

13 years nigh upon half a million of the population had been taken into custody for being drunk and disorderly."

Matters are still worse farther north—

"In Manchester not less than a million a year"—about \$5,000,000—"is spent in profligacy and crime." In Edinburgh there are one thousand whisky shops, one hundred and sixty in one street, and yet this city contains only two hundred bread-shops—a poor half-penny-worth of bread to a most intolerable deal of sack. In Glasgow the poor-rates are £400,000 a year. 'Ten thousand,' says Alison, 'get drunk every Saturday night, are drunk all day Sunday and Monday, and not able to return to work till Tuesday or Wednesday.'—*True Witness*.

We should like the Editor of the *Canada Temperance Advocate* to state, next time he favors the community with the drinking statistics, to what country the "180,000 gin-drinkers in London" belong—what people spend \$5,000,000 in Manchester "in profligacy and crime"—and what people are supporters of the whisky shops in Glasgow and Edinburgh. "Fair play is a jewel." We do not believe that there are 1,000 whisky shops in Edinburgh; neither do we believe that there are "160 in one street."—*Witness* and "*True Witness*" notwithstanding.—*Com. Advertiser, late Courier*.

So these gentlemen ride their own hobbies—the one trying his hand at defaming protestant countries, and the other shaping his interrogatories against a people supposed to be of Romish extraction. Both these editors know that when we give the statistics of intemperance, we have no reference to the religious faith of those who are referred to. But it is characteristically unjust in the "*True Witness*" to give statistics of Scotland and England, as from our authority, to the exclusion of those given as evincing the deplorable condition of Ireland. The effects of alcohol have nothing to do with religious opinions, but with man as man. So we go against the traffic in every country, because it is dangerous to health and good morals, wherever it exists. We should be pleased to oblige the Editor of the *Commercial Advertiser* on the matter in question. But we do not think we are called to give any additional information, when it is so very evident that precious little attention has been paid to that already given. We advise the *Advertiser* to pursue his statistical investigations, and as he doubts our word respecting Edinburgh, he can find out from credible persons in that fair city, whether our authority was good and substantial. We hardly know what to say respecting the winding up sentence. "*The Witness* and *True Witness* notwithstanding." The statements of the *Montreal Witness* were not called in question, and we beg to assure our contemporary that the *Canada Temperance Advocate* has editorially no more to do with "*The Witness*" than the "*True Witness*." On the temperance question there is more agreement, but each is totally independent of the other. We do not think it any disparagement to be ranked with "*The Witness*," and on the temperance and Maine law questions, we rejoice to be identified with so able and consistent a coadjutor. We have both a full conviction that our principles will be triumphant in Canada, and we can well bear the taunts and jeers of all kinds of opponents.

Streams from Temperance Springs.

Sometimes an argument is strengthened as well as illustrated, by comparing things which in some respects may differ. It is so particularly in relation to the argument by which we sustain and defend the principle of the Maine Law. Take the following in evidence, which we cut from the "*Life Boat*" published in Ohio. It is very properly designated, "Food for thought."

"Was it praiseworthy and humane, in the thinking friends of human progress of former days to denounce and oppose the detestable vice of gaming? As its hydra heads multiplied; as it grew more formidable and appalling in its constantly increasing

devices to fascinate the young and unwary, enervating and debasing their minds at the best, and in many instances giving them over to total ruin and luring them into lives of crime and villainy, did the parent do right to forbid it? did the friend do right to counsel and warn? did the pastor do right to preach, exhort and pray against it? and when all these failed, and the blighting mildew of its deadly influence still invaded all ranks of society, was it right for the law-maker to interpose, and prohibit and punish it as a crime? Who says nay to all these questions? Or rather who will withhold a decided yea to them all? No law-abiding, peace and order loving citizen surely! But the enslaved and deluded votary of chance,—the cold, unfeeling casuist, who persuades himself it is right to subject all things to the gratification of his desires, without regard to consequences—and the law-defying, cold-blooded, murderous hearted gambler by profession, who lives only to destroy, these men will boldly deny the right of society to protect itself by legal enactments, and talk about the individual inherent rights of man, and the right to possess and enjoy their machines and devices, as glibly and sagely as one of our sires who signed the glorious old bill of rights. Well what does society do in the premises? Does it assent to the doctrine claimed and preached upon by these men? No, certainly. It passes law for the seizure and destruction of the apparatus for gaming, wherever it may be found, and to punish all who use it by fine, imprisonment, and even incarceration in the penitentiary, according to the nature of the case.

Yet when a law, far less stringent in its provisions than the gaming laws, is asked for to stay the progress of intemperance, whereby the axe will be laid at the root of all crime, pauperism almost banished from the land, lost men restored to their families and friends, ignorance and depravity now brooding over thousands of young hearts changed to knowledge and virtue, indolence and unthrift converted into industry, enterprise and freedom, public and social morals purified, and the whole nation restored to its complete physical and mental energies—we are met with the cry that we are invading the most sacred rights of men, and deposing liberty herself. And this is not confined entirely to the makers and venders of liquors, but many citizens who are worthy of all regard in reference to other matters of public interest, not only refuse to aid in the great work of reform, but give ear to the absurd pretences of those interested. Why is this? Surely the evils entailed upon society by the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage are vastly greater and more manifold than those arising from gaming; and of all the means which human wisdom could possibly devise to suppress gaming itself, none would be half so effectual as the abatement of tippling houses. Then why should society be denied the right to remove this most flagrant of all social evils, by any and all legal enactments they may deem necessary to secure the desired end? Oh ye office-holding, office-hunting, hypocritical pretenders of patriotism, tell us why it is so?"

It would be rather hard to tell why it is so. A difference is made between gambling and grog selling, but the evils of the latter are by no means less than the former. Multitudes suffer from the rum business, while a few only can suffer and that but temporarily from a prohibitory enactment. Both may cry out, but as the "*Adeocate* and *Home Circle*" says "which shall we hear!" To which class of sufferers shall we pay attention and attempt to relieve. The paper just named shall answer its our interrogation.

It says:—

"There are two classes who claim that their interests are deeply involved in the proposed anti-liquor law. The first, are violently opposed to it. If it is passed, say they, it will seriously affect our business, and subject us to great pecuniary loss. They plead with us in the name of shattered fortunes, and beggared families not to urge its adoption. We confess it is not right to trifle with the pecuniary interests of any man.

It is, indeed, with the deepest regret, that we perceive that any are so situated as to suffer loss by the triumph of the cause of truth and righteousness. We love to see prosperity in others as we love to enjoy it ourselves. We would not dare to interfere in this matter, but for the wail of woe that reaches our ears from that other class who also have great interests at stake. They plead with tears and outstretched arms that this law may at once be enacted. They remonstrate against the right of any set of men to fatten upon their blood—or to convert their tears into dia-