

BEGIN RIGHT:

OR,

FACTS IN FIGURES

FOR THE PEOPLE.

TO THE RATE-PAYERS AND OTHER CITIZENS
OF TORONTO.

Presented to

Mrs. Bayner
Miss J. Adams Compton.

This tract is one of an advance edition, to be called the "Toronto Temperance Circulating Library," by which it is intended to distribute first class Temperance reading once a week, to every family in the City, for the purpose of diffusing information and enlisting and training public sentiment in favor of Temperance.

The value of the movement is highly prized by all friends of the cause, and it is hoped that when they are appealed to on its behalf; they will support it with that aid which its usefulness deserves.

REV. WM. MCCLURE, President.

NEIL McEACHERN, Secretary.

BEGIN RIGHT; OR, FACTS IN FIGURES

FOR THE PEOPLE.

TO THE RATE-PAYERS, AND OTHER CITIZENS, OF
TORONTO.

IN these days of great undertakings, whether in the management of mind or of matter, the value of the maxim *begin right* can hardly be over rated, and in the present agitation towards a much needed retrenchment of public expenses ; it is a matter of no small importance, that a right beginning be made towards accomplishing that object.

The Toronto Temperance Reformation Society beg leave to address you upon a subject having the most intimate bearing on this point, and which they deem worthy of a full and careful consideration, also to lay before you an account of the money which you are called upon from time to time to contribute, with a statement and review of some important items of your City receipts and expenditure for the year 1864, as shewn by your public Financial Statement just published.

Amongst other recommendations in your retrenchment committee's report is a reduction of your Police force cost and the donations to public charities. Both of these amounts of expenditure are the natural and inevitable effects of certain causes within your control and to try to take away or lessen the EFFECT without removing or diminishing the CAUSE is so unreasonable that to an intelligent public it should scarcely be necessary to urge the argument in more than very general terms.

In opening this question we think we BEGIN RIGHT to assume what you will not deny us, namely, that the greatest wealth and the surest basis even of the material prosperity of any country or city is the character, virtue and intelligence of its people. To form that character is our first and highest interest as a city or country. For this purpose our common school system was founded, and is now being sustained at the annual expense of about twenty-eight thousand dollars, about twenty-four thousand dollars of which came from your Municipal Fund. But while you are cherishing your

schools with a fidelity worthy of all praise, you are neglecting, or rather indeed allowing, yes, even fostering at an immense expense, an evil that does as much to make bad citizens as schools do to make good ones. If you doubt the existence of such an evil, or the amount of injurious results flowing from it, and its great cost, we will refer you to authenticated accounts from your police officers and other overseers of public institutions where crime is punished or distress relieved. The statistics of crime for 1864, as returned by our excellent Chief of Police, shew the whole number of arrests to be 3566, viz., 2402 male and 1164 female, being about 80 for each constable of the police force. These cost you, for the mere arrest and police court trial, \$24,862, or about \$7 each. Of the thirty-seven headings under which the crimes are classified, the *Drunk and Disorders* and *Illicit Liquor Sellings* count up 2216, the balance are mainly under the three heads of *Vagrancy*, *Larceny*, and *Assault*, and we are borne out by the best testimony that fully three-fourths of these may be attributed to the effects of liquor, which makes a total of 3229 directly chargeable to that traffic, leaving only 337 cases to be accounted for without liquor, or *less than one-tenth* of the whole. There were 554 individuals who were twice or oftener in the hands of the police, producing of themselves 1576 arrests. Now deducting the number of arrests above one each, counted on those who were taken up more than once, shows the number 2544 individuals arrested. These cost us for prosecution and imprisonment \$35,352, or \$14 each in addition to the \$7 each which they cost for arrest.

We now deduct the proportion shewn above, namely one-tenth, and we have about 2300 different individuals, from which if we still take 200 for non-residents we have 2100 *Citizens of Toronto*, or about 1 in every 22 of the whole population brought to police correction by the licensed liquor traffic.* Thus far, a summary review of public crime for 1864, and we would just mention the significant fact that in that year there were fewer arrests by 558 than in 1863, when the licensed drinking places were more numerous. To shew this better we will put it in tabular lines thus:—

1863.

Number of Taverns Licensed, 235. | Number of Shops Licensed, 125.
Number of arrests, 4124.

1864.

Number of Taverns Licensed, 180. | Number of Shops Licensed, 131.
Number of arrests, 3566.

