68TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

DOCUMENT
No. 204

SEVENTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AGAINST ALCOHOLISM

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

A REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE TOGETHER WITH A REPORT OF THE DELEGATES OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE SEVENTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AGAINST ALCOHOLISM AT COPENHAGEN, DENMARK AUGUST 19-24, 1923

FEBRUARY 17 (calendar day, FEBRUARY 19), 1925.—Read, message referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRNTING OFFICE
1925

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

SENATE RESOLUTION 342

REPORTED BY MR. MOSES

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 17 (calendar day, February 20), 1925.

Resolved, That the report of the delegates from the United States to the Seventeenth International Congress against Alcoholism be printed as a Senate document.

Attest:

GEORGE A. SANDERSON,
Secretary.

CONTENTS

	Page
Report of delegation	1
Program of conference	2
Agenda for discussion	2
Extracts from addresses	3
Status of liquor traffic in other nations:	
Argentina	25
Australia	32
Bechuanaland	31
Belgium	17
Brazil	25
Bulgaria	24
Canada	9
Chile	25
Colombia	26
Costa Rica	26
Cuba	27
Czechoslovakia	22
Denmark	22
Dominican Republic	27
Ecuador	27
Egypt	24
Esthonia	22
Finland	20
France	16
French West Africa	30
Germany	18
Great Britain	13
Greece	23
Guatemala	27
Holland	18
Honduras	28
Iceland	21
Italy	17
Japan	30
Latvia	23
Mexico	28
New Zealand	31
Norway	19
Palestine	30
Panama	29
Paraguay	29
Peru	29
Poland	21
Rumania	23
Salvador	29
South Rhodesia	31
Sweden	19
Switzerland	19
Turkey	24
Union of South Africa	31
Uruguay	30
Yugoslavia	23
Zanzibar	24

	Page
European antiprohibitionists organized	33
Temperance education of youth	34
Substitute for intoxicants	38
Industrial alcohol	39
Europe's enforcement problem	41
Addresses:	
Volstead, Hon. A. J.: Prohibition in the United States—General results	43
Stoddard, Miss Cora Frances: Results of prohibition in the State of Massachusetts	50
Bennet, Hon. William S.: The smuggling of liquor into the United States	54
Wheeler, Dr. Wayne B.: Smuggling—Statistics—National prohibition	63
Dinwiddie, Dr. E. C.: Prohibition in America	68

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, together with its accompanying report of the delegates of the United States to the Seventeenth International Congress Against Alcoholism, held at Copenhagen, Denmark, in August, 1923.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 19, 1925.

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

The PRESIDENT:

Referring to the item in the third deficiency act of 1923, approved March 4, 1923, providing for the expenses of delegates of the United States to the Seventeenth International Congress Against Alcoholism, held at Copenhagen, Denmark, August 19–24, 1923, the undersigned the Secretary of State has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Congress, the report of the delegates who attended the Congress on the part of the United States.

It may be proper to state that there is an unexpended balance of $1,068.50 remaining of the appropriation above mentioned, from which, should Congress so authorize, the cost of publication might be charged.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 19, 1925.

REPORT OF DELEGATION TO THE SEVENTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AGAINST ALCOHOLISM

AT COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, AUGUST 19-24, 1923

DELEGATES

WAYNE B. WHEELER, Chairman.
PETER J. O'CALLAGHAN, Vice Chairman.
LENNA LOWE YOST (Mrs. ELLIS A.).
E. C. DINWIDDIE.
WILLIAM S. BENNET.
A. J. VOLSTEAD.
ALBERT SUTCLIFFE.
CORA FRANCES STODDARD.
EMOR L. CALKINS.
ERNEST H. CHERRINGTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 13, 1925.*

Hon. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The delegates to the Seventeenth International Congress Against Alcoholism, held at Copenhagen, Denmark, August 19–24, 1923, appointed by the late President Harding under an act of Congress approved March 4, 1923, desire to submit to you the following report and to express their appreciation of the uniform courtesy which was extended to them by the representatives of the state departments of the various countries they visited.

This congress was the seventeenth to be held. The first was held at Antwerp, Belgium, in 1885. Later congresses were held, in 1887, at Zurich, Switzerland; in 1890, at Christiania (now Oslo), Norway; in 1893, at The Hague, Holland; in 1895, at Basel, Switzerland; in 1897, in Brussels, Belgium; in 1899, in Paris, France; in 1901, at Vienna, Austria; in 1903, at Bremen, Germany; in 1905, at Budapest, Hungary; in 1907, at Stockholm, Sweden; in 1909, at London, England; in 1911, at The Hague, Holland; in 1913, at Milan, Italy; in 1920, at Washington, D. C.; in 1921, at Lausanne, Switzerland; in 1923, at Copenhagen, Denmark.

The congress was opened on Monday, August 20, by the Minister of the Interior of Denmark, Doctor Kragh, and Dr. R. Hercod, president of the permanent committee of the congress. At the opening session there was an impressive roll call of the nations with more than 40 responding in a spirited manner. The Pope was represented by the Bishop of Copenhagen, and the Archbishop of Canterbury sent a representative with greetings.

The congress is an open forum, and every phase of the reform through which the United States has passed was discussed—regulation, restriction, Government control, substitution, moderation in use, reduction of public houses, education, local option, and prohibition.

The topics and speakers on the official program were as follows. Each topic after its formal presentation by the speaker announced was discussed from the floor:

Statistics on the influence of alcohol on health and duration of life: Prof. Harald Westergaard, Copenhagen.

The organization of social statistics concerning alcohol: Professor Olbrecht, Brussels.

Experimental contributions illustrating the influence of alcohol on offspring: Dr. Taav. Laitinen, Helsingfors, Finland, and Dr. Agnes Bluhm, Berlin.

Prohibition in America:

General results: Hon. Andrew J. Volstead, United States of America; Prof. Jens Warming, Copenhagen.

Results in a single State: Massachusetts—Miss Cora Frances Stoddard, Boston, Mass.

Prohibition in Finland: Rev. E. Aro, Helsingfors.

Prohibition in Iceland: Ejnar H. Kvaran, Reykjavik.

Promotion of total abstinence among young people:

By education: Dr. Thorild Dahlgren, Lund, Sweden.

By young people themselves: Ferdinand Goebel, Berlin.

By the help of students and universities: Sigfrid Borgstrom, Stockholm.

Alcohol and transportation business: F. A. Brandt, Utrecht.

International commercial policies and the partial or total prohibition of alcohol: Dr. R. Hercod, Lausanne.

The influence of duties on alcohol smuggling: Dr. Johan Scharffenburg, Christiania, and Hon. William S. Bennet, Chicago.

The industrial uses of alcohol, especially in the motor industry: Louis Jacquet, Paris.

Woman in parliament and the fight against alcoholism: Princess Puzyna, Warsaw.

Woman's suffrage and the alcohol question: Mrs. Laura K. Pearson, London.

The influence of Danish war rationing on health with special reference to the alcohol restrictions: Dr. M. Hindhede, Copenhagen.

The Swedish system of restrictions: Dr. Gahn, Stockholm.

Importance of communal and county veto in the fight against alcoholism: Doctor Slotemaker de Bruine, Utrecht, and Pater Franke, Berlin.

Recent facts concerning the alcohol traffic in the colonies: Rev. A. R. Blackburn, London, and M. Julien, Paris.

The agenda for discussion was as follows:

1. Principles for and criticism of the statistics of the production and consumption of alcoholic beverages.
2. The latest race-hygienic research work.
3. Promotion of alcohol-free life of young people by instruction and by the young people themselves.
4. The alcohol prohibition in the United States, general results and the result in one of the states.
5. The alcohol prohibition in Finland and Iceland.
6. Smuggling of alcohol in the United States and in Norway.
7. International trade policies and alcohol prohibition or restrictions.
8. The influence of alcohol taxes on the consumption of alcohol.
9. The system of restrictions or of rationing.
10. The influence of the suffrage of women on the antialcohol movement.
11. The effects of alcoholism on the means of communication: (*a*) Railways; (*b*) other means of transportation, especially automobiles.
12. The latest reports on the trade with alcoholic beverages in the colonies.

Social courtesies were extended to the congress at the opening festival meeting, by an excursion to Skodgborg Sanitarium, and an official reception by the city government of Copenhagen at the city hall.

An exhibition arranged in the Students' Union, where the meetings of the congress were held, displayed literature on the alcohol question from many countries, and nonalcoholic fruit preparations in the development of which there is growing interest, especially in the grape-producing countries.

Coming at a time when thinking men, industrial leaders, and statesmen the world over had their attention centered on the economic problems due to war experiences, after-war burdens, and a concrete example of 110,000,000 people, nearly a whole continent, freeing themselves from the age-old burdens of alcoholism, the Seventeenth International Congress Against Alcoholism occupied a high and strategic place in current world events. The prominence given to it by the press in Europe, the character of the congress, its personnel, men of all shades of thought on the question, scientists, economists, educators, antialcohol workers and leaders, the many languages and countries represented, the large attendance, freedom of discussion, intensity of interest, gave this great world problem the dignity and influence it deserves.

Among all the forces none was more significant than that represented by the students and leaders of student work who shared in the congress. The greatest revival of activity and interest among the students of Europe who are seeking to remove alcoholism from the social life of the world was full of inspiration to the American delegates. This, with the attendance of student delegates from lands as far away as Japan, and the vigorous program proposed by the student section, was significant.

One morning of the congress was given over principally to the discussion of prohibition in America. The United States policy was both a standard and a target for delegates who came from countries in various stages of the reform. The United States delegates took an active part in the discussion and defended the policy adopted by their country, both from principle and because of the beneficial results, etc., which followed the passage of prohibition laws in many States, and in the Nation itself.

The following extracts from some of the principal addresses made before the congress by the representatives of other nations are characteristic:

Prof. Harald Westergaard, of Copenhagen, devoted himself to the subject of statistics on the influence of alcoholism on health and the duration of life. In view of the obvious difficulty of procuring accurate statistics, he urged the congress to institute some regular method of research. With figures from official sources, in Denmark, the United States, England, and New Zealand, he proved that mortality is most frequent among heavy consumers of alcohol. Besides this high rate of mortality among users of alcohol, he demonstrated the relationship between the frequency of suicides and the drink habit, showing that the group in which suicide is most frequent is composed for the greater part of inn and hotel proprietors, innkeepers, wine, beer and spirit merchants, occupations which offer great temptations to intemperance. The chairman of the American delegation pointed out the many false conclusions published in Europe about American prohibition because of the failure to take into account the rapid change in population and other conditions.

Professor Olbrecht, of Brussels, also spoke on alcohol statistics, calling for an agreement among the Governments to form a common basis for those statistics and suggested that the International Congress Against Alcoholism assume direction of the work. As showing the inadequacy of statistics, he cited mortality figures which only

take into account the principal and direct cause of death, frequently ignoring the subjective influence of alcoholism.

Doctor Laitinen, of Helsingfors, proved by experimentation with guinea pigs that alcohol when given in relatively small quantities has a perceptively degenerative influence on the offspring. He extended his thesis on the effect of alcoholic consumption to the human race.

Mr. A. J. Volstead spoke on prohibition in America. He was given a prolonged ovation as the champion of the national prohibition act. He pointed out the steps taken in education; local, State, and finally national legislation, which was adopted as public opinion reached the point where it was ready to accept prohibition. He showed what efforts were needed to maintain the ground and go forward and showed the economic and social gain that prohibition has brought to the United States. He quoted a prominent Englishman who said, "We shall eventually be forced to accept prohibition in order to keep up economically with you." (See attached copy of entire address.)

Miss Cora Frances Stoddard presented the results of a survey on prohibition in the State of Massachusetts. Her presentation of the facts and figures was fair and convincing and made a strong impression upon the delegates. (See attached copy of entire address.)

Mr. Jens Warming, of Copenhagen, who had recently visited the United States, contended that 50 per cent plus majority on the side of prohibition in the United States was too small to warrant an amendment to the Constitution. He said he would be unwilling to have prohibition adopted in Denmark by less than a 70 per cent vote. He felt that it would have been wiser to allow local prohibition to continue. He estimated that the consumption of strong drink in America had fallen to 30 per cent of its former total.

Dr. Wayne B. Wheeler defended the American policy of government as follows (see attached copies of addresses):

> Every governmental advance raises the question, How long should a forward-looking, recognized majority wait for a backward minority before taking action? Ninety-five per cent of the territory of the United States was dry, as we call it, under local or State prohibition before national prohibition went into effect. Sixty-eight per cent of the population lived in this territory. When more than two-thirds of the people are ready for an advanced step in a government that is controlled by majorities it is not hasty action or an infringement of the liberties of the minority to ask them to obey a majority mandate of the people. The right of the majority to rule is fundamental to the existence of a republic or a democracy. The duty of the minority to obey the law enacted by the majority is equally clear.

Dr. Ferdinand Goebel, of Berlin, spoke of the interest in prohibition among the younger generation in Europe. He stated that the call of abstinence is strongest in those countries where "youth movements" are most influential, while organizations of young people which have held aloof from the youth movement do not adopt the definite attitude on the alcohol question. He declared that the victory of the abstinence movement depends upon success in leading the young to practice abstinence as the result of conviction and by free decision and said that a happy evolution in this direction had been accomplished in Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, and Holland.

Mr. Sigfrid Borgstrom, an editor from Stockholm, gave the history of prohibition movements in Scandinavian universities and schools

He told of booklets and newspapers, and offering free summer excursions to the poor. In Sweden the activity of the student prohibition bureau is strong. It influences the Government method of handling prohibition. In Norway the student organizations supply 100 newspapers weekly with responsible antialcoholic news.

Mr. F. A. Brandt, chairman of the Dutch Tram and Railway Men's Abstinence Society, said that the bodies with which he is connected are working for abstinence and that railway managements in most countries have recognized that drinking during working hours must be prohibited. Railway men themselves have united in special temperance societies as they have come to recognize their responsibility for the safety of the public. Their mutual aim, he declared, was to make the notion "railway man" and "abstainer" identical.

The troublesome question of the boycott in Norway and Iceland was discussed by Doctor Hercod, of Lausanne. He recalled what had been done to compel Iceland to repeal the prohibition of wine and Norway the prohibition of strong wines, by the compulsion exerted on them by commercially stronger nations. He stated that the policy of the wine-growing countries of France, Spain, and Portugal was a grave danger for the temperance movement in the smaller States. He suggested that diplomatic action must be taken and that the prohibition States must unite in common resistance to the economic pressure of alcohol-producing countries. To avert the menace of the wine-producing countries, he suggested the necessity of arousing public opinion, organizing boycott of wine-producing countries which have recourse to commercial war to insure an outlet for their products, and the organization of prohibition States for common resistance.

Doctor Hartvig, of Lubeck, advocated increasing duties on alcohol and alcoholic beverages as a restraining measure. This increased taxation, he believes, will reduce consumption of alcoholic beverages, thus lowering eventually the revenue from such taxes. The larger returns from general taxes and economy in the "unproductive expenditure of the State" through the decreased use of intoxicants will make up this deficit.

The fight against smuggling was treated by Dr. John Scharffenburg, of Christiania. He stated that smuggling took place not only in total prohibition countries, such as the United States and Finland, and partial prohibition countries like Norway and Iceland, but also in nations, such as Sweden, with its restrictive system and heavy taxation. The amount of smuggling depends upon the financial returns of the illicit business. He believes that the economic crisis of central Europe resulting from the great war and the condition of the money market have contributed much to the increase in smuggling. An interesting portion of his address was a report of the amount of corn brandy and spirits confiscated by customs alone in Norway, that confiscated by the police not included.

Year	Total liters yearly
1918	121
1919	1, 412
1920	8, 866
1921	16, 989
1922	92, 591
1923 (first quarter)	51, 741

Norway has prohibited beverages containing more than 21 per cent of alcohol since 1916 and in 1917 adopted prohibition of strong wines, which, however, was abolished in 1923 to accept the wines from Spain and Portugal. To check this smuggling, Doctor Scharffenburg advocated that the government employ war ships, armored cars, airplanes and other war factors, if necessary, with confiscatory fines and imprisonment meted out to the offenders.

Hon. William S. Bennet, of Chicago, presented a strong paper on rum smuggling. He adovcated a treaty between all nations to give nonprohibition countries the right to operate their ships according to their own laws within the territorial limits of prohibition countries by recognizing the rights of nations to search vessels for alcoholic contraband within four leagues of the coast. (See attached copy of entire speech.)

M. L. Jaquet, of Paris, pointed out the extent to which alcohol is used in his country as a "national carburizer," which gives it an economic value apart from its beverage use.

The part women play in the prohibition movement was pointed out by Princess Puzyna, of Poland, and Mrs. Laura E. Pearson, of England. Princess Puzyna discussed the activity of the Polish women in the fight against alcoholism, while Mrs. Pearson said the crux of the situation lay in the training of the children. Mrs. Pearson urged women to equip themselves for the fray; to educate themselves before instructing others, and to give time, money, and themselves to the cause.

Mr. Hindhede reported the results of his statistical study in Denmark of the effect of alcohol on the life of the individual. His figures show that the greater mortality of men over women in Denmark was caused almost entirely by the addiction of men to drink. At this time, after the severe rationing of liquor in 1918, delirium tremens has practically disappeared. Mr. Hindhede stated that were the last remains of alcohol, chiefly represented by beer, to be eliminated, it would probably mean the disappearance of the last remains of supermortality. In Copenhagen, where the alcoholic consumption was highest, the rate for delirium tremens was three times that in the provincial towns, while the towns had four or five times the rate of the country where the consumption was lowest.

The Bratt system of alcoholic restriction as practiced in Sweden was described by Dr. Hans Gahn, of Stockholm. He stated that the improvement since the introduction of the "motbok" system was especially noticeable in the towns, while in the country the results were less favorable. In Sweden the greater part of the alcohol consumption consists of spirits. Beverages below 2½ per cent are not covered by legislation.

The need for patient work to bring about prohibition was emphasized by Doctor Slotemaker de Bruine, of Utrecht. He said that the first phase of the movement for local option should be education, to be followed by more education to bring about partial or total prohibition. He believes that every law must be understood and approved by a great majority of the people to avoid excessive violations, quoting America as an example. He urged the support of local option measures by church, school, young people's movements, workmen's movements, the family, and the press.

The status of the alcohol traffic in the colonies of Great Britain and France was discussed by Doctor Blackburn, of London, and Mr. Julien, of Paris.

Since information as to the status of the struggle against alcohol in the different countries of the world is of special interest, there is appended to this report the accompanying data. Some of these facts were obtained by members of the delegation while in Europe. Others were secured from other sources by individual initiative.[1] It was manifestly impossible for every delegate personally to verify every detail here stated, but special pains were taken by those who secured the information to have it as accurate as possible.

The delegates were greatly pleased with the congress and the contacts which it enabled them to make in Europe. In practically all of the civilized nations of the world an effort is being made now to further regulate, restrict, or prohibit the beverage liquor traffic. The results of these observations, supplemented by further inquiry, are attached to this report.

WAYNE B. WHEELER, *Chairman.*
PETER J. O'CALLAGHAN, *Vice Chairman.*
LENNA LOWE YOST (Mrs. ELLIS A.).
EDWIN C. DINWIDDIE.
WILLIAM S. BENNET.
A. J. VOLSTEAD.
ALBERT SUTCLIFFE.
CORA FRANCES STODDARD.
EMOR L. CALKINS.
ERNEST H. CHERRINGTON.

[1] The Canadian data has been corrected to date. The other data is as of June, 1924.

APPENDIX

STATUS OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN OTHER NATIONS

CANADA

In Canada six Provinces have prohibited the sale and importation of intoxicating beverages, although nowhere is there a total prohibition law. Even in dry Provinces there are distilleries and breweries, licensed by the Federal Government, which have the right to manufacture and to sell liquor for export. Nowhere is manufacture or exportation by brewers and distillers forbidden. The situation in the separate Provinces is as follows:

Newfoundland in August, 1924, adopted Government control of the liquor traffic after six years of prohibition. The fact that St. Pierre-Miquelon, a French colony, noted as a base of bootlegging operations, was only a few miles from its south coast, made enforcement difficult.

Ontario began to limit the sale of liquor with the passage of the Dunkin Act by the Legislature of Canada in 1864. In 1878, 25 counties and 2 cities in the Province adopted the Canada temperance act. For political reasons this law was never thoroughly enforced, and whilst it accomplished a certain amount of good it never became very popular. It was repealed after a brief trial of three to six years in practically every country where it had been enacted. Shortly after this a somewhat ineffective local option law which had been on the statute books of Ontario since the days of confederation in 1867 was amended and made an effective weapon against the liquor traffic. The movement spread rapidly and by 1916 nearly 70 per cent of the municipalities in the Province were dry. This local-option law was so successful that in the last six years of the local option period, out of 1,330 opportunities for repeal in 1,260 cases opponents could not muster enough strength to bring the issue to vote. The Ontario temperance act was adopted in 1916 by unanimous vote of the members of the legislature and sustained by the citizens on a referendum on its continuance in 1919, the dry majority being 407,789. Before the adoption of this act three-fourths of the municipalities and half the population were under prohibition. In 1921 Ontario invoked the provisions of the Dominion act forbidding the importation of liquor. Six distilleries and 29 breweries under Federal permit are operating in the Province for export trade. In October, 1924, Ontario by a plebiscite reapproved prohibition and rejected government control of liquor.

