

**No case against the United Kingdom Alliance and the permissive bill : a reprint and review of a pamphlet issued by the executive committee of the Provincial Licensed Victuallers' Defence League, entitled "The case against the United Kingdom Alliance and the permissive bill" / dedicated by the Executive Council of the United Kingdom Alliance to the sober judgement of the British Parliament and public.**

### **Contributors**

United Kingdom Alliance.  
Provincial Licensed Victuallers' Defence League.

### **Publication/Creation**

Manchester : The Alliance, [between 1872 and 1879?]

### **Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/ru9z46ta>

### **License and attribution**

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

6

NO CASE

AGAINST THE

UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE

AND THE

PERMISSIVE BILL:

A REPRINT AND REVIEW OF A PAMPHLET ISSUED BY THE EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE OF THE PROVINCIAL LICENSED VICTUALLERS'  
DEFENCE LEAGUE,

ENTITLED

"THE CASE AGAINST THE UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE  
AND THE PERMISSIVE BILL."

DEDICATED BY THE

*Ed*  
*1891*  
Executive Council of the United Kingdom Alliance

TO THE SOBER JUDGMENT OF THE  
BRITISH PARLIAMENT AND PUBLIC.

*1891*  
Alliance Offices:

41, JOHN DALTON STREET, MANCHESTER. 52, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON.

LONDON: CLARKE & CO., 13, FLEET STREET.

MANCHESTER: JOHN HEYWOOD, 141 & 143, DEANSGATE.



ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.—“Where, then, are we to look for the proper authority to decide whether there shall be public-houses or not? I give you the answer which is in accordance with all modern legislation and with the feelings of the people in every part of the empire: I give you the answer, that the people want to control it themselves.”

ARCHBISHOP MANNING.—“I look upon the Permissive Bill as no more than giving a legal right and power to the people of this country to protect themselves.”

RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.—“A Government should so legislate as to make it easy to do right and difficult to do wrong.”

RICHARD COBDEN.—“Every day's experience tends more and more to confirm me in my opinion that the Temperance cause lies at the foundation of all social and political reform.”

## UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE.

TO PROCURE THE TOTAL AND IMMEDIATE LEGISLATIVE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN ALL INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

1871-2.

### President :

Sir WALTER C. TREVELYAN, Baronet, M.A.

### Vice-Presidents :

Right Hon. Lord Claud Hamilton, M.P.  
The Most Rev. Archbishop Manning, Westminster.

The Ven. Archdeacon Sandford, Redditch.  
Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M.P., Brayton Hall, Carlisle.

Lieut.-Col. Sir G. B. Pechell, Bart., Alton.  
Sir John F. Davis, Bart., K.C.B., Bristol.  
Sir Thos. Bazley, Bart., M.P., Manchester.  
M. R. Dalway, Esq., M.P., Carrickfergus.  
The Very Rev. F. Close, D.D., Dean of Carlisle.  
Thomas Whitworth, Esq., M.P., Manchester.  
William Euing, Esq., Glasgow.

Frederick Schwann, Esq., London.  
The Rev. William M'Kerrow, D.D., Manchester.  
James Haughton, Esq., J.P., Dublin.  
John Hope, Esq., W.S., Edinburgh.  
The Rev. Jabez Burns, D.D., London.  
Edward Backhouse, Esq., Sunderland.  
Joseph Thorp, Esq., J.P., Halifax.  
Thomas Clegg, Esq., Manchester.  
John Cadbury, Esq., Birmingham.  
The Rev. Canon Jenkins, M.A., Welshpool.  
The Rev. Chancellor Morgan, M.A., Machen.  
Peter Spence, Esq., J.P., F.C.S., F.S.A., Manchester.

Charles Jupe, Esq., Mere, Wilts.  
The Rev. G. T. Fox, M.A., Durham.  
Robert Charleton, Esq., Bristol.  
The Rev. Prebendary Venn, Hereford.  
Joseph Crook, Esq., J.P., Bolton.  
Handel Cossham, Esq., F.G.S., Bristol.  
Edward Vivian, Esq., J.P., M.A., Torquay.

Thos. Watson, Esq., Rochdale.  
Benjamin Whitworth, Esq., J.P., Manchester.  
Edward Pease, Esq., Darlington.  
C. J. Darbishire, Esq., J.P., Rivington.  
Rev. Wm. Arthur, M.A., London.  
Mr. Alderman George Tatham, Leeds.  
W. H. Darby, Esq., Brymbo, Wrexham.  
Richard Allen, Esq., Dublin.  
John Grubb Richardson, Esq., Bessbrook.  
Rev. Dr. Morgan, Belfast.  
John Crossley, Esq., Halifax.  
Professor F. W. Newman, Clifton, Bristol.  
The Rev. Principal Antliff, D.D., Sunderland.  
J. Mackenzie, Esq., J.P., M.D., Inverness.  
Hugh Mason, Esq., J.P., Ashton-under-Lyne.  
P. H. Chambres, Esq., J.P., Denbigh.  
W. R. Callender, jun., Esq., J.P., D.L., F.S.A., Manchester.

The Rev. Sir Lovelace T. Stamer, Bart., Stoke-upon-Trent.  
Richard Roberts, Esq., J.P., Aberystwyth.  
Professor Rolleston, Oxford.  
Rev. Samuel Romilly Hall, Penzance.  
E. R. Le Mare, Esq., J.P., Manchester.  
Ebenezer Pike, Esq., Bessboro' House, Cork.  
Robert Whitworth, Esq., Manchester.  
William Hoyle, Esq., Tottington, Bury.  
Henry Crabtree, Esq., Manchester.  
James Barlow, Esq., J.P., Bolton.  
Mr. Alderman Robert Smalley, J.P., Bolton.  
Hon. William Fox, Prime Minister, New Zealand.

### Executive Committee :

Armitage, William.  
Addleshaw, J. W.  
Brunskill William.  
Booth, Councillor George, J.P.  
Caine, Rev. W., M.A.  
Clark, Rev. James.  
Fildes, James.  
Harvey, James.

Heywood, William.  
Hoyle, William.  
Latimer, James.  
M'Kerrow, Alderman J. B.  
Owen, J. W.  
Pope, Samuel, Q.C.  
Pearson, Edward.  
Robinson, Rev. W.

Shirley, Thomas.  
Spence, Frank.  
Steinthal, Rev. S. A.  
Sugden, John.  
Thompson, Charles, J.P.  
Whitworth, Benjamin, J.P.  
Whitworth, Robert.

CHAIRMAN OF EXECUTIVE—Benjamin Whitworth, Esq., J.P.

TREASURER—William Armitage, Esq.

HONORARY SECRETARY—Samuel Pope, Esq., Q.C., Recorder of Bolton.

SECRETARY—Mr. T. H. Barker.

ELECTORAL AND PARLIAMENTARY AGENT—Mr. J. H. Raper.

BANKERS—Manchester and County Bank (Limited), Manchester.

CENTRAL OFFICES—41, John Dalton Street, Manchester.

LONDON OFFICES—52, Parliament Street, S.W.




## INTRODUCTION.

---

A novelty in literature has appeared : the publicans have resorted to the printing-press in a deliberate attempt to justify themselves and put their opponents in the wrong. The Alliance hails this alteration of tactics as an admission on the part of the Liquor interest that Rowdiness is not King, and that the question at issue is to be decided by an appeal to a superior tribunal and a nobler judge. It will be observed that in replying to the pamphlet of the Provincial Licensed Victuallers' Defence League, it has been thought desirable to follow the order of the accusation, and to furnish an answer, paragraph by paragraph, to the whole of that production. No charge of garbling or omission can therefore be advanced ; and if the Defence League should offer a rejoinder to this publication, they will best prove their confidence in their case by imitating the example thus set, and by reprinting in full the answers that are here set forth. The Executive Council of the Alliance are content with having done their part to provide their disinterested and unprejudiced fellow-citizens with the knowledge by which error is dispelled, calumnies rebutted, and the advancement of social reform, by legislative and other agencies, eventually assured.





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
Wellcome Library

<https://archive.org/details/b30571546>

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
<b>I.—THE ALLIANCE V. THE TRADE AND THE PUBLIC.</b>	
Introductory.....	7
Outline of Contents .....	8
The Liquor Trade .....	8
Capital in the Trade .....	10
Revenue .....	12
The Present Licensing System : Regulations and Hours ..	13
Inns and the Public Convenience .....	14
The Alliance Attacks ...	14
Is Intemperance Increasing ? .....	16
Manchester and Liverpool .....	20
The Evidence from the Revenue Returns .....	24
Alliance Exaggerations as to Disease and Insanity .....	26
Inconsistency of the Allianceites .....	28
The Permissive Bill in Parliament .....	30
The Alliance £100,000 Fund.....	31
Mr. Trevelyan's Five Lectures .....	33
The Trade and Politics .....	35
The Trade and the Licensing System .....	37
 II.—SUMMARY OF REASONS AGAINST THE PERMISSIVE BILL .....	42
 <b>III.—HISTORY OF THE FAILURE OF ALL PROHIBITORY EXPERIMENTS.</b>	
Inefficacy of Sumptuary Laws .....	48
Failure of Prohibitory Legislation in England .....	48
The Sunday Maine Liquor Law in Scotland .....	53
Failure of the Maine Law in the American States.....	54



## IV.—OPINIONS OF EMINENT MEN.

PAGE.

Lord Stanley, M.P. ....	60
The Earl of Derby .....	64
Mr. John Stuart Mill .....	68
The Right Hon. John Bright, M.P. ....	72
The Bishop of Gloucester .....	74
The Bishop of Bath and Wells .....	76
Archdeacon Denison .....	77
Mr. Charles Seely, M.P. ....	78
Mr. Henry Fawcett, M.P. ....	79
Mr. George Dixon, M.P. ....	79
Mr. H. H. Vivian, M.P. ....	81
Mr. Hugh Miller .....	82
The <i>Times</i> .....	83

## V.—APPENDIX.



## I.—THE ALLIANCE *v.* THE TRADE AND THE PUBLIC.

---

### **Introductory.**

The United Kingdom Alliance proposes once more to test the opinion of Parliament on the subject of its Permissive Bill. It does this notwithstanding the fact that the Government is pledged to the introduction of a measure for the regulation of the licensing system; and it has been shown, by its recent declarations and policy, that the enactment of no measures founded upon statesmanlike and moderate principles will lead to a cessation of the agitation which it has now carried on for nearly twenty years.

THE UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE exists to do a certain work, still undone, so that its persistence cannot be considered remarkable; nor, after the reception given by the publicans to the Government Licensing Bill of the last session, will the Alliance leaders be condemned for refusing to wait till another Government scheme has been produced, and perhaps withdrawn.

Indeed, the very bill which Sir Wilfrid Lawson is about to introduce under the auspices of the Alliance, is only accepted by that association as an instalment. It partially disavows all responsibility for that scheme, and intimates its resolve to be content with nothing less than "the total and immediate suppression" of the trade in alcoholic beverages.

The Alliance has not "partially disavowed all responsibility" for a scheme "introduced under its auspices;" but it has affirmed without variation, that if the Bill of Sir Wilfrid Lawson can be amended, so as to carry out more effectually its design,—viz., the fullest expression of public opinion, armed with the prohibitory veto,—it will both receive and forward such amendments. At the same time it is quite true that the Alliance is "content with nothing less than the suppression" of the traffic, and only accepts the Permissive Bill as a means to this end. The suppression of drink-selling which the Alliance seeks, it, however, seeks in union with, and never in defiance of, the public community to be affected by the measure. This important fact the authors of the pamphlet carefully suppress.



It becomes, therefore, of great importance to the trade against whose interests its energies and efforts are directed, as well as to the great body of the public whose comfort and convenience are threatened, to examine the pretensions of this organisation, with a view of showing that the principles it advocates are unsound; that the law it seeks to introduce has failed wherever it has been tried, that its policy is adverse to the spread of temperate and sober habits, and that its continued agitation is inimical to the interests of the country, and ought to be strongly and effectually discouraged by public opinion and the decisive action of Parliament.

If, instead of "examining the pretensions of this organisation" (the Alliance), the traffickers in strong drink would justify their own position, and would show the compatibility of their business with public sobriety, morality, and prosperity—with public "comfort and convenience" in their legitimate sense—they would serve their own object more completely than by aspersions upon others. The Alliance will only be effectually "discouraged" when evidence is adduced that the liquor traffic is a blessing to the country, or that, at least, it compensates in one way for the mischief it causes in another, and that it is unjust that localities should be consulted concerning its exclusion from their midst.

**Outline  
of  
Contents.**

It is proposed, therefore, to state as briefly as possible a number of facts (many of them but imperfectly known) with reference to the trade, the licensing system, and intemperance; to show some of the evils—civil, social, and political—attendant on the continued agitation for a prohibitory law; and to indicate the views of the trade on the subject of the licensing system. In subsequent sections will be found a history of the failure of all prohibitory experiments, and a collection of opinions and arguments against the Permissive Bill and the Alliance, selected from the speeches and books of men of eminence in the State, the Church, and in Literature.

Had the public been dependent upon "the trade" for printed information upon the licensing system and intemperance, its ignorance must still have been profound; and a change of policy may now be hailed with satisfaction as an appeal to the power by which, very extensively, the question will be decided.

**The Liquor  
Trade.**

The Liquor Trade, against which the Alliance directs its attacks, is an ancient industry, and is probably more widely distributed over the country than any other. The number of persons actually and actively employed in it, and deriving their livelihood from it, is estimated by Professor Leone Levi\* to be no fewer than 846,000. The figures are made up as follows:—

---

\* A Report to M. T. Bass, Esq., M.P., on the Capital Invested and the Number of Persons Engaged in the Liquor Trades.—*By Professor Leone Levi, F.S.A.*







and support in the liquor traffic. This is to put the case very moderately, since it has been repeatedly proved that the liquor traffic gives but a very trifling employment to the industrial classes of the country.

2. As to the second question it must be remarked that the extent to which any particular business attracts custom and absorbs labour and capital, cannot of itself decide whether the business is a national good or evil. A tree is known by its fruits, and if the fruits are bad the amount of labour and expense incurred in the culture is a measure of the loss sustained. If without a particular trade the nation would lose nothing really valuable, that trade is a dead weight upon the national resources ; but if its operations are for evil, and if (as is true of the liquor traffic) it feeds every social curse, and weakens every social reform, the numerical and pecuniary magnitudes of such a trade render it a calamity of the highest order. A trade that multiplies pauperism, crime, insanity, every variety of vice and suffering, and the taxation required to punish or support the victims of such evils, cannot plead its extent as a justification. This plea is but an aggravation of the offence. There is, thank Heaven, but one trade that answers to this description, and that trade is "THE trade" represented by the pamphlet under review. To sum up: an "industry" may be "ancient" without being legitimate or respectable, or endurable] in a properly-constituted State. It may be "more widely distributed than any other," and may, on that account, only the more widely cumber the ground and exhaust the virtues of the soil. There is no reason to believe that 846,000 persons are engaged in the liquor trade, and that 1,500,000 draw their subsistence from it. There is every reason to believe that the money spent in strong drinks would employ far more capital and labour if spent on other articles. And, to crown all, there is the surest and saddest evidence that the sale of intoxicating liquors results—as no other business does result—in flooding the country with every kind and degree of evil, oppressing it with needless taxation, and hindering its development in all that would otherwise render it virtuous, prosperous, and secure.

**Capital in the  
Trade.**

The same authority estimates the capital, fixed and floating, invested in the Liquor Trade of the United Kingdom as follows :—



	Fixed Capital.	Half the Floating Capital.	Total.
	£	£	£
Beer.....	12,400,000	16,000,000	28,400,000
Spirits—British.....	5,000,000	7,200,000	12,200,000
„ Foreign and Wine.....	.....	6,900,000	6,900,000
Glass Bottle and Cork Manufacturers.....	500,000	.....	500,000
Wine and Spirit Dealers, Bottlers, &c. ...	3,000,000	2,000,000	5,000,000
Public-houses.....	57,000,000	.....	57,000,000
Wages of Dealers' Workmen, Bottlers, &c.	.....	250,000	250,000
Wages of Public-house Servants.....	.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
License Duties.....	.....	850,000	850,000
Total.....	77,900,000	39,200,000	117,100,000

In this calculation, the floating capital is taken at one-half, in order to represent as accurately as possible the amount actually invested at any one time.

It thus appears that the aggregate investment is £117,100,000, and it is distributed in the following proportions :—

England.....	£92,315,000
Scotland .....	£13,344,000
Ireland .....	£11,441,000
	£117,100,000

Professor Levi, in a paper read before the Statistical Society of London, reduced this estimate to £114,000,000, and he admitted that it might be subjected to an immense reduction if the value of the property *capable of being used other than in the liquor and subsidiary trades* were subtracted from the totals. The estimate as to “fixed capital” goes on the preposterous assumption that the property referred to has no value except as property held by liquor-vendors; and the estimate as to the “floating capital” is arrived at by reckoning the value of raw materials, cost of production, wages, excise taxes, and license duties, and then dividing the whole by two! In a critique upon Professor Levi's reports to Mr. Bass, M.P., it is shown that the fixed and floating capital inseparable from the liquor traffic does not probably exceed £37,350,000.\* Besides, to make any such calculations practically useful and not delusive, account should be taken of the reduced value of property in the vicinity of public-houses; the losses suffered by owners of property, capi-

\* See “Statistics of the Liquor Traffic,” by Rev. Dawson Burns, M.A., F.S.S., pp. 5–9.



talists, and employers of labour owing to intemperance ; and the proportion of rates upon property due to the crime and pauperism springing out of this intemperance. Beyond all these considerations are those that relate to the increase of national capital which would arise from a proper use of the hundred millions sterling now spent in alcoholic liquors, and the suicidal folly of employing capital to any extent so as to destroy the nation's wealth, and diminish those physical and moral qualities, the general possession of which is essential to national greatness and future progress. In a word, the figures are all wrong in the way they are quoted ; and if they were all right, they would not bear the intended application unless it were made clear that the liquor traffic is a social blessing.

It will serve to show the magnitude of the liquor trades as compared with other great industries of the country, if (still availing ourselves of Professor Levi's statistical calculations) we note that the total capital, fixed and floating, invested in the cotton trade, is estimated at £85,500,000 ; of the woollen manufacture at £22,600,000 ; and of the iron manufacture at £25,500,000.

We *know* that the cotton, woollen, and iron trades are an unmixed benefit : no one, however—not even the dealers in strong drink—can say the same of the liquor traffic, while there are millions who believe it to be an unqualified bane. Comparisons are only possible between things capable of being compared. Even statistically viewed, the above paragraph is fundamentally fallacious, for while the total capital of the liquor trade *includes* all the property employed in the *retail* traffic, and half the taxes, &c., paid upon the liquors, the account of the total capital included in the cotton, woollen, and iron trades *omits* all the value of the property used in the retail branches. This statement may be verified by referring to Professor Levi's First Letter to Mr. Bass, M.P., page 17 (Second Edition).

The duties and licences imposed upon liquors and the liquor trade contribute more than one-third to the total revenue of the country. That revenue for the year ending the 31st of March, 1870, was £73,503,719 ; and the sum received by the Exchequer from the liquor trade was, £24,820,623, or 34 per cent of the whole, as follows :—

**Revenue.**

Malt Duty .....	£6,483,612
British Spirits .....	£10,969,188
Foreign Spirits .....	£4,191,400
Wine .....	£1,476,604
Licences (1869) .....	£1,699,819
	<hr/>
	£24,820,623



For the year ending March 31st, 1871, the duty from the taxes on liquor and licences was still greater, viz., £26,185,000, which, in a total revenue of £69,945,000, gave a proportion of 37 per cent.

These taxes are borne by the publicans' customers; and therefore, the credit, whatever it is, must be awarded to them, and not to the sellers, who are always anxious that the taxation should be reduced. Looked at morally, the only excuse for this taxation lies in its effect in reducing consumption; yet as a reduced income from this source implies diminished drinking, some Chancellors of the Exchequer have congratulated the country upon the smaller amounts realised by the Treasury in certain years, from the duties imposed upon distilled and fermented liquors. The immediate aid to the revenue is doubtless large, yet it is dearly bought when the other side of the account is considered—the waste of the national resources, and loss of national life, virtue, and happiness from the drinking system. Who will propose to double the drinking in order to double the exchequer income from it? Who would not rejoice and consider it an omen for good, if the exchequer receipts from this source were to drop one-half? In the Budget speech of Mr. Lowe, on March 25th last, he said: "Coffee is a stimulant which in a certain degree has been set up as a rival, though I am afraid it has not been a very successful one, against the injurious stimulants which are so much adopted, and to which even the enormous amount of the spirit revenue, I assure the Committee, by no means reconciles me."

**The present  
Licensing  
System.  
Regulations  
and Hours.**

The laws at present in force for the regulation of public-houses are of considerable stringency. Setting aside the Suspensory Act of 1871, which was professedly a temporary measure, and passed for one year only, the Governing Act is 9 Geo. IV., c. 61. A public-house must be first licensed by the justices before the keeper of it can sell exciseable liquors. The licence must be renewed annually. It compels the holder to keep unadulterated liquors, to use only legal measures, not to permit drunkenness, or unlawful games, or bad characters; and, lastly, not to open his house at certain specified times. Constables have the power to enter public-houses at all times.

As regards the restrictions upon the hours, public-houses are required to remain closed until one o'clock on Sundays. They must again be shut from three to five p.m., and shut altogether at eleven p.m. until four a.m. on the following day. They are thus permitted to be open on Sundays for eight hours in all. On week days, in towns which have adopted the One o'clock Closing Act, public-houses are required to close between the hours of one a.m. and four a.m. Elsewhere, under the general act, public-houses may remain open, if respectably conducted, all night. In Scotland inns are closed the whole day on Sunday.



The "stringency" noticed in the first sentence of this paragraph refers to the terms of the legal conditions on which licences are granted, and not to their enforcement. To say that the licence "compels the holder to keep unadulterated liquors, to use only legal measures, not to permit drunkenness," &c., is to ascribe to the licence an efficiency which universal observation demonstrates not to exist. And the publicans know this, or they would not resist as they do a system of inspection and control worthy of the name.

**Inns  
and the Public  
Convenience.**

Whilst thus providing for the maintenance of good order, the law, on the other hand, has not been unmindful of the public convenience; and, with this view, mine host is fenced in by requirements which are not applied to any other tradesman. He is bound, for example, to open his house to all travellers without distinction, and has no option to refuse such shelter, refreshment, and accommodation as he possesses, provided the person who applies is of the description of a traveller, and able and ready to pay the customary hire, and is not drunk or disorderly, or labouring under any infectious disorder. There are other protective regulations which need not be specified, but which are of special value to the public, and particularly to travellers in out-of-the-way and rarely frequented places. Apart from legal privileges, however, the British inn has for centuries been celebrated for its hospitable reception of wayfarers; and, in large towns, for the combined independence and privacy which it ensures to its guests. What Shenstone, the poet, sang long ago, is true now:—

Here, waiter, take my sordid ore,  
Which lackeys else might hope to win:  
It buys what courts have not in store,  
It buys me freedom at an inn.  
Whoe'er has travelled life's dull round,  
Where'er his stages may have been,  
May sigh to think he still has found  
His warmest welcome at an inn.

The writer of the above must have reckoned on the readers ignorance and credulity, or he would not have sought to pass off the "British inn" and its "hospitable reception of wayfarers" as a type of the common public-house and beershop. Excellent and adequate provision for travellers' wants may be made, and in many towns is offered, apart from the sale of intoxicating liquors. Some of the best and most frequented hotels in this kingdom are conducted without a liquor business, and are preferred by great numbers of persons who are not habitual abstainers.

**The Alliance  
Attacks.**

It is against this great industry, which, for the public convenience, has grown with the growth of the country, and which, for the preservation of social order and the protection of the revenue, is guarded round by stringent regu-



lations, that the Alliance has directed its incessant attacks for the last nineteen years, using in reference to it the most unjustifiable vituperation, and striving, by exaggerated and totally unfounded assertions, to arouse popular prejudice against all concerned in the trade.

It is *not* against "*this* great industry"—inn-keeping—that the Alliance directs its attacks, but against facilities and temptations to drinking which beset and betray innumerable men and women, who, but for these snares, would lead honest and useful lives. The "stringent regulations" have proved to be as tow in the flame before the fiery greed of gain on the part of the drink-vendor, and the fiery thirst for alcohol developed in the drink-consumer. The Alliance has not endeavoured to "arouse popular prejudice against all concerned in the trade;" for its charges have been scrupulously directed, not against the private character of the traffickers, but against their traffic and the legislation which exempts it from popular control.

No other class of tradesmen has ever, for so long a period, been subjected to similar unmeasured abuse, and the result of the violent attacks of the Alliance has been to irritate and disturb the trade without a single compensating public advantage. The unreasonableness and injustice of such a course scarcely requires demonstration.

It is no abuse of a trade to expose the mischiefs which result from it; and "no other class of tradesmen" could have had their business subjected to similar criticism, because no other business produces such results; and "unmeasured abuse" if directed against other tradesmen, would have been disregarded. The conscience which makes cowards of the guilty, has co-operated with the Alliance in irritating and disturbing the liquor interest.

It would be tedious, if not impracticable, to follow the Alliance through all the evils which it attempts to fasten upon the trade, and which really have their origin in many concurrent defects of our social system—such as the want of education, decent dwellings, wholesome recreation, and the like—and we shall therefore confine ourselves to the presentation of a few facts in relation to the subject of intemperance.

"Concurrent defects" of the social system will explain some of its sufferings and evils, and they have no doubt assisted to give greater scope to the injurious action of the public-house; but these could not have produced social intemperance had not intoxicating drink been laid-on near to the houses of the people, inasmuch as they are not found to operate in districts which are free from liquor-shops. The love of alcoholic liquor is produced by the liquor, and by it alone; and



what is chargeable upon the dealers in strong drink is their active concurrence in the promotion of a traffic which, in proportion as it extends, carries in its train every social evil, and notoriously aggravates the very "defects" to which this paragraph refers.

**Is  
Intemperance  
Increasing?**

Perhaps the assertion most frequently made by Alliance advocates is the one that intemperance is fearfully on the increase. As nothing but the truth will, in the long run, serve the cause of either one side or the other, it is a matter of great importance to arrive at a sound conclusion on this subject. Probably if the absolute truth in a broad way could be ascertained, it would be found that there is an increase, though not a large one, in the number of habitual drunkards, but that the great mass of the people is more sober and temperate than at any previous period.

