

The St. Andrews Standard.

PUBLISHED BY A. W. SMITH, No. 45, SAINT ANDREWS, N. B., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1856. [Vol. 23]

LORD STANLEY and the TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT.

LORD STANLEY, M. P., was lately applied to by the secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, a society formed for the suppression of the liquor traffic, to honour a meeting at Manchester on the 22nd inst. His lordship returned a reply, in which the following formed the principal passages:

I draw a wide distinction between the voluntary temperance movement, and that which seeks to attain its end by legislative intervention. Of the first I entirely approve; the second, I regret to say, I cannot support.

I have drawn out a statement of my reasons for not supporting the alliance, which I enclose. If you choose to give it publicity, I do not object. My wish is to point out the objections which occur most forcibly to my own mind, so that if they can be met you may be prepared to meet them.

The reasons Lord Stanley gave were eight—

1. Because the law-making power in England, being practically in the hands of the wealthy, the temperance class is generally speaking, the lowest in the scale, the proposed prohibition would be a cutting off by one class of the (supposed) enjoyments of another—a measure to which the law-makers will not venture, in prudence, to resort; and which, if resorted to, would be regarded by those whom it affected as partial and unjust.

2. Because while the desire of drink is so strong as to lead to an annual consumption of from £50,000,000 to £75,000,000 sterling in liquor, the proposed prohibition, if carried, would be evaded by smuggling to an enormous extent; with, probably, the connivance of many magistrates, M. P.'s, and others who would regard the law as impracticable and absurd, and would, therefore, not exert themselves to see it enforced. Hence a double evil—(a) disregard of, and contempt for, law; and (b) less of that practical control which is now exercised over places where drink is sold; the trade falling into more disreputable hands, and a criminal class being artificially produced.

3. Because, in the present lamentable condition of the labouring class as a body, the labourer has especially in rural districts, no amusement or recreation whatever, nor any place of social meeting, except the public house. This state of things is not sought to be defended, nor even palliated; but it exists, and, before closing public-houses, some better substitute should be provided.

4. Because the suppression of the liquor traffic—assuming to be possible—would cause a loss of £30,000,000 of revenue yearly; and, though it is admitted that the social aspect of this question is more important than the fiscal, yet it must be considered that so large a deficit can only be made up by the imposition of direct taxes to a vast amount; the discontent produced by which must be added to a rising directly out of a restriction so stringent, and which would be generally felt by the many. This is no argument against gradual diminution of the traffic, but a strong argument against total and violent suppression.

5. Because a habit of self-control required by the individual in every respect, a better protection than an arbitrary enactment. In those communities of primitive people where no access has ever been had to intoxicating drink, it is found that the desire for it, when casually introduced, becomes an irrepressible passion; and entire tribes have been, and are being swept off in consequence of yielding to this passion. Prohibition augments desire, and the absence of temptation cannot confer moral strength.

6. Because difficulty will arise, if it is meant to be consistent, in defining intoxicating substances. Is tobacco to be included? Is opium? Where the craving for stimulants is strong, these or similar compounds will be substituted for alcoholic liquors. Chemical science will be employed to discover or produce them at small cost. You will only have replaced one form of intoxication by another. Suppose these two prohibited—a measure which will greatly increase the amount of opposition to be reckoned upon—new means of intoxication can, and will be found, calling for new and further extension of the law.

7. Because the suppression of traffic in liquor can never suffice; it has not been found in America to put a stop to its habitual use. Apart from actual smuggling, allowed to be, the law may be evaded in many ways; E. g. It would probably be-

come the practice for labourers to stipulate for a certain quantity of liquor to be given them in addition to their wages, an abuse which employers are doing their best to put down, but which prohibition of the liquor traffic would render general. Pretended exhibitions would be got up, as was done in the States, where, after paying for admission, the visitor would receive his share of the liquor gratis. Drinking clubs would be established on the same principle. You can't stop such frauds, unless you declare the possession as well as the sale of liquor illegal, by which enactment every man's house becomes liable to search, and the capital actually invested in private stores of wine and spirits, &c., is destroyed.

