

Canada Temperance Advocate.

MONTREAL, MAY 15, 1852.

Why and Because.

Every effect must have a cause, says the philosopher. If the effect contemplated be evil, the cause cannot be other than evil. A bad tree bringeth forth bad fruit. But it does seem strange sometimes, that apparently very intelligent persons cannot discern the relation of cause and effect, and even suppose that certain effects can be removed without removing the causes. The inconsistency and blindness to which we refer has been remarkably exhibited by certain editors, in various places, where and when the necessity of an anti-liquor law has been considered and discussed. Already we have had bad specimens of bad argument and false logic in Canada; quite enough to satisfy us that, when the subject shall come before our Legislature, there will be found arrayed against us some of our ablest political journalists and commercial advertisers. There are, however, but few persons who uphold the traffic as morally honest. It cannot be justified. Drunkenness is detested, and it is seen to be connected with the protected traffic. That is, we believe it is so seen, except by those who are some way or other worshippers at the shrine of Bacchus. We do not impute motives to our enemies; yet there are some things so plainly palpable to the senses, so perfectly transparent, that it is hardly possible to form an erroneous judgment concerning them. Advertising patronage does not always sway editors. In Canada there are several known and pledged abstainers connected with the press who advertise liquors. Some of them have written well in defence of the Maine Law. But, in other cases, it is pretty clear that both appetite and interest have presided over the desk when fulminations against teetotallers have been incited. It will be the duty of those who, in Canada, are in editorial charge of the *bona fide* temperance papers, to exercise great patience and forbearance during the coming struggle for Canadian freedom. We have admired very much the temper of our friend, the *Temperance Telegraph*, of New Brunswick. He has had some provocation, but calmly progressed toward the accomplishment of the fact, the passage of the Maine Law for that fair portion of her Majesty's British American possessions. We could not help noticing the course of the *St. John Morning Times*. Snarling at the *Telegraph* in one column, misrepresenting the proposed liquor law in another, and on three sides of the sheet advertising all sorts of drunkards' drink. Yet the folly and absurdity of opposing direct and prohibitory legislation was never more clearly demonstrated than in the very paper to which we have referred, and all in one number. *The Police Intelligence*, for the city of St. John, stands recorded in due form just in the centre, between editorial deprecation and brandy advertising. Here is given nearly the whole police proceedings for three consecutive days. We quote the paragraph, only wishing it again to be noted that the *clairvoyant* editor is an enemy to the Maine Law:—

Wednesday, March 17.

[Before W. O. Smith, Esq.] Daniel Barrett, for getting drunk, having been given in charge by Thomas Griffin, for beating him, was fined, on confession, 5s.

Robert Cameron, found lying drunk on public streets on previous night, was fined 10s.

Patrick Mahoney, drunk on the public streets, having been given in charge by Mrs. Ogle, for abuse, was fined 5s.

Daniel Quinlan and Dennis Quinlan were fined 5s. each for

getting drunk, and disturbing the public peace, on the previous night, by fighting.

Thursday, March 18.

Patrick Sullivan was fined 5s., for being drunk and fighting, on the night of the 17th inst.

John Daley was fined 10s., for being drunk and disorderly on the public streets, on the night of the 17th inst., having been given in charge by his wife for beating and abusing her in a brutal manner, and turning her out of doors.

Friday, March 19.

Michael Murphy, for being drunk and disorderly on the public streets, was fined 5s.

Michael Carrigan, for like offence, was fined 5s.

Margaret McGunigle, for being drunk on the public streets, was sent 40 days to the Penitentiary, as a vagrant.

Why all this drunkenness? Because the law justifies and protects the traffic. Why, with all the dreadful weight of evidence before them of the iniquities of the traffic, with the accumulated proofs of the demoralizing effects of the business itself, why will wise and religious men uphold this system of making and selling these poisons for beverages? Why will sensible editors oppose the enactment of a law that would increase sobriety and good order, and promote the prosperity of every lawful enterprise? Why? Because!! There we stop. We shall probably hear from these gents, by and bye. The why and because may be plain to us, but not so plain to others. Let us be patient.

Temperance Jottings.—No. 7.

However some may underrate *moral suasion*, every reflecting mind must acknowledge its importance. As a means of enlightening the mind, producing conviction, prompting to action, and confirming decision, its value is apparent in every undertaking in life. Is not this apparent in the Temperance enterprise? Mind has influenced mind in this matter, and led to the most pleasing results. It has raised up from all ranks, in every community, a host of adherents to the Total Abstinence principle, and numbers of them have been and are still successful advocates in this great reform. Yet, since the excitement produced by the Maine Liquor Law, many have talked about the inefficiency of moral suasion with as much reason and warrant as people sometimes talk of the inefficiency of the voluntary principle in higher matters.

Now, while we highly appreciate the influence of law, if really the voice of the people, we maintain that such a thing would never have been thought of, and certainly not sustained to any extent when agitated, but through and in connexion with the prior influence of moral suasion. With many everything that is new is eagerly embraced, and what preceded is called *old*, and is laid aside as useless. This is egregious folly. Now, it is just so, among other things, with *moral suasion* and the *liquor law*. We are in favor of each; but if the latter is to be attained, we must agitate the question, reason, adduce facts, make appeals, persuade, and urge, and bring the masses thereby to petition, and thus secure Legislative enactments. Here, then, is moral influence. There can be no liquor law without it. And when an act of this nature has passed, moral suasion will still be necessary, that men may voluntarily approve of the principle, pledge themselves to it, and thus prevent a reaction, smuggling, &c. By no means must we dispense with the present plan of influencing the public mind in all its ramifications by moral suasion, when by the pulpit, the platform, the press, or more private efforts. We must rather increase this moral power. But yet we are in favor of Legislative enactments, if it can be fairly carried.

Objections, of course, will be raised to it. Some of them may appear very plausible; but the matter must be thoroughly inves-