

JOURNAL

OF THE

STATISTICAL AND SOCIAL INQUIRY SOCIETY OF IRELAND.

PART XLVII., *May*, 1875.

I.—*Suggested Practical Checks on excessive Drinking and Habitual Drunkenness.*—By David Ross, Esq., LLB.

[Read Tuesday, 15th December, 1874.]

IN the session of 1871, the late Government introduced into Parliament a Licensing Bill, and the late Mr. Donald Dalrymple introduced an Habitual Drunkards' Bill. Neither Bill became law; and in the interval between the sessions of 1871 and 1872, much public attention was directed to a consideration of the legislative measures to be adopted to restrain or prevent the evils of excessive drinking.

Immediately after the commencement of the session of 1872, Mr. Dalrymple obtained a committee of the House of Commons, to consider the best plan for the control and management of habitual drunkards, and that committee took a good deal of valuable evidence, and made their report on the 13th of June, 1872; but as yet their recommendations may be considered as in the main disregarded. In the same year, the Licensing Act, 1872, was passed, and a 'harassed' interest was thereby put in trouble, which I believe is hardly removed by the Act of the last session.

But however this may be, excessive drinking still continues; and in the year 1873, the convictions for drunkenness in Ireland were 95,623, being an increase of 12,334 on the number of convictions for the year 1872.

Prior to the appointment of Mr. Dalrymple's committee, I had drawn up a paper of suggestions to check drunkenness, in which I arrived at conclusions, which in many respects are confirmed and receive authority from the Report of the committee; but as they were come to independently of that Report, and the subject has in nowise lost importance and interest, I have thought that they might fitly be submitted to this Society.

A Medical Declaration respecting alcoholic drinks, published in the London newspapers of the 23rd of December, 1871, and signed by 266 physicians and surgeons, many of them persons of great professional distinction, indicated a strong feeling on the part of a class of men peculiarly enabled to judge of the evils of excessive drinking, that some restrictive legislation was necessary. After referring to the caution that ought to be exercised in prescribing alcoholic liquors in disease, and to the responsibility which attached to medical practitioners to inculcate great moderation in their use by persons in health, the declaration proceeded :

“ Being also firmly convinced that the great amount of drinking of alcoholic liquors among the working classes of this country is one of the greatest evils of the day, destroying more than anything else the health, happiness, and welfare of those classes, and neutralizing, to a large extent, the great industrial prosperity which Providence has placed within the reach of this nation, the undersigned would gladly support any wise legislation which would tend to restrict within proper limits the use of alcoholic beverages, and gradually introduce habits of temperance.”

The importance of the evil to which reference is made was proved by the statistics referred to by Mr. Dalrymple, when introducing his Habitual Drunkards' Bill ; according to which it appeared, that from returns obtained by him from 259 chief constables and superintendents of police in England, there were, in the districts from which he was able to obtain returns, and which excluded the metropolis, 233,935 convictions altogether in Great Britain, in the year ending September, 1870; of which 106,982 were for drunkenness, and 27,450 for offences due to drunkenness—making 134,432 convictions due to drunkenness in some form.

But the evil exists no less in Ireland ; and it may be proper to consider it a little more in detail. This can be done from the facts stated in the *Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for 1873*.

Putting out of account 5,204 persons apprehended for indictable offences not disposed of summarily, and which comprehend the most serious crimes, it appears that in the year ended the 31st December, 1873, there were proceeded against summarily, before Justices in Ireland, the total number of

223,843 persons.

The nature of the offences in respect of which these persons were proceeded against, is set out at p. 130 of the tables appended to the Report ; and it appears therefrom that, of the above total number,

95,623 persons

were proceeded against for the offences described as “*Drunkenness*,” or “*Drunk and Disorderly*.” It further appears that, of the remaining persons included in the above number of persons summarily proceeded against, 30,114 were proceeded against for common assaults, 3,388 for assaults on peace officers, 4,425 for aggravated assaults on women and children ; and it is well known that a large proportion of these assaults are directly due to excessive drinking.

It is probably not an over-statement to say, that of the above-mentioned number of 223,843 persons summarily proceeded against, one-half, or

111,921 persons,

were prosecuted in consequence, directly or indirectly, of their having indulged in excessive drinking.

This fact, in itself, is of sufficient seriousness; but it by no means represents the full extent of the evil, inasmuch as it is well known that in many cases of drunkenness, even in public, the police do not think it their duty to prosecute the offender.

