted, for, except a mere remnant, the African slave trade is no more. But it has been replaced by a far greater curse. "The old rapacity of the slave-trade," says Archdeacon Farrar, "has been followed by the greater and more ruinous rapacity of the drink-seller. Our fathers tore from Africa a yoke of whips; we have subjected the native races to a yoke of scorpions." "If the slave trade were revived with all its horrors," says Sir Charles Burton, "and Africa could get rid of the white man with his gunpowder and rum . . . Africa would be the gainer in happiness by the exchange."

The trader is of course the principal villain in this tragedy. Bishop Taylor, who served thirty-three

years as a missionary in Africa, thus describes the method of the traders in Angola :

“Caravans arriving from the interior with ivory, dyewoods and rubber were invited to deposit their loads in the compound of the trader. They were then debauched with rum for several days, when they were told what price would be paid for their products. If they expostulated they were informed that the trader now had possession of them and they must take his price. When forced to do so, they were paid in rum, also at his price.”

This is one episode in a long list equally disgraceful.

But even more shameful than the part played by the trader has been that of the great civilised states in upholding the trader with their power. In the early part of the nineteenth century, British planters began to raise sugar on the island of Mauritius, and from the refuse they manufactured a rum of exceedingly vile quality. This they shipped to Madagascar for sale among the natives. The immediate results were so appalling that King Radama I. tried to stop its importation and ordered that which was already landed to be destroyed, paying part of the cost from his own resources. The English Government at once interfered and compelled the king to permit the sale of the liquor. His son, Radama II., became a drunken maniac, as a result of the traffic. Forced to permit the traffic, the government of Madagascar nevertheless tried to restrict it by imposing a duty of 33 per cent. The people were robbed of this protection by another great nation. In 1867 the United States consul at Madagascar, Finkelmeier by name, protested against a higher duty than 10 per cent. The reason for the protest was that the consul's son

was engaged in the rum business at Tamatàve. The United States supported the, disinterested, demand of Mr. Finkelmeier, and the duty was forced down to 10 per cent. To mention one other instance, in 1886 an outcry was raised among the Mohammedans of Egypt against the liquor traffic plied industriously there by Europeans. The khedive said that he desired to stop the business but that the rum traders were backed by the powers of Europe, whom he dared not displease.

The ravages of the liquor traffic in Africa of course cannot be measured numerically. But we have valuable testimony from those who are familiar with the subject. The most valuable is that of natives of Africa. Like the Maori chiefs of New Zealand, the native chiefs of Africa have been strong opponents of the use of liquor. In 1884 the British Parliament appointed a commission to investigate the liquor traffic in Africa. Almost all the rulers and chiefs of Southern Africa appeared before his body;—Cetewayo, King of the Zulus; Khama, King of Bechuanaland (the same who four years ago journeyed to England to beg the British government to prevent its subjects from violating the prohibitory laws of his nation); Kaulelo and Fongo of Peddie; Petrius Mahonga and Sam Sigernu; Mankai Renga, Umgudlwa, Mangele, Sandile, Vena, Sigidi, Sitonga, and Nocengana of the Tembu people; and Chief Dalasile and sixty of the headmen of Idulywa. None of these men defended the liquor traffic; most of them condemned it emphatically and prayed for its abolition. The commission in its report summed up the evidence in these words: "The use of spirituous liquors is an unmitigated evil; and no other cause or influence . . . is so completely destructive, not only

of all progress and improvement, but of the reasonable hope of any progress."

Prince Momolu Massaquoi of Vei, Africa, said in a lecture in Boston in February, 1894; "I can assure you . . . that in my tribe in the last two years more than eight thousand men and women have been slain as a result of this liquor traffic." King Malike, the Mohammedan emir of Nupe, wrote this pathetic letter to Bishop Crowther in 1886:

"It is not a long matter: it is about *barasa* [rum or gin]. *Barasa! Barasa! Barasa!* By God! It has ruined our country: it has ruined our people very much: it has made our people become mad. I have given the law that no one dares buy or sell it; and any one who is found selling it, his house is to be eaten up [plundered] and any one found drunk will be killed. I have told all of the Christian traders that I agree to everything for trade except *barasa*."

The Rev. James Johnson, a native pastor in the island of Lagos, said before a committee of the British House of Commons in 1887:

"The slave trade has been to Africa a great evil, but the evils of the rum trade are far worse. I would rather my countrymen were in slavery and being worked hard, and kept away from drink, than that the drink should be let loose upon them. Negroes have proved themselves able to survive the evils of the slave trade, cruel as they were, but they show that they have no power whatever to withstand the terrible evils of the drink. Surely you must see that the death of the negro race is simply a matter of time."

The earliest means of awakening the English pub-

lic to conditions in Africa was the Aborigines Protective Society, formed during the seventies. The agitation received a fresh impetus in 1887, when, through the efforts of Canon Ellison, chairman of the Church of England Temperance Society, a body known as the United Committee on Native Races and Liquor Traffic was organised in London. This committee by memorials to the government, pamphlets, etc., aroused great interest in the wrongs of Africa. The same interest had been aroused in Germany. On May 14, 1889, the Reichstag adopted a resolution censuring those engaged in the drink traffic in the German colonies. In the same year memorials on this subject were presented to almost every government in Europe. Meanwhile an agitation had been conducted in many parts of Europe, principally by Cardinal Lavigerie, against the African slave trade, which was still carried on to a great extent. The result of this agitation was the international congress of Brussels, called by Leopold II. of Belgium, which met on November 18, 1889. Though the primary object of this congress was to consider the slave trade, yet when the evils of the rum traffic were described by Lord Salisbury and others, such an impression was made that the congress embodied in the treaty which it framed certain provisions to restrict that traffic. These were, in brief, that each power possessing territory or a sphere of influence in Africa between the 20th degree of north latitude and the 20th degree of south latitude should prohibit the traffic within a certain district thereof, to be determined by itself, and should tax distilled liquors in the remainder at a progressively increasing rate, as an experiment by which to determine a minimum tax which would be prohibitive to natives. This

treaty was signed by sixteen nations, among them the United States. In 1899 it was renewed, and the tax on spirits was now fixed at a minimum of 52 cents per gallon.

The attitude of the British government in recent years toward the sale of liquor to native Africans does it great credit. Its policy has been expressed by Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain as follows:

“I hold, as a matter of deep conviction, that the liquor traffic in West Africa among native races, is not only discreditable to the British name, not only derogatory to that true imperialism—the sentiment which I desire to inculcate in my countrymen—but it is also disastrous to British trade.”

In the Niger Territories, the East African Protectorate, Cape Colony, Natal, Rhodesia, and Bechuana-land the sale of liquor to natives is now strictly prohibited. Further, in 1900 Lord Kitchener instructed the *moodirs* of the Sudan to see that no liquor was sold to the natives. The Orange Free State and the Transvaal also prohibited the sale of liquor to natives until their laws were suspended by the war with Great Britain.

INDIA.

When the British East India Company assumed the government of India drunkenness naturally followed in its train. But the problem of intemperance had appeared in India long before, as we have related in Chapter I. The Hindoos were not a child people,

and hence English rum did not spread among them such havoc as among the Africans. Nevertheless drunkenness increased under British rule and the government, instead of trying to check it, encouraged it by using the liquor traffic as a source of revenue. This policy was begun in 1791 and despite protest from leading natives and English officers continued for more than a century. In 1888 the Hon. W. S. Caine, after observing conditions in India with his own eyes, returned to England and formed the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association, which began an agitation for reform. Parliament, on April 30, 1889, responded to the appeals of the Association and its friends by censuring the Indian Government for its lax policy toward the liquor traffic. The Indian Government announced a program of reform, the basis of which should be the following principles: (1) That the taxation of spirituous and intoxicating liquors and drugs should be high, and in some cases as high as it is possible to enforce; (2) that the traffic in liquor and drugs should be conducted under suitable regulations for police purposes; (3) that the number of places at which liquor or drugs can be purchased should be strictly limited with regard to circumstances of each locality; and (4) that efforts should be made to ascertain the existence of local public sentiment, and that a reasonable amount of deference should be paid to such opinion when ascertained. A considerable number of liquor-shops were closed and the consumption of liquor was temporarily reduced. But the zeal of the government soon cooled, its restrictions were relaxed, and the consumption of liquor now seems to be increasing.

An active temperance propaganda has been in progress for some time, led by native reformers. One

of the most successful of these was Mahamp Kesho Ram Roy of Benares, a devout Hindoo who died about five years ago. Of those now living Bipin Chandra Pal, a Christian, is among the most influential. There are now 283 societies in India affiliated with the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association. In 1896 the numerous societies in the neighbourhood of Bombay formed a federation known as the Bombay Temperance Council. This is a most successful and influential body. Its president is Dr. Bhalchandra Krishna, L.M., J.P., its secretary Dhanjibhai Dorabji Gilder, a scholarly native of the Parsee faith.

THE PACIFIC ISLANDS.

The spectacle of civilisation forcing its vices upon inferior peoples against the resolute but vain persistence of their rulers is exhibited by the history of the Hawaiian Islands even more strikingly than by that of Africa. The art of distillation was introduced into Hawaii in 1800 by some former convicts of Botany Bay, who made a sort of rum out of native plants. The resulting evils soon became so serious that King Kamehameha I. ordered all the stills to be destroyed and forbade the manufacture of rum in the future. This order seems not to have been effective, for in 1823 we find King Kamehameha II., who had himself been addicted to intemperance, pledging himself to abstinence in the future and urging his subjects to do likewise. Soon after his death in 1825, Boki, the governor of Oahu, leased some ground and a warehouse in Honolulu to certain whites. They at once began to raise sugar and to

use the warehouse as a distillery. The queen regent, Kaahumanu, ordered this sugar-cane to be dug up by the roots and the lease to be cancelled. The queen regent next enacted stringent legislation against other forms of vice than intemperance. The British consul, Richard Charleton, protested against these measures in the name of his government. Lieutenant John Percival, commanding a naval vessel of the United States, also protested, and then terrorized the governor of Oahu into connivance at the violation of the law. In 1829 Kaahumanu took another step in her reforms by forbidding the sale of liquor on Sundays. A protest against this law was presented to the government signed by most of the white residents of the islands, including most of the consuls and some missionaries, who described themselves as "viewing with alarm the encroachments made on our liberties, religion, and amusements."

Meanwhile the native chiefs had been active in forming temperance societies based upon the following pledge:

- "1. We will not drink ardent spirits for pleasure.
- "2. We will not traffic in ardent spirits for gain.
- "3. We will not engage in distilling ardent spirits.
- "4. We will not treat our relatives, acquaintances or strangers with ardent spirits except with the consent of a temperance physician.
- "5. We will not give ardent spirits to workmen on account of their labour."

On November 26, 1835, a petition signed by six chiefs and several thousand other natives was presented to the king asking for the total prohibition of the trade in spirituous liquors. The king granted

the request, but again civilisation frustrated native reform. Many of the white population were interested in the rum traffic. Among these was Mr. Charleton, the British consul, who had vigorously opposed previous attempts at reform. On July 17, 1839, the French frigate *L'Artemize* steamed into the harbor of Honolulu, and her commander, Captain C. O. LaPlace, at the cannon's mouth, compelled the young king Kamehameha III., to sign a treaty, one clause of which read as follows: "French merchandises or those known to French procedure, and particularly wines and brandy, cannot be prohibited, and shall not pay an import duty higher than five per cent. *ad valorem*." On March 26, 1846, England followed the French example by stipulating with Hawaii for the privileges of the most favoured nation, and on August 19, 1850, the United States did the same.

Forced by the Christian powers to abandon his prohibition reform, Kamehameha attempted moral suasion, publicly pledging himself to total abstinence in 1842. The British consul deplored this action, assuring the people that "moderation is the virtue set forth in the word of God, and not total abstinence." In spite of the disapproval of the consul the king persisted in his opposition to intemperance, and so did his successors to the end of the dynasty in 1872. Though entire prohibition was impossible, the laws forbade the sale of liquor to natives. In 1865 the Legislature was bribed by the notorious Kalakaua to pass a bill repealing this law. King Kamehameha V., promptly vetoed the bill with the remark: "I'll never sign the death warrant of my people." When Kalakaua assumed the crown in 1874 the law

was repealed. Drunkenness and crime have since that time increased enormously and the native population is rapidly diminishing.

In the Philippine Islands, during the three hundred years of Spanish domination, the vice of drunkenness was not developed. The Spaniards drank wine, but not to excess. The natives drank *vino de coca*, *vino de nipa*, *anisado*, and other juices distilled from native plants. These liquors somewhat resemble ordinary gin and are fiercely intoxicating, but the natives used them with moderation. The problem of intemperance was introduced by the United States in 1898. During the summer of that year the American forces captured the city of Manila. Before the city fell into their hands it contained three bars, which were supported by the few European and American residents, besides the native *tiendas*—small shops where fruit, nuts, etc., are sold and which occasionally furnish the native *vino*. Within the first few months of American control the number of dram shops, excluding *tiendas*, increased to about four hundred. Drunkenness and debauchery ran riot among the soldiers. The report of Judge-Advocate John A. Hull, of the eighth army corps, stationed in the Philippines, for the ten months preceding June 30, 1899, shows that during that period, among the average 20,078 men of the command, 12,401 were tried for various offenses by court-martial. The natives have not yet adopted the customs of the Land of the Free. The price of liquor is high, and moreover the natives hate the Americans and all their ways. When the relation between their resources and the price of American liquor is better adjusted, and when they have overcome their prejudice against American

institutions, it is to be expected that the Philippines, like their great foster mother across the Pacific, will take up the new burden of national drunkenness and join the march of civilisation.

Many other instances besides those of the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines seem to establish the rule that, in the islands of the Pacific which have been opened to civilisation by the Spaniards, no temperance problem of any importance has arisen, while without exception the natives of islands opened to civilisation by the Anglo-Saxons have been degraded by rum, and, in some cases, to a degree that threatens their extermination. Great Britain about twenty-five years ago made some amends for her share in this business by prohibiting the sale of liquor to the natives of all the Pacific Islands under her dominion or her protection. This prohibition was also extended, so far as British subjects were concerned, to the New Hebrides and other islands which were independent of her control. In 1884 she proposed an international agreement forbidding the sale of fire arms and intoxicants to any native of the Pacific Islands. The draft of the proposed agreement was sent to France, Italy, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Hawaii, and the United States. Acceptance of the proposal was urged by Secretary of State Frelinghuysen and again, in 1892, by Secretary Foster. In 1892 the Rev. John G. Paton who served forty-three years as a missionary in the Pacific Islands, principally the New Hebrides, came to America to ask Congress for a law prohibiting American traders from selling spirits to the natives of the New Hebrides. Unsuccessful in this attempt, he renewed his appeal in 1900. In a message to Congress Presi-

dent McKinley advocated the "restriction of the liquor traffic with all uncivilised people, especially in the Western Pacific," and the United States Senate passed the following resolution on motion of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this body the time has come when the principle, twice affirmed in international treaties for Central Africa, that native races should be protected against the destructive traffic in intoxicants should be extended to all uncivilised peoples by the enactment of such laws and the making of such treaties as will effectually prohibit the sale by the signatory powers to aboriginal tribes and uncivilised races of opium and intoxicating beverages."

Congress passed a law in accordance with this resolution, applying to the New Hebrides, in February, 1902.

THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS.

As remarked elsewhere the Dominion of Canada prohibits the sale of liquor to Indians. The law has been fairly well enforced. The manner in which the United States has cared for its "wards," as the Supreme Court has called the Indian peoples, is a different story. The Indian Bureau of the government has been a disgrace to the nation. Situations under this bureau, being located in remote parts, outside of the range of public attention, have been used by politicians as a means of rewarding assistants of disreputable character. State laws from the first have forbidden the sale of liquor to Indians. Federal law likewise since 1834 has prohibited the sale of liquor in the Indian Territory, extending this rule

to Alaska when that country was purchased from Russia in 1867. In 1899 high licence was substituted for prohibition in Alaska. But whatever the law, the welfare of the Indians has been of little interest to the Indian service; these laws have not been enforced, and the "wards of the nation" are doomed to extermination through whisky.*

* For further information than is contained in this chapter, see Wilbur F. Craft's *Protection of Native Races Against Intoxicants and Opium*; Dr. Dennis, *Christian Missions and Social Progress*; the annual reports of the United Committee for the Prevention of the Demoralization of the Native Races by the Liquor Traffic (London); *Temperance in all Nations*, edited by J. N. Stearns; Visger, *The Story of Hawaii*; Alexander, *History of the Hawaiian People*.



CHAPTER XXIV.

TEMPERANCE AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

The Quakers.

IN the temperance reform of America the Quakers were the pioneer religious sect. An interest in temperance was manifested as early as 1745, when at the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting the query proposed for discussion, according to the custom of the society, was "Do Friends keep clear of excess in drinking drams or other strong drink?" Again, in 1855 the Yearly Meeting discussed a similar query;—"Are Friends careful to avoid the excessive use of spirituous liquors?" In 1785 the question was "Are Friends careful to discourage distillation or use of spirituous liquors?" The New England Yearly Meeting in 1784 adopted this resolution:

"The excessive use of spirituous liquors of all kinds having for a long time been seen by our society to be a practice tending to lead from calmness and innocency to the many evils of intemperance, and a concern having arose for the spread of this testimony that others may be encouraged to restrain its use within limits of truth, we recommend all Friends to look carefully at the motives of being concerned therewith; not only using but distilling, importing, trading in, or handing out to others.

"We entreat, therefore, those who have begun well and made advances in the way toward their own peace, that as soon as may be they forbear said practices."

And four years later the following:

“It appearing that divers of our members do not yet forbear importing, trading in, and handing out distilled liquors, it is recommended that committees be appointed, and all such as continue in either of said practices or distilling be dealt with, and if unreclaimed, that they be testified against.”

The New York Yearly Meeting likewise early turned its attention to this subject. In 1758 it discussed the query: “Are Friends clear from frequenting taverns or drinking to excess?” and to this question it voted the following answer in 1763: “We are mostly clear from unnecessary frequenting taverns or drinking to excess there or elsewhere.” It warned its members in 1785 against “being concerned in importing, distilling or selling spirituous liquors” and against encouraging others “in a traffic so pernicious to our fellow-men.” From the position taken by the early Friends, their successors have never receded, but have rather advanced. The society is now divided into seven Yearly Meetings. All of those have declared their hostility to the use of intoxicants in the strongest terms. We quote the utterances of the New York Yearly Meeting as a type of the rest. The Advices of this division contain the following precept:

“All are most earnestly desired to abstain from all partaking of any intoxicating liquors and stimulating or narcotic preparations, and to avoid the use of tobacco in any form. The baneful effects of the use of these are so widespread that the subject should claim serious consideration.”

Its Discipline contains a chapter on Intoxicating Liquors, the spirit of which may be judged from this paragraph:

“As the alcoholic liquor traffic is the source of so large a proportion of the vice, misery and crime in the land, no member of our society should lend his influence in any way toward the continuance of such a demoralising and destructive business.”

The Methodist Church.

John Wesley was not only a total abstainer, but also a prohibitionist. By the General Rules formed by him and his brother Charles in 1743 the members of the society of Methodists were required to abstain from “drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity;” and the first rules for the organisations within the church, known as Band Societies, directed the members “to taste no spirituous liquor, no dram of any kind, unless prescribed by a physician.” In 1773 John Wesley said:

“It is amazing that the preparing or selling of this poison should be permitted (I will not say in any Christian country, but) in any civilised state. O! it brings in a considerable sum of money to the government. True; but is it wise to barter men’s lives for money? Surely that gold is bought too dear, if it is the price of blood. Does not the strength of every country consist in the number of its inhabitants? If so, the lessening their number is a loss which no money can compensate. So that it is inexcusable ill-husbandry to give the lives of useful men for any sum of money whatever.”

The Methodist Church of America was at first in

hearty sympathy with the principals of the founder of the society. In 1780 the General Conference, presided over by Francis Asbury, passed the following resolution :

“ Question: Do we disapprove the practice of distilling grain into liquors? Shall we disown our friends who will not renounce the practice?

“ Answer: Yes.”

In 1789 the words “ unless in cases of extreme necessity ” were struck out of the temperance clause of the General Rules. But in the very next year a reaction appeared. The words “ buy or sell spirituous liquors ” in the clause in question were now struck out and the flexible “ necessity ” clause reinserted, so that the rule now forbade “ drunkenness, or drinking spirituous liquors, except in cases of necessity.” Wesley’s straight-forward prohibition of the sale of liquor was replaced in 1796 by the following innocuous substitute :

“ If any member of our society retail or give spirituous liquors, and anything disorderly be transacted under his roof on this account, the preacher who has oversight of the circuit shall proceed against him as in the case of other immoralities, and the person accused shall be cleared, censured, suspended or excluded, according to his conduct, as on other charges of immorality.”

For a long period after this transaction the temperance sentiment of the church remained at low ebb. In 1812, James Axley, a rude preacher from the Southwest, over whose homely speech the learned

dogmatists made merry, came to the General Conference and proposed this resolution :

“ *Resolved*, That no stationed or local preacher shall retail spirituous or malt liquors without forfeiting his ministerial character among us.”