The sophist is fully aware of the advantage to be gained in addressing careless thinkers, by treating a false or subordinate issue as if it were a real or the principal one. This artifice is illustrated in the foregoing paragraph, since it is not true that "the assertion most frequently made by Alliance advocates"—or that to which they attach any primary importance—"is the one that intemperance is fearfully on the increase." If intemperance had not increased since 1853, or 1800, there would be sufficient reason for the efforts of the Alliance and of all temperance reformers to remove the causes of so great a curse. Considerable imperfection attaches to the means of comparing the extent and intensity of such a vice at different periods; and there is no reason at all for waiting till it is made clear that the evil is increasing, before the most vigorous exertions are made to bring about its reduction, and, if possible, its extinction.

What "the absolute truth in a broad way" may exactly mean can only be vaguely guessed; but if there is "an increase, though not a large one, in the number of habitual drunkards"—and if, as the late Mr. Charles Buxton calculated in 1855, the number of such drunkards was 500,000—the state of things, as thus exposed, is surely bad enough to move every lover of his country to earnest action for the removal of an evil so disgraceful and so pernicious to the social fabric.

To prove this position there are two tests available: first, the police returns of committals for drunkenness; second, the revenue returns of the consumption of beer, wines, and spirits. The police returns are, no doubt, trustworthy in a statistical sense, but it is to be observed that they are merely statistical—that is to say, they give no information whatever as to the relative stringency with which the laws are put into operation in particular localities.



Had the authors of this pamphlet felt strong enough to meet the only vital question—Do the effects of the Liquor Traffic justify a Permissive Prohibitory enactment?—they would not have ridden-off upon another of far inferior importance. As to police returns, it is admitted that they give “no information whatever as to the relative stringency with which the laws are put in operation in particular localities ;” and it might be added that there is no uniform system observed in the treatment of persons apprehended for drunkenness. The police force of the country is itself very unequally distributed ; and the only thing certain is, that the police cases of drunkenness bear no kind of proportion to the acts of drunkenness visible in public-houses and the public streets.

Now it is notorious that exceptionally stringent measures have been taken in Manchester and Liverpool, where the police force has been very largely augmented during the last twenty-five years, and where the Alliance people have constituted themselves into vigilance committees and amateur informers, in order to hound on the magistrates and constabulary against drunken people and the keepers of public-houses. Manchester and Liverpool, accordingly, show an increase of committals for drunkenness during the last ten years. Upon this subject we propose to say something further on.

On the above it is sufficient to remark—

1.—No specific facts are given as to the vigilance committees, amateur informers, and the hounding on of magistrates and police against drunken people and publicans in Manchester and Liverpool.

2.—It is abundantly evident, from the tone of this extract, that the exercise of strict supervision of any kind, official or unofficial, is regarded by the publicans with disgust and alarm ; sentiments which disclose the insincerity of the professions they so often make of a wish to see the law faithfully carried out, and transgressors punished.

3.—According to the admission of this writer, a more than ordinary strictness in looking after publicans and their customers adds enormously to the average of drunken apprehensions ; the natural inference being, that an equal strictness elsewhere would lead to a proportionate increase of apprehensions for the same offence. In other words, we are asked to believe that Manchester and Liverpool are not more drunken than other places, but that their public drunkenness is brought into fuller official notice ; and because it is so, the liquor sellers are exceedingly annoyed. Comment upon such a confession may well be spared.



As regards the rest of England, omitting the two great Lancashire towns, the available evidence founded upon the police returns of committals proves that drunkenness is not increasing. On the contrary, when the augmentation of the population is taken into account, there is clear evidence that intemperance is on the decline. Thus, exclusive of Manchester and Liverpool, we find that in 91 towns, with a population exceeding 10,000, there were—

In 1841 .....	52,017 cases of drunkenness.
„ 1845 .....	45,031 „
„ 1869 .....	49,600 „

The population of these ninety-one towns having in the interval more than doubled.

It would have been more satisfactory if the great towns here referred to had been enumerated, and if the official authority for the figures had been stated; especially as, immediately after, London (one of the 91 towns) is credited with 30,816 cases of drunkenness in 1841, leaving only 21,201 cases for ninety other towns. Why, too, are the figures in regard to towns alone cited, and not those in regard to the whole kingdom? Without either asserting or denying a decrease in police-registered drunkenness, one consideration should be borne in mind, viz., the greater familiarity of the police with drunken cases, and the consequent tendency to suffer the persons thus affected to recover when and where they can. Even where disorder is added to drunkenness, the policeman is often tempted to let the evil “cure itself,” especially where drunken persons are alone concerned.

Again, as regards the metropolis, whereas in 1841 there were 30,816 cases of drunkenness in a population of 1,948,000, in 1869, when the population had increased to 3,251,000, there were but 21,056. Or, to put the same in tabular form:—

London, in 1841 .....	1,948,000	.....	30,816
„ 1869 .....	3,251,000	.....	21,056
„ Increase of population .....	1,303,000		
„ Decrease of drunken cases ..			9,760

The statistics here given for London are misleading, as previous to 1844 the arrests for drunkenness with disorder were not distinguished from arrests for disorder without drunkenness.

The return for 1841, when analysed, stands thus—

Apprehensions for drunkenness .....	15,006
„ disorderly conduct .....	15,810
	<hr/>
	30,816

Had both drunken and non-drunken disorderly cases in 1869 been reckoned together (as in 1841) the return would have been



21,056 (drunken) and 16,724 (common assaults)—a total of 37,780, an increase of 6,964 cases, and not a decrease of 9,760. It may still be asserted that the apprehensions for drunkenness in 1841 were greater than in 1869; but if instead of 1841 we come down to 1844—the first year when the present classification was made—we shall find that the total apprehensions were 16,474—a number 4,582 fewer than the apprehensions in 1869. Taking increase of population into account, 1869 still compares favourably with 1844—a tribute to the result of the persistent and combined efforts of all who had been engaged during a quarter of a century in counteracting, to some extent, the pernicious influence of the public-house. But that the liquor traffic is putting a powerful check upon the collective agencies tending to render the metropolis more sober, is made clear by the following extracts from the “Judicial Statistics” for 1867-8-9-70 :—

	1867.	1868.	1869.	1870.
Apprehensions for drunkenness in } the Metropolitan district..... }	16,608	18,872	21,056	20,813
Ditto in the City of London.....	414	446	357	396
Totals.....	17,022	19,318	21,413	21,209

Thus it will be seen that from 1867 to 1870 there was an increase of apprehensions for drunkenness of 4,187.

We will now take three large towns and institute a similar comparison, merely premising that the only way to test the increase or decrease of drunkenness, as shown by the apprehensions, is to place the figures in juxtaposition with the population at the respective periods, and thus show the ratio of drunken cases to the number of inhabitants :—

	Population.	Apprehensions for Drunkenness.	Ratio of Drunken Cases to Population.
Bristol in 1841 .....	122,296	1,076	1 in 113
„ 1869 .....	182,529	1,042	1 „ 175
Birmingham in 1841 .....	182,922	1,588	1 „ 115
„ 1869 .....	343,696	2,244	1 „ 153
Liverpool in 1841 .....	286,487	15,822	1 „ 18
„ 1869 .....	493,346	21,113	1 „ 23

It will thus be seen that in every case, even including the notorious Liverpool, a proportionate diminution in the number of apprehensions has taken place in the twenty-eight years between 1841 and 1869.



Mr. Henley, M.P., in the course of a debate in the House of Commons in April, 1869, showed by most elaborate statistics that, leaving Lancashire out of consideration, drunkenness had perceptibly diminished of late years. The persons apprehended for drunkenness in the whole of England in 1867 (excluding Lancashire) were only at the rate of one in every 103 persons. The West Riding of Yorkshire, with a population of 1,500,000, had 6,000 cases of drunkenness in 1861, and in 1867, with a largely augmented population, only 6,063.

All the evidence obtainable from the *Judicial Statistics* points in the same direction, viz., that drunkenness is not on the increase in the country at large, and that, on the whole, it has a tendency to diminish, and in some places, especially in the Metropolis, it has materially declined.

If the statistics of Bristol and Birmingham as to the arrests for drunkenness in 1841 are as fallacious as those of the Metropolis for the same period, the comparisons instituted above are of little weight.

That some error of classification exists is very probable, since the figures for 1861 and 1869 for Bristol and Birmingham were as follows :—

	1861	1869
Apprehensions for drunkenness in Bristol .....	560	1,042
„ „ Birmingham ...	1,186	2,244

So that if the police returns show a decrease in 1869 as compared with 1841, there has been an increase of almost a hundred per cent since 1861 ; and for the reasons before stated we are much surer of the increase since 1861 than of the decrease since 1841. As to Liverpool, the apprehensions, which in 1861 were 9,832, rose to 21,363 in 1871.

Whether “all the evidence obtainable from the ‘Judicial Statistics’ points in the direction that drunkenness is not on the increase in the country at large,” may be tested by the following figures :—

1864-5 total cases.....	105,310
1865-6 „ ..	104,368
1866-7 „ ..	100,357
1867-8 „ ..	111,465
1868-9 „ ..	122,310
1869-70 „ ..	131,870

In 1867-8 the Liverpool and Manchester cases conjointly numbered 23,991 ; in 1869-70 they were 32,196, an increase of 8,205 ; while the national increase, as shown above, was 20,405.

**Manchester and Liverpool.** The state of affairs in relation to drunkenness in Manchester and Liverpool is exceptional, and has therefore been reserved for separate consideration. It has already been shown that to include the committals of these towns in the aggregate for England would prevent us from arriving at just conclusions



as to the increase or decrease of drunkenness in the country generally. It has also been shown that the apprehensions for drunkenness in Liverpool were comparatively smaller in 1869 than they were in 1841, a decline having taken place from 1 in 18 to 1 in 23 of the population. Still, it must be admitted that the aggregate number of drunken cases remains very large. As regards Manchester, the increase in the number of committals has been steady and continuous, as the following figures will show :—

1860.....	2,329	1866.....	5,639
1861.....	2 284	1867.....	9,742
1862.....	3,373	1868.....	9,540
1863.....	3,206	1869.....	11,461
1864.....	3,587	1870 .....	11,083
1865.....	3,679	1871.....	10,699

Opinions differ widely as to the causes of the exceptional condition of things in the two leading Lancashire towns, but undoubtedly the chief reason is the extraordinary activity of the police and the peculiar influences brought to bear upon the magistrates. In Manchester the police force was increased sixteen per cent during the ten years from 1860 to 1870 ; and, in relation to the area over which its duties extend, it is by far the largest in the country. Thus, in London, the number of the police constables is 21 per thousand acres; in Liverpool, 86 ; and in Manchester, 122. Archdeacon Denison recently declared that he should be very thankful if the “ admirable police regulations which he was told existed in Lancashire ” could be extended throughout the rest of England ; but he wouldn’t find many people to agree with him in the over-policed city of Manchester. Enormous as the force is in Manchester, it is supplemented, as regards the watching of public-houses and the arrest of drunken men, by a body of amateur detectives—Good Templars, teetotal spies, and adherents of the Alliance, of which association Manchester is the headquarters. Harassed by these emissaries, whose object is as discreditable as it is obvious, the Manchester constables arrest scores and scores of inoffensive inebriates, who in any other town in the kingdom would be allowed to go quietly home ; and this assertion is confirmed by the fact that the number of persons proceeded against to each constable is the largest in Manchester of any town in England.\* In the Metropolis this number was 10·8; in the City of London, 16·2; in Leeds, 29·0, and in Liverpool, 38·7: but in Manchester it was 40·7. Now, of the whole number of persons taken before the magistrates for all sorts of offences during the year 1871, no less than 41 per cent was for drunkenness—a fact which proves our position to demonstration, namely, that the energies of the police have been peculiarly directed to one particular department of their duties.

This lengthy paragraph is eloquent in its suggestiveness. Put into practical phraseology, it signifies that if the liquor-traffickers had the ordering of municipal affairs in Manchester, they would keep the drunkenness their business produces as much in the statistical background as possible, and so manipulate the police arrangements as to give an impression the exact contrary of the fact. This design is conveyed in all but these precise words, and it casts a flood of light upon the professed

---

\* See Captain Palin’s Statistical Returns of the Manchester Police for 1871.



hatred felt by publicans towards drunkenness, and upon their avowed anxiety for its prevention. It now appears, on their own showing, that it is the *detection* of drunkenness, and not its commission, which chiefly distresses them; and they cannot conceal their chagrin and spite when something like an honest attempt is made, as in Manchester, to bring the evil into the open view of the police-court and the Chief Constable's Annual Report. They would, if they could, make things *appear comfortable*; and their attack on the municipal authorities of Manchester for preferring another course is as self-criminating as it is audacious.

Another fact from Captain Palin's statistics is worthy of citation; though, if the truth were known, it is probably not exclusively illustrative of Manchester. Of the 10,699 persons proceeded against for drunkenness in 1871, 10,366 were badly educated or wholly ignorant, and only 333 could read and write well.

The want of ability to read and write well is not a certain indication of deficient general ability and technical skill. When their purpose is to blame the Wine Licences Act, and the sale of wine by grocers, the publicans perceive and insist that education is not a safeguard against intemperance; and the fact, whether asserted or denied by drink vendors of any grade, is too patent to be called in question. Even where drunkenness is not directly the parent of ignorance, it consigns the children of drunkards to the loss of educational advantages which they would otherwise receive. A pound for the publican and a penny or nothing for the schoolmaster, must make its mark on the moral and intellectual condition of any people.

It is a glaring and grievous defect of these statistics that they draw no distinction between cases and persons. The same person as—for example, an habitual drunkard—may be, and frequently is, brought up ten, twenty, or thirty times in the course of a twelvemonth. How many "cases" of this kind are there in Manchester? The police statistics do not tell us, and yet the character of the whole population is misrepresented and aspersed by the absence of such information.

Professor Levi has made use of a Parliamentary return to estimate that the re-committals in the year ending September 29, 1870, were 52,000, leaving 80,000 as the number of distinct persons apprehended for drunkenness, or 60 per cent of the whole. Applying this rule to the Manchester committals the distinct persons apprehended may be set down at 6,420. But Professor Levi, though reporting to Mr. Bass, M.P., notes this important *addendum* to his calculations: "It should be remarked



that the committals for drunkenness are far fewer than the number subject to drunkenness, the police only interfering where the drunkard is helpless or offensive." It is, indeed, "a glaring and grievous defect" of all official returns of intemperance that they take no cognisance of the intemperance practised in private, and that they register but a small proportion of that intemperance which is exposed to the public gaze. No constable or citizen of Manchester, outside "The Trade," imagines that a tithe of the drunkenness generated in the public-houses of that city comes under official review; and yet if the arrests in the whole kingdom were proportionate to the Manchester ratio, they would mount from 132,000 to three times that number!

As an illustration of the delusiveness of comparative statistics, as well as of the increased stringency of the police regulations in reference to intemperance, it may be observed that what are called "refused charges" have very much diminished. Ten years ago there was a large number of refused charges, 1,800 in 4,044 persons taken up by the police; in 1870, the charges refused were only 800 in 11,000. This points to increased rigour on the part of the Watch Committee and the magistrates, and it is a fact that these local authorities, also, have been influenced by the Alliance agitators and the numerous teetotal societies in the city. On the whole, there is reason to believe that police interference is vastly overdone in Manchester. The result, on the one hand, is to give the city an evil pre-eminence which is by no means its due; and, on the other, it proves that the system adopted is powerless as a deterrent, and that if intemperance is to be effectually checked it must be accomplished by other and entirely different means.

The inhabitants of Manchester are better able to decide than the Provincial Licensed Victuallers' Defence League whether "police interference is vastly overdone" among them. They will probably prefer to know something of the evil in their midst instead of shutting their eyes to it and regarding their ignorance as bliss; and by so doing they set an example to other cities and parishes which might be wisely followed. It is true, however, that the mere police detection and even punishment of drinking do not deter its victims from the vice, and therefore the cure and prevention "must be accomplished by other and entirely different means"—viz., the removal of public facilities and temptations to its commission.

As regards Liverpool, it has already been shown that drunkenness is declining, if we take the apprehensions in their ratio to population; and, apart from statistics, persons well acquainted with the town have recently borne emphatic testimony to the same effect. At a meeting of the Liverpool Domestic Mission on Monday the 19th of February, 1872, Mr. S. G. Rathbone said "the town and people were more prosperous. The amounts deposited in



the Liverpool Savings Bank had increased from £49,226 in 1862 to £68,955 in 1871; and that increase had been steady, and did not at all follow the fluctuations of commerce in the town. During several years there had been also a decrease of pauperism, as the following figures would show:—

“Persons relieved in the parish of Liverpool:—

In the year 1867 .....	29,700
„ 1868 .....	24,300
„ 1869 .....	22,360
„ 1870 .....	16,859
„ 1871 .....	12,831

“There was also a marked decrease in the amount of serious crime. If they agreed that the advocates of temperance were right in their assertion that drunkenness filled the poorhouses and prisons, the converse of that proposition must be true; if they found those places steadily emptying, they might take it as a proof that the amount of drunkenness was steadily decreasing. He had asked a number of gentlemen who were in the habit of coming face to face with the people if they thought drunkenness was increasing, and their answer had been that it was decreasing; and the conclusion he had come to was that not only in Liverpool, but throughout the whole country, the vice of drunkenness was rapidly decreasing amongst them.”

An increase of £19,729 in the deposits of the Liverpool Savings Bank between 1862 and 1871 is but little indication of increased sobriety and thrift, considering the increase of population and the growth of trade and commerce. Within those years, the people of Liverpool spent upon intoxicating liquors a sum of at least twelve millions sterling, and the increase of deposits in the Savings Bank was under £20,000! If the poor relieved in Liverpool are diminishing, as stated above, the same cannot be affirmed of England generally; the returns for the past four years being as under:—

January 1st, 1867 .....	958,824	indoor and outdoor paupers.
„ 1868 .....	1,034,823	„ „
„ 1869 .....	1,039,549	„ „
„ 1870 .....	1,079,391	„ „

If pauperism and crime decrease, as they ought to do in a country so favoured as ours, none the less ought the chief causes of that measure of evil which remains to be vigorously attacked; and what those chief causes are in Liverpool, as elsewhere, not a qualified observer has ever disputed. It would be a miserable plea for permitting sanitary abuses, that the mortality in England has greatly diminished since the century commenced.

**The Evidence  
from  
the Revenue  
Returns.**

While the *Judicial Statistics* show that there has been a decline in the apprehensions for drunkenness, the revenue returns concurrently prove that there has been no increase in the consumption of spirits (the chief cause of drunkenness) at all proportionate to the increase of population. Indeed, the consumption of spirits is smaller now than it



was ten years ago. The Commissioners for the Inland Revenue give the quantity of British spirits used for beverages only as follows :—

	Gallons.	Per Head.
1860 ... ..	24,435	0·83
1870 .. ..	21,980	0·71

The detailed figures show a decrease for England of 18 per cent, Scotland of 8 per cent, Ireland of 9 per cent, and for the United Kingdom of 14 per cent. But whilst showing an actual decrease in the consumption of British spirits, the Commissioners report an increase in the importation of foreign and colonial spirits from 0·19 per head in 1860 to 0·37 per head in 1870. Even with this, however, there is on the whole a decrease, and moreover a considerable quantity of foreign and colonial spirit is used for manufacturing purposes, the exact absorption of which it is impossible to trace or specify.

The above statistics are erroneous, as they omit the three last figures.

The corrected figures are :—

	Gallons.
1860 .....	24,435,443
1870 .....	21,980,678

The Inland Revenue returns, from which the above figures are taken, do not, however, include the whole of the years 1860 and 1870, but refer to the years ending March 31st, 1860 and 1870; and, therefore, relate chiefly to 1859 and 1869. In the early part of 1860, however, there were exceptional influences at work, which ought to have been stated. It was the year of the French treaty, when the duty on spirits was raised from 8s. 1d. to 10s. The report of the Commissioners states, that, anticipating the rise, the trade took out of bond during the two weeks preceding the financial statement in February, the enormous number of 1,380,000 gallons more than in the preceding year. This fact is entirely ignored by Professor Levi; and, hence, wholly invalidates the value and truth of his figures.

The "Judicial Statistics" show that there has been a large increase, and not a decline, as above stated, in the apprehensions for drunkenness—the increase of population since 1864 having been 10 per cent, and of apprehensions 31 per cent.

The consumption of spirits may be the chief cause of drunkenness in some districts, but it is not so in all, and probably not in the majority of English parishes. To understand fully how the case stands in reference to the consumption of all intoxicating liquors in 1860 and 1870, the following comparison will suffice :—



	1860. Gallons.	1870. Gallons.
British spirits .....	21,404,088	22,613,490
Foreign and colonial spirits .....	5,521,923	8,439,386
Total spirits ..	26,926,011	31,052,876
Wine .....	6,718,585	15,079,354
Malt liquor .....	674,170,326	951,849,252

Reckoning the average alcoholic strength of the ardent spirits at 50 per cent, of the wine at 20 per cent, and of the malt liquor at 5 per cent, the consumption of alcohol in 1860 was 48,515,240 gallons, and in 1870 it was 66,134,758 gallons—an increase of 17,619,518 gallons, or 36 per cent, the population having increased in the same period 12 per cent only.

Commenting on this question of the consumption of liquors, and citing the respective statistics, Mr. H. P. Gilbey, in a letter to the *Times* of January 6th, 1872, remarks that “the consumption per head of half a gallon of wine, one gallon of spirits, and twenty-one gallons of beer per annum will be admitted on all hands not to be an excessive quantity; and were the medical profession to frame, in accordance with your valuable suggestion, a set of rules in regard to food, drink, and exercise, showing what is the proper allowance of solid food, of port, sherry, and beer, they certainly would not fix a lower standard than that just named. Taking wines and spirits, and treating them in a strictly medical light, it appears that, were they equally consumed by the entire population, the quantity that at present finds its way into the country would only give for each individual a daily supply of half a tablespoonful of spirits and a quarter of a tablespoonful of wine, proportions which are almost homœopathical.”

Instead of the consumption of beer being twenty-one gallons per head, it was, in 1870, nearly thirty-one gallons; and to divide, as Mr. H. P. Gilbey does, in imagination, the whole consumption of intoxicating liquors equally among the population, is a flight of fancy without relevance to the actual facts. Mr. Gilbey knows that every person in the United Kingdom neither will nor can consume an equal amount of intoxicating liquor; and Professor Levi, in his second Report to Mr. Bass, much more sensibly calculates the number of actual consumers at 17,558,000, who, if they were to use equal quantities of alcoholic liquor, would consume above half a gill a day of proof spirits. This would give to every such person an annual consumption of nearly seven gallons of proof (raw) spirit, or about three and a half gallons of absolute alcohol.

**Alliance Exagger-** Another favourite assertion of the Alliance advocates is  
**ation as to** that both disease and insanity are mainly due to the use  
**Disease and** of intoxicating drink. On this subject we may quote the  
**Insanity.** authority of Dr. Barclay, a leading physician in Leicester, who, in a pamphlet on Temperance and Intemperance, published by Mr. Bosworth, of Regent-street, London, in 1861, presented some remarkable statistics from his own practice. In 3,746



ases, he says, he found 5 per cent only attributable to drink, and 0.55 to tobacco. And he adds :—

“The result of such an investigation shows the folly of trusting to vague ideas of numbers. It is stated, on medical authority too, in some of the teetotal books, that ‘the diseases distinctly referable to ardent spirits alone amount to 75 cases out of 100.’ \* \* \* ‘About 50 per cent of all the sickness admitted to the Glasgow Infirmary is connected more or less with the use of spirituous liquors.’ I quote these two assertions (continues Dr. Barclay) to show their utter fallacy : they are the only two distinct associations of numbers that I can find to lay hold of. Such expressions as ‘tens of thousands dying,’ ‘destroying more lives than the sword,’ ‘vast amount of disease,’ ‘large proportion of all disease,’ are quite common. The same gross exaggeration has prevailed with regard to cases of lunacy. Lord Shaftesbury stated publicly that 60 per cent of them could be traced to intemperance. The numbers, even in Edinburgh and Glasgow, are only 24 and 21 per cent ; while in an average of five asylums taken at random in England, Scotland, and the United States, the average per cent is scarcely above 14.”

That a large proportion of disease, including insanity, is due to the use of alcoholic liquors, is an assertion not confined to advocates of the Alliance or of personal abstinence. There is probably no proposition having behind it a greater *consensus* of medical authority, and of evidence proceeding from persons having no connection with temperance movements of any kind. It is ridiculous to suppose that this mass of testimony can be affected, much less invalidated, by Dr. Barclay, of Leicester, whose pamphlet, on its appearance in 1861, was answered in Leicester and elsewhere. There is an ambiguity in the expression “attributable to drink” which allows of the exclusion of a large number of cases whose origin or peculiar severity may have been connected, with not primarily, originated by the use of strong drink. In estimating the ravages of intoxicating liquors, account should be made of the diseases produced not by personal drinking only, but by the privations, anxieties, and ill-usage arising from the drinking habits of others. In cases of insanity the indirect agency of alcohol is very powerful ; and in the transmission of hereditary predispositions to insanity, its influence is universally acknowledged to be of the most pernicious kind. The experience of the Temperance Provident Institution for twenty years has attested the greater longevity of abstainers compared with the most moderate users of intoxicating drinks, and has shown a remarkable superiority in the vitality of such persons compared with that of the general population.

But, in connection with this subject, Dr. Barclay carries the war into the teetotal camp. He shows among other things that total abstinence from



stimulating drink actually predisposes to certain diseases. Of the European regiments in India the sick are to the strong—

Teetotallers .....	31.30 per cent.
Temperate .....	17.78 „
Intemperate .....	20.16 „

In fever, dysentery, and diarrhœa, the average is in favour of the intemperate as against the total abstainer.

The above table relates to sickness from dysentery and fever only ; but on the next page Dr. Barclay gives—what the authors of “The Case” had not the candour to extract—another table, shewing the sickness from all diseases :—

Teetotallers .....	130.38 per cent.
Temperate .....	141.59 „
Intemperate .....	214.86 „

As to the proportion of deaths Dr. Barclay gives a third table which the authors of “The Case” carefully suppress :—

Teetotallers .....	1.11 per cent.
Temperate .....	2.31 „
Intemperate .....	4.45 „

The one exceptional table has been satisfactorily explained, as including the sickness endured by the 84th Regiment when stationed in 1849 (the year referred to) at Secunderabad, the hot-bed of dysentery in India. But it ought to be noticed that the peculiarly sober habits of this regiment, while not exempting it from sickness, had the effect of lowering the mortality from 70 per 1,000, which was the usual rate, to little over 22 per 1,000. Nothing could more plainly prove the trade bias under which the pamphlet has been written, than the assertion that the disuse of strong drink predisposes to disease in the climate of India. The Royal Commission on the sanitary state of the British army in India, reported in 1863, that “the whole tenor of the evidence goes to prove that the consumption of ardent spirits by the troops is a very potent cause of disease in India, and that much benefit to the efficiency of the army would accrue from discontinuing its use, if it were practicable to do so.”