From what precedes, it is not too much to infer that, for the evils alluded to, some legislative remedies are certain to be applied, and are indeed imminent.

To guard against plausible but inconclusive objections that may be made to my suggestions, it will be important carefully to bear in mind that in certain cases our existing law treats drunkenness as in itself an offence, and punishes the drunkard, and I assume as an admitted principle that it rightly does so.

But it seems to me that our law falls far short of what it ought to do in making provisions against the abuse of alcoholic beverages by many persons who partake of them in excess; and it is in this direction that in my opinion we are to look most hopefully for a decrease in the evils of intemperance.

The existing law as to drunkenness may be stated shortly as follows:—The provisions against it extend only to being drunk in a highway or other public place, the punishment for which is, in the country generally, a fine not exceeding 10s. or two weeks' imprisonment, on a second conviction within twelve months a fine not exceeding 20s., and on a third conviction within twelve months a fine not exceeding 40s. In default of payment of the 10s. fine, a fortnight's imprisonment, and in default of payment of the 20s. or 40s. fine, a month's imprisonment may be awarded, with or without hard labour. If the offender is, while drunk, guilty of riotous or disorderly conduct, or is in charge of any carriage, horse, cattle, or steam engine, or is in possession of loaded fire arms, he is liable to a uniform penalty of 40s., or, in default of payment, to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a month. In very many instances, I understand, the administrators of the law only inflict on the offender a trifling fine.

No distinction (save the possible ones above set out in the case of persons convicted two or more times in twelve months) is by law made between the case of the man found drunk for the first time, and the habitual drunkard—between the man who may be overcome by the temptation of the friendly glass, and the man known to the police as the desperate and habitual drunkard, who wastes his substance, ruins his health, and neglects every duty to his family.

Nor does the law at all take cognizance of habitual *private* drunkenness, whether it has resulted in the extreme forms of dipsomania, or of *delirium tremens*—whether its devotee has stopped short with a wasteful but partial expenditure of his substance in drink, leaving an abundant margin for the support of his family (which, perhaps, cannot be taken notice of by law), or, being the father or other breadwinner of a family, neglects his calling, unduly wastes his means, or drinks to an extent that necessarily involves the speedy ruin of his health.

The intemperate man may now, either at home or in licensed hours in a public house, drink with impunity, to a degree that will involve in ruin not only the moral but the material interests of himself and his family; and, though he may be drunk every week, or even every night, his conduct is free from legal constraint or interference, though his neighbours and all connected with him know that he is starving and neglecting his family, and sending forth his children into the world to swell the ranks of the pauperized, the worthless, or the criminal population.

It appears to me that the evils I have here alluded to have only to be looked at with honest fairness to induce society to say that it will not tolerate the drunkard—in those cases at least where his conduct is ruinous to those connected with him and clearly highly injurious to the community in which he resides.

Society already treats drunkenness as an offence when it comes forth publicly to offer a scandalous example, to endanger human life, or to lead to a possible or probable breach of the peace. But do not all these considerations apply with equal force to the case of a drunkard in his own home? and in this instance there must be added the domestic misery which the drunkard brings into a home, which though his own is also the home of others, and is his own to be protected rather than to be desecrated.

Some persons may think that a determined and thorough course of dealing with the class of habitual drunkards would not do much to abate the evils of intemperance. But bear in mind that the ascertained misery that would be relieved by applying stringent measures to habitual drunkards would alone be very great. This will be at once seen from the examination of some of the figures given in the volume of statistics already referred to. In that volume, the character of the persons proceeded against in 1873, is, so far as known to the police, set out in the tables at p. 134; and the male offenders are thus referred to at p. 29 of the Report:

Men of ascertained bad character proceeded against on indictment and summarily.	Men proceeded against in Ireland in 1873.	Per-centage of each class to total of bad character.
Total number,	13,696	100
Habitual drunkards (not included in other classes),	5,739	42
Suspicious characters,	4,180	31
Vagrants, tramps, and others without visible means of subsistence,	2,648	19
Known thieves,	1,129	8

These figures, owing to repeated proceedings against the same person within the year, do not represent distinct persons. Still, when the proceedings against habitual drunkards, not included in the other classes, are five times the number of proceedings against known thieves, or 42 per cent. of all the proceedings against persons of an ascertained bad character, we see what a great field there is for applying either preventive or punitive law, to an actually existing, ascertained, and numerous class of persons, who require either reformation or punishment.