Strange to say, after a strenuous fight this resolution was defeated, whereupon Axley, as Laban Clark, who seconded his proposition, tells us, “turned his face to the wall and wept.” The conference, however, compromised by adopting an address regarding the “uses of ardent spirits, dram drinking, etc., so common among Methodists,” in which it said: “We do most earnestly recommend the annual conferences and our people to join with us in making a firm and constant stand against an evil which has ruined thousands both in time and eternity.” At the next General Conference, held in 1816, Axley won the adoption of his resolution by confining it to spirituous liquors. An attempt in 1820 to extend the prohibition to all members of the church as well as preachers, failed.

At the General Conference of 1832 the committee on temperance reported a manifesto, prepared by Mr. (later Bishop) H. B. Bascom, which was a veritable trumpet blast for temperance, as will be seen by the following quotation :

“God and nature have so disowned and frowned upon it [liquor] as to stamp it with the character of unmitigated evil. There is no one redeeming element or aspect about it. In its best and most imposing forms, it offers nothing but plague and pollution; God forbids it; it is the object of nature’s abhorrence, and its uniform effects demonstrate that to persist in its practice is to renounce

the friendship of Heaven, and claim kindred, not with brutes, but with infernals. All, therefore, must look upon it as an evil unhallowed by any, the smallest good. We have seen that it invariably undermines health and leads to death, and, in most instances, death timely and disgraceful. However insidious in its progress, it is fatal in its issue. We need not ask you to look at the brutal, the polluted and demoralising victim himself—a curse and a nuisance, whatever his name, or wherever found. We need not quote his beggared family and heart-broken connections. We need not cite you to the beggared thousands found as criminals in your penitentiaries, patients in your hospitals, lunatics in your asylums, and vagabonds in your streets. Few, perhaps, are aware of the extent, the secret and insidious spread of the evil we would arrest. Its destructive influence is felt in every department of business, duty and society: in our legislative halls; at the bar of justice; upon the judicial bench, and even in the pulpit. A large portion, we fear, of the most important and responsible business of the nation is often transacted under the influence, in a greater or less degree, of alcoholic excitement; and can those be innocent who contributed to secure such a result, whether by the pestilential example of temperate drinking, as it is called, or the still more criminal means of furnishing the poisonous preparation by manufacture and traffic for the degradation and ruin of others.”

The Conference, influenced by the temperance enthusiasm then sweeping over the country adopted this resolution. But though the tide had turned it rose slowly. Not till 1848 was the temperance rule of Wesley restored. The term “spirituous liquors,” as used in this rule, was declared in 1868 to include “ale, lager beer, cider, wines, and stronger drinks.”

Having now, after the lapse of a century, joined company with John Wesley again in respect to tem-

perance, the American church proceeded to join him also in respect to prohibition. The General Conference of 1868 declared:

“We hail every legal measure to effectually restrain and extirpate this chief crime against society, and trust the law of prohibition may yet be the enactment of every state and of the national Congress, and be successfully executed throughout all our republic.”

In 1872 the General Conference resolved:

“That we earnestly protest against the members of our church giving countenance to the liquor traffic by voting to grant licences or signing the petitions of those who desire licence to sell either distilled or fermented and vinous liquors, by becoming bondsmen for persons asking such licence or by renting property to be used as the place in or on which to manufacture or sell such intoxicating liquors.”

The following magnificent declaration was adopted in 1888:

“The liquor traffic is so pernicious in all its bearings, so inimical to the interests of honest trade, so repugnant to the moral sense, so injurious to the peace and order of society, so hurtful to the homes, to the church and to the body politic, and so utterly antagonistic to all that is precious in life, that the only proper attitude toward it for Christians is that of relentless hostility. It can never be legalised without sin. No temporary device for regulating it can become a substitute for prohibition. Licence, high or low, is vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy.”

Finally, in 1892 the church reached the culmination of its utterances in the following declaration:

“We emphatically declare that men engaged in the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages ought not to receive the commercial patronage of Christian people, nor should those who either directly or indirectly sustain the ungodly traffic receive the suffrages of Christian men.

“Licence laws are the liquor traffic’s strongest bulwark of defence. They are wrong in principle and impotent for good. We are unalterably opposed to the enactment of laws that propose by licence, taxing or otherwise, to regulate the drink traffic, because they provide for its continuance and afford no protection against its ravages. We will accept no compromise, but demand the unconditional surrender of the rebellious business. . . .

“We do not presume to dictate the political conduct of our people, but we do record our deliberate judgment that no political party has a right to expect, nor ought it to receive, the support of Christian men so long as it stands committed to the licence policy, or refuses to put itself on record in an attitude of open hostility to the saloon.”

The Presbyterian Church.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1811, moved by an address of Dr. Rush, appointed a committee to consider the subject of temperance in the church. In the following year, pursuant to the recommendations of the committee, the General Assembly urged the ministers of the church “pointedly and solemnly to warn their hearers, and especially the members of the church, not only against actual intemperance, but against all those habits and indulgences which may have a tendency to produce it;” and enjoined upon “all church sessions within the bounds of the General Assembly, that they exercise a special vigilance and care over the conduct

of all persons in the communion of their respective churches, with regard to this sin, and that they sedulously endeavour, by private warning and re-monstrance, and by such public censure as the different cases may require, to purge the church of a sin so enormous in its mischiefs, and so disgraceful to the Christian name."

The General Assembly of 1834 declared: ". . . . The traffic in ardent spirits, to be used as a drink by any people, is in our judgment morally wrong, and ought to be viewed as such by the churches of Jesus Christ universally." In 1842 the question was presented to the General Assembly, "whether the manufacturer, vender or retailer of intoxicating drinks should be continued in full communion." The Assembly refused to adopt a rule excluding such persons, and the question remained unsettled, a source of constant contention, until 1865. In that year the Assembly, at the instance of Dr. David Elliott, of the Western Theological Seminary, declared that the church "must purge herself from all participation in the sin of the liquor traffic by removing from her pale all who are engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks for use as a common beverage." Subsequent Assemblies, in 1871 and 1880, have reaffirmed this resolution. The Assembly of 1871 declared that those who knowingly rent their property to a liquor dealer for use in his business, or who endorse licences which legalise such business are responsible for "reprehensible complicity in the guilt of the aforesaid traffic." In 1880 the following resolution, proposed by Dr. Herrick Johnson, was unanimously adopted by the Assembly:

"In view of the evils wrought by this scourge of our

race, this assembly would hail with acclamations of joy and thanksgiving the utter extermination of the traffic in intoxicating liquors as a beverage, by the power of Christian conscience, public opinion and the strong arm of the civil law."

Finally, in 1892 the General Assembly made the following declaration:

"While it is not in the province of the church to dictate to any man how he shall vote, yet the committee declares that no political party has the right to expect the support of Christian men so long as that party stands committed to the licence policy, or refuse to put itself on record against the saloon."

The Roman Catholic Church.

The Catholic Total Abstinence Union, whose initial inspiration was derived from the work of Father Mathew, was organized in Baltimore on February 22, 1872. Its members now number eighty-one thousand. Its pledge reads as follows:

"I promise, with the Divine assistance and in honour of the sacred thirst and agony of our Saviour, to abstain from all intoxicating drinks; to prevent as much as possible, by advice and example, the sin of intemperance in others; and to discountenance the drinking customs of society."

The third Plenary Council of Roman Catholic Prelates, which met at Baltimore in 1884-1886 passed the following decrees:

"A Christian should carefully avoid not only what is positively evil, but what has even the appearance of evil,

and more especially whatever commonly leads to it. Therefore Catholics should generously renounce all recreations and all kinds of business which may interfere with keeping holy the Lord's day, or which is calculated to lead to the violation of the laws of God or of the state. The worst, without doubt, is the carrying on of business in barrooms and saloons on Sunday, a traffic by means of which so many and such grievous injuries are done to religion and society. Let pastors earnestly labor to root out this evil; let them admonish and entreat; let them even resort to threatenings and penalties, when it becomes necessary. . . . Lastly, we warn our faithful people who sell intoxicating liquors to consider seriously by how many and how serious dangers and occasions of sin their business—although not unlawful in itself—is surrounded. If they can, let them choose a more honourable way of making a living; but if they cannot, let them study by all means to remove from themselves and others the occasions of sin."

Shortly afterwards the declarations of this Council and the work of the Total Abstinence Union received the approval of the Pope in the following letter, written to Bishop (now Archbishop) John Ireland:

“TO OUR VENERABLE BROTHER, JOHN IRELAND,
Bishop of St. Paul, Minnesota.

“*Venerable Brother: Health and Apostolic Benediction.*

“The admirable works of piety and charity by which our faithful children in the United States labour to promote, not only their own temporal and eternal welfare, but also that of their fellow-citizens, and which you have recently related to us, give to us exceeding great consolation. And above all, we have rejoiced to learn with what energy and zeal, by means of various excellent associations, and especially through the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, you combat the destructive vice of in-

temperance. For it is well known to us how ruinous, how deplorable, is the injury, both to faith and to morals, that is to be feared from intemperance in drink. Nor can we sufficiently praise the prelates of the United States, who recently, in the Plenary Council of Baltimore, with weightiest words condemned this abuse, declaring it to be a perpetual incentive to sin and a fruitful root of all evils, plunging the families of the intemperate into direst ruin, and dragging numberless souls down to everlasting perdition; declaring, moreover, that the faithful who yield to this vice of intemperance become thereby a scandal to non-Catholics, and a great hindrance to the propagation of the true religion.

“Hence we esteem worthy of all commendation the noble resolve of your pious associations, by which they pledge themselves to abstain totally from every kind of intoxicating drink. Nor can it at all be doubted that this determination is the proper and truly efficacious remedy for this very great evil; and that so much the more strongly will all be induced to put this bridle upon the appetite, by how much the greater are the dignity and influence of those who give the example. But the greatest of all in this matter should be the zeal of priests, who as they are called to instruct the people in the Word of Life, and to mould them to Christian morality, should also, and above all, walk before them in the practice of virtue. Let pastors, therefore, do their best to drive the plague of intemperance from the fold of Christ by assiduous preaching and exhortation, and to shine before all as models of abstinence, that so the many calamities with which this vice threatens both church and state may, by their strenuous endeavours, be averted.

“And we do most earnestly beseech Almighty God that, in this important matter, He may graciously favour your desires, direct your councils, and assist your endeavours; and as a pledge of the Divine protection, and a testimony of our paternal affection, we most lovingly

bestow upon you, venerable brother, and upon all your associates in this holy league, the apostolic benediction.

“ Given at Rome, from St. Peter’s, this 27th day of March, in the year 1887, the tenth year of our pontificate.

“ LEO XIII., POPE.”

The Congress of Catholic Laity held in Chicago in September 1893 adopted even stronger resolutions than had the Council of Prelates in 1884. It declared :

“ We strongly commend every legitimate effort made to impress upon our fellow-men the dangers arising, not only from the abuse, but too often from the use of intoxicating drink. To this end we approve and most heartily commend the temperance and total abstinence societies already formed in many parishes, and we advise their multiplication and extension. We favour the enactment of appropriate legislation to restrict and regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors, and, emphasising the admonition of the last Plenary Council of Baltimore. We urge Catholics everywhere to get out and keep out of the saloon business.”

In the following year Bishop John A. Watterson, of the diocese of Columbus, Ohio, issued an order against the admission of saloon-keepers into Catholic societies, which read in part as follows :

“ To give greater efficacy both to the recommendations of the bishops and to the declarations of our Catholic laity at the recent Congress in Chicago, concerning the saloon business, I hereby withdraw my approbation from any and every Catholic society or branch or division thereof in this diocese that has a liquor dealer or saloon-keeper at its head or anywhere among its officers ;

and I suspend every such society itself from its rank and privileges as a Catholic society until it ceases to be so officered. Happily there is not much occasion now for such suspensions. I again publish the condition, without which for some years past I have declined to approve of new societies or new branches of old organizations in this diocese, namely:

“‘That no one who is engaged either as principal or agent in the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors can be admitted to membership.’”

An appeal was taken from this decision to the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, Mgr. Satolli, who decided in favour of Bishop Watterson, saying: “. . . Every good Catholic must hold it for certain that the Bishop has ordained that which seems to be of great benefit to the spiritual welfare of the faithful and to the decorum of every Catholic society . . . [The order of] the Right Rev. Bishop . . . are not only in harmony with the laws of the church, but are also opportune and necessary for the decorum of the Catholic Church . . . I approve, therefore, what the Right Rev. Bishop has prescribed in his decree, and it should be observed. If it perhaps appears to cause temporal loss at present to some, it should be borne patiently for the spiritual good of many and for the honour of our Catholic Church.”

Other Religious Bodies of America.

The Protestant Episcopal Church has never made an official declaration in favour of temperance, emphasising rather the principle of “Christian liberty.” Its members, as a rule, favour high licence and local option rather than prohibition. There is a Church

Temperance Society in this sect which is supported by many prominent bishops and other officers as individuals. The constitution of this society lays down "as the basis on which it rests and from which its work shall be conducted, union and co-operation on perfectly equal terms, for the promotion of temperance, between those who use temperately and those who abstain entirely from intoxicating drinks as a beverage."

The Lutheran Church has favoured prohibition since 1879. Its strongest resolution on the subject, passed by the General Synod of 1887 and re-affirmed in 1889, reads:

"The right, and therefore the wisest and most efficient method of dealing with the traffic in alcoholic liquors for drinking purposes is its suppression; and we, therefore, also urge those who comprise the church which we represent to endeavour to secure in every state the absolute prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage."

The Universalist Church, at its General Convention of 1891, declared its attitude toward temperance in the following resolution, which has been re-affirmed at subsequent Conventions.

"The Universalist Church, in Convention assembled, remembering its oft-repeated words in former days on the evils of intemperance, and the importance of total abstinence from all intoxicants, would again make its deliverance on this vitally important subject. The home, the state and the church are confronted by no foe to their peace and prosperity so great as is the drink habit; and neither of them, nor any man or woman however situated in regard to them, can fully discharge its or his duties, except by that love of sobriety and its at-

tendant blessings which encourages total abstinence from the accursed cup, and that hatred of the drink traffic which employs all possible means for its outlawry and destruction. Less than these jeopard life and happiness, dishonours the home, is an abuse of political privilege and a burning shame to the church. We call upon all in the Universalist communion, therefore, and through them on all Christians, to manifest not only their love for temperance, but also their hatred against all the agencies of intemperance; for we are convinced the demand is imperative that personal influence, political duty and loyalty to the church of Christ, must lead us not only to sympathy with and help to the victims of the drink habit, but also to persistent war on the traffic in intoxicants, on which no halt shall be called until the saloon and the entire business of furnishing intoxicating beverages is utterly destroyed."

The General Synod of the Reformed Church of America, in 1895, declared:

"Whereas, We, the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, do firmly believe that the saloon is not in accordance with Divine will, and that we should speak in no uncertain manner against the acknowledged enemy of the church of God; be it

"Resolved, That we will hereafter do all in our power to prevent further growth of the rum traffic."

At the Jubilee Convention of the Disciples of Christ, held at Cincinnati in 1899, the following resolutions were adopted: "That we pledge our undying hostility to the liquor business, and that we favour the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage." The Convention of 1900, held at Kansas City, declared: "We record our unceasing enmity to the liquor traffic, and

pledge ourselves to every wise measure looking to its overthrow and destruction."

The General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of 1900 declared:

"The greatest single obstacle to religious progress in the world is the whisky traffic, and the strength of the whisky traffic is the law . . . But the law is made by the lawmakers, the lawmakers are elected by the voters. . . . The citizen of the temporal kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ ought to be the best citizen of the civil government in which he lives, and this church asks of its members that they make clean records in the exercise of their civil and political privileges."

"The Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church held in Chicago, May, 1900, adopted the following resolution:

"The assembly declares that the legalising of the liquor traffic is a sin against God, and a crime against man, and that any party favouring licencing thereof has no right to expect, and should not receive, the votes of Christian citizens."

The sixth Annual Meeting of the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America, held at Lynn, Massachusetts, in May, 1901, declared:

"*Resolved*, That we declare that intemperance is a sin against the individual, the home and the country. As consistent and courageous Christian men, we protest against any form of licence which shall legalise the importation, manufacture or sale of intoxicating beverages, and declare uncompromising warfare on the liquor traffic, demanding its unconditional surrender. Partisan friendship with the saloon must be accepted as hos-

tility to the church, the home and all that is valuable in society. No party is worthy of the support of Christian men that fails to antagonise the saloon."

The National Holiness Association, a society which represents all denominations and which seeks to revive the principles of the primitive gospel, adopted the following resolution in May, 1901:

"*Whereas*, The liquor traffic is the giant foe of God and the chief ally of Satan to-day; therefore resolved that we kindly urge all holy people to unite with and vote for the candidates of those parties in county, state and national elections who declare themselves for the principle of prohibition."

The National Convention of the Christian Endeavour Society, held at Cleveland, Ohio, in July, 1894, resolved:

"That we recognise the sale and use of intoxicating liquors as the greatest evil of the times and the chief enemy of the social, moral and spiritual well-being of man; and we hold ourselves pledged as Christian Endeavourers to seek the overthrow of this evil at all times and in every lawful way."

Since that time, though the society has declared itself "opposed to the saloon, the gambling den, the brothel, and every like iniquity," it has not expressed hostility to the liquor traffic in such strong and specific terms as in the resolution of 1894.

The Epworth League, through its board of control, declared in 1900:

"*Whereas*, The liquor traffic has become a menace, not only to our homes, but to the very liberties of our land; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That the Epworth League should maintain its uncompromising hostility to the liquor traffic. We believe in total abstinence as a rule of temperance, and in prohibition as the principle of Christian government.”

The Southern Baptist Association declared in 1900:

“*Resolved*, That while we cannot approve of any feature of the licence system, we enter our emphatic protest against the issuance of licences by the national government in states or localities that are covered by prohibitory laws.

“*Resolved*, That, in brief, we favour prohibition for the nation and the state, and total abstinence for the individual, and we believe that no Christian citizen should ever cast a ballot for any man, measure or platform that is opposed to the annihilation of the liquor traffic.”

The Churches of Great Britain.

The churches of Great Britain were very slow in giving their support to the temperance reform. There were some very important exceptions. As related in Chapter XV., it was a group of clergymen, headed by Dr. John Edgar, who started the reform in Ireland. But we may say that as a whole the churches were apathetic during the early years, when the end sought by the temperance workers was moderation.

When total abstinence took the place of moderation, the attitude of some of the churches changed from apathy to hostility, but otherwise there was little alteration. There are, again, important exceptions to this statement. Thus, the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian church in the North of Ireland resolved in 1835:

“That we highly approve of the great principle em-

bodied in the constitution of temperance societies, recommend ministers, elders, and people to bring forward this grand principle in their respective spheres, and encourage it by precept and example; and also that Sessions be enjoined to treat with such of the people under their care as are engaged in the traffic in ardent spirits, in order to induce them to abandon the demoralising employment."

Again, Wales owed her temperance reform from its very beginning to the ministers of her churches. The first temperance society there was founded by the Rev. Dr. Evan Davies of Llanerchymedd, in 1835. It had a total abstinence pledge, though members might promise, instead of total abstinence, abstinence from spirits only or moderation in all liquors. The reform continued from that time to be pushed with unflinching earnestness by the Welsh clergy. The Rev. Daniel Rowlands, a historian of the cause in Wales, says: "It was a very strange thing in Wales to hear of ministers in England looking with a jealous eye upon the movement, and even stooping to denounce it." Other examples were furnished by isolated ministers in other parts of the kingdom; such as the Rev. F. Close and the Rev. Thomas Spencer of the Church of England, the Rev. Christmas Evans of the Baptist church, and the Rev. J. Pye Smith of the Congregational.

But the great body of the churches either opposed or ignored the reform. The Methodist church had so far forgotten the teaching of its founder that in 1841 the Wesleyan Methodists (the largest of the Methodist bodies) adopted at their Conference rules forbidding the use of unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper, forbidding the use of any chapel for the advocacy of total abstinence, and forbidding any min-

ister to advocate total abstinence without the consent of his superintendent. The Roman Catholic church did not support Father Mathew, and to a great extent even opposed him.

The Rev. William Wight of Newcastle-upon-Tyne wrote in 1843 regarding the attitude of the church:

“What an astounding fact does the history of Great Britain exhibit at this present moment! The ministers and the professors of religion have it in their power to remove a vast amount of crime, misery and wickedness—they have it in their power to reclaim hundreds of thousands of drunkards, and all this at the paltry sacrifice of abandoning the use of intoxicating drinks; yet ministers and professors hesitate—refuse to make the sacrifice. And this crime, misery and wickedness exist and will continue—these hundreds of thousands of immortal beings are drunkards, and will continue drunkards—because the ministers and professed followers of the cross will not abandon their pernicious drinking practices.”