Drunkenness arrests in Toronto, the chief city of the Province, have decreased from 241 per 10,000 of population in 1915 to 77 per 10,000 in 1922. Cases of serious crime have also decreased greatly. In spite of a large increase in population, arrests for offenses related to prohibition in 1922 were only one-third the total in 1914. Decreases in death rates and in cases of poverty due to intemperance, and increased savings accounts, school attendance, and general prosperity have been marked.

Novia Scotia cleared the liquor traffic from the entire Province except Halifax in 1882 by means of the Canada temperance act. A provincial prohibition law, exempting Halifax, was adopted in 1910. In 1916 Halifax was also brought under its operation. Importation of liquor was forbidden under Dominion act in 1921.

New Brunswick adopted a provincial prohibition law in 1917. In 1920 the voters by a majority of 20,667 voted to retain this law and gave a majority of 14,662 against light wines and beer. In 1922 the importation of intoxicating liquor was prohibited.

British Columbia adopted a prohibition act in 1916, to be enforced if approved by a referendum in 1917. It was approved. In 1921 sale of liquor through Government dispensaries was legalized; since then, as repeated stories in the press illustrate, the Province has become a bootleggers' paradise. An investigation by the attorney general showed recently that the Government stores were not handling half of the liquor entering the Province. The Retail Merchants' Association of Vancouver has protested against the diversion from legitimate business of the large sums expended for liquor. This Province now shares with Quebec the questionable honor of having high drug addiction rates. In June, 1924, sale of beer by the glass was authorized by a plebiscite.

In Manitoba the people by plebiscite in 1916 gave a majority of 24,593 in ratification of a prohibition act passed the previous year. In 1923 the Province voted to adopt Government sale, as in British Columbia, but rejected the proposal to legalize sale of intoxicants in hotels. The heavy wet vote of the foreign-born population is credited with this change of sentiment.

In 1915 the Province of Saskatchewan closed all its bars and its 38 liquor stores, but established Government dispensaries for the retail sale of liquor in original packages. These dispensaries were made subject to the will of the various municipalities and six of them were immediately wiped out. The remainder a year later were abolished by a vote of more than four to one. The sale for beverage purposes of all intoxicating liquors became operative on January 1, 1917, although the law permitted the manufacture and sale of liquor for export. Importation of liquor forbidden in 1921. In 1922 export warehouses were closed. In July, 1924, Government control of liquor, without sale on licensed premises, was approved by popular vote.

Alberta substituted Government sale of liquor for prohibition by popular vote.

Prince Edward Island carried the Canada temperance act in its three counties and the city of Charlottestown about 1880, but repealed it in Charlottestown in 1891. The remainder of the island, however, retained the law until 1902, when it was repealed to make way for a province-wide measure that had been passed in 1900. The Canada temperance act, being a Federal measure, had to be repealed before the provincial law could become operative.

The liquor traffic in Quebec, except that in strong liquors sold in liquor stores, is conducted under a license system similar to that which we had before prohibition. The Government store provides for the sale of whisky and strong liquors, including wine. The liquor is sold in packages, not to be consumed on the premises. Only one bottle of whisky or the stronger liquors can be purchased by any

one person in one day. There is no limit on the amount of wine that may be purchased. Licenses are granted for the sale of intoxicating liquors by the following classes of persons:

1. Any person licensed in charge of a tavern may sell beer by the glass.
2. Banquet licenses for beer and wines are granted.
3. Groceries are licensed to sell beer upon order given at the store or by telephone on condition that no quantity less than one bottle be sold and the beer not consumed at the store.
4. Cafe and restaurant licenses are granted.
5. Club licenses.
6. Licensed to sell during meals at dining rooms of any establishments recognized by the commissioners as serving meals.
7. Licenses for the sale of liquor on steamboats and railway trains.
8. Brewers are licensed to make and sell beer to persons holding Government permits. Each brewer pays a $5,000 license fee and 5 per cent on the sales.

The present system is the outgrowth of brewery activity which started several years ago. At that time 92 per cent of the Province of Quebec was dry. It looked as though the Province would go dry. The opposition started a campaign for Government control for the sale of 2.51 per cent beer. They won out in the contest, but no sooner was 2.51 per cent beer legalized than they renewed their efforts with increased financial resources to secure the sale of beer of ordinary alcoholic content. Step by step this has increased until to-day one can purchase any amount of beer, wine, whisky, gin, brandy, or any other kind of liquor one desires in any quantity whatever. Even at the Government-control stores, which indicate that the purchaser can buy only one bottle, he is not prevented from buying a bottle at every store in the city, or in the Province, if he can reach it in one day. As a common practice, men go into the same stores several times a day and the bartender will not recognize them as former purchasers.

The tavern is the same as the old beer saloon in the United States. They are required to have tables in them. This may be a wise precaution, as the purchaser can drink even after he is unable to stand. The law against sales to minors and drunkards and excessive drinkers is violated just as it was in the United States under the license system.

The mail order department of the liquor commission sells liquor by mail to any one in the dry municipalities and Government liquor shops are established in dry municipalities where they have not actually voted against the sale of liquor. In such a municipality, when a protest is filed, the protestants are told that they are too late. There is no provision for a vote in the Canadian Government control law. Liquor shops are started in this dry territory contrary to the protests of the churches, town councils, and other representatives of the municipalities. Liquor shops are started without notice being given to the people in these dry towns, and the Government recently emphasized its refusal to insert a provision to require notice of such application and to give the people a chance to show that the majority did not want liquor sold.

By sending liquor by mail into dry municipalities the Government is undermining the dry territory and only about half of the Provinces are now under local prohibition. One of the strange inconsistencies of the Government-control system is the limits to which they go in pushing the sales of liquor, while the health department advises in its bulletins that, "If you want to grow up healthy and strong and avoid disease, abstain from alcoholic liquors." Consistency is no part of the Government-control plan.

The liquor commission distributes documents showing how the provincial debt can be wiped out by liquor revenues. They naïvely point out that a large part comes from United States tourists, dwelling on this point with great glee. The Government is most indifferent to liquors withdrawn to be shipped into the United States in violation of our laws. We were informed before investigation that none of this liquor was withdrawn for export into the United States, that it was simply withdrawn on a blanket export application, but on examination of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics report from Ottawa, issued in September, 1924, we found that the Government permits the withdrawal of whisky, ale, and beer to be exported to the United States. The exact amounts are given in the reports. Of course, the officers know that not one drop of liquor can be shipped legally into the United States, but they take the position that it is up to the United States to stop liquor smuggling and that they have no responsibility for the outlaw who carries on this nefarious business. There are many precedents for nations preventing their territory from being used as a base for supplying a contraband product to a friendly nation.

The conference between the United States and Canada took place last summer. The officials agreed upon a program to help curb smuggling, but it has not been ratified. Canada was not willing to require those who withdraw liquor for shipment into the United States to (1) make a showing that it was to be shipped for legal purposes; (2) to give the point where it would reach the consignee; (3) to furnish a receipt showing that the consignee had received the shipment; (4) to provide for the O. K.ing of the order by representatives of the Canadian Government or our Government that the liquor was shipped to a bona fide consignee.

Canadian officials point with considerable pride to one reform which they have initiated. Formerly small boats filled with liquor were cleared for points in Mexico, and elsewhere. It was so manifestly a farce that such boats could weather an ocean voyage that they added a condition that these boats could not be cleared unless they were seaworthy to reach the alleged point of destination. This does not help much in the smuggling situation in the United States, however, because these small boats can reach our border, and they are cleared to points on the coast of the United States.

The Government-control system is used as a most effective weapon to destroy prohibition. Its advocates claim that it will reduce the consumption of hard liquors and produce temperance through the larger sale of lighter liquors, such as beer and wine. It has reduced the dry territory in the Province of Quebec and caused the repeal of the provincial prohibition laws in the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

The Government-control system reveals to the people of the United States that the people get just as drunk on whisky and beer provided by the Government as by an individual. Women and children in the homes of drunkards find little comfort in the fact that the family income has been destroyed and their happiness ruined by Government-sold liquor.

GREAT BRITAIN

Several elements have reduced the drink bill in Great Britain in the past few years, notably an enormous increase in taxation and a reduction in the hours when sales are permitted. In spite of these, however, the nation spent between $1,500,000,000 and $1,800,000,000 in 1922 for intoxicants, or over one-third of the total amount of Great Britain's war debt to this country. Sir George Paish estimates the country's drink bill at 365,000,000 pounds. Geo. B. Wilson, of the United Kingdom Alliance, estimates it at 354,000,000 pounds for 1922. Proposals for nationalizing the liquor traffic suggest from 700,000,000 to 900,000,000 pounds as the price to be paid in Great Britain.

The adoption of a measure to prevent the sale of liquor to persons under 18 and the fight now on to secure a local option law are the most recent developments in the temperance and prohibition fight. The growing strength of the antiliquor sentiment is shown in the number of minor measures adopted for the control of the traffic and in the parliamentary debates upon this subject. Still more significant is the change in the licensing policy. In the past eight years 18,000 unlicensed premises or saloons have been closed and licenses to reopen refused. New licenses have been granted each year, but in no year has the net decrease in the number of licenses to sell alcoholic beverages to be drunk on the premises been less than 585, while the reduction in some years has amounted to over 1,200 licenses. "Off licenses" to sell drinks to be consumed off the premises have been reduced annually, but not to any great extent. Over 3,000 parishes in England and Wales are no license by landlord option. In Scotland 308 parishes are dry by landlord option and 35 by the poll of 1920.

The general economic depression, unemployment, higher taxes, and limitation of hours of sale reduced the sale of these beverages in 1921 and 1922. In spite of this, according to the latest report of the chief commissioner of the metropolitan police district, arrests for drunkenness in London in 1922 were the highest in the past seven years, while the ratio per 1,000 population advanced from 3.88 to 4.37.

While the ratio of crime has decreased in this country, it has increased in Great Britain, according to the last published Statistical Abstract, which gives the number on trial at assizes and quarter sessions in 1917 as 4,585; in 1918, 5,904; in 1919, 7,883; in 1920, the last year compiled, 9,130, an increase since 1917 of over 100 per cent. The number "apprehended and summoned" in 1918 was 494,395. In 1920 this had increased to 691,525, or 39 per cent. Of the number thus taken in custody in 1920, 64,383 were for indictable offenses. This year, 1920, under prohibition in this country, showed a remarkable decrease in arrests and court cases throughout America.

Proceedings for drunkenness in England and Wales were as follows in the years given (three war years and three postwar years): 94,289

in 1916, 52,427 in 1917, 32,703 in 1918, 64,495 in 1919, 103,632 in 1920, and 85,166 in 1921.

In Scotland, where they recently held about 300 local option elections, the increase in crime is shown by an increase of 55 per cent in the cases before the high court of justiciary in 1920 over 1917. The number "proceeded against" in Scotland in 1920 was 141,517, as against 98,593 in the preceding year. Of these 20,789 were for indictable offenses. In this connection it is interesting to note that Lord Birkenhead when Lord Chancellor said that he was satisfied of the essential truth that drink was responsible for a large proportion of the crime statistics of the country (quoted in Licensed Trade News, March 21, 1908).

The changes in the rules governing the sale of liquor seem to prove Lord Birkenhead's statement. The last quarter of 1921 showed 39.7 per cent of the year's convictions for drunkenness in Greater London. The abolition of restrictions imposed by the central control board with the increase in the number of hours in which liquors could be sold took effect in this quarter.

The unemployment in England is relieved by Government doles, which Sir Allan Smith, in a letter to the Prime Minister, August 11, 1923, says amounted to 400,000,000 pounds sterling. The number unemployed according to the Employment Register of Great Britain at the end of August was 1,266,000. In addition, there were 64,900 on August 6 working short time and drawing allowances for interval employment. In this connection it might not be amiss to quote the First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Amery) in the debate of July 16, where he points out the "essential fact in production is that between success and failure a very narrow margin of efficiency makes all the difference." The assertion is made by Floyd Parson that production per man in dry America is 2.6 times as great as in wet Great Britain. Mr. Vyles, in the Brewing Trade Review, says that 7 workmen in America are equal to 10 in England. Our nearest competitor may need reference to American prohibition and British drink for explanation. In addition to the unemployment doles, in England and Wales the expenditure for relief of the poor was 37,000,000 pounds in 1922–23, an increase of nearly 130 per cent since 1917, while Scotland expended 3,378,000 pounds, or a similar increase per cent over the 1917 totals. The reduction in cases of poverty and in demands upon charity in America since prohibition offers a suggestive comparison with these figures.

If the $30,000,000 spent weekly for drink in England and Wales had been turned into channels of legitimate trade, making possible increased employment for multitudes, it is probable that the larger part of this outlay for poor relief and unemployment doles might have been avoided. The increased efficiency of the sober workmen and the reduced accident rate, evidenced by American experience since prohibition, might have reduced the production costs sufficiently to place the industries of Great Britain on competing terms with her rivals.

When nearly every other business in Great Britain has been passing through severe and trying times, 94 brewing companies paid from 10 to 25 per cent dividends; although in the year 1914–15, 56

brewery companies paid under 10 per cent and 27 no dividend at all. The net profit of some of the brewers in pounds are as follows:

	1914–15	1921–22
Guinness	£1,511,678	£2,925,755
Bass	256,789	386,063
Mitchell & Butters	208,533	430,004
Watney Combs	233,211	614,614

The worst paying industry in the world which, according to the Board of Trade, pays in wages £7 for each £100 of product, against £55 in wages for mining, £40 for shipbuilding, and five times the brewing average for standard trades in general, is the only business reaping such enormous profits in Great Britain.

The shortage of homes in Great Britain is being met very partially by subsidies paid by the Government from moneys raised by taxation. America under prohibition had been making contracts for from 6,000 to 9,000 new homes monthly without any subsidies in spite of greatly increased cost of building.

Alcoholism as a cause of death has advanced in Great Britain, according to the registrar general's latest report, which gives the following rate per million living for the years named: 1918, 2; 1919, 3; 1920, 6; 1921, 5.

At the last parliamentary elections the manifestoes of the Liberal Party and the Labor Party declared explicitly for local option. The Liberal Party manifesto was signed among others by David Lloyd-George and Mr. Asquith. The Conservative Party in their manifesto declared against local option and the Conservatives were overwhelmingly defeated.

The Labor Party came into power but without a majority in its own rights, Mr. Ramsey McDonald being selected as Premier because he was the official leader of the opposition. The Welsh local option bill came up in February. It was a privy bill. The Government refused to accept it and the spokesman from the Government in the debate actually opposed it. The newspapers report that the bill was lost by a majority of 28. Two or three years ago when the same bill came up it was lost by a majority of 1.

The labor Premier, Ramsey McDonald, has stated his attitude on democracy and liquor in these words:

> I have had some letters addressed to me on this subject, and this is an argument that has been used: They say, "We want no class legislation. The rich man can go to his wine cellar and club on Sunday, or he can go there at 2 in the morning, or at 5, or on any day or hour of the day. Therefore," they say, "we appeal to you as a labor member to prevent this sort of class legislation, which is going to keep for the rich man his drink and deprive the poor man of his." It is a specious argument; what does it mean? It is an appeal to the rights of the democracy * * *. We must differentiate the rights that are of good report from the rights that are of evil report, and we say: Do not cling for five minutes to a right that is of no value. If the rich want to keep the road open to their own loss, that is their affair. No; democracy ought not to say, "Because one class has such and such a right, all classes ought to claim the same right." It is not worth it. Let us see to it that the rights the democracy claims, that the rights the working classes claim, are rights worth having, and not rights that come with disease and canker and vice in their train. * * * The right to go wrong, to go down, to go astray—well, we will make a present of these rights to any one who wants them."

FRANCE

The fact that just before the war there were 3,830,851 acres of land used as vineyards in France explains that country's slow advance in the control of the traffic in intoxicating beverages. The French vine harvest is three-tenths of the total world production and is estimated at a value of 10,000,000,000 francs. Over 4,000,000 people are engaged in its exploitation. For many years this nation has had the highest per capita consumption of alcohol. The number of liters of pure alcohol used per capita, according to Frazier Hunt, was 12.47 in 1890, 16.62 in 1900, 21.17 in 1913, and 16.01 in 1920. The decrease in the latter year was due to the economic depression and to the 800 per cent increase in the Government tax.

The small glass of liquor, taken with his morning coffee by the average Frenchman, formerly cost the equivalent of 4 cents for the two. The cost to-day is 30 cents or more for liquor and coffee.

The effect of this consumption is mirrored in the statistics of the country. Northern France has 1 saloon for every 38 people and 1 bar to every 10 families. In Normandy, where the drink habit is strongest, perhaps, Dr. Maurice Legrain, the celebrated alienist, says that 50 per cent of 600 boys examined by him for service during the war could not pass the military tests. He further has declared that while the percentage of tuberculosis among conscripts in France was 13.5 per 1,000 in Normandy, it was from 23.1 to 42.3 per 1,000 in the 10 years before the war. The high death rate and the low birth rate in this country are not unrelated to the liquor problem.

Victor Cambon, addressing the Society of Civil Engineers of France, said:

> I have seen Brittany villages, where 40 per cent of the conscripts are invalided, sad victims of the alcoholism of their parents.

It is difficult to arrive at the actual consumption of alcoholic beverages in France. Prior to June 30, 1916, home distilling was permitted without taxation. Since that date the amount thus permitted has been limited to 10 liters. In 1920 there were 1,728,029 home stills, or 1 for every 23 people. It is generally admitted that millions of liters of wine are sold untaxed in France and do not appear in her statistics. Illicit distilling and selling is general.

France prohibited the manufacture and sale of absinthe March 16, 1915, but the law is frequently violated by the sale under other names of strong drinks similar to absinthe. On October 1, 1917, the sale of alcoholic beverages to persons under 18 was forbidden, and the employment of women servants in places where alcoholic beverages were sold was regulated by law. A measure to control the sale of distilled alcohol was proposed March 14, 1918, but was not able to command a majority.

French chambers of commerce are investigating the relation of alcoholism to industry. A report of such an inquiry by the Chamber of Commerce of Epinal gives the following: "Of the 15,000 building workmen in the Vosges over one-third are such 'passionate' drunkards that discharges reach frightful proportions." An employer from St. Die says, "If I were to be strict toward the drunkards, I would have to discharge a third of my workmen." Three employers from Remiremont are quoted: "We can not deal too severely with drunkenness;

we should lack hand labor." Another says, "In varying degrees 75 per cent of my adult employees are alcoholic."

Paul Renaud, director of L'Institut Scientifique et Industrial, made an inquiry during the war among factory managers and superintendents, from whom the following is quoted:

M. F. Brazzola, constructing engineer (Paris-Passy): "I can say that 50 per cent of my laborers were discharged for intoxication."

M. A. Cothias, of Cothias Metal Co. (Ivry-Port Seine): "The only serious disagreement we have had with the help had drink as purely the cause."

Director of Rouen Co.: "Alcoholism certainly accounts for 50 to 60 per cent in reducing the actual output of our port workers; yet we employ on the average from 1,000 to 1,200."

Mr. Clavel: "Alcoholism is almost always disastrous. Those of our workmen who succumb to it are half as effective workers as the others."

To this study of Mr. Renaud may be added a statement made by the president, T. P. Carmichael, and the vice president, F. Roy, of the Union of Syndicates of the Textile Industries of France, including 70 syndicates employing over 800,000 workers and paying over half a billion in wages annually; and speaking of the crisis in industry and the need to secure the greatest possible productivity of labor because of the loss of men in war, they say: "The great majority of our members consulted on this subject are of the opinion that the truly practical remedy would be total prohibition."

The growth of a taste for outdoor sports, developed by contact with English-speaking soldiers during the war, is aiding the temperance movement in France.

ITALY

Premier Mussolini has issued this statement: "Wine and spirit drinking must no longer corrupt and debauch the Italian race—excess of drinking, that is." The closing, since the beginning of the war, of 17,094 places where intoxicating liquor was sold is a large step forward for Italy whose consumption of pure alcohol was second only to France for many years. The law now limits liquor licenses to one for each 1,000 population. The effects of this will be gradual, the number of licenses being diminished as the innkeepers now holding them die or withdraw from the trade. The hours for the sale of liquor are limited, and serious efforts are being made to utilize the grape industry for other purposes than wine growing. The sale of beverages containing more than 21 per cent alcohol is prohibited on Sunday.