It will be borne in mind, too, that the above class of habitual

drunkards, only includes those who have, in some way, come under the cognizance of the criminal and police law in one year ; and by no means fully represents the evils of habitual drinking.

It is impossible to believe that any civilized society will permanently permit such a class of persons to remain undealt with, bringing, as they do in many cases, ruin, and in all misery, on themselves and those belonging to them.

Among the class of drunkards, I shall try to distinguish those who may, from those who may not, be subjected to the operation of the law.

In a very able pamphlet by the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, entitled, *On Uncontrollable Drunkenness, considered as a Form of Mental Disorder*, and published in 1866, the author distinguishes between the ordinary class of drunkards who only occasionally drink to excess, and who have to a great extent the capacity of resisting a tendency to indulge to excess, and another class whom he describes as *dipsomaniacs*, and in whom intemperance has assumed, as he considers, many of the characteristics of bodily and mental disease. Of the latter class (*dipsomaniacs*) he says :

“ In these cases the morbid craving for physical stimuli of all kinds, is uninfluenced by any motives that can be addressed to the intellect, heart, or conscience. Self-interest, self-esteem, friendship, love, religion, morality, are appealed to in vain. The passion for intoxicating drinks paralyzes the will, and obtains a complete mastery over the understanding and moral sense, making every other emotion of the soul subservient to its base and demoralizing influences. This disposition for stimulants is often associated with an intense horror of the practice. The invalid (for so he must be considered) is often painfully conscious of his infirmity, and bitterly laments his inability to conquer the disordered appetite. . . . I have, in my own experience, known both men and women (occupying high social positions), of decided genius, of wonderful attainments, and cultivated intellectual taste, fall a prey to this form of insanity, and become utterly wrecked in mind, body, and estate. It is difficult for those unprofessionally conversant with these cases to appreciate the extent to which this vice prevails in all ranks of society, and the difficulties in the way of its successful treatment.”

But in all these cases the law, as it now exists, allows no interference ; and it is only when such mad indulgences result in the acute temporary form of insanity known as *delirium tremens*, that the patient's liberty can be interfered with ; and, inasmuch as the reasoning powers in the latter case are soon restored, the sufferer cannot be confined for a sufficient time in a lunatic asylum to work an effectual cure. Besides, Dr. Winslow points out that it is undesirable that the imputation of insanity (in its commonly understood sense) should attach to a man addicted only to an apparently morbid appetite for stimulants, and that it would be injurious to associate compulsorily inebriates with persons of disordered intellects.

Dr. Winslow shows that it is possible to distinguish between ordinary drunkards (with whose freedom of action he thinks we should not be justified in interfering), and *dipsomaniacs* whose cases clearly overstep the boundaries of physical and mental health ; and he approves of the erection of hospitals or sanatoria in which persons of the latter class might be legally confined and detained.

I would beg to refer to this pamphlet as containing valuable facts on this subject. The suggestions, too, therein are sanctioned by the great name of the author.

I shall assume, without further discussion, that the class of *dipsomaniacs*, as above described, ought to be made subject to confinement and detention for reform, and, so far as they should continue incorrigible, to the further provisions applicable to their case, suggested further on.

But I cannot admit that legislation should stop short with them, as Dr. Winslow seems to think. Were it to do so, it would omit dealing with many cases that would be more hopeful as regards reform, and, socially speaking, not less important than the case of those who have arrived at the extreme and uncontrollable stage of dipsomania.

Persons who are falling into, or who have formed, habits of drinking to excess, though still able to control their appetite, and whom I shall call ordinary habitual drunkards, ought, I think, in certain cases, to be subjected to the restraints of the law I shall presently refer to.

In addition then to dipsomaniacs, I propose to deal with the following classes of ordinary habitual drunkards :—

1. Those who have indulged to such excess that they are suffering under, or recently have had, an attack of *delirium tremens*.

2. Habitual Drunkards who come under any of the following descriptions, namely :

(a) Persons who by habitual drunkenness, or the idleness resulting from it, have brought their wives or children on the rates.

(b) Persons who withdraw from the support of their family and devote to intemperance, funds required for the support in decent comfort, according to their rank in life, of their wives and children, or others properly dependent on them.

(c) Persons who are proved to have been drunk in the public streets or on public roads, (say) three times in the preceding six months.

(d) Persons who shall be proved to be drunk, and when drunk engaged in drunken brawls, whether on public streets or roadways or not, (say) three times in the preceding six months.