**Inconsistency of the Allianceites.** The facts cited might be indefinitely multiplied did space permit. They indicate sufficiently, however, the value to be placed upon the random assertions by which the Alliance seeks to promote its agitation. That agitation is further condemned by the fact that it is, on the part of a great portion of its members, thoroughly inconsistent. It is not necessary by the rules of the Alliance that its members or adherents should themselves be total abstainers ; and as a matter of notorious fact, a very large number of them are habitual users of alcoholic liquors.



If the constitution of the Alliance had made abstinence a condition of membership, that arrangement would have been adduced as a proof that the society was composed of "a teetotal faction" only. Indeed, in spite of its wider basis, this very charge is often advanced with a wilful disregard of the fact which refutes it. In the present case, the charge preferred is one of inconsistency. If the allegation were well founded the answer would be obvious, that it is better to be inconsistent through partial well-doing than consistent through unbroken mis-doing. But as a change of legislation is the object sought, those who seek the change, and are willing to conform to it, do not act inconsistently with the obligations they assume ; while so far as support of the Permissive Bill is concerned, no shadow of inconsistency rests on non-abstainers who co-operate in the promotion of that measure.

Three out of the six Members of Parliament whose names were on the back of the Permissive Bill of 1871 are known not to be abstainers. Yet these people have actually the inconsistency to ask the Legislature to pass a law that would prevent the poorer classes of society from obtaining those beverages which they use themselves, and which their wealth would enable them to continue to obtain even in the event of the passing of the Permissive Bill.

Much charity is required to impute to accident the gross misrepresentation given above of the Permissive Bill, which would *not*, if passed, prevent the poorer classes obtaining the beverages used by other classes ; for the passing of that measure would do nothing until the local electors had adopted the Act by the required majority. What Members of Parliament are requested to do, is simply to allow the people to decide for themselves whether the drink traffic shall be perpetuated in their respective districts ; and not only members who use intoxicating liquors, but those also who wish to see the traffic continued, might consistently support the Permissive Bill. That measure does not say that the liquor traffic *shall* be stopped, but that, under certain conditions, it *may* be. If a man of one party supports a Bill which, by enfranchising a new class of citizens enables them to choose representatives of another party, is he, therefore, inconsistent ? The one question is not—What will the electors do ? but are they entitled to the franchise ? The publicans, like the Communists, profess that they are devoted to the public good, but they are not willing to submit their pretensions to the public vote. What inconsistency can equal this ?



**The Permissive  
Bill in  
Parliament.**

That measure has been presented to Parliament four times with the subjoined result:—

Votes and Pairs.	For the Bill.	Against.	Majority against.
June, 1864	... 40	... 297	... 257
May, 1869	... 94	... 200	... 106
July, 1870	... 115	... 146	... 31
May, 1871	... 136	... 208	... 72

It will be observed, and observed with regret, that the number present on these occasions have been only about one-half of the House, and it is to be feared that a grievous want of moral courage has frequently prevented honourable members from expressing their honest convictions on the subject of the measure.

Who could imagine that a lamentation over “the grievous want of moral courage” shown by members of Parliament could flow from a class whose illicit influence and threats were believed to have made every plan of licensing amendment impossible previous to the Reform Act of 1868? Even yet, hon. gentlemen well know that their moral courage is not seldom called into vigorous exercise to resist the pressure put upon them by “the trade” from mercenary motives. How tender were the publicans over “the honest convictions” of members, when Mr. Bruce’s Licensing Bill had been brought in! How solicitous that no appeals but those that might sway the judgments of members should be addressed to them! When constituencies urge their representatives to vote for the Permissive Bill, the gentlemen thus importuned are sure, at least, that base or selfish objects do not inspire or blend with this entreaty. Men who have unscrupulously declared that they will put their private gains above all political and public ends, are the last who, for very shame, should set up for guardians of the “moral courage” of the House of Commons.

On the last occasion, in May, 1871, numbers left the House after the debate without taking part in the division, and this despite the very earnest, almost imploring, appeal of the Home Secretary. Mr. Bruce said:—\*

“The House has already by its votes misled the public upon this subject, for of those members who had voted for the bill on a previous occasion he did not believe that one half, one-third, or even one-fourth of them were really in favour of it. He objected to a measure which diverted attention and strong feeling throughout the country from plans which were efficacious to those which were delusive. It was pitiable to see large petitions, signed by 40,000 or 50,000 confiding people, presented from Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, and other large towns in favour of the Bill, when nothing could be clearer than that, if approved by Parliament, it had not the slightest chance of adoption in any of those places. There could be no doubt as to the decision of the House that day, but it was to be hoped that the division would represent the

---

\* The *Times* Parliamentary Report, May 18, 1871.



real meaning of the House. Many members really opposed to the bill failed to vote, withdrawing from the performance of a great public duty. Thus the opinion of the House had never yet been fairly tested. Such a course was not creditable to the House. The country had a right to expect that members would act, not upon the dictation of large sections of their constituents, however earnest and well-meaning, but upon their own well-matured convictions. He hoped, therefore, that honourable members would to-day give a decisive aye or no to the question from the chair."

The appeal was in vain. Only about half the members constituting the House voted, and members were to be seen hurrying away, whilst some of those who recorded their votes in favour of the bill have since declared that they are opposed to the measure. (See speech of Mr. Vivian, M.P., quoted in section 4 of this pamphlet.) In this way the hopes of a most delusive agitation are fostered, and the country is defrauded of that decisive action which it has a right to expect from its representatives in Parliament. Nor is it in the House only that members have shown their inconsistency. The professions of antagonism to the Permissive Bill, made on the hustings, have not been redeemed in practice by their votes in the House. Not a few who have gained support at contested elections by their denunciations of prohibitory legislation have systematically absented themselves from every division. Their neutrality is not merely unfair to their constituents; it invites the continuance of a pernicious movement out of doors, and leaves a question unsettled which, on every ground of social policy, demands a final and emphatic decision.

This scolding lecture is too general to be severely felt; but it is a valuable admission of a power residing somewhere, and in lively operation, able to countervail the "moral influence" which the publicans so gently employ. The members who have committed themselves against the Permissive Bill are not so numerous as is here pretended; and it seems not to have entered into the mind of the Liquor Defence League that Members of Parliament may grow wiser as they grow older. Scores of the M.P's. who hoisted the flag of "Protection" at the general election of 1841 followed Sir Robert Peel into the lobby in 1846—nor does the country now blame them for the deed. The question at issue undoubtedly "demands a final and emphatic decision;" but in asking for this the publicans may discover that they have courted what will prove, when it arrives, the overthrow of their hopes. The Alliance will never accept as "final" a decision adverse to the Permissive Bill, and with sufficient intelligence and moral courage in Parliament "an emphatic decision" favourable to that measure will not be despaired of.

**The Alliance**  
**£100,000**  
**Fund.**

Outside Parliament the Alliance is carrying on its campaign with increasing vigour. But for all practical purposes its bark is much worse than its bite. Its influence on the vast majority of the public is infinitesimally small. It would be the extreme of folly to accept



the resolutions passed at its meetings as an indication of the way the people would act if any attempt was really made to enforce the prohibitory system. There is an immense, inactive, but very influential mass of public opinion which approves of moderate drinking. The representatives of this latent feeling do not attend Alliance meetings, and their voice is rarely heard amidst the clamour and hurly-burly of the Alliance agitation; but their votes are very tangible things, and recent elections have shown decisively how they will be cast when any occasion for a protest or a struggle occurs.

How eager for consolation must the liquor interest be when it alleges "the very influential mass of public opinion which approves of moderate drinking" as a sign of its own strength, and of the small influence of the Alliance, although a few sentences before the reader has been reminded "as a matter of notorious fact," that "a very large number of them [Alliance adherents] are habitual users of alcoholic liquors." Why, if the Alliance is so weak politically, need the publicans be disturbed? Why should the "moral courage" of M.P.'s in voting against it be represented at so low an ebb?

The latest attempt of the Alliance to cast dust in the eyes of the world, and make its movement seem to be a very influential and portentous affair, is the announcement of the raising of a guarantee fund of £100,000. A few words will reduce this apparently gigantic scheme to its proper proportions. The subscriptions to the fund are to extend over five years; in other words only one-fifth of the promised amounts will be called up annually, and the appeal issued by the Council of the Association intimates that "the promise to the Fund will not be held as binding in the event of death or inability to subscribe." Now, as the fund annually raised by the Alliance for some years past has not fallen short of from £10,000 to £15,000, it will be seen at once that the £20,000, which it is now proposed to raise annually for the next five years is not a very appreciable increase on its recent efforts. The only bigness about it accrues from the massing of the several sums into one heap, in the delusive hope that its apparent magnitude will strike the imagination and intimidate unthinking people into a notion that the Alliance is striding onward to an assured and early triumph.

The income of the Alliance from all sources was a little under £15,000 in the year ending September 30th, 1871, but of this amount £8,800 was the total received from subscriptions and donations only. If the annual receipts from the Guarantee Fund alone should amount to £20,000, it is clear that the financial strength of the society from this source will be doubled; yet, say its critics, this will "not be a very appreciable increase on its recent efforts." Is their arithmetic likewise at fault? As to "the apparent magnitude" of the Guarantee Fund, and the "delusive hopes" associated with it, what can it mean when the very explanations contained in the paragraph are borrowed from the documents of the Alliance?



As a matter of fact, its efforts are more discredited than ever; every parliamentary and many municipal elections with which it has interfered have resulted in the utter rout of the candidates whose cause it has espoused; a large number of its recent meetings have been signalised by the presence of strong bodies of opponents; and lastly, and most significant incident of all, not a few teetotal leaders have ventured of late to challenge its policy, and to declare that, instead of helping on the cause of temperance, its existence has proved detrimental to the progress of sobriety and a serious obstacle to the exertions of those advocates who rely upon moral suasion for success.

The clauses of this remarkable feature may be separately and briefly disposed of:—

(1.) If believed by the publicans, why do they now, “more than ever,” make themselves busy, and issue, for the first time, their shilling pamphlet?

(2.) As false in fact as in grammar, if the reference includes the last general election; and if confined to recent elections, it has little point.

(3.) The “strong bodies of opponents” thus “signalised,” have in every case taken the shape of organised disturbers, who have assailed episcopal dignity, personal worth, and public decency by outrages of which barbarians would be ashamed.

(4.) Not a single “teetotal leader,” entitled to the name, has done anything of the kind. The conduct described has been left to a few persons of no recognised status in any temperance organisation in the kingdom. The real and trusted temperance leaders well know that “moral suasion” is robbed of its deserved rewards by the legalised traffic which sets the liquid bait, and relies on ignorance, self-confidence, appetite, and social custom for the success of its machinations.

**Mr. Trevelyan's** The Alliance has, however, made one convert recently, and he happens to be a Member of Parliament.  
**Five Lectures.**

Whether either side is to be congratulated, time alone can show. Mr. George Otto Trevelyan, the “Competition Wallah,” seems to have an itch for notoriety. In pursuit of this he seceded two years ago from the Liberal Government, in which he held a subordinate office, upon grounds which friends as well as opponents generally regarded as wholly inadequate, and tried to get up a public agitation on the question of army reform. Deprived of this crotchet by the action of the very Government from which he withdrew,

[The impertinence of this passage is equalled—and that is saying much—by its disingenuousness. Mr. G. O. Trevelyan is one of many recent converts to the Alliance; and he can well afford to be the butt of abuse from men whose social rapine he has vigorously condemned. Seeing that the Government deprived him of his “crotchet” by making it



their own, and carrying it into legal effect, his credit is as great as is the discredit of the men who warp language to conceal the truth.]

he has now taken up with the Permissive Bill, and in company with its author, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, stumped the country very industriously during the recess. Five of his speeches he has republished in a pamphlet. To say that they reproduce all the stale exaggerations of the Alliance is to say little. Mr. Trevelyan, like all converts and novices, is a perfect prodigal in exaggeration. Of course he ascribes all the crime, misery, and irreligion in the country to the use of drink; and equally, of course, there is one sure and certain way of bringing the Millennium and bringing it very speedily—namely, the adoption of the Permissive Bill.

As there were no “stale exaggerations” to reproduce, and as Mr. Trevelyan’s speeches disprove the character here given of them, it may seem surprising that a calumny so easily refuted should be ventured; but the authors relied as usual upon the ignorance of their readers. Neither Mr. Trevelyan nor the Alliance regard the Permissive Bill as “the one sure and certain way of bringing the Millennium;” but one writer, the late Mr. Charles Buxton, who ought to be an authority with “the trade,” in his essay, “How to Stop Drunkenness,” said: “The struggle of the school, and the library, and the Church, all united, against the beer-house and gin palace, is but one development of the war between heaven and hell. \* \* It is, in short, intoxication that fills our jails; it is intoxication that fills our lunatic asylums; and it is intoxication that fills our workhouses with poor. Were it not for this one cause pauperism would be nearly extinguished in England.” The *Times* (quoted as an authority in “the case”) once said: “No way so rapid to increase the wealth of nations and the morality of society could be devised as the utter annihilation of the manufacture of ardent spirits, constituting as they do an infinite waste and an unmixed evil.”

To follow Mr. Trevelyan through this rhetorical tirade and show its hollowness would be to slay the slain. The only novelty in the address is the political and electoral twist which Mr. Trevelyan contrives to give to it. He compares the liquor trade to negro slavery in America, and says that “just as the Republicans in America drifted into being abolitionists, so the Liberal party of this country, in spite of its antecedents, in spite of its fancied interests, in spite of itself, must ere long become a temperance party.” He means, of course, a Maine Law party. Elsewhere he says “you must put down drink if you want men to be Liberals,” and he insists that every candidate declining to support the Permissive Bill shall be proscribed. Mr. Trevelyan is not a political leader, and he has no influence as a politician, so that perhaps it is unnecessary to attach much weight to the dictatorial advice he gives to the party to which he professes to belong; but his observations shew how far a fanatic is prepared to carry his crotchets. Mr. Trevel-



yan would not only force everybody to be a total abstainer, but he would make adherence to his doctrine a test whether a man was a Liberal, and he would turn what professes to be a social reform into the battle-cry of a political party. Surely the force of folly could no further go!

As every object seems yellow to a jaundiced eye, Mr. Trevelyan's advice is discoloured by the publicans' vision. Mr. Trevelyan being an honest Liberal believes that all Liberals should be liberal enough to pass the Permissive Bill, and an equally honest Conservative might as consistently hold that all Conservatives wishing to conserve the best interests of the country should do the same. The Alliance is notoriously not a party society, and is as zealously supported by Conservatives as by Liberals. Hence "the force of folly could no farther go" than to suppose that there is any wish to turn a demand for a social reform into the battle-cry of any political party.

**The Trade  
and  
Political  
Parties.**

To meet the aggressive action of the Permissive Bill advocates, the trade has been compelled to combine for the protection of its interests; and one result of the combination has been the introduction of a new, disturbing, but inevitable element into the electoral contests of recent years. Since the promulgation of Mr. Bruce's Licensing Bill in the summer of 1871—a bill which was largely inspired by a wish to meet the views of the Alliance—the elections have undoubtedly been considerably influenced by the trade, reinforced and supported by that large majority of the public, which, heretofore quiescent, has at last been aroused to the monstrous character of the Alliance scheme.

It is true that "the trade"—how significant is the definite article as thus used!—has done what the Alliance has not done—made itself a party, having Selfishness emblazoned as the one article of its creed; and that this new element should be "inevitable," simply marks the inevitably low moral and political tone of the publicans' programme. Hence, the bill of Mr. Bruce—which he denies to have been "inspired by any wish to meet the views of the Alliance"—was virulently opposed by "the trade," whose subsequent political action against certain candidates, and in support of others, was directed by a sudden animosity against the Government and its licensing policy. To represent that any "large portion of the public" was infected by this mercenary fever, or a sympathy with it, is a clear misrepresentation.

In no single instance during the past nine months has a promoter of the Permissive Bill, or anyone showing the slightest tendency in that direction, succeeded in obtaining a seat in the House. A more remarkable series of defeats has never been recorded. The first occurred in Norfolk. The Liberal candidate was the eldest son of a landed gentleman who had himself repre-



sented the county. He was influential and personally popular. He had fair chances of success, although his predecessor was a Conservative. But the trade was active, and he lost his election. Durham followed, and then, in rapid succession, Truro, East Surrey, Plymouth, Shrewsbury, Colchester, Southwark, the Isle of Wight, and the Northern Division of the West Riding.

The election in Southwark occurred, not within the last nine months, but in the February of 1870 ; and Colonel Beresford, who was successful owing to the Liberal divisions, promised not to vote against the Permissive Bill. In none of the other elections was the Permissive Bill a prominent question, except in those for Plymouth and the North-west Riding of Yorkshire ; and in both those cases the successful candidates became so as much by the want of union among their opponents and other causes, as by the support of "the trade." There is no reason for believing that in any one case the action of the publicans was the principal determining cause of their candidate's triumph. At a more recent election (that for the Wick Burghs) all the candidates agreed to support the Permissive Bill.

The case of Plymouth was exceptionally noteworthy. The leading newspaper in that town—alone among the daily newspapers of the kingdom—has been advocating the Permissive Bill and prohibitory legislation generally, in season and out of season, with most extraordinary pertinacity and persistence. It has dragged its objections to the liquor trade into almost every issue of the journal. Moreover, as regards political parties, it is absolutely and fairly neutral, so that in espousing the cause of any candidate no suspicion of Radical or Tory favouritism could possibly be entertained. Of the two candidates, the Permissive-Bill-ite was the best known in the town, the other was a stranger from Liverpool. Yet, with all these advantages, the Alliance man never had a chance, and the opponent of the Permissive Bill won by a considerable majority.

The *Western Morning News* has been honourably distinguished by its support of social reforms of every kind, including the Permissive Bill ; but it is well known that the candidate at Plymouth, who was supported by the friends of the Alliance, was deserted by many political allies for reasons quite irrespective of that measure ; and that, but for this desertion, his election would have been secured despite the publicans' opposition.

Dover furnishes another instance in point. Mr. Jessel sought re-election after his appointment as Solicitor-General. It was a very close contest, and it is generally believed that nothing would have availed him had he not, a night or two before the polling day, emphatically declared his opposition to the Permissive Bill.

The Solicitor-General promised not to support the Permissive Bill ; he did not promise to oppose it ; and he was far from receiving the



general support of the publicans. At that time there was no organization in Dover of the friends of the Permissive Bill; but partly as the result of the domineering airs of the publicans, who pretended to dispose of the representation, an association has been formed, composed of Liberals and Conservatives, to give electoral effect to the principles of the Permissive Bill. These facts are suggestive, and indicate that the publicans' victories (such as they are) are likely to resemble those of Pyrrhus, by leading to their ultimate defeat.

In Yorkshire, the defeated candidate, Mr. Isaac Holden, had no reason to thank the members of the Alliance. His reference to the licensing question in his address was one of the most guarded nature, and certainly did not commit him to prohibitory legislation; but a meeting of delegates of the Alliance, which met at Bradford, passed a resolution in his favour and promised their support, and from that moment his chances were gone.

Seeing that the election was won by Mr. Holden's opponent by 44 votes only out of 13,878 votes recorded, how could his "chances" have been extinguished by a resolution weeks before? Nothing is better known than that differences among the Liberals on other questions, conducted more powerfully to his defeat than did the hostility of the liquor vendors.

It has never until recently been a part of the policy of the trade as a trade to interfere in political elections; it is repugnant to all its traditions and convictions to do so now; and it has only at last been forced into the conflict by the signs and portents of the recent attempts at legislation, by the aggressive attitude of an antagonistic organisation of prohibitory agitators, and by the dilatory, half-hearted, and unsatisfactory way in which the House of Commons has dealt, on several occasions, with the Permissive Bill of its enemies, the United Kingdom Alliance.

In past years the action of the publicans has been confined, at elections, to assisting in the drunkenness and demoralisation of constituencies, and thus covering our representative institutions with disgrace. They now propose to combine to cast all other considerations to the wind, and to make a candidate's support of their traffic the sole ground of their support of him. If they can be shut out from their traditional procedure, and limited to their later policy, the alteration need not be feared. In some instances they may turn the scale in favour of their candidate; but this selfishness will disgust all right-minded electors, and recoil heavily upon the cause it is designed to serve.

**The Trade  
and the  
Licensing  
Question.**

It only remains for us, in this section, to explain the views of the trade in reference to the licensing system.

They have already been laid before the Home Secretary by a deputation from all the societies of licensed victuallers in England, and may be thus summarised:—



1. That the licensing authority should be the present licensing magistrates.

The Alliance does not give any opinion as to the choice of a licensing authority ; it asks that whatever that is, the people affected shall have a veto upon the issue of licences in their midst. This power the licensing magistrates have always had by law, and a concurrent jurisdiction to the extent of a veto is all that the Alliance asks on behalf of the public and the public good.

2. That licences shall not be withdrawn unless three convictions are proved against the applicant at the General Annual Licensing Meeting. The Court of Appeal to be the Quarter Sessions, with a jury if required by the appellant.

Why "three convictions," when the licence is held conditionally upon the observance of its terms? Previous to the Act of 1828 the refused applicant had no appeal, and if an appeal is to be allowed him it ought to be permitted to those who have opposed his application. If the local authority cannot be trusted absolutely to refuse applications, why should it be trusted absolutely to grant them?

3. That annual attendance for the renewal of licences be abolished, except in the case of offenders.

The annual attendance reminds the publicans of the strictly annual nature of the licence ; hence their wish for an alteration, and hence the reason why no alteration should be made. Still, if all the actual offenders were to be compelled to attend, we fear the absent would be few indeed.

4. That there is no necessity for the creation of a new staff of inspectors, the powers of the excise and police being abundantly sufficient to detect and punish those who violate the excise or police enactments.

Whether the "powers" of the excise and police are sufficient for inspection, it is perfectly certain that the powers are not exercised, and no probability exists that they will be. This the publicans understand, and they are much deceived if they think the public do not understand the reason of their opposition to a system of inspection that should answer the purpose for which it was established.

5. That a select committee of the House having in 1868 reported against any alteration of Sunday hours, that question need not now be raised, but the hours in the week days to be uniform in town and country, and affect alike grocers and others engaged in the sale of exciseable liquors.

The Select Committee of 1868 made that report by a majority of one vote, in consequence of the temporary absence of one member, but



the evidence taken proved that much benefit would arise from further restrictions.

6. That persons licensed under the new Bill should have the power of giving evidence upon oath in their own defence in police and excise cases.

7. That the principles of the Suspensory Act in reference to the removal of old licences to an entirely new neighbourhood be embodied in any new enactment.

This seventh suggestion would, in effect, operate most tyrannically if disconnected from the prohibitory veto, as it would allow publicans to carry the ravages of the trade into districts previously unspoiled, and forcibly reminds one of the endeavours of southern slaveholders to carry their "peculiar institution" into new territories. It is a suggestion instinct with the spirit of greed pervading the whole procedure of "the trade."

8. That if the foregoing resolutions are embodied in a statute at once, the Suspensory Act need not be renewed; but, if not, the Suspensory Act should be renewed, say for three years, the grocers should be included, and no further privileges extended to them.

The adoption of these suggestions as the basis of an amended licensing system would simplify and consolidate the existing law. The chief result would be the establishment of uniformity. The public-houses in town and country would be treated alike, and grocers who deal in excisable liquors would be brought under the restrictions and regulations which now apply to licensed victuallers. The equity of the latter requirement is obvious. The principle of uniformity was originated by the Beer Act of 1869, promoted by Sir Selwyn-Ibbetson. That measure abolished the free-trade system in the licensing of beerhouses, and brought them under the control of the justices. The removal clause inserted in the Suspensory Act of 1871, if justly administered, would lead to a redistribution of public-houses, by a transference of them from localities where there are more than are required for public convenience, to new and increasing neighbourhoods, or to places where a recognised deficiency of accommodation exists. As population is constantly fluctuating, it is desirable that some such regulation should be in force, and it would in a short time effect a certain improvement, and lead to a fair adjustment of the supply to the needs and convenience of the public. The experience of the past two years has done something towards proving the utility of the Beer Act in checking the indiscriminate multiplication of beer-houses; and a fair and adequate trial is likely to tell with corresponding force in favour of the Suspensory Act removal clause.

The substance of this paragraph is that the general trade principle of competition should be superseded where the indiscriminate multiplication of beer-houses (!) is to be checked: but that there is to be no check to the power of preying upon new districts where publicans are concerned.

It is a grievous blunder to assume, as the Alliance is so fond of asserting, that the licensed victualler is interested in the existence or promotion of the



vice of drunkenness. It is not only obnoxious to him as a tradesman and the head of a family, but it is as detrimental to him as to any other citizen. If the vice of drunkenness leads, as it doubtless does lead, to pauperism and the commission of crime, the licensed victualler as a ratepayer suffers with the rest of his fellow-countrymen, and is mulcted quite as heavily in the shape of augmented rates and taxes. Just in proportion as this evil is costly to the country is it costly to him.

If drunkenness means increased drinking the publican must profit by it, and nobody else does ; whereas all classes bear the cost of the pauperism and other resultant evils. That is the difference, and it is a radical one, between the relation of the publican and the public to the national vice. But it is a mistake to treat the matter as one of drunkenness only. The *Times* has repeatedly asserted that at least one-half of the publicans' profits represent mis-spent money, and that no licensing reform will be achieved until that expenditure is saved. Professor Levi calculates that the working-classes expend sixty millions annually in intoxicating liquors—one-seventh of their wages ; and it does not admit of a moment's dispute that this practically means the abstraction from their families of much that is absolutely essential to domestic comfort and welfare ; not to speak of the numberless evils directly increased by this mal-appropriation of the household resources.

Any regulations, therefore, which can be framed with a view to the stamping-out of drunkenness will receive his adhesion and support—always supposing that they do not interfere with his business in such an arbitrary and prohibitory fashion as to punish the majority of his customers for the vices of the few.

It is quite credible that the publican has no preference for drunkenness as such ; and doubtless he would be thankful if Providence would create him customers incapable of becoming drunken, however much they consumed. This affected concern for "the majority of his customers" is really an anxiety for their custom ; for as the Permissive Bill would not take effect without the consent of the majority, his alarm that they should be "punished in an arbitrary and prohibitory fashion" has no reasonable origin.