* Dr. F. Lee in his prize essay on the liquor traffic says:—"It is certain that two millions of persons are constantly suffering from police-recognised drunkenness alone; not to speak of private drinking, which is four times as great, and ten times as bad in effects on domestic life," and shows by the statistics of crime for the following places the proportions of arrests to the population.

Liverpool, . . . 1 in 20.	Glasgow, . . . 1 in 22.
Edinburgh, . . . 1 in 57.	Cork, . . . 1 in 10.
Dundee, . . . 1 in 26.	Dublin, 1 in 14.
Belfast, 1 in 33.	

Showing that the proportion in numbers between the licensed liquor places and the arrests, in either year, was, as usual, exactly alike, namely $11\frac{1}{2}$ arrests to each license, and showing that notwithstanding a slight increase in shop licenses, your city crime was reduced by a reduction of the number of Tavern licenses; or if plainer English is wanted we will say emphatically, historically, and prophetically "The more Taverns the more Crime." Besides this, it is plain in all statistical accounts of crime, that, other things being equal, the relative proportion of arrests is invariably greatest when the drinking houses are allowed to carry on their business on Sundays. Take the City of Glasgow for example, which shows the same proportion as your own, namely, 1 in every 22 of the population. Immediately after the passage of the law known as the Forbes-McKenzie Act, prohibiting the Public Houses from keeping open on Sundays, there the number of arrests fell one-third and has kept down ever since, notwithstanding the many predictions to the contrary of the professedly wise opponents of the measure; while the Jail which was crowded to excess before, has testimonials to the honor and memory of the Act, in the profitable and truth-telling shape of empty cells.

If inductive reasoning be allowed, the least fair play, we infer that, imperfectly as prohibition on Sundays is carried out in Toronto your proportion of public crime would be much greater (perhaps up to the mark of Dublin or Cork), were the machinery for its production allowed to run, full blast, on Sundays as it is in those places.

Now for a glance at the statistics of your public charities for the same year.

You have many excellent institutions and admirably conducted. Your House of Industry, with its 110 inmates and its 700 families receiving outdoor relief. Your House of Providence, with its 350 inmates and its 300 outdoor poor, and the three Homes,† namely, your "Orphans," "Boys," and "Girls," Homes with their total of 170 inmates. These with other less populous institutions, will all show a total, including children, of about 4500, from which we deduct 500 for those obtaining relief in different institutions, and consequently counted more than once,—this gives the number 4000 brought to ask public alms during the year at a cost to

† The popular historian Sir A. Allison says of the records of the Glasgow House of Refuge:—

"These highly curious annals of crime shew, in the clearest manner, the fatal influence of the drinking of whiskey upon the lowest classes of the people for out of 234 boys who at present are in the institution, it appears from their own account that the drunkenness of their parents stood thus:—

Had drunken Fathers	72
Had drunken Mothers,	62
Had both Fathers and Mothers drunken,	69

So that upwards of two-thirds of the boys in the institution have been precipitated into crime through the use of liquor by one or both of their parents.

the citizens of \$34,428, exclusive of street and door relief. Now we are reasonable in computing that three-fourths of these, or 3000, are actual dependents on public relief through liquor, all of whom may attribute their position of dependance to the use of strong drink, either in themselves or in those whose moral and social duty it should be to protect and provide for them. If we now deduct 300 for the number of individuals brought to both correction and charity it shows us 2700, and adding these to the 2,100 citizens brought to public correction by the same cause we have a total of 4800 (an under calculation) of different individual Toronto citizens brought in the year 1864 by liquor to public correction or public charity, being 1 in about every 10 of the population, or about 27 to every licensed drinking bar, or about 13 to every place where liquor is sold within your limits, and being 1 for every second family in the city.

There are visible causes that perpetuate this evil. Intemperance has its agencies as well as education. The one is as plainly nurtured in your drinking houses as the other is in your schools. The ordinary product of the one is good and useful citizens, and of the other paupers, drunkards, and criminals. Why then is it not as necessary to shut up your pauper, drunkard, and criminal factories, as it is to keep open your schools? But the evils arising from intoxicating drink are by no means limited to those whom it brings into your houses of charity or correction; a large number of the distressed are relieved by private charity, while crimes against morality and integrity are perpetrated through it by a great number who escape the policeman's baton or the jury's committal, and crushing woes and sorrows are entailed in many a home through it where the material relief of the benevolent is either not yet required, or where delicacy yet forbids the much needed help being solicited. Yes, indeed, many miseries that may never come to the surface of public observation, multitudes of woes and shames, each defying the whole world's wealth or currency to shew an equivalent for, and an accumulation of guilt and guilty responsibility that the judgment day only can and certainly will shew up in their enormity of consequences on the present and future generations of the deceived, not only against all those who have aided and abetted this scourging traitor to human happiness and hopes but against all who have either refused or neglected to join in the battle against him.*