BELGIUM

The dry forces in Belgium are working for the total prohibition of spirits. These may at present be sold in groceries in a minimum quantity of 2 liters, but not in public houses. Beers and wines of 18 per cent alcohol may be sold in the drinking places. The annual drink bill of Belgium is 1,200,000,000 francs. On September 1, 1923, there were 116,649 places where beer and wine were sold and 20,092 places where liquors and alcohol in quantities from 2 to 6 liters were sold. In July, 1923, there were 1,979 breweries and 38 distilleries in the country, but no wineries. The consumption of beer has risen from 213,931,262 gallons in 1919 to 234,713,044 gallons in 1920; 282,056,377 gallons in 1921; and 351,501,666 gallons in 1922. The

consumption of wine has fluctuated thus: 12,401,222 gallons in 1919, 12,890,355 in 1920, 11,118,000 in 1921, and 12,404,288 in 1922. The sale of alcohol in 1919 was 917,711 gallons; in 1920 it was 4,121,066 gallons; in 1921 it was 3,295,422 gallons; in 1922 it was 4,010,766 gallons.

HOLLAND

The internal-revenue tax on spirits was increased 150 per cent and on beer 100 per cent by the Dutch Parliament December, 1920. A local option bill came within one vote of passage at the 1921 Parliament and will probably be passed by the next one, the result of 1922 elections. This measure, which is to be reintroduced, provides for local option on the sale of all intoxicating liquors except wines containing less than 22 per cent of alcohol or other beverages containing less than 15 per cent.

The decision of The Hague municipal council absolutely forbidding the selling of spirits during the week of festivities in honor of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the reign of Queen Wilhelmina is one evidence of the progress prohibition is making in Holland. The Socialists made this motion, which was supported by the Conservatives. Other cities in Holland followed the action of The Hague.

GERMANY

German trade unions, representing all organized labor, have suggested to the chancellor the prohibition of the manufacture of alcohol. Voluntary polls in various parts of the country show large majorities (about 90 per cent) in favor of prohibition. A bill prohibiting the sale of distilled spirits to persons under 18 and wine and beer to those under 16 has been passed. The prohibition of the sale of absinthe was passed by the Reichstag in June. A local option measure is being considered. The local option bill, if passed, will require a two-thirds vote to make dry any community. The number of deaths from wood alcohol this year has compelled the authorities to join employers in warning against the blinding or fatal consequences of this chemical used as a drink.

Before the war, 80 per cent of Germany's production of alcohol was distilled from potatoes. The consumption of 6,000 distilleries amounted to 2,500,000 tons of potatoes annually, producing 3,000,000 hectoliters of alcohol. The loss of Posen to Poland took 25 per cent of the potato crop from German control.

To conserve the foodstuff of the nation, the German Government limits the price alcohol manufacturers may pay for potatoes. The production of alcohol is under government monopoly, the state supervising the production and distribution of the product and fixing the prices.

By a commercial agreement with Portugal, December 6, 1921, Germany authorizes the importation in the first year of 50,000 hectoliters of wine, four-fifths of the total to be port and the remainder Madeira, and thereafter annually at least 40,000 hectoliters in the same proportions. In return, Germany receives most favored nation treatment from Portugal.

SWITZERLAND

A plebiscite on local option, taken under the initiative, law is planned for 1924 in Switzerland. A referendum vote, June 3, 1923, defeated the proposed amendment to the constitution extending Federal monopoly of grain distillation to fruit distillation also. Switzerland has 24,000 licensed houses, or one for every 160 inhabitants. It has also 86 breweries and in addition to the Federal monopoly alcohol manufacturies, 36,000 fruit distilleries run by peasants. Most of these fruit stills are small, scarcely selling anything.

NORWAY

Norway's prohibition of wines containing up to 14 per cent alcohol was suspended by vote of Parliament in March, 1923, to legalize proposed contracts to take 500,000 liters of Spanish wine, 450,000 liters of French wine, and 850,000 liters of Portugese wine. This was done practically under threat of a fish boycott by France, Spain, and Portugal. Only the prohibition against brandy remains. A referendum vote on prohibition gave the drys a majority of 184,344 in October, 1919, making permanent war-time prohibition which forbade the manufacture, sale, or importation of beverages with over 14 per cent alcohol. Under this law, drunkenness was reduced from one-half to two-thirds. In January, 1924, Parliament formally repealed the prohibitory laws which had been suspended.

SWEDEN

The sale of distilled spirits is a monopoly of the State of Sweden. Under the Bratt system, citizens may purchase a limited quantity of distilled liquors each month, the amount being entered in a motbook. Societies controlled by the State act as retailers, paying all profits above a fixed percentage to the State. Smuggling has been promoted by this system. In 1922, over 2,000 smugglers were captured as against 105 in 1919. The amount of whisky confiscated in 1922 was 119,000 liters, against 960 in 1919. The manufacture of beer over 3.2 per cent alcohol is forbidden after October 1, 1923, except for export, medicinal, scientific, technical, or industrial purposes. Whisky and wine is sold in 97 of Sweden's 111 cities and in 134 of its 2,406 rural communities. Real beer (1.8 to 3.2 per cent alcohol by weight) is permitted in all cities and rural communities. Malt liquor over 3.2 per cent may not be made nor sold. The number of breweries in 1922 was 160, making beer not exceeding 3.2 per cent; and 374 making tax-free malt liquors under 1.8 per cent alcohol. There are no wineries in Sweden. The number of distilleries was 107 in 1922 using foodstuffs; 20 sulphite distilleries and 8 yeast press factories where whisky is produced as a by-product.

The production of whisky in 1922 was 40,646,856 liters; of beer not exceeding 2.8 per cent alcohol (stronger beer being forbidden in that year), 1,153,284.2 hectoliters; and the production of malt liquors under 1.8 per cent was 612,881.6 hectoliters.

The sale of spirits (both domestic and imported) in 1922 was 25,745,200 liters only. The rest was consumed for technical, scientific or medical purposes or was exported. Spirits and wines are sold by companies, only. The total sale of spirits was 117,687,806 kroner

and wine 13,847,462 kroner. The estimated drink bill for malt liquors under 1.8 per cent was 35,000,000 kroner, and of beer over 1.8 but under 3.2 per cent, 85,000,000 kroner The total drink bill is estimated at 252,000,000 kroner, without including profits by hotels, restaurants and cafes which would bring the gross drink bill to 300,000,000 kroner.

Each community has local option in prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors but mot-book holders may bring in their own liquors and companies may ship liquors from other communities to holders of mot-books. On-sale is permitted as follows: Spirits, 12 noon to 10 p. m., except Sundays and holidays; wine and malt liquors, 9 a. m. to 10 p. m., but before 3 p. m. only with a meal. On Sundays and holidays sale is forbidden during morning service. In some larger cities, on-sale hours are extended to 11 p. m. or 12 p. m. Some cities forbid all sale of spirits on the day before Sunday, holidays, Christmas Eve, New Year's Eve, Easter Eve and Whitsun Eve.

Off-sale hours are from 9 to 5 except on Saturdays and days before holy days when the closing hour is 2 p. m.

FINLAND

Finland adopted state prohibition upon becoming independent in 1917, her prior action in adopting prohibition having been twice vetoed by the Russian Czar, under the threat of withdrawal of French loans if Finnish prohibition was permitted. The prohibition law went into effect June 1, 1919. Enforcement went into effect under a strong law August 15, 1919. A proposal for a plebiscite on prohibition, introduced by the liquor interests, was rejected early in the year 1923, on the ground that all elections had shown a tremendous majority for prohibition. In the commission of 1917, elected by the Parliament to consider the proposition of plebiscite, only one vote was cast for it; that vote was from the mover of the plebiscite. Finland was almost ruined when the war closed. Russia had taken her industrial product in return for worthless rubles and later the Bolshevist forces had looted her. Her industrial output to-day is nearly three times that of 1919, while the 200,000 unemployed in 1918 has been reduced to 800 in June this year. The nation's deficit in its budget of half a billion marks in 1919 has become a surplus of 400,000,000 marks. Her currency is stable and her war debt is steadily reduced.

Finland has joined Norway, Sweden and Denmark in warfare on smugglers. Customs officers of these nations are now cooperating and exports of pure alcohol and spirits by small vessels are forbidden without special permits under conditions that indicate that the transportation is for a legal purpose.

Finland permits the sale of light beer, 2 per cent alcohol, but finds that this does not prevent violation of the law by illicit sale, smuggling, etc.

Unlimited permission for the prescription of alcohol for medicine has resulted in abuses in Finland. During the 12 months ending September 30, 1923, one physician used 66 books, each containing 100 prescription blanks, another used 53, one 42, one 41, while nine used 31 to 40 books and 20 used between 21 and 30 books. Veteri-

narians, who are allowed a similar privilege, availed themselves of it to this degree: Five veterinarians used from 41 to 80 books apiece, 6 used between 31 and 40 books apiece, and 17 used from 21 to 30 books. The law does not limit the frequency with which prescriptions may be given to one person nor the amount prescribed.

Drunkenness has greatly decreased in Finland. In Helsingfors, before the war, such arrests were as follows: 1911, 18,142 arrests; 1921, 22,727 arrests; 1913, 23,266 arrests;1914, 13,121 arrests.

Russian prohibition went into effect when the war began, August, 1914. Hence the low number in that year. Liquor was strictly banned during the war. That and possible defects in the statistics explain the few arrests in the next five years, as follows: 1915, 4,446; 1916, 4,290; 1917, 5,133; 1918, 2,928; 1919, 5,488.

The law now provides that "every one who is seen intoxicated in the street, or public highway or in other public place or in public occupation or a public gathering shall be punished by fines from 100 to 5,000 Finnish marks." Under this law, the arrests for drunkenness are as follows under permanent prohibition: 1920, 12,307; 1921, 13,769; 1922, 13,082; 1923, 13,562.

The legal sale of light beer does not check the smuggling of alcohol. The seizures of brandy in Finland since 1919 have been as follows: 1919, 8,440 liters; 1920, 110,268 liters; 1921, 72,897 liters; 1922, 225,458 liters; 1923 (11 months only), 601,379 liters.

The temperance societies of Finland receive annually from the government nearly $40,000 for their work.

ICELAND

Prohibition is temporarily suspended as far as wines with upwards to 21 per cent alcoholic content is concerned; beers stronger than 2¼ per cent alcohol are still prohibited, also all drinks stronger than 21 per cent alcohol. A plebiscite was taken on September 10, 1908, forming the basis of the law adopted in 1909; this dry law partly went into effect January 1, 1912, when the legal importation of liquors into the country ceased. Under threat of boycott from Spain, which declined to take Iceland's fish unless Spanish wines were admitted, Iceland in 1922 was compelled to suspend her prohibition laws until she finds new markets for her fish. Such new markets now opening may enable her to return to total prohibition.

POLAND

Poland has local option in force since January 1, 1921. On petition of one-tenth of the citizens, a vote on license may be taken, but not oftener than once in three years, during which period the result of the last election controls. Counties may adopt prohibition by a two-thirds vote. Other units need only a majority vote. Sales of liquor containing over 45 per cent of alcohol, sales to those under 18, sales on Sundays or holidays or on railroads, at army camps, barracks or sporting places is forbidden by law. Saloons are limited to one for each 2,500 population.

The excise tax on alcohol was doubled in June, 1923.

After February 24, 1924, Poland has prohibited the importation of certain luxuries, including "fruit" juices with alcohol, arrack, rum,

cognac, silowitz and other brandies and liquors in all kinds of receptacles; grape-fruit and berry wines and wines containing over 25 per cent of alcohol.

To conserve food, the ministry of provisionment prohibited the manufacture of alcohol from grain in 1922.

DENMARK

Denmark's annual drink bill is about 400,000,000 Danish crowns. In 1922 the liquor consumption was 125,200,000 liters of beer, brandy, whiskey, cognac, and wine. The alcohol in this quantity would have amounted to 1,864,010 liters of 100 per cent alcohol. War-time prohibition of beer with over 3 per cent of alcohol was repealed in April, 1923. The only war-time prohibition measure is the limitation of the manufacture of brandy to 2,500,000 liters annually, one-tenth of the pre-war amount. A local option law has several times been adopted by the House in Parliament, but a compensation amendment added by the Senate has in each case caused its defeat. Out of 320 votes taken since 1907, the drys have won in 260 parishes.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The sale of spirits to those under 18, the sale of beer and wine to those under 16, or the sale of liquors at dances are forbidden in Czechoslovakia. The importation of liquor is subject to commercial treaties. A local option bill and the limitation of licenses to one for each 400 or 500 inhabitants was proposed in Parliament last year. Czechoslovakia has been obliged to promise not to hinder importation of 2,000,000 liters of wine from Portugal, 4,000,000 liters from Spain, 5,000,000 liters from Italy, and 5,000,000 liters from France. Brewers complain of poor sale, due to publications of Sokol Gymnastic Unions. The commercial treaty with France signed August 17, 1923, reduces the Czechoslovakia import tax on wines and barrels. Pilsner breweries with capacity of 3,000,000 hectoliters now produce 700,000 hectoliters. The trade in malt was made subject to state control by legislation passed in 1921. Licenses for the exportation of malt are required by a law passed last year.

ESTHONIA

Esthonia replaced war-time prohibition with a system similar to the Bratt system of Sweden, allowing a liter of brandy each month to persons over 20 years, later increasing this to 2½ liters. This change of policy was followed by an increase of 1,000 per cent in arrests for drunkenness, and 400 per cent in more serious crimes. Venereal disease increased 60 per cent. The number of suicides per half year leaped from 22 to 70. In the last half of 1923 the number was 930. The death rate from alcoholism is very high. The consumption of spirits, excluding wines, liquors, and beers, in 1922 was 4,125,000 liters. In the first six months of 1923 it totaled 2,010,985. The population of the nation is 1,140,000. The government support is promised a bill to be submitted to Parliament next year granting local option. Other restrictive measures, including prohibition for youth and Sunday closing, will be proposed. Scien-

tific temperance teaching is compulsory in the schools. A plebiscite on the prohibition of distilled spirits is planned for 1926.

The importation of spirits and alcoholic beverages is prohibited except by special permission of the minister of finance. Transshipment of beer of over 25° alcoholic content is forbidden in the territory of the country. All ships with such cargoes, except passenger ships making regular sailings, or ships forced to put into harbor because of accident at sea, are warned not to stop in Esthonian waters.

Translations of American posters are used in 2,000 elementary schools of Esthonia.

Esthonia's drink problem is related closely to agriculture. Before the war there were 281 distilleries, producing annually about 43,000,000 liters of spirits. The war halted both potato growing and distilling. St. Petersburg markets were closed to Esthonian potato growers by her secession from Russia. Distilleries are now taking an increasing volume of potatoes. In 1919, 77 factories produced annually twenty-seven and seven-tenths million graads of spirits, using 1,700,000 poods of potatoes. Last year's total was about 183 factories, producing 69,000,000 graads of spirits, or 8,500,000 liters, and using 4,200,000 poods of potatoes.

The manufacture of potato flour, potato sirup, and dried potatoes may offer another outlet for this crop. The dried potatoes are intended to furnish an auxiliary substitute for flour.

LATVIA

In Latvia the Government and distillers have an agreement whereby the distillers sell a minimum of 3,125,000 liters annually, giving the Government an income from the tax on spirits amounting to about $4,000,000 last year. Before this agreement monthly sales of spirits averaged less than 125,000 liters. Local option has been adopted by Latvia.

YUGOSLAVIA

Measures for the control of the liquor traffic have been drafted by the ministry of health in Yugoslavia, fulfilling the clause of the constitution which pledges the State to combat the misuse of alcoholic beverages, but no action has been taken by Parliament.

GREECE

Importation of all drinks containing alcohol, except those which are bottled, has been forbidden in Greece by royal decree since 1920.

RUMANIA

The importation of champagnes, wines, and liquors were included in the list of luxury articles whose importation into Rumania was forbidden in 1921.

A sales tax of 15 per cent was imposed upon liquors and expensive wines as articles of luxury in 1922.

BULGARIA

Bulgaria officially recognized the anniversary of the date when national prohibition became effective in the United States by lectures in the schools January 18, 1923, on scientific temperance and the evil effects of alcohol. The nation is under local option and 30 localities have voted dry. Under a law providing that an institution or business injurious to material or intellectual values may be closed, many other saloons have been put out of business. Measures for reducing drink shops by four-fifths, prohibiting those under 20 from entering saloons, making temperance education in the schools compulsory, and raising taxes and freight on liquor to ten times the present schedules have been under discussion by Parliament from time to time.

TURKEY

Because the tax on alcohol had halted the importation of industrial alcohol, Turkey has cut the tax on such imports from 15 paras per degree per liter to 5 paras, the pre-war rate.

In 1922 the Turkish Parliament enacted the prohibition law. It did not go into effect throughout the whole of Turkey at once. The date for its going into effect was postponed two or three times. It finally did go into effect throughout the whole of Turkey, but its enactment and its enforcement were greatly handicapped by the opposition and by the intrigues of foreign powers, especially England, Greece and France, particularly France. The newspaper dispatches recently reported that the law had been repealed.

EGYPT

A year ago when the new government of Egypt was formed, the Egypt Temperance Society was created for the purpose of promoting prohibition ideas. This society is very influential in character. Its patrons are His Highness Prince Omar Touson, of Alexandria, and His Highness Prince Mohammad Ali, of Cairo, the latter being a nephew of the King.

Following the formation of the Society of the Egyptian Government arbitrarily quit issuing any new liquor licenses and none have been issued since that time. The Parliamentary elections held on January 12, 1923, returned a Parliament almost unanimously favorable to prohibition. Practically the only obstacles in the way of early prohibition for Egypt is the capitulations with European powers. The Egyptian Government is seeking to relieve itself of these capitulations so that they may be able to put into effect the National ambition for prohibitory laws.

ZANZIBAR

Zanzibar is ruled nominally by a Sultan but actually by a British resident who dictates the policies and acts of the Sultan. The population is about 203,000 of which a little more than 200,000 are non-Christians, chiefly Hindus and Moslems.

Early in 1922 the Hindus and Moslems, acting under the National Indian Association, chiefly, demanded a prohibition law, which was granted by the Government, but certain classes, chiefly Christians

were exempt from its operations. An organization is now in the process of formation looking to the extension of the prohibition law to include the Christians as well as the non-Christians.

ARGENTINA

Argentina is developing the use of alcohol as a substitute for oil. In the west and north, where the sugar mills manufacture alcohol as a by-product, it is in common use in lamps.

In Beunos Aires 3,273 street lights burn alcohol. This outlet for one of the by-products of the sugar industry promises to relieve the economic pressure which has prevented the success of prohibition legislation. Arguments of the need of revenue or the dependence of basic industries on the legal sale of alcoholic beverages were among the factors preventing the passage in 1921 of the following measure:

"All importation of alcoholic beverages, of any kind, strength or origin, is forbidden after January 1, 1922. Stocks of such liquors are to be disposed of within six months of the passage of the law."

An earlier measure, also defeated, proposed that "the number of drinking places shall be limited to one for each 1,000 population in cities and one for each 500 population in towns or the country. Liquor can not be sold in business houses where any other goods are sold, except hotels, restaurants, and cafés.

Sale of liquor in hotels, restaurants, and cafés is forbidden from noon Saturday to 8 a. m. Monday. The employment of women and minors under 18 in places selling liquor is forbidden. The teaching of prohibition is required by law in schools, penitentiaries, and jails. All advertisement of alcoholic drinks is forbidden.

BRAZIL

Closing of drink shops in Rio de Janeiro, after 7 p. m., which went into effect in 1919, immediately decreased crime in that city.

The sale of intoxicants to those under 21 is forbidden. A bill forbidding the importation of alcohol and prohibiting drunkenness has been introduced in Congress but not yet passed.

A consumption tax was imposed from January, 1922, on alcoholic beverages as follows: Absinthe, liquors, and brandy 900 reis a liter; foreign wines 50 per cent increase over preceding rates; high fermentation beer 240 reis per liter; low fermentation beer, 300 reis per liter.

The alcohol produced as a by-product of the sugar mill is being urged as a substitute for gasoline as a motor fuel. Tests made under official auspices have been pronounced successful. The price of this alcohol is about 27 cents per gallon against 75 cents per gallon for gasoline.

CHILE

Chile's first prohibition legislation was passed in 1892 but was defeated in the courts where the plea of the rights of the individual, the argument of the need of revenue and the opposition of the wealthy found expression. Bars are closed from Saturday evening to Monday morning and on all holidays. Liquor stores are forbidden within certain specified distances of churches and schools.

In 1917 there were 157,883 vineyards in Chile. The amount of capital invested in wine production placed this as fourth in the rank of Chilean industries. The consumption of alcohol is very high, having reached 12 quarts per capita in 1914.

The Chilean Federation of Labor has asked the Government to turn distilleries, breweries, and wine factories into plants for the production of food on the ground that the drink traffic takes 350,000 pesos a year from the working man. Organized laborers refuse to unload alcoholic beverages. The President of the Republic, Arture Alessandri, has uprooted his own vines and planted walnuts instead as evidence of his sincerity in his fight to "save the race from alcoholism." He has prepared a bill facilitating the manufacture of non-intoxicating beverages and forbidding the sale of alcoholic drinks in places of amusements, prohibiting minors or women from entering saloons, imposing heavy license fees and preventing certain classes from receiving liquor licenses.