The Rev. W. Reid of Edinburgh wrote on the same subject in 1850:

“If we understand aright the design of the church, one of the main objects of its institution is to testify against sin in all its forms, and devise measures for its destruction. What, then, are the facts of the case respecting intemperance? Seldom is the sin condemned; and as to measures for its suppression, beyond an occasional synodical deliverance, nothing is done. It would seem as if there was a common understanding to blink the evil in question. Infidelity, Sabbath desecration, schism, and other evils, are all looked at specifically, and measures adopted to meet them; but intemperance is shunned till circumstances render the matter imperative, and then some declaration is issued

which is worse than worthless, inasmuch as such documents have the appearance of meeting the evil, which they promulgate no adequate remedy; indeed, we might challenge the production of a single proof, that these ecclesiastical deliverances have ever been followed by the slightest modification of the evil in question."

But the upward movement which has carried the British churches to their present high position had already begun when this severe criticism was made. In 1848 the British Temperance Association called a conference of ministers at Manchester to consider the subject of temperance. A resolution was adopted and signed by 583 ministers of all denominations and from all parts of the kingdom, urging all members of the Christian church, especially ministers, to give to the temperance cause their aid and co-operation, and declaring that "the total abstinence principle is simple, practical, and efficient, both for the restoration of the drunkard and the preservation of the sober members of society." A similar ministerial conference was convoked in 1857 by the United Kingdom Alliance. It also met at Manchester. The subject of discussion was the liquor traffic, and the following resolution was adopted:

"We, the undersigned ministers of the gospel are convinced by personal observation within our sphere and authentic testimony from beyond it that the traffic in intoxicating liquors, as drink for man, is the immediate cause of most of the crime and pauperism and much of the disease and insanity that afflict the land; that everywhere, and in proportion to its prevalence, it deteriorates the moral character of the people, and is the chief outward obstruction to the progress of the gospel; that these are not its accidental attendants, but

its natural fruits; that the benefit, if any, is very small in comparison with the bane; that all schemes of regulation and restriction, however good as far as they go, fall short of the nation's need and the nation's duty; and that, therefore, on the obvious principle of destroying the evil which cannot be controlled, the wisest course for those who fear God and regard man is to encourage every legitimate effort for the entire suppression of the trade, by the power of the national will, and through the form of a legislative enactment."

This declaration was drafted by the Rev. W. Arnot, and was signed within three years by 2,390 ministers.

About this time total abstinence societies began to be formed in connection with the Free Church of Scotland and the United Presbyterian church. In 1862, a total abstinence society was formed in the Church of England with the name of "the Church of England Temperance Reformation Society." This organisation was discontinued in 1873 and its place was taken by the present Church of England Temperance Society, which has a section devoted to moderation besides its total abstinence section.

The period following 1862 has been characterised by an astonishing expansion of temperance activity in all religious denominations. The Bishops of London, Durham, Gloucester and Bristol, Rochester, Newcastle, and Bedford have distinguished themselves by their work for total abstinence. Arch-deacon Farrar's sermons on temperance are among the classics of the reform. Canon Wilberforce and the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon have worked for the reclaiming of drunkards. Temperance societies have been organised in the following denominations: the Wesleyan Methodist, the Primitive Methodist,

the United Methodist Free Churches, the Methodist New Connexion, the Calvinistic Methodist, the Baptist, the Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Unitarian, the New Churches, and many other distinct bodies. In the Roman Catholic church Cardinal Manning in 1874 formed the League of the Cross. Its active membership grew within six years to 35,000, and in its meetings during that period 179,000 pledges were administered.*

Although the Christian church has not always been above reproach with respect to temperance; although she has sometimes adhered to low standards or abandoned high ones; although she has thundered gloriously in utterance, only to falter weakly in action;—yet by far the greater part of the temperance reform stands to her credit. The fact that many of the early opponents of temperance came from the church, claiming her authority and that of the Scripture for their opposition, cannot obscure the vastly more important fact that in both the earlier and the later part of the nineteenth century the great volume of the advocacy of temperance came from the same source. And the church to-day, criticise her as we may for the wide gulf which yawns between her resolutions at the general convention and her conduct at the general election, is yet the hope—and by no means a forlorn one—of the temperance reform in the future.*

* For further information on the subjects treated in this chapter see Michener, *A Retrospect of Early Quakerism*; Wheeler, *Methodism and the Temperance Reformation*; John Wesley, *Works*; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Church*; *One Hundred Years of Temperance*; and Burns, *Temperance in the Victorian Age*.

APPENDICES.

CHAPTER I.

A.

Dr. Brown also quotes an Egyptian papyrus more than 5,400 years old in which the people are exhorted to let wine alone. Says the writer: "My son, do not linger at the wine shop or drink too much wine. It causeth thee to utter words regarding thy neighbours that thou rememberest not. Thou fallest upon the ground, thy limbs become weak as those of a child. One cometh to do trade with thee and findeth thee so. Then say they: Take the fellow away, for he is drunk."

B.

Plutarch also repeats a legend (*Morals*, Vol. IV, p. 71.) recording the origin of drunkenness among the Egyptians. He says that the Kings, being also priests: "Began first to drink it in the reign of King Psammeticus, but before that time they were not used to drink wine at all, no, nor to pour it forth in sacrifice, as a thing they thought anyway grateful to the gods, but as the blood of those who in ancient times waged war against the gods, from whom, falling down from heaven, and mixing with the earth, they conceived vines to have first sprung; which is the reason, they say, that drunkenness first renders men beside themselves and mad, they being, as it were, gorged with the blood of their ancestors."

C.

The following are some extracts from *Soma Chants to Indra*. (Wilson's translation, pp. 67, 72, 195, 219, 229): "Indra delights in it from his birth: lord of bay horses, we wake thee up with sacrifices; acknowledging our praises in the exhilaration"

ration of the Soma beverage." "Be exhilarated by the Soma. The Soma is effused, the sweet juices poured into the vessels; this propitiates Indra." "Indra comes daily seeking for the offer of the libation. The pleasant beverage that thou, Indra, hast quaffed in former days thou still desirest to drink of daily; gratified in the heart and mind, and wishing our good, drink, Indra, the Soma that is placed before thee. As soon as born, Indra, thou hast drunk the Soma of thine invigoration. I proclaim the ancient exploits of Indra, the recent deeds that Maghavan has achieved: when indeed he had overcome the divine illusion, thenceforth the Soma became his exclusive beverage." "Indra verily is the chief drinker of the Soma among gods and men, the drinker of the effused libation, the acceptor of all kinds of offerings; whom others pursue with offerings of milk and curds as hunters chase a deer with nets and snares, and harass with inappropriate praises."

D.

While in London, early in 1900, one of the writers of this volume met a son of a Hindu nobleman who was studying law in England. While on a little frolic in his own country, together with some Europeans, he recklessly indulged in some wine and was found out. He had broken the law of Manu and had "lost caste," the most dreadful fate that can overtake a Hindu of any of the three upper classes. No one would sell him anything to eat or wear. His own mother would not recognise him. There was nothing left but to take his possessions and leave his country, never to return.

E.

One common Greek legend gives the following account of the origin of wine: Deucalion, the Noah of the Olympian theology, who peopled the earth after the flood, had a son Orestheus. Orestheus owned a dog which gave birth to a block of wood instead of pups as was her duty to do. The son buried the stick, which sprouted and became a grape vine.

F.

Hopewood, in his *History of Inebriating Liquors* (page 23), gives a valuable disquisition on the knowledge of the ancient Arabs and Saracens in distilling.

G.

The Parsees of India claim to be the theological descendants of the faith of Zoroaster, and are a very abstemious people. It is interesting to note that the present Secretary of the Indian Temperance Association, Mr. Dhanjibhai Dorabji Gilder, is a follower of Zoroaster and a Parsee.

CHAPTER II.

A.

The following typical classic toast is familiar to every student of Latin :

“ Te nominatum voco in bibendo.
Bene te ! Bene tibi !
Salutem tibi propino.
Bacchi tibi suminis haustus.”

B.

One of the famous *Excerpts of Ecgbright* enjoins “ that bishops and priests have a house for the entertainment of strangers, not far from the church.”

C.

Perhaps the famous monastic penance of St. Gildas the Wise (A. D. 570) should be excepted : “ If any monk through drinking too freely gets thick of speech so that he cannot join in the psalmody, he must be deprived of his supper.”

D.

From this pagan custom, the early German Christians got their practice of drinking in honour of the Saviour, a practice followed for centuries in Middle Europe.

E.

Samuelson, in his *History of Drink* (p. 107), gives a literal translation of an old Latin drink song, popular among the German students of the Middle Ages : “ The mistress drinks, the master drinks, the soldier drinks, the clergy drinks, the man drinks, the woman drinks, the man-servant together with the maid-servant drinks, the active drinks, the lazy drinks, the white drinks, the black drinks, the constant drinks, the fickle drinks, the learned drinks, the boor drinks, the poor and sick drink, the exile and stranger drink, the young and old drink, the dancer and dean drink, the sister and brother drink, the wife and mother drink, this one drinks, that one drinks, thousands drink.”

F.

The most important of the earlier laws was the act of 1496. The law was against “ vagabonds and beggars ” and empowered two justices of the peace “ to reject and put away comen ale-selling in townes and places where they shall think con-

venyent, and to take suertie of the keepers of ale-houses of their gode behavying, by discrecion of seid justices, and in the same to be avysed and agreed at the time of their sessions."

G.

The desires of those in authority may be instanced by the charge of Lord Keeper Egerton (1602) to the Judges as they were about to go on a circuit; he bade them ascertain, for the Queen's information, how many ale-houses the Justices of the Peace had pulled down, so that the good Justices might be rewarded and the evil removed.

H.

Dr. Eddy, in his *Alcohol in History*, thus describes some of the later clubs, successors of the Mermaid: "Clubs with outrageous names, and addicted to still more outrageous acts, were organised in this century, and continued their existence and depredations far into the next. Such were the Thieves who gloried in stealing and destroying property; the Lying Club, any member of which telling the truth between the hours of six and ten in the evening, paid a fine of a gallon of wine; the Bold Bucks, whose members all denounced the claims of God, and who, after disturbing divine service by parading back and forth before the churches with bands of music and boisterous shouts, sat down to dine on dishes named in blasphemous derision of sacred things, prominent among which was 'Holy Ghost pie,' after which they rushed into the streets, and shouting the motto: 'Blind and Bold Love,' committed the most horrible and disgusting atrocities; and the Sword Clubs, whose members, after getting roaring drunk at their suppers, took possession of the town, rushing violently about with sword in hand, demanding of all passers to defend themselves or suffer."

I.

French quotes Oliver Goldsmith as saying in the *Bee*: "Ale-houses are ever an occasion of debauchery and excess, and either in a religious or political light it would be our highest interest to have the greatest part of them suppressed. They should be put under laws of not continuing open beyond a certain hour, and harbouring only proper persons. These rules, it may be said, will diminish the necessary taxes; but this is false reasoning, since what was consumed in debauchery abroad would, if such a regulation took place, be more justly, and perhaps more equitably for the workmen, spent at home; and this, cheaper to them, and without loss of time. On the other hand, our ale-houses, being open, interrupt business."

CHAPTER III.

A.

One of the Governor's first acts was to discourage toasting. In his diary, Oct. 25, 1630, he records: "The Governor, upon consideration of the inconvenience which had grown up in England by drinking one to another, restrained it at his own table and wished others to do the like, so it grew, little by little, into disuse."

B.

These instructions read: "We pray you endeavor, though there be much strong waters sent for sale, yett see to order it, as that the salanges may not for lucre sake bee induced to the excessive use or rather abuse of it, and, at any hand, take care or people give us ill example; and if any shall exceed in that inordinate kind of drinking as to become drunk, wee hope you will take care his punishment be made exemplary for all others."

C.

Henry A. Miles, who ransacked the Massachusetts Colony revenue records for the purpose, estimates that, toward the close of the seventeenth century, the people of the colony consumed an annual average of two barrels per family of intoxicating liquor. In 1675, Cotton Mather stopped long enough in his pursuit of witches to declare that "every other house in Boston was an ale-house."

D.

Chief Justice Sewell, the famous persecutor of witches made the following entry in his diary regarding a visit to a Harvard function: "Sixth day, Oct. 1, 1679. Had first Butter, Honey, Curds and Cream. For diner, Very good Rost Lamb, Turkey, Fowls, Aplepy. After Diner, sung the 121 Psalm.

"*Note.*—A glass of spirits my wife sent stood upon a Joint-Stool which Simon W. joggling, it fell down and broke all to shivers. I said 'twas a lively emblem of our Fragility and Mortality."

CHAPTER V.

A.

It is interesting to note that Thomas Jefferson was once interested in the establishment of a brewery for temperance purposes. In a letter written to Charles Yancey, in 1815, he says: "There is before the Assembly (Virginia) a petition of a Captain Miller, which I have at heart, because I have great

esteem for the petitioner as an honest and useful man. He is about to settle in our country, and to establish a brewery, in which art I think he is as skillful a man as has ever come to America. I wish to see this beverage become common instead of the whiskey which kills one-third of our citizens, and ruins their families. He is staying with me until he can fix himself, and I shall be thankful for information from time to time of the progress of his petition." Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Ford edition, Vol. X., p. 2.

B.

The pledge of this society read: "We, the subscribers, having witnessed and heard of many cases of misery and ruin in consequence of the free use of ardent spirits, and desirous to prevent, if possible, so great evils; Therefore, Resolved: (1) We will abstain from the use of ardent spirits on all occasions, except when prescribed by a temperate physician. (2) We will discountenance all addresses by any of the male sex with a view of matrimony, if they shall be known to drink ardent spirits, either periodically, or on any public occasion. (3) We, as mothers, daughters, and sisters will use our influence to prevent the connection of any of our friends with a man who shall habitually drink any kind of ardent spirits."

C.

At the first meeting, Feb. 26, 1834, Benjamin F. Butler, then Attorney-General of the United States, introduced the following resolution, which was adopted:

"*Resolved*: That Temperance Associations, formed on the plan of entire abstinence from the drinking and furnishing of ardent spirit, in view of the evils they are designed to suppress and to prevent; the means by which they propose to effect this end; the good already accomplished; and the beneficial results which may be expected from their future triumphs, deserve to be ranked among the most useful and glorious institutions of the age, and are eminently entitled to the active support of every patriot and philanthropist."

CHAPTER VI.

A.

There is some disagreement about the date of this initial meeting. Burns puts the date at April 3, Blair and Dunn at April 2, while other authorities give it as April 5. Eddy states that the initial meeting was on April 2, at which time the committee was appointed and reported; that the discussion was continued from night to night till April 5, when the

pledge was drawn up and signed. As April 5 is the date on which the anniversaries were held, the version of Dr. Eddy is doubtless correct. The fifth annual report of the American Temperance Union (for 1841) gives the date as April 5, and does not mention any previous meetings. The number at the first meeting is generally given as six, but John H. W. Hawkins, in his famous Faneuil Hall speech, held in May, 1841, says, "Our society originated in a rum mill where twenty of us, all drunkards, resorted. Our pledge was drawn up, and first signed by six persons who now stand firm in the cause."

B.

These men were all from the humbler walks of life, and there is some uncertainty as to their correct names. The names given are those stated in the annual report of the American Temperance Union for the year 1842, and are doubtless correct. Dr. Burns gives the same list with a little variation in the spelling of two names. Dr. Eddy gives the list as: K. Mitchell, J. T. Hoss, D. Anderson, G. Steers, J. McConley and A. Campbell. Daniels gives the list as: William Mitchell, David Hoss, Charles Anderson, George Steer, Bill M'Curdy, and Tom Campbell.

C.

The form of pledge used by Father Mathew read:

"I promise, while I belong to the Teetotal Society, to abstain from all kinds of intoxicating drink, unless used medically; and that I will discountenance, by advice and example, the causes of intemperance in others."

D.

On page 392 of his autobiography. Mr. Gough says: "I had from the beginning advocated a prohibitory law. I was engaged expressly in Connecticut for that purpose previous to their election, and worked faithfully to that end—the enactment of the law. I do not profess to be able to grasp the legal and political question with the facility that many men possess. I suppose I lack the logical power—at least it is said that I do—and if God has not seen fit to bestow on me this faculty, I must try to use the power He has given me, and do the best I can. This I have tried conscientiously to do." On the occasion of his last visit to Edinburgh Mr. Gough said: "I wish to put myself right on prohibition. I am a thorough prohibitionist, for we must not only abstain, but educate public opinion to vote right at the ballot box on this question."

Dr. Eddy quotes Father Mathew as saying regarding prohibition: "The question of prohibiting the sale of ardent spirits, and the many other intoxicating drinks which are to be found in our country, is not new to me. The principle of

478 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

prohibition seems to be the only safe and certain remedy for the evils of intemperance. This opinion has been strengthened and confirmed by the hard labor of more than twenty years in the temperance cause."

CHAPTER VII.

A.

The following have been the Most Worthy Templars of the Supreme Temple from the beginning :

A. D. Wilson	New York.....	1846
Alex. Van Hamm	Ohio	1848
William R. Stacy	Massachusetts.....	1850
J. P. Simons.....	Pennsylvania.....	1852
Rev. G. B. Jocelyn, D.D.....	Indiana.....	1854
T. H. McMahon.....	Texas.....	1856
Rev. John Boynton.....	Michigan.....	1858
R. C. Bull.....	New York.....	1860
Alex. Van Hamm.....	Ohio.....	1862
George F. Turner.....	Pennsylvania.....	1864
Charles Leets.....	Massachusetts.....	1866
J. Wadsworth.....	Ohio.....	1868
A. H. Freeman.....	New Jersey.....	1870
Rev. A. W. Tibbitts.....	Ohio.....	1872
S. H. Wallace.....	Pennsylvania.....	1874
J. N. Stearns.....	New York.....	1876
F. H. Sage.....	Connecticut.....	1878
E. H. Clapp.....	Massachusetts.....	1880
Rev. A. H. Sembower.....	Pennsylvania.....	1882
Rev. C. S. Woodruff.....	New Jersey.....	1884
D. I. Robinson.....	Massachusetts.....	1886
W. O. Buckley.....	Connecticut.....	1888
D. McNally.....	New Brunswick.....	1889
A. L. Taylor.....	Ohio.....	1890
D. B. Bailey.....	Wisconsin.....	1892
D. B. Bailey.....	Wisconsin.....	1894
W. F. Tait	Illinois.....	1896
W. L. Condit.....	New Jersey.....	1898
G. C. Gates	Rhode Island.....	1900

B.

The presiding officers of the Grand Lodge of New York up to 1855 were the following :

Nathaniel Curtis.....	1852
Garry Chambers.	1852-3
Rev. D. W. Bristol.....	1853-4
Nathaniel W. Davis.....	1854-5

The presiding officers of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge and the International Supreme Lodge have been the following:

Rev. James M. Moore.....	Kentucky.....	1855-6
S. Merwin Smith.....	Pennsylvania.....	1856-7
Orlo W. Strong... ..	Illinois.....	1857-8
Hon. S. B. Chase.....	Pennsylvania.	1858-63
Hon. S. D. Hastings.....	Wisconsin.	1863-8
J. H. Orne, Esq.....	Massachusetts.....	1868-71
Rev. John Russell... ..	Michigan	1871-3
Hon. S. D. Hastings.....	Wisconsin.....	1873-4
Col. J. J. Hickman.....	Kentucky.....	1874-6
Col. Theo. D. Kanouse.....	Wisconsin.....	1876-8
Col. J. J. Hickman.....	Kentucky.....	1878-81
Geo. B. Katzenstein.....	California.....	1881-4
John B. Finch.....	Illinois.....	1884-9
Wm. W. Turnbull.....	Scotland.....	1889-91
Dr. Oronhyatekha.....	Canada	1891-93
Dr. D. H. Mann.	New York.....	1893-7
Joseph Malins.....	England	1897

The following are the present officers of the International Supreme Lodge:

- R. W. G. T., Joseph Malins, 168 Edmund St., Birmingham, England.
- P. R. W. G. T., Dr. D. H. Mann, 194 Clinton St., Brooklyn, New York.
- R. W. G. Cr., Geo. F. Cotterill, Seattle, Washington.
- R. W. G. V. T., Mrs. D. C. MacKellar, N. P. Manse, Denny, Scotland.
- R. W. G. S. J. T., Miss Jessie Forsyth, 80 State St., Boston, Mass.
- R. W. G. S., B. F. Parker, 208 Oneida St., Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- R. W. G. Tr., W. Martin Jones, Rochester. N. Y.
- R. W. G. A. S., D. C. Cameron, Choral Hall, Moray Place, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- R. W. G. Chap., Rev. F. B. Boyce, Sydney, New South Wales.
- R. W. G. Mar., John Fox Smith, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.
- R. W. G. D. Mar., Miss Charlotte A. Gray, Paris, France.
- R. W. G. G., Peter Svendsen, Trondhjem, Norway.
- R. W. G. Sent., Geo. W. Irving, Vernon River Bridge, Prince Edward Island.
- R. W. G. Mess., Miss Emilie Lindquist, Esloep, Sweden.

C.

The following were the presiding officers of the seceding organization during the ten years of its separate existence:

480 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

Rev. James Yeames.....	England.....	1876-7
Rev. William Ross.....	Scotland.....	1877-9
Rev. G. Gladstone.....	Scotland.....	1879-80
Joseph Malins.....	England.....	1880-5
Rev. W. C. Lane.....	Nova Scotia.....	1885-7

D.

