If any other year be taken similar discrepancies are shown. In 1909 the six counties with the highest and the six with the lowest number of licences exclusive of county boroughs, gave the following results :—

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County.** | Licenses per 10,000. | **Convic­tions per 10,000.** | **County.** | **Li­cences per 10,000.** | **Convic­tions ' per 10,000.** |
| Huntingdon | 91∙51 | 20∙60 | Middlesex . . | 11-84 | 33∙32 |
| Cambridge . | 74∙04 | 11∙18 | Northumberland | 19∙o9 | 133∙12 |
| Oxford . | 63∙68 | 9∙56 | Essex | 19∙13 | 16∙95 |
| Brecon . | 63∙28 | 54'34 | Glamorgan . | 20∙56 | 75∙34 |
| Rutland. . | 61∙79 | 14∙14 | Lancaster . | 21'43 | 3≡∙45 |
| Buckingham | 59∙72 | I5∙76 | Durham | 21∙67 | 80∙49 |
| Mean . | 69∙00 | 20-93' | Mean | 18∙95 | 62-94 |

It is curious that the mean figures for these two groups at oppo­site ends of the scale almost exactly reverse the number of licences and convictions; but the individual discrepancies show that other factors really determine the results. The chief of these is unquestion­ably occupation. All the counties with the highest number of convictions are pre-eminently mining counties. Year after year Northumberland, Durham and Glamorgan occupy the same place at the head of the convictions, and other mining counties are always high up. These areas are not drunken because the public-houses are few, but vice versa; the licences are kept down because of the drunkenness. The influence of occupation and character is further revealed by a broader survey. The following table from the judicial statistics for 1894 brings out these elements very clearly:—

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Persons Proceeded Against for Drunkenness per* 10,000. | |
| Seaports  Mining counties .... Metropolis · ....  Manufacturing towns .  Pleasure towns .... | 126∙07  ■ H3∙67  ■ 63∙74 47∙00 28∙93 |
| Agricultural counties— |  |
| (1) Home counties | . 24∙50 |
| (2) South-Western | . 20∙94 |
| (3) Eastern .... | 10∙99 |

In other countries the same distribution is observed; drunken­ness is most prevalent in seaports and mining districts. It is further fostered by a northerly situation, and these three factors go far to explain the condition of Scotland, as of Northumberland and Durham.

*The United States.—*The Census Bureau at Washington issues from time to time statistics of cities, which contain a good deal of information concerning drunkenness. The last return, published in 1910, contains details of 158 cities having a population of over 30,000 in the year 1907, to which the statistics relate. It appears from these returns that drunkenness is exceedingly prevalent in American towns. The figures are not comparable with the English ones, because they relate to arrests, which are more numerous than “ proceedings ” and still more than convictions. The number of women included is very considerable, but the data are too imperfect to permit the calculation of a general percentage. In New York the proportion of women arrested for drunkenness and disorder was 24∙3 per cent, of the whole number. The cities are divided into four groups according to population:—(1) over 300,000,

(2) 100,000 to 300,000, (3) 50,000 to 100,000, (4) 30,000 to 50,000. The average number of arrests per 10,000 inhabitants in each group and in all cities together is—(1) 191∙0, (2) 193∙6, (3) 245∙8, (4) 244·8; mean of all cities, 205∙1. The comparatively small range of differ­ence between the groups is remarkable, and indicates a general prevalence of police drunkenness. The higher figures for groups

(3) and (4) are explained by the excessive number of cases in certain manufacturing, mining and Southern coloured towns of small and medium size. These figures are for drunkenness alone, so that they cannot be confused with other offences; but on examining the details of individual cities it becomes clear that the practice varies considerably in making up the returns, and that in some places nearly all the arrests of drunken persons are charged to drunken­ness whereas in others a large proportion are returned under the head of disorderly conduct. In considering the relation between drunkenness and the number of licensed houses, therefore, it seems desirable to put both sets of figures, as in the following table. It will be seen that there is no correspondence between the number of licensed houses and the amount of drunkenness alone or of drunkenness and disorderly conduct together, except that the fourth group has the largest number of licences and the most disorder.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Arrests and Licences per* 10,000. | | | |
| **Cities.** | **Arrests, Drunkenness.** | **Arrests, Disorderly Conduct.** | **Retail Liquor Dealers.** |
| Group I  Over 300,000 | 191∙0 | 108∙8 | 3°∙3 |
| Group 2 |  |  |  |
| 100,000 to 300,000 | 193∙6 | 112·8 | 27∙7 |
| Group 3  50,000 to 100,000 | 245∙8 | 78∙7 | 28∙4 |
| Group 4 |  |  |  |
| 30,000 to 50,000 | 244·8 | 121∙4 | 31∙5 |
| Mean | 205·1 | 106∙8 | 29∙6 |

