CANADA TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

but they have legislated on such wrong principles, that they have etand of the people. ulended protection over the rumseller instead of the people. This license system, is a warrant to them to do all the mischief by are accomplishing. They are now a set of government offiall over the land, to distribute the poison to all who will buy, you can't reach them by all your m ral suasion.

89.4 Can't reach them by all your in nai Buasion. eout and told him he ought not to sell poor Joe Strickland any where rum; and he told me to mind my own business, and said he had a license and he should sell as long as Joe had money to buy with.

Mr. L. Well now, Squire Liberty, we want you to sign a petithen to the Legislature asking them to undo what they have done and the Legislature asking them to undo what they have done ad break up this license system.

 $\mathcal{S}_{q}^{\text{oreak}}$ up this license system. $\mathcal{S}_{q}^{\text{oreak}}$ \mathcal{L}_{o} Well, I'll do that. It's infringing on my liberty to have and man allowed to sell liquor and not another. If it is right for one to a sell liquor and not another. one to sell it is right for all. But now when the Legislature have the sell it is right for all. But now when the Legender Let the that, then stop. For why legislate about temperance? Let there we have a stop of the ere that, then stop. For why legislate about components when he stops man buy and sell and drink what he pleases, and when he stops have a laws with fines bears, and have none of this legislation, these laws with fines And imprisonments. They are all wrong; at variance with the state of the drink let them drink it is and Principles of civil liberty; or to drink, let them drink — it is automatic liberty. bothing to me. 1 say, let us have liberty.

Mr L. Well, suppose Squire Liberty, a man should want to al lainted meat in the market, would you let him? Let him? hin) Or powder by the barrel next door to you, would yon let bin) No. Or obsecne pictures in a shop window in your street, Would you let him? No. But how are you going to hinder him Without let him? No. But how are you going to hinder him hout law, and how will you have law without legislation ? So r hav, and how will you have law with eating and drinking the do with eating and drinking and dri

 $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{1}}^{\text{total law}}$, and how will you have law without regression $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{2}}$. But that has nothing to do with eating and drinking. $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{r}_{1}}$, \mathbf{x}_{2} But that has nothing to do with eating and drinking. It prevents a poor man from have \mathbf{x}_{2} to \mathbf{x}_{2} be it has with eating. It prevents a poor man from have he tainted meat sold to him for good. Suppose now there should a have meat sold to him for good. Suppose non-difference or bar which should forbid a man's selling poisoned liquors, or hailer which should forbid a man's setting poisoned and a straight doctored with arsenic, or vitriol, or sugar of lead, or other and a doctored with arsenic or vitriol, or sugar of lead, or other and the setting of t have doctored with arsenic, or vitriol, or sugar of ited, the mor-have poisons, and which laid many a drunkard low, in the mor-logistic here on the same principle? Na poisons, and which laid many a drunkard low, in the same of life, would you not legislate here on the same principle? So L. Yes, I suppose so. I have always said, no place is too but L. Yes, I suppose so. I have a ways such that if they bud men that will do it; and I have told them that if they not trust them near my weld Put poison in their liquors, I would not trust them near my

Mr. L. Now, Squire, you are a great Jackson man; come, tell why Now, Squire, you are a great Jackson man; come, tell wer, L. Now, Squire, you are a great Jackson man, when should be what did Gen. Jackson in 1834, to save the poor Indians? Subat did Gen. Jackson in 1834, to save the poor moments what I would do myself. He made a law, ordering every Indian what I would do myself. He made a law, ordering every Indian by which which a same of destroy every drop of liquor brought and while man to seize and destroy every drop of liquor brought the Indian country. W. L. Well, that was right, was it not?

 δ_{g} , L. Well, that was right, was it not into the old General stood of L. Why, yes, to be sure it was. The old General stood of L, why, yes, to be sure it was. Notector of those poor, weak, defenceless creatures.

Why L. Well, Squiro Liberty, are there none who need just by Drute otion among us? Didn't you say just now, that you hat down loss frickland, and Ol. went down to old Olcott to protect poor Joe Strickland, and Ol-tout laughed in your face. Was your moral suasion good for any and? Dia in your face. Was your moral suasion good for any and? Dia hing? Did not Joe need a law that should make Olcott afraid to state Prison offence? Now, Squire lig? Did not Joe need a law that should man or one of the should not Joe need a law that should man offence? Now, Squire liberty, by making it a State Prison offence? Now, Squire liberty, by making it a state prison offence? Now are the him, by making it a State Prison offence i now, out the third, by making it a state Prison offence i now, out of the state of the s for the two are a reasonable man; look at this turns. I herty, so are 1,-but I am not for licentiousness, nor are you. I m for the ant I,-but I are not for licentiousness, nor are you. I "werty, so am I, --but I am not for licentiousness, not all you. In for the liberty of doing just what I please, if it does not in please, has and I am for their having liberty to do what they have that in the source of unnecessarily injures me. A Metters; and 1 am for their having merry so the second state of th han hay hake a bonfire in the street, if it does no harm; but he if i hake a bonfire in the street, if it does no harm; but They may make a bonfire in the street, if it does no marm, out by it is sets fire to my building.—You want every body should and the liberty of selling rum; and I'll consent if it does good, does below the liberty of selling rum; and I'll consent if it does done does no harm. Now do you tell me what good is done it the sale of the content of the vale of rum, and I'll try to tell you a few of the evils of

Southers, June about rumselling. It is the most used that But you must put it down The business on God's foot-stool. But you must put it down y horal and store would all other evils. hy noral sussion. Treat it as you do all other evils. Mr. 1 Sussion. Treat it as you do all other evils.