People cry out for license reform. But license reform is not moral reform. It is merely a regulative administrative process. The reform of the drunkard must, in the main, be sought in other directions. It must come from within. It must have its basis in a moral change.

Very possibly license reform, as conceived by the publicans, is not a moral reform, and never would be ; but there is a strong conviction in the minds of others that license reform, if genuine and not a sham, may be the means of a moral reform of vast benefit to the nation. Do not the licensed victuallers laud the Act which puts beersellers under



magisterial control, because of its "utility" in promoting sobriety? All experience proves that drunkenness and tippling are reduced by the removal of temptation; and the prevention of drunkard-making will be a sufficient motive for license reform and the Permissive veto, even if the cure of the drunkards already made could not be completed by these means. Legislative agency does not interfere with other agencies, but each supplements the other and supplies an influence the other could not exert.

Ignorance, as we have already shown, has an immense deal to do with the vice of drunkenness, an overwhelming majority of the drunkards arrested being men or women who are absolutely, or almost wholly, destitute of the most elementary rudiments of education.

Ignorance of what—of the effects of drinking? How is that possible when the effects are bitterly and ruinously experienced? To be destitute of the most elementary rudiments of education is an evil more frequently inflicted on children by parental intemperance than by poverty. Yet this ignorance will not lead to drunkenness where drinking-houses are absent; and where they are present, the educated, in proportion to their numbers, are scarcely less ensnared than the other customers. As, however, they belong to a higher social grade they do not fall so readily as do others into the hands of the police.

Dwellings unfit for human habitation, overcrowding, monotonous overwork, the want of wholesome recreation, all contribute their quota, both in large towns and the rural districts, to the creation of drunkards.

All these abuses mainly arise from the waste of money in the public-house, and the habits engendered by public-house drinking and associations. Convert the liquor-shop into a recognised victualling-house, and, whatever insanitary conditions are present, the "creation of drunkards" will cease, and the prospects of sanitary reform will immediately brighten.

Change these conditions, alter the degrading circumstances amidst which a large portion of our fellow-countrymen live, give the Education Act time to work, and slowly but surely, with no chance of reaction and no class revolt against premature prohibitory legislation, intemperance and excess among the poor and ignorant will give place to thrift, sobriety, and self-respect.

Premature prohibitory legislation is not possible where the legislation can only be applied when a favourable public sentiment has been matured; and all other legislation and action for the abatement of social evils will acquire a power for good hitherto unknown, when unhampered and unthwarted by the liquor traffic. Education Acts can never realise their legitimate purpose while temptations to improvidence and insobriety are legalised on every hand. The late Lord Brougham, one of the pioneers of popular education, recognised this truth, and therefore attached himself to the United Kingdom Alliance.



## II.—SUMMARY OF REASONS AGAINST THE PERMISSIVE BILL.

---

1. Because it introduces a principle that is absolutely new to the constitution—that of giving a majority the power of interfering with the social habits and tastes of the minority.

REPLY.—There is no principle more thoroughly constitutional than the right of the majority to interfere with social habits and tastes that interfere with public morality and the public weal ; nor has the wildest advocate of personal liberty denied that it is constitutional to interfere with trades which tend to impair the vigour and multiply the burdens of society. Laws against bull-baiting, cock-fighting, prize-fighting, duelling, gambling, betting, profane swearing ; and all legislation against sanitary abuses, neglect of education, &c., have interfered with the habits and tastes of multitudes. By “social habits and tastes” the objectors mean, in this connection, drinking ones ; but the Permissive Bill would not interfere even with these, except as they were dependent upon a traffic which either generates or aggravates the worst social conditions of our times. What right has a minority to claim that its habits and tastes shall be gratified at such a cost ?

2. Because, on account of its permissive character, it would be unequal in its operation. Thus, it would probably be adopted only in places where prohibition is unnecessary, and be rejected in districts that might be supposed to require it most. The gain—gauging gains from the Alliance point of view—would be apparent, and not real. Whilst causing an immense amount of inconvenience to the public, it would simply shift the locality of the consumption, and such evils as are attendant upon excess would be concentrated and intensified.

REPLY.—Permissive laws are always unequal in their operation, yet Parliament has repeatedly and recently passed them as preferable to inaction, where general and peremptory legislation was impossible. If the Alliance is willing to accept the disadvantages of such a position the liquor vendors may well be satisfied. Would one locality drink more



because another drank less? Would the drinkers remove from localities where the traffic was prohibited? What data for either supposition exist? Not any! The 2,300 prohibitory districts of the United Kingdom yield no support to such conjectures; and, if in any case the evils of excess became "concentrated and intensified," the afflicted locality would be able to avail itself of the means of relief which its neighbours had employed. Besides, *where is prohibition "unnecessary?"* We have yet to find the place where the traffic is present, and where its prohibition would not be a blessing.

3. Because the Act (should it ever become one) would be a perpetual and ever-recurring source of agitation, strife, and dissension. This is not matter of theory. It has proved to be the experience of all those States in America where the experiment has been tried. The evil would be a thousand-fold worse in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, as the self-governing divisions in this country are proportionately smaller, and infinitely more numerous. In boroughs ward would be divided from ward, in rural districts parish from parish, and the agitation would permeate all the endless ramifications of our administrative system.

REPLY.—(1.) It is a grossly erroneous statement that the self-governing divisions of the United Kingdom are infinitely more numerous than those of the United States. (2.) The Permissive Act, if adopted, would be no perpetual and ever-recurring source of agitation, as it would be secured a three years' trial; if not adopted, it would be the interest, and no doubt the effort, of "the trade" to conduct its affairs with the utmost possible care. Should "the trade" succeed in becoming innocuous, what agitation would it fear?—should it fail, and remain an incubus and curse, why should an agitation for its removal be deprecated and denounced? (3.) The adoption of all Permissive legislation involves a certain amount of local agitation; but is not this better than stagnation in evil and wrongdoing? It is infinitely less to be feared than the nightly scenes of woe and misery which the traffic constantly forces upon us. If the publicans were conscious of a good cause, they would not shrink from the scrutiny and verdict of their neighbours, for whose convenience alone they are ostensibly licensed from year to year.

4. Because prohibitory legislation, wherever put in force, would lead to endless attempts to evade the law, and to practices which, both socially and morally, would tend to the demoralisation of the people by substituting for an open, legitimate, and responsible trade, a secret, surreptitious, and irresponsible traffic in alcoholic liquors. The experience of Scotland in regard to the Forbes Mackenzie Act, and of the American States, again removes this



assertion out of the region of theory into the irrefragable and indisputable arena of fact. Prohibitory legislation, wherever tried, has failed to make a people sober, whilst, on the other hand, it has encouraged a system of deception and hypocrisy quite as deplorable as the excesses which the legislation was designed to remove, and has created offences before the law which are against the moral sense of the people.

REPLY.—Illicit traffic does not carry with it the moral sanction of the law. Its power of tempting the masses cannot compare with that of the open and authorised traffic. The present open traffic is neither “legitimate,” judged by its fruits, nor “responsible,” judged by the intense anxiety of the sellers to avoid inspection, and their refusal to compensate society for the damages their business inflicts upon it. “The irrefragable and indisputable arena of fact” (the metaphors of “the trade” are as eccentric as their reasonings) does not contain one instance where prohibition, fairly executed, has not been far more successful in producing a state of social sobriety than any licensing system ever invented; and to charge the law prohibiting a social nuisance with encouraging the vices connected with offences against itself is an abuse of all language and reason. How, too, can prohibition, when it is the expression of the people’s will, “create offences before the law which are *against* the moral sense of *the people*?”

5. Because such an Act would place in jeopardy a recognised and legitimate trade, which has been established in our midst for centuries, and has grown up under the sanction and encouragement of successive Governments. In places where adopted it would at once annihilate that trade, and, without compensation, would deprive large numbers of honest and most respectable citizens and their families of their capital and their means of livelihood. It would, in fact, institute a system of arbitrary confiscation at the mere bidding of a section of the ratepayers. In addition to this, it would place the trade throughout the country (*i.e.*, in every place where the Act was not yet adopted) on a precarious footing, depreciate its value by reason of that precarious tenure to an incalculable extent, and reduce what is now an honourably-conducted, arduous, and responsible business to the level of a gambling and reckless speculation. The extent of so grievous and irreparable an injury may be gathered from the fact that the capital (fixed and floating) at this moment invested in the trade amounts to about £115,000,000, and that it gives employment and livelihood to nearly a million and half persons.

REPLY.—(1.) The capital invested in the liquor-traffic and the employment it gives are nothing like so great as is here represented (see page     ); if they were, it would only be an additional reason for finding them some more legitimate scope and outlet; and the objectors take no notice of the fact that the money saved from their traffic would be spent with other trades employing more skilled and better remunerated manual labour,



(2.) This "reason" is framed on the supposition—in defiance of all experience—that the traffic in intoxicating liquors is open to no objection, and that to seek its diminution or removal is a gratuitous interference with the rights of property. Not a word is said which could suggest to a stranger that the drink-traffic is restricted because of its dangerous nature—that it is illegal to all except a privileged and licensed class—that the licences expire annually, and are again issued, *or not*, at the discretion of the authorities—that they are never to be issued again when there has been previous damage to the interests of society—that these interests are known to be injured to an immense extent and in every possible manner—and that it is in vain to hope for any sufficient redress from any licensing authority: not a word of all this is suffered to transpire—all the leading facts are suppressed—and the Provincial Licensed Victuallers' Defence League expect their readers to be so ignorant or stupid as to ignore them also, and to accept in lieu of the terrible realities of our drink-cursed social system, idle talk about "honest and respectable citizens," "arbitrary confiscation," "honourably-conducted, arduous, and responsible business!" In brief, they assume everything that is inadmissible, and are silent upon what is universally notorious, and then bring in a verdict for themselves of calumniated and injured innocence!

6. Because such an Act, where carried into force, would intensify class distinction, and virtually establish one law for the rich and another for the poor. The richer sections of the community, by means of clubs and the facilities they would still enjoy of importing and storing their own beverages, would be regarded as unduly favoured, whilst the poorer classes would be forcibly deprived of the conveniences of social enjoyment, and the opportunity of obtaining what they require in such ways and in such quantities as are most consonant with their pecuniary resources. The tap would cease to run, but the cellar would be inviolable. In fact, an English Maine law, however carried, whether by the Legislature or a ratepayers' majority, would be an invasion, by the rich, of the pleasures of the poor. Even if not so in reality, it would appear to be so, and that in a matter of social legislation is an important consideration, which no wise statesman could afford to disregard.

REPLY.—(1.) This division of society into "rich" and "poor" is indefinite and delusive, excluding as it does the middle strata and a considerable portion of the artisan class. As all orders will be consulted in the adoption of prohibition, and as the decision would undoubtedly lie with those who were chiefly affected, the question is narrowed to this:



Ought the many to decide upon that in which the many (including their children) are deeply concerned?

(2.) Others besides the rich would have the means of procuring liquor if they chose to make the necessary provision. To say nothing of the increased wealth of the artisan when he keeps his wages for the benefit of his own family, the club system is not limited to the wealthy; and the Permissive Bill, while preserving them from the public solicitations of the interested trader, would allow the people to decide whether or not they would resort to private means for procuring alcoholic drinks.

(3.) While the rich indulge in objections to the Permissive Bill, drawn from the supposed opposition of the poor, the poor are in great numbers supporters of the Alliance, and appraise the publican's sympathy at its true value. A law for the poor which would save them from terrible temptation and raise them in the social scale, is not one which the thoughtful poor regard with disfavour.

7. Because such an Act would inflict grievous and insufferable hardship upon all travellers, tourists, and commercial men. Although the Alliance people are fond of parading the aggregate number of licensed victuallers as one reason why a reduction is necessary, it must be remembered that inn-keeping is the most ramified and widely-distributed industry in the country. No other trade or profession can, in this respect, vie with it. It exists for the public convenience everywhere, in the loneliest way-side places equally with the large city. The hostelry is to be found in the smallest villages, in sea-side or summer resorts, in rarely-frequented solitudes (the haunt only of the angler or the adventurous tourist), all along our numerous highways and by-ways; wherever, in short, business or pleasure or the service of the public demands. The sudden cessation of an enormous trade like this, or even its partial destruction, through the operation of a permissive measure, would not only be an unparalleled revolution in our social system, but would tell with painful force upon tourists, and would prove simply intolerable to that large and industrious body of emissaries who travel in the interest of our great commercial and manufacturing establishments through every nook and corner of the country.

REPLY.—As before observed (page     ), this inn-keeping argument is exaggerated and pretentious. The number of licensed houses used as inns, viz., places of lodging and refreshment for travellers, is very small compared with the number of ordinary drinking-shops; to argue from the one to the other is manifestly unfair, yet the licensed victuallers would resent any distinction in legislation upon both classes. Houses for travellers away from home can exist without any sale of intoxicating drink, and many of those that do are extensively patronised by non-



abstainers. The commercial "emissaries" referred to are frequently found at such houses, preferring to be exempt from the inducements to drink which meet them at the licensed inn, and have proved the ruin of many of their ablest acquaintances on the road. As prohibition extended, and with it habits of sobriety and thrift, travellers would increase, and the inn-keeper would find himself remunerated in a more legitimate manner than by the sale of intoxicating drink.

8. Because such an Act would be founded on an erroneous principle. It would impose mortifications upon the majority for the vices and excesses of a small minority. It would be a law designed to check an *abuse*, and would go to the other extreme, and limit or prevent, and, as far as possible, prohibit, under penalties, the moderate and rational *use* of an article which only a small number of people regard as absolutely and invariably injurious. It would impose a sacrifice upon the sober many for the sake of the intemperate few. Legislation upon such a basis is radically unsound, and, if adopted in this case, would be a retrogression in statesmanship, tyrannical in theory and in practice, and entirely foreign to the principles upon which Government has been conducted in modern times.

REPLY.—A Permissive Prohibitory Act would "impose" nothing upon the majority, for it could only be imposed on the majority by their own deed, and they would not be likely to "mortify" themselves farther than they saw well. The vices and excesses of a small minority may bring serious evils on a majority, who for their own sake, as well as for the sake of the minority, might be ready to take even such a step in "self-denial" as would be implied in stopping the public tap. Whether the use of alcohol is absolutely and invariably injurious is not a question calling for an affirmative reply, in order to enable even users of it to determine, that such a use of it as is encouraged by the public-house system is injurious on the widest scale and to an extreme degree. If the intemperate were few—though they are not—those who suffer from their intemperance are not few, neither is the effect of their habits upon society transient and feeble; and if the sober many were to make some sacrifice to cure such a vice and stop its spread, they would be recompensed a hundredfold. All legislation is based on a principle of self-restraint; and no basis of legislation could be more evidently sound—more accordant with the noblest civilisation and loftiest morality—or more certain of a magnificent reward, than that which should regard facilities for mere sensuous gratification as of inferior value to the correction of great public evils, by giving power for the removal of their public causes whenever the public sentiment should concur and approve.



### III.—HISTORY OF THE FAILURE OF ALL PROHIBITORY LAWS.

---

#### **Inefficacy of Sumptuary Laws.**

The Maine Liquor Law, which the Alliance seeks to introduce into this country, partakes, in part, of the nature of a sumptuary law. Enactments of this kind have long been regarded as opposed to the principles of political economy, and they have always proved inoperative. They were frequently imposed in ancient Rome, and habitually transgressed. In England, sumptuary laws were in great favour from the time of Edward the Third to the Reformation. The tenth statute of Edward the Third enacted that no man, whatever his condition or estate, should be allowed more than two courses at dinner or supper, or more than two kinds of food at each course. The wearing of furs, skins, and silks was also prohibited. Servants were forbidden to eat flesh meat or fish above once a day. "It was easy to foresee," says Hume, "that such ridiculous laws must prove ineffectual, and could never be executed." They were, in fact, universally disregarded; and all subsequent laws to the same effect shared a like fate. A similar result followed the enactment of sumptuary laws in France and Scotland. Most of the sumptuary laws in England were repealed in the time of James the First, having long been of no effect, but it is a curious fact that a few remained in the statute book as late as 1856.

Sumptuary laws differ *toto cælo* from laws which aim at the protection of social interests, and are calculated to reduce poverty, crime, vice, and taxation. Sumptuary laws limit useful production, but the suppression of the liquor traffic would multiply beyond calculation the production of articles of utility and wholesome enjoyment. Sumptuary laws cannot be enforced, as they attempt to regulate matters purely personal and arrangements necessarily private; but laws against injurious trades can be very extensively enforced, and the more effectually they are enforced, the more fully is public evil averted and public benefit conferred.

#### **Failure of Prohibitory Legislation in England.**

Something very like prohibitory legislation was tried in England in the reign of George the Second. In 1731, the Gin Act was passed. It was not a Government measure, but proceeded from a philanthropist, Sir Joseph Jekyll (the Sir Wilfrid Lawson of that day). Its history, as told by Earl Stanhope in his *History of England* (vols. 2 and 3, chapters 17 and 25), is instructive:—



"Drunkenness, a vice which seems to strike a deeper root than any other in uneducated minds, had greatly augmented, especially in London, during the last years of peace and prosperity. In this session, the Justices of Middlesex thought it their duty to present a petition to the House of Commons on this subject, stating that the evil had grown to an alarming pitch; that the constant and excessive use of Geneva had already destroyed thousands of Her Majesty's subjects, and rendered great numbers of others unfit for useful labour and service, debauching at the same time their morals, and driving them into all manner of vice and wickedness." This petition having first been referred to a committee, Sir Robert Jekyll proposed to lay on gin and other spirituous liquors a tax so heavy as to amount to a prohibition for the lower classes, namely, a duty of 20s. on each gallon sold by retail, and £50 yearly for a licence to every retailer. Neither Pulteney nor Walpole (premier) approved of the scheme; the former complained of the invidious distinction between the poor and the rich; the latter foresaw that such exorbitant duties had a tendency to defeat themselves, and to encourage smuggling and fraud. Sir Robert Walpole made, however, no opposition to the bill, merely predicting that his successors would have to modify it, and provided that the Civil List did not suffer in consequence. It was to the Civil List that the small duties hitherto levied had belonged, to the amount of above £70,000 yearly; and this sum Sir Robert proposed should be granted to the King in compensation for the loss from the greatly reduced consumption of spirituous liquors. This clause, just and reasonable as it seems, was not carried without much altercation and difficulty in the House, or great clamour out of doors. To the lower classes the measure was already most unwelcome; and it was now exclaimed that Walpole was ready to sell the comfort of the people to the highest bidder, and indifferent who might suffer, so that the revenue did not! In 1742, after five years' experience, the act was repealed. It was found, as Walpole had foretold, that the duties imposed, amounting nearly to a prohibition, had only afforded encouragement and opportunity to fraud. Informers were terrified by the threats of the people; justices were either unable or unwilling to enforce the law; and it was proved that the consumption of gin, instead of diminishing, had considerably augmented since the heavy duties were imposed. Though no licence was obtained, and no duty paid, the liquor continued to be sold at all the corners of the streets; nay, we are even assured that the retailers of it used to set up painted boards, inviting people to be drunk at the small expense of one penny, assuring them that they might be dead drunk for twopence, and have straw for nothing! They accordingly provided cellars or garrets strewn with straw, to which they conveyed those poor wretches who were overpowered with intoxication, and who lay there until they recovered some use of their understanding; whilst the other dens for drinking were hideous receptacles of the most filthy vice, resounding with continual riot, oaths, and blasphemy. To check these frightful disorders, and at the same time prevent the loss to the revenue, the ministers had framed a new bill, by which a small duty per gallon was laid upon the spirits at the still-head, and the price of licences reduced to twenty shillings. Through this measure it was thought that the price of gin would be moderately but really raised—so much as to discourage the drunkard, yet not so much as to encourage the smuggler, that the law being mitigated would be enforced, and that the revenue would gain a clear and certain accession. The bill passed the House of Commons rapidly and almost without remark, but in the Lords encountered a most vigorous resistance. All the Bishops opposed it. It was denounced as a sanction to vice, as a licence granted to the people for poisoning themselves, as 'a bait spread over the pit-falls of debauchery,' as



an infamous attempt to raise the revenue at the expense of the health and morals of the people. Lord Hervey moved that several eminent physicians should be summoned to the bar, to prove to the House the fatal effects of dram-drinking. But the palm of eloquence on this occasion was undoubtedly borne away by Chesterfield. His two speeches on this question, far better reported than most others of that day, may still attract our admiration, and have seldom been surpassed as combinations of lively wit and impressive forebodings. Yet, notwithstanding his exertions and those of the right rev. bench, the bill passed by a great majority."

So ended the Gin Act, the first determined attempt to introduce the principle of prohibition. We may add to Lord Stanhope's graphic narrative the striking fact (see M'Culloch's *Commercial Dictionary*) that within two years of the passing of the act, no fewer than 12,000 persons (in a population of about five millions) had been convicted of offences against it. "The more respectable traffickers abandoned the proscribed business, which fell into the hands of reckless and disreputable men, who set at nought the provisions of the law." Just the result which may be expected to follow any advance towards the adoption of a Maine Liquor Law now. "The law," continues our authority, "became odious and contemptible (having no moral power to sustain it); and policy, as well as humanity, forced the Commissioners of Excise to mitigate its penalties. The Government relinquished the fruitless contest."

The genius of inaccuracy possesses the authors of the pamphlet when referring to the past as well as to the present. The Gin Act took effect not in 1731, but in 1736, and was preceded by debates exceedingly interesting and able. Earl Stanhope's description requires considerable modifications, in order to be accepted as accurate. The £70,000 clause for compensating the Crown, was carried on a first division by 211 votes against 109, and on a second division by 183 votes to 110. It is a great error to suppose that it was proved that the consumption of gin instead of diminishing had considerably augmented since the heavy duties were imposed. The journals of the House of Commons for 1743 (p. 200), contain a return of spirits manufactured, which establishes the contrary.

	June 24, 1735-6. Gallons.	June 24, 1736-7. Gallons.	June 24, 1737-8. Gallons.
Proof Spirits .....	6,083,016.	4,233,072.	5,401,902.
Low Wines..... (Spirits under proof)	9,972,147½.	6,751,468½.	8,888,903.

The year 1736-7 thus showed a decrease of 1,800,000 gallons of proof spirits, 30 per cent, and of 3,000,000 gallons of low wines, 33 per cent, although during one quarter of the year (June to September, 1736) the law was not in operation—the very quarter, be it observed, when there would be the greatest activity in making and selling the gin before the new law had come into force.



Another statement is, that "though no licence was obtained, and no duty paid, the liquor continued to be sold at all the corners of the streets; nay, we are even assured that the retailers of it used to set up painted boards, iuviting people to be drunk at the small expense of one penny, assuring them that they might be dead drunk for twopence and have straw for nothing." But the Debates shew that the state of things thus described existed before the Gin Act, and was pleaded as a reason for the legislation of 1736, one of the speakers remarking as to excessive gin drinkers, that "many of them continue at the gin shops till they cannot find their way to an alehouse, or even to their own beds, if they have any, but content themselves with the clean straw which at some of those places they can have for nothing."

It was the misguided legislation of earlier years, permitting the sale of spirits to be almost free, which raised the consumption from 524,000 gallons in 1684 to 3,520,000 in 1724, and brought in a new flood of intoxication, setting at defiance the spasmodic and often irresolute efforts at correction subsequently made. The reasons for the failure of the Gin Act of 1736, so far as it did fail, are not far to seek. A premier unfriendly, a police system utterly inefficient, the whole alehouse and tavern system left intact, a want of preparation and co-operation in the public mind, and the financial exigencies of the Government—these are sufficient to account for that repeal of the Act which was carried in the Lords by a vote of 82 to 55. Not "all the bishops," but all the ten bishops present, voted with the minority. To argue from the Gin Act of 1736 to the Permissive Bill of 1872, and to conclude that because the one was repealed the other ought not to be enacted, is to disregard times, circumstances, and every element of difference and contrast.

A similar result attended the Sunday Closing Scheme of Colonel Wilson Patten. The honourable and respected member for North Lancashire succeeded in obtaining the passing of an Act in 1854 for the diminution of the hours during which liquor could be sold on Sundays from eight to five and a half. Previously, under the General Licensing Act of George the Fourth, the hours were from one to three, and from five to eleven, as they are now. Colonel Patten's Act made the hours from one to half-past two, and from six to ten. Moderate as this restriction was in comparison with the demands urged by the Alliance advocates, it caused much public inconvenience and great agitation in the large towns, and involved the trade in expensive litigation. After a twelve months' trial the Act was repealed. Its author, Colonel Patten, speaking at a temperance bazaar in Lancashire, in the August of 1868, told the story of its failure :—



He had attempted legislation with a view to further restricting the liquor traffic on Sundays, but it had failed lamentably. Why did it fail? It failed simply because he did not carry the public opinion with him, and the consequence was that the measure he introduced into Parliament had to be abandoned. His bill was enacted in 1854 and repealed in 1855, because he had not acted in accordance with the feeling of the public. He thought they should never lose sight of that experience. Legislation on the subject of intemperance must be governed by the rules that guided them in other matters; if they legislated beyond what the public were prepared for they would be sure to fail. He was opposed to anything like another attempt to legislate until they could carry the public with them.

Measures to *regulate* the trade have been passed since the repeal of Colonel Wilson Patten's Act, but no distinctly restrictive legislation in the direction of prohibition has again been attempted. In the two experiments hitherto made in England, it is sufficiently proved that the public convenience was not adequately consulted, and that the evils which attended the attempt were, in both cases, far greater and far more inimical to social order than those which they were professedly designed to remedy.

Colonel Wilson Patten's Bill was drafted in accordance with the report of the Select Committee on Public Houses in 1854, but was modified to conciliate the licensed victuallers of London. The absence of Colonel Wilson Patten from England during a portion of the subsequent session rendered him unable to speak from personal observation of what then transpired, or he could never have represented the partial repeal of the Act of 1854 as owing to a want of public support. It was in the session of 1855 that Sir George Grey, then Home Secretary, affirmed—"I believe if universal suffrage could be acted upon in reference to this question, it would be found that the desire of the people would be that the public-houses should be closed throughout the Sunday." (June 26th, 1855.) The Select Committee of Enquiry which Mr. Berkeley moved for, and over which he presided, with a foregone conclusion to sustain, produced evidence so strong in favour of the act of 1854, from London, that only one witness from the country was examined, though twenty had been summoned and were in attendance; and with discreditable haste and hurry, increased by the Hyde Park disturbances (which had no connection with the Sunday Beer Act of 1854), a bill was carried through Parliament allowing the sale of intoxicating liquors for two hours and a half longer than had before been legal. But let it be noted, that Colonel W. Patten's statement is that he failed "*simply because he did not carry public opinion with him.*" Now the legislation proposed by Sir Wilfrid Lawson can never be applied in advance of



public opinion, because the Permissive Bill is not to operate without the desire of the large body of the ratepayers.