Hundreds of families are living in a condition where industry, respectability or morality are almost impossible. You look on this perishing class as the natural and inevitable sediment of society; this is a mistake. It is the product of agencies that are under your control, the whole process of making this class is open to your inspection, the money that should furnish comfortable tenements, good food, clothing and other enjoyments, and otherwise improve their condition, goes for drink, while the industry and moral principle which should use that money to advantage goes with it to waste and

* I challenge any man who understands the nature of ardent spirits, and yet, for the sake of gain, continues to be engaged in the traffic, to shew that he is not involved in the guilt of murder.—LYMAN BEECHER, D. D.

destruction. This part of your population is rapidly dying out through the effect of intoxicating drink and still more rapidly being recruited by the same agency from all classes of society, but all from the ranks of the professed moderationists, and for them there is no hope but in removing the temptation which they either cannot or will not withstand.

In plain reality many thousands of dollars are being annually diverted from the stores, workshops and warehouses of the useful, refining and elevating branches of industry, and sunk in the liquor shops to buy that which pushes its purchasers downwards. We do not say that intemperance is wholly due to your drinking houses, but we do say that it depends on them as much as education does on your schools. We do not assert that you can entirely put an end to its evils but we do say that you can do as much to diminish intemperance as you can to increase education, this is a practical matter and quite within your power, now that we have a law in our land giving municipalities the right to order away and cast out from their borders this thing of such notoriously evil influence, the drinking bar.

The evidence from city records shows that intoxicating drink visibly and publicly impoverishes and degrades 4800 of your population. If the education of three thousand children that attend your schools be a good reason for their support surely the intemperance and demoralisation of the thousands that attend drinking houses is a good reason for their suppression. To retain both of these opposing agencies is hardly creditable to the good practical common sense of this Queen City of our Western Canada. To spend \$28,000 in your schools in supporting the advancement of intelligence and morals, and to lay out \$75,349 incurring the actual nett loss of nearly \$54,000 annually in keeping up a powerful counteracting and degrading influence seems utterly unreasonable, yet, so it is, and all this too under the popular and absurd delusion that you cannot afford to go without it because it is such a good paying thing and you want money badly. The account debtor and creditor accompanying this tract speaks for itself. You will see that the liquor traffic brings you in \$21,573, but takes away from you in cash \$75,349. Now, is this the way to get money? If you had no other sources of income, or if all other sources of revenue yielded in the same *good paying* proportion could any of your clever financiers show how to pay \$75,349 out of \$21,573? The privilege of keeping a drinking bar is sold for \$60 a year, and that of selling in a shop for \$50, but they all actually cost you an average in cash of \$242 each, so that you are really supporting these agencies, 311 in number, by a clear bounty of about \$187 each, besides allowing them the very vitals of society for perquisites, or \$53,776 bounty, which is assessed out of the rate payers generally and given to support the liquor dealers along with the license or legal charter to pursue a business in itself not only thus far an imposition but beyond the power of human arithmetic, damaging and desolating to homes and hearts, and destroying to immortal souls.

We could easily furnish evidence in abundance that similar results are true in every place where the liquor traffic is carried on. Take the following for example,—Mr. James Gray, Chairman of the Edinburgh Parochial

Board, says:—As a manager of the Edinburgh Charity Workhouse previous to the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act, I have had ample opportunity of knowing the extent as well as the prevailing cause of the pauperism. The expenditure of the City Parochial Board for 1849, was £27,040. The number of enrolled paupers 270: but in addition there are about 750 who receive occasional relief; of these, *at least two-thirds are brought to poverty by their own intemperance*. It is more difficult to ascertain who are reduced to that condition by the drunkenness of relatives; but I *know* that upwards of 100 orphans are now provided for by the parish, whose parents brought themselves to a premature grave by dissipation; and *a still greater number of children* have been removed from the custody and *poisonous influence of their parents* to the country, where they are provided for, and educated by the Board. There are *numerous* instances of *parents in the decline of life*, reduced to poverty through the profligacy of drunken children. I have no *doubt* that a poor rate of 4½d instead of 12½d would be amply sufficient for the relief of the sober and industrious poor.

