

That beer-shops, public-houses, and all such places of entertainment as, generally speaking, promote dissolute manners, and of which the keepers are placed under restrictions not imposed on traders in general, are, when open on that sacred day, frequented by the most disorderly classes; and consequently become a source of moral corruption to the idle and young, and of annoyance to the reputable classes; while multitudes of poor families are plunged into ruin through the habits of extravagance and drunkenness here formed, and the children of those families abandoned to wretchedness and crime.

That those houses are now licensed to be open on Sundays, and placed under police inspection; but that it is found that the licenses authorise that which occasions disorder and crime, and it is notorious that the supervision fails to prevent the mischief. Your Petitioners therefore believe that the continuance of this most prolific source of criminality would lead to the aggravation of national vice, which, as Christian Ministers, they deplore, and which they feel bound to call on the Legislature to diminish, so far as in it lies.

That, ever since the closing of public houses in England on the morning only of the Lord's Day, there has been a perceptible diminution of disorderly conduct, and that your Petitioners cannot but rejoice in any Act of Parliament that tends to diminish the evil of which they complain; but that the records of police courts continue to show that, on the day which ought, of all others, to be the most peaceful, and freest from the disturbances of drunkenness, revelry, and violence, offences against public order are the most numerous, and to be traced almost entirely to those parents of dissipation.

That since the entire closing of public houses in Scotland on the Sabbath day, committals for disorderly conduct have been reduced to a very small number, or have almost entirely ceased on that day.

Your Petitioners rejoice, therefore, to observe that large bodies of their countrymen desire a similar amendment of the law for England, and they entirely concur with all friends of religion and morality in desiring that the idle, the improvident, and the young may be protected from the temptations to the worst kinds of Sabbath-breaking, which cannot but abound so long as the places aforesaid are suffered to be open.

Your Petitioners therefore pray your honorable House to enact a law that shall effectually close all beer-shops, public-houses, and places of entertainment during all the hours of the Lord's Day.

On behalf and by order of the Conference,

JOHN FARRAR, President.

JOHN HANNAH, D.D., Sect'y.

Birmingham, July 27th, 1854.

## Original Correspondence.

### The Tobacco Question.

CONCLUDING ARTICLE.

(To the Editor of the Canada Temperance Advocate.)

Sir,—I suppose you are becoming tired of our correspondence on the Tobacco Question, as I fear it is not of a character to be very interesting or profitable to your readers. I have been hesitating for some time whether I should let the question drop with my namesakes last letter, (especially as I consider he has advanced little or nothing in it that will operate materially against my former statements), or make just one more reply. After some consideration I have decided in favour of the latter method, and would, therefore, crave your indulgence once more.

In reference to the thief and murderer case, which my friend imagines he has converted into an argument exactly

suitable to his own views of the subject, I would ask, What is the common practice of law officers in such cases? Do they ever refuse to pursue a thief on the grounds that a murder was committed about the same time? Would they not be hooted at by the merest child or simpleton for such a course? Nay, would they not themselves be brought to justice for such a dilatory enforcement of our country's laws? The duty of a J.P., in a case similar to the supposed one, is very plain—if the constables are all in pursuit of a murderer, he must increase their number, until he has sufficient for both purposes; and so long as a man can be found able to carry a cudgel, he will not be justifiable in pleading weakness. It is a delusion of Satan to suppose that we are not able to oppose the evils of both liquor and tobacco at the same time, and is a like delusion for us to suppose that our opposition to one will weaken our opposition to the other. We are able, if willing, to oppose both, and it is useless for Anti-Bachus No 2, to advance, in this day of enlightenment, an idea that ought to have been buried with our great-grand-fathers, that "two things cannot be done well at the same time." Had Anti-Bachus No 2, lived at the time of Sir Walter Raleigh, in some superstitious corner of "Old Ireland," he might have preached such doctrines to the gaping multitudes, who would have listened to him with as much earnestness "as though an angel spoke" and believed his phantoms as firmly as they did the story of the banishment of the snakes and frogs by St. Patrick, but the intelligence and enlightenment of the 19th century dispels such an idea as does the noon day sun the mists and fogs of a summer morning.

He misunderstands me, altogether, if he supposes that I would introduce the tobacco question into our temperance pledges and societies. No! I go for reforming a man as much as possible—if not of all his evil practices, of as many as we can—if we cannot induce him to give up drinking grog, try if we can, giving tobacco, and vice versa.

In glancing over the two letters of my friend, (in which I must confess he has displayed no ordinary abilities with the pen) the following questions have suggested themselves to me; What effect are these letters likely to have on the readers of the *Advocate*? Will their prosy eloquence be likely to produce an impression favourable to the Maine Law? Will his hawking up some of the failings of the sublime and venerable Milton produce a salutary influence? Will there any good come out of his historical sketch of Napoleon and Sir Walter Raleigh? the latter of whom, it seems, used the narcotic weed in the same manner as some have the intoxicating cup—to help them to die—not to prepare for death. I fear most of these questions must be answered in the negative, and if so, his letters as he says, "have occupied space in the *Advocate*" that might have been better filled." And now, I cannot refrain from expressing my suspicions that the writer of these letters only feigns himself to be either an advocate for the Maine Law, or a hater of tobacco. He dreads these suspicions in his last, and well he might; for I will leave it to any man of "common sense," if the sentiments which he has expressed in that letter are not those that are hailed by every slave of the weed. Indeed, it is surprising that a man who abominates tobacco, as he professes to do, should