8. Because the exertions of temperance societies on the voluntary principle are impeded, and odium is excited against them by every attempt at forcible suppression of the traffic. To effect to employ physical or moral force is, in itself, a confession that moral force is inadequate for the object proposed.

Mrs. Pore, the secretary of the association, repeats and contests Lord Stanley's reasons. Her reasons—

1. That the alliance desires to obtain, not a class, but a purely democratic law, demanded by the people themselves.

2. That the desire to drink grew by indulgence, and that the law would be absolute, not partial, so that evasion would be easily detected.

3. That because the peasantry had little amusement, it did not necessarily follow that what they had should be poisoned by drink.

4. That the revenue would gain, not suffer, by the change as the millions withdrawn from the purchase of spirits would be transferred to productive instead of unproductive industry.

5, 6, 7, and 8. That to enable the people to gain the habit of self-control, we must use them by restrictive laws; and that the use of opium and tobacco would cease with that of spirits; that the extent of evasion of the Maine liquor law in America is exaggerated; and, lastly, that experience did not prove that injury was suffered by temperance societies by the exertions of the alliance.

To these objections Lord Stanley replied:

1. The writer assumes that a Maine Law will be called for by public opinion acting with irresistible force, and states that the object of the alliance is to create such public opinion. But if a vast majority of the British people be disposed to put an end to the use of intoxicating drinks, they have the remedy in their own hands. There is in that case no need of legislative interposition. Of what avail is it to compel men to abstain from doing that which, by the hypothesis, they are not inclined to do?

2. and 3. The writer endeavours to draw a distinction between the desire for strong drink and that for other sensual gratifications, concluding that the former alone grows with indulgence. I have always understood that the difficulty of combating any bad habit increases with the length of time during which such habit is persisted in. If this be so (and it is the universal experience of mankind) the phenomena must be regarded, not to an exceptional, but to a general law. The parallel drawn from the purchase of bread or calico is not applicable. To prove the writer's case, it ought to have been shown that other passions besides that of intemperance may be habitually gratified without thereby becoming stronger—a conclusion which the whole history of man refutes.

I contend that a Maine Law, if passed, would be evaded to such an extent as to render it practically ineffectual—that is to say, I contend that even supposing a majority in the legislature, backed by one out of doors, were to pass such a law, the minority in every class would still be strong enough to support law-breakers; against what would be regarded by its opponents as a tyrannical interference with freedom of private action. If, indeed, the nation were unanimous, this would not be the case; but then, as I have urged before, no law would be needed. I quite admit that a great deal of the existing habit is the result of temptation. The labourer has in general no club, no place of social enjoyment except the public house, which he cannot enter without asking for liquor, though his chief inducement to go there may be the love of good company, rather than of drink. This is an evil; but it is an evil which society can remedy without the help of the law. Already in many places working-men's clubs have been formed, where the labourer may enjoy a good fire, society, newspapers, his cup of coffee, &c., on payment of a small annual or monthly subscription. Such institutions are the most practical means of promoting temperance, and deserve all possible encouragement.

4. I have spoken of the necessity of raising 20,000,000 additional by direct taxation as a serious objection to the immediate liquor traffic. I readily concede

that the community, and, in the end, the revenue, would gain by the saving of the fifty, sixty, or seventy millions now spent in drink; but this saving, even if effected, would not prevent a serious deficiency, which would extend over several years. There would be a reduction in poor rates, police, and prison expense, together with an increase in the consumption of tea and sugar; but all these together would not make up the deficiency, and a severe temporary pressure must at least ensue.

5 and 6. I have nothing to add to my former observations under these heads.

7. Great discrepancies of opinion prevail with regard to the Maine Law in America. This, at least, is certain—that in a country where population is so scattered, and the Executive so weak as in the United States, the enforcing of the law, if it be enforced, must depend wholly on the support afforded it by the people; that is to say, if operative, it is operative, because it represents the public will, not because it is the law of the land. But in that case the popular will would have been equally effective without the agency of law, which is the proposition I am endeavouring to defend.