Mural suasion. Treat it as you do all other event. Mr. L. So I say, just as we treat counterfeiting, stealing, arson, Dirac to Maine Law. had J. So I say, just as we treat counterfeiting, steaming, stream Now, Squiro That's just the moral suarion of the Maine Law. Now, Squiro Liberty, I hope you see why we should legislate on a metane Tomperance. It is not as some suppose, to make men temperance. It is not as some suppose, to make men temperance. to her in and suppress the traffic, and prevent interto hem in and suppress the traffic, and provent makes, and to hem in and suppress the traffic, and provent makes and hem in other words, to root out its cause, Legislatures have and hem in other words, to root out its cause, Legislatures have have forbidding all sale to minors, and to drunkards, and have forbidding all sale to minors, and to drunkards, and he laws forbidding all sale to minors, and to statistic may an conducting railroads, and if they may to some they may

Sq. L. But, why aint you satisfied. Mr. L. with the laws you have, and not be troubling the Legislature overy year ?

Mr. L. Because the laws we have, are just good for nothing. They are not designed to break up the traffic, only to regulate it, and even for this they are almost worthless; for the only valid witnesses of their violation are the vender and the consumer. No one else knows what is sold and drank. The Maine Law wants no such testimony. The liquor itself is the witness.

Come, Squire Liberty sign this petition for a Maine Law. It will give you just what you want. You boast of freedom while you are ground in the dust, by the heavy taxes the liquor seller lays upon you. And it is growing worse and worse. See how paupers and criminals multiply and crowd your jails and poor houses. See how exempt Maine is from the curse, and with what freedom from all these evils we shall be blessed if we can have a Maine Law.

Sq. L. Well, Mr. L, I'll think on't. I never did see why we should legislate for temperance, any more than for religion, but I see now it is for protection. I believe you are about half right. And I don't think much of the laws we have, especially of the Sunday laws. Men sell more then, than any other day. I guess I shall go it. There is nothing like a fair talk to bring a man over.—Maine Law Advocate.

Ireland and Canada.

As in our appeal to the Legislature we have specially referred to Ireland, in proof of our assertion respecting the insufficiency of moral sussion alone, we think it right to give the evidence on which our remarks are founded. We say that notwithstanding the astonishing effects at one time manifested through moral suasion, there has since been a painful increase of intemperance. owing chiefly to the fact that distilling and importing fiquors is still legalized in that country. Let it be remembered that the same argument applies with equal force to Canada, especially Lower Canada. Thousands of French Canadians were induced under the teachings of M. Chiniquy and others, to abandon the use of strong drinks, and great numbers of tippling houses were closed. But it is a painful fact that many of them have been reopened, and the number of licensed houses has greatly increased the last year or two. Moral suasion alone will not rid the coun. try of the moral pestilence that rages in the land. But let us now call attention to the facts as they relate to Ireland. At Belfast, not one of the most intemperate places in Ireland, a public meeting was held on the 4th of May last, for the purpose of organizing a temperance society. At that meeting the Rev. Wm. Johnston delivered a most able and lucid speech, from which we make the following extract. We trust the whole will be read by every member of the Canadian Legislature. Mr. Johnston said :-

Limiting our attention to Ireland, from a return ordered by the House of Commons, 2nd July, 1851, the quantity of wine con-sumed in Ireland for the year ending the 5th January, 1851, was 515,735 gallons, which, at fifteen shillings per gallon, would cost the country £386,801. The quantity of spirits, of all sorts, retained for home consumption in Ireland was 7,621,549 gallons, which, at an average price of nine shillings per gallon costs the country £3,429,697; and if you add a fourth for porter, ale, beer, and such drinks, you find the fearful aggregate of £4,770,622 paid by Ireland in one year for strong drinks alone. No wonder that Ireland, thus thoroughly drained by drunkenness, should be a by-word for beggary and poverty. By the return ordered by the House of Commons for the year ending the 5th January, 1850, the quantity of spirits retained for home consumption was 7,228,-829 gallons, and thus there is a manifest increase in the drinking habits of the Irish people during the past year to the extent of 392,740 gallons, and £176,733 taking spirits alone as the item of our calculation. In fixing the attention of this meeting upon the state of matters in and about Belfast, he could speak with similar accuracy, and with similar sorrow and shame. He held in his hand a set of tables with which he had been kindly furnished by a friend, drawn from authentic documents, and those tables