**The Sunday  
Maine  
Liquor Law  
in  
Scotland.**

Another restrictive experiment has been tried, and is still on trial, in Scotland. It is known as the Forbes Mackenzie Act, and was passed in 1853. It may be fittingly and adequately described as a Maine Liquor Law for Sundays, all places for the sale of liquors being absolutely and entirely closed on that day, except to lodgers and *bona-fide* travellers—an expression that has caused much difficulty in construction. There is no doubt that the law is evaded. In *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, we are told that “various devices have been attempted to evade the stringency of the provisions, the most successful of which has been the plan of forming clubs with a nominal entrance-fee, where the members have stores of their own, from which they can be supplied in the club-house. The police returns also show that numerous arrests for drunkenness continue to be made on Sunday, a fact which proves that drink can be and is still obtained by those who desire it.” But the most complete account of the working of the act is contained in an elaborate historical report by Mr. John Walsh, superintendent of the Perthshire police, and from it the subjoined extracts are taken:—

“The expected reformation is to all appearance as far off as ever. This condition of things does not exist because the Public-houses Acts have not been put into fair operation, for few acts have been as well enforced. \* \* \* The source from which mischief proceeds is the ‘shebeens.’ This evil cannot be laid at the doors of the public-house keepers, but sprang into existence on the hours of the regular trader being curtailed; and their continuance is due to the difficulty of detection, and the smallness of the penalty and imprisonment imposed, on a conviction taking place. Shebeens, as they now exist, are not frequented except at the time the regular licensed houses are closed, unless it be by those who have given themselves up to the practice of every kind of vice, and have no home. A considerable quantity of drink is sold in these houses every day, but Sunday is the principal one for business. A person going into the lane or street in which there is a number of these houses would, in all probability, observe no movement amongst the inhabitants; whether shebeens existed there or not he could not tell; but if two or three constables go in (one is of little use in such a case) they would see a movement. No sooner do they enter at the one end, than all those standing at the doors apparently taking the air, disappear, and preparations are quickly made in case of a visit. All those houses which, before the constables appeared, had their little parties sitting drinking, are at once so changed as to cause one to imagine that the Maine Liquor Law was in force in that district; but no sooner do they pass on to another part of the town, than the state of matters existing before they appeared is resumed. As it is not in the shebeen keeper’s house where he generally keeps his drink, but in the house of some friend, it is most difficult for the police to make a detection. Large quantities of drink are also carried away, to be drank elsewhere; but it is only to those whom the shebeen keeper knows well will not inform upon him that he sells it to.”

From all which it would appear that the chief effect of the Forbes Mackenzie Act has been to substitute secret drinking, even with all its concomitant evils, for the open, responsible, regulated, and respectable trade which it has supplanted.



A sufficient reply to the above is contained in the facts, (1) that no law has more entire hold upon the great bulk of the Scottish people than the Act of 1853, and that there are few Members of Parliament from Scotland who are not its cordial supporters ; (2) that the Act has greatly reduced the consumption of ardent spirits and the arrests for drunkenness on Sundays and week-days ;\* (3) that any temporary increase of secret drinking could not compare with the evils fostered by the open sale, and that fresh legislation has provided more effectual police control over the shebeen traffic ; (4) that the Royal Commissioners appointed in 1859, whose Report, with the evidence received, filled two blue books, unanimously sustained the Act, and suggested amendments to increase its efficiency. On the Sunday closing provisions they declared—" Evidence was adduced from all classes of persons of the benefits which have arisen from it. The improvement in large towns has been remarkable."

**The  
Maine Law  
in  
America.**

The law prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages in the State of Maine was passed in 1851. All the New England States followed the example, and several Western States subsequently entered upon a similar course. In some the laws have been repealed ; the New England States, with the exception of Rhode Island, retain the prohibitory enactment on their statute books. It is important, therefore, that the result should be examined, and it fortunately happens that the information is tolerably ample. In every instance prohibition has proved a conspicuous and uncontrovertible failure. The evidence to this effect is cumulative and so overwhelming as to render a selection somewhat difficult. What we offer is from responsible authorities, and the source is given in every instance.

It is necessary to premise that, in comparison with England, the American States are more favourably situated as regards climate and temperature for such an experiment as the Maine Liquor Law, and that the habits and character of the people are in many respects better calculated to ensure its success. In the first place, it is to be noted that while Great Britain lies between latitude 50° and 58°, those States of America with whom the Maine Law has found favour lie between 39° and 47°, and medical and physiological authorities agree that the need for stimulants diminishes the

---

\* In the four years ending December 31, 1853, the gallons of British spirits consumed in Scotland were 28,736,071—an average of 7,184,000 gallons, when the population was under three millions, being at the rate of 2½ gallons of British spirits alone, per head of the population ; while in 1870 the consumption of British, foreign, and colonial spirits combined was 5,867,000 gallons, less than two gallons (1·83) per head of the population. Taking Edinburgh as a fair example of the apprehensions for drunkenness, the following comparisons will show what the facts are, and will dispose of many misrepresentations afloat upon the subject :—Total apprehension—1852-3, (before the Act) 12,094 ; 1869-70, 3,760. Sunday apprehensions—1852-3, 1,370 ; 1869-70, 275. Monday apprehensions—1852-3, 1,504 ; 1869-70, 433.



nearer a people are to the Equator. The American people have, in this respect, a considerable advantage as regards the lessened pressure of temptation and probably in respect of the necessities of health ; for the instinctive tendency of all northern nations, of whatever race, to alcohol must indicate some more imperious need than that of a merely unbridled appetite. So it comes to pass that in America common habit greatly strengthens the chances of success of any prohibitory experiments. "The real native American," says Mr. Justice M'Carthy, "north of St. Louis at least, seem to me the soberest men under the sun. Outside the large cities his habit is not to drink wine or spirits at all. Even in the large cities drinking at dinner is a rare and exceptional performance. The right to drink wine, spirits, or even ale, openly, and as a part of one's natural diet, is nowhere recognised in the United States as it is everywhere in England."

These being the advantages upon which the Americans can count in the effort to suppress intemperance by legislative measures, it is all the more remarkable that repression has in every instance proved inefficacious. In Maine, according to Mr. Justice M'Carthy, the law is "an impotent unreality." Mr. Robert Russell, a shrewd Scottish farmer, says—"It is a mere dead letter."\* Writing in the *New York Tribune*, in January, 1872, its editor, Mr. Horace Greeley, a strong upholder of the principles of the Maine Law, says that after twenty years of prohibition in the State of Maine, "the use of intoxicating beverages has not entirely ceased. The liquor traffic is still prosecuted in nearly all the cities and most of the considerable villages of Maine. Those who love liquor still obtain it, if able to give time and money to procure it. Perhaps no person in that State has long thirsted because liquor was not to be had on any terms. Prohibition has not exterminated the liquor traffic."

How little the authors of this pamphlet can be relied upon when their prejudices are concerned, may be judged from the errors into which they fall as to matters only incidental to the question discussed. Almost incredible ignorance is shown in representing the climate of the Maine Law States of America to be milder than that of Great Britain, because the former lie in latitude 39°—47°, and the latter in 50°—58°; the truth being that our own country enjoys a remarkably mild temperature, owing to insular and other causes ; while the inhabitants of New England are subjected to an extreme of cold in winter and of heat in summer, far more trying to the constitution than is the softer climate of the British Isles. Northern nations evince no instinctive tendency to alcohol till it is placed within their reach ; and the Hindoo when he yields to the temptation to drink becomes as speedily the victim of the drunken appetite as the Russian. With regard to the prohibitory law in Maine, the testimony of a travelling man of letters

---

\* *North America : Its Agriculture and Climate.* By Robert Russell. Edinburgh : A and C. Black.



(Mr. Justin [not Justice] McCarthy) and a Scottish farmer are quoted as if conclusive against the authority of the most eminent citizens of the State. The quotation from Mr. Greeley's article is clear proof of the operation of the law; and in another portion of the same article, not quoted, he observes: "It may be safely assumed that throughout more than half the area of that State, liquor is purchasable only with difficulty, and by traversing a considerable distance. Thus, thousands of the youth of Maine are reared in blissful ignorance of strong drink. That Maine has fewer paupers, criminals, vagabonds, than she formerly had—that her people are steadily advancing in thrift and wealth, are inevitable."

Massachusetts passed a more stringent law than Maine. After being twelve years in force, the Legislature, in 1864, finding its provisions inoperative, appointed a special committee to consider the expediency of licensing the sale of spirituous liquors, and of repealing or modifying so much of the law as imposed imprisonment on persons convicted of selling malt liquor, wines, or cider. The committee sat seventeen days, and received evidence from all parts of the State. The substance of the evidence was, that intoxicating drinks were freely sold in every city and town in the State—in most of them without attempt at concealment, and in others with considerable ostentation. In some small towns the law was apparently observed, but such persons as choose to drink can be, and are plentifully supplied from the neighbouring towns. Throughout the State there was a current saying that it was easier for a stranger to get a glass of spirits than a glass of milk. In no city or town, with two exceptions, was the sale more restricted than it was before the Prohibitory Act of 1852, and in most of them the sale had decidedly increased since that time. According to the testimony of the "district prosecutors," witnesses would not give evidence, and when they did, jurors would not convict; there was an indisposition on all sides to enforce the law; and when a conviction took place the penalty was not enforced by the judge, in consequence of the intercession of influential citizens. After summing up the general reasons against a prohibitory law, and against retaining on the statute book any law that had become inoperative and could not be enforced, or was opposed to the convictions of a large portion of the community, a majority of the special committee arrived at the conclusion that a license law was expedient, and that the sale of wine and malt liquors should not be punished by imprisonment. Since then a prohibitory act has again been passed. Mr. Mundella, M.P., in a speech recently delivered to his constituents at Nottingham, gave the result of his observations during a tour in the States last year. He said the law in Massachusetts was systematically broken both by Senators and the other leaders of public opinion. "He had taken wine with the most honoured names in America at the largest hotel; and when he expressed his surprise that it should be produced, he was told that 'it did not matter, the drink was there.' He asked if they could get spirits in the same way. He was taken down to the bar of the hotel, where he found the students of the University drinking as much whisky as they had a mind to pay for. Mr. Wendell Phillips, one of the noblest men in America, admitted to him that the law was most scandalously broken in this respect. It was not only in towns that they found the law broken. In nearly every village drink could be got."



Error upon error again. The Joint Special Committee of the Legislature of Massachusetts, referred to above, was appointed not in 1864 but in 1867, and sat not on seventeen days only, but on twenty-seven. The majority of the committee did recommend a stringent licence law, under which the licensee was required to obtain a recommendation from a majority of the board of select men of his own town—not to keep a public bar—not to sell on Sunday—and to be subject to the cancelling of his licence at any time on conviction of a violation of its conditions, &c. A licence law on this pattern was passed, but worked so ill that, as the authors of this pamphlet significantly admit, “a Prohibitory Act has again been passed.” Yet in Massachusetts, if in any free community, a license law could have been successfully carried out, and the licensed dealers under the act of 1867 had every possible inducement to conduct their business without injury to the public good. By the present law the sale of spirits and wine is universally prohibited, and so also is the sale of malt liquors, unless the inhabitants vote to the contrary; and at the last polling day only 30 towns out of 189 voted for the sale. That violations of the Prohibitory law, and connivance at violations, should occur, and receive sanction from some who ought to do better, may excite surprise when the plainest laws of morality cease to be transgressed by persons of position and education among ourselves. Mr. Wendell Phillips is a powerful advocate of prohibition, and would indignantly repudiate the use of his name in support of the opinion that such legislation is either undesirable or incapable of being adequately enforced.

Michigan has upon its statute books the most efficient prohibitory law of any State in the Union. The *State Republican*, the leading paper of Lansing, the capital city of Michigan, says: “So far as Detroit, Jackson, East Saginaw, Grand Rapids, and other of our large cities are concerned, the law is a dead letter upon our statute books. In our own city it is enforced when complaint is made; but we know of no complaints except of the lower order of saloon, whose proprietors are periodically, perhaps three or four times a year, hauled up and made to pay a fine of ten dollars and costs, amounting in the aggregate to fifty or sixty dollars—the profits of a week’s business. In three-fourths of the towns in Michigan the law is a dead letter. There is not one man pledged to total abstinence now, where there were ten, twenty years ago. The proportion of drunkards may not be greater, but the men who have the moral stamina to enforce such laws are decreasing in number.”

Mr. Justice McCarthy, in his able and exhaustive essay contributed to the *Fortnightly Review* on Prohibitory Legislation in the United States, gives a large mass of similar evidence, the result of personal experience and observation, with regard to Iowa and three or four other States, and he sums up his



conclusions, as we may sum up this rapid survey, with the remark that "the repression of liquor selling [in the American States] is possible and does exist in small villages under peculiarly favourable circumstances, but hitherto it has proved a failure in all towns which swell beyond the dimensions of a village. Where it is least needed, it is practicable: where it is much needed, it is impracticable."

The law in Michigan is anti-license, but its provisions for the suppression of the traffic have never entitled it to be styled "the most efficient prohibitory law of any State in the Union." The opinion of the *State Republican* is about as trustworthy with regard to the Temperance sentiment and power of Michigan as the opinion of the Provincial Licensed Victuallers' Defence League upon the position of the Alliance in the United Kingdom. Mr. Justin [not Justice] McCarthy gave too little attention to the subject, and allowed himself to look too exclusively for breaches of prohibitory and restrictive laws, to entitle his testimony to the weight assigned it by the authors of the pamphlet. If a law is salutary, when in operation, the want of enforcement is not an argument against the law, but a ground of complaint against those who should attend to its execution; and further, a judicious observer will always consider not only what evil exists under a given law, but the amount that would prevail in its absence. Every law on our own statute book is violated, and comparatively few of some offences are followed by punishment; yet he who should maintain the failure of the laws, and the policy of their repeal, would be thought to have taken leave of his senses. Neither Mr. McCarthy, nor any other visitor to America who has tried to bring an evil report upon prohibitory legislation, has shown that, where carried out, it has failed to realise all the good expected of it, or that where suitable efforts have been used, its execution has been practically impeded. Faithful ministers of the law always find it as easy of administration as any other statute; and the benefits resulting have been of a kind and degree not secured under the best executed license law ever devised. This is the case not only in Maine Law States, but also in other States where, as at Vineland, in New Jersey, the Permissive, or "local option," principle is applied to the liquor traffic.

The pitiful scantling of so-called evidence furnished by the authors of the pamphlet concerning the American trial of prohibition, is in striking contrast with the deep and concurrent volume of evidence furnished from



all places where the sale of intoxicating liquors is excluded, of the social and civil advantages thence accruing. One testimony alike is borne by the two thousand districts in England and Wales where no licensed house exists : by the two hundred parishes of Scotland where a similar rule prevails ; and by those parts of Ireland, including the town of Bessbrook, and  $61\frac{1}{2}$  square miles in the county of Tyrone, where the sale of intoxicating liquors is not known. In all these places the objections brought by the authors of this pamphlet against the Permissive Bill have been met and answered by anticipation ; and it now rests upon the British Parliament as a solemn duty, to afford to any legally defined district of the country the power of deciding, whether its interests shall be permanently impaired by the licensing system, or permanently improved by the adoption of a safer and wiser plan. The liberty to protect themselves against agencies of insobriety, improvidence, vice, and oppressive taxation, is not a form of freedom which an enlightened legislature can consistently refuse to a suffering people.



## IV.—OPINIONS AND ARGUMENTS OF EMINENT MEN.

---

LORD STANLEY, M.P.

In the autumn of 1856, when the Alliance was about four years old, Mr. Samuel Pope, honorary secretary of the Alliance, invited Lord Stanley, M.P. (now Earl of Derby), to its annual meeting. His lordship declined the invitation, and gave the following as his reasons for objecting *in toto* to the objects and principle of the association :—

“ I draw a wide distinction between the voluntary temperance movement and that which seeks to attain its end by legislative intervention. Of the first I entirely approve ; the second, I regret to say, I cannot support. I have drawn out a statement of my reasons for not supporting the Alliance, which I enclose. If you choose to give it publicity, I do not object. My wish is to point out the objections which occur most forcibly to my own mind, so that if they can be met you may be prepared to meet them.”

The authors of the pamphlet re-publish Lord Stanley’s “ reasons for objecting ” to the Alliance, but they omit all mention of Mr. Pope’s replies, which were judged so satisfactory that the correspondence was published by the Alliance in a distinct form, and widely distributed. Another fact is suppressed—that nearly the whole of the objections contemplate a species of legislation which should simultaneously and instantaneously suppress the whole liquor traffic of the United Kingdom. It is plain that objections so framed have little or no pertinence to the Permissive Bill, which, if enacted, would operate conditionally and gradually, and only where public opinion was ready to sustain it.

“ 1. Because the law-making power in England, being practically in the hands of the wealthy, while the intemperate class is, generally speaking, the lowest in the scale, the proposed prohibition would be a cutting off by one class of the (supposed) enjoyments of another—a measure to which the law-makers will not venture, in prudence, to resort ; and which, if resorted to, would be regarded by those whom it affected as partial and unjust.

“ This objection applies less to the case of the United States, although even there complaint is made that the rich, who can afford to buy liquor wholesale, are virtually exempt from the law which enforces abstinence on the poor.”

Since the above was written, the second Reform Bill has made it impossible to assert that “ the law-making power in England is prac-



tically in the hands of the wealthy ;" so that the force of the objection, whether much or little in 1856, has evaporated in 1872. As, also, the law would be permissive, and not imperative, and as there is not the least probability that the wealthy would ever seek, or be able if they did, to impose it upon the other classes, any gloss of plausibility which the objection might have retained has been removed. The minority might consider the law "partial and unjust ;" and minorities have the same impression respecting all laws which they have opposed ; but a majority of two-thirds would have a right to consider it still more "partial and unjust" if deprived of the power to put away the proven cause of their most painful local evils.

"2. Because, while the desire of drink is so strong as to lead to an annual consumption of from £50,000,000 to £70,000,000 sterling in liquor, the proposed prohibition, if carried, would be evaded by smuggling to an enormous extent, with, probably, the connivance of many magistrates, M.P.'s, and others who would regard the law as impracticable and absurd, and would, therefore, not exert themselves to see it enforced. Hence a double evil—(a) disregard of, and contempt for, law ; and (b) less of that practical control which is now exercised over places where drink is sold : the trade falling into more disreputable hands, and a criminal class being artificially produced."

This objection is substantially obviated by the permissive and local character of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Bill. So large a majority as two-thirds would be a guarantee for a strong local sentiment, and an efficient legal oversight would do the rest. Thus there would be no contempt for law engendered, nor would evils at all equal to existing ones arise. Does Earl Derby believe that "practical control" is now exercised over drink-shops? and is it not one of the chief charges against them that they artificially produce a criminal class which, but for them, would have no existence? Mr. Justice Keating has said: "Some of the saddest cases with which we have to deal are those in which men go into public-houses respectable and respected, and come out felons."—(*Report of Committee of Convocation on Intemperance, People's Edition, p. 53.*)

"3. Because in the present lamentable condition of the labouring class as a body, the labourer has, especially in rural districts, no amusement or recreation whatever, nor any place of social meeting except the public-house. This state of things is not sought to be defended, nor even palliated, but it exists, and before closing public-houses some better substitute should be provided."

The state of things described above has been considerably amended during the past sixteen years ; and working-men's clubs, "British Work-



man" public-houses, &c., have put within reach of large portions of the labouring classes, places and means of entertainment separate from the influence of the drinking-shop. Were the *liquor* to disappear, the *shop* could be speedily utilised.

"4. Because the suppression of the liquor traffic—assuming it possible—would cause a loss of £20,000,000 of revenue yearly; and though it is admitted that the social aspect of this question is more important than the fiscal, yet it must be considered that so large a deficit can only be made up by the imposition of direct taxes to a vast amount: the discontent produced by which, must be added to that directly arising out of a restriction so stringent, and which would be severely felt by so many. This is no argument against gradual diminution of the traffic, but a strong argument against total and violent suppression."

The Permissive scheme gets rid effectually of the fiscal objection as here stated, and no Chancellor of the Exchequer would fear to trust to the recuperative state of the revenue under a gradual reduction of the duties received from intoxicating liquor, and an increased consumption of other articles, and augmentation of the national industry and wealth. A "gradual diminution of the traffic" is thus made possible, and the derangement consequent on a "total and violent suppression" averted.

"5. Because a habit of self-control acquired by the individual is, in every respect, a better protection than an arbitrary enactment. In those communities of primitive people where no access has ever been had to intoxicating drink, it is found that the desire for it, when casually introduced, becomes an irrepressible passion; and entire tribes have been, and are being, swept off in consequence of yielding to this passion. Prohibition augments desire, and the absence of temptation cannot confer moral strength."

This paragraph admits of several replies—

(1) A habit of self-control is very valuable, but the habit of drinking, especially as acquired and fostered in public-houses, tends to prevent the formation of the other habit, and to weaken it when acquired. The truth, therefore, enunciated by Lord Stanley is one adverse to the liquor traffic, and favours the adoption of means for its removal.

(2) Primitive communities are no doubt very easily corrupted by the use of strong drink, and they are also very subject to epidemical diseases in their worst form when introduced. Is this an argument for the introduction of the drink or the diseases? or should this fact induce indifference to the perpetuation of either in communities not primitive, but frightfully cursed by both?



(3) Prohibition may augment desire in some, but it may avert suffering from more ; and if no prohibition is desirable, what becomes of both legal and moral restraints ?

(4) The absence of temptation may not confer moral strength *directly* ; but who is justified in offering, and increasing, temptation ? Besides, there are cases, as with the absence of strong drink, where the absence of temptation, in one form, enables the moral character to develop and strengthen itself so as to be able to resist temptation in other forms, as it would not have done if the first temptation had been present and had taken effect.

“6. Because difficulty will arise, if it is meant to be consistent, in defining intoxicating substances. Is tobacco to be included ? Is opium ? Where the craving for stimulants is strong, these or similar compounds will be substituted for alcoholic liquors. Chemical science will be employed to discover or produce them at small cost. You will only have replaced one form of intoxication by another. Suppose these two prohibited—a measure which will greatly increase the amount of opposition to be reckoned upon—*new means of intoxication can and will be found, calling for new and further extension of the law.*”

The multiplication of theoretical difficulties is ever easy ; and if these were allowed to impede legislation, or action of any kind, nothing would ever be done. It is not found that abstainers from alcohol resort to other intoxicating substances, nor that people, where the liquor traffic is prohibited, resort to new means of intoxication. The rule is otherwise—a substitution of weak alcoholics by stronger, and they again by opium, &c., because the appetite is already formed and indulgence is easy. Besides, in any change of law we have to provide even more for those who are yet unfallen, than for those who might seek to gratify a passion for poisonous stimulants at any cost.

“7. Because the suppression of traffic in liquor can never suffice, as has been found in America, to put a stop to its habitual use. Apart from actual smuggling alluded to before, the law may be evaded in many ways ; *e.g.*, it would probably become the practice for labourers to stipulate for a certain quantity of liquor to be given them in addition to their wages, an abuse which employers are doing their best to put down, but which prohibition of the liquor traffic would render general. Pretended exhibitions would be got up, as was done in the States, where, after paying for admission, the visitor would get his share of liquor gratis. Drinking clubs would be established on the same principle. You can't stop such frauds, unless you declare the possession as well as the sale of liquor illegal, by which enactment every man's house becomes liable to search, and the capital actually invested in private stores of wine and spirits, &c., is destroyed.”



The answer to the above is that the law should do what it can, and that to plead its inability to do everything as an excuse for doing nothing, is to exclude it from operation altogether. Whatever evasions are practised are not comparable in mischief, taking all the interests affected, to the permission to carry on the traffic. American testimony is explicit on this point, as is the evidence from prohibitory districts in this country.

“8. Because the exertions of temperance societies on the voluntary system are impeded, and odium is excited against them, by every attempt at forcible suppression of the traffic. To offer to employ physical or material force is in itself a confession that moral force is inadequate for the object proposed.”

Temperance societies have suffered too much from the liquor traffic, both in opposing their efforts and in subverting their work, to fear the odium which auxiliary legislation may excite. If they had shrunk from odium they would never have been formed nor have struggled on under a concurrence of adverse forces. In its own sphere the will of society is as lawfully exercised as the will of the individual ; and if society wish to suppress the traffic it is as justified in so doing as the individual is to suppress his own drinking if willing. Does not Lord Derby as a legislator hold a “physical or material force” in reserve, to enforce, if needs be, good legislation ? Does he regard this as derogatory to legislation ? If persuasion were adequate to the suppression of all social evils, where would the evils now be ? Law is moral force, armed with material force, and properly so armed, to overawe any material force employed to frustrate the moral objects sought to be attained by beneficent legislation.

---

#### THE EARL OF DERBY.

Speaking at a meeting in Liverpool, on the 9th of January, 1872, the Earl of Derby said :—

“There is a matter of great social interest with which Parliament will probably have to deal next session ; I mean the licensing question. It is not a very easy or simple one, and, as usually happens, those who see its difficulties least are surest that they have found the way to settle it. (Laughter and applause.) There is a general feeling, and I am afraid one cannot deny that it is well founded, that as a nation we are a little too fond of good liquor. (Laughter.) I think there is great exaggeration in what is commonly said about drunken habits, because we must remember that a perfectly sober, temperate man of the middle or upper classes, who consumes his three or four glasses of wine daily and never is the worse for them, gets through a great



deal more drink in the course of the year than most of the poor fellows who go in for too much beer on Saturday night, and get into trouble in consequence." (Renewed laughter.)

Laughter three times repeated may have been a tribute to the noble speaker's jocularly, but jocularly to treat "a matter of great social interest" was not a high compliment to his audience or himself. If, however, all that is at fault is that the nation is "a little too fond of good liquor," a merry way of looking at it may have been the readiest. Earl Derby gives no reason for thinking that there is "great exaggeration in what is commonly said about drunken habits" except this odd one—was this a part of the drollery?—that people who don't get drunk, often drink more than those who do! The statement is true, but how does it disprove the drunkenness that is seen, and its effects that are seen and felt? How, too, is the noble lord sure that three or four glasses of wine consumed daily leave a man "never the worse for them?" Has he ever read the observations on Alexis St. Martin, by Dr. Beaumont, and medical testimony as to the cumulative effect of small doses of alcohol? Perhaps not, and after all, how can much harm come out of being "a little too fond of good liquor?"