8. "Moral force is not enough for the world as it is." Not enough! The writer means to put down moral evil. Do the supporters of a Maine Law forget that this, their main aim, might be fitly inscribed on the doors of the Inquisition? They regard intemperance (very justly) as a social evil. Earnest Roman Catholics regard heresy as a social evil. They are prepared to suppress intemperance. The Governments of Italy are equally prepared (if the feelings of the nation allowed them) forcibly to suppress heresy. Where is the difference? Unless the functions of the State be strictly limited and defined—unless the legal rule *volenti non fit injuria* be carried out consistently to its logical results—unless the prevention of violence and the administration of justice be acknowledged as the sole legitimate objects of internal administration—I see no security against an indefinite continuance of the bit-ter and most degrading contests under which the human race has ever suffered—the contests of sect against sect for religious supremacy, where the possession of such supremacy confers the right of persecuting the vanquished party. The writer's argument is, "Because this or that practice is wrong, and because moral force is not sufficient to put it down, therefore the State should do so." Wrong in whose judgment? In that of the majority. But taking the existing state of opinion throughout the British islands, it is probable that a majority of their inhabitants regard habitual absence from public worship as morally wrong. Nevertheless it is certain that a large minority of our people do thus habitually absent themselves from public worship. Moral force has not succeeded in this instance. Are you prepared to try the effect of penal legislation, and as in early ages make church-going compulsory? To draw a distinction between the cases is impossible. For though all rational men condemn intemperance, yet total abstinence is not regarded as a duty by more than a small portion of the people, while attendance on religious rites is regarded as a duty by the majority of all classes. If, therefore, you seek to enforce by law a practice which only a few, comparatively speaking, consider binding upon them? It may be argued that to interfere is expedient in one case and inexpedient in the other. I deny the expediency in either; but be that as it may, I am not prepared to hold my personal freedom of action on so uncertain a tenure as this—that society, on the whole, thinks it more advisable not to coerce me. The principle of individual independence, of personal liberty of action, permitted where it does not come into collision with the personal liberty of others, is at once the result and the guarantee of modern civilisation. Encroach upon it, under whatever idea of benefiting mankind, and you will find that compulsion has produced resistance—that the best feelings of men are enlisted in support of their worst vices—that intemperance has gained foremost in those who would otherwise have been foremost to denounce it—and that you will have given to bigotry, political and religious, a precedent of which it will not be slow to avail itself.

Our Billingsgate neighbor of the Gazette accuses us of quackery, because we publish Dr. Ayer's advertisement. Now this same editor knows the Pharmacopoeia itself is not free from the suspicion of quackery than his medicines. He knows they are endorsed by the medical Journals of this country and prescribed by our best physicians, and have the commendation of professors and eminent men of character too exalted for his comprehension, and he knows too that they have done and are doing in this community an amount of good which the utmost stretch of his ability can never hope to equal. (Banks Co Press Reading, Pa.)

FRANKLIN AMONG THE PHILOSOPHERS.

Franklin's public celebrity in France seems to have been quite eclipsed by the social esteem in which he was held in private, and his seat at Passy, a few miles from the centre of Paris, was the centre of attraction for the savans. "His company was sought," says Miquet, "not only as the most illustrious, but as the most agreeable that the times afforded. He inspired his friends with sentiments of tenderness, admiration and respect; nor was his attachment to them less strong." Madame Helvétius dined with him every week. D'Alembert and Diderot sought him out. The celebrated Turgot was introduced to him. Among the first to welcome him at Paris was Condorcet, the biographer of Voltaire and Turgot; and among his intimate friends were Cabanis, Buffon, Raynal, Mably, Visé d'Aray, La Rochefoucauld, the Abbe Moleslet, the Abbe La Roche, Le Roy, Le Vailland, Malesherbes, Mirabeau and other eminent statesmen and men of letters. He also met with Voltaire on two occasions, and was received by him with pleasure. The philosopher of Ferney was then in his eighty-fifth year. They met at the Academy of the Arts and Sciences, and being placed side by side, elicited an outbreak of Parisian enthusiasm.