Chile's exports of wines and liquors in 1920 were 85,273 bottles, valued at 249,807 gold pesos; in 1921 there were 86,485, valued at 351,883 gold pesos.

The proposed revision of Chile's tariff by a commission does not contemplate any alteration in the tax on alcoholic beverages.

COLOMBIA

Laws restricting the production and consumption of alcoholic beverages were passed this year by the Colombian Legislature and approved by President Ospina. These forbid the sale of such beverages in theaters or at public entertainments. Liquor shops must close between 6 p. m. on week days and all day on Sundays and religious and national holidays. The distillation and manufacture of alcoholic liquors is controlled by the Government which has authority to fix retail prices.

The director of hygiene in the Department of Bolivar appointed a committee to organize a departmental league against alcoholism, acting with the National League Against Alcoholism.

The director of health department has forbidden the manufacture or sale of artificial wines, not made from grapes, of artificial brandy or cognac not distilled from wine, and of liquors containing ether.

Temperance cafés have been opened since 1921 in combating the use of alcohol.

A new surtax of 30 per cent of the regular duties was imposed on alcoholic liquors by a decree of March 6, 1923. After that date the importation of empty bottles with liquor labels is forbidden.

COSTA RICA

A proposed law, closing drinking places on Sunday and after 9 p. m. on week days, was rejected in 1921.

President Señor Julia Acosta, after his inauguration in 1920, sent to the heads of departments a recommendation that no person subject to "alcoholic vice" be proposed for civil or military appointment and that any of the personnel of the executive department publicly intoxicated would be dismissed.

The latest revision of the Costa Rican tariff raises the import tax on whisky, rum, and cognac from 1.20 to 2.40 colones.

The former tax of 80 cents on wine is retained and the increase in the tax on champagne from 1.50 to 3 colones, made in 1920, is unchanged in the new tariff.

CUBA

The development of an outlet for industrial alcohol instead of rum as a by-product of the Cuban sugar industry may be the turning point in the movement for prohibition in the island. Rum has been hitherto the only readily salable product from the sugar wastes. During the past two years, the production of industrial alcohol has made great advances. Drivers of alcohol automobiles for hire petitioned for permission to cut the standard rate one-third since they can operate more cheaply than their competitors using gasoline.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

By a law passed in 1921, the Dominican Republic forbade the sale or gift of intoxicating drinks in hotels, restaurants, saloons, or "other places where liquor is on sale."

By Executive order 332 on January 1, 1920, the military government of the Dominican Republic has fixed the tariff on whisky and brandy at 70 cents per liter, rum and gin at 35 to 45 cents; champagne at $1.50 and sparkling wines at 80 cents.

This duty, so far as it affected rum, was further increased in September, 1922, to three shillings.

A stamp tax on alcoholic drinks was imposed March 1, 1922.

ECUADOR

Ecuador, by decree of September 5, 1921, forbids after January 1, 1922, the Sunday sale of alcoholic liquor, guarapo, chicha, and beer. Debts for liquor are thereafter not collectible by law. The executive power is authorized to regulate or restrict the liquor traffic.

A tariff decree of November 16, 1922, forbids the importation of rum after January 1, 1923. Surtaxes on drafts used in payment for luxury articles imported, including liquors of all kinds, were cut to 5 per cent on March, 1923.

The Ecuador Congress of 1921 passed a law creating a Government monopoly of alcoholic beverages, to become effective when the executive may deem it expedient. It was made effective July, 1922. Under this monopoly the importation and distillation of alcoholic beverages has been prohibited and the use of apparatus for distillation, refining, and rectifying alcoholic spirits restricted under Government supervision.

Surtaxes of 50 per cent additional on champagne and foreign liquors had been imposed by a law effective January 1, 1922, the receipts going to fund for the national defense.

GUATEMALA

The sale of liquor outside the towns of Guatemala has been strictly forbidden since 1920, while the sale in towns has been greatly restricted.

By a commercial treaty with France, signed July 28, 1922, and effective May 8, 1923, France was accorded conventional rates on

wines imported into Guatemala. Previous to the signing of this treaty, by a decree of May 15, 1922, all fiscal or municipal taxes were removed from the manufacture or export of fruit wine produced in Guatemala under 18 degrees. Machinery for the manufacture of fruit wine was granted admission free of all duty for five years, in July, 1922.

The Guatemala Government is seeking to encourage the increase in production and use of industrial alcohol by exempting from taxation its manufacture for use in the production of heat, light, and power, and removing taxes from alcohol used in the manufacture by authorized distilleries of such products as varnish, ether, medicinal extracts, and other chemical and pharmaceutical products, except as perfumery. A large part of the raw material which could be derived from the sugar industry is now wasted.

HONDURAS

The sale of alcoholic drinks by private persons or companies where agricultural, mining or railroad operations are conducted, is forbidden in Honduras in 1917.

Funds for improvements, such as electric light plants, waterworks, and roads are raised by taxes levied on the sale of rum in the section to be benefited by the improvements.

The budget of Honduras for 1922–23 reckoned the receipts from the Government monopoly of the manufacture and sale of agaurdiente at 2,224,020 pesos.

MEXICO

The campaign against alcohol in Mexico has been making slow but steady progress. Article 117 of the Federal Constitution of 1917 has this provision: "The Federal Congress and State legislatures shall at once enact laws against alcoholism." There is the constitutional ground for legislative measures against alcohol.

The State of San Luis Potosi enacted a law last September which forbids the manufacture of liquors after 1928. No new liquor factories will be allowed and any one being closed is not to be reopened. The sale of liquor out of the factory or of the saloons is forbidden; no saloon can be transferred from one owner to another; taxes on liquor will never be reduced; at least 10 per cent of the saloons are to be closed every year and the tax belonging to the closed saloons is to be added to those kept open; all saloons are to be closed from the date of the law, on Saturday noon through Sunday till Monday morning; all saloons and alcohol factories to be entirely suppressed on July 1, 1928. This law has been duly enforced and the present governor has gone even further in the restriction of the liquor traffic.

The State of Oaxaca over a year ago enacted a law establishing so many restrictions and such a heavy tax that all saloons were closed with the exception of five, in two of the largest cities of the State. The law is enforced properly. The State of Oaxaca has more than 1,000,000 inhabitants.

The State of Yucatan has established local option and a great many towns have voted to close all saloons. In order to enforce the

law, committees of women are organized to detect the lawbreakers so that they may be properly punished.

The labor unions in the States of Yucatan and Campeche have passed resolutions instructing all their papers to eliminate from their pages any favorable notice or advertisement with reference to the liquor traffic.

Several States have included in their course of studies for public schools systematic teaching against alcohol. Others are only waiting for proper literature for teachers in order to pass similar laws.

The department of agriculture and farming has ordered a clause in the contracts entered into with parties receiving lands from the State for agricultural purposes to the effect that such lands will never be devoted to the cultivation of plants which may be used for the manufacture of alcohol.

PANAMA

The number of retail liquor licenses in Panama was reduced from 680 to 100 by the 1919 regulatory law which raised the license fee from $150 to $1,800 per year.

PARAGUAY

Prohibition zones have been established in Paraguay as the first movement toward restricting the manufacture and sale of distilled spirits. The reform was initiated by American meat-packing companies, which have forbidden the sale of intoxicants on their premises, but found their employees importing liquor from the neighborhood.

PERU

An alcoholic monoply, incorporating the former monopoly of denatured alcohol was established in Peru April 23, 1923, whereby the distillation and sale of native alcohol of cane, grape, or other extraction is placed under Government supervision. Importation of alcohol is forbidden. Wines and beers may be made and sold or imported but are heavily taxed. Denatured alcohol, produced under special permits, is free from taxation.

A special surtax of 10 per cent ad valorem, effective January 1, 1922, was levied in Peru on champagne, absinthe, and various wines and liquors. Ordinary customs duties were also increased as follows: Whisky, bottled, from 0.70 to 3 soles; whisky, not in bottles, from 0.55 to 2 soles; wines, 50 per cent increase and champagne from 1 to 3 soles increase.

SALVADOR

To relieve the financial situation, the Government of Salvador placed a prohibition on the importation of beer, champagne, and sparkling wines, from January 1, 1921. These were permitted by a decree in effect May 17, 1921, which fixed a duty of $1 (gold) per kilo of champagne and sparkling wines and 10 cents (gold) per kilo on beer.

The free importation of machinery and materials for producing ether alcohol, with freedom from internal taxation for 10 years, is given by a law adopted this year. Sugar factories may manufacture ether alcohol on payment of tax of 0.05 colon per liter, providing a

fair basis for the competition of industrial alcohol with imported gasoline. Ether alcohol is free from export duty.

URUGUAY

The sale of distilled alcohol beverages is forbidden in public places or on trains in Uruguay by a law adopted in May, 1920. The importation and manufacture of beverages with a base of absinthe and the like are prohibited. One year from the date of the promulgation of the law the sale and storage of such beverages was absolutely prohibited. Importers and manufacturers of alcohol are only allowed to sell it to manufacturers of liquors or for industrial or medicinal purposes. Nonalcoholic beverages are admitted duty free until factories are established in Uraguay for making the same or similar beverages, when the customs taxes will be reestablished.

A bill was introduced into Congress in 1922 providing for a Government monopoly on the importation and sale of alcohol, allowing owners of alcohol factories one month to dispose of their product and allowing those owning alcohol 90 days to sell their holdings.

The income from the tax on alcohol and alcoholic drinks in the fiscal year 1922 was approximately 1,125,000 pesos.

The sale of any intoxicants is forbidden in all military posts and in the neighborhood of markets, parks, and harbors.

Drink shops are not allowed to open on Sunday.

By a decree of 1921, offenders against the liquor laws must pay their fines within 24 hours or go to prison. Lectures against alcoholism are given in the schools by visitors from the League Against Alcoholism.

JAPAN

Japan adopted its first prohibition law in 1922, when a measure prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors to persons under the age of 20, and forbidding the use of alcoholic beverages by all such minors, was adopted by the Japanese Parliament.

The use of industrial alcohol is being stimulated by an imperial decree of June 28, 1922, granting a refund of revenue taxes on alcohol used in the production of various articles of Japanese manufacture.

There are 235 prohibition organizations in Japan with a membership of 117,982.

PALESTINE

The commercial wine industry of Palestine has been built up in the last 35 years by Jewish colonists who propagated foreign vines, practically all of the vineyards being on the Plain of Sharon. Their principal market is Egypt and the Turkish Empire, although some wine for sacramental purposes is shipped to the United States. The industry has not assumed large proportions, the total shipments for 1921, the last year whose figures are obtainable, being 278,427, valued at $252,045.

FRENCH WEST AFRICA

The importation of all foreign alcohols has been forbidden by order of the Governor General of French West Africa. This puts into effect the French law which forbids such importation into all colonies

and protectorates of France, except India, Tunis, Morocco, and the Ivory Coast and Dahomey.

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Southern Rhodesia entered upon representative government on October, 1922, and a movement was almost immediately set on foot, led by several members of the Rhodesian Parliament, looking to the adoption of a local-option law.

THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

The union of South Africa is well organized for a local-option drive. Two years ago the local-option bills were defeated in Parliament by a slender majority of nine.

The Dutch Reform Church, which is the dominating religion in the Orange Free State and also the Transvaal, is officially committed to local option in the synods of both States.

The States of South Africa make their own laws in reference to the liquor traffic, but the States are more and more yielding their power to the central authority. Generally speaking, prohibition prevails as to selling liquor to the blacks.

This, however, is not true as to Cape Colony. The mixed bloods, called the colored race, form a class socially and legally by themselves. They have the vote and it is not illegal to sell liquor to this class of people.

BECHUANALAND

This is a British protectorate in South Africa about the size of the State of Texas. It is ruled by a king. A British resident gives advice but he does not interfere with the internal affairs of the kingdom.

Khama inaugurated a prohibition law more than 50 years ago and enforced it with an iron hand during his lifetime. He died 4 or 5 years ago. His son and successor carries out the same policy, so that the only part of the faculty under complete prohibition is the self-governing kingdom of Bechuanaland and a few minor reservations inhabited fully by blacks.

NEW ZEALAND

New Zealand's last poll on the liquor question was December 7, 1922, when the required half of the valid votes cast was not secured by any of the issues presented, the vote being for prohibition, 300,791; for continuance, 262,669; for State control, 35,727. The next poll will be taken in 1925. The amalgamation of the 10 most important of the 56 breweries in the Dominion, with the issue of £1,000,000 in debentures with 10 per cent interest guaranteed for three years, free of income tax, is regarded as a move to secure a large number of voters with a financial interest in breweries. Less than half of the debentures were taken by the public, however.

A corporate control plan is being advocated by the brewers, moderate league, hotel men, liquor merchants, and other former members of the New Zealand Licensing Reform Association. Put forward by three Anglican clergymen and one layman, it has not

received official recognition by any section of that church nor by a single nonconformist church or minister. It is generally regarded as a device to prevent prohibition or continuance being the sole issues on the ballot, thus dividing the prohibition vote. Formerly State control was on the ballot but received so few votes that it has been discontinued. Corporate control means that hotels, breweries, and wholesale liquor merchants would be taken over by a corporation which would issue shares to the present owners, amounts equal to the value of their present business. Nine directors, five nominated by the Government and four representing the liquor trade, shall direct the corporation. These directors are to be "practical and experienced men," insuring the continuance of control by liquor men. One-fifth of the shares are to be given the Government without payment. Dividends limited to 10 per cent on these shares are to be credited on their value until the total value is refunded and thereafter the Government will receive dividends in cash. If corporate control is carried at the poll, there can be no further vote for nine years, thus insuring the liquor traffic nine years' life and 10 per cent profit annually.

The dry forces in the Dominion are urging legislation limiting the ballot to two issues. This can not be enacted until 1924.

AUSTRALIA

The commonwealth drink bill for the year ending June 30, 1922, aggregated 28,804,875 pounds, according to the customs and excise official returns.

Prohibition is the declared objective of the dry organization in each State in the Commonwealth. The demand for a clear issue between prohibition and continuance is growing increasingly insistent. Reduction and State control are discredited issues. Parliamentary electorates are advocated as suitable and effective local option areas. The election of parliamentary representatives favorable to regularly recurring polls on a distinct issue and on a democratic basis is being urged. While defeated in their contest this year, the drys are confident on winning in each State, culminating in nation-wide prohibition within 10 years.

New South Wales faces a referendum on prohibition, but carrying a clause providing for the payment of compensation to the liquor interests.

In Victoria the poll on prohibition was scheduled for 1923 but has been continued until 1930. The 1920 poll canceled 107 licenses in 70 districts. Two districts went no-license.

The Queensland Parliament has canceled the state-wide poll and hereafter triennial local option polls will be taken on petition of 10 per cent of the electors, the issues being continuance, reduction, and local prohibition, the latter requiring a three-fifths majority to prevail.

In West Australia the licensing act provides for reduction of licenses and a State-wide poll on prohibition, but the qualifying provisions render progress very difficult.

The South Australia government is unfriendly to prohibition and no provision exists for popular vote on the question.

Tasmania has a local-option law but the issues are confined to continuance and reduction. Only municipal rate payers are entitled to vote. A 25 per cent vote of all enrolled voters is required.

EUROPEAN ANTIPROHIBITIONISTS ORGANIZED

Opposition to prohibition in Europe comes from those interested in the manufacture of intoxicants rather than from the people. It has entered the field of international relations. By boycott and economic threat, prohibition legislation has either been suspended or repealed in some nations. Even while their people are recipients of charity from dry America and while the nations themselves assert their inability to pay their debts to this country, the wine interests of Europe pledge large sums of money to wage what is characterized as a "merciless" campaign against prohibition in the United States

Iceland was the first nation to meet this warfare of the liquor interests. By popular vote this small nation adopted prohibition. Spain was her largest customer for fish—the principle article of export from Iceland. Wines were Spain's principal export to Iceland. Under threat of boycott of her fish trade if she refused, Iceland was compelled by Spain to suspend her prohibition laws in 1922.

Norway first suspended and later repealed her prohibition laws, which expressed the will of the great majority of her people, under threats of economic boycott by larger nations. By contract under treaty she was compelled to agree to admit 500,000 liters of Spanish wine, 450,000 liters of French wine, and 850,000 liters of Portuguese wine, in spite of her prohibition laws.

Czecholsovakia has been obliged to promise not to hinder importation of 2,000,000 liters of wine from Portugal, 4,000 liters from Spain, 5,000,000 liters from Italy, and 5,000,000 from France. By special treaty with France the Czechoslovakian import tax on wine and barrels has been reduced to secure trade opportunities.

Turkey's prohibitory law was repealed in 1923 under the hardly veiled threat of wine-producing nations.

The conference of wine-producing nations at Paris in June, 1923, unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

Considering the vital interest which the nations represented have in uniting for the defense of the viticultural interests and in coming to an agreement with a view of meeting prohibitionist campaigns; and

Considering that wine, when moderately used, is a healthful and useful drink, and in certain cases, necessary, and that it is scientifically proved that wine is the best agent with which to combat alcoholism;

It is recommended to the nations represented:

1. To bring together with the least possible delay the scattered documents in every nation of a nature to demonstrate the beneficial effects of wine;

2. To organize scientific experiments with a view of completing those, however numerous, which have been made up to this time;

3. To furnish to private organizations, national or international, the necessary documents to intensify their action in the prohibitionist countries or with prohibitionist tendencies; to give aid and all encouragement in their power to these organizations in unifying their propaganda and in supporting uniform and concerted action from diplomatic and consular representatives of interested nations;

4. The qualities of wine and its utility in rational feeding being proved, to unify the action that private national or international organizations may consider to meet prohibition campaigns;

5. To plan together with a view to reaching a compelling agreement on common diplomatic action, whenever there shall be occasion for it, and thus effective action toward the prohibitionist nations, assuring defense of legitimate viticultural interests;

6. To endeavor to spread the taste for wine—

(*a*) By organizing in the countries where it is not yet in common use, or exhibition for giving samples for tasting, with educative meetings;

(*b*) By seeking to obtain from importing nations a law and facilities which belong to them among products largely consumed.

This action of the wine producers last year is in harmony with the action of the International League Against Prohibition, organized at Paris in 1922, when a large fund, reaching many millions of francs, according to the Associated Press, was pledged for the campaign in the United States and other countries. Count DeMun, of France, was named as the head of this international organization, whose campaign plans would be secret, it was announced.

The international wine interests, centering in southern Europe, to-day constitute the most important, as well as the most dangerous, factor in the world's liquor traffic. During the last five years this growing menace has made alarming headway in its fight against the advance of prohibition, especially among the small countries of northern Europe.

It is this international wine traffic that succeeded in throttling prohibition in Iceland. It is the same interest that has defied the will of the people and has broken down the prohibition law of Norway. It was the threatening attitude of this same interest that succeeded in defeating by a small majority in the national plebiscite held in Sweden in 1922. It is this same interest that has blocked the progress of local option and prohibition sentiment in Denmark. Powerful forces back of this interest in Spain, France, Portugal, and Italy are now threatening the prohibition law of Finland, and have decreed that no advance temperance legislation shall be permitted in Austria.

The international wine traffic, with all its intricate relations to the agricultural, commercial, and international trade interests of the countries of southern Europe, stands as the greatest barrier to-day against the progress of temperance legislation in practically every country of Europe, and is rapidly gaining a foothold in some other countries.

TEMPERANCE EDUCATION OF YOUTH

The United States of America has led in requiring regular and systematic instruction of the children in the public schools in the facts concerning the nature and effects of alcoholic drinks. The first law in the world requiring such instruction was passed in Vermont in 1882. By 1902 every State in the United States and the Congress had passed laws making obligatory this instruction in the schools under their respective jurisdiction. The influence of the teaching in building public sentiment for sobriety has been generally recognized. This instruction continues to assist in helping the children and youth of the United States to understand the advantages of sobriety and the physical, mental, and consequently social and economic reasons which underlie the action of the nation in debarring alcoholic liquors. It is continued also to enable the millions of foreign-born children or children of recent immigrants, a large part of whom come from countries where there is little organized antialcohol movement, to understand the advantages to themselves and their life in America of sobriety in the use of alcoholic beverages. The instruction is required in the States where it is compulsory as a part of the regular course of instruction. Graded textbooks are available. Lectures are given in many schools at the invitation of educational officials by persons qualified to give up-to-date information. Many schools carry on essay contests, prizes for which are given by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. About 20 States have appointed by law a "temperance day" on which the schools shall give special attention to the alcohol question.

In England, the board of education issued a "temperance syllabus" in 1909 without advising any special emphasis upon the instruction other than that which would incidentally appear in instruction on healthful living. In 1920 a syllabus for lessons in the schools on

"The hygiene of food and drink" was issued with the recommendations that local school authorities should take the necessary steps to give the instruction an appropriate place in the curriculum, supplemented by occasional and incidental instruction.