The following table shows the number of members and subordinate Lodges under jurisdiction of the various Grand Lodges for the year ending May 1, 1899 :

	Members.	Subordinate Lodges.
Arizona.....	814.....	20
Alabama.....	297.....	9
British Columbia.....	609.....	20
California.....	2,041.....	70
Canada (Ontario).....	3,134.....	99
Central South Africa.....	2,389.....	42
Channel Islands.....	717.....	12
Colorado.....	368.....	13
Connecticut.....	714.....	25
Delaware.....	130.....	3
District of Columbia.....	527.....	12
Denmark.....	5,174.....	120
England.....	57,404.....	1,369
East South Africa.....	1,841.....	34
Florida.....	427.....	7
Florida, Junior.....	1,090.....	6
Georgia.....	1,215.....	32
Germany, No. 1.....	1,520.....	52
Germany, No. 2.....	1,286.....	40
Iceland.....	1,822.....	29
Ireland.....	7,241.....	151
Illinois.....	5,634.....	207
Indiana.....	2,515.....	36
Iowa.....	6,158.....	160
India.....	3,542.....	96
Idaho.....	250.....	10
Jamaica.....	220.....	6
Kansas.....	2,221.....	43
Kentucky.....	352.....	16
Madras.....	553.....	24
Maine.....	14,921.....	222
Manitoba.....	1,707.....	52
Maryland.....	822.....	13
Maryland, Junior.....	1,153.....	24
Massachusetts.....	6,847.....	173

	Members.	Subordinate Lodges.
Massachusetts, Junior.....	778.....	24
Michigan.....	7,204.....	122
Minnesota.....	3,327.....	82
Minnesota, Junior.....	2,147.....	51
Missouri.....	700.....	20
Montana.....	1,142.....	20
Natal.....	866.....	17
Nebraska.....	1,485.....	13
New Brunswick.....	4,459.....	68
New Hampshire.....	4,005.....	59
Nevada.....	353.....	13
Newfoundland.....
New Jersey.....	572.....	11
New York.....	24,559.....	463
New York, Junior.....	475.....	11
New Zealand.....	3,822.....	113
New South Wales.....	4,766.....	178
Norway.....	16,967.....	338
North Dakota.....	1,885.....	41
Nova Scotia.....	6,714.....	197
Oregon.....	625.....	27
Ohio.....	2,807.....	73
Pennsylvania.....	3,542.....	111
Prince Edward's Island....	1,229.....	28
Quebec	1,447.....	46
Queensland.....	1,225.....	32
Rhode Island.....	575.....	20
Scotland.....	42,883.....	688
South Australia.....	221.....	6
South Dakota.....	834.....	22
South Carolina.....	138.....	5
Sweden.....	83,256.....	1,511
Switzerland.....	1,601.....	50
Tasmania.....	434.....	10
Texas.....	1,378.....	30
Tennessee.....	365.....	11
Vermont.....	2,822.....	67
Victoria.....	669.....	25
Virginia.....	4,460.....	90
Washington.....	2,949.....	89
Wales (England).....	5,891.....	125
Wales (Welsh).....	3,580.....	85
West South Africa.....	2,776.....	53
West Virginia not reported.
West Australia.....	964.....	18
Wisconsin.....	11,675.....	289

482 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY.

	Members.	Subordinate Lodges.
Subordinate lodges subject directly to the Interna- tional Supreme Lodge....	1,020.....	37
Total of the above.....	403,287.....	8,361
Juvenile membership.....	172,839.....	2,877
Grand total.....	576,126.....	11,508

E.

The National Order of Good Templars, the Templars, the Verdanti, the Temperance Army and the Blue Ribbons of Sweden are also off shoots of the I. O. G. T.

CHAPTER VIII.

A.

Various events during the years 1846-7 indicated the healthy sentiment of the times. President James K. Polk had journeyed to Washington and opened his house without wine on his table. In a banquet given in his honour at Boston the Mayor of the city refused to preside if wines were served. At the inauguration of Edward Everett as President of Harvard University, six hundred distinguished citizens sat down to the inaugural feast without wine. The venerable Ex-President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, speaking at a public meeting in his own town, said: "I regard the temperance movement of the present day as one of the most remarkable phenomena of the human race, operating simultaneously in every part of the world for the reformation of a vice often solitary in itself, but as infectious in its nature as the small-pox or the plague, but combining all the ills of war, pestilence and famine. Among those who have fallen by intemperance are included untold numbers who were respected for their talents and worth, and exalted among their neighbours and countrymen." See Marsh, p. 142; also Burns, Vol. I., p. 280. In a speech at Springfield, Illinois, on February 22, 1842, Abraham Lincoln, said:

"Whether or not the world would be vastly benefited by the total and final banishment from it of all intoxicating drinks, seems to me not now an open question. Three-fourths of mankind confess the affirmative with their tongues; and, I believe, all the rest acknowledge it in their hearts. . . . And when the victory shall be complete—when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth—how proud the

title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace and the cradle of both those revolutions that shall have ended in that victory. How nobly distinguished that people who shall have planted and nurtured to maturity both the political and moral freedom of their species." Nicholay and Hay, *Speeches and Letters of Abraham Lincoln*, Vol. I., p. 63.

B.

The following extracts from Appleton's report shows its general character :

"We shall not question that it was the design of the licence laws to regulate and restrict the sale of ardent spirit and even to prevent its abuse ; but our present inquiry is not into the design, but the actual tendency of the law. This, we believe, has been to promote intemperance, to give it being and to continue it down to the present time. It first assumes what the united testimony of physicians and thousands of others have proved false ; that alcohol is necessary for common use ; and then makes provision that there shall be no deficiency, by making it the interest of a select few to keep it for sale. The mere circumstance, whether few or many keep it for sale, is unimportant, provided those who are licenced kept sufficient to supply the demand. It is the inevitable tendency of the shop and bar-room to decoy men from themselves and from their control ; and our whole experience under the licence laws of the state has proved how hopeless it is that such places should exist, and men not become intemperate. If the poison were not freely offered for sale under the sanction of the law, it could not—it would not—be purchased.

"The great test of the utility of any law is experience ; and by this rule the licence law has been most satisfactorily tried, and there is no reason for supposing that the amount of ardent spirits used has been less, but rather that the consumption was much greater in consequence of the law ; for the law has given character and respectability to the traffic, and has done much to fix on the minds of the public, the impression that rum was necessary, and that the public good required it.

"Go to the retailer and beseech him to empty his shop of the poison, and he will tell you that it is his regular lawful business ; that he is as much opposed to intemperance as you are, and that he always withholds the cup from the drunkard. You again appeal to his sympathy, and point him to the consequences of the traffic on all who use the article. He again replies, that the law has determined that a certain number of retailers are necessary to the public good, that he has paid his fee, and got his licence in his pocket, and that he cannot be answerable for the consequences. Now, it is very plain that the retailer is right, unless the law is wrong. Repeal the present law, and prohibit the sale, and then every man who ventured to sell rum would do so on his own responsibility

he could not plead the statute, nor throw off the reproach upon the state."

The report then summarizes the objections to licence laws and declares for a prohibitory policy in the following language :

"The objections, then, to licence laws are these :

"1. They assert or imply what is false in point of fact, viz., that ardent spirit is useful and necessary.

"2. That all laws are necessarily of injurious tendency which directly legalize any trade or business which is in itself destructive of the peace and virtue of society.

"3. That the manner in which the traffic is regulated is suited to give character and reputation to the trade, and, of course, to extend its evils far and wide.

"4. These laws oppose an insuperable obstacle to the cause of temperance ; so long as these laws exist, just so long intemperance will abound.

"Your committee are not only of the opinion that the law giving the right to sell ardent spirits should be repealed, but that a law should be passed to prohibit the traffic in them ; except so far as the arts or the practice of medicine may be concerned. The reasons for such a law are as numerous as the evils of intemperance. Such a law is required for the same reason that we make a law to prevent the sale of unwholesome meats ; or a law for the removal of any nuisance ; or any other laws which have for their object to secure the good of the people of the state in the quiet and peaceable enjoyment of their rights, and against any practice that endangers the health and life of the citizens, or which threatens to subvert our civil rights and overthrow our free government. We would prohibit the sale of ardent spirits because intemperance can never be suppressed without such prohibition. There is no more reason for supposing that this evil can be restrained without law, than for supposing that you can restrain theft, or gambling, or any other crime without law."

Anticipating the cry that "prohibition doesn't prohibit," the report said :

"It is in vain, therefore, to object to a law that it cannot prevent an offense it prohibits. We have a law against theft, but have we no larcenies ? Yet who would be secure in his property without the law ? So it is believed that a law to prevent the sale of ardent spirits would have the most salutary influence. It would then be as disgraceful to keep a rum shop as a gambling shop. Besides, the mere existence of such a law would exercise a most salutary influence on the public mind. It would of itself go to correct public opinion in regard to the necessity of ardent spirits ; for it is not more true that laws are an expression of public opinion, than that they influence and determine public opinion. They are as truly the cause as the effect of the popular will. It is of the nature of

law to mould the public mind to its requirements, and to fasten upon all an abiding impression of its value and necessity."

The assaults upon the constitutionality of the law, by Choate, Webster, Vest and a host of other advocates, were anticipated by General Appleton's report in these words:

"But it is too late to deny the right of the Legislature on this subject. It has already, in numerous cases, legislated on the sale of ardent spirits, and these acts have received the sanction of the highest judicial authorities. What are the present laws but a prohibition of the traffic to all who do not first obtain licence? It is only necessary to extend the prohibition to every citizen, and the whole object is at once obtained. And it appears evident to the committee that, if we have any law on the subject, it should be absolutely prohibitory. The trade is a public evil, or it is not; if it is, it is the right and duty of the legislature to stay it at once; if it is not an evil, it should be equally free to all.

"But the trade in ardent spirits is a public business carried on in the market places; and if it is found by experience that this business is necessarily ruinous to individuals, and a great public nuisance, there can be no question that it clearly comes within the right of the Legislature to suppress it. We would not prohibit the sale of ardent spirits because it is inconsistent with our religious and moral obligations—although doubtless this is the fact—but because the traffic is inconsistent with our obligations as citizens of the state, and subversive of our social rights and civil institutions."

Appleton's report had been preceded by a petition, in 1834, signed by "one hundred female citizens of Brunswick," of which the Legislature ordered five hundred copies printed. The petition read in part:

"We remonstrate against this method [liquor selling] of making rich men richer and poor men poorer, of making distressed families more distressed, of making a portion of the human family utterly and hopelessly miserable, debasing their moral natures, and thus clouding with despair their temporal and future prospects. Human misery, intense human misery, without a single incidental benefit is the result of the legalized iniquity against which we remonstrate. . . .

"Disclaiming all intentions of dictating to our civil fathers, we respectfully inquire if the pernicious traffic in ardent spirits cannot be prohibited, or confined within such limits as medical purposes may require; whether some legislative provision cannot be made in favor of the wives of the habitually intemperate, by which the wives may be entitled to their earnings and be legally protected against the society and intrusion of their husbands, during such time and subject to such limitations as your wisdom may provide.

"We further represent, as a peculiar and aggravated in-

justice to our sex, that in consequence of this nefarious traffic, the wives of the intemperate are in frequent instances driven by the force of mere despair to the same utterly destructive practices of intemperance; brutalizing themselves and entailing on society a race of vicious, brutified children."

C.

The liquor dealer's bonds required that he "support all paupers, widows, and orphans, and pay the expenses of all civil and criminal prosecution growing out of or justly attributable to such traffic. A married woman may sue for damages done to her husband, and no suit shall be maintained for liquor bills."

D.

After six months trial of the law in his state, the Governor had this to say regarding its working: (Marsh, p. 259.) "The Maine liquor law, in its operations, has been decidedly successful. Not a grog shop, so called, is to be found in the state since the law came into force. I do not mean that there are not a few dark spots, where, by falsehood and secrecy, evasion may be managed; but, in a word, the traffic is suspended. I have not seen a drunkard in the streets since the first of August. Crimes which directly result from rum have fallen away half. The opposition predicted to the enforcement of the law is not realized. Its enemies cannot get up an opposition to it, because it commends itself to all men's judgments; another reason is, the incentive to violence is taken away—riot is always preceded by rum. Take away the rum and you cannot have the riot. At the late State Agricultural Fair, from twenty-six thousand to thirty thousand people, of all conditions, were assembled, and not a solitary drunkard was seen, and not the slightest disturbance made. Some jails are almost tenantless. The home of the peaceable citizen was never more secure."

E.

The vote was as follows: For Clark, Fusion and Prohibition, 156,804; for Seymour, Anti-Prohibition, 156,495; for Ullman, Know Nothing, 122,232; for Bronson, Hard Democrat, 33,350.

F.

The vote in the House was 80 to 44, in the Senate 29 to 11. The victory cannot be credited to any particular party, as has been generally stated. It is true that Clark, the Fusion candidate, was also the candidate for the Whigs, but the party was not unanimous on the policy of prohibition. The vote in the bill in the House was politically distributed as follows:

	For	Against.
Whigs.....	54.....	10
Know Nothings.....	13.....	8
Soft Shell Democrats.....	8.....	16
Hard Shell Democrats.....	2.....	10
Republicans.....	3.....	
Total.....	80.....	44

Later both factions of the Democrats, the "Hard Shells" and the "Soft Shells," declared for the repeal of the law, and the bulk of the temperance sentiment drifted into the Republican party, which was then being formed.

CHAPTER IX.

A.

President Dodge's successors have been the Rev. Mark Hopkins, D.D., the Rev. Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D., Gen. O. O. Howard, and the present incumbent, Joshua L. Bailey. The society's catalogue of publications now includes over two thousand works ranging from the one page tract to the bound volume of one thousand pages.

B.

Dr. Dunn, in his *History of the Temperance Movement*, in the *Centennial Temperance Volume*, gives a very good statement of the state legislation for this period. H. H. Lyman, in his second annual report as Commissioner of Excise of the State of New York, gives a very good sketch of liquor legislation in the various states, which, however, contains numerous errors.

C.

At the Republican state convention held in Topeka, in 1882, the following plank was inserted in the platform:

"Resolved: That we declare ourselves unqualifiedly in favour of the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and pledge ourselves to such additional legislation as shall secure the rigid enforcement of the constitutional provision upon this subject, in all parts of the state."

D.

After Mr. Crowell's interview with Colonel Cheves, he became solicitous about the information he had imparted, and wrote to Colonel Cheves, April 1, 1890:

"The conversation we had was a matter, to a great extent, of the strictest confidence, and a part of it should be kept secret, and not used as I gave it to you. That was about our

United States Senator. Should you make use of that in connection with my name it would do me a great injury, and if it got to his ears would be the means of doing your cause a great deal of harm; consequently, my advice to you is to be very careful, and not let the matter get any publicity."

CHAPTER X.

A.

Under date of May 15, 1901, Mr. H. W. Hardy, the "Father of High Licence," who was largely responsible for the enactment of the original high licence law of Nebraska, writes from Lincoln, Nebraska, to one of the authors of this volume regarding the policy which he once so warmly espoused:

"The high licence law is a measure best calculated to deceive honest temperance people of anything that has ever come to the surface. We supposed that it was a step in the right direction, but after a year or two we discovered it was a step the other way. We were not long deceived. John B. Finch was our right hand man in constructing the ordinance for the city of Lincoln, and when it was made a state law, every temperance man and woman was equally deceived. It reduced the number of saloons in the city of Lincoln from twenty-two to five, but it did not reduce the drink curse one bit; it actually made the saloons more respectable and thus they became a stronger temptation to young men. When simmered down it is nothing more or less than the people going into partnership with the saloon-keeper and taking a part of the profits. It thus serves as a bribe to the voter. Hundreds of church members in the city of Lincoln vote for the continuance of the licence system just for the forty thousand dollars that we get out of the profits, and it is just as bad everywhere. We look back upon the part we took in the matter as the mistake of our life. If left to the liquor dealers alone, high licence would receive nine-tenths of their votes. It is actually a saloon perpetuator."

CHAPTER XI. .

A.

A distinguished exception to this statement is furnished by that noble veteran of many reforms, Susan B. Anthony. This lady began her public career in 1847 (being then twenty-seven years old) in New York State, as a temperance lecturer and organizer. A few years later she was refused admission to a temperance convention on account of her sex, and in 1851 she herself called a temperance convention at Albany. In 1852 she helped to organize the Woman's New York State Temperance Society. Dr. Marsh in his *Temperance Recollec-*

tions records as a prodigy that, at the World's Temperance Convention in New York, in 1853, "a female from western New York presented herself on the platform, expressing much interest in the cause, and asking to be received as a delegate from two societies. Admitted."

B.

The subsequent National Conventions of the Society have been held at the times and places following: Cincinnati, Ohio, 1875; Newark, N. J., 1876; Chicago, Ill., 1877; Baltimore, Md., 1878; Indianapolis, Ind., 1879; Boston, Mass., 1880; Washington, D. C., 1881; Louisville, Ky., 1882; Detroit, Mich., 1883; St. Louis, Mo., 1884; Philadelphia, Pa., 1885; Minneapolis, Minn., 1886; Nashville, Tenn., 1887; New York, N. Y., 1888; Chicago, Ill., 1889; Atlanta, Ga., 1890; Boston, Mass., 1891; Denver, Colo., 1892; Chicago, Ill., 1893; Cleveland, Ohio, 1894; Baltimore, Md., 1895; St. Louis, Mo., 1896; Buffalo, N. Y., 1897; St. Paul, Minn., 1898; Seattle, Wash., 1899; Washington, D. C., 1900; Ft. Worth, Texas, 1901.

C.

The following are the present officers of the National W. C. T. U. (1902): president, Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, 150 Free Street, Portland, Me; vice-president-at-large, Miss Anna A. Gordon, Rest Cottage, Evanston, Ill.; corresponding secretary, Mrs. Susanna M. D. Fry, Rest Cottage, Evanston, Ill.; recording secretary, Mrs. Clara C. Hoffman, Kansas City, Mo.; assistant recording secretary, Mrs. Frances E. Beauchamp, Lexington, Ky.; treasurer, Mrs. Helen M. Barker, Evanston, Ill. The national headquarters are at Rest Cottage, Evanston, Ill.

D.

The following are the countries where the W. C. T. U. has been planted, with the name of the present national president of each, and the date of organisation:

- 1874—United States: Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, Portland, Me.
 1876—Great Britain: Lady Henry Somerset, Eastnor Castle, Ledbury.
 1882—New South Wales: Mrs. J. A. Nolan, Montague St., Balmain, Sydney.
 1883—Canada: Mrs. Rutherford, 94 Spencer Ave., Toronto.
 1885—New Zealand: Mrs. A. J. Schnackenburg, Auckland.
 1885—Queensland: Mrs. Carvosso, Arthur St., New Farm, Brisbane.
 1885—Victoria: Mrs. McLean, William St., Windsor.
 1885—South Australia: Mrs. Lyall, 3 Hutt St., Adelaide.
 1885—Tasmania: Mrs. Rooke, Burnie, Emu Bay.
 1886—Bulgaria: Mrs. Gavril-Gedikoff, Philippopolis.

490 TEMPERANCE PROGRESS OF THE CENTURY

- 1886—Japan : Mrs. Kaji Yajima, Tokyo.
 1886—China : Mrs. M. J. Farnham, 12 Range Ave., Shanghai.
 1887—Siam : Mrs. George B. McFarland, Bangkok.
 1887—Straits Settlement : Mrs. Gusta M. Morgan, Malaysia Mission, Singapore.
 1887—Burma : Mrs. Glenora Green-Hill (Acting President), Rangoon.
 1887—India : Mrs. Hoskins, Cawnpore.
 1887—Cape Colony : Mrs. John Mackay, Port Elizabeth.
 1888—Madagascar : Mrs. Pearse, L. M. S. College House, North Antananarivo.
 1888—France :
 1888—Denmark : Miss Astrid Blume, Silkeborg.
 1889—Chili : Miss Adda Burch, Casilla, 250, The College, Concepcion.
 1889—Natal : Mrs. Fernie, Congregational Manse, Sydenham.
 1889—Orange River Colony : Mrs. Mary W. Gray, The Manse, Pretoria, Transvaal.
 1889—Sierra Leone :
 1890—Korea :
 1890—The Bahamas : Mrs. Annie W. Dillet, P.O. Box 176, Nassau, New Providence.
 1890—Newfoundland : Mrs. J. E. P. Peters, St. John's.
 1891—Egypt : Miss A. Y. Thompson, American Mission, Cairo.
 1891—Madeira Islands : Mrs. Smart, Funchal, Madeira.
 1891—Spain : Mrs. Alice Gordon Gulick ; (Temporary address) Biarretz, France.
 1891—Italy : Miss Vickery, Plazzo Moroni Vicola, San Nicola de Tolentina, Rome.
 1891—Greece.
 1891—The Transvaal : Mrs. Mary W. Gray, The Manse, Pretoria.
 1891—Australasia : Mrs. E. W. Nichols, Dutton Road, Medinie, Adelaide.
 1892—Argentina : Miss Mary F. Swaney, 949 Calle Comercio Rosario.
 1892—Uruguay : Miss Van Dornselaar, 36 Calle Asamblea, Montevideo.
 1892—Brazil : Miss M. H. Watts, Collegio Americano, Petropolis, Rio Janeiro.
 1892—Norway : Miss Johannessen, Nordahl Brundgade 5, Bergen.
 1892—Jamaica : Mrs. Abercombie, Kingston.
 1892—West Australia : Mrs. Ferguson, Arundle St., Fremantle.
 1893—The Netherlands :
 1894 —Austria : Baroness Langenau, 12 Dorothea Casse, Vienna.
 1894—Mexico : Mrs. B. B. Blachley, Guadalajara, Jalisco.