A royal commission was appointed in 1784 to investigate the subject of animal magnetism, which was then brought to notice by Mesmer. Franklin was placed at the head of the commission, and associated with him were Le Roy, Bailly, Guillotin (the proposer of the instrument of execution,) and others. The report was not favourable, although admitting certain phenomena attributed to the imagination.

He was now to take his departure for home, which was marked with the regrets of official and distinguished personages, who took leave of him, one by one, with marks of affectionate interest and regard, and but for the short notice of his intended leave, a national valedictory would have been put at his service. To Mr. Hartley, he wrote in his eightieth year: "I cannot quit the coasts of Europe, without taking leave of my ever dear friend, Mr. Hartley. We were long fellow-laborers in the best of all works, the works of peace. I leave you still in the field, but having finished my day's task, I am going home to go to bed. Wish me a good night's rest, as I do you a pleasant evening. Adieu."

SHOCKING OCCURRENCE.—Two Women Eaten by Wolves.—The Dumfries (Canada) Reformer, of Oct. 15th, contains the following account of a shocking event which occurred in the township of Mornington, Canada:—

"Our paper has seldom had to record a more heartrending circumstance than we are about to relate. Some ten days ago, in the northerly extremity of the township of Mornington, two females went out in the evening in search of their cows, and not returning that night search was made in the morning, when sad to relate their skeletons were only to be found, their flesh having been completely devoured by the wolves.—We are yet unable to record the particulars—the sad outcome only having as yet reached us. Our informant also states, that a man in that locality has been missing for the last ten days. No trace of him can be found whatever, and fears are entertained that he met the same lamentable fate as the unfortunate women.

The wolves were never before known to be so numerous or so voracious as they are this season in this section of the country. It is regarded as unsafe to be alone on the public highways after dark. Reports are reaching us almost every week of some of their ravages through the country.—Almost every body has been visited by them, and mischief done to a greater or less extent.

A farmer in North Easthope had thirty sheep killed in one night by them.—They drove them to the barn yard, and killed them there. A few nights previous they killed twelve belonging in the same man. Bears are also numerous and saucy. A Mr. Bennett of Mornington was attacked a short time ago in his own field, a little after dark, by an old bear with three cubs. He fought her off till some of the neighbors came to his relief. An immense one was killed in Mornington a few days ago."

A WHOLE FAMILY IN HEAVEN.—A whole family in heaven—who can describe their everlasting joy? No one is absent. No father, nor mother, nor son, nor daughter, is away. In the world below, they were united in faith, and love, and peace, and joy. In the morning of resurrection they ascend together. Before the throne of God they bow together in united adoration. On the banks of the River of Life they walk hand in hand, and as a family they have commenced a career of glory which shall be everlasting.—There is hereafter to be no separation in that family. No one is to lie down on a bed of pain. No one is to wander away into the

NAUTICAL IMPROVEMENT.

A device recently patented by J. S. Robbins, of San Francisco, two rudders are employed in steering a vessel. One of them is attached to the sternpost, in the usual manner; the other placed directly behind the first, and secured in an iron frame which projects back for the purpose. The two are connected together with arms, in such a manner that the force of the water, when it comes in contact with the after-rudder, will assist the helmsman in moving the post rudder, so that they counterbalance each other. This, it is represented, reduces the labor of steering to almost nothing, gives complete steadiness to the vessel and wheel, and enables a single man, or even a boy, to guide the largest vessel in the fiercest storm, with perfect ease. (Boston Atlas.)

