

I shall again address you, if I find any thing worthy of communication; and remain, dear Sir, your's truly,  
JOHN DOUGALL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

SIR,—I beg to express the satisfaction which I, no doubt in common with other teetotallers, have received from the conduct of some of the Captains of the Volunteer Companies, in furnishing hot coffee to their men on guard, in place of beer or other intoxicating liquor, a practice which I trust will be universally followed.

It may be said one glass of beer will do no harm; but if it only excited an appetite for more, its effect would be injurious. The practice, however, is bad, as it keeps up the mistaken notion, that intoxicating liquors are necessary or beneficial in situations like the one alluded to; and it lends a sanction which ought not to be thrown around drinking. The trouble of furnishing coffee is very little, but even if it were more, surely the additional benefit conferred on the men, and its freedom from fostering bad habits and erroneous opinions, should give it the preference with all well-disposed persons. I am, Sir,

A LOYAL VOLUNTEER.

## 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, JANUARY, 1838.

TAVERN LICENSES.—We are glad to perceive, from a public advertisement, that our worthy Magistrates have "resolved to reduce materially the number of Tavern Licenses for the city and parish of Montreal for the ensuing year." We hail this determination with pleasure. It is honourable to our civic authorities—it affords evidence not only that they are able to discover what wise measures the public welfare may require; but that they have the fortitude to act upon them, notwithstanding the prejudices that sway public opinion.

Yet we hail this measure only as a commencement. Every tavern is, in our opinion, a nuisance, and the way to deal with a nuisance is, not to "reduce" it, but to remove it. But the principle which has brought our Magistrates so far as the above resolution, will, we have no doubt, carry them the full length of this more desirable "consummation" at which we have hinted. In 1 year or two it will call for another "reduction," then for a second, and so on, till they are compelled either to go the whole length, or return to the ground which they originally occupied.

In our opinion there cannot be a piece of greater folly, in principle, than for magistrates, who desire to see peace and good order prevail, to license taverns for the sale of intoxicating liquors; for they thereby take a most effectual method of destroying peace and good order, and defeating all the measures which they may

adopt for establishing them. It is undeniable that all the turbulent and evil disposed persons in the community are attracted to the public house. It is not more certain that the law of chemical affinity prevails amongst chemical substances, than that some similar law of affinity prevails between the tavern, and the wicked and worthless of the population. The tavern is the focus around which they congregate; and there they corrupt one another, and instigate one another to crime and outrage. And can any absurdity be greater than for a magistrate solemnly to license such a house! If a physician were to make it his object to destroy life, or a "teacher of righteousness" to disseminate the most wicked principles, the contradiction would not be greater than when a magistrate grants a tavern license. For he, who ought to preserve the public peace, and public morals, thereby raises up, and sanctions and protects, by an instrument under his own hand and seal, an establishment, which, in its effects, is highly injurious to both these great interests.

But the question may be reduced within very narrow limits. Taverns are either a public good, or a public evil. If the former, how dare our magistrates "reduce" them, or place them even under the restriction which the law of license necessarily supposes? If the latter, how dare they grant any license whatever?

By the following extract from the Maine Temperance Union, our readers will perceive the state of public opinion on this question amongst our neighbours on the South:—

"We rejoice to learn that the friends of temperance in a number of States, are taking measures to petition their respective Legislatures against the continuance of the license law. New Jersey calls for such a 'modification' of them, as will tend to diminish the number of places at which spirituous liquors are sold; but they have been modified and remodified until it is found as impracticable to bring them under any decent regulation as to shoot a humming-bird on the wing. They will have their labor for their pains. If they do not find that they have rowed up *sauz rizer*, then we say all past experience is no guide."

"We are not less pleased with the sound of the movements in this State. Our Methodist brethren are circulating petitions with commendable activity, and others are rapidly following their example. The following short and appropriate petition is circulating in Kennebec County. A similar one is also got up in the County of Washington:—

To the Honourable the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, in Legislature Assembled:

"The undersigned inhabitants of the town of \_\_\_\_\_, being deeply impressed with a sense of the evils arising from the use of spirituous liquors as a drink and being fully convinced that the traffic in such liquors is an immorality which ought not to be sanctioned; respectfully pray that the Laws of this State banning the sale of such liquors may be repealed—and that, except for mechanical and medicinal purposes, the sale of INTOXICATING LIQUORS, in less quantities than twenty-eight gallons, be prohibited by law."

LORD CHESTERFIELD'S OPINION.—"It appears to me," said Lord Chesterfield, in the House of Lords, "that since the *spirits* which distillers produce, are allowed to enfeeble the limbs and vitiate the blood, to pervert the heart and obscure the intellect, that the number of distillers should be no argument in their favour; for I never heard that a law against theft was repealed or delayed because thieves were numerous. It appears to me, my Lords, that if so formidable a body are confederates against the virtue or the lives of their fellow citizens, it is time to put an end to the *havoc*, and to interpose while it is yet in our power to stop the destruction. So little, my Lords, am I affected with the merit of the wonderful skill which the distillers are said to have attained, that it is my opinion no faculty of great use to mankind, make palatable poisons: nor shall