- 1895—Finland : Fru Helenius, Helsingfors.
 1896—Germany : Fraulein Otilie Hoffman, 28 Dodden, Bremen.
 1896—Iceland : Miss Olfia Johannsdottir, Reykjavik.
 1896—Belgium : Madam Keelhof, 2 Rue de l'Industrie, Brussels.
 1896—Ireland : Mrs. Crawford, 25 Lesson Park, Dublin.
 1896—Turkey : Mrs. Shepherd, M.D., Central College, Antib.
 1896—Panama : Miss Marie Duchatellier, Panama, Isthmus of Panama.
 1896—Sweden.
 1897—Syria : Mrs. H. H. Jessup, Beirut.
 1897—Armenia : Miss Rebecca Krekorian, Dr. Simpson's Bible Institute, Nyack, N.J., U.S.A.
 1898—Ceylon : Dr. Lucile Leslie, Cinnamon Gardens, Colombo.
 1899—Bermuda : Mrs. Christie, The Manse, Paget.
 1899—British Honduras : Mrs. Watrous, Punta Gorda.
 1900—West Indies : Mrs. Shafner-Ethier, Calle de Vol, Ponce, Porto Rico.

E.

The conventions of the World's W. C. T. U. have been held as follows : Boston, U. S., in 1891 ; Chicago, Ill., in 1893 ; London, England, in 1895 ; Toronto, Canada, in 1897, and Edinburgh, Scotland, 1900.

The present officers (1902) are : Lady Henry Somerset, president ; Mrs. Lillian M. N. Stevens, vice-president at-large ; Agnes E. Slack and Anna A. Gordon, secretaries, and Mrs. Mary E. Sanderson, treasurer.

F.

In Canada, temperance instruction is required by law in the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario, and Prince Edward Island. In Quebec, it is optional. It was introduced into the schools of one province in Belgium in 1887. Ten years later, it was extended to the whole country. In Finland, twenty of the thirty-six towns have been granted government aid for temperance instruction. Compulsory temperance instruction with special text books is the law of Natal.

Twenty-five schools of Burma give temperance instruction. It is now being introduced into Switzerland and into Australia, and the question of its introduction is being agitated in Germany.

A few of the red ribbon reform clubs still exist. Probably the most important is the Red Ribbon Club of Lincoln, Nebraska, of which Dr. T. J. Merryman is president. This club has held regular Sunday afternoon meetings since the year 1877 and has a record of over twenty thousand signers to its pledge. It has five thousand members.

H.

For further information on the subjects treated in this chapter see the *Centennial Temperance Volume*, especially pp. 698, 705; "Mother" Stewart's *Memories of the Crusade*; and Frances E. Willard's *Glimpses of Fifty Years and Woman and Temperance*.

CHAPTER XII.

A.

This document was signed by the following men: R. M. Foust, of Philadelphia; J. H. Orne, of Marblehead, Massachusetts; Joshua Wadsworth, of Cincinnati; S. W. Hodges, of Boston; J. A. Spencer, of Cleveland, Ohio; R. C. Bull, of Philadelphia; H. D. Cushing, of Boston; Rev. Peter Stryker, of Philadelphia; Joshua Nye, of Waterville, Maine; Rev. Samuel McKean, of Cambridge, New York; T. M. van Court, of Chicago; Rev. J. G. D. Stearns, of Clearwater, Michigan; William Hargreaves, M.D., of Reading, Pennsylvania; D. W. Gage, of Ames, Iowa; Rev. J. C. Stoughton, of Chicago; P. Mason, of Somerville, New Jersey; Rev. Edwin Thompson, of Boston; Rev. Elnathan Davis, of Fitchburg, Massachusetts; Ebenezer Bowman, of Taunton, Massachusetts; B. E. Hale, of Brooklyn; J. F. Forbes, of Cincinnati; Samuel Foljambe, of Cleveland; L. B. Silver, of Salem, Ohio; O. P. Downs, of Warsaw, Indiana; G. N. Jones, of Chicago; Dr C. H. Merrick, of Cleveland; Jay Odell, of Cleveland; Rev. William C. Hendrickson, of Bristol, Pennsylvania; Enoch Passmore, of Kennett Square, Pennsylvania; Neal Dow, of Portland, Maine; Rev. John Russell, of Detroit; James Black, Lancaster, Pennsylvania; Charles Jewett, of Pomona, Tennessee; Rev. James B. Dunn, of Boston; Rev. George Lansing Taylor, of New York City; John O'Donnell, of Lowville; Rev. William M. Thayer, of Franklin, Massachusetts; Rev. N. E. Cobleigh, Athens, Tennessee; Peterfield Trent, M.D., of Richmond, Virginia; J. N. Stearns, of New York City; Rev. William Hosmer, of Auburn, New York; Rev. S. H. Platt, of Brooklyn; S. T. Montgomery, of Indianapolis; Rev. G. H. Ball, of Buffalo; George P. Burwell, of Cleveland; G. N. Abbey, of Cleveland; Luther S. Kauffman, of Minersville, Pennsylvania; A. T. Procter, of Cleveland; George S. Tambling, Jr., of Cleveland; H. V. Horton, of Cincinnati; Rev. Moses Smith, of Xenia, Ohio; Gen. J. S. Smith, of Kingston, New York; T. P. Hunt, of Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania; D. R. Pershing, of Warsaw, Indiana; George Gabel, of Philadelphia; William H. Fries, of Clinton, Pennsylvania; and S. J. Coffin, of Easton, Pennsylvania.

B.

A table of the votes cast by the Prohibition party in the

Presidential elections since its formation follows. The figures for 1888, 1892, 1896, and 1900 are taken from the New York *World Almanac*, those for the preceding years from Waldron's Prohibition Hand book.

PROHIBITION PARTY VOTES FOR PRESIDENT.

STATE.	1872. Black.	1876. Smith.	1880. Dow.	1884. St. John.	1888. Fisk.	1892. Bidwell.	1896. Levering.	1900. Woolley.
Alabama				613	583	239	2,147	2,762
Arkansas					641	113	839	584
California			*61	2,960	5,761	8,096	2,573	5,024
Colorado				761	2,191	1,652	1,717	3,790
Connecticut	205	378	409	2,305	4,234	4,026	1,808	1,617
Delaware				64	400	564	355	533
Florida				72	423	561	1,778	2,234
Georgia				168	1,808	988	5,613	1,396
Idaho						288	179	857
Illinois		141	443	12,074	21,695	25,870	9,796	17,626
Indiana		38		3,023	9,881	13,050	3,056	13,718
Iowa		36	592	1,472	3,550	6,343	3,192	9,502
Kansas		110	25	4,495	6,779	4,553	1,921	3,605
Kentucky		818	258	3,139	5,225	6,442	4,781	3,780
Louisiana				328	160			
Maine			93	2,160	2,691	3,062	1,570	2,585
Maryland		10		2,827	4,767	5,877	5,918	4,582
Massachusetts		84	682	9,923	8,701	7,539	2,998	6,202
Michigan	1,271	767	942	18,403	20,942	20,857	5,025	11,859
Minnesota		144	236	4,684	15,311	14,017	4,343	8,467
Mississippi					218	910	485	
Missouri		64		2,153	4,539	4,298	2,169	5,965
Montana						549	186	298
Nebraska		1,599		2,899	9,420	4,902	1,193	3,655
Nevada					41	89		
N. Hampshire	200		180	1,570	1,566	1,296	779	1,270
New Jersey		43	191	6,153	7,904	8,131	5,614	7,183
New York	201	2,329	1,517	24,999	30,231	38,193	16,052	22,043
N. Carolina				454	2,789	2,635	675	1,006
N. Dakota						899	358	731
Ohio	2,100	1,636	2,616	11,069	24,356	26,012	5,068	10,203
Oregon				492	1,677	2,281	919	2,536
Pennsylvania	1,630	1,319	1,939	15,283	20,947	25,122	19,274	27,908
Rhode Island		68	20	923	1,250	1,654	1,160	1,529
S. Carolina			43					
South Dakota							685	1,542
Tennessee				1,131	5,969	4,856	3,098	3,900
Texas				3,534	4,749	2,165	1,786	2,644
Utah								205
Vermont				1,752	1,460	1,424	733	368
Virginia				183	1,682	2,798	2,350	2,150
Washington						2,553	968	2,363
W. Virginia				739	1,084	2,145	1,208	1,585
Wisconsin		153	69	7,656	14,277	13,132	7,509	10,124
Wyoming						530	136	
Totals	5,607	9,737	10,366	150,626	249,907	279,191	132,009	209,936

* Returned as "scattering," but nearly all, if not all, were cast for Dow.

CHAPTER XIV.

A.

These are as follows :

NOVA SCOTIA.	NEW BRUNSWICK.	P. E. ISLAND.	QUEBEC.	MANITOBA.
Annapolis. Cape Breton. Cumberland. Digby. Guysborough Hants. Inverness. King's. Pictou. Queen's. Shelbourne. Yarmouth.	Albert. Carleton. Charlotte. Fredericton. Kings. Northumberland. Queen's. Sunbury. Westmoreland. York.	King's. Queen's. Prince.	Richmond.	Lisgar. Marquette.

B.

In proposing the resolution in the Liberal convention the Hon. Sydney A. Fisher, now Minister of Agriculture, said : " I propose to read the resolution which will bring about this result, and which pledges the Liberal party, if returned to power, to give the people of Canada an opportunity to express their views upon this question, and the Government in power must necessarily carry out the expressed will of the people. There is no doubt that this is what the Liberal party would do, for we know their pledges can be trusted."

To a deputation of Winnipeg prohibitionists, Sir Wilfrid Laurier made a statement in 1894, which was reported as follows: " He would pledge his honour that as soon as the Liberals came into power at Ottawa they would take a plebiscite of the Dominion by which the party would stand, and the will of the people would be carried out even were it to cost power forever to the Liberal party."

During the discussion of the plebiscite bill in the House of Commons the Premier also stated at different times that when the will of the people was ascertained, the Government would have to take such steps as would give effect to that will. On other occasions similar statements were made by different members of the Government.

C.

Sir Wilfrid's letter in full was as follows :

" OTTAWA, 4th March, 1899.

" DEAR MR. SPENCE : When the delegation of the Dominion Alliance waited upon the Government last fall to ask, as a consequence of the plebiscite, the introduction of prohibitory legislation, they based their demand upon the fact that

on the total of the vote cast there was a majority in favor of the principle of prohibition. The exact figures of the votes recorded were not at that time accurately known, but the official figures, which we have now, show that on the question put to the electors, 278,487 voted yea, and 264,571 voted nay. After the official figures had been made public, it was contended by some of the opponents of prohibition that the margin of difference between the majority and the minority was so slight that it practically constituted a tie, and there was, therefore, no occasion for the Government to pronounce one way or the other. The Government does not share that view. We are of the opinion that the fairest way of approaching the question is by the consideration of the total vote cast in favor of prohibition, leaving aside altogether the vote recorded against it.

“In that view of the question, the record shows that the electorate of Canada, to which the question was submitted, comprised 1,233,849 voters, and of that number less than 23 per cent., or a trifle over one-fifth, affirmed their conviction of the principle of prohibition.

“If we remember that the object of the plebiscite was to give an opportunity to those who have at heart the cause of prohibition, who believed that the people were with them, and that if the question were voted upon by itself, without any other issue which might detract from its consideration, a majority of the electorate would respond, and thus show the Canadian people prepared and ready for its adoption, it must be admitted that the expectation was not justified by the event. On the other hand, it was argued before us by yourself and others, that as the plebiscite campaign was carried out by the friends of prohibition without any expenditure of money and without the usual excitement of political agitation, the vote recorded in favor of it was comparatively a large one. This statement I did not then controvert, nor do I controvert it here and now. I would simply remark that the honesty of the vote did not suffer from the absence of those causes of excitement, and that even if the totality of the vote might have been somewhat increased by such cause, its moral force would not have been made any stronger. I venture to submit for your consideration, and the consideration of the members of the Dominion Alliance, who believe in prohibition as the most efficient means of suppressing the evils of intemperance, that no good purpose would be served by forcing upon the people a measure which is shown by the vote to have the support of less than 23 per cent. of the electorate. Neither would it serve any good purpose to enter into further controversy on the many incidental points discussed before us. My object is to simply convey to you the conclusion that, in our judgment, the expression of public opinion recorded at the polls in favor of prohibition, did not

represent such a proportion of the electorate vote as would justify the introduction by the Government of a prohibitory measure.

“ I have the honor to be, dear Mr. Spence,
 “ Yours very sincerely,
 “ WILFRID LAURIER.”

CHAPTER XV.

A.

Their names were John Gratrix, Edward Dickinson, John Broadbelt, John Smith, Joseph Livesey, David Anderton, and John King. These men originated the reform in question in the sense that their propaganda was the first which had wide influence. Others had advocated total abstinence before them. Thus, in 1814, Basil Montagu, Q. C., had published a pamphlet entitled: *Some Inquiries into the Effects of Fermented Liquors by a Water Drinker*, advising total abstinence. Also, in 1817 Jeffrey Ledwards, a reformed sailor of Skibbereen, Ireland, formed a total abstinence society, which reached a membership of five hundred. “The Skibbereens,” however, represented a purely local movement.

B.

Dicky Turner—a homely and rugged reformer, like the rest—in addressing a meeting of workingmen in the Cock Pit of Preston in September, 1832, said: “I’ll be a reet down out-and-out t-t-totaler,” repeating the *t* for emphasis. “This shall be the name of our new pledge,” cried Livesey, and the word *teetotaler* forthwith became a common word in England. Although it had been used in America before (see *supra*, p. 70), yet there can be no doubt that it was original with Dicky Turner.

C.

The present *British League Temperance Advocate* is the successor of this paper, and is therefore probably the oldest total abstinence paper in the world.

D.

This society is sometimes referred to as the British Society for the Suppression of Intemperance. Dr. Burns uses the name in the text, and Whittaker the other. Since both refer to a Manchester organisation which later became the British Temperance League, there can be no doubt that the two names are identical. To add to the confusion, the society is also sometimes called the British Temperance Association.

E.

ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS CONSUMED IN THE UNITED KINGDOM IN THE CENTURY.

Decennial Period.	Yearly Average Population.	Yearly Average Consumption (gals.)		
		Beer.	Wine.	Spirits.
Year 1800...	15,680,000	286,930,000	7,290,000	11,980,000
1800-09 * ...	16,780,000	478,390,000	6,390,000	13,930,000
1810-19.....	19,300,000	475,940,000	5,110,000	14,730,000
1820-29.....	22,500,000	559,840,000	5,800,000	19,810,000
1830-39.....	25,180,000	718,370,000	6,490,000	23,500,000
1840-49.....	27,000,000	680,030,000	6,240,000	25,560,000
1850-59.....	28,020,000	735,270,000	6,850,000	30,580,000
1860-69	29,760,000	780,770,000	11,900,000	27,520,000
1870-79.....	32,640,000	1,048,750,000	16,850,000	37,720,000
1880-89.....	35,900,000	980,640,000	14,280,000	35,710,000
1890-1900...	38,980,000	1,171,240,000	15,210,000	39,220,000
Year 1900...	40,920,000	1,317,250,000	16,660,000	48,070,000

* Inclusive.

F.

An International Conference against the Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors was held in Antwerp in 1885. This has been followed by similar conferences at the following times and places: 1887, Zurich; 1890, Christiania; 1893, The Hague; 1895, Basle; 1897, Brussels; 1899, Paris; 1900, London; 1901, Vienna. From 1887 to 1895 these Conferences were called International Congresses against the Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors. Since that year they have been called International Congresses against Alcohol.

G.

For further information on the subjects treated in this chapter see Whittaker, *Life's Battles in Temperance Armour*; McGuire, *Life of Father Mathew*; Burns, *Temperance in the Victorian Age*; Charlotte A. Gray, *Temperance in all Nations*; Dorchester, *The Liquor Problem*; the National Temperance League's, *Handbook of Temperance History*; and W. B. Luke, *Sir Wilfrid Lawson*.

CHAPTER XVIII.

A.

In 1889 the people of South Dakota adopted prohibition as a part of the state Constitution by a vote of 40,234 to 34,510.

In 1894 a vigorous attempt to resubmit the prohibitory amendment was defeated. In 1896 the amendment was again submitted to the people with the following results : For repeal, 31,901 ; against repeal, 24,910. In 1898 the people voted upon a proposed dispensary amendment to their Constitution with this result : For a dispensary, 22,170 ; against a dispensary, 20,557. At the election of 1900, the people voted upon a proposition to repeal the dispensary amendment. The repeal was carried with the following vote : For repeal, 48,673 ; against repeal, 33,927. The effect of this, so the courts ruled, was to leave the old licence law in force.

B.

Further information regarding Russia and Finland may found in the journal of the World's Temperance Congress held in London in 1900 ; the report of the International Congress for the Prevention of the Abuse of Alcohol, held in Christiania in 1880 ; the British *Foreign Office Reports*, miscellaneous series, 1898, No. 465 ; and the *Manchester Alliance News*, May 23, 1910.

CHAPTER XXII.

A.

Since 1892, the beer hall only has been known as the canteen. The entire establishment is officially designated as the " post-exchange," of which the canteen is a department.

B.

A clerk in the Adjutant-General's office mailed a copy of the opinion, by mistake, with other matter to Dr. W. F. Crafts, superintendent of the International Reform Bureau at Washington. General Lieber admitted having rendered the opinion.

C.

Further information on temperance in the army may be found in the following works : Drake, *History of Boston* ; Dorchester, *The Liquor Problem* ; Cross, *Military Laws of the United States : Revised Army Regulations* (of the United States army) (1861 and 1863) ; William P. F. Ferguson, *The Canteen in the United States Army* ; the journal of the World's Temperance Congress, held in London in 1900, and the *National Temperance League's Annual* for 1901.

GENERAL APPENDICES.
CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS IN THE UNITED STATES DURING THE CENTURY.

FISCAL YEAR.	GALLONS CONSUMED.				GALS. PER CAPITA CONSUMED.			
	Spirits.		Wines.		Malt Liquors.		Total.	
	Spirits.	Wines.	Malt Liquors.	Total.	Spirits.	Wines.	Malt Liquors.	Total.
1800.....	7,348,222	1,679,185	1.38	0.31
1810.....	29,890,539	1,164,592	4.11	0.16
1820.....	1,754,322	0.12
1830.....	2,666,594	0.21
1840.....	43,060,884	4,873,096	28,310,843	71,244,823	2.52	0.29	1.86	4.17
1850.....	51,833,473	6,315,871	36,563,009	94,712,353	2.23	0.27	1.58	4.08
1860.....	89,968,651	11,059,141	101,346,669	202,374,461	2.86	0.35	3.22	6.44
1870.....	79,895,708	12,225,067	204,756,156	296,876,931	2.07	0.32	5.31	7.70
1871.....	64,059,661	15,834,063	241,138,127	321,031,851	1.62	0.40	6.10	8.12
1772.....	68,422,280	16,682,037	270,298,916	355,403,233	1.68	0.41	6.66	8.75
1873.....	68,037,139	18,847,031	300,697,262	387,581,432	1.63	0.45	7.21	9.30
1874.....	64,540,090	20,468,714	299,521,065	384,529,869	1.51	0.48	7.00	8.97
1875.....	66,120,558	19,991,330	294,953,157	381,065,045	1.50	0.45	6.71	8.61
1876.....	59,983,890	20,161,808	308,336,387	388,982,085	1.28	0.45	6.83	8.69
1877.....	59,420,118	21,876,330	304,926,667	386,223,115	1.22	0.47	6.58	8.33
1878.....	51,931,941	22,263,949	317,969,352	392,165,242	1.09	0.47	6.68	8.24
1889.....	54,278,475	24,377,130	344,605,485	423,261,090	1.11	0.50	7.05	8.66
1880.....	63,526,694	28,320,541	414,220,165	506,076,400	1.27	0.56	8.26	10.90

CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS IN THE UNITED STATES DURING THE CENTURY.—Continued.

