

TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE,

DEVOTED TO

TEMPERANCE, EDUCATION, AGRICULTURE, NEWS, &c.

VOL. XV.

MONTREAL, AUGUST 15, 1849.

No. 16.

"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.—*Vacnight's Translation.*

PLEDGE OF THE MONTREAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, DO AGREE, THAT WE WILL NOT USE INTOXICATING LIQUORS AS A BEVERAGE, NOR TRAFFIC IN THEM; THAT WE WILL NOT PROVIDE THEM AS AN ARTICLE OF ENTERTAINMENT, NOR FOR PERSONS IN OUR EMPLOYMENT; AND THAT IN ALL SUITABLE WAYS WE WILL DISCOURTAGE THEIR USE THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
<i>The Traffic</i>	241
<i>The Mail Coachman</i>	242
<i>New York State Society</i>	243
<i>Father Mathew's Visit—Spirit of the Press</i>	244
<i>A Problem for Law Makers</i>	245
<i>Dr. Mussey on Brandy in Cholera</i>	246
<i>The Death of the Intemperate</i>	246
PROGRESS.....	247
POETRY— <i>The Social Cup</i>	247
MUSIC— <i>Cold Water—Pleasure in Sobriety</i>	248
EDITORIAL— <i>Temperance House</i>	249
<i>Cheering Progress</i>	250
<i>Scottish Temperance League</i>	251
<i>Dublin Statistical Society</i>	252
CORRESPONDENCE.....	253
AGRICULTURE— <i>Rotation on Light Lands</i>	253
<i>News, &c.</i>	"

THE TRAFFIC.

(From the National Temperance Advocate.)

It has been the source of considerable doubting and disputation whether we, as moral reformers, should ask for legislative enactments in putting down the traffic in strong drink. The question is more especially interesting at the present moment, when our transatlantic brethren are advocating the no-licensing movement, and we are agitating for the repeal of the beer-bill. The opponents of legislative interference say this evil is a moral evil, to be bent back by moral suasion; and to step from the course and legislate upon the subject is to extend the province of government too far, and to unduly interfere with the liberty of the subject.

Let us test this objection, if we can, for a moment. Governments, properly defined, are moral necessities, and their functions are popularly limited to the protection of the lives and liberties of the subject. Judges and the medical profession are the highest authorities in all matters pertaining to the two most important communitive results—crime and disease. Now just in the proportion that intoxicating drinks incite to those results, do they become obnoxious to legislative interference. Well, then, what do these authorities say of those drinks? Simply this. The judges say—'Without doubt, drinking those fluids is the principal cause of crime; that nearly every criminal case that comes before us is caused by drinking.' The medical profession—at any rate those in the higher walks—say that 'very many of the diseases incidental to our civilization—and of consequence premature deaths—are caused by drinking intoxicating drinks; that alcohol is a poison; and that intoxicating drinks as a beverage are perfectly pernicious.' Coroners, subordi-

nate to those authorities, and whose duties are to enquire into the causes moving to all violent and sudden deaths, unequivocally affirm that in a proportion of more than two-thirds of the cases coming under their observation, the moving cause of the death of the individuals is intoxicating drinks. These statements are too notorious to be denied by any one.

In England there is an old parochial law, which holds that a person being non-compos mentis, and the overseer of the parish being cognizant of the fact, allowing him to go at large, is responsible for the acts of the lunatic. Just so; and that contains the gist of the whole question. Governments are bound by the relation that they bear to the subject, to suppress, *vi et armis*, any traffic that jeopardizes the lives of individuals, be they few or many. Whatever interferes with the liberty of the subject—*i.e.*, produces crime or disease—governments are bound to put down; or if they do not, they are amenable to the constitution, and are liable to impeachment.

What is the condition of our criminal population? Is the predisposition to crime in them educational or organic? And in what proportion does the government, the publican, and the criminal, share in those cases that come before the country for judicial investigation? I will state a few cases off-hand, indicate the normal condition of the culprit, and leave it to the reader to discriminate the degree of responsibility of the above named parties.

Some three or four years ago, three blackguard lads sat drinking in the town of Barnard-Castle all day. At night they went drunk to a dancing in Gilligate. At the dancing was a silly good-natured tailor, tipsy, dancing with his sweetheart. One of the three young men had a spite at the tailor for giving evidence in a criminal case at York some time before; the young man and his sweetheart went out, were followed by these young ruffians, attacked on a bridge crossing the Tees, robbed, and then were thrown into the boiling and roaring water below, and drowned! The young men were apprehended, and tried at York for the murder; but in consequence of a deficiency in the chain of evidence, were acquitted. They returned to Barnard-Castle, got drunk, threatened to murder the young woman who had given the evidence in chief, went down to the water side and danced upon the very spot on the bridge from which they had hurled their victims into eternity—for the link in the chain of evidence being completed, they were again apprehended, and transported for life for the robbery. At about the same time a party of country people in a village in the county of Northumberland, went to church with a child to christen. As is the custom in villages in that part of the country, the people, after leaving the church, went to the village ale-house to have a drink. While there, the father of the child and a countryman, a stranger to that part of the country, and a surly sort of fellow, differed, and went to the door and fought, when the stranger was worsted. The party thinking that all was over, left for home, which was a short distance from the village. But not so. The stranger returned to the public house, washed the blood from off his face, drank glass after glass, was seen to sharpen a large clasp-knife on a stone at the door—took a short cut