

"He has now commenced his work in this city. In this labor we wish him success, as we have rejoiced in his usefulness, and in the public honors which philanthropy has received through him. We do not share in the apprehensions of some of our Protestant brethren, of the evil to arise from the fact, that Mr. Mathew is a Roman Catholic priest. Some denounce him as an emissary of the Pope. But we think the Pope would be doing a very commendable thing were he to send such emissaries in such numbers as to persuade all his people to leave off drinking rum. Or if popery, or any other religion, can gain influence by doing good, it is legitimately entitled to it. If we Protestants, with our Bibles and Free Schools and Colleges, cannot hold our own against such 'emissaries' let us go the wall. But we are under no such concern."

In relation to Mr. Mathew, the *New York Evangelist* uses the following language:—

"The Rev. Theobald Mathew has been raised up by Divine Providence as an Apostle of Temperance among the Irish Catholic people. To them his labors have been confined, and we presume, from the nature of the case, will necessarily be confined. That he is a man of pure philanthropy, we have no doubt, and by many rare qualities, adapted to his peculiar field of labor. He has awakened in the Irish Catholic heart, a just and deep confidence in his philanthropy; but in connexion with this, is the power of that reverence, which from the force of education they feel for the priest. The very mode of taking the pledge shows this. Mr. Mathew is not remarkable as a lecturer, and therefore could never have aroused the Protestant people of this country like Dr. Hewitt and other men. Where a reverence for the priest is not felt, he would of course have proved unsuccessful. So far, therefore, as the cause in this country is concerned, the epithet, the Apostle of Temperance by no means belongs to him. The great work in our country has been started and carried on by other influences. At the same time, we believe he will find a large field among us in the Irish Catholic population, and on their account, we hail his visit as auspicious and timely."

"It is peculiarly grateful to witness the generous and unsectarian spirit of Protestantism manifested in his reception in this country. We honor good men and philanthropists, of every denomination, and bid them God speed. Yet who can help, at the same time, remembering that if our American Apostle of Temperance had gone abroad, there is not a Roman Catholic people in the world that would have received him, because he is not of their church. These are facts of great significance."

Says the *American Messenger*:

"It is a cheering evidence of the change in public sentiment on great moral questions, that such a reformer as Theobald Mathew can command the plaudit of municipal governments, and become the nation's guest. Surely, if a Protestant community can be roused to enthusiasm by the arrival of a preacher of temperance—a Roman Catholic—an Irishman—a priest—who comes on an errand of mercy, there is hope that moral enterprises are coming to have a more just position in public regard. It may be, after all, that the nobility of goodness, and the heroism of benevolence, even in a wicked world, shall come to be estimated as the chief titles to public applause—that those who stand in the front rank as the benefactors of the world, shall have a welcome as cordial as the world has been wont to give to the greatest destroyers."

"We trust Father Mathew will not be diverted by public adulation from the vastly important work of his life, but that he will gather the hundreds of thousands of his immigrant countrymen under the temperance banner. Thus will his visit to America be made a national blessing."

A PROBLEM FOR LAW MAKERS.

The effects of the sale of intoxicating drinks are *uniformly the same everywhere*, and in all conditions of society. Sell them to savages or civilized men, whites or blacks, Turks, Hindoos, or Christians, and the effect upon all is just the same. It makes them alike noisy, ill-tempered, quarrelsome, abusive to neighbors and relatives; it is followed by poverty, degradation and crime; assaults and battenings, riots, lightings, and murders, follow in the wake of the liquor traffic, just as certainly and uniformly as a report follows the explosion of gunpowder.

The effects of the traffic are also *wholly injurious* in all cases. It cannot be pretended that the case ever happened in which a community was rendered wiser, better, more industrious, wealthier, or more respectable in consequence of the traffic, licensed or unlicensed. And there is not the least reason to hope that such beneficial effects ever will follow this business.

When, therefore, a legislature licenses this traffic, it does so with a perfect assurance that it will result only in misery, degradation, poverty, and crime. Now, suppose that the man who buys drink of your licensed vender, after making himself drunk, should go into the house of the law-maker, and do there what he is accustomed to do at his own house, that is to say, break the looking-glass, kick over the supper table, beat the children with the tongs, break the chairs over the mother's back, and compel the whole family to fly barefoot and half-dressed into the snow to save their lives! what would our law-maker say to that? Would he say it was more than he had bargained for? But we tell him, nay, it is *not more* than he bargained for, because all experience shows that men will act in this way when they get drunk, whether on licensed or unlicensed sales. The only difference is, that he beats the family of the man who licensed the sale, instead of his own innocent family, who had nothing to do with it.

Now it seems to us that any magnanimous, high-minded man would prefer that the legitimate consequences of his acts should come upon himself and his family, rather than fall upon the heads of innocent wives and children who protest against his acts, or at any rate are wholly innocent of all participation in them. If the consequences of the traffic in strong drinks were not universally and invariably such as described: if it only happened once in a while, even, that the traffic resulted in doing good and making families happier, wiser, and better, why then the law-maker might say that he had hoped for the best in licensing the business, and, if it turned out otherwise, it was *accidental and unfortunate*. But nothing of the sort can be pretended. The result of the traffic is *bad only*—and continually—and everywhere—and in all times and places. The licenser knows it, and, instead of throwing the consequences on the family of the drunkard, should hold his peace if they fall on his own household.—*New York Organ*.

DR. MUSSEY ON BRANDY IN CHOLERA.

In a discussion on Cholera at a late session of the "Ohio State Medical Convention," Dr. Mussey made the following remarks in reference to the use of brandy as a prophylactic:

"Upon boats on the river the increase of brandy drinking, consequent upon the approach of the cholera, has been frightful, and the mortality on board those vessels has been terrible and unprecedented. One boat lost forty-three, another forty-seven, and a third fifty-nine of its passengers and crew. Spirits is not a prophylactic in any case. To the temperate it is an active exciting cause. To the drinker it is not advisable to drop off the use suddenly; but the quantity should be diminished rather than increased."

In Albany, in 1832, the cholera was very severe and