

nature of the question we are discussing, there must be "first principles in common," and whether we be Christian or Heathen, Jew or Turk, Catholic or Protestant, or whether our opponents in Canada be one or the other, makes no difference. Alcoholic drinks will kill any of us, and it is the right and duty of the State to prevent the destruction of human life. To assume that there is no common ground on which Catholics and Protestants can stand, when endeavoring to adjust the laws relating to human happiness and social progress, is, to say the least, perfectly absurd. We regard the Catholics of Canada as our brethren, and consider that man an enemy who interposes a wild and senseless sophism for the purpose of preventing harmonious co-operation for the accomplishment of a public good. To say, on this question of the Maine Law, that there is nothing in common to which Catholics and Protestants can alike appeal, is a palpable evasion; and Lavater has justly said, "evasions are the common shelter of the hard-hearted, the false, the impotent, when called upon to assist; the real great alone, plan instantaneous help, even when their looks or words presage difficulties." The *True Witness* need be under no apprehension that we shall undermine the faith of Catholics. On Transubstantiation, Sacraments, and Purgatory, we have here nothing to say. On these subjects, it is probable we should not agree as to the standard of appeal, and the source of authority, and, therefore, could hardly be expected to start fair in any question purely ecclesiastical; but in reference to the use of liquor, and its indiscriminate sale, we maintain that there are common principles of judgment acknowledged by all men. The facts and evidences which bear upon the case, may all be brought together, and whether Catholic or Protestant, an honest reasoner cannot resist the logical deduction, that the Maine Law is agreeable to the rights of man, as man, and absolutely just toward society as such.

May we not call in the aid of Catholics, of Catholic priests, and of Catholic bishops, to prevent the mischief that might follow the opposition of the *True Witness* to the prohibitory liquor law? We have before us M. Chiniquy's Manual of Temperance, published, not without Episcopal sanction. The whole tenor of that book goes to prove the wickedness and immorality of the traffic. Take the following from page 148:—"La distillerie! C'est la torerresse ou se préparent les chaines qui vous lieront bientôt les pieds et les mains, pour vous bannir plus facilement de chez vous. La distillerie! C'est la citadelle d'où le démon lance continuellement des dards enflammés pour consumer vos maisons et vos champs, et les réduire en cendres. La distillerie! Ah! elle est un nuage embrasé qui, passant au dessus de vos têtes, et y laissant tomber, comme autrefois sur Sodome, une pluie de feu, couvrira le pays de ruines et de larmes." Does the *True Witness* subscribe to the above scorching denunciation of distilleries, printed with the approving sanction of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal? Perhaps he does not approve, but suggests that M. Chiniquy says nothing there of prohibition. No, he does not directly! But ought society to permit, and legalize, and draw a revenue from a distillery, of which M. Chiniquy says: "It is the citadel from whence the demon (i. e., the devil) continually launches fiery darts to consume our houses, and our fields, and to reduce them to ashes." That is the business our *True Witness* would protect and defend. But let us hear M. Chiniquy before the Parliamentary Committee in 1849. He thus speaks plainly:—"The law which authorizes the granting of licenses to sell strong liquors, such as it has been in operation in Canada since I have been able to experience its results, is one of the most immoral, and the most inhuman that I can possibly conceive, and the

proof of this assertion is written in letters of blood from one end of Canada to the other." How is the mischief to be prevented? Hear M. Chiniquy once more. He says to the Committee and Parliament: "If, in your wisdom, you think that the hour has arrived to prohibit, throughout the country, the wholesale and retail traffic of strong liquors, I shall, WITH ALL MY HEART, applaud such a measure." Now, whether this sort of assent to the Maine Law be according to the principle involved in "populus vult," or "Deus vult," or whether here "vox populi" is "vox Dei," we cannot stay to enquire. It is sufficiently democratic for any country; but what we want to know from the *True Witness* is, on what platform does M. Chiniquy stand? On what, the Bishops who endorsed his opinions? Our unity of thought and action with an undoubted Catholic, neither prompting or countering the other, does look very much as though there were "first principles in common," to which the unsophisticated mind invariably turns, as the needle to the pole. What say you of the *True Witness*? Be cautious! or be assured that both Protestants and Catholics will discern you! But answer, we beg of you—What are your "first principles in common?"

#### PRESENTMENT OF THE GRAND JURY OF THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

We have to thank the Editor of the *Montreal Witness* for placing before the public this presentment; for rescuing it, as it were, from the oblivion to which our political press seemed determined to consign it. We are sorry the names comprising the Jury are not given, as we take pleasure in heralding the men who have the moral courage to stand up in the midst of this country, and declare such sentiments. We hope they will have their due weight in the right quarter.

The Grand Jury would further beg leave to state, that they have been at considerable pains to ascertain the cause of the crimes which have come before them; and, from all the evidence, it appears to them the use of intoxicating liquors to be the predominant cause; and that, to this, either directly, or indirectly, by far the greater proportion of the cases can be distinctly traced. To remedy this evil, therefore, ought to be the great object of all who regard the well-being of their fellow-men, and the peace, happiness, and prosperity of the country. The Grand Jury are unanimously of opinion, that the system of licensing houses for the sale of intoxicating drinks, is the bane of this and every other country where it is practised; and that every house so licensed is more or less a nursery for crime.

They are further of opinion, that for every shilling that goes into the coffers of the Municipality for licenses, or is collected by the Government in the shape of duties, the country at large is taxed to at least four times the amount, independent of the misery, wretchedness, and crime that it entails upon the community, for which no pecuniary consideration can compensate.

They would, therefore, recommend the adoption of what is commonly called the Maine Law—the prohibition of the sale of all intoxicating drinks used a beverage, and thereby cease to make a traffic respectable by law, which practice proves to be the greatest source of evil to the community.

The great advantage and utility of the Maine Law in diminishing the public peace and morals, and in diminishing the public burdens, is fully brought out by the Reports which have been made by authority, subsequently to the passing of the Law, whereby it appears that the public peace and morals have been greatly benefited, and that the public burdens have been diminished, in some cases, 72½, and in others, 97 per cent.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS,

Several Communications have been received, and shall appear in our next.

We have to apologize to our readers for the non-appearance of the "Temperance Jottings" in the present number, owing to the great press of matter.