"Still, making allowances of that kind, there is no doubt that a good deal of crime and disease is due to intemperance. (Applause.) We all want to check that, if we only knew how; and every year various plans are put forward for that purpose. One of those plans is the preposterous scheme framed by a body of men calling themselves the United Kingdom Alliance. Their theory is, that if by any means you could persuade two-thirds of the ratepayers of a district that beer is objectionable, they shall have the right to impose that rule of diet on the remaining third. Now that is sheer tyranny and intolerance of the worst sort. It would be just as reasonable to lay it down that where two-thirds of the population of any district were Protestants, no Catholic should be allowed to open a place of worship; or that where two-thirds were Liberals, no Conservatives should be allowed to set up a newspaper. (Laughter.) But I won't waste your time on that theory. We have our national faults, but a sour and morose fanaticism is not one of them. (Cheers.) If those Puritans of the nineteenth century were to carry their point, they would find, like the Puritans of the seventeenth century, that they only produced during a few years an apparent conformity, which would be followed by a reaction of excess which everybody would regret." (Cheers.)

A straight stick put in water appears crooked, and the scheme of the Alliance, put in the Earl of Derby's language, may seem "preposterous," and even be so; but may not the preposterousness lie in the language and not in the scheme? Instead of the noble lord's explanation we



prefer one of our own, viz., that two-thirds of the voters of a district will have the power to exclude the sale of intoxicating liquors, with the view of escaping its baneful effects upon health, morality, industry, and taxation; and the minority to accept this decision. Subject to this ruling, their rule of diet will not be interfered with. If this be "sheer tyranny and intolerance of the worst sort," what sort of tyranny and intolerance would characterise the other alternative, of allowing the one-third to perpetrate a traffic which is a burden and curse to the whole community? The pretended analogy between the toleration of drinking-shops and of religious and political differences could scarcely have imposed on a judgment so usually acute as that of the noble earl. It is precisely because we find that the differences named do not involve the consequences known to arise from the liquor traffic, that they are tolerated; but it is not permitted for men under religious and political pretences to offend against legalised morality and the order of society—for example, to commit bigamy or incite to treason. The Puritans are not in favour with Lord Derby, it seems; but greater statesmen than even he have borne tribute to their merits, and have acknowledged that to them the liberties of England are largely due. They had, of course, their faults—as we all have, even peers of the realm—but there is little nobleness shown in sneering at these while ignoring their more conspicuous virtues. One thing they certainly failed in—making the ale-house harmless; their opponents, the cavaliers, were equally unsuccessful; and if the Puritans were wrong in trying to force their habits on others, this is an error the Alliance carefully avoids, by giving the people power to settle the question of license or no license for themselves.

"Well, the other proposals are in various ways to cut down the number of licensed houses by refusing fresh licences and gradually cancelling the old ones. That is the direction which the last attempt at legislation took. But there is one very awkward feature attending it, that the more you follow the policy of limiting numbers the more you are putting into a few hands a close and profitable monopoly, with the inevitable result that a worse article is supplied at a higher price. I own I am not sanguine of much good being done in that way, though any scheme of that sort which gives just consideration to existing interests deserves at least a fair hearing." (Hear.)

Lord Derby is alive to some of the evils of a monopoly in liquor licences; yet he thinks the scheme "deserves a fair hearing." But why so? It is a striking inversion of the free-trade rule applied to other



trades, and it ensures, he says, "a worse article at a higher price." Does it not, then, stand self-condemned? What hearing does it deserve? By his own phraseology Lord Derby tacitly admits that there are elements in this case distinct from other kinds of trade; and does not this difference involve the public right to interfere and, if need be, to prohibit?

"Another course, again, is to leave the trade open to all competitors, but to enforce stricter regulations as to hours and management. That is a policy which is just now out of fashion, though it is easier to abuse it than to show that it is wrong. On the whole, I do not think that we shall pass any large measure which will what is called 'settle the question;' but something will be tried, and I think it will be the duty of Conservatives to help as far as they can. (Hear, hear.) For myself, I have no great faith in this kind of legislation, except as a temporary expedient. Time, and teaching, and the force of opinion will do more than any Act of Parliament, and it is on them we must rely. (Applause.) The passion for drink is a disease as well as a vice—a disease generated sometimes by bad air, sometimes by excessive labour; often by poor and ill-chosen diet, and often, again, by inherited morbid tendencies. To believe that you could cure it throughout the country in a year, or even in a few years, is to go against all the teachings of experience. That there will be improvement I do not doubt, but I believe it will be a work of time, and that in the poorer classes as in the richer classes a reform of social habits will come about gradually and almost imperceptibly." (Cheers.)

The preference of Earl Derby for the open trade (as to sellers) is clear. Yet he would have "stricter regulations as to hours and management," again conceding that the business is one calling for special oversight, apart from those who carry it on. Why is this? and how can Lord Derby promise that other regulations will be better enforced than existing ones, or that they will secure the absence of the evils now complained of? "Time, teaching, and the force of opinion" are good things in their way; but if "time" is used in licensing public temptations, and "teaching" to drink is made the law of the land, and the "force of opinion" in favour of sobriety is counteracted by the force of seduction to sensual indulgence, how long may the nation wait till general temperance is attained? Neither a few years nor a few centuries will witness the transformation; and to expect a nation to sow drinking-shops and reap sobriety is, indeed, "to go against all the teachings of experience." The passion for drink is "a disease;" but not a disease to which flesh is heir till the germs are imbibed; and it is from the drink-shop that the germs are strewn broad-cast. Bad air, excessive labour, &c., never "generate" it, though they may sometimes hasten the development; a distinction which others besides the noble lord may well and wisely ponder.



## MR. JOHN STUART MILL.

[From his Book "On Liberty."]

In his book entitled *On Liberty*, Mr. John Stuart Mill, the eminent political economist, refers repeatedly to the Maine Liquor Law, with the view of showing that the principles advocated by the Alliance are unsound. Mr. Mill's reasoning is singularly cogent and powerful; but, as befits a philosophical treatise, it requires very close and attentive study, and detached passages necessarily lose some of their force when divorced from the context. Mr. Mill explains at the outset that the subject of the Essay is Social or Civil Liberty: "The nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual—a question seldom stated, and hardly ever discussed, in general terms, but which *profoundly influences the practical controversies of the age by its latent presence*, and is likely soon to make itself felt as the vital question of the future." How true this is could not be better exemplified than by the position which, since the essay was written, the advocacy of prohibitory legislation in regard to beverages has assumed in this country.

The excellences of Mr. Mill's Essay "On Liberty" are numerous; but to enunciate sound canons is one thing, and to apply them soundly is another; and, by general consent, Mr. Mill has done the one more successfully than the other. Whether he has succeeded in his estimate of the Alliance will be discussed. It ought to be explained that Mr. Mill's objections had respect to national prohibition, and not to a local system which would admit of purchases outside the protected area.

Discussing "the limits to the authority of society over the individual," Mr. Mill says:—

"Under the name of preventing intemperance, the people of one English colony, and of nearly half the United States, have been interdicted by law from making any use whatever of fermented drinks, except for medical purposes: for prohibition of their sale is in fact, as it is intended to be, prohibition of their use. And though the impracticability of executing the law has caused its repeal in several of the States which had adopted it, including the one from which it derives its name, an attempt has notwithstanding been commenced, and is prosecuted with considerable zeal by many of the professed philanthropists, to agitate for a similar law in this country."

The points here requiring correction are several. (1) At no time were the people of nearly half the United States under the operation of prohibitory laws. (2) Prohibition of sale is not tantamount to prohibition of use. In some parts of England more than half the people who use beer do not buy, but make it. Under a Permissive arrangement local prohibition would not entail local disuse where trouble was taken to obtain it from outside; though the ordinary use would be made less



easy, and local temptations to indulgence excluded. (3) The repeal of the Maine Law, in any of the American States, was never occasioned by the impracticability of enforcing it. In Maine itself the law was repealed for a short time, but was re-enacted after a brief trial of license, and has been in operation for the last fourteen years. Mr. Mill gave the fact as he knew it in 1857; but why was his statement republished without the corrections rendered necessary by lapse of time?

Mr. Mill then proceeds to deal with the arguments of Mr. Samuel Pope, honorary secretary to the Alliance, as used in the celebrated controversy with Lord Stanley (the present Earl Derby) in 1856. For facility for reference we place Mr. Pope's leading points side by side with Mr. Mill's rejoinder.

MR. POPE.

1.—All matters relating to thought, opinion, conscience, appear to me to be without the sphere of legislation; all pertaining to social act, habit, relation, subject only to a discretionary power vested in the State itself, and not in the individual, to be within it.

MR. MILL.

1.—No mention is made of a third class, different from either of these; viz., acts and habits which are not social, but individual; although it is to this class, surely, that the act of drinking fermented liquors belongs. Selling fermented liquors, however, is trading, and trading is a social act. But the infringement complained of is not the liberty of the seller, but on that of the buyer and consumer; since the State might just as well forbid him to drink wine, as purposely make it impossible for him to obtain it.

Mr. Mill admits that trading as a social act comes under the operation of "social law;" but drinking is an individual act, and individual acts ought to be free. For the sake of argument this may be admitted (though some individual acts are as much subject to legal prohibition as some social ones), but the admission does not carry with it the conclusion of Mr. Mill—that the social act of drink-selling should be free also; for this would be to put the individual above the law, whose express function is to decide what social acts should be allowed or forbidden. The "ego" may say, "I want to drink, and must get it, and must buy it;" but the State may reply, "Drink if you can get, and get it if you can, but you must not buy when I have decided that the sale is unsafe." Surely where there is any conflict of liberties, the individual should give way to the State, and not the State to the individual.



2.—I claim, as a citizen, a right to legislate whenever my social rights are invaded by the social act of another. [And now for a definition of these "social rights."] If anything invades my social rights, certainly the traffic in strong drink does. It destroys my primary right of security, by constantly creating and stimulating social disorder. It invades my right of equality, by deriving a profit from the creation of a misery I am taxed to support. It impedes my right to free moral and intellectual development, by surrounding my path with dangers, and by weakening and demoralising society, from which I have a right to claim mutual aid and intercourse.

2.—A theory of "social rights," the like of which probably never before found its way into distinct language; being nothing short of this—that it is the absolute social right of every individual, that every other individual shall act exactly as he ought; that whosoever fails thereof in the smallest particular, violates my social right, and entitles me to demand from the legislature the removal of the grievance. So monstrous a principle is far more dangerous than any single interference with liberty; *there is no violation of liberty which it would not justify*. It acknowledges no right to any freedom whatever, except perhaps to that of holding opinions in secret, without ever disclosing them: for, the moment an opinion which I consider noxious passes any one's lips, it invades all the "social rights" attributed to me by the Alliance. The doctrine ascribes to all mankind a vested interest in each other's moral, intellectual, and even physical perfection, to be defined by each claimant according to his own standard.

It passes comprehension how Mr. Mill could have extracted from Mr. Pope's declaration "the monstrous principle" he has produced. Mr. Pope impeaches the liquor traffic of invading his rights as a citizen, thus: (1) Causing social disorder, which destroys the right of security; (2) by making profit out of that which adds to the general taxation, and so appropriating unequal advantages to itself; (3) by multiplying the dangers of society, and so far impeding that liberty of individual and social improvement which the social system is intended to defend and promote. If the liquor traffic is rightly impeached of doing all this, its condemnation is inevitable; for it would be a truly "monstrous principle" to uphold, that the law ought to suffer these things to be done and make no provision for their cessation.

Having thus dissected and exposed the unsound principles which lie at the basis of the Alliance agitation, Mr. Mill, in other portions of his treatise, deals with one or two other points, asserting in one place that "drunkenness, *in ordinary cases*, is not a fit subject for legislative interference," on the ground that "purely self-regarding misconduct cannot properly be meddled with in the way of prevention or punishment."



Can Mr. Mill, or anyone else, show that drunkenness in any case is "purely self-regarding misconduct?" It is a state of incapacity for every domestic, civil, and political duty; and how can it be "purely self-regarding?" It throws the offender upon some other person or persons as a being to be protected from receiving injury, or forcibly prevented from inflicting it: how can it be termed "purely self-regarding?" In its direct and indirect consequences it is mischievous to society, and if general and continuous would break up the social system: how, then, can it be described as "purely self-regarding?" It may be confidently affirmed that drunkenness is never self-regarding, and never can be, unless the drunkard is segregated in a degree scarcely possible whilst he remains a member of society at all.

On the question of licensing and regulating the sale of strong drink, Mr. Mill lays down the following principles:—

"The question of making the sale of these commodities a more or less exclusive privilege must be answered differently, according to the purposes to which the restriction is intended to be subservient. All places of public resort require the restraint of a police, and places of this kind peculiarly, because offences against society are especially apt to originate there. It is, therefore, fit to confine the power of selling these commodities (at least for consumption on the spot) to persons of known or vouched-for respectability; to make such regulations respecting hours of opening and closing as may be requisite for public surveillance; and to withdraw the licence if breaches of the peace repeatedly take place through the connivance or incapacity of the keeper of the house, or if it becomes a rendezvous for concocting and preparing offences against the law. *Any further restriction I do not conceive to be, in principle, justifiable.* The limitation, in number, for instance, of beer and spirit houses, for the express purpose of rendering them more difficult of access, and diminishing the occasions of temptation, not only exposes all to an inconvenience, because there are some by whom the facility would be abused, but is suited only to a state of society in which the labouring classes are avowedly treated as children or savages, and placed under an education of restraint, to fit them for future admission to the privileges of freedom. This is not the principle on which the labouring classes are professedly governed in any free country: and no person who sets due value on freedom will give his adhesion to their being so governed—unless, after all efforts have been exhausted to educate them for freedom and govern them as freemen, it is definitely proved that they can only be governed as children."

The publicans who claim Mr. Mill as an ally cannot have understood the force of the short sentence they print in italics, which, if acted upon, would throw their trade open and destroy that monopoly which they belaud as the bulwark against universal intemperance and vice. Are they prepared for this application of Mr. Mill's teaching? It is the Alliance alone which consistently repudiates the basis of his argument



and all that he builds upon it. He gives to the principle of individual liberty an extension it cannot justly bear, and which, as applied to the liquor traffic, is more likely to turn men into savages, and unfit them for the privileges of freedom, than any other course. Mr. Mill is not a *doctrinaire*, but he argues in the spirit of one when he strains his pet principle of individualism till he makes it include free trade in liquors which have impoverished, demoralised, and ruined countless multitudes of our countrymen, including men and women of the finest culture and otherwise most auspicious prospects. Even if it were not permissible to interfere to save the offenders, the State owes a duty to itself which cannot be neglected without wrong to the millions who suffer from the operation of an agency that receives, while it is cursing society, the legal protection awarded to the most beneficent institutions. Rightly understood, legitimate liberty is not honoured or exemplified by this proceeding, and Samuel Butler is as wise as witty when he teaches—

“Law does not put the least restraint  
Upon our freedom, but maintain it ;  
Or, if it does, 'tis for our good  
To give us freer latitude :  
For wholesome laws preserve us free  
By stinting of our liberty.”

Individual liberty becomes libertinism, and would lead to social chaos, unless held subject to social safeguards and the conditions of social progress.

---

#### THE RIGHT HON. JOHN BRIGHT, M.P.

[From a Speech at Birmingham, January 20, 1870, in reply to an Alliance Deputation.]

I have voted against the Permissive Bill in the House of Commons on more than one occasion—I think twice. I have spoken against it, at the same time supporting what after all is the essential principle of the bill, and very much approving of the objects to be secured by it. But the bill, as a machinery, I never would vote for. I hold it to be a bad bill for the purpose of temperance ; and, as it is drawn, it would be a bill creating contest, confusion, and difficulty ; and I hold that the end to be obtained by it may be better obtained with less harm by a different machinery. Therefore I should not vote for the bill. It is not the custom, neither is it constitutional, to refer great questions by themselves individually to the votes of great masses of persons, that they may determine the great questions of legislation. It is that they may determine the persons by whom questions of legislation



shall be considered and determined. Therefore, when you consider what shall be done to control—that is the proper word—the granting of licences as the means of providing these drinks, then it is a very serious matter whether you should depart from all you have done before, or whether we should adhere to the constitutional and wise purpose of giving the immediate decision to a body elected by the people. This is one of the great reasons why I object to the Permissive Bill.

Seeing that Mr. Bright supports “what after all is the essential principle of the bill,” he must be much nearer to the Alliance than to the publicans. If the machinery of the bill is capable of amendment, or of being superseded for the better, none will rejoice more heartily than Sir Wilfrid Lawson and his friends. Possibly Mr. Bright may have had in view a Licensing Bill which the Permissive Bill does not pretend to be. In any case Mr. Bright’s objections do not appear very forcible when weighed, provided the choice lies between the bill and a rejection of its principle. Whatever “contest, confusion, and difficulty” would attend its operation would not compare for a moment with the unremitting evil flowing from the machinery of the liquor traffic as kept in motion by the licensing system. Mr. Bright may prefer that the decision should rest with a body elected by the people, rather than with the people directly; but as a variety of Permissive Acts are now in force, under which a direct popular vote is taken, nothing unconstitutional can be justly said to attach to the mode of action proposed by the Permissive Prohibitory Bill.

It would work with embarrassment and confusion, and I think it a monstrous provision that the ratepayers of any given town or parish, and the ratepayers of all the parishes of England, are at once to suppress the occupation of 100,000 people or families. You propose by this bill—through an excited and inflamed state of public opinion it may be—to suppress the business which hitherto the law in every Christian and every civilised country has admitted to be a business that was as fairly to be carried on as every other business. There is no provision for compensation in the bill. It is a bill without any legislative quality or character. The bill, as a bill to do what is proposed to be done, is about as bad a bill as could be contrived. I hold the machinery to be bad, impracticable, and impossible. It is not in the power of Parliament, by an Act of Parliament, to change the habits of the people; and in all probability a law such as you propose, if it were to be passed, would fail absolutely and become a dead letter.

There is no provision in the bill that the ratepayers, or other voters, “are at once to suppress the occupation of 100,000 families,” but a provision that a large majority of them may prevent the re-issue of licences to sell intoxicating liquors; this sale never being supposed to constitute



the sole occupation of men who style themselves "licensed *victuallers*." Mr. Bright would be the last to maintain that what the law in any Christian and civilised land has once tolerated, should for ever continue to be so upheld : if so, how could slavery have been abolished ? Besides, as he concedes the essential principle of the bill, and would give full power to an elected board or town council, he undermines his own objection on this score while in the act of adducing it. As for compensation, when a case for it is made out, and the compensation due to the sufferers from the liquor traffic has been assessed and admitted, the plea for compensation to liquor dealers will be readily allowed. Were the publicans to believe that the bill, if passed as drafted, would remain "a dead letter," their opposition would quickly subside ; but on this point they may be imagined capable of forming a shrewder judgment than even the distinguished member for Birmingham himself.

---

### THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

The Right Rev. Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester, speaking at a meeting of the National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance at Bristol (January, 1872), said he had noticed in the plan of the Alliance three things which rendered him somewhat anxious as to the wisdom of their proceedings. In the first place, he noticed that the plan proposed by the temperance Alliance did import what seemed to him to be a principle that was novel in our constitution, that of placing the power—and that a great power—in the hands of the majority over the minority ; and though he had very carefully read many of the speeches that had been spoken by most distinguished advocates of the Alliance cause, he had been unfortunate enough to find no complete answer to this statement that what they were advocating was a legislative proceeding novel to our constitution.

Rather, it would be a novelty in our constitution to give a minority of voters power over a majority. How the other arrangement can be said to be "novel," when the most important questions are decided by majorities, it is impossible to divine. At present the power to grant or refuse licences rests with a majority of magistrates. But the liquor dealers are in a dilemma. If the minority ought to rule, and if the Alliance is (as the publicans affirm) in a minority, then the Alliance should rule. If, on the contrary, the majority should decide, the *Permissive Bill*, which gives this power to a large majority, ought to be enacted.



In the second place, his attention had been directed to the fact that it was deemed necessary by the Alliance to raise a sum of £100,000. He could hardly understand for what ends or purposes so large a sum was required. No doubt those who took the trouble and responsibility of going round the country to gather round them well-wishers and friends of the cause incurred certain expenses; but when he considered so large a sum as £100,000 was required to aid in passing a measure through Parliament, he could not but feel that there was some net-work of agencies beyond which he had any knowledge in the matter; therefore he should require some information as to the exact purposes for which that very large sum of money was required.

The authors of this pamphlet have answered, on a previous page of their pamphlet, the excellent and right rev. prelate, by declaring that the sum of £100,000, to be called up in five years, is not very large after all. Certainly no one who reflects upon the magnitude of the "interest" on the other side, can conclude that the Guarantee Fund is excessive; yet the executive council of the Alliance would only be too glad to announce to the subscribers that the major portion of their promised contributions would not be required. Moreover, the annual reports of the Alliance are open to his lordship, and he may there see what has been done with the former Guarantee Fund of £50,000; and he will not find it very difficult to understand that a doubled amount is to be used to re-double all the agencies and operations of the Alliance.

The third point was, perhaps, more difficult to allude to publicly; yet he must not shrink from the responsibility of stating his anxiety at observing that there was so strong an admixture of party politics in the Alliance movement generally. Five speeches on the liquor traffic had been sent to him by a person who was a warm advocate of the Alliance cause. Those five speeches were delivered at five public centres, and throughout those speeches he found constant allusion to the Liberal cause. He found himself carried into an arena which he declined to go into, namely, the arena of party politics. They must discard party politics in this matter; and, were he a warm friend of the Alliance, there was nothing he should more deprecate than the publication of those five speeches on the liquor traffic.

Mr. Trevelyan, as a well-known Liberal statesman, very naturally, in some few passages of his speech, addressed himself specially and directly to politicians of his own school; but the Alliance is one with Bishop Ellicott in believing that in a question such as this, party politics should be discarded, and the sincerity of this conviction is shown by the union of men of all political parties in the membership and on the platform of the Alliance. When the Rt. Hon. Lord Claud Hamilton and Colonel Taylor co-operate with Sir Wilfrid Lawson and Mr. Jacob



Bright, no political observer can fail to discern that a happy fusion has been effected, and that the Permissive Bill has been successfully excluded from "the arena of party politics."

### THE BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS.

[The Right Rev. Lord A. C. Hervey, D.D.]

Speaking at Bath in January, 1872, the Bishop of Bath and Wells said :—

He could not agree with those who thought it would be either fair, just, or wise to make it impossible for persons to obtain what they call intoxicating drinks. He believed they are given by God for use ; he believed they have their use, and that the only fault arises when we come to use those things intemperately. In this matter he judged for others as he judged for himself. He knew very well that he was very glad of a glass of sherry at his dinner, and sometimes he had a glass of cold brandy and water, and felt much the better for it ; he did not find it intoxicating, because he took it in moderation and not to excess. Beer, like other things, is not intoxicating except when used to excess, and therefore he for one should be sorry to deprive the working man of what he believed is given to him to assist his strength, and to be a comfort to him after a hard day's work. With regard to the prohibition of the sale of liquors on Sunday, of course at first sight it seemed very desirable that there should be no such thing as an open public-house on Sunday ; but Sunday was a great day with the working men, their only leisure day, and surely they were not doing wrong in drinking a glass of beer with their families at home on Sunday. Therefore he did not think it would be right to put it out of people's power to obtain these drinks even on Sunday.

The opinion entertained by the Bishop of Bath and Wells concerning alcoholic drinks cannot obliterate or alter the terrible and widespread results of the liquor traffic, and the duty of efficient action for their removal ; and it is for his lordship to show, if he can, how those results are to be effaced and their repetition prevented, so long as the traffic remains. The opinion was held by many churches and bishops in America that slaves were given by God for use, and that slavery was even a divine institution ; and pleasant pictures were drawn of Christian masters surrounded by happy and well-cared for dependents ; but slavery in its sum of effects remained as hideous as before, and its abolition is now esteemed a transcendent blessing. When will English bishops consider that the question is not whether they are "glad" of a glass of sherry, and fancy it does them good—perhaps without ever trying the other course—but, how society is to be protected and countless masses saved



from utter wretchedness and ruin? The Bishop of Bath and Wells must know that though he may refuse to call beer intoxicating—why not ardent spirits too?—the sale of beer is not the same practically to society as the sale of bread; and is it too much to ask that, instead of deciding for the working man, he should enable the working men at large to decide whether they will have the beershop and public-house placed near to their dwellings or not? The Bishop's plea for the Sunday sale of liquor shows a strange ignorance of facts; for publicans themselves have established the possibility of serving beer on Saturday for Sunday's consumption: and sad, indeed, is it to hear a prelate make excuses for the beerseller on the Lord's Day which he would not advance for the fishmonger, the grocer, or the draper.

---

#### ARCHDEACON DENISON.

[Speech at Bath, January, 1872.]

He did not believe that anything legislation could do would really touch the root of this tremendous evil [drunkenness], which he believed comes more than from any other source from the enormous accumulation of people in great centres, the high wages, the great increase of wealth, and the excitement which is necessarily produced among large numbers of people having no home life. No doubt the Legislature was bound to do what it could, and he for one should be glad and thankful to see anything done in a reasonable way, remembering at the same time that they were temperance, not prohibition men; he wanted the thing so done that a man might have his drink without any undue restrictions. As for going any further he never would consent to interfere with the just use of those things which Providence has placed in our hands. With regard to Mr. Trevelyan's speeches, a copy of which had been sent him, he submitted that though they might be very good addresses to people who had made up their minds, they were not by any means a fair representation of the case. Mr. Trevelyan quoted statistics, but he only quoted on his own side; and three-fourths of his argument, if reasoned out logically, went to prove prohibition and not temperance.

Archdeacon Denison can only mean that the causes he assigns are secondary ones, for the immediate cause of drunkenness must, in the nature of the case, be the consumption of strong drink, and the chief cause of that consumption all experience proves to be the facilities and temptations presented by the liquor traffic. The Permissive Bill does not apply to the "things which Providence has placed" in the people's hands, without the intervention of those who make and sell intoxicating



drink for gain ; but Providence is neither brewer nor distiller, nor is it a fiat of Providence that men should be licensed to trade in liquors which the inspiration of the same Providence has described under the names of "mocker," and "raging." How little the venerable Archdeacon could have read of Mr. Trevelyan's speeches is apparent from his ignorance that the arguments they contain were *intended* to prove prohibition, and to secure the spread of temperance by stopping the manufacture of intemperance in prohibitive districts.

---

MR. CHARLES SEELY, M.P.

[Meeting at Nottingham, January 3rd, 1872.]