(e) Persons who having their labour, whether professional or otherwise, only or chiefly to depend on, are proved to be addicted to drinking to such a degree that their health is likely to be thereby seriously endangered if not ruined.

If our law boldly dealt with the preceding classes of offenders against the welfare and good order of society, not only would a large number of these persons be reformed, but a still larger number, both of these persons and of others who are predisposed to fall into and constitute the classes enumerated, would be deterred from excesses, which many persons are now prepared to regard with ridicule ; but which, under the operation and sanction of a reasonable law, would soon come to be regarded by all as serious social offences. For it is to be remembered that a law in consonance with the general moral sense of a community reacts on, vivifies, and strengthens that moral sense. Examples of this are afforded by the well known humanizing effects of the law that protects the lower animals from wanton cruelty,

the law that takes up and cares for idiots and lunatics and withdraws them from the ridicule and mockery of boys and thoughtless persons, and the more recent law that enables the tumbling street Arab, whose career was crime, to be an example of what thoughtful care may do with those whom careless legislation till lately permitted to be a curse of society.

In the classification of persons to be dealt with by the law, as above mentioned, I have not included those who may fall into occasional private excess. The occasional public offence of being drunk on the streets, or drunk and disorderly, might be punished as at present, but by a higher fine, and in aggravated cases by imprisonment without the option of a fine.

The question remains to be considered, what should be the nature of the punishment or discipline that ought to be applied to the case of the dipsomaniac, and of the ordinary habitual drunkard who may fall within any of the classes above set out.

And at the very threshold of this question, we are met by the fact that the mass of the community hardly regard drunkenness as a crime at all. We have the magistrates constantly letting the offender off with the lowest fine possible; we have the ordinary member of society more disposed to laugh at the poor fellow who goes reeling home through the streets after spending far more than he can well afford, than to see him dealt with by law; and we have kindly and even thoughtful persons with a sigh declaring of the social and good-natured drunkard, who is becoming a wreck both in mind, body, and estate, that "he is no man's enemy but his own."

I therefore think that in laying down a strict law of the character I have tried to shadow forth, it will be necessary, as well as wise, to make the leading, or perhaps better, the exclusive idea of the sanction of that law be, in the first instance, *reformation* rather than punishment.

I would therefore propose that persons belonging to the several classes of habitual drunkards I have above adverted to, including of course "dipsomaniacs," should be deprived of their liberty for considerable periods; and that in the extreme cases of absolute dipsomania and *delirium tremens*, they should be sent to hospitals for distinctively medical treatment. Those whose cases were not so extreme ought to be sent to reformatories, to undergo a course of regular industrial discipline, in a healthy country situation, and entirely withdrawn from the temptations that were too strong for them. To the same reformatories the cases from the hospitals ought to be sent, after their convalescence was well established. After having been in the reformatory for such a period of their detention as might seem right, the inmates might be allowed out on licence; which would be subject to immediate withdrawal if certain conditions, which ought to require the practice of strict temperance and the application of their earnings to the support of their families or those dependent on them, were violated.

The foregoing ought to be the foundation of the system. As subsidiary thereto, but at the same time as necessary adjuncts, there ought to be a certain number of penitentiaries to which persons committing

breaches of discipline in the reformatory, or violating the conditions of their licence, above mentioned, might be sent for the purpose of punishment.

Thus *punishment* would be kept entirely in the back ground; still it would be invaluable as the means of restraining the most abandoned. In cases that would appear to be incorrigible, it ought, however, I think, to be distinctly understood that perpetual detention in penitentiaries would be the final result of persistent and extreme indulgence. On every ground, both of discipline, of principle, and of the welfare of society, it would be justified. It would give life and reality to the prior discipline in the reformatory, and to the efforts of the individual himself after leaving it on licence. It would save relations, as well as the offender himself, from untold and hopeless misery. Persons of the class of incorrigible drunkards, again, appear to me to be no more worthy of their liberty than are actual lunatics, or even habitual criminals: and if it be true, as stated by Dr. Winslow, that dipsomania is in a high degree hereditary, is not society justified in withdrawing from the devotee of drink the opportunity of afflicting coming generations?