While these official recommendations are relatively recent, for many years practically all the national temperance organizations have carried on educational work with youth through study course, examinations, and school lectures. The lecturers of the Band of Hope Union, for instance, have had open to them the doors of thousands of schools for lectures, not only in England, but in other parts of Great Britain and Ireland. The Temperance or Collegiate Institution, incorporated in 1904, under the active presidency of Sir G. Sims Woodhead, professor of physiology, Cambridge University, offers three-year study courses designed to fit students for active educational work. The National Temperance League has a physical lecturer now addressing students of colleges, universities, and the great boys' schools on the scientific facts concerning alcohol and the reasons for sobriety.

In British Dominions conditions vary. In most of the Canadian Provinces temperance instruction is definitely required. In Australia it is a part of the curriculum of several States. New Zealand's Minister of Education has issued a syllabus and requirements that make the subject a class subject which must be taught. In South Africa the official primary school is said to provide for temperance teaching; a teacher to give special instruction is being trained.

Ireland, in 1917, following several years of school lectures given by representatives of various national temperance organizations, issued a syllabus of temperance lessons which were made compulsory. The temperance organizations, combined to foster it, offered prizes in competitive examinations.

Education against alcoholism in the primary schools in France was put into operation by ministerial order in 1879. It is directed only against spirits and the immoderate use of fermented beverages, as is that of Belgium, where antialcohol instruction began voluntarily in 1889; it was made obligatory in 1898. In Belgium it is combined with a plan for school temperance societies.

Sweden was early interested in the United States plan. It began in 1886 officially to prepare material for such instruction, which, in 1892, was made obligatory in all primary and secondary schools and in training schools of primary teachers. Owing to lack of trained teachers and suitable textbooks, little was done for nearly a decade, when the Swedish temperance societies took hold of the problem and the Central Federation for Antialcohol Instruction was organized. Specialists were enlisted as instructors. In the next 20 years the federation conducted over 100 general courses covering a week each with attendance ranging from 300 to 1,500 teachers each year who were given leave of absence for this purpose. In addition, 11 special courses of 6 weeks each and 9 courses of 9 weeks each were given between 1908 and 1919, the expenses being paid by the Government not only of conducting the courses but of the teachers attending them. Teaching material was compiled, a special journal established, also a permanent exhibit and central library. In 1919, under a plan adopted by the Parliament, the Government itself made detailed provision for the training of teachers to give

antialcohol instruction. The Central Federation, which received a Government appropriation, continues training for voluntary temperance teaching, under the approval of the General Government educational direction.

In Norway, as in many other countries, well-organized instruction of youth is done by the temperance organizations.

In Finland there has long been much antialcohol instruction in the schools. The Teachers' Temperance League arranges each year a course for teachers and holds contests in the schools. Over 15,000 pupils took part in 1922.

In the Baltic States, Latvia, in 1923, has made hygiene with special emphasis on temperance instruction compulsory in all public and private primary and secondary schools and in trade schools. In Esthonia, in 1922, chiefly on two special temperance days, 2,920 lessons were given 75,734 children in 865 schools. At the present time, translations of temperance material used in the United States on the physical effects of alcohol are being placed, with the permission of the Governments in all common schools of Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Czechoslovakia, with the assistance of university and normal school professors, has long had antialcohol instruction in some of its schools. It is said to have had very considerable results in Moravia, Bohemia, and Silesia. The national convention of teachers in 1920 unanimously adopted a resolution calling upon all members of their profession to give up the use of alcohol in every form.

The minister of public instruction in Poland recently addressed a circular to local school boards calling attention to complaints on the use of alcoholic drinks by children. He recommended school boards to take immediate action against alcoholism, to urge masters of primary and secondary schools to inculcate principles of abstinence among young people, to support societies for youth which stand for abstinence, to have special lessons given children from time to time on the evils of alcohol, to warn parents of the dangers of alcoholism. He also advised lessons on the evils of alcohol. He also advised lessons in normal schools to prepare teachers for giving antialcohol instruction.

In Germany and Austria temperance instruction is not compulsory, but much voluntary work is done by teachers and special lecturers, by literature and exhibitions. In Germany in 1920 the teachers' union founded a German center for temperance instruction of regular and special teachers. In some cases, local temperance organizations pay the expenses of the teacher who will take this special training. In one of the German cities at the present time, the head of the normal training school is developing, as he can make opportunity for it in his courses, instructions of future teachers in the facts and methods of temperance instruction. From the same city a teacher has been sent to the special school, and on completion of her course there will be given opportunity to give temperance instruction in the public schools of her home city at public expense.

In Yugoslavia the Government cooperated with private initiative in behalf of temperance education as long ago as 1906 when the ministry of education asked directors of all public schools to give an hour's instruction on the dangers in alcoholic beverages. This was followed later by official approval of school temperance societies, subsidies

for purchasing antialcohol literature and journals for school use; physicians were asked to give occasional temperance lessons in connection with those on hygiene. In 1920 the ministry of education designated an antialcohol day for temperance instruction in all schools.

Before the war practically all the leading countries of Europe were developing through the temperance organizations either instruction of children in distinctively juvenile temperance societies, some of which, as in Belgium, were officially knit up with the school system, or where, owing to the laws of the country, associations could not be found, courses or talks or lectures which were reaching many thousands of young people. The war badly disorganized the temperance work in middle Europe, but it is being gradually resumed.

In the Asiatic countries there is much temperance instruction going on through agencies furnished by international temperance organizations and by the missionaries in the mission schools. In India, where the major problem is that of habit-forming drugs, the government of some Provinces requires lessons on their effects. Translations for use in schools and colleges have been made of temperance books and pamphlets from other countries. In Ceylon textbooks on alcohol have been placed in both upper and lower grades. The annual report of the superintendent of scientific temperance instruction of the World's W. C. T. U. for 1922 states that the educational department in Ceylon offers a bonus to any teacher who gives this instruction, which is not yet compulsory. In Burma the educational department gives a grant toward the traveling expenses of the W. C. T. U. secretary for temperance work in the schools, railways furnishing transportation. The same organization has had representatives at work in the schools of China for four years, to whom the doors of Chinese schools have been opened. In Japan, also, much instruction goes on through the agencies of the temperance organizations, though it is not a formal part of the school system.

In South America the Argentine and Uruguay educational officials are cooperating in furnishing literature for school temperance instruction and with school lecture work done by the World W. C. T. U. representative. Chile has an educational federation in which government departments are represented by their heads, together with members of educational and distinctively temperance organizations. The Chilean Federation of Labor, representing 300,000 members, in 1920 adopted unanimously a resolution ordering its executive committee to initiate a campaign of education against alcohol, one feature of which should be antialcohol teaching in all schools and colleges. Peru by a law of 1916 requires that the curriculum for primary and elementary schools shall provide for antialcohol instruction. The temperance societies cooperate in providing suitable teaching material. In Venezuela an act of 1910 requires antialcohol teaching in all schools and colleges.

The long period of disorder in Mexico has hindered the development of plans for temperance instruction recommended by educators 15 years ago but there is much sympathy for it and purpose for its establishment as soon as conditions permit. The minister of education has placed copies of temperance books in the hands of a thousand school-teachers.

Omission of countries from the foregoing statement does not mean that they have no temperance instruction. Much voluntary work is being done by teachers in Switzerland, Holland, Luxemburg, and other countries. Everywhere experience shows that effectiveness of the instruction depends on the attitude of supervising school officials and teachers, and especially on intelligent support by educational authorities in giving the instruction definite time and place in the curriculum and in providing adequate teaching material and training of teachers.

The principle of temperance education is established. There is every indication that within the next decade its practice will become a recognized part of the school systems of many nations.

SUBSTITUTE FOR INTOXICANTS

Lack of a social substitute for the custom of treating to alcoholic drinks has been a difficulty in the way of prohibition legislation in many countries. The American soda fountain or soft-drink bar is meeting this problem, and, at the same time, furnishing a business opportunity of sufficient importance to attract the attention of the Department of Commerce. In this, as in so many other fields, restriction of the liquor traffic is involved with economic problems as well as deeply rooted social usages.

During the year, 1922, there were approximately 3,000 soda fountains installed in the United Kindgom, of which over half were of American manufacture. By far the largest percentage of crushed fruits and sirups sold to the British ice cream and fountain trade is of American make. Although the soda fountain first invaded Great Britain 12 years ago, it was not until 1921 that it became a popular resort. Chain confectionery and tea shops then began installing fountains. From London the demand spread to outlying districts and near-by towns until the trade in fountains and ice cream machinery began to be a considerable factor in business. Sales of crushed fruits, juices, and sirups to the fountain owners amounted to about 6,000 pounds in 1921. In 1922 this had mounted to over 16,000 pounds. The sales of the present year are expected to total not less than 40,000 pounds.

Not only the southern half of England but the midlands, notably Birmingham and Manchester, and as far north as New Castle, Glasgow, and Edinburgh, are installing fountains to meet the new trade.

The soft-drink trade is compelled to meet the liquor traffic on nearly equal terms in the United Kingdom. It is affected by restrictions as to early closing hours and the sale of sweets and confectionery after certain hours. In this respect, American soda fountains recall the early restrictions on coffee in Europe, where Germany forbade its sale except by licensed dealers in drugs and in England the King threatened to close coffee shops as possible haunts of evildoers.

Reduction of the high price of ice and materials for soda and ice cream will doubtless increase the number of those who are substituting these harmless products for alcoholic beverages. The average price of a dish of ice cream in the United Kingdom is 9 pence or nominally 18 cents. Sundaes range from 1 shilling 6 pence to 1 shilling 9 pence, or from 36 to 42 cents. The consumption of ice cream has increased 1,000 per cent in the past two years.

Objection to extremely cold drinks has made the introduction of the soda fountain into the continental cities slow. In Italy soft drinks of sirup and water are generally used. Throughout the Continent the use of soda water is generally confined to the bottle variety. In some countries, notably in Spain, social customs prevent women patronizing soda fountains.

The United States Department of Commerce will, on January 1, 1924, begin the listing of exports of soda fountains in its reports on foreign commerce.

INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL

The new uses for industrial alcohol, the improvement in means of transportation of fresh and better methods of preserving or otherwise utilizing fruit have altered the economic aspect of the liquor problem. It no longer appears that the prosperity of any considerable section of those nations is dependent upon the alcoholizing of the people.

Experiments in Italy and Switzerland have developed methods for the production of satisfactory dried fruits, unfermented concentrated grape juice, sterilized fruit beverages, etc. A dozen or more such products of high nutritive value have been produced in Italian laboratories.

In France, a Syndicat des Sans Alcohol was formed in June, 1923, following the French apple and grape congress. This syndicate has requested the minister of agriculture to study methods of encouraging the manufacture of concentrated grape juice in order to utilize most successfully the fresh juice with this three-fold result, conservation of vintage in a product made directly from the grape, reducing the purchase of sugar abroad to the advantage of French capital, and solving the wine-production crisis by utilizing the excess production.

A similar movement in Switzerland resulted in a meeting September, 1923, of delegates from the Swiss Agricultural Society and of the Rural Secretariat with others interested in methods of sterilizing grape juice. The National Swiss Farmer Society in its journals earnestly urged its sections this autumn to organize courses on rational utilization of fruits without fermentation.

In Italy, Prof. Eudo Monti, of Turin, has demonstrated the practicability of converting grape juice to thick sirup, making it easy to transport, capable of long preservation, and ready for many uses in eating, drinking, dissolving food and drugs, and for preparing wholesome bread from rough brans hitherto believed unfit for human food. The Milan municipal council recently passed a resolution urging the protection of new industries to utilize the product of the vine to better advantage for food and to meet the economic needs of the community. The municipality of Genoa has also taken up the question of grape utilization.

Other crops than the grape crop are involved in this movement to free cultivators from the liquor manufacturer, hitherto their only or most important purchaser. Distillation of potatoes has been the source of much of the spirits in Germany and some of the nations formed since the war. While the scarcity of food since the war has opened other markets for some of these nations, difficulties of transportation have prevented the farmer profiting from the sale of bulky

products, such as potatoes, sold at any considerable distance. The distilleries offered a near and profitable market.

The manufacturer of potato flour, potato sirup, and dried potatoes to be used in making an auxiliary substitute for flour is being urged as a solution of this problem of agriculture, as well as of temperance.

The amount of alcohol distilled from potatoes in Germany in 1912, the last year for which statistics are available, was 66,000,000 United States gallons. Germany's industrial expansion was closely related to her development of the industrial alcohol which was made free of tax in 1879, stimulating this use by government subsidies.

The manufacture of alcohol for industrial purposes is also being stimulated in many nations which see in this diversion of ethyl alcohol from beverage to industrial uses larger possible economic gains. Turkey has cut its import tax on alcohol to one-third the former rate because the high duty has halted the importation of industrial alcohol. Egypt has reduced its taxation of industrial alcohol by one-third. Japan by an imperial decree of June 28, 1922, grants a refund of revenue taxes on alcohol used in producing certain articles of Japanese manufacture.

This diversion of alcohol from beverage to business use has perhaps been more marked in Latin America than elsewhere. In the Argentine Republic the economic pressure which has delayed prohibition legislation is being somewhat relieved by new channels for the use of alcohol. In Buenos Aires alcohol produced as a by-product of the sugar industry is used to light the street lamps. In Brazil the development of alcohol as a motor fuel in place of gasoline is being pushed. Cuba has taxis operated by alcohol so successfully that their drivers have petitioned for a reduction of the fares since they can operate cheaper than gasoline driven autos.

Guatemala has exempted from taxation industrial alcohol used in the production of heat, light, and power or in producing varnish, ether, and medicinal extracts.

Salvador grants free importation of machinery and materials for producing ether alcohol, with freedom from taxation for 10 years. Ether alcohol is free of export duty and is subject to a low internal tax to enable it to compete with gasoline.

In Peru denatured alcohol, which may be produced only under special permits, the Government having a monopoly by law, is free from taxation.

These nations are following some of the steps in the United States before the adoption of prohibition. The problem of an outlet for their vineyard, orchard, or cane plantation products, however, is more serious than it was with us. In 1906 Congress passed the first act permitting the withdrawal of alcohol free from tax from distillery bonded warehouses, provided it was denatured for industrial use. The first year showed a denaturization of about 1,000,000 gallons which largely went into varnishes, shellacs, felt-hat manufacture, and for domestic fuel uses. From this developed the transfer of large quantities from beverage to industrial use until chemical industry to-day without alcohol would be impossible. Similar development of industries using alcohol is being planned in Latin America.

EUROPE'S ENFORCEMENT PROBLEM

Even as in America there were gross and open violations of the law intended either to control or to tax the liquor trade, so there are to-day throughout Europe illicit distilling, unlicensed sales of liquor, smuggling which involves international relationships and is considered sufficiently serious to be the subject of joint agreements between governments, and the sale of poison liquor falsely labeled.

The liquor-smuggling problem has been made the subject of conference between Norway, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany by invitation of Norway. The prohibition of exports of pure alcohol and spirits from all harbors, including free ports, by small vessels without special permit, and the requirement of the return within a fixed time of certificates showing that the consignee received alcohol or spirits, were approved by resolutions passed at this conference. It was agreed also that customs officials should exchange information to aid in curbing smuggling.

Additional regulations have been suggested but not adopted extending the territorial limits to 12 miles, giving permission to pursue smugglers found within that limit and to arrest them if they pass into international waters. The customs authorities of nations into whose waters smuggling vessels escape would be asked to arrest and punish the smuggler as though the offense had been directed toward their own country. An international alcohol convention has been suggested as the best way of dealing with this problem.

Norway has had prohibition of beverages exceeding 21 per cent alcohol, by volume, since 1916. The stronger wines were also prohibited after 1917, but this was abolished in 1923. In spite of the fact that liquors with a high alcoholic content are admitted, smuggling has been general. The confiscations of corn brandy and spirits by the customs service, ignoring the additional seizures by the police, have arisen from 121 liters in 1918 to 16,989 liters in 1921 and 92,591 liters in 1922. In the first quarter of 1923 these seizures totaled 51,741 liters.

Suggesting that professional smugglers deprive national exchequers of their dues and should be treated as outlaws on land and sea, just as are pirates and slavers, a group from Norway urges a special customs police made up of total abstainers, not to be bound by restricted district frontiers (corresponding to our State lines), who should have the facilities of speedy vessels with wireless, good automobiles, and the right to summon the aid of soldiers, warships, and airplanes.

As penalties to be imposed, the following have been proposed in Norway: Confiscation of the smuggled commodity and the means of transport unless the owner proves that he was not responsible, seizure of moneys in possession of the smuggler, which are to be considered as acquired from sale of smuggled goods, and seizure of weapons and ammunition of the smugglers. Occasional smugglers are to be fined at least five times the sum of which they have defrauded the customs, while professional smugglers are to have increased fines based on their probable profit from liquor-running. Prison sentences at hard labor are to be imposed. Foreign smugglers are to be deported on expiration of their term of sentence and native professional

smugglers placed under police supervision or forced to remain at certain places.

Esthonia forbids the transshipment of beer over 25 per cent alcoholic content in her territory, and does not allow ships with liquor cargoes to enter her waters unless they are passenger ships making regular trips or vessels which have met with accident at sea.

In France millions of liters of wine are sold untaxed because of the number of home stills, which numbered 1,728,000 in 1920. Home distillation was tax free until 1916, when the limit of 10 liters was placed upon the amount thus permitted. Strong drinks similar to absinthe are sold in violation of the law prohibiting absinthe.

The permitted sale of 2 per cent beer in Finland does not prevent violation of the law by illicit sale of smuggling of stronger drinks.

The Bratt system, with its high prices set for liquor, has developed home distilling, smuggling, and bootlegging in Sweden. In 1922 over 2,000 smugglers were arrested as compared with 105 in 1919. Alcohol seized in Stockholm since 1919 reached the following totals: 1919, 960 liters; 1920, 4,994 liters; 1921, 43,760 liters; 1922, 119,638 liters.

PROHIBITION IN THE UNITED STATES—GENERAL RESULTS

By Andrew J. Volstead

America is trying on a big scale a radical method of dealing with the traffic in intoxicating liquor, that of prohibiting the use of such liquor as beverage. Millions of our people are in dead earnest, determined to give the policy a fair trial.

The policy was not the product of hysterical or fanatical impulse. It was not adopted suddenly, without consideration, but deliberately and as the result of careful and repeated trials. Failure to eliminate by regulations the evil growing out of the traffic induced communities to ask for and obtain laws allowing them, when a majority of the voters should so elect, to forbid the sale of liquor altogether.

Under these so-called local option laws, many localities forbade the sale, and thus an opportunity was had to test the merits of the two methods—regulation or prohibition. Though the liquor interests and their allies did everything possible to discredit and defeat these laws, the dry places grew in number and influence; and as enforcement became more and more effective, the advantages of the policy became evident. This practical demonstration of its value induced people to demand and secure an opportunity to determine by their ballots whether liquor should be sold in their States; and gradually State after State prohibited liquor until, when national prohibition went into effect in 1920, 33 of the 48 States were in the prohibition column, and more than 60 per cent of the people lived in that territory where liquor could not be legally sold.

National prohibition was a stunning blow to many people in so-called wet territory. These people, living mostly along the Atlantic border, had looked with mingled pity and contempt upon the agitation for prohibition as the aberration of irresponsible fanatics. They could not believe that the National Government would enforce in their communities laws such as had been enacted in the prohibition States. Disappointed in that, they try to defeat the law by creating the impression that it is not and can not be enforced. They make this claim, though there is hardly a place in the United States where people can purchase any liquor that they have any assurance is fit to drink or obtain any without paying for it a price so high as to be practically prohibitive. The record of the National Prohibition Commissioner shows that less than 1 per cent of the liquor sold is pure or safe to drink. To argue, as some do, that because it is possible in certain places to get this impure or poisonous liquor, that only a few dare to drink or are willing or able to pay for, therefore prohibition is a failure, is ridiculous. While it is true that the law is violated, so are all laws. So beneficial and successful has been the policy, however, that even the strongest opponents of the law concede that the saloon was a curse and that it and the sale of whisky and other spirituous liquors can not be defended. They do not dare to openly ask for the return of either.

It takes time to overcome such opposition, but great progress has been made in enforcement. On July 1, 1918, there were 1,092 breweries and 236 distilleries which manufactured and sold intoxi-

cants in wholesale quantities. Approximately 180,000 saloons sold liquor publicly over their bars by the drink or for consumption in the homes. Now these breweries and distilleries are closed. The open transportation of liquor by drayloads and carloads that was in evidence almost every hour of any day in the large wet cities has disappeared, and whatever transportation is still carried on is done by criminals who convey the liquor in their pockets or satchels, or in automobiles along alleys under cover of night. The business is an outlaw; it hides in attics and cellars and operates under all sorts of disguises.

Beer, which, according to the report of the brewers—who, by the way, owned most of the saloons—was more than 90 per cent of the liquor business, has practically disappeared. The so-called home-brew has greatly diminished and is destined to practically disappear, as it has in every prohibition State. As a rule, the product is so vile and the trouble and danger of making it so great that few persist in the business. Alcoholic beer and home-brew are not much of a problem.

A few facts as to what the law has done in our two largest cities, New York, with about 6,500,000 people, and Chicago, with about 3,000,000, will throw some light on the question.