There are large discrepancies between different cities, but not greater than among British towns. The following table gives the figures corresponding to the above for each of the great cities in­cluded in group I, with the exception of San Francisco, the popula­tion of which could not be estimated :—

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Arrests and Licences per* 10,000. | | | |
| **Cities.** | **Arrests, Drunkenness.** | **Arrests. Disorderly Conduct.** | **Retail Liquor Dealers.** |
| New York .... | IO5∙9 | 120∙2 | 25∙5 |
| Chicago | 169∙l | 5∙3 | 34∙2 |
| Philadelphia | 287∙5 | 81∙0 | 131 |
| St Louis .... | 106∙3 | I73∙7 | 33∙5 |
| Boston | 614∙9 | 16∙9 | I3∙5 |
| Baltimore .... | 75∙ι | 302∙5 | 4i∙3 |
| Pittsburg .... | 33i∙4 | 236∙9 | I5∙3 |
| Cleveland .... | 355'2 | 34∙9 | 40∙4 |
| Buffalo | 318∙9 | 153∙3 | 3≡∙4 |
| Detroit | 87∙2 | 82∙5 | 46∙9 |
| Cincinnati .... | 82∙4 | 66∙4 | 44'8 |
| Milwaukee .... | 100-5 | 53∙ι | 70∙4 |
| New Orleans . | 239-5 | 220∙7 | 50∙0 |
| Washington | 130∙6 | 338∙4 | 16∙6 |

To a certain extent the same inverse relation appears here as in England; the places with the smallest proportion of licences— namely, Philadelphia, Boston, Pittsburg and Washington—are con­spicuous for drunkenness and disorder, while those with the largest proportion of licences—namely, Detroit, Cincinnati, Milwaukee and New Orleans—are distinguished by the lowest amount, with the exception of New Orleans, which is a special case by reason of the large coloured and Creole population. The exceptional position of Boston is obviously due to exceptional police activity and that of Chicago to the opposite. At Boston and Cleveland, it will be noticed, the police prefer the charge of drunkenness; at Baltimore the opposite. The position of Washington is explained by the very large coloured population and the strength of the police force, which is greater in the capital than elsewhere and very strict in regard to order in the streets. Philadelphia, Pittsburg and Cleve­land are great manufacturing centres with a large population of foreign workmen; the vast influx of European immigrants, con­sisting of men disposed to drink by age, occupation, race and habits, and receiving higher wages than they have been used to, must always be borne in mind with regard to drunkenness in the United States. It is interesting to note the condition of those cities in which there is no licensed trade. There are none such in the first two groups, but 14 in the third and fourth groups. The following are the figures:—

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Arrests for Drunkenness and Disorder per* 10,000. | | | |
| Group 3 | | Group 4 | |
| Cambridge (Mass.). | 218·5 | Topeka (Kansas) . . | 227∙1 |
| Kansas City (Kansas) - | 178∙0 | Malden (Mass.). . . | 100∙8 |
| Somerville (Mass.) . | 130∙5 | Chelsea (Mass.). . . | 336∙O |
| Charleston (S. Carolina) | 342'7 | Salem (Mass.) - . . | 329 ∙o |
| Portland (Maine) . | 605 | Newton (Mass.). . . | 168∙1 |
| Brockton (Mass.) . | 240∙9 | Wichita (Kansas) . . | 392'7 |
|  |  | Fitchburg (Mass.). . | 161∙5 |
|  |  | Everett (Mass.). . . | 99-6 |

The majority are prohibition cities in Massachusetts, the only state in which this measure was applied to any place of considerable size in 1907. In all of them the drunkenness is below the mean for the group and considerably below that of similar and neighbour­ing towns. For instance, Brockton is a boot-manufacturing town.