FISCAL YEAR.	GALLONS CONSUMED.				GALS. PER CAPITA CONSUMED.					
	Wines.		Malt Liquors.		Spirits.		Wines.		Malt Liquors.	
	Spirits.	Total.	Spirits.	Total.	Spirits.	Total.	Spirits.	Total.		
1881.....	70,607,081	24,162,925	444,112,169	538,882,175	1.88	0.47	8.65	10.50		
1882.....	73,556,976	25,502,927	526,379,980	625,499,883	1.40	0.49	10.03	11.92		
1883.....	78,452,687	25,778,180	557,497,940	655,728,207	1.46	0.48	10.27	12.21		
1884.....	81,128,581	20,508,345	590,016,517	691,653,443	1.48	0.37	10.74	12.60		
1885.....	70,600,092	21,900,457	596,131,866	688,632,415	1.26	0.39	10.62	12.26		
1886.....	72,261,614	25,567,220	642,967,720	740,796,554	1.26	0.45	11.20	12.90		
1887.....	71,064,733	32,325,061	717,748,854	822,558,648	1.21	0.55	12.23	13.99		
1888.....	75,845,352	36,335,068	767,587,056	879,767,476	1.26	0.61	12.80	14.67		
1889.....	80,613,158	34,144,477	779,897,426	894,655,061	1.32	0.56	12.72	14.60		
1890.....	87,829,562	28,956,981	855,792,335	972,578,878	1.40	0.46	13.67	15.53		
1891.....	91,157,565	29,033,792	977,479,761	1,097,671,118	1.43	0.45	15.31	17.19		
1892.....	98,328,118	28,467,860	987,496,223	1,114,292,201	1.51	0.44	15.17	17.12		
1893.....	101,197,753	31,987,819	1,074,546,336	1,207,731,908	1.52	0.48	16.20	18.20		
1894.....	90,541,209	21,293,124	1,036,319,222	1,148,153,555	1.34	0.31	15.32	16.97		
1895.....	77,828,561	19,644,019	1,043,292,106	1,140,764,716	1.13	0.28	15.13	16.54		
1896.....	71,051,877	18,701,406	1,080,626,165	1,170,379,448	1.01	0.26	15.38	16.66		
1897.....	73,166,833	38,588,307	1,069,310,262	1,181,065,402	1.02	0.53	14.94	16.50		
1898.....	81,467,587	20,567,317	1,164,226,462	1,266,281,366	1.12	0.28	15.96	17.36		
1899.....	87,310,228	26,360,696	1,135,520,629	1,249,191,553	1.17	0.35	15.28	16.80		
1900.....	97,248,332	30,427,491	1,221,500,160	1,349,176,033	1.27	0.40	16.01	17.68		
1901.....	103,086,839	28,791,149	1,258,249,391	1,390,127,379	1.33	0.37	16.20	17.90		

B.

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE ONTARIO LIQUOR
ACT OF 1902.

I. LICENCES.

1. *Kinds of Licences.*—The act provides for two kinds of licences, druggists' wholesale licences and druggists' retail licences. They are defined as follows by the act :

“The expression ‘druggist’s wholesale licence shall mean a licence authorising a chemist or druggist duly registered as such under and by virtue of the pharmacy act, to sell, subject to the provisions of this act, in the warehouse or store defined in such licence, alcohol not exceeding in quantity ten gallons at any one time to any person for mechanical or scientific purposes, and to sell to any duly registered practitioner, and to any druggist holding a druggist’s retail licence, but to no other, liquor not exceeding in quantity five gallons at any one time.” (Section 105, f.)

“The expression ‘druggist’s retail licence’ shall mean a licence authorising a chemist or druggist duly registered and licenced to practice and carry on business as such under and by virtue of the pharmacy act, to sell liquor for medical and sacramental purposes only, in the store defined in such licence, subject to the further provisions relating to druggists’ retail licence and to the other general provisions of this act.” (Section 105, g.)

2. *Conditions Governing the Granting of Licences.*—Every application for a licence must be accompanied by the affidavits of the applicant and two reputable persons verifying the statements of the application. The applicant must be “a person of good reputation and character and . . . without a conviction of any offence against any of the provisions of this act or any previous liquor licence act within three years prior to his application.” The applicant must give bond jointly with two sureties, to the amount of \$1,000, and obey the act and pay the penalties which may be incurred by its breach. All applications must be filed with the chief inspector in Toronto on or before March 1 of the year from which the licence is to date. Before any action is taken on any applications for a licence, a list of all the applications on file is to be published in the *Ontario Gazette*, and in each locality represented by an applicant such part of this list as affects that locality is to be published in a local newspaper. Opportunity is thus given to the people of a locality to raise objection to the granting of a licence to any applicant, and objections signed by

ten ratepayers of a locality must be given a public hearing before the application in question is granted.

3. *Popular Surveillance over Licences.*—Section 137 of the act provides that ten or more ratepayers of a locality may by filing complaint and depositing twenty dollars institute proceedings for the cancellation of a licence on the ground that it “has been obtained by fraud or false statements or in an improper manner, or that the conditions necessary to the granting of such licence do not exist at the time of the complaint, or that the licenced premises are constructed in such a way as not to be in accordance with the requirements of this act, or that the licensee is not keeping the licenced premises in an orderly manner or in accordance with such requirements, or that he has been guilty of any infraction of this act for which his licence is declared subject to forfeiture.” The case is to be heard by the county or district court judge, who shall, “if he finds the complaint established, report accordingly to the Minister, who shall forthwith cancel the licence, and the said sum of twenty dollars shall be thereupon refunded to the successful complainants.”

4. *Regulations of the Business of Licensees.*—Some of these are given in the definition above of “druggist’s wholesale licence” and “druggist’s retail licence.” The following additional regulations are also prescribed: All licensees must keep an accurate record of each sale of liquor which they make. Wholesale licensees may sell alcohol only on a written or printed affidavit, “which shall set forth that the alcohol is required for mechanical or scientific purposes alone, and not intended to be used as a beverage or to be mixed with any other liquid for use as a beverage, nor to sell, nor to give away, and that it is intended only for the applicant’s own use, and that the applicant is over twenty-one years of age, and shall also set forth the quantity desired.” (Section 140.) Wholesale licensees are forbidden to transact business between seven P. M. on Saturday and seven A. M. on Monday, and on other days between eight P. M. and seven A. M. Retail licensees may sell liquor only in four cases: (a) upon a physician’s prescription; (b) to dentists for use in their profession; (c) to veterinary surgeons for use in their profession; and (d) to clergymen for sacramental purposes.

II. PROHIBITION.

1. *Prohibition of Sale.*—Section 151 is as follows:

“No person, shall, within the province of Ontario, by himself, his clerk, servant or agent, expose or keep for sale directly or indirectly, or upon any pretence, or upon any device, sell or barter, or in consideration of the purchase or transfer of

any property or thing, or at the time of the transfer of any property or thing, give to any other person any liquor without having first obtained a druggist's wholesale licence or a druggist's retail licence under this act, authorizing him so to do, and then only as authorised by such licence and as prescribed by this act."

Excepted from this prohibition are sales under execution or by assignees in bankruptcy, and sales to licencees, persons in other provinces, and persons in foreign countries, by manufacturers of liquor licenced by the Dominion government.

2. *Prohibition of Purchase.*—"No person shall purchase, any liquor from any person who is not authorised to sell the same for consumption within the province." (Section 159.)

3. *Prohibition of Possession.*—Section 152 is as follows :

"No person within the province of Ontario, by himself, his clerk, servant or agent, shall have, or keep, or give liquor in any place whatsoever, other than in the private dwelling house in which he resides, without having first obtained a druggist's wholesale licence or a druggist's retail licence under this act, authorising him so to do, and then only as authorised by such licence."

This prohibition is not intended to prevent the possession of liquor (a) by persons engaged in scientific or mechanical pursuits, for the purposes of those occupations; (b) by clergymen for sacramental purposes; (c) by hospitals, physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons, and sick persons, for medical purposes; (d) by common carriers, when engaged in lawful delivery; and (e) by manufacturers licenced by the Dominion.

4. *Prohibition of Consumption.*—Sections 156 and 159 provides as follows :

"No person shall use or consume liquor in the province purchased and received from any person within the province, unless it be purchased and received from a licencee. This section shall not apply to any person who within a private dwelling house innocently uses or consumes liquor not thus purchased and received."

"No person shall consume any liquor in or upon any licenced premises, nor in any liquor warehouse mentioned in section 155 hereof, nor in any distillery or brewery mentioned in section 154 hereof, . . . and no person who purchases liquor shall drink or cause any one to drink or allow such liquor to be drunk upon the premises where the same is purchased."

The Manitoba liquor act of 1901 is practically identical, *mutatis mutandis*, with the Ontario liquor act of 1902, excluding provisions regarding the referendum, which form part I. of the latter.

INDEX.

A.

- Aborigines Protective Society, 437.
Abstainers and General Association, 384.
Ackerman, Jessie, 224.
Adams, A. S., 320.
Adams, John, attitude of, 55.
Adams, John Quincy, 86; quoted, 482.
Æschylus, quoted, 14.
Affica, conditions in, 433 *et seq.*
Ahriman, 16.
Alabama, dispensary in, 349.
Alaska, 445, 446.
Alcohol, among the ancients, 1, 355 *et seq.*
Alexander the Great, 14.
American Anti-Saloon League; see Anti-Saloon League.
American Association for the Study and Cure of Inebriety, 373.
American Federation of Labour, 402
American Medical Temperance Association, 377.
American Railway Union, rules of, 400.
American Society for the Promotion of Temperance, 117.
American Temperance Life Insurance Company, 384.
American Temperance Society, formed, 71; report of, quoted, 390.
American Temperance Union, 82, 98, 391.
American Tract Society, early publications of, 59, 74.
Amherst, Gen., order of, 407.
Amos, quoted, 17.
Andrews, Mrs. E. W., 224.
Anglo-Indian Temperance Association, 439, 440.
Angola, rum in, 434.
Anthony, Susan B., 216, 488.
Anstie, Dr., 375.
Anti-Alcoholic League, 308.
Anti-Dramshop Party, 231.
Anti-Saloon League, 246 *et seq.*
Appleton, Gen. James, petition to Mass. legislature, 120; report of, 125, 483.
Appleton, John, first maltster, 33.
Arabia, distillation in, 1; 15.
Aristophanes, quoted, 14.
Armstrong, Dr. John, 358.
Armstrong, Rev. Lebbeus, 64.
Armstrong, William H., 146.
Army Canteen (U. S.) 244, 406 *et seq.*; established by Col. Morrow, 416; abolished by Congress, 418; abolished from Navy, 420; Grigg's opinion, 423; abolished by Congress, 424; British Army, 425; in France, 428; in Canada, 430; in Russian, German and Japanese armies, 431; in the Philippines, 443.
Army Temperance Association, 425 *et seq.*
Arnot, W., 469.
Arthur, P. M., quoted, 403.
Asbury, Francis, resolution of, 450.
Aschaffenburg, Prof., investigations of, 375.
Ashton, John, quoted, 30.
Association of German-speaking Medical Abstainers, 378.
Association of Pentecostal Churches of America, 463.
Athens, (Ga.) high license in, 177.
Atherton, J. M., on high license, 183.
Atkinson, A. R., 320.
Atwater, W. O., investigations of, 374.
Atwell, Mr., 274.
Augusta, prohibition in, 127.
Austin, Dr., experiments of, 374.
Australasian Temperance and General Mutual Life Assurance Society, 382, 383.
Australia, 310, *et seq.*; statistics, 316.
Australian Temperance Society, 311.
Austria, 308 *et seq.*
Austrian Society for Checking Inebriety, 308.
Axley, James, efforts of, 450.

B.

- Bacchus, 3, 13.
Backhouse, James, 311.
Bailey, Joshua, L., 487.
Bailey, Westley, 107.

- Bain, Col. George W., 217.
 Baird, Robert, 305.
 Baker, Rev. W. R., 380.
 Bands of Hope, 305.
 Band Societies, 449.
 Bangor, Prohibition in, 127.
 Baptist Church, declaration of, 465.
 Barney, Mrs. J. K., 224.
 Bascom, H. B., manifesto of, 451.
 Bates, C. A. quoted, 155.
 Beaumont, Ralph, 403.
 Becher, Jean J., 355.
 Beddoes, Dr. Thomas, 358.
 Beecher, Henry Ward, 132; quoted, 133.
 Beecher, Lyman, quoted, 41, 59, 60, 72, 115, 117, 131, 296, 358, 368, 388.
 Beer Act, 284.
 Belgian Association Against the Abuse of Alcoholic Beverages, 307.
 Belgium, 307.
 Bell, George, 311.
 Belshazzar, feast of, 17.
 Benezet Anthony, pamphlet of, 55.
 Beni-Hassan, Tombs of, 2.
 Bentley, Charles E., 243.
 Beowulf, story of, 22.
 Berry, Graham, 315.
 Bes, 3.
 Bible wines, 16.
 Bidwell, Gen. John, 241.
 Bienfait, Prof., investigations of, 375.
 Bjorkenheim, Edv., quoted, 350.
 Black, James, 230, 231, 233.
 Black-strap, 46.
 Blaine, James E., on high license, 186.
 Blair, H. W., 151, 220.
 Blomfield, Dr. (Bishop of London), 233.
 Blue Cross Society, 305, 306, 308.
 Blue Ribbons, 482.
 Boadicea, Queen, quoted, 21.
 Bode, Dr. William, 306.
 Boerhave, Dr. Hermann, 358.
 Book of the Dead, quoted, 3.
 Bolag, 324; in Stockholm, 327.
 Bombay Temperance Council, 440.
 Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular, on high license, 185.
 Boston, conditions in 1642, 34.
 Boston Recorder, quoted, 339.
 Botany Bay, convicts of, 440.
 Bowler, J. S., 169.
 Boyce, Canon F. B., 316.
 Boyle, Mrs. R. J., 223.
 Bradford Temperance Society, 283.
 Bradley, Justice, opinion of, 171.
 Brahamism, 10, 15.
 Branvin, 329, 323, 324.
 Brede, F. W., quoted, 166.
 Brethour, Rev. J., 274.
 Briggs, Governor, 95.
 Bright, John, 299.
 Britain, ancient, 18; see United Kingdom, Scotland, Wales, etc.
 British-American Order of Good Templars, 111.
 British and Foreign Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, 294.
 British and Foreign Temperance Society, 289.
 British Columbia, laws in, 276.
 British East India Company, 438.
 British Empire Mutual Life Assurance Company, 384.
 British Medical Temperance Association, 363, 370.
 British North America Act, 264.
 British Order of Good Templars, 111.
 British Society for the Promotion of Temperance, 287.
 British Teetotal Temperance Society, 289.
 British Temperance Association, 465.
 British Temperance League, 288.
 British Women's Temperance Association, 293.
 Brooks, John A., 179, 239.
 Brown, Dr. John, 357.
 Brown, Mrs. Mattie McClellan, 208.
 Brown, Dr. W. L., quoted, 2, 471.
 Brughnibbs, 18, 20, 21.
 Brunonian system, 357.
 Brussels, International Congress of, 437.
 Buckingham, J. S., 239.
 Buddha, see Buddhism.
 Buddhism, 9.
 Bunge, Prof. von, investigations of, 374.
 Bunsen, Prof., referred to, 2.
 Burma, 491.
 Burns, Dr. Dawson, 290; quoted, 304.
 Burrows, Dr. George, 366.
 Burton, Sir Charles, quoted, 433.
 Bushnell, Dr. Kate, 224.
 Busk, Dr. George, 366.
 Butler, Benj. F., 410, 413; resolution of, 478.
 Butler, Mrs. Allen, quoted, 215.

C.

- Cadets of Temperance, 105, 250.
 Caine, W. S., quoted, 300; work in India, 439.
 Cameron, Malcolm, 253.
 Campbell, Colln H., 273.
 Canada, early conditions in, 49 *et seq.*; introduction of fraternal societies in, 103; before confederation, 248 *et seq.*; since confederation, 255 *et seq.*; Scott Act, 257; second Royal Commission, 261; consumption of liquor in, 276-277; selling to Indians prohibited; temperance instruction in, 491; see Ontario, Quebec, etc.

- Canada Temperance Act, 257; votes on, 258, 267.
- Canadian Parliamentary Commission, (first) 255-256; (second) 261; present liquor laws, 275.
- Canadian Prohibitory Liquor Law League, 251.
- Cantor Lectures, 355, 368.
- Card, Nathaniel, 296.
- Carheil, Etienne, quoted, 51.
- Carlisle, Sir Anthony, 358.
- Carman, Dr., 267, 274.
- Carpenter, Dr. W. B., prize essay of, 31.
- Carriage and Wagon Makers' International Union, 405.
- Carroll, Dr. H. K., quoted, 70, 101.
- Carse, Mrs. T. B., 214.
- Cary, General S. F., 101.
- Casey Bros., quoted, 169.
- Cass, Gen. Lewis, 77, 82; on Father Mathew, 96, 410; abolishes spirit ration, 412.
- Cassidy, Lewis C., 164.
- Catholic Church, early attitude in Canada, 248; in Quebec, 266; agitation in, 456; and Father Mathew; see Jesuits.
- Catholic Total Abstinence Association, 293, 457.
- Cetawayo, 435.
- Chamberlain, Joseph, quoted, 438.
- Chambers, Dr. W. F., 366.
- Chapin, E. H., 133.
- Chapin, Rev. Calvin, 62.
- Charleston, 345; "blind tigers" in, 347; crime in, 348; see Dispensary.
- Charleston *Courier*, quoted, 390.
- Charleston, Richard, 441, 442.
- Charlevoix, quoted, 52.
- Cheever, Dr. Geo. B., 82, 83.
- Cheves, R. S., 159, 487.
- Cheyne, Dr. George, 353.
- Chicago *Daily News*, on high license, 188.
- Chicago, high license in, 189, 190.
- Chicago *Tribune*, on high license, 187.
- Childs, L. D., 341 *et seq.*
- China, ancient, 3-7.
- Chiniquy, Father, crusade of, 250.
- Chittenden, Prof., investigations of, 375.
- Choate, Joseph H., 172.
- Choate, Rufus, 122.
- Christian Church, 447 *et seq.*
- Christiania, 332; drunkenness in, 336.
- Christian Endeavorers, resolution of, 464.
- Christian Temperance Alliance, 246.
- Christmas, 23, 39, 42.
- Christmas, J. S., 249.
- Church ales, 25.
- Church of England Temperance Reformation Society, 469.
- Church of England Temperance Society, 437, 469.
- Civil Damage Legislation in Wisconsin, 130.
- Clark, Dr. Billy J., 47, 64, 360.
- Clark, Laban, quoted, 451.
- Clark, Myron H., 132; quoted, 138; detailed vote for, 486.
- Clark, Sir Andrew, 377.
- Clark, Sir James, 366, 377.
- Clarke, Mayor, 261.
- Clarkson, J. S., 240.
- Clarre, 24.
- Clausen, President, quoted, 154.
- Clay, Henry, quoted, 95.
- Close, Rev. F., labours of, 466.
- Cole, George, 311.
- Collier, Rev. Wm., 72.
- Collins, A. L., 168.
- Collins, William, 283.
- Columbia, "blind tigers" in, 347; see Dispensary.
- Committee of Fifty, quoted, 191, 193, 194; 376.
- Compton, Theodore, 380.
- Comstock, Elizabeth, 205.
- Confucius, quoted, 4, 6.
- Congregational Church, early action of, 59.
- Congress of Catholic Laity, resolutions of, 459.
- Congress, United States, abolishes spirit ration, 413; provides trading posts, 414; prohibits beer, 418, 422, 424.
- Congressional Temperance Society, 82; reorganised, 91.
- Coon, Levrett E., 107.
- Connecticut, legislative action, 121; local option in forties, 124; prohibition in, 132, 140, 145, 151.
- Conservative party, Canada, 266, 267.
- Constitutional Amendments, 146 *et seq.*
- Continental Army, 407.
- Continental Congress, action of, 54.
- Corbin, H. C., quoted, 418, 423.
- Crafts, Dr. W. F., cited, 446.
- Cranfil, J. B., 241.
- Crawford, George W., 412.
- Crooks, Rev., 311.
- Crothers, Dr. T. D., 378.
- Crowell, H. P., 157 *et seq.*; 487.
- Crusade, Woman's, 202 *et seq.*
- Cumberland Presbyterian Church, declaration of, 463.
- Curtis, Nathaniel, 107.
- Cuyler, Dr. T. L., 103, 133, 143, 487.

D.

- Dagget, Chief Justice, David, on prohibition, 120.
- Dagon, 17.
- Dalrymple House, 378.
- Dana, Gov., vetoes Maine law, 126.
- Daniel, quoted, 17.

