

matter into right or wrong. Is the Traffic virtuous, does it promote virtue? Then in the name of virtue continue it. But reverse the question—is the Traffic destructive to virtue, is it ruinous to health and happiness, is it demoralizing in all its phases, wherever it exists is purity destroyed, is innocence corrupted, is virtue ruined, are families desolated, is it productive of pauperism and crime, is there multiplied disease and premature death, are there idiocy and insanity, in fine, *is the Traffic a Public Immorality*, then in the name of humanity, in the name of Morality, prohibit the traffic forever.

I.—THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.—ITS EVILS.

There are several reasons which would amply justify any Legislature in prohibiting the traffic in ardent spirits or in prohibiting the distillation of grains used for food by man. Such prohibition has lately been enforced by the Emperor of France, as a preventive measure against general want or famine which might ensue from a scarcity brought on in a large degree by the vast destruction of grain by distillation. When it is considered that upwards of 45,000,000 bushels of grain are annually used for the purposes of brewing and distillation in Great Britain, there can be no question that the prevention of scarcity, would justify the immediate prohibition of the manufacture of all kinds of intoxicating drinks. The amount of grains thus destroyed in Great Britain by its 43,000 Brewers and 500 Distilleries has been ascertained for ten consecutive years to have been sufficient to feed 5,500,000 human beings annually; while the poor and pauper populations, the classes that suffer indistinguishably in years of scarcity in England, do not exceed half that number.

If the traffic should be found injurious to the revenue of the state as it is destructive to the property of individuals; if instead of adding to the Government funds it should subtract from them, that also would be considered a perfect justification of its prohibition. If in Great Britain the public revenue should lose £15,000,000 sterling annually, instead of deriving that vast sum from the traffic—if in Canada from Distillers and shops for the sale of liquors, and also for the duties and per centum upon liquors imported, a revenue of almost £100,000 were not realized, political expediency would instantly demand the prohibition of the Traffic in spirits of all kinds. If then, Prohibition could justly be demanded for such reasons, as a preventive against scarcity, as a protection for the Revenue of a country, reasons that are undoubtedly sound and sufficient, how much more urgently might it be sought, how infinitely more readily should the Prohibition of the Traffic be effected for that far more important reason, on account of its public immorality?

Countless facts, statistics, incidents and testimony of unquestionable veracity, demonstrate the whole business in the manufacture, in the adulteration of liquors, in its sale, in its effects, in all its infinite ramifications as a fearful immorality. The man that looks abroad with impartial eyes cannot fail to see the evil in all directions. There is not a grade, a rank, a phase of society, where he does not see its immorality. Take for instance, out of multitudes of evidences, and illustrations of its immorality, the effects of the traffic in reference to *Pauperism, Crime and Insanity*. If the traffic can even in a small degree be truly proved to be productive of these evils, who can for a moment deny the propriety, the necessity of its immediate Prohibition? If such effects were produced by it in the neighbouring states, it ceases to be marvellous in our eyes that the question of prohibition is canvassed most energetically throughout the length and breadth of that great Federation.

I.—PAUPERISM.

1. During the agitation of Prohibition in the adjoining States much useful information on Pauperism, Asylums for the young, on Poor Houses and other charitable institutions, was collected and diffused abroad. It became thus ascertained beyond all doubt that the pauperism in that country, and the prodigious expense of all their establishments for the relief or for the instruction of their inmates, might be traced directly in whole or in a very great proportion, to intemperance. The collection and publication of these facts and statistics run back as far as 1830 and cover the whole period from that time to this. It may here be stated that each county in the several States supports its own poor, and builds and keeps its own poor-house. The following tabular statement has been constructed with great care and from returns certified by the keepers of the respective Poor-houses, and may be relied on as correct, as they were published under the authority of the State.

A TABULAR STATEMENT

Of Pauperism in the several Counties of the State of New York, showing that a very large proportion thereof was the product of Intemperance.

PAUPERISM IN NEW YORK.

Poor House for each County.	Year.	Not through Intemperance	Through Intemperance	Total.	Expense Yearly.	County Population.	Expense for ten consecutive years.
Allegany . . .	1833	11	5	34	\$ 4,500	26276	\$ 45,000
Broome . . .	1830	3	4	19	830	17576	8,300
Cayuga . . .	1833	70	9	14	4,634	47916	46,340
Chautauque . .	1833	17	13	22	52	34671	
Chemungo . . .	1833	20	142	74	1,074	37222	10,740
Clinton . . .	1833	27	53	107	157	19311	45,190
Columbia . . .	1831	17	47	136	210	39907	12,000
Delaware . . .	1833	14	23	50	87	30304	30,300
Dutchess . . .	1833	29	60	354	413	50920	119,750
Eric . . .	1833	42	17	176	233	35719	47,370
Essex . . .	1831	14	15	65	94	19267	28,000
Franklin . . .	1834	26	30	65	111	11312	13,050
Genesee . . .	1835	15	16	93	124	3,437	52,147
Greene . . .	1833	29	13	68	110	6,251	62,540
Herkimer . . .	1834	18	19	68	125	3,000	36,000
Jefferson . . .	1834	43	18	126	157	3,425	34,250
Kings . . .	1831	37	97	201	395	4,719	47,190
Lewis . . .	1833	4	8	9	21	1,130	14,956
Livingston . . .	1833	4	11	35	50	2,000	27,710
Madison . . .	1833	32	16	70	120	2,422	49,037
Monroe . . .	1833	116	224	650	1020	6,511	49,682
Montgomery . .	1831	39	24	98	161	2,500	25,000
Niagara . . .	1833	22	20	113	164	2,224	16,185
Oneida . . .	1833	43	44	120	207	6,616	71,326
Onondaga . . .	1833	69	38	178	255	2,050	59,974
Ontario . . .	1833	24	15	87	176	3,085	40,167
Oranget . . .	1833	57	49	131	227	11,513	45,366
Orleans . . .	1833	11	8	26	45	2,254	15,773
Oswego . . .	1832	20	9	85	114	1,960	27,104
Otsego . . .	1833	33	5	152	190	5,190	51,900
Putnam . . .	1833	19	29	33	81	2,140	12,625
Queens . . .	1834	2	0	29	31	1,610	22,400
Rensselaer . . .	1834	23	31	628	682	8,690	49,420
Richmond . . .	1834	6	0	11	26	1,036	7,082
Swaga . . .	1834	7	40	141	164	4,162	38,679
Schenectady . .	1834	3	20	94	117	3,273	12,347
Scholaric . . .	1833	7	0	16	32	1,055	27,902
Seneca . . .	1833	19	12	67	97	1,627	21,041
Steuben . . .	1831					6,292	33,851
St. Lawrence . .	1834	14	50	90	154	7,702	36,354
Suffolk . . .	1834					145	2,678
Sullivan . . .	1833	0	2	25	27	2,052	12,364
Tioga . . .	1833	5	19	29	53	3,313	27,694
Tompkins . . .	1833	22	17	96	135	2,956	36,545
Ulster . . .	1833	8	12	209	228	4,600	36,556
Warren . . .	1834	23	33	16	77	1,430	17,700
Washington . . .	1834	0	15	133	148	4,066	42,635
Wayne . . .	1834	31	10	80	130	3,000	33,043
Westchester . .	1833	22	70	113	205	7,150	34,556
Gates . . .	1832	14	3	50	67	1,676	19,060
Cortland . . .	1835					1,200	23,791
Rockland . . .	1833					490	938
Cataraugus . . .	1829						16,724
Total . . .		1175	1325	5489	7959	179,104	1,701,640