by an enormous increase in home production, the capital invested in breweries having risen from 4 million dollars in 1850 to 515 million dollars in 1905. The consumption of spirits is at a much higher level than in the United Kingdom, and two considerations add greatly to the significance of the fact—one is that drinking takes place more between meals and less at them, and the other that it is more confined to men. Women, other than prostitutes,

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Consumption per head in Gallons, United· States.* | | | | |
| **Year ending June 30.** | **Spirits.** | **Wine.** | **Malt.** | **Total·** |
| 1840 .... | 2∙52 | O∙29 | I∙36 | 4∙I7 |
| 1850 . . . . | 2∙23 | O∙27 | 1∙5≡ | 4∙θ8 |
| i860 . | 2∙86 | O∙35 | 3’22 | 6-43 |
| 1870 ... | 2\*07 | O∙32 | 5∙3I | 7∙70 |
| 1880 . | I∙27 | 0-56 | 8-26 | 10∙08 |
| 1882 . | I∙40 | 0∙49 | IO∙O3 | II∙92 |
| 1884 . . | I∙48 | θ∙37 | 10’74 | I2∙6o |
| 1886 . | I∙28 | o∙45 | 11 \*20 | 12∙92 |
| 1888 . | I∙26 | **o∙6ι** | I2∙8o | 14-67 |
| 1890 . . . . | I∙40 | 0∙46 | 13∙66 | 15∙53 |
| 1892 ... | I-49 | °∙43 | 15-17 | 17∙lo |
| 1894 .... | ι∙34 | 0∙32 | 15∙32 | 16∙96 |
| 1896 | I **∙OI** | O∙27 | 15∙84 | 17∙12 |
| 1898 . . . . | I∙I2 | O∙28 | 15-96 | 17-36 |
| 19∞ .... | I-28 | 0∙39 | 16∙01 | 17∙68 |
| 1901 .... | ι∙33 | 0∙37 | i6∙2O | 17∙9o |
| 1902 .... | 1∙36 | 0∙63 | 17-49 | 19∙48 |
| 1903 | 1∙46 | 0∙48 | 18-04 | 19∙98 |
| 1904 | 1∙48 | o∙53 | 18∙28 | 20-35 |
| 1905 . | ι∙45 | O∙42 | 18∙50 | 20∙38 |
| 1906 . . . . | 1∙52 | o∙55 | 2o∙19 | 22∙26 |
| 1907 ... | 1∙63 | 0∙67 | 21∙24 | 23-53 |
| 1908 | 1∙44 | o∙6o | 20∙98 | 23∙02 |
| 1909 ... | r∙37 |  | 19-79 |  |

do not frequent the bar as they do in the United Kingdom, and children not at all. The expenditure in drink, so far as it can be calculated, has fluctuated somewhat, but shows a general tendency to rise. The following table has been prepared by Mr G. B. Waldron, an American statistician. It is taken from the *Prohibition Year Book,* with the American currency converted into English on the basis of 4s. to the dollar, omitting fractions of a penny; for purposes of comparison with the British statistics given above.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Annual Drink Bill, United States.* | | | | | |
| **Year.** | **Total Expenditure.** | **Expenditure per head.** | **Year.** | **Total**  **Expenditure.** | **Expendi­ture per head.** |
| 1878 | *£*  90,655.754 | £ ∙s∙ *d.*  I 18 I | 1898 | £  208,312,573 | £ s. *d.*  *2* 17 I |
| 1888 | 163,617,545 | 2 14 7 | 1899 | 214,137,995 | 2178 |
| 1889 | 168,176,169 | 2 14 II | 1900 | 234,445,322 | 3 I 5 |
| 1890 | 180,529,173 | 2178 | 1901 | 243,999,598 | 3 2 10 |
| l89i | 195.9’6,560 | 3 I 4 | 1902 | 269,556,728 | 383 |
| 1892 | 202,978,872 | 3 2 4 | 1903 | 282,122,043 | 3 10 2 |
| ï893 | 215,896,634 | 3 5 I | 1904 | 292,735,706 | 3 ii 7 |
| 1894 | 204,924,298 | 307 | 1905 | 293,180,332 | 3 10 6 |
| 1895 | 194,189,466 | 2 16 4 | 1906 | 321,604,383 | 3 16 4 |
| 1896 | 192,418,995 | 2 14 9 | 1907 | 351,461,570 | 4 in |
| 1897 | 198,640,711 | 2 15 6 | 1908 | 335,ι67,639 | 3 16 II |

Comparison with the British table shows at a glance an opposite movement in the two countries. While expenditure has steadily fallen in the United Kingdom since 1899, it has as steadily risen in the United States; and whereas in 1888 the expenditure in the former was 41 per cent. higher than in the latter, the two had drawn equal in 1906 and since then have changed places. Moreover the different system of taxation brings back a much larger proportion of the whole expenditure into the exchequer in the United Kingdom (see Liquor Laws). The comparison is of much interest in view of the very different laws and regulations under which the trade is conducted in the two countries. It may be objected that the statistics are merely estimates, but both sets are put forward by the advocates of prohibition and are of equal authority, so that they hold good for comparison.