- Daniel, William, 238.
 Danish Temperance Society, 307.
 Dartmouth College, early conditions of, 45.
 Darwin, Dr. Erasmus, 358.
 Dashaways, The, 112.
 Daughters of Temperance, 102, 250.
 Davies, Dr. Evan, labours of, 466.
 Davis, E. J., 103.
 Davis, Col. F., 255.
 Davis, Dr. N. S., 370, 373, 375.
Deacon Giles' Distillery, 83.
 Dean of Gothenburg, see Peter Wieselgren.
 Deemster, President, quoted, 43.
 Delaware, early conditions in, 38; prohibition in, 130, 140.
 Delavan, Edward C., 74, 84, 132, 414.
 Delirium Tremens in Gothenburg, 331.
 Democratic party and prohibition, 220.
 Demosthenes, 14.
 Denmark, 307 *et seq.*
 Department of Labor, 190.
 De Quincey, Thomas, quoted, 295.
 Dexter, Samuel, LL.D., quoted, 48, 66.
 Dharmapala, H., quoted, 9.
Dharma Shastra, quoted, 8.
Dhammika Sutta, quoted, 9.
 Dickie, Samuel, 240, 245.
 Dinwiddie, E. C., 246.
 Diodorus, quoted, 18.
 Dionysius, quoted, 11.
 Disciples of Christ, 462.
 Dispensary, statistics of drunkenness, 200; 339 *et seq.*; profits of, 345; sales of, 346; in Russia, 350 *et seq.*; in S. Dakota, 497.
 Distillation, by Arabs, 1; in Sweden, 322; in Norway, 332; introduced in Hawaii, 472.
 Dix, Maj.-Gen., 414.
 Dodge, William E., 133, 143.
 Dominion Alliance for the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic, 257, 265, 268, 273.
 Dominion of Canada; see Canada.
 Domitian, 18.
 Douglass, Frederick, 296.
 Dow, Neal, 125, 217; presidential nominee, 237, 236.
 Druids, 17, 20.
 Drunkenness, law against, 26; arrests for in American cities, 197; in Gothenburg, 330, 331; in Christiania, 336; in Charleston, 348.
 Dunlop, John, 230, 281, 282, 294; quoted, 364; declaration of, 366; quoted, 392, 394, 395.
 Dunkin Act, 253.
 Dunkin, Christopher, 253.
 Dunn, Dr. J. B., 143.
 Dunstan, Archbishop, 23.
 Dupré, Dr., experiments of, 374
- Duroy, Dr., investigations of, 373.
- E.
- Eaton, James H., 410.
 Ecgbright, excerpts of, 473.
 Eddy, Dr., quoted, 474.
 Eddy, Jesse B., quoted, 169.
 Edgar, John, 279, 465.
 Edmonds, Dr. James, quoted, 371.
 Edwards, Dr. Justin, 71; on prohibition, 119.
 Egerton, Lord Keeper, order of, 474.
 Egypt, ancient, 2-3, 471; efforts against liquor, 435.
 Elizabeth, times of, 25, 339.
 Ellis, James, 380.
 Ellison, Canon, 437.
 Elliott, Dr. David, quoted, 455.
 Ellsworth, Col. E. E., 414.
 Enpolis, quoted, 414.
 Epworth League, declaration of, 464.
 Equitable Life Insurance Company, 384.
 Erastothenes, quoted, 1.
 Esthonia, agitation in, 352.
 Euripides, quoted, 14.
 Evans, Rev. Christmas, 466.
 Evans, John Gary, 343.
 Evarts, Rev. Jeremiah, 63.
 Everett, Edward, 482.
 Ewell, Gen., 414.
- F.
- Fairfield County, consecration of, 60.
 Falun, first *bolag* at, 325.
 Farquharson, Mr., 273.
 Farrar, Archdeacon, quoted, 433.
 Fenton, Mr., 251.
 Field, Justice, opinion of, 174.
 Field, Kate, 169.
 Field, Mrs. J., 320.
 Fifteen Gallon law, Mass., 86.
 Fillmore, Millard, 86.
 Finch, John B., 110, 178, 238.
 Finland, 321, 350, 351, 352; 491.
 Fisher, Maj.-Gen., 233.
 Fisher, Sydney A., 266; quoted, 494.
 Fisk, Gen. Clinton B., 233.
 Fisk, Rev. Wilber, on prohibition, 119.
 Fitzgerald, Percy, quoted, 29.
 Fleming, R. J., 261.
 Flint, T. B., 269.
 Flip, 46.
 Flying Artillery, The, 112.
 Forbes, Henry, 233.
 Forbes-Mackenzie Act, 302.
 Forel, August, 308, 377.
 Forster, Dr. T., 358.
 Foster, George E., 103, 260, 266.
 Foster, J. Ellen, 146, 210, 221.
 Foster, John W., 444.
 Fournier, Edouard, quoted, 1.
 Fox, Sir William, 318.

- France, 304 *et seq.*; army of, 428.
 Franklin, Benj., quoted, 55.
 Fraser, D. C., 260.
 Fraser, W., quoted, 248.
 Free Church of Scotland, 469.
 Free Templars, Independent Order of, 111.
 Free Templars of St. John, 111.
Freie Presse, on high license, 186.
 Frelinghuysen, Senator, 77; on prohibition, 119; 444.
 French, quoted, 18, 21, 36, 474.
 French Anti-Alcohol Union, 304.
 French Temperance Society, 304.
 Friends of Temperance, 112.
 Furth, Emanuel, 168.
 Furer, Prof., investigations of, 375.
- G.
- Gaines, Maj.-Gen., quoted, 410.
 Gallifet, order of, 429.
 Gardiner Temperance Reform Club, 226.
 Garfield, James A., 217.
 Garhioflac, 24.
 Garrison, William Lloyd, 296.
 Gautama, Siddartha, see Buddha.
 General Assembly, see Presbyterian Church.
 General Conference, see Methodist Church.
 George IV, times of, 278.
 Georgia, early conditions, 38; dispensary in, 349.
 German Society Against the Abuse of Alcoholic Drink, 306.
 German Union Against Alcohol, 306.
 Germany, 305 *et seq.*; army beer canteens in, 431; resolution of Reichstag, 437.
 Gibbon, quoted, 1.
 Giboney, D. C., quoted, 191.
 Gilder, Dhanjibhai Dorabji, 440, 472.
 Gin Act, 23.
 Gipps, Sir George, 311.
 Gladstone, W. E., 299, 301.
 Goldsmith, Oliver, quoted, 474.
 Gompers, Samuel, quoted, 402.
 Good Templars, Independent Order of, 107 *et seq.*; 147; political resolution of, 229, 230, 250, 302, 305, 306, 307, 313; organization of 473-482.
 Goodwin, Henry, quoted, 166.
 Gordon, Anna, 211.
 Gough, John B., 91; on prohibition, 97, 296, 477.
 Gothenburg, pauperism in, 329, drunkenness in, 330; delirium tremens in, 331.
 Gothenburg, Handlestiding, 325.
 Gothenburg System, see Sweden, Norway, Gothenburg, Stockholm, Malmo, Christiania, Bergen, etc.; Finland, etc.
- Government control, ancient China, 7; by Elizabeth, 25, 339; dispensary, 339 *et seq.*; in Russia, 350 *et seq.*; see Dispensary.
 Graham, Gen., 422.
 Grant, T. Q., 343.
 Gray, R. G., 249.
 Great Britain, see United Kingdom.
 Greece, ancient, 10-15; legend of, 472.
 Greek Church, action of, 352.
 Greeley, Horace, 132; quoted, 134, 153, 234.
 Greenback party, 219.
 Greenock Temperance Society, 283.
 Gregson, Gelson, work of, 425.
 Grier, Justice, opinion of, 123.
 Griffiths, Sir Samuel, 315.
 Griggs, Attorney-General, opinion of, 423.
 Grindrod, Ralph Barnes, 288, 360; cited, 364.
 Gull, Sir W., 377.
- H.
- Haller, Dr. Albrecht von, 353.
 Hamilton, Alexander, 55.
 Hammond, Dr., cited, 375.
 Harcourt, Sir William, 301.
 Harding, John, 318.
 Hardy, H. W., 178; quoted, 488.
 Hargreaves, Dr. William, 371.
 Harper, James, 133.
 Harris, Dr., report of, 361.
 Harvard University, early practices, 43, 41.
 Hawaii, distillation introduced into, 440.
 Hawkins, Hannah, 88.
 Hawkins, John H. W., 88; quoted, 89.
 Hayes, Rutherford B., 103; prohibitory order of, 415.
 Hector, society at, 70.
 Hedlund, A. S., 325.
 Helenius, Matti, quoted, 350.
 Henry VII, laws of, 25.
 Henry VIII, laws of, 25.
 Herodotus, mentioned, 2, 3.
 Hewitt, Rev. Nathaniel, 72.
 Hickson, Sir Joseph, 261.
 Higginson, Col. T. W., quoted, 44.
 High license, 158 *et seq.*; 177 *et seq.*; statistics, 197; H. W. Hardy on, 488.
 Hillis, Rev. Newell Dwight, on Gough, 94.
 Hindu, 9, 438, 440, 472.
 Hippocras, 24.
 Hitchcock, Prof., quoted, 76.
 Hobbs, Dr. William, 103.
 Hockday, 24.
 Holland, 306 *et seq.*
 Home Protection party, 217 *et seq.*; 237.

- Hood, Helen L., 220.
 Hooker, Gen., 414.
 Hooker, Rev. Edward W., 72.
 Hopewood, Samuel, quoted, 1; 472.
 Hopkins, Bishop, on infidels, 84.
 Hopkins, Mark, 143, 487.
 Houston, Dr., quoted, 279, 280.
 Houston, General Sam, on Father Mathew, 96.
 Howard, Gen. O. O., quoted, 419; 487.
 Howarth, J., 285.
 Hoyt, Aurette, 205, 208.
 Hrothgar, story of, 22.
 Hubbard, Gov. John, signs Maine law, 126.
 Hull, Judge Advocate John A., report of, 443.
 Humphrey, Rev. Heman, 60; on prohibition, 119.
 Hunt, Dr. Ezra M., 370.
 Hunt, Mary H., 224.
 Huntington, Asahel, 122.
 Huss, Professor, quoted, 352.
- I.
- Iler, Peter E., on high license, 181.
 Illinois, prohibition in, 140; high license in, 178.
 Independent Order of Good Templars, see Good Templars.
 India, ancient, 7-10; British Army in, 425; influence of East India Company in, 438.
 Indiana, early local option contests, 124; prohibition in, 131, 140.
 Indians, prohibition of sales to, 445.
 Indian Territory, prohibition in, 445.
 Indra, 7, 8, 471.
 Industry, early conditions of, 39, 47; 387 *et seq.*
 Inebriety, 378 *et seq.*
 Ingalls, John J., on prohibition, 147.
 Ingham, Mary A., 210.
 International Congress for the Prevention of the Abuse of Alcohol, 350.
 International Medical Association, 370.
 International Medical Congress, 371.
 International Seamen's Union, 405.
 International Society Against the Use of Alcohol, 398.
 International Temperance Congress (1895) 304, (1880) 307, (1901) 309, 497.
 International Typographical Union, resolution of, 404.
 International Union of Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners, 405.
 Iowa, early local option contests in, 124; legislation, 131; prohibition in, 140, 151; mulct law in, 194.
 Iowa State Register, quoted, 194.
 Ireland, ancient, 16, 18; early temperance agitation, 278; early conditions in, 279; Father Mathew's crusade, 290 *et seq.*; Sunday closing in, 303.
 Ireland, Archbishop John, 457.
 Irish Temperance League, 297.
 Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of the United States, 405.
 Isalah, quoted, 16.
 Isitt, Frank W., 320.
 Isitt, Leonard W., 319.
 Israel, drink in, 16.
- J.
- Jackson, Andrew, 86; abolishes spirit ration, 411.
 Jackson, Rev. J., 283.
 Jago, John, 320.
 James, Dr. Robert, 358.
 Jamieson, Mr., 260.
 Japan, army canteens in, 431.
 Jefferson, Thomas, attitude of, 475.
 Jeffries, Dr. Julius, declaration of, 305-306.
 Jesuits, in Canada, 49, 53.
 Jewell, Rev. Joel, 70.
 Jewett, Dr. Charles, 360; quoted, 302; cited, 363.
 Johnson, Dr. Herrick, 455.
 Johnson, Mary C., 210.
 Johnson, Prof. J. F. W., 375.
 Johnson, Rev. James, quoted, 436.
 Johnson, William E., liquor men's letters to, 156 *et seq.*
 Jones, Adjutant-General, quoted, 410.
 Jonson, Ben, 26.
 Johnston, Alexander, quoted, 356.
 Josephus, quoted, 17.
 Journeymen Tailors of North America, 405.
 Jutkins, Dr. A. J., 217.
 Juvenile Templars, 111.
- K.
- Kaahumanu, Queen, prohibition of 441.
 Kalakua, King, 442.
 Kamehameha I., prohibition of, 440.
 Kamehameha III., treaty of, 442.
 Kamehameha V., quoted, 442.
 Kansas, prohibition in, 147, 151.
 Keats, Admiral, 283.
 Kellogg, Dr. J. H., investigations of, 376.
 Kerr, Dr. Norman, 378.
 Khama, 435.
 Kirkland, Rev. S., quoted, 42.
 Kittredge, A., quoted, 117.
 Kitchener, Lord, order of, 438.
 Knights of Jericho, 107, 112.
 Knights of Labour, constitution of, quoted, 403.
 Koppe, Prof., investigations of, 374.

- Koran, 15.
 Kraepelin, Prof., investigations of, 374; 377.
 Krishna, Dr. Bhalchandra, 440.
 Kynett, A. J., 246.
- L.
- Lallemand, Dr., investigations of, 373.
 Lansdowne, Marquis of, quoted, 423.
 La Place, Captain C. O., raid on Hawaii of, 442.
 Lathrop, Mary T., 205, 210.
 Laur, F., 153.
 Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 265, 266, 267; letters to F. S. Spence, 494.
 Laval Bishop, prohibition of, 50, 51.
 Lavigerie, Cardinal, agitation of, 437.
 Lavoisier, Antoine L., 356.
 Lawson, Sir Wilfrid, 293, 299, 300, 302.
 League of the Cross, 306, 470.
 Leavitt, Mary Clement, 223, 224, 317.
 Leavitt, Mrs. S. K., 205.
 Lecky, quoted, 27.
 Ledwards, Jeffrey, 406.
 Lee, Dr. Charles Alfred, 360.
 Lee, Gen. R. E., 414.
 Lee, Mrs. A. B., 292.
 Lees, Dr. F. R., referred to, 23; 238, 365.
 Le Grain, Dr., 304.
 Leo XIII., letter to Archbishop Ireland, 457.
 Leopold II., 437.
 Lewis, Dr. Dio, 202 *et seq.*
 Liberal Party (Canada), 256, 265, 273, 274.
 Liebig, Baron von, cited, 356; cited, 372, 373, 374.
 Lieber, Judge Advocate General, 423.
 Life Insurance, 379 *et seq.*
 Lincoln, Abraham, 413; quoted, 482.
 Litchman, Charles N., 403.
 Livingston, David, quoted, 433.
 Livesey, Joseph, 284; quoted, 285; 287, 496.
 Local option, contests of "forties," 124; *post-bellum* contests, 145 *et seq.*; in Canada, 257 *et seq.*, 275; in Sweden, 324; in Norway, 332, 337.
 Local Veto, 299 *et seq.*; in Australia, 314 *et seq.*; in New Zealand, 318.
 Lodge, Henry Cabot, resolution of, 445.
 London, in 1725, 23; in 1797, 30.
 London Temperance Hospital, 371.
 London Temperance Society, 233.
 Long, John D., order of, 420.
 Longevity, 379 *et seq.*
 Long Island, early conditions in, 37.
 Lonsdale, Lord, quoted, 28.
 Lord of the Tap, 25.
- M.
- MacGregor, Sir James, 364.
 Mackay, Dr., 274.
 Mackenzie, Alexander, 256.
 Maclaren, J. J., 258, 265, 274.
 Madhoo, 8.
 Madagascar, rum trade in, 434.
 Madison, James, 86.
 Maine, legislative action, 121; early prohibition agitation, 125 *et seq.*; early results of prohibition, 126 *et seq.*; pro. repealed, 133, 140, 151.
 Malike, King, quoted, 436.
 Malleliu, Bishop, 103.
 Manila, 443.
 Manitoba, 262, 270, 275, 494.
 Manning, Cardinal, 470.
 Manning, J. W., 255.
 Manu, Law of, 9, 10, 472.
 Maoris, 435.
 Marsden, Rev. Samuel, 310.
 Marsh, Dr. John, quoted, 41, 45, 47, 66, 72, 74, 78, 85, 88, 93, 98, 133, 296, 391, 436, 488.
 Marshall Fraternity of Temperance, 104.
 Martin, Dave, quoted, 165.
 Martin, William, 290.
 Massachusetts, report on pro., 121; local option contests of, 124; prohibition in, 131, 140; *post-bellum* agitation, 143 *et seq.*; 151; high licence law, 178.
 Massachusetts Bay Colony, 32 *et seq.*
 Massachusetts Medical Society, utterance of, 360.
 Massachusetts Soc. for the Suppression of Intemperance, formed, 66; reorganized, 67.
 Massachusetts Temperance Society, formed, 67.
 Matthew, Father Theobald, 95, 290 *et seq.*; pledge of, 477.
 Mauritius, rum trade in, 434.
 McClellan, Gen. Geo. B., 413.
 McClintock, Emory, investigations of, 385.
 McDonald, H. J., 270, 272.
 McDonald, Judge, 261.
 M'Donnell, Captain, 317.
 McKinley, William, 214, 423; quoted, 444.
 McLeod, Dr. J., 261.
 Medill, Joseph, on high licence, 187.
 Medicine, 355 *et seq.*
 Meikle, James, investigations of, 384.
 Mencius, quoted, 4.
 Mendel, Prof., investigations of, 375.
 Merryman, Dr. T. J., 491.

- Metcalf, Henry B., 245.
 Methodists, early activities of, 55; in Canada, 273; 449 *et seq.*; see Wesleyan Methodist.
 Metz & Bro., on high licence, 184.
 Mexico, prohibition in army of, 432.
 Michigan, early local option contests, 124; prohibition in, 140, 145, 151; laws of, quoted, 400.
 Miles, Henry A., quoted, 475.
 Miles, Gen. N. A., 415; order of, 421; 424.
 Miller, Emily Huntington, 208.
 Miner, Dr. A. A., 143.
 Minnesota, prohibition in, 131, 140, 145; high licence in, 178.
 Mississippi, early gallon law, 121.
 Missouri, high licence in, 178.
 Mitchell, J. T., 390.
 Mitchell, W. K., 88, 97.
 Moderation Societies, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 249, 278 *et seq.*
 Moerlein, Geo., quoted, 166.
 Mohammed, 10, 15; followers of, in Egypt, 435.
 Momolu, Massaquoi, Prince, quoted, 436.
 Montagu, Basil, 496.
 Moore & Sinnott, 164.
 Moreau, Temperance Society of, 61.
 Morrow, Henry A., 416.
 Morton, Rev. Marcus, 71.
 Mowat, Sir Oliver, 274.
 Mulct law, in Iowa, 194.
 Murphy, Francis, 236.
 Mussey, Dr. Reuben Dimond, 360, 361.
 Mutual Life Insurance Company, 385.
- N.
- National Christian Total Abstinence Society, 306.
 National Holiness Association, declaration of, 464.
 National Order of Good Templars, 482.
 National Party, 221, 243, 245.
 National Prohibition party, see Prohibition party.
 National Prohibition Reform party, 234; see also Prohibition party.
 National Protective Association, 156, 183.
 National Relief Society, see Sons of Temperance.
 National Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, 156.
 National Temperance Convention, political resolution of, 229.
 National Temperance League, 294.
 National Temperance Society, 143, 294.
 Nebraska, prohibition in, 140, 151; amendment campaign, 156 *et seq.*; Slocumb law, 177.
 Nelson, R. W., 217.
 New British and Foreign Temperance Society, 280, 294.
 New Brunswick, early laws, 251; prohibition in, 252; local option in, 257; 263, 275, 491, 494.
 Newfoundland, early prohibition in, 248.
 New Hampshire, early local option law, 121; local option contests, 124; prohibition in, 130, 140, 151.
 New Hampshire Medical Society, utterance of, 359.
 New Haven Colony, conditions in, 37 *et seq.*
 New Hebrides, 444.
 New Jersey, early local option contests in, 124.
 New South Wales, 310 *et seq.*
 New South Wales Alliance for the Suppression of Intemperance, 312.
 New South Wales Political Association for the Suppression of Intemperance, 312.
 New South Wales Temperance Society, 311, 317.
New Voice, The, 238; see *New York Voice*.
 New York, early attempts at prohibition in, 131 *et seq.*; 140, 145, 146; vote for Clark, 1835, 486.
 New York city, high licence in, 192.
 New York State Temperance Society, 84.
New York Times on Prohibition, 135.
New York Voice, 159, 191, 192, 195, 196, 293; quoted, 386; cited, 400; see *New Voice*.
 New Zealand, 317 *et seq.*; life insurance department, 384.
 Nichols, C. M., 202.
 Non Partisan, W. C. T. U., 221.
 North Carolina, dispensary in, 340.
 North Dakota, prohibition in, 151.
 Northwest Territories, 256.
 Nott, Rev. Eliphalet, 71.
 Norway, 333 *et seq.*; distilleries in, 333; consumption of liquor in, 333, 334; sales in *samlag* cities, 335.
 Nova Scotia, early agitation in, 219; early laws, 251; 275, 491, 494.
 Nuisance, liquor traffic Attorney-General Wirt's decision, 79; Chief Justice Waite's decision, 171.
 Numa, law of 11.
 Nupe, Emir of, quoted, 436.
- O.
- Odin, 17.
 Offerings to gods, 3, 8, 11, 16, 17, 24, 471.
 Ogden, Robert, quoted 167.
 Oglethorp, Governor, prohibition of, 88.
 Ohio, prohibitory amendment, 131; prohibition in, 140, 151.

