

three drams per day, and sweetens it for his children—always has it about his house—thinks it necessary—can't possibly do without it. It is good to take when you are cold or hot, wet or dry, &c.

Yours, &c., S.

*Remarks.*—In a moral point of view, this was substantially a **MURDER**, the guilt of which rests with a number of persons. The man who supplied the brandy—the “friends” who insisted on the poor lad's drinking it—and the father who had inculcated in his son the habit of drinking, were all accessories. And the guilt and responsibility of any one of them are not lessened by the multiplication of the actors. Let things be called by their right names, and when ramsellers kill their customers with alcohol, let it be called **murder**; when friends kill friends with strong drink, let it be called **murder**; and when sons die in consequence of the appetite for stimulus which their fathers have fostered, let it be called, though it is a hard sentence, let it still be called—**MURDER**!—*Standard*, Nov. 19, 1838.

#### EXTRACTS FROM THE JOURNAL OF THE AGENT.

**MORE VICTIMS.**—Died, on Monday the 14th of last month, — **WELLS**, a Volunteer. He was a bricklayer by trade, and so excellent a workman that he could earn a dollar and a half a-day. On this account he wrought but little—he seldom began earlier in the week than Thursday or Friday, and after receiving his wages he continued drinking till all was spent. He swilled amazing quantities of beer and spirits. His death took place as follows. He was on guard on Sunday the 13th; it is to be remembered, however, that he had been drinking hard for about two weeks previously—on the preceding Saturday he went about the streets with a man's hood on, for a frolic. In this debauched state of body he went on guard the following day, and soon began to feel unwell. He had several pints of beer in the guard room. On Monday morning his breakfast was brought him, with a quantity of spirits, which he drank. He then ate a pie, and soon after began to feel worse, and supposing that the pie was the cause of his pain, he cursed and swore at the maker of it. When the men were dismissed from guard, he walked home very slowly, had some hot beer mixed with spirits, and then took some dinner. Feeling his pain increase, he again began to curse about the pie, declaring, with the most fearful imprecations, that he would never buy another from the same man. In the midst of these blasphemies, he was seized with a fit of trembling, and fell dead on the floor! How fearful his end! But where does the guilt lie? At whose hand will his blood be required?

**ANOTHER.**—**B.** was once an active healthy man. He opened a grocery in one of the suburbs, and by close attention to his business soon made a little money: but alas! he made himself a drunkard at the same time. He often became mad from the effects of drink; at such times he sought to vent his rage upon his wife, so that it was necessary for her to flee, and more than once she barely escaped with the life. When she had been thus expelled, and the children would begin to cry for their mother, he would often sit down beside them, bereft of reason, and cry for his mother also. At last he drank himself into a state of idiocy, from which he never recovered. He would wander about town, without seeming to know what he was doing, or stagger into a tavern, and get drunk, and remain there till some of his family found him out, for he was so silly that he could neither tell his name nor place of abode. He soon died, and surrendered into the hands of God, that soul which he had so greatly abused, by quenching the light of reason in it, through strong drink.

#### CANADA TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

“It is good neither to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor do any thing by which thy brother is made to stumble, or to fall, or is weakened.” ROM. xiv. 21.—*Macnight's Translation.*

MONTREAL, FEBRUARY, 1839.

**ST. ANDREW'S DINNER.**—Our strictures on this subject, last month, have not been without effect. A writer, signing himself “**TEMPERANCE**,” has stepped forward, and attempted to parry the blow which we aimed; and as a matter of course, his lucubrations have appeared in the *Herald*. We shall now take some notice of this writer, but we find we must do it very gently, for his weakness is such that he will not bear rough handling.

We have spoken of his weakness, and as decisive evidence of it, we have only to mention, that he does not controvert a single statement which we have made respecting the dinner, or its brood of immoral consequences. He does not attack a single position, nor call in question a single fact, nor attempt to overturn or even to invalidate, a single conclusion. What then, it may be asked, is the object of his letter? It seems to be simply to defend the clergymen from the severe, but well merited reproof, which we administered to them, at the close of the article. Not a word is said on behalf of the *Saint*, or his *Day*—not an attempt is made to defend the *Dinner*, as an Engine of public charity. and even the philosophical “commentary” of the *President* is suffered to lie upon the ground, in shreds, as we left it. On all these points therefore, “**TEMPERANCE**” yields us the victory.

All the insinuations which “**TEMPERANCE**” throws out against our personal character, such as our being actuated by “self-conceit”—or being a “professor of ambition”! or “standing upon the pinnacle of modern virtue,” (the second of these phrases, we confess, we do not understand, the third is culled from the slang of the infidel,) we shall pass over without any notice. Did any person believe them, we would not think it necessary to attempt to conciliate his good opinion. We must be permitted to state, however, that our animadversions were not directed against the personal character of the clergymen in question, but against their public conduct; and that only in one instance, in which we found them actively promoting a celebration which seldom or never fails to lead to intemperance. And when it is considered that this is the very vice against which this humble periodical is directed, it will be as evident, we think, that we did not go out of our way in making the attack, as that they did go out of theirs in giving us occasion. Does not “**TEMPERANCE**” know that some of those who were at the dinner “kept it up” till three o'clock next morning, and consequently were prevented from concluding the one day, and disqualified from commencing the next, in such a manner as professing christians, and especially members of the *Kirk of Scotland* ought to do? Yet ministers of that Kirk were instrumental in presenting the temptation before which these men fell! Does he not know that some who attended, had arrived at that critical stage, in the progress of intemperance, in which very little more was needed to plunge them into its “depths” irrecoverably?—now, to lead such men amongst the fascinating accompaniments of a public feast, where their minds would be excited by toasts and addresses, can be compared only to the conduct of him, who sets a man adrift in the stream which sweeps over the falls of Niagara, when it is certain he will be carried forward, with a constantly increasing rapidity, till he