SYDNEY SMITH'S FEELINGS.—Sydney Smith thus mimics Sir James Mackintosh's grandiose and flowing style:—It struck me last night as I was lying in bed, that Mackintosh, if he were to write on peppers, would thus describe it:—Pepper may philosophically be described as a dusty and highly pyrexised seed of an Oriental fruit; an article rather of condiment than diet, which, dispensed lightly over the surface of food with no other rule than the caprice of the consumer, communicates pleasure, rather than affords nutrition and by adding a tropical flavor to the gross and succulent viands of the North approximates the different regions of the earth, explains the objects of commerce, and justifies the industry of man, against a cold and dreary climate.

This little paragraph, which we find going the rounds, is eloquent and true:—"If there is a man who can cut his bread in peace with God and man, it is the man who has brought that bread of the earth. It is clobbered by no fraud, it is wet by no tears, it is steeped in no blood."

WHY THERE IS NO RAIN IN PERU.—In Peru, South America, rain is unknown. The coast of Peru is within the region of perpetual southeast trade-winds, through the Peruvian shores, and the winds of the great South sea blow, yet never rain there. The reason is plain. The southern trade-winds, on the Atlantic ocean, first strike the coast of Africa, west they blow obliquely across the ocean until they reach the coast of Brazil. By this time they are heavily laden with vapor, which continues to pour down as the equator, depositing their rain there, and leaving little or no moisture in the air. The trade-winds of the Amazon, finally they reach the lower part of the coast of Africa, and there they deposit the last particle of moisture that a year's low temperature can extract. Reaching the summit of that range, they no longer descend so cool and dry winds on the Pacific slopes beyond. Meeting with no opposing surface, and no temperature colder than that to which they were subjected on the mountain top, they reach the ocean before they become charged with fresh vapor, and before, therefore, they have any which the Peruvian climate can extract. Thus we see how the equator of Andes becomes the reservoir from which are supplied the streams of Columbia and the Amazon.

THE ST. PETERSBURG CORRESPONDENT OF THE LONDON POST AND THE JOINT STOCK COMPANY HAS JUST BEEN FORMED AT ST. PETERSBURG UNDER SOMETHING MORE THAN GOVERNMENT PATRONAGE, FOR THE GREATER PART OF THE SHARES HAVE ALREADY BEEN TAKEN BY VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THE IMPERIAL FAMILY, AND BY SOME OF THE MOST ANCIENT AND POWERFUL RUSSIAN GENTLEMEN. TWENTY COMMERCIAL STEAMERS OF THE LARGEST CLASS ARE TO BE BUILT IN THE FIRST INSTANCE. SOME OF THEM WILL BE CONTRACTED IN AMERICA, SOME IN ENGLAND, AND A FEW IN THE GULF OF FINLAND.

REMEDY US AGE!
ment.
REMEDY.
surface of our
Ointment,
carried to and
affections of
the Lungs,
are by its
Every house-
freshly through
leanness. This
readily pene-
fleshy part of
most dangerous
not be reached

UMATISM
HUMOURS
so much for
skin, wether
is Ointment.—
la, or Erysipe-
lous influence—
ver many parts
principal hospitals
ving advice as
thus been the
sa numbers to

REASTS,
ERS
surgions how
this wonderful
cope with the
t, ulcers, plan-
uris. Professor
the East large
to be used in
It will cure
stiffness or
in 20 years

PULAS
stressing com-
cured if the
over the parts
following the
sh pot.
-foot
-hands
(soft)
sted and Sud
is
dar Swelling
go
tation
implies.

of Professor
Temple Bar
a New York
Druggist, and
brought out the
3d., 3s. 3d
ble saving by
ble 3 1/2
e guidance of
are affixed to

URNER,
is And-
only Charlotte

on, now land.
LASSES,
ended 3 1/2
STREET

ARRIOWS, &c
Hemlock Bark
oduce, taken in
be Sale.

EDAY, BY
Andrews, N. B

advantage.
of the year.
ITS
or continued
reactions.
der is 4d.
es 4d per line.
1d per line.
ye agreed on