I believe it is extremely doubtful whether intemperance, as a whole would be checked if public-houses were put a stop to altogether, and no greater evil could be inflicted on the community than a change in the habit which people had now of drinking beer at the public-houses, into taking a bottle of gin to their own homes to drink with their wives. If such a bill as the Permissive Bill were put into operation, I very much doubt whether the evils of intemperance would not actually be increased. But, apart from that, I consider it a most monstrous act of tyranny on the part of the majority to attempt to put down public-houses in any particular parish ; and therefore I cannot, and never have, given in my adhesion to the Permissive Bill.

Mr. Seely cannot have read a line of the evidence presented in the Report of the Convocation Committee on Intemperance, or he would have been unable to utter the above remarks. Why should the absence of drinkselling lead to taking gin home to drink ? and if gin is fit to be drunk in the public-house without the restraint of home, and under every temptation to excess, why should there be any evil in taking it home ? Mr. Seely would legislate, it seems, for home sobriety by setting up public drinking-houses ! As he does not explain how the operation of the Permissive Bill would be "a most monstrous act of tyranny," he will, perhaps, when he next delivers his sentiments, compare this hypothetical tyranny with the practical tyranny of the present system, which enables a minority to subject a majority and themselves to all the ill effects of a business which is expressly licensed as a benefit to all. Will Mr. Seely next come to regard it as "a most monstrous act of tyranny" for a majority in Parliament to attempt to put down what a minority are very anxious to preserve ?



## MR. HENRY FAWCETT, M.P.

[Speech to his constituents at Brighton, 15th January, 1872.]

The next subject on which you will probably expect me to say a few words, is the licensing question. (Cheers.) I am the more desirous of doing so because I know that upon this question there is a difference of opinion between many of my best friends and myself. Not a few in this constituency, whose good opinion I particularly esteem, are strongly in favour of the Permissive Bill. I am told that many are prepared to make it a test question at the next election ; but if this should be the case, it is all the more reason why I should at once tell you that nothing whatever should induce me to vote for the Permissive Bill. Rather than support it I would infinitely sooner never enter the House of Commons again. I value political liberty, but, if possible, I value individual liberty more. (Cheers.)

The above declaration amounts in substance to this : that not a few of Mr. Fawcett's constituents, whom he "particularly esteems," are strongly favourable to the Permissive Bill, and that he is strongly adverse to it. Is it not possible that they may be right and he wrong? That they should make *it* a test question is surely as much within the scope of their rights as electors, as it is to make any other cardinal article of agreement a condition of a candidate's support. Mr. Fawcett may consistently refuse to re-enter the House as their representative on this subject ; and they may as consistently decline to send him there unless he is. Individual liberty is very valuable, but not when it claims a right to sacrifice the social liberty of extinguishing a physical, domestic, and national curse.

## MR. GEORGE DIXON, M.P.

[Speech to his constituents at Birmingham, January 29, 1872.]

I have received intimations, not only from some of my valued supporters in this town, but directly from headquarters at Manchester, that the time has come when those who are not prepared to support in Parliament Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Permissive Bill are no longer to be considered as worthy representatives of the people ; and we have been told that if it be not desirable openly to oppose such men, at any rate that votes should not be given in their favour. Now, when you listen to my objections to the Permissive Bill, I hope that you will hear me with patience, and that you will remember that I, too, think I am as much a temperance man as the members of the United Kingdom Alliance, and that the only difference between us is—not in the object to be gained, but in the way that we go in order to gain it. In the first place, I object to the Permissive Bill, because it is a permissive bill. That is to say, let a permissive bill be passed, and it would be entirely inoperative in a place like Birmingham. And before it could be brought into operation there would have been a period of strife and contention between the dealers in liquor and the temperance people, that in my opinion would be prejudicial to some of the greatest interests of the community.



Is a law not to be passed because it would be inoperative in Birmingham? Besides, how can Mr. Dixon be sure that the Permissive Bill would be "entirely inoperative in a place like Birmingham?" Does he suppose that Birmingham, as a whole, would have to reject or accept it? Birmingham has its wards, and a ward in Birmingham, like the twenty-second ward in Philadelphia, might be wise enough to vote "No licence." But, then, the "strife and contention!" Has Mr. Dixon forgotten who said, "I come not to bring peace, but a sword"? The peace worth cherishing has often to be earned with travail. Thunder is not the zephyr breeze, but thunder clears the air.

Then this Permissive Bill is either entirely prohibitory or it is nothing. I think the objection against it, if it be something, is that it prohibits the sale of liquor altogether, and that, therefore, if not unjust, at any rate it imposes a great sacrifice upon the portion of the community which is admitted to be moderate in the use of liquors.

The Bill "imposes" no sacrifice, but it allows the community to decide whether they will sacrifice the proximity of the public-house, or the blessings of which the public-house now robs them. Individuals may now "sacrifice" the use of liquors by personal abstinence: why should they not collectively "sacrifice" the facilities of getting the liquor which the traffic supplies? Why should Mr. Dixon declare that *he* will not allow them to make that sacrifice? If he says he protects the unwilling minority, he can only do this by shackling the willing majority; in a word, reversing the rule of civil government all the world over.

The bill, moreover, confers no compensation on those liquor dealers who are disestablished by it. In my opinion that would be unjust to the licensed victuallers and beerhouse keepers. I do hope that these objections which I have stated will not be in their opinion any obstacle, or, at any rate, a great obstacle in the way of their gaining their ends. In my opinion the true policy to be observed with reference to this question is that we should enlist on our side the great body of moderate drinkers and the respectable portion—for I do not hesitate to say there is a respectable portion—of the traffickers in liquor. When we seek as we ought to seek, and as I for one wish to seek, for the ultimate eradicating of the vicious habit and the old-established system of the drinking habits and customs of this country—then, I say, it is wiser that we should proceed by degrees, although sometimes the progress might be slow.

The liquor dealers are never legally established for more than a year, and unless they should get their licences renewed their establishment



would come to an end. They have no legal claim to re-establishment, and their only moral claim is that they have done service to society. It is upon this claim that the Permissive Bill would allow the people to be consulted, and would give to their decision the force of law. An adverse decision would, in effect, be a declaration that no compensation was due, because the only reason for compensation would be a reason for renewed permission to sell, *i.e.*, a refusal to adopt the Act. Some traffickers—they are very few—see the justice of this, and are ready to abide the appeal. The “great body of moderate drinkers” would be the parties with whom would lie, from their numerical strength, the adoption or rejection of the Bill. Mr. Dixon advises progress “by degrees,” but gives no definition of the degrees. The Alliance is not opposed to degrees of general restriction, but it asks for the full protection of prohibition where due preparation for it exists. It may be doubted whether in his heart Mr. Dixon does not admit the justice of this demand, for when at the close of his speech he said he thought the inhabitants “should have power within reasonable limits to regulate the number of public-houses to suit their wishes,”—a question was interposed: “Suppose they do not require any?” He replied, “Well, if they do not require any, I presume they will not have any.” It is this power—to decide that they may not have any—that the Alliance claims for the people of every district.

---

MR. H. H. VIVIAN, M.P.

[One of the 136 members of the House of Commons who, in 1871, voted for Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Permissive Bill.]

I altogether deny the right of any man, or any number of men, to say to his neighbour, “You shall not eat or drink this particular thing.” It may be said I voted for Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Bill: true, I have done so in one shape or another. Since I have been in Parliament I have voted in favour of every measure calculated to reduce intemperance, but I have done so in the sense that it is utterly impossible that such a policy as Sir Wilfrid Lawson's should become law, and simply as a protest that earnest legislation on this matter must be undertaken. I have never advocated, and never will advocate, the passing of a measure that would enable one portion of the inhabitants of a district preventing the other portion from prudently enjoying those beverages which a good Providence has provided.



Mr. Vivian must settle with his conscience and constituents the consistency of his vote ; but it is not to be assumed that other M.P.'s vote for measures they do not wish to see become law. The Permissive Bill does not dictate what people shall not eat or drink, or prevent them enjoying what a good Providence provides ; but it permits a large majority to decide that the public victualling shall be carried on free from the sale of liquors, which lessen the real comforts and multiply the distresses of mankind. Whether Providence sends alcoholic liquors or not, the law licenses the salesman ; and whether he should be licensed, is the question the people are best able to determine.

---

### HUGH MILLER ON WATER DRINKERS.

*In My Schools and Schoolmasters.*

"Fanaticism in itself is not a good thing ; nor are there many quiet people who do not dislike enthusiasm ; and the members of new sects, whether they be religious sects or no, are almost always enthusiasts, and in some degree fanatical. A man can scarce become a vegetarian even without also becoming in some measure intolerant of the still large and not very disreputable class that eat beef with their greens, and herrings with their potatoes ; and the drinkers of water do say rather strong things of the men who, had they been guests at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, would have seen no great harm in partaking in moderation of the wine. There is a somewhat intolerant fanaticism among the teetotalers, just as there is fanaticism amongst most other new sects."

Hugh Miller did not condemn teetotalism, but intolerant teetotalers ; and if there are intolerant advocates of the Permissive Bill, they do not prove the Bill to be fanatical. The Free Church of Scotland, of which Hugh Miller was an ornament and leader, was denounced as fanatical ; and such a cry is ever the easy and puerile resort of those who have ceased to reason, and are inspired by prejudice and spite. It is even better to be fanatical in a good cause than cold-hearted in the receipt of money some of which is the price of blood, and much of it the measure of privation and suffering among the poor.

---

### CHIEF BARON KELLY ON DRUNKENNESS.

[At the Leicester Assizes, 29th Feb., 1872.]

He might say, and he did it with great pleasure, that he had observed that such of the offences as were charged in the calendar did not appear



to have been at least materially occasioned by the grievous offence of drunkenness, and that in this part of her Majesty's dominions it did seem that some check at least had been placed upon this description of self-indulgence, which had for a long time been the besetting sin of this nation. It was also a matter of satisfaction to them all that the attention of the Legislature had been directed to this important subject, and, whilst he was addressing them, both Houses of Parliament were engaged in the task of devising some legislation for its modification and diminution throughout the United Kingdom. Now, it would not become him upon such a subject and upon such an occasion to enter upon the matter at great length; but without trespassing upon the forbidden field of politics, he would observe, as he had observed more than once in addressing grand juries, that it appeared to him that the subject might be dealt with without tending in the slightest degree to endanger the liberty of the subject, or without even invading the rights of property.

The liberty of the subject would not be endangered by a measure that would simply abridge the liberty of converting sober subjects into tipplers and drunkards; and as no legal rights of property inheres in licences, none could be sacrificed by refusing to renew what is inimical to the public good. As the publicans quote Lord Chief Baron Kelly, on account of the last two lines, an extract from a letter of his to the chairman of the Convocation Committee on Intemperance may be quoted: "I can only express my belief—indeed, I may say my conviction—that two-thirds of the crimes which come before the courts of law of this country are occasioned chiefly by intemperance;" and he recommends "a rigid supervision, with almost despotic power in local boards or magistrates, *private individuals and others, over public-houses.*"

---

#### THE *TIMES* ON THE DIVISIONS ON THE PERMISSIVE BILL.

[In November, 1871.]

Something must be done to settle the question, if only, as we have hinted in the interest of future candidates. When Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Bill was brought on last session, it was remarked how large a proportion of Liberal members absented themselves altogether from the division. The plan of shirking a difficulty thus adopted cannot be conveniently repeated; and unless some feasible alternative be presented, we shall see many of the absentees of last year voting for the Permissive Bill next spring. We wish to avoid the scandal thus threatened, and the greater scandals that would follow were this to happen. It is not creditable to the Legislature that its members should be supporting a bill the principles and details of which they denounce; and it would be equally little to its credit to find a measure pushed forward one session in obedience to the clamour of one set of fanatics, and hurriedly rejected immediately afterwards in obedience to men resenting the inter-



ference of a paternal despotism with their accustomed freedom. The subject must, in fact, be rescued from both extremes; and this can only be done by a bold and comprehensive measure, which the Prime Minister himself might not disdain to introduce, and which should be promoted with all the influence of the Government.

But the publicans have given timely notice that any measure at all resembling the Government Bill of 1871 will meet with the same clamorous opposition which was given to that. The *Times*, in repeated "leaders"—from which the authors of this pamphlet do not quote—has affirmed its conviction that the sort of Bill the Government ought to introduce, and without which no sufficient reform will be gained, is one that will reduce the publicans' profits one-half. This is but one of many proofs of the effect of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Bill in promoting a call for large and vigorous changes. Let these be refused, and the growing discontent will add new force to the agitation for the Permissive Bill; let them be carried, and the impetus thus acquired will lend new energy to the Alliance, and reduce the resistance of the liquor traffic to that full measure of local control, which the Alliance demands and the Permissive Bill is intended to confer.



## V.—APPENDIX.

---

From the "Quarterly Review," October, 1820.

Public-houses are almost equally objectionable [with fairs]. There are such multitudes of these in town and country perpetually holding out allurements to those classes of the community who are the least able to resist them, that they can be regarded in no other light than as seminaries of iniquity, of which no principle of political economy that we are aware of can justify the continuance. It is in them that time and money, which tradesmen and labourers can ill spare, are spent; domestic unhappiness created or increased; bad connections formed; familiarity with crime established; and consent too often given to become participators in its perpetration. It is there plans for the commission of crimes are usually proposed and arranged, and there the actors in them almost universally assemble after they have been committed. If the multiplication and management of public-houses really augment guilt as much as we have now supposed, the good they do to agriculture and the revenue by the sale of spirits is but a slender compensation for the evil they occasion. To connive at dissolute or desperate habits, because they may afford a temporary supply to an exhausted treasury, will be thought but a miserable shift for any minister, as long as any sense of right and wrong is left among us. It has not even the merit of a sound State expedient; for private vices, when traced through all their consequences, will never prove, in the end, to be public benefits; and we believe no prodigal heir ever disposed of his expectations so improvidently as a finance minister who, for any sum of ready money, virtually assigns the expectant virtue of his country.

---

From "Tait's Edinburgh Magazine," October, 1845.

By THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

The most remarkable instance 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. They first conciliate a man's countenance through his intellectual perceptions of what is right; and next they sustain it through his conscience (the strongest of his internal forces) and even through the weakest of his human sensibilities. That resolution, therefore, which no combination of men can further by abating the original impulse of temptations, they



often accomplish happily by maturing the secondary energies of resistance. Already in their earliest stage, these temperance movements had obtained, both at home and abroad, a national range of grandeur. Our northern climates have universally the taste latent, if not developed, for powerful liquors. And through their blood, as also through the natural tendency of the imitative principle amongst compatriots, from these high latitudes the greatest of our modern nations propagate the contagion to their brothers though colonising warm climates. And it is remarkable that our modern preparations of liquors, even when harmless in their earliest stages, are fitted, like stepping-stones, for making the transition to higher stages that are not harmless. The weakest preparations from malt lead, by graduated steps, to the strongest, until we arrive at the intoxicating porter of London, which, under its local name (so insidiously delusive) of beer, diffuses the most extensive ravages. 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. 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.

---

From the "Times," Wednesday, December 7th, 1853.

It is a peculiarity of spirit drinking, that money spent upon it is, at the best, thrown away, and in general far worse than thrown away. It neither supplies the natural wants of man, nor offers an adequate substitute for them. Indeed, it is far too favourable a view of the subject to treat the money spent on it as if it were cast into the sea. Yet even so, there is something exceedingly irritating in the reflection that a great part of a harvest, raised with infinite care and pains, on an ungrateful soil, and in an inhospitable climate [referring to Sweden and Norway], instead of adding to the national wealth, or bringing the rich returns that in this season of famine it could not fail to command—is poured in the shape of liquid fire down the throats of the nation that produced it, and instead of leaving them richer and happier, tends to impoverish them by the waste of labour and capital, and degrade them by vicious and debilitating indulgences. A great portion of the harvest of Sweden and of many other countries is applied to a purpose compared with which it would have been better if the corn had never grown, or that it had been



mildewed in the ear. No way so rapid to increase the wealth of nations, and the morality of society, could be devised as the utter annihilation of the manufacture of ardent spirits, constituting as they do an infinite waste and an unmixed evil.

---

From the "Edinburgh Review," July, 1854.

Whatever doubt may be entertained concerning the effect of strong drink on the physical health of the population, its noxious influence on their moral health admits of no dispute. This will be at once allowed by everyone who has the slightest knowledge of the labouring classes. Yet, we confess that we were not prepared to find so overwhelming a proportion of crime directly caused by intemperance; and we think the Temperance Society has done good service by the evidence which it has published on this branch of the subject.

The labouring man, it is said, requires the support of stimulating drink, and cannot sustain severe bodily exertion without it. To this assumption the teetotaller opposes a flat denial. He contradicts both the fact asserted and the theory on which it rests. Theoretically he shows, by the reasons already given, that no permanent support can be derived from alcohol. And practically he undertakes to prove, that in the long run, more work can be done without strong drink than with it. On such a point facts are the best arguments. And of facts the temperance writers have collected a formidable array to show that the most trying kinds of labour are well performed by men who never taste fermented liquor.

But, further, there are some trades to which the State applies not restriction merely but prohibition. Thus the business of coining money is utterly suppressed by the laws of all civilised States; thus the opening of lotteries is a commercial speculation forbidden by the law of England. If it be asked on what grounds the State is justified in annihilating these branches of industry, it must be answered as before, that society may put down what is dangerous to itself—*salus populi suprema lex*. Any trade, employment, or use of property detrimental to the life, health, or order of the people is, by English law, a *public nuisance*. And in suppressing it the State assumes the right of sacrificing private interests to the public good. And this not only when the detriment is physical or economical, but also when it is moral. Thus unwholesome graveyards are shut up, and noisome vitriol works pulled down, for their physical noxiousness; private coining is made illegal for economical reasons; slave-trading, lotteries, cockpits, bear gardens, gambling houses, brothels, and obscene print shops are prohibited on moral grounds. Now the liquor traffic, and particularly the retail branch of it, is a public nuisance in all three respects—physically, economically, and morally. By its physical consequences it causes death to thousands; reduces thousands more to madness or idiocy; and afflicts myriads with diseases involving the most wretched forms of bodily and mental torture. Considered in its



economical results it impairs the national resources by destroying a large amount of corn which is annually distilled into spirits ; and it indirectly causes three-fourths of the taxation required by pauperism and by criminal prosecutions and prison expenses ; and further, it diminishes the effective industry of the working classes, thereby lessening the amount of national production. Thirdly, viewed in its moral operation, it is the cause (as we have previously shown) of two-thirds of the crime committed ; it lowers the intelligence and hinders the civilisation of the people ; and it leads the men to illtreat and starve their families, and sacrifice domestic comfort to riotous debauchery. Meanwhile there can be no harm in that full discussion of the question which will be elicited by pressing it on the attention of Parliament. Everyone must rejoice that efforts should be made to convince the masses of the penalties which they entail upon themselves by intemperance. Nor can we condemn the attempt to persuade the English constituencies to restrain themselves by law from a brutalising self-indulgence whereto they are proved, by the report of every election committee, to be so lamentably addicted. If such efforts fail they leave the people no worse than they found them. If they succeed they make them wiser and better.

### From the "North British Review," February, 1855.

While proposing various legislative restrictions on the sale of intoxicating liquors, we must not pass over the idea which has been making way of late in some quarters, that the simplest way of dealing with the subject would be to pass a "Maine Law," forbidding the sale of them altogether. Undoubtedly it would be a happy thing for our country if such a law were sought for by the people themselves, and enforced with their full concurrence. Experience has shown that a "Maine Law," sustained by public opinion, is not by any means so absurd a piece of legislation as it looks at first sight. The chief objection made to such a law is, that it would be greatly evaded. But the use of it would be, not so much to deprive drunkards of their liquor, as to *remove temptation from those who are not yet fallen*. We think, under these circumstances, it might not be amiss to permit the application of a similar law to some parts of the United Kingdom. In fact, we are ourselves acquainted with villages where it has been virtually enforced with the utmost benefit, by the mere refusal of the landlord to allow any sort of beerhouse on his estate. But what we would throw out for consideration is the question, whether it should not be allowed that where five-sixths of the ratepayers of a parish demand the entire extinction of all the places for the sale of fermented liquors, their prayer should be granted, and all licences then existing should expire after a fair time had been allowed for the publicans to make other arrangements. [And in a note on the above]—If the "Maine Law" were applied in the way we have proposed, it would in each case spring from the *public opinion* of the locality, and be supported by it.—*Article by the late Charles Buxton, M.P.*



### The late Mr. JUSTICE CRAMPTON on the Permissive Bill.

Before retiring from the Irish Bench, in the early part of 1859 Judge Crampton addressed a charge to the grand juries of the city and county of Dublin, in which, alluding to remarks he had offered to the same bodies on the subject of intemperance and the liquor traffic about eighteen months before, he observed: "Modern legislation has introduced a system of law which is of a most valuable kind—I mean the system of permissive enactments. This kind of statutes at once encourages self-government, and respects the principle of personal liberty. Of these we have several instances; I mention only two. One of these is seen in the statutes which enables cities and towns to light and pave their own streets, and to perform certain other acts for the convenience and comfort of the inhabitants; and for that purpose to lay a moderate rate upon the inhabitants of the district. No tyrant minority is allowed to control the will of the major part of the inhabitants. Another instance of a permissive enactment is, the act for the promotion and regulation of reformatory schools. These permissive statutes always suppose a previous voluntary movement by associated individuals before they can be made to act. I hail this principle as a valuable one, and I would apply it to a measure not yet brought before Parliament, though for some time before the public—a Permissive Bill it has been termed, and one which I hope, at a future period, may become part of the law of the land. Such a bill (like the acts referred to before) infringes not upon personal liberty, and acknowledges the principle of self-government. If the inhabitants of any town or district choose to encourage or support the liquor trade with all its attendant evils, they can have their will; but if they choose to exclude the unhallowed traffic from their district, it shall be lawful for them so to do. It is every man's duty to be active in the coming struggle. The evil spirit has many friends, retainers, and votaries on his side. The makers, vendors, and retailers of intoxication are all with him; and he has many supporters in and out of Parliament. This, however, is only an argument for energetic action, not a ground for despair. The slave trade, after many a hard conflict, gave way before the pressure of sound public opinion. Slavery within the British dominions, after a long struggle, and at the expense of twenty millions of money, was for ever abolished. And, in like manner, some of those who now hear me may live to see the day when the Permissive Bill shall become established, and slavery to the despotism of strong drink shall be abolished by law."

---

### The late LORD BROUGHAM on the Alliance and the Permissive Bill.

It is desirable to place on permanent record the chief utterances of the late Lord Brougham on the Temperance question, while President of the Social Science Association. They are as follows: At the Social Science



Congress held at Bradford in 1859, Lord Brougham devoted a considerable portion of his presidential address to intemperance, its baneful effects, the value of the temperance movement, and "the services of the great Alliance, and of its able and learned hon. secretary, Mr. S. Pope," which he said were "truly above all praise." His lordship alluded also to the Maine Law in America, and the happy results following upon its enactment. He added :—

"If the same preparation of the public mind which led to that experiment being tried (and secured its success) takes place in other countries, the great example may then be followed safely and successfully. Then the philanthropist would no longer complain with the Recorder of Birmingham, that into whatever path of benevolence we may strike, the drink demon starts up before him and blocks his way ; or comparing what is cheerfully squandered upon the fuel of intemperance with what is grudgingly bestowed upon the means of mental improvement, lament to find tenfold the price of food to the mind paid for poison to the body ; but would delight to hear our poor reclaimed from the worst excesses, free from the yoke of the cruel though perfidious tyrant, declare as they did to the American missionary, that the law must have come from heaven, for it was too good to be the work of man."

At the ensuing meeting, held in 1860 at Glasgow, a reference to "the grand Alliance" was made by Lord Brougham, to whose mint the Alliance is indebted for that since oft-quoted epithet. "The proposal of the grand Alliance," he said, "well deserves a careful consideration—the plan of enabling a certain proportion of the inhabitants in every district—a proportion considerably above the commercial majority—to give the magistrates authority for placing the district under a general repressive act, passed with such modifications as, according to the Act's provisions, may be allowed in the peculiar local circumstances."

In the same year (1860), Lord Brougham was only prevented from attending the seventh anniversary meeting of the Alliance by a long-standing engagement for the opening of the Free Library at Liverpool. At that opening, his lordship, towards the close of his speech, said : "There has lately been a very important assembly in the neighbouring town of Manchester—I mean the annual assembly of the grand Alliance for promoting temperance among the people. I was unfortunately unable to attend upon that occasion, but I have had the greatest satisfaction in hearing from a worthy friend this morning, who attended that meeting officially, that it was a most entire success—that it succeeded beyond all the previous meetings that the grand Alliance has ever held. It is absolutely incalculable how great the benefit is which these measures of the Temperance Alliance are calculated to produce."

In June, 1861, Lord Brougham presented a Permissive Bill petition from Plymouth to the House of Lords, and expressed his entire concurrence with it. A few days afterwards, his lordship took occasion, on the second reading of an excise bill, to remind their lordships of the "great



Plymouth petition" he had presented in the previous week, and of its prayer for the permissive veto.

At the Dublin meeting of the Social Science Congress, in 1861, Lord Brougham again introduced a recommendation of the Permissive Bill into his presidential speech, and at the same time spoke a good word for *Meliora*, the quarterly review of the Alliance. On the 21st of August, at a great public meeting in Dublin, for the promotion of temperance and the Permissive Bill, his lordship was in the chair.

In the following year, the Social Science Congress met in London; and here again Lord Brougham was mindful of the Alliance, in allusion to "intemperance, the mother of distress and nurse of crime, with which our excellent and useful sister, the grand Alliance, wages unceasing and successful war."

At the Manchester meeting of the same Association, in October, 1866, allusion was made by Lord Brougham to that city as the headquarters of "the great Alliance movement," and the "important services" rendered by it.

## TWENTY YEARS OF PROHIBITION IN MAINE.

By HORACE GREELEY, Editor of the *New York Tribune*.

Maine, if I mistake not, first prohibited the sale of intoxicating drinks in 1851; she soon returned to licence for a year only; so that prohibition has been her rule for nearly or quite twenty years, as it bids fair to be for the next hundred. Our great civil war, with its fierce excitements and its many hardships, doubtless initiated many into habits of drinking who would have abstained; for war is the natural adversary of all moral reforms. Illicit grogshops were multiplied, especially in the vicinity of recruiting stations and camps of instruction; still Maine held fast her often violated law. Since peace returned it is more generally obeyed, while the hope of seeing it repealed has grown fainter year by year. Her late Governor (Chamberlain) was deemed either a great antagonist or a lukewarm supporter of prohibition; his successor now in office (Perham), is known to all as an early and steadfast upholder of the "Maine Law," yet his vote was larger (as was his majority) than that of Chamberlain.