In New York City admissions to the alcoholic ward of Bellevue Hospital in 1917 numbered 8,210, while in 1921 the number was 2,318. Deaths from alcoholism in this hospital averaged in the last nine wet years 237 each year. In 1920 there were 10 deaths from the cause, and in 1921 only 8.

Judge W. N. Gemmill, of the municipal court of Chicago, said recently that since prohibition two police courts in that city, where from 200 to 300 cases were tried each day, have been abolished for lack of business, and that in the 20 years preceding 1918 the record of the city prison showed that 45,000 persons were sent there for alcoholism; that for many years a special ward was maintained in that institution for persons afflicted with delirium tremens, where from 50 to 100 patients were kept most of the time strapped to steel beds in order that they might not injure themselves or anyone else. This ward is now closed, and last year there was not a single case of delirium tremens there or in the city hospital.

Such a showing in cities where there must have been hundreds of thousands of persons so addicted to the use of liquor that they were almost ready to go through fire to get something to drink shows clearly that prohibition does prohibit. What is true of these cities is more emphatically true of the country generally. Aside from certain limited localities, the law is enforced the same as any other law.

The effect that prohibition has had on institutions for the care of inebriates is illuminating. More than 240 of these have been in operation, treating hundreds of thousands of patients. The Neal Institutes numbered at one time 68, located in different cities. Doctor Neal, one of the brothers operating these institutes, is authority for the statement that in the last 12 years before prohibition they treated 125,000 patients, but that after two years of prohibition they are all closed.

There used to be 50 Keeley institutes, some of them very large; one by one they have disappeared until they have all been reported out of business. If any still are in operation they are very small.

Dr. Horatio M. Pollock, statistician of the State Hospital Commission of New York, said recently, "There are now no institutions in this country solely for inebriates. There used to be six State institutions of that kind, but prohibition has closed them all."

The disappearance of these hospitals suggests that alcoholic insanity, or alcoholic psychosis, as it is called, is not as prevalent as formerly. Dr. Horatio M. Pollock, just mentioned, has made a study of the question. His report, which reviews available data in different States, shows that among first admissions to State institutions since prohibition the number of such patients has been greatly reduced. The official reports of deaths from alcoholism made to the National Bureau of Vital Statistics shows that coincident with the advent of prohibition there was a remarkable decline in the rate of such deaths. From 1910 to 1917 the deaths from alcoholism averaged 5.1 per 100,000 people, while during the years of 1918 to 1921 the ratio was 1.7 and for the years of 1920 and 1921 the rate was 1.4. For each year the rate was as follows:

1910	5.4	1916	5.8
1911	4.9	1917	5.2
1912	5.3	1918	2.7
1913	5.9	1919	1.6
1914	4.9	1920	1.0
1915	4.4	1921	1.8

The reason why the years of 1918 and 1919 are included in the period affected by prohibition is that during both years the sale of liquor was greatly restricted both by State and National laws. During the last half of 1919 the war prohibition act was in force.

The reports from charitable organizations show that prohibition has done wonders in helping dependent people. These reports have come from all sorts of organizations and all sections of the country. A report from 21 cities, including cities like New York, Chicago, Boston, St. Louis, and Washington, D. C., shows that the people coming to these organizations for relief because of drink are now much less in number than formerly. As compared with the year 1917, they were 74 per cent less in these cities in 1922. Here are the figures:

Organizations	Per cent decrease
St. Louis, Mo., Provident Association	84.3
Chicago, Ill., United Charities	69.9
Boston, Mass., Family Welfare Society	72.6
Pawtucket, R. I., Associated Charities	82.4
Atlantic City, N. J., Welfare Bureau	81.4
Newport, R. I., Charity Organization Society	46.7
Portland, Me., Associated Charities	97.4
Cleveland, Ohio., Associated Charities	67.3
La Crosse, Wis., Social Service Society	88.3
New York City, Charity Organization Society	68.8
Hartford, Conn., Charity Organization Society	92.0
Washington, D. C., Associated Charities	71.7
Rochester, N. Y., Social Welfare League	88.2
Providence, R. I., Society for Organizing Charity	100.0
Newburyport, Mass., Community Welfare Service	84.5
Plainfield, N. J., Charity Organization Society	72.2
Unnamed city, Wisconsin, Family Union Society	77.7
Lexington, Ky., Associated Charities	79.5
Fitchburg, Mass., Family Welfare Association	99.5
Haverhill, Mass., Associated Charities	39.0
Portland, Oreg., Public Welfare Bureau	60.3

Commander Evangeline Booth, of the Salvation Army, is authority for this statement:

> Many jails have been converted into dwelling apartments; prisons turned into schools and social centers, health has been improved, mortality reduced, with increase of the privileges and opportunities of life for boys and girls of the poorer classes.

This statement, coming as it does from the recent head of the Salvation Army, the organization that deals directly with the poor and unfortunate, needs no corroboration.

The mortality rate in the United States during the first three years of prohibition—that is, from July 1, 1919, to July 1, 1922,—shows a substantial decline. If the rate prevailing prior to these years had continued, there would have been 500,000 more deaths than did occur. That prohibition had a large share in saving these lives can not be doubted. That a person addicted to the use of intoxicating liquor has less power to resist disease than one who abstains from its use is not only established by medical testimony but by years of experience in the life-insurance business. No insurance company in my country cares to write as a risk a person addicted to the use of intoxicating liquor. Dr. W. F. Deacon, head of the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the State of Michigan, says that prohibition is to be credited with reducing the death rate from tuberculosis from 93.1 per 100,000 persons in 1917 to 71.6 in 1921. There is available a large amount of data from different sources showing a reduced death rate since prohibition from diseases usually associated with the excessive use of liquor. But time and study will be necessary to determine definitely the extent of that effect.

Though in America, as elsewhere, the World War has naturally lessened the restraints of law and order, crime, instead of increasing, has decreased. Wherever prohibition has been tried in the States it has greatly diminished crime. It is too well known to need proof that a person while drunk will commit crime that he could not be induced to commit while sober. The number of arrests for drunkenness prior to and since prohibition is not comparable because now a plain drunk goes to jail in most places, while before prohibition a person was seldom arrested for drunkenness unless he was disorderly or in such a condition that he needed personal care. Still, arrests for drunkenness are much less numerous than before prohibition.

Judge William N. Gemmill has made a study of the effect of prohibition on crime. He recently made this statement:

> Not only has the prison population in the United States been greatly reduced since the enactment of the eighteenth amendment, but crime, serious and otherwise, has been reduced in a most remarkable degree. I have before me the record of 63 cities of the United States touching crime, brought down to January 1. In all of these cities save five there has been a remarkable reduction in the number of arrests for serious crimes. What is true in reference to crime is true in reference to drunkenness. Twenty per cent of the jails of the United States have been without prisoners since prohibition went into effect. I have collected the prison statistics for the last seven years in several of the leading States, and everywhere the number of prisoners has been decreased since prohibition. I have not found a single State or a single prison where there was not a marked decrease in the prison population in 1919 and 1920. In most of the States there was an increase in 1921 over 1920, but with that increase the prison population is still from 20 to 25 per cent less than it was before the war.

From the last year before the prohibition act went into effect to the first year following its enactment, the population of the city prison of Chicago decreased over 50 per cent.

Many of the changes effected by prohibition are from their nature such that they do not appear prominently in official reports. Many do not appear there at all. To illustrate: With the advent of prohibition the slum districts in large cities gradually disappeared. Streets known before prohibition as chiefly occupied by saloons and infested with filthy, ragged derelicts of society can hardly be recognized now. The saloon buildings have found other uses, and the blear-eyed and sodden victims of the traffic have apparently, like the Arab, folded their tents and disappeared. They have not gone, however, they are still there; but you would not know them now. They have lost the brand of the derelict. They are men. I have visited a number of these places just to see what has happened. On my journey to this Congress I stopped some days in New York City. While there, I wandered about the streets. I saw the old slum districts where in years past I could have found dozens of drunks, but I did not see a single drunk. I have talked with people from all sections of our country and they all tell me the same story. The transformation that has taken place in the slum districts of New York, Chicago, and other cities has been described in the local newspapers, but I know of no official record showing these changes.

The beneficial effect that prohibition has had on the country's business can not easily be overestimated. The Real Estate Board and Business Guide, a New York journal, published last November an article by Wm. D. Kilpatrick, one of the most prominent real estate men of that city, which states that effect in emphatic language, I clip from it the following:

The obvious is frequently overlooked, and certainly nothing could be more obvious than the fact that if the sale of liquor was stopped, a good portion of the $700,000,000 spent annually in New York for liquor refreshments would find its way into other and more useful channels. The benefits of prohibition to realty have been enormous. In the increased rents of retail stores in every part of the city it is worth untold millions to property owners. The money which formerly found its way into the saloon cash register is now devoted to buying of wearing apparel, shoes, hats, furniture, food and other necessaries, as well as luxuries. Realty men should be the foremost in the field to uphold the eighteenth amendment from purely selfish motives, and they will be supported by the great body of our people as it begins to be realized more, and that the staggeringly big sums uselessly and harmfully handed over to the saloon keepers to enrich a chosen few are now distributed among the people at large, so millions benefit not only financially but in every good and useful manner.

An abundance of like testimony is available from leading men in all walks of life. The Manufacturers' Record, one of our leading business journals, to get the judgment of the country as to the effect of the law, sent out a letter asking the views of some 1,500 manufacturers, merchants, railway presidents, labor leaders, lawyers, doctors, and others in business of official life. It appears from the answers that 85½ per cent were in favor of strict enforcement of the present law; that a few favored some modification of the law, but only 1½ per cent were opposed to prohibition. These men point out that as a result of prohibition there has been a surprisingly large increase in savings deposits, in life insurance, and in the building and purchase of homes; that rents and debts are more promptly paid; that labor is more efficient; that accidents in factories have greatly

decreased; that drunken men on the streets are rare; that destitution in the cities has greatly diminished; that the death rate is less; that diseases incident to the use of alcoholic drinks are not as frequent and are less fatal. They lay especial stress on the fact that the laboring men and their families are saving money, buying homes and enjoying life as they never did before. The testimony of these men is worth volumes of statistics. They are in actual contact with the conditions affected by the law, and as such in position to know what has taken place is the result of prohibition.

On my recent visit to New York I clipped from a current number of the New York Times, one of the leading newspapers of America and one that is decidedly hostile to prohibition, the following editorial statement:

> No one familiar with the new social life of the people in the industrial plants will dispute Judge Gary when he authorized the statement that the families of the workingmen in the steel mills would vote with practical unanimity in favor of total prohibition although some of the husbands might, perhaps, be in favor of the sale of beer and light wines.

Judge Gary is the head of the United States Steel Corporation, the largest industrial corporation of America, if not of the world. He says in this interview what social workers have said everywhere, that the families of the workingmen are better clothed and better treated since prohibition.

That Judge Gary is not far afield in his estimate of the value placed on prohibition by the industrial workers may be inferred from the vote cast in the two great industrial States of Ohio and Michigan on a proposition to return to the sale of beer and light wines. It was overwhelmingly defeated. Those are the only States that proposition has been directly voted on in recent years.

Collier's Magazine, one of our most popular magazines, not long ago employed Mr. Jack O'Donnell to make a careful survey of what sentiment he could find in favor of the repeal or modification of the present law. After traveling extensively through the country he furnished in February of this year this bit of information:

> I am a wet. I always shall be. I was loath to admit it even to myself, but there is an abundance of evidence that a great "dry wave" is rolling eastward, slowly but surely grinding down opposition to prohibition, and riding the crest of that wave are the clean substantial citizens of the Nation, the John Smiths and Tom Browns, and always their wives and sisters and mothers are riding at their sides. Some day we wets are going to find that an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States are weary of bootleggers and dry-law violators. Some day, and that day is not far distant, these people are going to rid the country of the bootleggers and rum runners, just as the vigilantes of the fifties rid the California mining camps of undesirable gamblers, gunmen, and prostitutes.

Let me also quote the views of our lamented and much beloved President Warren G. Harding. He said:

> In every community men and women have had an opportunity to know what prohibition means. They know that debts are more promptly paid, that men take home the wages which once were wasted in the saloons, that families are better clothed and fed, and more money finds its way into the savings banks. The liquor traffic was destructive of much that was most precious in American life. In the face of so much evidence on that point, what conscientious man would let his own selfish desires influence him to vote to bring it back? In another generation I believe that liquor will have disappeared not only from our politics but from our memories.

There appears to be an idea among some of the opponents of prohibition that one favoring such a policy must be a fierce fire-eating person. While the miseries caused by the liquor traffic may well incite denunciation of it, we in America have in the main relied on reason and not passion as a means of winning the victory. We have not striven so much to inflame as to convince. While we have pointed to the miseries caused by the traiffic we have held up to the public the great practical advantages of saving the enormous sums uselessly and harmfully wasted on liquor. If our country spent as much for liquor in proportion to population as some countries do, we would spend between four and five billion dollars annually. Think of what the saving of that stupendous sum means when used for the necessaries, conveniences, and luxuries of life.

THE RESULTS OF PROHIBITION IN A SINGLE STATE (MASSACHUSETTS)—SUMMARY

By Cora Frances Stoddard

In studying the results of prohibition there is an advantage in making observations in a single State, especially when, as in the case of one selected for this study—Massachusetts—public records have been kept for many years and for the most part on a uniform basis. Owing to the variety in State laws in the United States and different bases for administering them, it is not possible always to compare one State with another in compiling the results of a social welfare undertaking like that of prohibition, but in a single State, comparison of data covering a considerable period does throw some light on changes occurring in the train of a change of public policy such as that of prohibition.

In population, Massachusetts stands sixth among the States of the United States. All but 202,108 of its people (94.8 per cent) live in towns and cities of more than 2,500 population and are chiefly engaged in commerce and manufacturing. By means of "local option" voting, the saloon had been barred from a considerable part of the State, and when national probibition came into effect July 1, 1919, there were 19 cities and only 91 towns which had saloons; in 19 cities and 225 towns the sale of liquor had been barred.

This report includes statistics of the city of Boston, which is the largest city in the six New England States, the capital of Massachusetts. Its population in 1920 was 748,060, but with many contiguous large towns and cities it is at the center of about one and one-half million people. Of its own population 31.9 per cent in 1920 was foreign born; 31.8 per cent more was native born but with both parents foreign-born or, at the most, but one generation removed from the ideas and customs of other lands. Of the white population 21 years of age and over, 47.2 per cent in 1920 was foreign born.

Massachusetts, up to the time of preparing this paper, has had no State law for cooperating with the Federal Government in enforcement of national prohibition. Hence, the results which appear are present despite ineffective enforcement conditions.

The accompanying tables summarize statistics, all derived from public records and covering a period of 11 consecutive years, 1912–1922. They, therefore, include five years before the United States entered the World War, the two war years, 1917 and 1918, and three and one half years of national prohibition beginning July 1, 1919. The detailed tables from which the accompanying averages are taken may be found in full in the report, "Wet and dry years in a decade of Massachusetts public records," and a supplementary report, "Prohibition in Massachusetts in 1922."

In nearly all cases the most conspicuous effects of the abolition of the liquor traffic appeared in 1920 before the illegal traffic had become organized. The facts, show however, that notwithstanding some

increase in arrests for drunkenness and in other conditions where drink is involved, the statistics for 1922, the latest available of the time of writing this paper, show improvement over those of the average for the "wet" years as indicated in the tables.

TABLE I.—*Statistics of Boston, Mass.*

[NOTE.—The percentage given in the last column showing increase or decrease compares the average of the "dry" years with the average of the "wet" years. The figures are given for 1922 in order that this latest year of prohibition may be compared with the average wet year]

	Boston, total, 1922	Average wet years, 1912–1918	Average prohibition years, 1920–1922	Decrease (per cent)
Arrests, drunkenness	37,643	59,308	30,143	49
Arrests, offenses versus person	3,684	4,068	3,500	13
Arrests, offenses versus property	4,155	5,144	4,512	12
Arrests, offenses versus chastity:				
Men under 20 years	17	62	38	39
Men 20–30 years of age	450	484	446	7.9
Men 30–50 years of age	458	430	439	[1] 2
Women under 20 years of age	43	50	44	12
Women 20–30 years of age	378	520	363	30
Women 30–50 years of age	348	403	252	37
Women, nightwalking	103	251	88	65
Arrests for all causes	77,653	90,079	66,210	[2] 26
Arrest of women, all causes	5,081	8,231	4,795	42
Arrest of women, drunkenness	1,849	4,743	1,612	66
Children under 10 years, arrests	196	365	198	45
Children under 15 years, arrests	1,507	2,426	1,714	29
Minors, arrests all causes	7,391	8,519	7,970	6
Neglected children, arrests	76	206	84	59
Delinquent children, arrests	1,912	3,124	2,322	25
Boston juvenile court:				
Cases begun	841	1,072	901	16
Neglected children before the court	24	118	45	62
Mortality:				
Death rate per 100,000 population	14.95	16.31	14.62	
Deaths from accidents	565	746	527	[2] 29
Deaths, cirrhosis of liver	54	84	49	41

[1] Increase.
[2] These decreases have occurred despite the increase in automobiles which affects both groups of statistics.

The alcoholic cases admitted to the Boston City Hospital in 1922 (2,226) were about double the average of the only two comparable preprohibition years, 1916 and 1917, which averaged 1,057 admissions. One reason for this larger number is the fact that beginning with 1921 the hospital changed its policy with regard to admissions and admitted every alcoholic presented, which had not been the case previously except with obviously critical cases. Another reason is that the patients treated at Boston hospitals at the present time apparently imbibe large doses which makes them sick as well as drunk, so that the police who arrest them take them to the hospital before they go to the court. There is the additional fact that doubtless the police arrest persons now who formerly would have been allowed to go their way if not disturbing public order, and this fact should be borne in mind in connection with the figures of arrests as well as with those of admissions to the hospital.

The Washingtonian Home, an old institution for the treatment of inebriates, admitted, in 1922, 931 patients, which is not far from the average of the wet years under review (955); but during the wet years the State of Massachusetts was also conducting a large State institution for inebriates. This State institution and the Washingtonian Home in the period 1912–1917 received annually an average

total of 2,096 patients. The State institution is now diverted to other hospital uses, hence the admissions to the Washingtonian Home (931 in 1922) represent a material decrease from the 2,096 of the two institutions in the preprohibition period. In addition, 10 smaller institutions for the treatment of inebriates have also disappeared.

Table II presents statistics for the entire State of Massachusetts. (See explanation at head of Table I.)

	Total, 1922	Average wet years 1912–1918	Average prohibition years 1920–1922	Decrease (per cent)
Arrests, drunkenness	75,655	108,123	57,366	47
Arrests, all offenses	167,589	178,082	145,093	[1] 18
Arrests, offenses against person	9,514	10,608	8,933	15
Arrests, offenses against property	14,404	14,256	14,487	[2] 1
Arrests, public order	143,671	153,207	121,613	20
Women, total arrests	9,308	12,943	8,358	35
Women, arrests, drunkenness	3,087	7,273	2,529	65
Women in penal institutions [3]	375	732	318	43
Total in penal institutions [3]	3,610	5,839	3,082	[4] 47
State farm: [5]				
Total commitments	943	2,959	652	78
Drunkenness commitments	744	2,483	477	80
Vagrancy commitments	170	347	137	60
Population end of year	524	1,258	404	67
Mortality: [6]				
Death rate per 100,000 population	13.0	14.73	13.29	
Deaths from liver cirrhosis	184	308	180	41
Homicides	102	107	98	9
Suicide	458	489	440	10
Alcoholic insanity, per cent of all first admissions to State hospitals	6.41	10.35	4.96	
Total, first admissions alcoholic insanity	215	340	156	54

[1] A decrease despite the increase in motor vehicles and arrests growing out of operation.
[2] Increase.
[3] On Sept. 30 of each year.
[4] The author is not unmindful of the influence upon penal population of changing methods of dealing with offenders, and would not claim here or elsewhere that prohibition is wholly responsible for changes. It is only fair to say, however, that the percentage of convicted persons placed on probation between 1916 and 1922 did not change materially.
[5] The Massachusetts State farm was one of the most populous prison farms for drunkards and vagrants to be found in the United States.
[6] Average for years 1912, 1917, 1918 omitted because they were the years of the influenza which made mortality statistics abnormal.

Especial consideration should be given the data involving women and children, which practically consistently represent greatly improved conditions. Apparently the women are less affected by the bootlegger than the men.

Some further light is thrown on the home conditions by reports from the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. In 1916 this society found intemperance a factor in 47.7 per cent of its cases; last year, 1921, it figures as a factor in only 16.8 per cent of its cases. Analysis in 1921 of 144 families which in 1916 contained 210 known alcoholics and which were suffering primarily from intemperance, showed that in 1921 the number of alcoholics was reduced to 94; in 115 families (79 per cent) there was definite improvement in the following respects: 88 in total income, 27 in general health, 66 in physical care of the children, 28 in medical care of the children, 36 in moral care of children, 74 in general home conditions. Prior to July 1, 1919, when national prohibition became effective, there were removed from these families 167 children, with only 47 returned. After July 1, 1919, there were but 16 removed and 30 returned.