*Norway and Sweden.—*The statistics for these countries are im­perfect, because there is no record of wine, and in recent years the use of spirits has been supplemented or replaced to a considerable extent by artificial wines heavily loaded with spirits. But, as they stand, the statistics derive special interest from the peculiar con­ditions under which the traffic is conducted. The Scandinavian company system was started in Sweden in 1865 and in Norway in 1871 (see Liquor Laws).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Consumption per head in Litres, Norway.* | | |
| Year. | Bränvin. | Beer, |
| l85i-6θ | 5-9 |  |
| l86l-70 | 4-6 |  |
| l87i-80 | 5-2 | 18∙2 |
| l88l-90 | 3-2 | 16∙0 |
| 1891 | 3’7 | 21∙7 |
| 1892 | 3-2 | 20-6 |
| 1893 | 3-5 | 20-8 |
| 1894 | 3’8 | 19∙8 |
| 1895 · · | 3-5 | 17∙7 |
| 1896 | 2∙3 | 16∙2 |
| 1897 | 2∙2 | i7∙8 |
| 1898 | 2-6 | 21-6 |
| 1899 | 3-3 | 23-2 |
| 1900 | 3-4 | 22∙7 |
| 1901 | 3-4 | 2O∙O |
| 1902 | 3-4 | 17∙8 |
| 1903 | 3-2 | 14∙l |
| 1904 | 3-3 | 13∙l |
| 1905 | 2∙7 | 13∙7 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Consumption per head in Litres, Sweden.* | | |
| Year. | Bränvin. | Beer. |
| 1856-60 | 9-5 | .. |
| 1861-70 | 9-7 | 10\*9 |
| l87i-8θ | I0∙9 | 16∙1 |
| l88l-90 | 7-5 | 21∙9 |
| 1891 | 64 | 30∙9 |
| 1892 | 6-5 | 30∙8 |
| 1893 | 6-7 | 31∙6 |
| 1894 | 6-9 | 33∙o |
| 1895 | 6-9 | 35-5 |
| 1896 | 7-2 | 42∙4 |
| 1897 | 7-5 | 45∙o |
| 1898 | 8∙o | 50∙0 |
| 1899 | 8-3 | 58∙i |
| 19∞ | 8-5 | 56-4 |
| 1901 | 8-4 | 60∙4 |
| 1902 | 7-8 | 56-6 |
| 1903 | 7-4 | 58-7 |
| 1904 | 6-9 | 52∙8 |
| 1905 | 7∙o |  |

The difference between these contiguous countries is remarkable. The consumption of spirits has always been much higher in Sweden than in Norway. In the old days before any legislation the estimated consumption was in Sweden 46 litres (1829) and in Norway 16 litres (1833) a head. In recent years, under the company system, the figures for both countries are vastly less, but the Swedish con­sumption has hardly ever been less than double the Norwegian and sometimes three times as great. This difference, observed over a long period before regulation and after, points to different condi­tions and national habits; but such constant differentiating factors hardly explain the strikingly dissimilar movements shown by the tables. Both countries are obviously affected by the state of trade. The high-water mark of spirit-drinking in modern times for both was the same period, 1874-76, as noted above for the United King­dom; Sweden then averaged 12∙4 litres a head and Norway 6∙6. Both show also the influence of the 1900 boom in trade and the subsequent decline. But in Sweden the increase of beer-drinking, which in 1871-80 was less than in Norway, has been enormous. If the two drinks are put together it cannot be said that the con­sumption in Sweden was appreciably less in 1896-1905 than in 1871-80, whereas in Norway it was distinctly less. This may in part be explained by the substitution of the made wine, called laddevin, to which reference has already been made. The marked fall in the consumption of spirits which occurred in 1896-98 is attributed to this cause (Rowntree and Sherwell) ; the importation of wine rose from 2,320,300 litres in 1891-94 to 5,876,750 litres in 1898. Subsequently importation was checked by heavier duties and reduced consumption followed. In 1886-90 the quantity consumed per head in litres averaged 0·88; in 1896-1900 it was 2∙49, with a maximum of 2∙75 in 1898; in 1905 it had fallen again to 0∙88 (Pratt).

A careful study of the foregoing statistics of consumption in the three countries—United Kingdom,. United States and the Scandinavian peninsula—which have paid most attention to. the problem and have for a long period applied forcible but widely different methods of control, does not permit any confident con­clusion upon the comparative merits of any particular system. The United States, in whose multitudinous liquor laws prohibition plays the most prominent part, has most conspicuously failed to check consumption. Norway and Sweden, both of which combine the