What, then, has been the general effect of twenty years of prohibition? What has Maine gained or lost thereby?

I. The use of intoxicating beverages has not entirely ceased. The liquor traffic is still prosecuted in nearly all of the cities and most of the considerable villages of Maine. Those who love liquor still obtain it, if able and willing to give time and money to procure it. Perhaps no person in that State has long thirsted because liquor was not to be had on any terms. Prohibition has not exterminated the liquor traffic.

II. It has, however, greatly restricted it. Liquor is sold openly in but a few places, and is not sold at all in one-fourth so many as when



the traffic was legal and unobstructed. Just as gambling flourishes and lottery tickets are sold in this city, though our laws forbid, so strong drink is still retailed in Portland and the other cities of Maine, as it clandestinely is in some of the townships. Even prohibition has not yet ushered in the millennium.

III. But it has done more than to reduce the number of grog shops. As with gambling in our state, liquor, since it has been outlawed in Maine, has lost caste, and "roosts lower" than it did. Drunkenness is less common and more shameful than it generally was. Thousands are growing up unintoxicated and untempted by strong drink. When I came to New York, in August, 1831, lottery placards clothed walls and filled newspapers far more than theatricals did. Now they are rarely seen. Liquor in Maine is advertised and dispensed furtively, if at all, as lottery tickets are here. And, as not one ticket is sold here now where ten would be if lotteries were still tolerated by law, so it is with liquor in Maine. It may be safely assumed that throughout more than half the area of that State liquor is purchasable only with difficulty and by traversing a considerable distance. Thus thousands of the youth of Maine are reared in blissful ignorance of strong drink.

IV. Prohibition operates as a public testimony to the peril and wrong of tipping. Whoever is incited or tempted to drink has the testimony and the veto of the State staring him in the face. Like the rattlesnake's warning, the law says to him, Beware! All will not heed this, but some will; and no one can fairly plead, "I learned to love liquor before I was ever told or ever suspected that I ought not to drink it."

V. That Maine has fewer paupers, criminals, vagabonds, than she formerly had, and that her people are steadily increasing in thrift and wealth, are inevitable. Very rarely do we hear of a great crime or outrage perpetrated on her soil. Very rarely does the telegraph report one of those brawls among her people whereby dozens are involved in a deadly strife, and three or four of them killed or maimed incurably. Their main incitement is lacking in some localities, and dispensed so cautiously and stealthily in others, that "wars and fightings" have fled in awe of the silent majesty of her legal interdict.

VI. These truths ought to impress themselves on the minds of the legislators of this (New York) and other states. Law in general seeks such ends as the Maine Law has achieved. If we had the Maine Law as well enforced here (New York) as the laws against gambling now are, we should still have liquor in ample measure, with as much drunkenness, and as many brawls as can reasonably be desired. But liquor would then skulk in by-places, and no longer thrust itself into the faces and eyes of everyone who walks our streets. Those who would have strong drink must seek it, must be at some trouble to obtain it, must imbibe it in the full consciousness that their indulgence was condemned by the law and the better portion of the community. They would not drink so often, and drinking would not be so general as at present. And drunkenness,



crime, pauperism, and general misery would soon become far less common than they now are.

VII. But we are not likely soon to see liquor-selling prohibited in this city. The interest and the appetites which protest against such an interdict are too powerful and too resolute for that. But our State might and should have a law requiring the people of each city and township to vote "Licence or no licence" at each municipal election, and forbidding, under effective penalties, the liquor traffic wherever and whenever any city or township had voted "No licence," until they, at a subsequent election, shall have reversed that decision. Such a law would enable us to test and measure the respective influences of licence and prohibition. We could then determine, if not with absolute and unquestionable certainty, yet with adequate and measurable accuracy, the effect of either policy upon the morals and prosperity of communities. If men drink more and rush to ruin faster because of Prohibition, that fact would be made manifest by the increase of pauperism and crime where the liquor traffic was forbidden. Why should not all consent to give this experiment a fair, deliberate trial?

---

## THE MAINE LIQUOR LAW.

### AN IMPARTIAL TESTIMONY.

Extracted from Speech of Mr. J. B. GOULD, United States Consul at Birmingham, at a Great Meeting held in the Town Hall, on 25th March, 1870 :—

"I am from the State of Maine, and it is in these two particulars (education and temperance legislation) that Maine leads the world. If you look upon a map of the United States, you will see that Maine stands at the head of the list, and stretches out into the Atlantic as the right hand of the republic, ready to exchange kindly greetings with England, and unite with her in every good cause. But it is especially in the cause of education and temperance that Maine is a leading State, for there, under the leadership of General Neal Dow, was first enacted the Maine Law, which has since been extended in its leading features to the other New England States. The question is often asked if that law is not a failure; and you can judge for yourselves when I state certain facts with which I am perfectly familiar. Like all the laws against crime in Great Britain and other countries, there are violations of this; but it cannot be counted a failure when it is understood that in all that State there is no open bar. There is no hotel or public-house which sells openly to customers; no sign with gilded letters advertising the traffic; no decanters displayed at the windows; no brilliant lanterns before the doors, giving evidence that drink is to be obtained. If obtained at all, it is in the private apartment of the hotel, or through some back door of the shops. The difficulty of this secret traffic is increased, in view of the



fact that it must be smuggled into the State, being seized by the police if brought in by the usual modes of transportation. Before coming to England I had boarded for two years at one of the largest hotels in the State, where, according to American custom, the guests all dined at a common table; and during those two years, not even ale or porter was seen upon the tables more than twice or thrice. There are drunkenness and crime there; but the one is disgraceful and but seldom seen among those who are considered respectable people, and crime is so lessened that only in a few of the largest towns is it necessary to maintain a police force. Windows are never closed with shutters at night, and there is a feeling of general security. Pauperism is confined to the young and helpless, or the old and feeble who are friendless, with the addition of an occasional idiot. The last are but few, as without drunkenness but few are born in that condition. Many of the towns have no poorhouse or poor tax, and the whole State does not probably average more than two to a thousand of the inhabitants who are chargeable to the public. It may be considered oppressive to enact such laws, but a system which banishes the sickening scenes and revolting crimes which are the results of drinking, which empties poorhouses and gives security to life and property without the omnipresence of police officers, is not especially objectionable in its repressiveness."

---

### WHAT IS THE PERMISSIVE BILL?

It is a measure based upon the broad principle that the Liquor Traffic is inimical to the well-being of the nation, and its preamble sets forth that,—

"Whereas the common sale of Intoxicating Liquors is a fruitful source of Crime, Immorality, Pauperism, Disease, Insanity, and premature Death, whereby not only the individuals who give way to drinking habits are plunged into misery, but grievous wrong is done to the persons and property of Her Majesty's subjects at large, and the public rates and taxes are greatly augmented; and whereas it is right and expedient to confer upon the ratepayers of Cities, Boroughs, Parishes, and Townships the power to prohibit such common sale as aforesaid."

ITS PROVISIONS WOULD SIMPLY GIVE EFFECT TO THE PUBLIC OPINION of the country upon a traffic which is confessedly dangerous and difficult to control.

IT WOULD GIVE RATEPAYERS the power to prohibit the traffic by a decided majority, a right confined at present to Licensing Magistrates, and landowners, who *seldom permit a public-house to be licensed near their own dwellings*, and who frequently exercise their power as landlords to prohibit them over large districts.

Its principal clauses provide—

I. That at any time after the passing of the Act, it shall be lawful for a given number of ratepayers in any Borough, Parish, or District, to



require the Mayor or Overseers to take the votes of the ratepayers as to the propriety of bringing into operation the provisions of the Act.\*

II. That the Mayor or Overseers shall, on receipt of such requisition, cause voting papers to be delivered to, and collected from, all ratepayers within the district.

III. That if, on examining these voting papers, it was found that two-thirds of those voting were in favour of the adoption of the Act, *no licence* could be granted or renewed within that district after the term for which the licence was current.

It is, therefore, a Bill which could only come into operation when a very large majority in any district were in its favour, and as a result would, *after all, prohibit only a privileged monopoly.*

---

### WHAT THE PERMISSIVE BILL IS NOT !

IT IS NOT a measure designed or calculated to curtail the true liberty of the subject, because it could only take effect by a *direct vote* of a large majority of the ratepayers.

IT IS NOT an unconstitutional measure. Landowners in several thousands of places now prevent the opening of houses for the sale of drink. Why not give to the people the power to do for themselves what the landlords now do for them ?

IT IS NOT a Bill that would prevent the application of *any* measure of License Reform, but would be a just complement to any well-devised scheme for a better regulation of the traffic, and by the expressions of public sentiment which it would call forth would be the best support to such measures, even where a sufficient majority was not found to adopt its provisions.

IT IS NOT opposed to the true interests of the State ; for, although the revenue from the liquor traffic would diminish if it was widely adopted, the people would become more industrious and frugal ; poverty, pauperism, and crime would decrease ; so that the burdens of the people would grow less, while they were actually becoming, year by year, better able to bear them.

IT IS NOT a Bill supported only by "*a few fanatics or zealots,*" as the following figures will show.

Petitions were presented during 1871, in favour of the Permissive Bill, to which were attached nearly 900,000 signatures.

---

\* ALL DETAILS, such as the number required to sign the requisition, extent of the district, &c., would be decided in Committee, after the general principle of the Bill had been accepted.



## PROGRESS OF THE BILL IN PARLIAMENT.

In 1864.	In 1869.
The votes and pairs were—	The votes and pairs were—
For the Bill ..... 40	For the Bill..... 94
Against .....297	Against .....200
In 1870.	In 1871.
The votes and pairs were—	The votes and pairs were—
For the Bill .....115	For the Bill.....136
Against.....146	Against .....208
In May, 1871—The Irish vote was—for the Bill, 32 ; against 18.	
The Scotch „ „ 24 ; „ 14.	
The Welsh „ „ 14 ; „ 6.	

Showing a majority of 32 in favour of the Bill, as far as Ireland, Scotland, and Wales are concerned.

## THE HOME SECRETARY AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

## Mr. BRUCE's Testimony as to the Demand for a Remedy.

The measure which he was about to ask the permission of the House to explain was one which had been demanded by the general voice of the country with an earnestness and a unanimity to which he recollected hardly any parallel. The question was one which had stirred the hearts and feelings of all classes of society in this country. (Hear, hear.) Committees of both Houses of Parliament, the Church in Convocation, ministers of every religion, judges and magistrates collectively and individually, boards of health and boards of guardians, had all united in proclaiming and impressing upon Parliament the mischiefs which had arisen from the excessive use of intoxicating liquors. Social and sanitary reformers, who spent their lives in doing good to their fellow-men, had declared that their labours for the moral and social improvement of their fellow-men were baffled at every turn by the recklessness and moral degradation which sprung from, and were occasioned by, the liquor traffic. (Hear, hear.) Our prisons, lunatic asylums, and workhouses were filled with inmates whose career had originated in their passion for intoxicating liquors. (Hear, hear.) The back streets, courts, and alleys of most large towns were thronged with a squalid and dangerous population, who owed their degradation to the same cause; and even the rural districts were not free from the curse. But, above all, the working classes of this country, who were the most affected by, and felt most the consequences of, this system, had with united voice called upon Parliament to deliver them from temptation. (Hear, hear.)—*Times*, April 4th, 1871.—Report of Mr. Bruce's Speech.

## Mr. BRUCE's Estimate of Public-houses.

Every public-house tends to aggravate the public rates, and to create disorder; and it also causes an additional necessity for the police. *Standard*, April 4, 1871.—Mr. Bruce's Speech.



## THE HOME SECRETARY AND THE PERMISSIVE BILL.

MR. BRUCE'S endorsement of the principle of SIR WILFRID LAWSON'S Bill.

He had explained that he could not in any way accept as a solution of that question the bill brought forward by his honourable friend the Member for Carlisle. At the same time he was bound to say he thought that measure contained a very valuable and wholesome principle, and that the principle of an appeal to the ratepayers, on matters affecting their interests, was one of which great use could be made. (Hear, hear.) Over and above the fact that the ratepayers were the persons chiefly interested, that it was their comfort and convenience, and not that of other people, that should be consulted; that they were the persons who bore the burden of all the crime and misery produced by the multiplication of those houses, and by their disorderly conduct;—over and above those considerations, there was another and, in his view, a most important one, namely, the advantages of enlisting the minds and hearts and feelings of the people in the thorough consideration of that subject. (Hear, hear.) Let them give the ratepayers a voice in that matter; let them give them the power, in some way or other, of deciding how far those houses should exist amongst them, and they would at once create a strong public opinion—they would at once create among them that sort of feeling which, among the upper classes of society, had long made drunkenness disgraceful, which was rapidly also making it disgraceful among the working-classes themselves, and which no longer permitted them to call a mere sot a good fellow, or to look upon the offence of drunkenness as merely venial. (Hear, hear.) He was satisfied, therefore, that if they were to create a wholesome and vigorous public opinion on that subject, they must give the ratepayers of the country some direct interest in it, and that the wider spread that interest was, the greater would be the social advantage. (Hear, hear.) —*Times*, April 4th, 1871. Report of Mr. Bruce's speech.

## AN ENGLISH BREWER'S TESTIMONY.

A LESSON TO MR. BASS.

Not only does this vice produce all kinds of positive mischief, but it also has a negative effect of great importance. It is the mightiest of all the forces that clog the progress of good. It is in vain that every engine is set to work that philanthropy can devise, when those whom we seek to benefit are habitually tampering with their faculties of reason and will—soaking their brains with beer, or inflaming them with ardent spirits. The struggle of the school, and the library, and the church, all united, against the beerhouse and the gin palace is but one development of the war between heaven and hell. It is, in short, intoxication that fills our jails; it is intoxication that fills our lunatic asylums; and it is intoxication that fills our workhouses with poor. Were it not for this one cause, pauperism would be nearly extinguished in England. \* \* \*



Looking, then, at the manifold and frightful evils that spring from drunkenness, we think we were justified in saying that it is the most dreadful of all the ills that afflict the British Isles. We are convinced that if a statesman who heartily wished to do the utmost possible good to his country were thoughtfully to enquire which of the topics of the day deserved the most intense force of his attention, the true reply—the reply which would be exacted by full deliberation—would be, that he should study the means by which this worst of plagues can be stayed. The intellectual, the moral, and the religious welfare of our people, their material comforts, their domestic happiness, are all involved. The question is, whether millions of our countrymen should be helped to become happier and wiser—whether pauperism, lunacy, disease, and crime shall be diminished—whether multitudes of men, women, and children shall be aided to escape from utter ruin of body and soul? Surely such a question as this, enclosing within its limits consequences so momentous, ought to be weighed with earnest thought by all our patriots.—*From Charles Buxton's Essay "HOW TO STOP DRUNKENNESS."* (Partridge & Co., London.)

## AN AMERICAN BREWER'S TESTIMONY.

AN EXAMPLE FOR MR. BASS.

At a recent meeting of a hundred or more gentlemen, late residents of the North Side (Chicago), where wide tracts of the beautiful lake shore have for years been ruined for homes or investment by the great breweries of that quarter—William Lill, a citizen of large wealth, whose thirty years' experience as a brewer has placed him confessedly at the head of his guild in the North-West, was among the speakers. The question being upon the rebuilding of the breweries, Mr. Lill said that he should never build nor own another brewery. IT WAS A BUSINESS THAT DEMORALISED BOTH MASTER AND MAN. HE HAD FOUND IT IMPOSSIBLE TO KEEP SOBER MEN ON HIS PREMISES. IT WAS A MANUFACTORY OF DRUNKARDS IN CONSTANT OPERATION; AND THE CURSE BEGAN IN THE BREWERY ITSELF, WHERE EVERY MAN WAS A BEER BARREL IN THE MORNING, AND A BARREL OF BEER AT NIGHT. He would have no more of it. He would be content to make less money in some other way. At this point an old acquaintance in the audience called out, "Lill, what are we to do for that excellent ale of yours?" Mr. Lill answered, "Do without, and be the better for it."

What will the advocates of beer say to this revelation? It is no new discovery that the beer saloon is one of the principal stations and ticket offices on the Dark Valley Railroad, but there is great value in this confirmation of the fact from one whose experience covers twenty years in a great brewery establishment.

If the business is demoralising to master and man, what must be the effect on the consumer, and what can we think of those who, knowing this fact, continue in the traffic?



RIGHT HON. LORD CLAUD HAMILTON, M.P., ON THE  
PERMISSIVE PROHIBITORY BILL.

SPEECH IN ST. JAMES'S HALL, LONDON, MAY 19, 1870.

I am most heartily with you, and do rejoice in promoting the great work you have at heart. Having said thus much, I may be permitted to mention that, as a representative of the county of Tyrone, in which the system of permissive prohibition has been tried, and tried with complete success, my occupying this chair is somewhat justified. I propose at once to allude to the remarkable success of restriction there, because that success has been much questioned. I am here, as representing the county, to assure you that the facts stated regarding the success of prohibition there are perfectly accurate. There is a district in that county of 61 square miles, inhabited by nearly 10,000 people, having three great roads communicating with market towns, in which there are no public-houses, entirely owing to the self-action of the inhabitants. The result has been that whereas those high roads were in former times constant scenes of strife and drunkenness, necessitating the presence of a very considerable number of police to be located in the district, at present there is not a single policeman in that district, the poor-rates are half what they were before, and all the police and magistrates testify to the great absence of crime. I have seen the efforts of our distinguished friend, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, in the House of Commons, and I can bear testimony to the difficult task he has had in hand. Coldness, objections, ridicule, and sneers he has borne, and yet he has persevered, and year by year he has continued his efforts. By his talents, by his energy, by his courage, he has raised this question to be one of the greatest public importance. It is entirely owing to the courage and perseverance of such early workers that the question has attained its present position in the public mind. It has by their efforts been raised to such a position that complete success and ultimate victory are simply a matter of time. As far as permissive restriction has hitherto been tried it has been successful. I only wish to see it further developed, being satisfied that it will produce greater and still more satisfactory results. There is a dignity attaching to self-imposed restriction that befits a free nation. I do not believe laws ever can be, or should be, really effective when they are not in unison with the national sentiment. When they fully represent the popular sentiment, then the people carry out their own laws and become their own police. You will be successful in your efforts if you allow legislation not to outstrip the permissive principle.

---

BESSBROOK :

AN IRISH MODEL TOWN.

Bessbrook is an Irish manufacturing town near Newry. Its principal founder, and now sole proprietor, is J. G. Richardson, a leading member



of the Society of Friends. This gentleman, with one or two other "Friends," founded the Bessbrook Spinning Company, and erected there the Bessbrook Mills. The factory has grown so large that it gives employment to 3,000 hands, most of whom reside in the neighbourhood of the works. In Bessbrook there is no licensed public-house, nor is there one in any of its surrounding lands. There are no police in the place. The Irish Constabulary, armed, occupy every town in Ireland, and have barracks for half-a-dozen men each along every road side ; but there are no police in Bessbrook. Mr. Richardson alleges that so long as he keeps out the public-house they can do without police ; but that so soon as the tap-room is introduced they will require the constabulary. There is no drunkenness in Bessbrook ; no quarrelling, *though the inhabitants are all Irish ; no theft ; no crime ; no infanticide—in short, the operatives are models of sobriety and good order.* Of course, it is not meant to be said that they have not their faults and their failings like mankind everywhere ; but the town is wholly free from sad scenes which are to be met with publicly every night in much smaller populations. *And the population of Bessbrook is composed entirely of operatives,* while that of many other towns is mixed, comprising the wealthy and the poor. The operatives themselves have not two opinions on the question of the absence or presence of the public-house. The results have decidedly confirmed the proprietor in his resolution, and would convince the most sceptical of the wisdom of the course he has adopted, if the town were only once or twice visited by them. Coupled with the exclusion of the drink-shops is also the exclusion of police and pawn-offices, as already referred to ; these follow in the wake of the dram-shop, and the exclusion of the public-house renders all the rest unnecessary.

#### PROHIBITION IN SALTAIRE, YORKSHIRE.

One thing there is which is not to be found in Saltaire, and Mr. Salt deserves as much praise for its absence as he does for anything he has provided. *Not a public-house or beerhouse is there.* And what are the results ? Briefly, these : There are scarcely ever any arrears of rent. Infant mortality is very low as compared with that in Bradford, from which place the majority of the hands have come. Illegitimate births are rare. The tone and sense of self-respect of the workpeople is much greater than that of factory hands generally. Their wages are not high, but they enable them to secure more of the comforts and decencies of life than they could elsewhere, owing to the facilities placed within their reach, and the absence of drinking-houses.—*From "HOMES OF THE WORKING CLASSES," 1866.—(Longman.)*

#### CONVOCATION OF PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY AND THE PERMISSIVE PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

The following clauses were embodied in the recommendation of the Report of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, on Intemperance and its Remedies :—



"Your Committee, in conclusion, are of opinion that as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors is to supply a supposed public want, without detriment to the public welfare, 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. Such a power would, in effect, secure to districts willing to exercise it, the advantages now enjoyed by the numerous parishes in the province of Canterbury, where, according to reports furnished to your Committee, owing to the influence of the landowner, no sale of intoxicating liquors is licensed.

"Few, it may be believed, are cognisant of the fact—which has been elicited by the present inquiry—that there are at this time within the province of Canterbury, upwards of one thousand parishes in which there is neither public-house nor beershop, and where, in consequence of the absence of these inducements to crime and pauperism, according to the evidence before the Committee, the intelligence, morality, and comfort of the people are such as the friends of temperance would have anticipated."

---

EXTRACT FROM THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED AUGUST 10TH,  
1870, BY THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE.

The Conference declares its judgment that a reform of the present licensing system is absolutely necessary ; and that in any measure which may hereafter be adopted, provision should be made in harmony with a recognised principle of self-government, that the ratepayers, who bear the charges resulting from the prevalence of intemperance and its consequent pauperism and crime, shall also have power to control the issue of licences for the sale of intoxicating drinks within their respective districts.

---

THE PERMISSIVE PROHIBITORY LIQUOR BILL.

REASONS FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE BILL.

BECAUSE—It is a remedial measure, which applies to the whole of the United Kingdom, and is introduced in response to a wide-spread and growing demand for such an enactment from all parts of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.

BECAUSE—This demand, as shown by Public meetings, Petitions, Memorials, &c., during the last and present Session, as well as in former years, is not confined to any section or party in the community, but all classes feel anxious for the means of protection and social amelioration provided by the Bill.



BECAUSE—Its adoption at once by Parliament will not destroy the necessity for any measure contemplated by the Government, for the purpose of amending or consolidating the laws regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, wherever continued in any part of the kingdom.

BECAUSE—The bill is the just complement of the Acts now in force, and will be equally so in respect to any acts which may be passed at the instance of the Government, or of any other party in the House.

BECAUSE—Notwithstanding the great diversity of the regulations and restrictions in force in England, Ireland, and Scotland, there is felt to be a common want of power to prevent the establishment or continuance of the trade in intoxicating liquors, in a parish or district where the inhabitants find the traffic to be a disadvantage rather than a convenience.

BECAUSE—This Bill simply provides, in accordance with the spirit of the licensing system, that it shall be illegal to force public-houses and beer-shops upon a parish, township, or district, against the will of the inhabitants.

BECAUSE—The provisions of the Bill are such as to render it inoperative in any community, unless there is a large and preponderating feeling in favour of its adoption.

BECAUSE—Where the conditions necessary for the adoption of the Bill are present in any parish, the injustice of perpetuating an admitted evil, which imposes crime and pauperism, with the consequent enhanced rates and taxes, becomes more oppressive.

BECAUSE—The existing Licensing laws all recognise local administration and control, and, as a consequence, the greatest variety in the number of Licences exists, according to the will of the local authorities; the number of Licensed houses varying from one to every ten houses, down to a great number of places where *there are none*.

BECAUSE—The provisions, enabling the inhabitants to show, in a formal and legalised method, whether they desire Licences to be accorded, would be a means of greatly lessening the responsibility of the Licensing authorities, and hence many magistrates greatly desire the immediate grant of this power of a determinative vote on the part of the people.

BECAUSE—The Bill does not propose to transfer the Licensing power from any existing authority, nor does it give any preference for any plan of Licensing which may in future be adopted.

BECAUSE—The protection supplied by local control being an admitted necessity by the Legislature, its practical recognition by this Bill cannot be wisely or justly refused.

BECAUSE—Whilst the legislature is passing measures enabling the people to tax themselves, for the purpose of removing and preventing crime and pauperism, originating in ignorance, it is eminently appropriate that this Bill should be passed, enabling the people to remove and prevent the manifold greater amount of crime and pauperism arising directly from the LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

BECAUSE—Wherever the facilities for the sale of intoxicating liquors



have been reduced, there has resulted a diminution of drunkenness, pauperism, and crime, and A DECREASE OF RATES AND TAXES; and at the present time, whilst all classes complain of increase of rates, by passing this Bill, the legislature would provide the parishes with power to reduce their rates where and when they may so determine.

BECAUSE—Wherever the issue of Licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors has been prevented by the action of landowners (many of whom are peers and members of parliament), the social results have been of the happiest description, and the evils anticipated by some, from the passing of the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill, have thus been shown to have no existence in fact.

BECAUSE—*We very respectfully and urgently submit, that to oppose this Bill is practically to determine that the sale of liquors, with all the consequent injuries and increased taxation, shall continue to be forced upon communities against the will of the people.*

---

### WHAT IS THE UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE?

The United Kingdom Alliance is an Association of Temperance and Social Reformers, and was formed in Manchester, on the 1st June, 1853.

At the first meeting of the General Council, held in Manchester, in October, 1853, when the Society was publicly inaugurated, the following DECLARATION was unanimously adopted as a basis for the agitation, and as indicating the character and scope of the movement:—

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, to waste the national resources, to corrupt the social habits, and 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 or regulate 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 Alliance has no test of membership bearing upon the personal habits of its members, their religious creed or political party. It invites the aid and co-operation of all good citizens, whether abstainers or not. It has but one object—the annihilation of the liquor traffic by a law enacted by Parliament, and enforced by public opinion, armed with executive power.

Persons may join the United Kingdom Alliance, and receive cards of membership, on subscribing one shilling and upwards. This may be forwarded to any of the Agents, or the Secretary of the Alliance, 41, John Dalton Street, Manchester, from whom documents and tracts explanatory of the movement, may be had, gratis, on application.

\* \* A copy of the "ALLIANCE NEWS" is sent gratis to every subscriber of ten shillings and upwards annually.