The Family Welfare Society of Boston, formerly the Associated Charities, in 1917 found that of the 3,589 families under its care, 27 per cent had intemperance as a factor; in 1918, 20 per cent. In 1919 the intemperance factor fell to 10.6; in 1920, to 2.5. In 1921 it was also 2.5, and in 1922 it was 4.1.

The better conditions among children as to delinquency, etc., are undoubtedly due, so far as prohibition is a factor, to the better home conditions, with a father or mother, or both, sober and attending to the duties of a parent. A mission in one of the former saloon sections of Boston reports that "The low aspect of life in the home is gradually disappearing, and many of the men are taking an interest and pride in seeing their children on an equal footing with their thrifty neighbors. There has been a greater interest in the homes as a result of closing the saloons. A greater interest is developed in the home and for the provision of those in it." Sober fathers at home tend to better discipline; the drinking father, and especially the one who was "sent up" for dunkenness, was often a seriously demoralizing factor in the moral training of the children.

The results of prohibition in Massachusetts are not all that they might be with better legal machinery for enforcement and better use of what already exists. The influence of the organization of the illegal traffic shows itself in statistical changes showing more results of drink in 1922 than in 1920, the first year of prohibition. The latter showed what is possible. But even present conditions in most cases indicate a great improvement over those of normal pre-prohibition years.

THE SMUGGLING OF LIQUOR INTO THE UNITED STATES

[Paper read at the meeting of the Seventeenth International Congress Against Alcoholism at Copenhagen, Denmark, August 21st, 1923]

By Hon. WILLIAM S. BENNET, *general counsel of the Edward Hines Associated Lumber Interests, Chicago, and American delegate to the congress.*

The discussion of this important topic calls for the answer, among others, of the following questions:

First. Is liquor smuggled into the United States?

Second. In what quantities?

Third. Is this smuggled liquor important in connection with the enforcement by the United States of the prohibition law?

Fourth. What, if anything, is the United States doing to suppress this smuggling and what further will it possibly or probably do?

Fifth. Do foreign nations owe the United States any duty to assist in enforcing its laws, and, if so, what?

Sixth. Is there anything which could be done by international agreement which would be mutually helpful?

At the threshold, I presume it entirely unnecessary to say that the delegates from the United States, though their presence here is provided for by an act of Congress and their appointment comes from the President of the United States, do not speak officially for the United States Government. We are without Government instructions and what we say represents our individual views, and can, in no sense, be held to be binding upon any department of our Government.

Frankly, however, in this paper it is my aim to lay before the Congress the views not only of the people of the United States but of the Government in the light that they both appear to me personally. In this light, then, I answer the questions into which I have divided my topic.

The first and second can be conveniently answered together. Liquor is smuggled into the United States. As to quantities, we have a coast line on the east bordering on the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico which is about 3,000 miles long. Near it lie the Bahamas, Bermuda, Cuba, the West Indies, the islands of the Caribbean Sea, Mexico, and the Central American States. Our northern boundary separating us from Canada is also about 3,000 miles long and for hundreds of miles it is just an invisible line crossed in many places by public highways and running elsewhere through waste, desolate, or remote regions, or through mighty forests. It is, of course, difficult to guard these 6,000 miles thoroughly and, without doubt, liquor smuggling in any year amounts to hundreds of thousands of gallons. The Pacific coast, though longer, has no near foreign neighbors, and besides, its structure does not lend itself readily to liquor smuggling as does the Atlantic.

This unlawful traffic is largely planned, directed, and conducted by citizens of the United States. Its first organized base was in the

islands of Nassau and West End in the Bahamas. The liquor was shipped there from distilleries in Baltimore and other points on the Atlantic coast between the time when the Volstead law passed and when it took effect. After the Volstead law became operative all this liquor was smuggled back to the coast of Florida and of other South Atlantic States and from thence surreptitiously distributed throughout the country by a class of criminals commonly called "bootleggers."

One of the most prominent, if not the most prominent, of the Baltimore distillers who started smuggling from West End has since been indicted and convicted for a crime other than smuggling but connected with the liquor business, and is now serving a term of years in the United States prison at Atlanta, Ga.

To the third question, "Is this smuggled liquor important in connection with the enforcement by the United States of the prohibition law?" "Yes" is the undoubted answer. If liquor is drunk there must be a source of supply. The hundreds of distilleries, breweries, and wineries which existed in the United States prior to prohibition are all either closed or so closely supervised as not to be a menace. No beverage liquor supply comes from them. The bonded warehouses contain, according to the latest figures, 42,911,406.68 gallons. Undoubtedly there have been fraudulent withdrawals in the past and there will be some, though fewer, in the future. There is a market for this supply for the purposes permitted by law; that is, other than beverage consumption. Therefore, no great beverage supply can come from this source. It amounts to only a little more than one-half of the withdrawals of 1917 alone. There remain therefore, as sources, home brewing, illicit manufacture, and smuggled liquor. In the beginning it was predicted that the United States would become a nation of home breweries. Recipes for home-brewed liquors were everywhere. That phase of the problem has already ceased to be serious. The effect of most of the home-brewed decoctions was found to be either weird or deadly. As a whole, the product makes no new friends for the alcoholic beverages, and, on the contrary, its effects have driven many to total abstinence. Home brewing is not being taken up at all by the younger generation and for that reason, if for no other, is a decreasing problem.

Illicit distilling, called colloquially, "moonshining," has been carried on in the Appalachian Mountains, in the border regions between the North and South Atlantic States, ever since the United States had a revenue law. The product was not great in quantity. The mountaineers who made it did it largely for local consumption and in most instances in the sincere though mistaken belief that they were but exercising a natural right. They were not a bad or vicious people, and, when taken from unfortunate environment, educated, and given a chance have, almost invariably, demonstrated both character and capacity.

The present illicit distiller is of an entirely different order. Almost invariably belonging to the criminal class, he brings to illicit distilling the lack of conscience and the desire for gain, however obtained, which distinguishes the criminal mind. This criminal attitude is reflected in the product of the illicit distiller. In Jones County, Miss., the "mash" from a captured still was spread by a light rain over a

courthouse lawn on which it had been dumped. The lye in the "mash" killed all the grass over which the lye spread.

In the forests of the lumber company of which I am general counsel, situated in southern Mississippi, we found an illicit still, in the "mash barrel" of which had been deliberately placed a rotting cowhide to aid fermentation, or, more properly, putrefaction. Even many of the most hardened drinkers keep away from the product of the illicit still. In addition this manufacture is and must be, furtive. There is no transportation by common carrier. The product, when sold for what it is, does not bring a high price and the demand for it is restricted. It is consumed mainly by confirmed and degraded liquor addicts, victims of the drink habit, who will drink anything with an alcoholic content, regardless of consequences.

The smuggled liquor on the contrary, is, or is believed to be, manufactured in countries where its manufacture is open and legal. Its quantity can be increased to meet the demand. It comes, usually to the customer, bottled and bearing a familiar label which in old competitive days bespoke at least care in manufacture. The "bootlegger" obtains a large price for it, and his customers are the most dangerous violators of the prohibition statute, for they are almost entirely men of wealth, substance, and standing who are nevertheless equally guilty with the "bootlegger" who serves them. Stopping smuggling will stop violations by the wealthy, and when the wealthy stop violating the law, enforcement as to the balance of the population will be relatively easy.

As smuggling is the greatest obstacle to law enforcement, the fourth question is important. "What, if anything, is the United States doing to suppress this smuggling and what further will it possibly or probably do?"

Both along the Canadian and Mexican borders the United States is using tried and usual methods to stop this smuggling. It is also doing the same thing along the seaboard. It can, as to the sea, and probably will, commence soon to use more frequently the so-called "hovering laws." Ever since 1797 we have had on our statute books what is known as the "hovering law" which permits our revenue officers to go on board vessels within 12 miles of our coast, carrying cargoes destined for our country for the purpose of inspecting the manifest, etc. In the recent Fordney Tariff Act this "hovering law" was reenacted as follows:

SEC. 581. Boarding vessels: Officers of the customs or of the Coast Guard, and agents or other persons authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, or appointed for that purpose in writing by the collector may at any time go on board of any vessel or vehicle at any place in the United States or within four leagues of the coast of the United States, without as well as within their respective districts, to examine the manifest and to inspect, search, and examine the vessel or vehicle and every part thereof, and any person, trunk, or package on board, and to this end to hail and stop such vessel or vehicle, if under way, and use all necessary force to compel compliance, and if it shall appear that any breach or violation of the laws of the United States has been committed, whereby or in consequence of which such vessel or vehicle, or the merchandise or any part thereof, on board of or imported by such vessel or vehicle is liable to forfeiture, it shall be the duty of such officer to make seizure of the same, and to arrest, or in case of escape or attempted escape, to pursue and arrest any person engaged in such breach or violation.

Officers of the Department of Commerce and other persons authorized by such department may go on board of any vessel at any place in the United States or within four leagues of the coast of the United States, and hail, stop, and

board such vessels in the enforcement of the navigation laws and arrest, or in case of escape or attempted escape, pursue and arrest any person engaged in the breach or violation of the navigation laws.

SEC. 584. Falsity or lack of manifest: Any master of any vessel and any person in charge of any vehicle bound to the United States who does not produce the manifest to the officer demanding the same shall be liable to a penalty of $500, and if any merchandise, including sea stores, is found on board of, or after unlading from such vessel or vehicle, which is not included or described in such manifest, or does not agree therewith, the master of such vessel or the person in charge of such vehicle shall be liable to a penalty equal to the value of the merchandise so found or unladened, and any such merchandise belonging or consigned to the master, or other officer, or to any of the crew of such vessel, or to the owner or person in charge of such vessel, shall be subject to forfeiture, and if any merchandise described in such manifest is not found on board the vessel or vehicle, the master or other person in charge shall be subject to a penalty of $500: *Provided*, That if the collector shall be satisfied that the manifest was lost or mislaid without intentional fraud, or was defaced by accident, or is incorrect by reason of clerical error or other mistake and that no part of the merchandise not found on board was unshipped, or discharged except as specified in the report of the master, said penalty shall not be incurred.

If any of such merchandise so found consists of smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking, the master of such vessel or the person in charge of such vessel shall be liable to a penalty of $25 for each ounce thereof so found. Such penalty shall constitute a lien upon such vessel which may be enforced by lible in rem. Clearance of any such vessel may be withheld until such penalty is paid or until a bond satisfactory to the collector is given for the payment thereof. The provisions of this paragraph shall not prevent the forfeiture of any such vessel or vehicle under any other provision of law.

SEC. 586. Unlawful unlading—Exception: The master of any vessel from a foreign port or place who allows any merchandise (including sea stores) to be unladened from such vessel at any time after its arrival within 4 leagues of the coast of the United States, and before such vessel has come to the proper place for the discharge of such merchandise, and before he has received a permit to unlade, shall be liable to a penalty equal to twice the value of the merchandise, but not less than $1,000, and such vessel and the merchandise shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture: * * *."

In the meantime the schooner *Henry L. Marshall* flying the British flag and sailing under British registry had been seized under the "hovering law" by a revenue cutter 10 miles from shore, brought in, libeled, and condemned by the United States district court. In July this year the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting in New York City, unanimously affirmed the judgment. The *Marshall* is but one of 14 vessels of foreign nationality which have, since the Volstead law, been seized by the United States under the "hovering law" outside of the 3-mile limit. None of these vessels has yet been released by the courts. So the next "rum fleet" which anchors just outside the 3-mile limit to make the smuggling of liquor easy may find itself the subject of an interesting lawsuit. I am not overlooking the fact that our State Department and Supreme Court apparently recognize that our municipal jurisdiction extends over the sea only to 3 miles from the shore, but Congress has the undoubted right, so far as our courts and executive departments are concerned, to make the limit 12 miles, as it has done. If this act of Congress violates international law, some international tribunal may some day make us pay, as an international tribunal in the Behring Sea on controversy made us pay for seizing British sealers, and as international tribunals and treaties made Great Britain pay us for the *Alabama* destructions, and France pay us a century and more ago for seized vessels. But in the meantime the law is on the statute books, State and the Treasury Departments

must enforce it as they find it, and the courts of the United States are without power to set aside an act of the United States Congress because that act is contrary to international law.

We have a splendid Coast Guard Service. It now embraces both the revenue cutters which patrol our coasts and the lighthouses and coast guard patrol on shore. With a 12-mile zone to work in it is simply a question of increasing the number of revenue cutters and coast guards.

Probably we can not entirely stop smuggling by sea, but we can make it so difficult and dangerous for the smuggler and so expensive for his customer as to lessen materially the quantity smuggled overseas.

Frankly, though, the greatest need at present is a greater will on the part of the rank and file to enforce the law. A force even of the present size could accomplish more than it does. In the old days the internal revenue men kept down "moonshining" remarkably well under very difficult conditions. To-day the Secret Service with a small force of intelligent well-trained, incorruptible men protects our paper and coined money from the counterfeiter. The results are remarkable. Our customs force, too, keeps down ordinary smuggling. What these bodies of Americans have accomplished the prohibition enforcement officers can accomplish also. Already there is improvement in the personnel, and with improvement in the personnel will come better enforcement.

The smugglers themselves unintentionally are helping. What might be called the ordinary profits of the unlawful traffic are generally believed to be large. But the smuggler and his "bootlegger" are not satisfied with this. The smuggled supply is doubled if not quadrupled by reckless adulteration. Labels of foreign bottles are counterfeited, seals of foreign governments are forged, bottles are refilled with American illicit distillations until the wealthy purchaser of so-called "imported" liquor is rapidly losing confidence in the authenticity of his purchases. Every particle of liquor seized by prohibition officers in Washington, D. C., last year was adulterated. This situation is now rapidly becoming generally known. As it becomes known "bootlegging" becomes more and more disreputable, and therefore it is correspondingly difficult for these "bootleggers" to make the necessary "connections" with prohibition enforcement agents.

"Bootleggers" are rapidly sinking to the level of men who smuggle opium, heroin, and other narcotic drugs. And against these latter every man's hand is set. Adulterated smuggled liquor is a great, though unintended, aid to law enforcement.

The fifth question is, "Do foreign nations owe the United States any duty to assist in enforcing its laws, and if so, what?" The laws the United States passes it must itself enforce. We have never yet asked any other nation to assist us in enforcing our laws. No nation, though, ought to go out of its way to assist its nationals to violate the laws of a friendly nation.

To illustrate: When the *Henry L. Marshall*, the vessel whose seizure has been discussed, cleared from the Bahamas, it was proper for the collector there to give her a clearance, stating that she was loaded with liquor and bound for Halifax. The *Henry L. Marshall*, under British law, had the right to load with liquor and clear for

Halifax. But when the same collector on the same day gave the same vessel a clearance, stating that she was proceeding to Gloucester, Mass., in ballast, something was wrong either with the British law or with that collector. As long as it is legal to manufacture and sell liquor in and export it from a particular country, the United States has no legal right of complaint against clearances of cargoes of liquors from such a country. If the cargo is diverted and attempted to be smuggled into our country, it is our duty, and ours alone, to execute our own laws and guard our own coasts.

The sixth and last question is, "Is there anything which could be done by international agreement which would be mutually helpful?" I think so. Nations ought to agree, for instance, to penalize any vessel the master or owner of which makes false statements to its own Government to obtain clearances the object of which is to assist it in violating the law of another country. Our country, I am sure, would join in such an agreement. An American vessel the master or owner of which makes false statements to an American official to obtain clearance so that such vessel can violate the laws of a foreign country ought to be severely penalized.

Another matter which requires attention is the conflict of laws between our country and other nations. You hear it said, even in the United States, that when Congress assembles in December it will fix it so that foreign vessels can come into United States harbors "wet." Don't believe it. I served four terms in Congress and have observed it closely for 20 years. It will not, in my opinion, pass any such law. I will have to ask to be excused from giving, before an international body, the purely domestic reasons why this, in my judgment, is true. I think though that a treaty could be entered into permitting a foreign ship in United States waters to seal its liquor supplies when coming into our territorial waters and take them out intact and to comply in the same waters with the laws of its own country regarding the serving of liquors to its crew if at the same time the right asserted by our Congress to search vessels within 12 miles of our coast and to seize them for violations of our laws was acquiesced in.

It is probably true that our 12-mile idea is good international law everywhere to-day so far, at least, as certain questions are concerned. Territorial jurisdiction over some distance out to sea has always been asserted by every nation bordering on the sea. When cannon were in their infancy this jurisdiction over the contiguous sea was placed at the distance a cannon would shoot, at that time 3 miles. Every nation now has seacoast artillery which will shoot 12 miles far more accurately than the old cannon would shoot 3. The measure of jurisdiction was not 3 miles, but the distance a cannon would shoot, or, as some writers put it, the distance that a nation can effectively police its shores. Now a cannon shoots 12 miles. The measure of jurisdiction being the agreed one, i. e., the distance a cannon will shoot or that a nation can police is 12 miles or even more.

The British and French prize courts proceeded on a similar course of reasoning on another branch of international law during the recent World War. It has long been international law that the nationality of a ship is that of its owner. The Wagner Line of steamers was owned by an American corporation duly organized under the laws of an American State.

The vessels were registered as American vessels under United States statutes. British and French cruisers seized them, libeled them, and condemned them in both British and French courts. Their courts found the fact to be that the majority stock ownership in the American corporation was in nationals of a country with which Great Britain and France were then at war; they therefore held the real ownership to be German, not American, and as the nationality of the ship was the nationality of the owner, the ships were German. By a similar process of reasoning if the measure of jurisdiction over contiguous sea was fixed as the length of a cannon shot and the length of a cannon shot has become 12 miles, the measure of jurisdiction extends correspondingly. If you grant the correctness of the British and French reasoning, where is the flaw in that which I have assumed to be the reasoning of our Congress?

One phase of this measure of jurisdiction will come before our Supreme Court probably in the early fall. The *Grace and Ruby*, a British vessel loaded with illicit liquor, cruised off the coast of New England and Long Island, N. Y., selling her cargo. She did not herself come within the 3-mile limit for the purposes of illegal traffic, but, on at least one occasion, she did send her boat in to deliver liquor. She was seized outside the 3-mile limit, brought into a New England harbor, and libeled. The United States district court in Boston condemned her, saying that, under international law, sending her boat inside the 3-mile limit was the same as coming in herself. From this decision an appeal was taken, as it could be, direct to our highest court. Not only has our Congress discarded the 3-mile limit for certain purposes, but its course in so doing has the sanction of foreign nations and text writers.

Great Britain, for instance, has had on her statute books since 1736 a "hovering act" which assumes for certain revenue purposes a jurisdiction of 4 leagues from the coasts by prohibiting foreign goods to be transshipped within that distance without payment of duties.

The United States has had a similar law on its statute books since March 2, 1797, the act being one of the last acts signed by our first President, George Washington. As passed on March 2, 1797, the statute did not authorize a seizure of a foreign vessel when beyond the territorial jurisdiction, but the law as it now stands in the Fordney Act does authorize such a seizure, and so did the law prior to the Fordney Act.

Our Supreme Court in an opinion by Marshall, C. J., in Church *v.* Hubbart, decided in 1804 (2 Cranch 187), upheld the seizure by Portugal of a United States vessel 15 miles from land and at anchor.

When the United States ship *Kearsarge* appeared off Cherbourg, France, in pursuit of the cruiser *Alabama*, in 1864, which was then lying in that harbor, the French minister of foreign affairs, who had been advised that the *Alabama* intended to meet the *Kearsarge*, and that the ships probably would attack each other as soon as they were 5 miles off the coast, made to the minister of the United States in an interview the following statement:

> That a sea fight would thus be got up in the face of France, and at a distance from their coast within reach of the guns used on shipboard in these days. That the distance to which the neutral right of an adjoining government extended itself from the coast was unsettled, and that the reason of the old rules, which assumed

that 3 miles was the outermost reach of a cannon shot, no longer existed, and that, in a word, a fight on or about such a distance from their coast would be offensive to the dignity of France and they would not permit it.

The American minister declined to recognize any rule except the 3-mile rule, but said if a fight were to take place, and we would lose nothing and risk nothing by its being further off, he had, of course, no objection, and so advised Captain Winslow of the *Kearsarge*. However, the French Government took no chances. It served notice on the captain of the *Kearsarge*, and when the *Alabama* left the harbor she was accompanied by a French man-of-war, apparently for the purpose of seeing that the battle was not begun too near the shore. As soon as the man-of-war left the *Alabama* the fight began with the *Kearsarge*, lying probably 7 to 9 miles offshore. The *Alabama*, which was defeated, was making for shore when she sank, but was still 5 miles offshore.

Doctor Twiss, a noted authority on international law, says that while no seizure beyond the 3-mile limit for revenue purposes can be sustained as a right, "in ordinary cases, indeed, where a merchant ship has been seized on the high seas, the sovereign whose flag has been violated waives his privilege, considering the offending ship to have acted with mala fides toward the other state with which he is in amity, and to have consequently forfeited any just claim to his protection."