As for many reasons it would be desirable that as little publicity as possible should be given to cases of the description I have referred to, I think that the adjudication of (say) two magistrates in their official capacity, might be sufficient to authorize the committal of the offender to the hospital, reformatory, or penitentiary, as the case might be—giving in all cases a right of appeal to the Chairman of the County. The complaint might be brought forward by a relative of the offender in all cases, and by the constabulary authorities in some cases, and by the relieving officer in others.

Where the offender has property, the magistrates ought, by a summary order, to appoint a guardian of the property, and direct such guardian to pay to the wife, children, or other person dependent on the offender, such sum as might seem to them proper. Where it was alleged he had no property, they might be enabled to direct strict inquiry to be made by trustworthy persons as to the circumstances of the offender's family; and if no means were forthcoming for their support, they ought to be enabled to name a reasonable sum for their support, to be provided out of the poor rates.

If excess in drinking, in the cases already pointed out, ought to be regarded as a serious offence in the person committing it, aiding and abetting in that offence ought also to be so regarded; and when, as in the case of the publican, drink is given for gain, the act ought to be severely punished. The recently enacted law which makes a person selling any intoxicating liquor to a drunken person liable to a penalty not exceeding, for a first offence, £10, and for any subsequent offence £20, ought to be stringently enforced, and I think that in such a case, at all events, the discretion given by the act of last session to the court, not to record a conviction on a licence, ought to be withdrawn.

Another regulation that I should recommend on this point is, that it should be competent to a magistrate, on complaint being made to him by any husband, wife, parent, or child, that the wife, husband,

child, or parent, respectively, of the complainant was indulging, or commencing to indulge, in habitual drinking, to an extent involving, in the opinion of such magistrate, flagrant neglect of family duties, to issue a notice to the holder of any licence named within a given distance, directing such holder not to supply the person against whom such complaint should be made with intoxicating beverages, for, say, two years from the date of such notice; and that wilful violation of the notice, or the wilful supplying such beverages to persons out on licence from a reformatory, should subject the holder of a licence to the loss of his licence.

By the kindness of the Rev. Dr. Hall of New York, and formerly of this city, I was transmitted a memorandum of the statutes relating to Habitual Drunkards in the State of New York. I should have appended it to this paper, only that its principal provisions are given in the evidence of the American witnesses examined before the committee of the House of Commons.

Dr. Hall says in his letter to me that "little has been done;" and I therefore suppose that the New York legislation is not there considered as satisfactory. I may observe upon it that it adopts the principle that habitual drunkards should be committed, as to both their person and estate, to a public authority; but I think in classifying drunkards with idiots, lunatics, and persons of unsound mind, it errs, and leads the minds of those dealing with them aside from the correct conception of their case; which is, I take leave to submit, that they are persons not incapacitated by nature, as are idiots and lunatics, but responsible persons who are gifted often with reasoning powers beyond the common, and at the worst are only incapacitated by persistent indulgence in an evil habit; and who, so far as they are physically diseased, ought to be cured, and as far as they are morally weak, ought to be aided in reforming; but whose *persistence* in vicious indulgences affecting persons other than themselves, is an offence on their part against society, and as such ought to be punished.

Mr. Dalrymple's Habitual Drunkards' Bill, above alluded to, appears to me to err in the same direction as the New York legislation. It treats habitual drunkards as persons of unsound mind, and assumes too much that such persons have only to be cured of a "disorder." Instead of this conception of their case, I should regard and treat them as *offenders*—offenders, however, whose conduct in the first instance will only subject them to temporary detention, and, so far as they are diseased, to curative treatment; but I should keep in reserve for them the wholesome dread of lengthened detention, and, in aggravated cases, of severe discipline or punishment.

The New York statutes, if I understand them aright, relate only to the case of persons having property, save apparently in the case of temporary committal to the New York State Inebriate Asylum. But this restriction to the class who have realized property appears to me to be essentially bad. It, however, naturally arises from habitual drunkards being classified with persons of unsound mind, as Chancery (or other courts representing it), take little care of persons of unsound mind, unless they have property to be taken care of. These

statutes, however, afford a satisfactory precedent for a public authority dealing with the property of habitual drunkards.

The legislation of the colony of Victoria affords a precedent for severe dealing with habitual drunkards. By "The Police Offences' Statute, 1865," of that colony (Consolidated Statutes, No. CCLXV.), s. 35 (with the copy of which I was furnished by the courtesy of the authorities of the Colonial Office), any habitual drunkard being thrice convicted of drunkenness within the preceding twelve months, is made liable to imprisonment in any gaol, for any time not exceeding twelve months, with or without hard labour.

