

would plead that he was licensed to sell it, and was not responsible for its "abuse" by the purchaser? What would these gentlemen, who tell of "the sacred cause of temperance," think of that butcher who made it a practice to keep tainted meat and exposes it publicly for sale, and who, when remonstrated with, excused himself by pleading that it was his property, that he had a right to make all he could out of it, and if people bought it, he could not be responsible either for its effects on the atmosphere while exposed for sale, or the sickness which it might cause? Would not these gentlemen be among the foremost to condemn the recklessness of the one, and want of feeling of the other? Would they not call for the enforcement of those stringent measures,—those laws which *prohibit the sale of tainted meat or stinking fish* in our market; which *prohibit the sale of poisons*, except with the moral certainty at least that no ill use shall be made of them? And behold, we are advised by these wholesale and retail venders of a poison than which none other has made more "victims," to "impose penal restrictions" upon these (their own) "victims." But the poison itself is not to be meddled with. O no!!!

Would not the druggist or the M.D. have as much right to expect the repeal of those laws which relate to the sale of arsenic, &c., or the butcher of those about tainted meat, as those men have that no interference shall be attempted in reference to the liquor traffic? I think they have; and I argue, that if it is right to license or permit the indiscriminate sale of intoxicating drinks, it is wrong to prohibit a *trade* in other poisons.

Before I close this, allow me just to remark that the public are not informed by these "penal-restrictions" men what those restrictions ought to be, nor have they attempted to define that state when the "victims of drunkenness" become "obnoxious to the laws of society." Why do they not exhibit their talents by preparing—first, "An Act to drive intemperance out of the land without interfering with the liquor trade," and secondly, by writing an essay which would *prove* that intoxicating drinks are not *hurtful* when used (as I presume I am to understand the expression) in moderation—that is to say, some quantity between a glass and a gallon?

## No. 4.

MR. EDITOR,—I now proceed to consider the conviction "that a resort to coercion for the purpose of ensuring sobriety . . . would be a signal failure . . . would lower instead of raising the standard of morality, and be highly detrimental to the sacred cause of Temperance."

Indeed! gentlemen. And what are the grounds of your conviction, that such would be the results? Are you really so ignorant of the import of the above sentiments as to believe them all trash? I would scarcely think you or any of you such zany. But seriously—is there one of you who would keep a drunken servant? Would you not *oblige him* to "keep sober," or if he would not, would you not think it for your interest to discharge him? Here is, then, not an uncommon attempt at "coercion," from which you expect a double benefit to arise, that is to say, *first*, to the inebriate himself, who would be a better servant, and *second*, to yourself, who would be better served by him.

And pray, gentlemen, how will you make out that the morality of that man would be *lowered instead of raised* by transition from drunkenness to sobriety, and that by a condition which you had *forced upon him*, as the only one upon which he could remain in your service? I do not believe you can make out a case.

If, then, the individual employer may, and does *impose* such a condition upon his *employée*, in order to secure a mutual benefit; why may not the legislature adopt a measure which *will* secure a universal good?

And have we no coercive measures already in force? What is the *act* of the corporation of Quebec, which *forbids* the erection of wooden buildings within the city limits? What is the act for providing the city of Quebec with water? Are these not coercive measures to all intents and purposes? Does not the first interfere with the individual who owns a piece of land, and oblige him either to erect a building thereon of incombustible materials, or keep his lot vacant? Does not the second provide that all the inhabitants *shall be taxed* at a fixed rate to defray the interest on the money expended in erecting the water works, whether they use the water or not? And who finds fault with either of these laws? There may be a *few* dissatisfied; but the general knowledge that the public good required them, they have been enacted; and the first *is*, and the last *will be*, enforced.

And so it will be with the liquor traffic. The public mind is getting awakened to the necessity of an enactment by which it *will be put down*, with the certainty that it will produce an immense amount of good in the community; and when we have it, it will, like the others, be enforced; the opinions of the petitioners, and all like thinking men to the contrary notwithstanding.

Yours, &amp;c.,

No QUARTER.

Quebec, May 30, 1853.

## St. Andrew's Division, No. 9, Sons of Temperance, Canada East.

At a regular meeting of this division, held at St. Andrew's County of Two Mountains, on the 16th ultimo, it was moved by Bro. H. Stewart, seconded by Bro. J. W. Milligan, that St. Andrew's Division No. 9 S. of T. do hereby express their sense of the honor conferred on them by the Grand Division of Canada East in having held their session in this place during the past week, and that they also acknowledge their obligations, and tender their sincere thanks to Bros. Kneeshaw, Easton, McEachern, Gordon, and Cole, of the Grand Division, for their impressive and excellent addresses at the public temperance meeting here on the 12th ultimo.

And furthermore, that they cordially and respectfully invite the Grand Division of Canada East to hold another session in this locality when it shall be convenient for them so to do.

M. McLEOD, R. S.

JUST PUBLISHED,

## THE TEMPERANCE SOIREE COMPANION.

A WORK of 226 pages, comprising Dialogues, Recitations in Prose and Poetry, Hymns and Melodies compiled for the use of the Temperance Community. Price 1s. 3d. per copy, or 9 Copies for 10s.—and 19 copies for 20s. Postage to any part of BRITISH NORTH AMERICA 3d per Copy. Orders should contain a remittance for the Books required addressed Post-paid to the Undersigned.

J. G. MASON, &amp; Co., Toronto.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE is published on the 1st and 15th of every month, at 2s. 6d. per annum—Agents receiving one copy gratis—by J. C. BECKET, Office, 22, Great St. James-St.; Residence, Brunswick-St., Beaver Hall, Montreal.