Certainly the so-called rum fleet which anchors close to the shore of the United States, for the express and avowed purpose of violating both its revenue laws and its prohibition laws, is acting with mala fides toward the United States. It is, therefore, evident that the so-called 3-mile rule is subject to at least two classes of exceptions. First, to acts necessary by a government in connection with its revenue laws; and, second, to questions of defensive power. Open, concerted action on the part of a number of vessels flying various foreign flags, which have for their purpose and object the violation of the laws of the United States, certainly permit the United States to go a long way outside of the 3-mile limit, and, without question, up to the 12-mile limit, in the exercise of its defensive powers as a nation.

We have announced our willingness to enter into a general treaty with all nations to make smuggling of all kinds more difficult. Our proposal to this end and the refusal of Great Britain to cooperate were published in the newspapers throughout the world in many instances on October 18, 1922.

We also protect ourselves against the misuse against us of a vessel which we ourselves have built. Before a vessel with American registry can be transferred to any foreign registry, an agreement must be made that if the vessel engages in smuggling operations, it shall be forfeited to the United States.

Some unreasonable furor was indulged in in the latter part of June because we insisted on enforcing our prohibition laws on foreign vessels in our own harbors. But the foreign vessels were so clearly wrong that they soon stopped the expensive practice of bringing liquor into our harbors and having it seized or destroyed. It is worthy of note that every nation so far heard from admitted the clear right of the United States to enforce its own laws in its own ports. Every other nation does the same thing. Great Britain, indeed, almost at the same moment was imposing a £500 fine on the German vessel

Cleopatra, valued at only £600 and whose offense against the British law relative to importing liquor was unintentional and, at the most, highly technical.

But a common sense treaty is the best way to settle these matters. We have no desire to interfere by our laws with the practices of other nations. They ought to be willing that we should have reasonable opportunity to enforce our own laws along our own coasts. I am aware that some of my very best friends in the temperance world will probably, in the first instance, disagree with the suggestion that we permit foreign vessels to bring liquor, sealed, into our ports and even to serve it to their crews if their laws require that, and I am also aware that many good American business men will think such a course imposing unfair competition on our own necessarily and properly "dry" American ships, particularly those operated by the Shipping Board. I am hopeful, though, that on reflection they will take the other view. I ask my temperance friends if by making our laws a Procrustean bed for other nations we do not lose more in those nations by making prohibition an odious and misunderstood term than we gain by keeping the members of certain foreign crews and the passengers on certain foreign ships partially and unwillingly "dry" for a few days at a time?

I remind my business friends that the average American travels with his family when he travels for pleasure, and that neither then nor when he travels alone on business would he place the "wet" smoking room above the safety and security of the "dry" ship and, particularly, the "dry" crew.

On land no American, no matter what his personal habits, would think of traveling behind a drinking engineer and when offered at sea the choice between a "wet" and a "dry" crew, his decision is certain. If foreign vessels wish to remain "wet," American vessels by advertising the fact that not only the smoking room but the crew is "dry" can get the business.

In the old days the drinking on shipboard was something which the majority of the passengers stood because they had to. To them, it was not then, and is not now, an added attraction. At any rate, whether I am right or wrong in my view, having adopted prohibition, we ought to be prohibition, whether it affects our ships well or ill.

Prohibition is a permanent American policy. Therefore, the smuggling of liquor into the United States will remain illegal. It follows naturally that if smuggling continues national intelligence will perceive that if the smuggling of one contraband article continues, smuggling generally will increase. It is inevitable. Wholesale smuggling affects the revenues. Therefore, if for no other reason, liquor smuggling will be more and more sternly dealt with. We shall not consciously violate international law, we shall harbor no resentment against nations whose laws permit the exportation of liquor, but we shall adhere to our own law forbidding their importation into our country, and, as the years go by, execute those laws with increasing efficiency and effectiveness.

EXTRACTS OF ADDRESSES OF WAYNE B. WHEELER, LL. D.

(Chairman of the Delegation from the United States to the International Congress Against Alcoholism at Copenhagen, Denmark)

SMUGGLING

Mr. CHAIRMAN. This is a very important question to the people of the United States at this time. Liquor smuggling is an indefensible attack on the sovereign right of a nation to enforce its own laws within its own jurisdiction. No nation should allow its territory or its ships to be used to violate the laws of any other nation. A law-abiding citizen will not only obey the laws of his own country but when he is in another country he will respect its laws also.

We have recently secured from the United States Supreme Court two important decisions which affect this whole smuggling situation. I presented the argument to the Justice Department and then to the Supreme Court in bringing about the legal status which is now challenged by ships of foreign registry smuggling liquor into our country. By former treaty provisions and customs regulations liquor could be shipped through the United States. The Constitution and the laws of our country after the adoption of the eighteenth amendment prohibited it. The situation for which we contended was challenged and the court of last resort in our Nation held:

> The eighteenth amendment meant a great revolution in the policy of this country, and presumably and obviously meant to upset a good many things on as well as off the statute books. It did not confine itself in any meticulous way to the use of intoxicants in this country. It forbade export for beverage purposes elsewhere. True, this discouraged production here, but that was forbidden already, and the provision applied to liquors already lawfully made. It is obvious that those whose wishes and opinions were embodied in the amendment meant to stop the whole business. They did not want intoxicating liquor in the United States and reasonably may have thought that if they let it in some of it was likely to stay.

The next question which arose was with reference to the illicit trade within the 3-mile limit. We contended that the transportation or possession of such intoxicants was a violation of the National Prohibition Act whether on foreign or American ships within the jurisdiction of our country. Every argument available from the trade was presented against this contention. The court sustained our viewpoint for these reasons, which are sound in any country. Our treaty relations simply require that we treat the ships of all nations alike which come within our ports. Such a requirement violates no rule of international law.

Each fully sovereign State has exclusive jurisdiction over its own territory and within that territory it is absolute. (Chief Justice Marshall in an early case, 7 Cranch, 114, said:)

> The jurisdiction of the nation within its own territory is necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself.

Any exception in a general prohibition law as to foreign ships can only arise by implication and would involve a limitation upon the sovereignty of the nation. It is a privilege of comity and not a right.

Sea stores have no particular status under international law which exempts them from the operation of municipal law. (172 Pac. Rep. 1050. Also 186 Pac. Rep. 870.)

Other nations than the United States in the exercise of their sovereign rights fix conditions upon which our vessels may enter their ports. Great Britain. The case of Annopolis *v.* Stoll (Lush, 295), the high court of admiralty held:

> The British legislature has no authority over foreign vessels on the high seas out of British jurisdiction, but may impose any conditions on foreign vessels entering a British port.

In securing these decisions against smuggling into our country, based upon the above principles of law, we cited decisions and legislation from other countries as well as from our own. You will find them fundamentally correct. We learned from experience in the last two years that when liquor is permitted under seal as ship stores to enter our ports it is used as a convenient method to aid smuggling. Liquor and opium are the slipperiest products with which we have to deal in international trade. Manyof the shipping interests of the United States insist that if foreign ships are permitted to bring liquor within the 3-mile limit and American ships are denied this privilege we are not treating all the ships that enter our harbors alike, and that it is an unjust discrimination against our own ships. In the brief which I presented to the Supreme Court I included an exhibit from one of the managers of an American ship showing the abuse which was made of the privilege formerly extended to foreign ships through ships' stores and the serving of liquor to their crews. Unless some definite and specific safeguards are proposed which will insure our country that these privileges will not be used to violate our laws I doubt whether the present legal status will be changed. If other nations will show an inclination to prevent their ships from participating in this illicit trade it will do much to bring about amicable agreement and more satisfactory regulations with reference to our international commerce. I indorse, so far as I understand them, the recommendations of the officer from Norway and the suggestions in Mr. Bennett's paper on fraudulent clearance papers. Double clearance papers used for liquor smuggling is indefensible. I agree also with Mr. Bennett that our hovering laws with a 12-mile limit are constitutional and should be enforced. There should be a more honest administration of the customs laws in the several countries. Every nation should maintain its law-enforcement machinery up to a standard that will prevent liquor smuggling as far as it has the power to do so. A ship that carries a contraband liquor cargo to another nation has no right to expect protection from civilized governments in its illegal transactions.

In conclusion, let me urge that all of us help to create a greater respect for law within our own countries as well as a greater respect for the laws of other countries. This is essential to the perpetuity of orderly government. Without it, civilization will go back to chaos and to anarchy and the only protection we will have in the

enjoyment of our personal and property rights will be the brute force which we can exert against the invader. In other words, civilization and law and order go hand in hand. Let us therefore respect the laws of our own country while they are in full force and effect. If they are unsatisfactory, let us change them by legal and orderly methods rather than by defiance of them. In this way we can build a greater civilization and bring about a better international feeling between the law-abiding nations of the world.

STATISTICS

Mr. CHAIRMAN. In comparing statistics it is important to have the same basis of comparison in reaching your conclusions. For instance, I have been asked many times about the statistics which are published on this side of the sea concerning prison population and arrests for drunkenness in the United States. The figures relating to our prisons, comparing 1917 and 1922, are misleading for this reason: They are based on a Federal report which shows on its face that 800 fewer prisons reported the number of their inmates in 1917 under the saloon system than in 1922 under prohibition. The managers of these State institutions did not have to report to the Federal officers and consequently the discrepancy in the comparison. There were, in other words, 800 prisons upon which there were no reports made in 1917 under the saloon system which did report in 1922. When we take this into consideration and the growth of the population in the States it shows a marked decrease in the number of prisoners in our State prisons. For instance, out of 2,939 city prisons in the United States, 1,390 had no prisoners at all in them on July 1, 1922. The prisons which did have prisoners showed a decrease of 9.3 per cent in 1917.

The statistics with reference to the arrests for drunkenness also need explanation. While there has been a decrease in the arrests for drunkenness of 50 per cent in former wet territory, this does not tell all the story. Under the license system we did not arrest persons intoxicated, as a rule, unless they were disorderly or disturbing the peace. Under prohibition, officers who are unfriendly to the policy arrest persons slightly intoxicated in order to discredit the law by showing that there are as many arrests as heretofore. Officers who are friendly to the enforcement of the law arrest persons slightly intoxicated because by so doing they can make them tell, as a rule, where they procured their liquor and thus arrest the man who is commercializing the appetites of his victims. In other words, a very much larger per cent of those who become actually intoxicated are arrested under prohibition than under the license system. Statistics are like high-power explosives—they should be handled by those who understand them.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION

Mr. CHAIRMAN. To sum up this discussion on behalf of the American delegation in five minutes is like putting an ocean of possibility into a thimble full of opportunity. I shall emphasize but two or three points.

National prohibition was not adopted until the large majority of the electorate wanted it. It is more difficult to amend our Constitution than it is to change the organic law of any other nation. It

takes a two-thirds majority of both branches of Congress to submit an amendment to the States for their adoption. It then takes a majority of the legislatures in three-fourths of the States to ratify it. In other words, we had to secure 72 State legislative bodies (house and senate) and two Federal legislative bodies to ratify the amendment. As a matter of fact, 93 out of the possible 96 State legislative bodies ratified it, with only 3 against it from 2 of the small States. The Congress that submitted the amendment was elected before the war, and the votes in the States since the war shows it was not adopted because of war influence. The forum where we test the sentiment of the Nation on national legislation is in the election of the Congress. In each election since the eighteenth amendment was adopted the people have elected a Congress favorable to sustaining and enforcing this law by a two-thirds majority. Since Congress adjourned recently six vacancies had to be filled, and we made a gain of two more dry Congressmen, increasing the two-thirds dry majority. In addition about 30 State legislatures have recently been in session; 23 strengthened their State enforcement codes, many of them adopting more stringent provisions than in the national law. One State only, New York, back-tracked, and you hear more about it than the score of States that strengthened their laws. We have prohibition in the United States because the large majority want it.

Every governmental advance raises the question, How long should a forward-looking, recognized majority wait for a backward minority before taking action? Over in the United States prohibition was a growth or development. Ninety-five per cent of the territory of the United States was dry, as we call it, under local or State prohibition before national prohibition went into effect. Sixty-eight per cent of the population lived in that territory. When more than two-thirds of the people are ready for an advance step in a government that is controlled by majorities, it is not hasty action or an infringement of the liberties of the majority to ask them to obey a majority mandate of the people. [Applause.] The right of the majority to rule is fundamental to the existence of a republic or a democracy. The duty of the minority to obey the law enacted by the majority is equally clear. If a majority are dissatisfied with the law, they have the undoubted right to persuade those of the majority to join them in amending or repealing a law and when they become a majority they can repeal the law by legal and orderly methods, but it is indefensible for a minority to defy or nullify the law as the outlawed liquor interests are trying to do in our country.

The next point is with reference to the reduced consumption of intoxicants. I can not agree with Professor Warming that if the reduction of consumption is but 70 per cent, it is a doubtful experiment. The interests opposed to prohibition admitted at the end of two years that national prohibition had reduced consumption 70 per cent. It is more than that; it is between 80 and 90 per cent, but if it were only 70 per cent it would be worth while. What about the alleged evils that are supposed to offset the reduced consumption benefits? It is true that there are violations of the law in some places, but the liquor interests violated regulative and restrictive laws before we had prohibition. They were never respectful of any law that did not give them the fullest liberty to sell their harmful product to the people. It is true that some of the officers of the law are corrupted.

but who are responsible for their corruption? I have met this argument in the recent debates I have had in New York with wet leaders on this issue. It is not the friends of prohibition who corrupt these officers, but outlawed liquor interests. They do not come into court with clean hands when they ask for the repeal of the law because they violate it and corrupt the officers whose duty it is to enforce it. They are like the incorrigible youth who murdered his parents and then asked for clemency on the grounds that he was an orphan. The alleged evils exist because the liquor interests and wet minority are more loyal to their thirst than to the Constitution. They will never overthrow the will of the majority.

It is also suggested that it might be better in the United States if we permitted the sale of 2 or 2½ per cent beer. Our Government did not do this because it found through experience in the States that you could not enforce a prohibition law with such an exemption. Thirty-four States had found by experience that the limitation of alcoholic contents to one-half of 1 per cent or less was necessary for effective enforcement before Congress adopted it in the Volstead Act. It was the duty of Congress to enact a law to enforce the Constitution. The only States that tried out an enforcement code with the so-called light-wine or light-beer exemptions proved it a failure. Practically all of the States had the one-half per cent alcoholic standard. Why should Congress ignore this experience and adopt a code that had proved to be nonenforceable? Congress could not legalize what the States had prohibited. To attempt to do so would encourage lawlessness. For the purposes of uniformity as well as on the account of the experience in the States Congress adopted the definition which obtained in by far the greater number of States.

We do not claim 100 per cent enforcement under this law. No law is that well enforced. Of course, some people get drunk and are arrested, but as Judge Gemmill says, there would have been 500,000 more arrests for drunkenness in 1922, had it not been for prohibition.

If one of these 500,000 had been your son you would consider this law a blessing. It is true that some liquor is being smuggled into the country against our will. We will continue to fight the liquor-law violator from within and the smuggler from without. There will be no cessation of hostilities with these liquor outlaws. The many benefits which have come to our Nation in reduced drunkenness, crime, misery, and poverty, and the increased wealth, health, and happiness strengthen our determination every year to maintain and enforce national prohibition as the best solution of the liquor problem.

REMARKS OF EDWIN C. DINWIDDIE

(National Chief Templar, International Order of Good Templars and Superintendent of the National Temperance Bureau)

PROHIBITION IN AMERICA

The statements of Professor Warming in regard to prohibition in America have failed to include several very important factors which must be taken into account in any fair, impartial survey of prohibition and its results there.

That there is smuggling of liquors in defiance of our Constitution and laws enacted to carry out the constitutional mandate, and that there is all too much drinking of liquors obtained illegally and through connivance with "bootleggers," we admit. But these violations are not because of an inherent defect in the law, nor do they in any way prove that the principle of prohibition is wrong. Violations occur through defects in its administration, and when we consider that for generations the appetite for liquors was gratified and, in a sense, fostered under legal sanction, and the enactment of a law does not change the habits and appetites of men, it is inevitable that during the early period following a transition from permissive license for the sale of beverage liquors to one of total prohibition of such sale, ways will be found to circumvent the law and satisfy the cravings of appetites accustomed to gratification. It was not humanly possible to foresee all the ways that degenerate purveyors and desperate users of prohibited beverages would employ to violate the law for selfish reasons.

But the results attained prove beyond any question that prohibition has been a success in the United States. This success has been freely attested by social workers of all classes, in the improved home life and living conditions in the tenement districts of our cities, where money which formerly went for drink now goes through legitimate channels into better home conditions, food, clothing, furniture, and all that goes to make up human betterment. Better living conditions are proven through the vast increase of business in stores and shops selling the necessities of life, such as groceries, dry goods, boots and shoes, and the like; the unprecedented increase in sales of real estate and home building, especially during the years since prohibition became our national policy.

Perhaps in no other line has the benefit from prohibition been so marked as in the enormous increase in bank deposits and the number of depositors, and this is especially marked in the savings banks of the country which all show manifold increase both in the amount of money deposited and in the numbers of depositors, the latter of which have been largely from the wage-earning classes, and practically everywhere the number of savings banks has been greatly augmented since prohibition has been in effect. The general prosperity of the country does not fully account for these bank increases, and bankers

are responsible for the statements that these great increases in deposits have been because huge sums of money formerly spent over the counters of saloons are now deposited in the banks, after better living conditions are provided for.

There has been a large increase in the sale of musical instruments, like pianos, victrolas, etc., in the homes of the masses, as well as an unprecedented demand for automobiles. Over 80 per cent of the entire number of automobiles of the world are used in the United States, the large relative increase in ownership being since the adoption of prohibition.

One of the outstanding proofs of the success and benefit of prohibition in the United States has been the tremendous increase in the numbers in our student bodies, in the grades, high schools, and in our seminaries, colleges and universities. The greatly augmented enrollment in our student bodies in all grades is due to prohibition more than any other cause. Attendance at schools and continuance therein through the higher grades, has been possible to the youth in great numbers of homes where under the old saloon regime students would have been forced out to work to supplement the family income, when the head of the family spent his wages over the bar.

Other beneficial results of prohibition in the United States could be recited and multiplied many times over, but we think these citations prove our contention beyond peradventure. We will, however, cite only one other well-known and generally conceded blessing from prohibition. During the period of deflation after the World War, following a period of great inflation, with the unprecedented Army of the United States coming back from Europe and from training camps in America, and entering the industrial life of our country, it had been freely predicted that we would have a vast army of unemployed, with great attendant suffering; that we would have bread lines everywhere, and soup houses to keep the unemployed from starvation. But we had none of these even in our great centers of population. The return from military to civil life and readjustment in our industrial and economic centers was accomplished in a quiet, orderly manner which would not have been possible had the saloon been open to entice the hordes of returning soldiers to congregate there, with the well-remembered resultant brawls and disorder of saloon days.

It is true, as Professor Warming has stated, that no one in America —or certainly so few as to be negligible—asks for the return of the saloon, but the clamor is for beer and wine. One fact is perhaps not so well known to visitors from other lands as to our own citizens, and that is that those who are demanding beer and wine now are of the same old crowd that fought against prohibition at every step of the way. Prohibition came by slow stages, through a succession of victories, and against the same old antagonists in every one.

The crowd now fighting for beer and wine to be returned opposed local option for cities and towns; beaten there, they fought county option; they fought against restrictive laws against the sale of liquors to minors, against closing hours, against any and every limitation upon their trade; they fought against state-wide prohibition, and when more than a majority of our States, in spite of the opposition of the liquor forces, had prohibited the manufacture and sale within their borders, but found their State laws nullified by conspiracies of

the "wets" of other States and law-breaking citizens of their own, to break down prohibition under state-wide enactments, the prohibition sentiment of the country wrote that principle into the Constitution for the whole country by will of the people, and now the same "wet" crowd that fought against every limitation and restriction upon the sale of alcoholic liquors all the way along, is the same relatively small minority of individuals who have consistently and persistently opposed any and every restriction upon the liquor traffic. They are the noise makers on the subject, but their numbers are small in comparison with the overwhelming majority in favor of prohibition and against any return of the alcoholic liquor traffic.

The attempt to restore the sale of beer and wine in America is foredoomed to fail for many reasons. All concede that the old saloon can not come back—and ought not to come back—and to dispense these beverages in the only ways suggested so far by any beer and wine advocates would be to convert groceries or soft-drink parlors into virtual saloons, or else plant the traffic with the sanction of the law in the homes of the country—right under the eyes of the children of all ages with all that that would mean—a scheme abhorrent to the conscience and judgment of the American people and prohibited in many of our States long before national prohibition came.

In several of our States which had adopted the prohibition policy before national prohibition the brewers brought on a vote to restore the sale of beer and wine after prohibition had been in force from one year to two or three, and in every instance the people by increased popular majorities defeated the attempt. What these States did, the Nation as a whole will unquestionably do—stand firm against any return of the sale of beer and wine or any alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes, because of the moral and material betterment of our people under prohibition.

O