The 52nd article regulating the Poor Law system at Elberfeld in Prussia, and which system was in the year 1871 the subject of a very remarkable and favourable report by Mr. Doyle, one of the English Poor Law Inspectors, to the Right Hon. Mr. Stansfield, provides (or until recently did provide) that when a person so far abandons himself to play, *drink*, or idleness, as to require relief either for himself or for those dependent on him for support, he should be punished with imprisonment for from seven days to one month. This provision affords a precedent for my suggestion as to dealing in our law with persons who have brought their children on the rates, and, in principle, equally applies to those who withdraw from the support of their families for indulgence in drink, an improper share of their income or wages, or who by improper indulgence ruin their health, and so destroy the means of supporting their families.

Though it may be unnecessary to say more on the subject of the state interfering with the property of drunkards, I may add such interference appears to me to be in principle authorized by the law of Scotland, in which the rule exists, that *prodigals* may be interdicted from dealing with their property so as to diminish their estate. This rule is adopted in the Scotch law from the Roman law, and, according to Mr. Bowyer, prevails generally in countries whose law is based on the Roman law; and though it has not hitherto been adopted in this country, I cannot but think that in the case of habitual drunkards, who are either wantonly wasting their means, or their health (which is the only means of many), it would be safe and politic to apply the rule. The result would, I doubt not, show that the interference of the state with the income or earnings of drunkards, as already recommended, would be abundantly justified.

On this question of the interference with prodigals, I may refer to *Bowyer's Commentaries on the Modern Civil Law*, pp. 55, 56, where the rule of the Roman law and also of the Scotch law is referred to.

I shall conclude with pointing out some very recent changes in our own law, which I think afford weighty analogous arguments in favour of what I have taken leave to suggest.

It is well known that the existence of a large habitual *criminal* class has for some years engaged the anxious attention of law reformers, statesmen, and the legislature, with a view both to repress the existing class of criminals, and, by preventive measures, deprive it, so far as possible, of its chief sources of increase.

The case of *existing* habitual criminals has been partially dealt with by the various acts regulating prison discipline; which combine with

punitive measures those measures of reformation which have made the Irish Prison system celebrated over the world. It is kept in view as a primary duty of those dealing with offenders against the peace of society, that they are, if possible, to be reformed; and bad as many of these cases have been, those who have worked on with a steady eye to that primary object have been abundantly rewarded. But in addition the legislature has enacted a series of most severe measures against habitual and persistent criminals. Previous convictions add to their punishment; and by the "Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871," a person who has been twice convicted of serious crime is, if found in certain circumstances leading the court to believe that he is continuing in his criminal courses, at any time within seven years from the termination of the sentence on his last conviction, made guilty of an offence against the Act, and made liable thereby to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year. The same Act enables the court to make any person convicted a second time liable to the supervision of the police for seven years after the termination of his sentence.

The Legislature has tried, and with great success, to cut off the *supply* of habitual criminals by the Reformatory School system and the Industrial School system.

It is known that *habitual crime* has been enormously decreased both among old and young offenders by the measures I have alluded to. For this object, the legislature have deprived persons of their liberty for long periods, who at former times would be untouched by law, and such legislation is approved by all. I think it may be doubted if the habitual criminal class, when it was at its worst, did as much harm, or caused as much suffering, as the habitual drunkard class can be charged with now. Why then should the latter class continue undealt with? Is it over-sanguine to anticipate, that if a system of strict and intelligent reformatory discipline, and, in persistent and aggravated cases, punitive discipline, were applied to habitual drunkards, and in certain cases to those who by entering on intemperate courses supply that class, the grave social offence of habitual intemperate drinking would be far more diminished than habitual crime has been?

It is in this direction, I submit with some confidence, that we are to look for a decrease of intemperance. The measures I have advocated will, I feel confident, when honestly examined, have the support of all reasonable men; they will, by making excess disgraceful, strengthen the hands of those who rely on moral appeals to their fellow men in favour of temperance, in addition to the positive good they may effect in reforming drunkards.

The rest must be left to the slow, but in the long run the effective, action of the moral and religious teachers of our race.

The limits of this paper prevent me referring to the recommendations of the Report of the committee of the House of Commons, and to the valuable evidence in the appendix thereto. They will amply repay perusal, and I venture to hope that what I have said may induce many to read them, and in some degree to promote the object of those who in different ways are working to promote the cause of temperance.