- Oliver, John W., 90, 100, 101.
 Omaha Bee, on high licence, 188.
 Omaha, high licence in, 188.
 Ontario, early agitation in, 249;
 early laws, 251; local option in,
 257; 491; liquor laws of, 501; see
 Canada, Quebec, etc.
 Orange Free State, 438.
 Orban Friar, 307.
 Oregon, prohibition vote in, 151.
 Orestheus, legend of, 472.
 Original Daughters, 102.
 Osgood, J. K., 226.
- P.
- Pacific, liquor in islands of, 440.
 Packard, S. W., 179.
 Palmer, Alice, 224.
 Panoplist, The, 63.
 Parker, Margaret, 223.
 Parkes, Sir Henry, 313; declaration
 of, 366.
 Parkman, Francis, quoted, 50, 52.
 Parrish, Clara, 224.
 Parsees, 472.
 Paton, John G., 444.
 Patriotic League Against Intemper-
 ance, 307.
 Patterson, S. M., quoted, 168.
 Payn, Isaac B., quoted, 47.
 Peabody, Dr. A. P., 66.
 Peabody, Prof., quoted, 44.
 Peebles, J. M., 250.
 Peel, Lord, proposals of, 302.
 Peg drinking, 23, 24.
 Penn. William, and beer, 36.
 Pennsylvania, early local option con-
 tests, 124; prohibition in, 140;
 post-bellum agitation, 145, 151;
 high licence in, 178.
 Pennsylvania State Temperance
 convention, prohibition resolu-
 tion of, 223.
 Percival, Lieut. John, conduct in
 Hawaii, 441.
 Perham, Governor, 227.
 Perrin, Dr., investigations of, 373.
 Persia, Ancient, 15.
 Petrie, Flinders, explorations of, 3.
 Phelps, Anson G., 133.
 Philadelphia, high licence in, 191.
 Philipoines, 443.
 Phlogiston, 375, *et seq.*
 Pitman, R. C., 143.
 Pittsburg, high licence in, 190.
 Pittsburg Commercial Gazette, on
 high licence, 190.
 Pittacus, quoted, 13.
 Plato, laws of, 13.
 Plebiscite votes, (Canada) 262, 266;
 Laurier on, 494.
 Plenary Council, see Catholic
 church.
 Pliny, mentioned, 2; quoted, 12;
 cited, 366.
- Plutarch, quoted, 3, 471.
 Plymouth Colony, 33, *et seq.*
 Polk, James K., 86, 482.
 Polyglot Petition, 225.
 Poech, Dr., 309.
 Porter, Rev. Ebenezer, 63.
 Porter, Cyrus K., 113.
 Portland, early local option victory,
 125; Neal Dow as Mayor; riots
 in, 139.
 Powderly, T. V., quoted, 403.
 Powell, A. M., 143.
 Presbyterian Church, early action
 of, 58, 65, 454, *et seq.*; see Cum-
 berland Presbyterian Church,
 United Presbyterian Church,
 Reformed Presbyterian Church,
 etc.
 Presidents, the Declaration of, 85.
 Preston Temperance Society, 233.
 Price, Hiram, 103, 246.
 Price-Hughes, 302.
 Prime, Rev. Irenæus, 65.
 Prime, Rev. Nathaniel S., 61.
 Prince Edward Island, 258, 273, 491,
 494.
 Privy Council, decision of, 264, 265
 271.
 Probus, Emperor, order of, 21.
 Prohibition, ancient China, 7; of
 Manu, 8; of Buddhism, 10; of
 Mohammed, 10; of Romulus, 11;
 of Plato, 13; in England, 26; in
 Virginia, 38; in early Georgia,
 38; of the Jesuits, 49; of Laval,
 50, 51, 52; Mitchell on, 97; Gough
 on, 97; Father Mathew on, 97;
 Sons of Temperance on, 101;
 Templars of Honour on, 104;
 I. O. G. T. on, 110; *ante-bellum*
 campaigns, 115 *et seq.*; Gerrit
 Smith on, 118; Dr. Justin Ed-
 wards, Francis Wayland, Rev.
 Wilbur Fisk, Atty.-Gen. George
 Sullivan, Rev. Heman Humphrey
 and Senator Frelinghuysen
 on, 119; Chief Justice David
 Dagget, Gov. John Cotton Smith
 and Gen. James Appleton on,
 120; early agitation of, in Maine,
 125, *et seq.*; early results of in
 Maine, 126 *et seq.*; H. W. Beecher
 on, 133; H. Greeley on, 134;
 N. Y. Times on, 135; results of
 in New York, 137 *et seq.*; in 1855,
 138; Henry Wilson on, 143; John
 J. Ingalls on, 147; Senator
 Blair's efforts, 151; "speak
 easies" in, 192; in Newfound-
 land, 248; agitation for in Early
 Canada, 251; in New Brunswick,
 251; in Northwest Territories,
 256; British Privy Council de-
 cisions, 264-271; Canadian ple-
 biscite votes on, 262, 266; Mani-
 toba contest, 269 *et seq.*; agita-

- tion for in Great Britain, 296 *et seq.*; agitation for in Australia, 318 *et seq.*; in New Zealand, 319; in Sweden, 324; in Norway, 332; agitation for in South Carolina, 341 *et seq.*; provision of S. C. constitution for, 344; of labor societies, 404; of Secretary of War Cass, 412; orders of in Civil war, 413 *ets eq.*; other military prohibitions, 418 *et seq.*; attempts at in Africa, 434 *et seq.*; in Hawaii; of sales to Indians, 445; in Alaska, 445; South Dakota, 497; in Ontario, 502.
- Prohibition Party, 221, 222, 229, *et seq.*; votes of, 492-493.
- Prohibition Reform Party, 218, 237.
- Proskowetz, Max de, 308.
- Prosperity Society, 305.
- Protestant Episcopal Church, attitude of, 460.
- Provincial Society of Lower Canada, 249.
- Putnam and the Wolf*, 74.
- Pytheas, quoted, 14.
- Q.
- Quain, Prof. Richard, 366.
- Quakers, early activities of, 55; record of, 447-449.
- Quay, M. S., 160, 240.
- Quebec, early agitation in, 249; early laws, 251; local option in, 257, 275, 494.
- Queensland, 315.
- Quin, James, 29.
- Quincy, Josiah, quoted, 45.
- R.
- Radama I, prohibition efforts of, 435.
- Railroad Conductors, Order of, 404.
- Railroad Telegraphers, Order of, 404.
- Raittindenystavat, 350.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter, 26.
- Rameses III, times of, 2.
- Raster Resolution, 155.
- Rawlinson, Prof., investigations of, 2.
- Raymond, Henry J., 132.
- Rechabites, The, 105, 250.
- Reform Clubs, 226 *et seq.*; 491.
- Reformed Church of America, 462.
- Reformed Presbyterian Church, 465.
- Regulation, ancient China, 6; Early Britain, 18, 25; in Mass. Bay Colony, 33 *et seq.*; in New Haven Colony, 37; on early Long Island, 37; gallon laws, 121, 123 *et seq.*; 145 *et seq.*; high licence schemes, 177 *et seq.*; in early Canada, 251; Beer Act, 284; in Australia, 312 *et seq.*; Gothenburg system, 321 *et seq.*; Dispensary system, 330 *et seq.*; in Russia, 350 *et seq.*; in India, 439.
- Reid, Rev. W., quoted, 467.
- Republican party, Raster resolutions, 155; repels Miss Willard, 219; 437.
- Retail Clerk's National Protective Association, 405.
- Revolutionary war, times of, 54, *et seq.*; 407.
- Reynolds, Dr. Henry A., 226.
- Rhode Island, early conditions in, 39, local option law, 121, 124; prohibition in, 131, 140, 151.
- Rice, Gov., 144.
- Richard, Dr., on prohibition, 429.
- Richardson, Sir Benj. Ward, cited, 355; quoted, 357, 367, 368, 380, 370, 373, 375.
- Richardson, Sir John, 364.
- Rig-Veda, mentioned, 7.
- Roberts, Earl, 425.
- Roblin, R. P., 272, 273.
- Rochat, Louis Lucian, 308.
- Roman Catholic Church, *see* Catholic Church.
- Rome, ancient, 10-15.
- Romulus, 11.
- Roper, E. C., 342.
- Rowlands, Rev. Daniel, quoted, 466.
- Roy, Mahamp Kesho Ram, work of, 440.
- Royal Commission; *See* Canadian Parliamentary Commission.
- Royal Templars of Temperance, 112, 250.
- Ross bill, 275.
- Ross, Geo. W., 103, 255, 273, 274 *et seq.*
- Rum Hospital, 310.
- Rush, Dr. Benj., pamphlet of, 55 *et seq.*; 353; quoted, 408.
- Russell, Howard H., 246.
- Russell, John, 230, 231, 232, 233.
- Russia, dispensary in, 330 *et seq.*; commission on alcoholism, 431.
- Ryer, Sieur de, quoted, 15.
- S.
- St. David, Synod of, 22.
- St. John Abstinence Society, 249.
- St. John, John P., 147, 220, 233.
- St. John Temperance Society, 249.
- St. Louis, high licence conditions in, 193.
- Sallsbury, Lord, 300, 437.
- Samaritans, The Good, 106.
- Samlag*, 332 *et seq.*
- Samson, 17.
- Samuelson, quoted, 473.
- Sands, Daniel H., 100, 101.
- Sargent, L. M., 75.
- Satoili, Mgr., decision of, 460.
- Saturnalia, feast of, 12.
- Saunders, John, 311.

- Sceptre Life Association, 381; statistics, 333.
- Scientific Temperance Instruction, 224, 491.
- Schade, Louis, on high licence, 186.
- Schletema, Dr. Adama von, 306.
- Schulinus, Dr., experiments of, 374.
- Scop, 22.
- Scotland, 278, *et seq.*
- Scott Act, 257; see Canada Temperance Act; votes on, 258, 259.
- Scott, Gen. Winfield, 414.
- Scott, R. W., 257.
- Scott, Sir Walter, defends Normans, 24.
- Scottish Temperance Life Association, 332.
- Scottish Permissive Bill and Temperance Association, 298.
- Sedgwick, Captain, first brewer, 33.
- "Seven Men of Preston," 285.
- Sewell, Chief Justice, quoted, 475.
- Seymour, Gov. Horatio, 132.
- Shafter, Gen. W. R., 422.
- Shakespeare, quoted, 20; referred to, 26.
- She-King*, quoted, 5.
- Shoo-King*, quoted, 4.
- Sheridan, quoted, 30.
- Shufeldt, & Co., on high licence, 125.
- Sikes, Rev. J. R., 163.
- Six Sermons*, 61, 72, 278, 368.
- Skibbereens, The, 496.
- Slave Trade, 39 *et seq.*; 433.
- Smith, Gerrit, 76; on prohibition, 118; 231.
- Smith, Gov. John Cotton, on prohibition, 120.
- Smith, Green Clay, 234.
- Smith, Prof., investigations of, 375.
- Smith, Rev. J. Pye, 466.
- Smith, Rev. Mathew Hale, 87.
- Society Against Alcohol, 308.
- Society Against Drunkenness, 308.
- Soldiers' Total Abstinence Association, 425.
- Somaras, 7, 471.
- Somerset, Lady Henry, 224.
- Sons of Jonadab, 113.
- Sons of Temperance, 99 *et seq.*; National Relief Society, 102; 250, 413.
- Sons of the Soil, 112.
- South Australia, 312, 315.
- South Australia Alliance, 315.
- South Carolina, 339 *et seq.*; constitutional provision, 344.
- South Dakota, prohibition in, 151; dispensary in, 349, 497.
- Southern Baptist Association, 465.
- Southgate, James H., 248.
- Spence, F. S., 266.
- Spenser, J. A., 230, 231.
- Spirit Ration, provided for in U. S. Army, 403, 410; abolished by order, 411; by law, 413.
- Spurgeon, C. H., 469.
- Stahl, George Ernest, 355.
- State Control, see Dispensary, Government control, South Carolina, etc.
- Statistics, high and low licence, 196; high licence cities, 197; low licence cities, 198; cities compared, 200; Plebiscite votes, 262, 266; consumption of liquor in Canada, 276; Ireland, 293; United Kingdom, 303; Australia, 316; New Zealand, 320; Sweden, 323, 324; consumption of liquor in Sweden, 326; licences in Sweden, 323; pauperism in Sweden, 329, 330; drunkenness in Gothenburg, 330, 331; delirium tremens in Gothenburg, 331; Norwegian, distilleries in, 333; consumption of liquor in Norway, 333, 334; Norwegian cities and villages compared, 335; of drunkenness in Christiania, 336; dispensary profits, 345; sales of dispensary, 346; crime in Charleston, 348; of life insurance, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385; wrights industrial, 397, 398, 399, 401; Army Temperance Association, 427; prohibition party votes, 494; consumption of liquors in the United Kingdom, 497; in the United States, 499.
- Stead, G., 235.
- Stearns, John N., 103, 143, 230.
- Stephens, Sir Alfred, 312.
- Sternburg, Gen. George M., quoted, 420, 423.
- Stevens, Mrs. L. M. N., 214.
- Stewart, Gideon T., 218, 232, 234.
- Stewart, Oliver W., 245.
- Stewart, Mrs. E. D. ("Mother"), 202, 210.
- Stockholm, *bolag* established in, 327.
- Strabo, quoted, 15.
- Stuart, Rev. Moses, 75.
- Sudan, Kitchener's order in, 438.
- Sudduth, Margaret A., 214.
- Sullivan, Atty.-Gen. Geo., on prohibition, 119.
- Sutlers, forbidden to sell liquor, 412.
- Swan, Rev. Rosewell R., 60.
- Sweden, 321 *et seq.*; early conditions, 322; law of 1835, 323; law of 1855, 324; first *bolag*, 325; consumption of liquors in, 326; record of licences issued in, 328; *bolag* and pauperism, 323, 329, 330; dispensary in, 339.
- Switchmen's Union of North America, 405.
- Switzerland, 303, 339.

T.

Tacitus, quoted, 17.

- Talon, decision of, 51, 52, 53.
 Taney, Chief Justice, decision of, 122.
 Taschereau, Cardinal, 267.
 Tasmania, early conditions in, 311.
 Taylor, Bishop, quoted, 433.
 Taylor, Tom., 320.
 Taylor, Zachary, 86.
 Taxation of liquors, ancient China, 7; ancient India, 10; Alexander Hamilton's, 55; high licence, 177; Beer act, 284.
 Teare, James, 235.
 Teetotallers, 70, 496.
 Temperance and General Life Assurance Company, 384.
 Templars of Honour and Temperance, 103.
 Tennessee, report on pro., 121; 151.
 Texas, prohibition in, 151.
 Thompson, Andrew, 310.
 Thompson, Eliza J. ("Mother"), quoted, 203, 210.
 Thompson, H. A., 237.
 Thompson, Sir Henry, 377.
 Thomson, R. D., 380.
 Thudichum, Dr., experiments of, 374.
 Tierney, Sir M. J., 283, 364.
 Tilley, Sir Leonard S., 103, 251, 252.
 Tillman, Benj. R., 342, *et seq.*
 Todd, Dr. Robert Bentley, 367.
 Torrey, Dr. John, 360.
 Total Abstinence, recommended by Pittacus; first society, 70; 72, 76 *et seq.*; 81; 91; fraternal temperance societies, 99 *et seq.*; in Canada, 249 *et seq.*; "Seven Men of Preston," 235; in Australia, 312; and life insurance, 379; in Wales, 466.
 Transvaal, prohibition in, 438.
 Travers, Dr. B., 366.
 Trevelyan, Sir Walter C., 30, 298.
 Truair, T. S., 107.
 Ty'ler, John, 86.
 Turkey, army of, 432.
 Turner, Dr. Edward J., 378.
 Turner, Richard (Dickey), 285, 496.
- U.
- Union Signal, founded, 214.
 United Committee on Native Races, 437.
 United Friends of Temperance, 112.
 United Garment Workers of America, 405.
 United Mine Workers of America, 405.
 United Kingdom, 278 *et seq.*; consumption of liquors in, 303; army of, 424 *et seq.*; reforms of in the Pacific, 414; attitude of churches of, 465; consumption of liquors in, 497.
 United Kingdom Alliance, 296; resolution of, 463.
 United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution, 380 *et seq.*
 United Kingdom Total Abstinence Life Association, 380.
 United Presbyterian Church, declaration of, 463, 469.
 United States, consumption of liquor in, 499. See Congress, etc.
 United States Brewers' Association, resolutions of, 154; 228.
 United States Supreme Court. Taney decision, 122; Tax receipt decision, 143; Stone *vs.* Mississippi, 170; Beer Company cases, 171; Kansas cases, 172; Crowley *vs.* Christensen and Kidd *vs.* Pearson cases, 173; Dispensary upheld by, 344.
 United States Temperance Union, formed, 82.
 United Temperance Association, 111.
 United Templar Order, 111.
 Universalist Church, 461.
 Usquebaugh, 25.
 Utah, high licence in, 178.
- V.
- Van Buren, Martin, 80.
 Van Dieman's Land; see Tasmania.
 Vanguard of Freedom, 112.
 Varro, quoted, 11.
 Verdanti, 462.
 Vermont, early local option in, 124; prohibition in, 131, 140.
 Vest, George G., 172.
 Victoria, 314 *et seq.*
 Victoria Alliance, 314.
 Victoria Society, 250.
 Victoria Temperance League, 312.
 Vidal, A., quoted, 255, 257.
 Virginia, 33.
 Vodka, 352.
- W.
- Waite, Chief Justice, quoted, 171.
 Wakes, 23; forbidden, 26; 40.
 Waldron, Geo. B., quoted, 197.
 Wales, agitation in, 466.
 Walker, G. W., 311.
 Wallace, Mrs. Governor, 210.
 Walpole, quoted, 20.
 Walworth, Chancellor, 85, 133.
 Ward, Mary L., 227.
 Ware, Dr. John, 360.
 Warner, Robert, 380.
 Warren, Henry, quoted, 387.
 Washington, prohibition in, 151.
 Washington, George, attitude of, 54; death of, 356; order of, quoted, 407.

- Washington, Martha, Society, 90.
 Washington *Sentinel*, on high licence, 186.
 Washingtonian Home, 378.
 Washingtonian Movement, 87 *et seq.*; leaders on prohibition, 97, 378.
 Watson, Dr. John, quoted, 36.
 Watterson, Bishop John A., 459, 460.
 Wavrinsky, Edward, 333.
 Wayland, Francis, on prohibition, 119.
 Webb, Sir John, 284, 364.
 Webster, Daniel, 122.
 Weas, Rev. Mason L., quoted, 62.
 Well conducted farm, 71.
 Wellington, Duke of, quoted, 425.
 Wells, David A., quoted, 153.
 Wesley, John, quoted, 55; 449 *et seq.*
 Wesleyan Methodist Church, 466.
 West Australia, 315.
 West, Mary Allen, 224.
 West Virginia, prohibition vote in, 151.
 Whig party, attitude of in New York, 437.
 Whiskey Rebellion, 55.
 White, Sir George, 425.
 White, Rev. William, 317.
 Whitaker, Thomas, quoted, 286.
 Whitaker, Thomas, Jr., 288, 302.
 Whittier, John G., 76.
 Wieselgren, Peter, 322, 323.
 Wieselgren, Sigfried, quoted, 322.
 Wight, Rev. William, quoted, 292, 467.
 Wilberforce, Canon, 469.
 Wilkins, Daniel, Prof., 230.
 Willard, Frances E., 205; quoted, 206, 209; 210, 211, 212; quoted, 213, 215, 216, 218, 219; death of, 222; 226.
 Willard, Mary B., 214, 220.
 Williams, Sir George Fenwick, quoted, 432.
 Willing, Jennie F., 208, 209, 211.
 Wilson, Henry, quoted, 143.
 Wilson, L. B., 246.
 Wine, legendary origin of, 472.
 Wine and Spirit Gazette, on high licence, 187, 192.
 Winthrop, Governor, quoted, 32.
 Wirt, Atty.-Gen. William, quoted, 77; nuisance decision of, 79.
 Wisconsin, early local option contests in, 124; civil damage law in, 130; attempts at prohibition, 131, 140.
 Wisdom, William A., 90.
 Wishart, A., quoted, 190.
 Wittenmeyer, Annie, 210, 227.
 Woodbury, Justice, 123.
 Woodhead, Dr. Sims, 377.
 Woolley, John G., 245.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 201 *et seq.*; in Australia, 317; conventions, officers and roster of, 480.
 Woman's National Temperance League, 207.
 Woman's Suffrage, 221.
 World's Temperance Convention of 1846, 296.
 World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 224; conventions and officers of, 491.
 Wright, B. F., 146.
 Wright, Carroll D., investigations of, 396 *et seq.*
- X.
- Xerxes, Epitaph of, 16.
- Y.
- Yale, early conditions at, 45.
 Youmans, Letitia, 223.
 Yuletide, see Christmas.
- Z.
- Zend-Avesta, 15.
 Zoroaster, 15, 472.



YB 07449

141443 HV5020
W7

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