The same gentleman said at a meeting of the Town Council, October 23, 1849:—There are thirty-four parishes in Scotland without a public house, and the effect upon the parishioners is, that they have not a penny of poor rate in one of them. Before I came to Edinburgh I lived eight years in a parish where there was no public house, and *during all that period I never saw a person the worse for drink*. There were no poor rates in the parish *then*; but *now* there are five public houses, and a poor rate of 1s 8d in the pound. In a foot note the following significant statement occurs; “It may not be out of place to state here, for the edification of our ratepayers, that in the two neighbouring parishes,—viz., Mertoun on the one hand, and Legerwood on the other, not a penny of poor rate is required; and why? The reason is quite obvious—not a whiskey shop is in either parish; while Earlston with eight such houses, has in round numbers £450 to pay annually in supporting a class, three fourths of whom have directly or indirectly been pauperized through the liquor traffic.”

At a meeting of the Parochial Board November 2, 1859, Mr. Blackadder, Ex-Lord Provost, said:—“As to the causes of the pauperism, first among the grizzly throng I would place drunkenness. I verily believe that out of 2700 paupers 2000 were made so by drink: so that we are, in fact, not so much supporting the poor, as we are supporting the public houses.”

Your Municipal officers might well and truly have posted on every door and window the announcement—“*Selling off at three hundred and fifty per cent less than cost price*.” For this is about the kind of business you are doing, positively giving away one thousand and thirty four dollars in cash, every week, to the liquor dealers of your city and allowing them to make as much more as they can besides. Pray what service do these men render your city or wherein do they help on the public welfare that you allow them to fatten thus at public expense? You keep a Police force to preserve peace and order consisting of 51 men all told, whose united salaries come to less than \$20,000 and you also keep a force to work

directly against them, numbering 311, at an actual cost of \$53,776 over and above all the fees you get from them, allowing them also untold perquisites and holding them not responsible for their damages.

Considering the immense influence that your corrective institution the Police force has to contend against and the extent of the work it performs, as well as the great need for the work that is being done by your charitable institutions in relieving distress, we cannot imagine how you could wisely reduce either branch of your expenditure until the cause which produces their necessity should first be abated, and even then, the saving proposed is but as a drop in the bucket compared with the money you are annually paying for the \$268,000 of debt incurred to get up your new jail and so called industrial farm, *not one shilling of which needed to be incurred but for the liquor traffic*, and while we make this assertion we would specially address you who call yourselves public economists and are yet upholders or apologists for the liquor traffic on the ground of its paying properties, and we will give you now another statement for which we shew you figures and challenge refutation, it is this: That all the money received from tavern licenses, shop licenses, license transfers, fines and fees of Police court, fines for breach of license laws, and every other channel having the liquor traffic for its source; *that every dollar of it all put together would not pay the one single item of its own expenses, namely the annual maintenance of the jail and premises alone, without a prisoner or even a caretaker in them.*

It will be seen that we have charged in the account, only three-fourths of the Police establishment expenses to the traffic, although most competent judges maintain that we might fairly charge it with a greater proportion of this as well as of all the other items of expenditure we have put down against it. It is our aim however in bringing the dark things of this subject to the light to make such estimates as cannot be gainsayed by the strongest friends of the business we are writing against.

In case however that some stout hearted and hard mouthed liquor advocate might even venture to dispute the reasonableness of this charge we will just quote for example one case from amongst many at hand quite similiar. The city of Middletown, in the State of Connecticut, during the existence of the prohibitory law, with its population of 10,000, had but one policeman and he had no more to do than he could easily accomplish; while at the present day in our city of good law abiding repute, two constables are no more than enough to maintain a very indifferent degree of order in the one short Stanley street alone.

Why not suppress the agencies that make bad citizens as well as support those that make good ones? This would seem a proposition without any good objection, but when we ask why spend in actual money outlay \$53,776 over and above all its income, being nearly twice as much to support the evil agency—your taverns—as to maintain the good one—your schools—we blush to think that there are men, otherwise rational, who would attempt to reconcile even this with reason. What merchant would continue a business where \$75,000 are paid out annually to get the sum of \$21,000?

incurring the actual loss of \$54,000. Yet this is just about what you are doing as citizens with your public funds.

Surely it is not because you are ignorant of the extent of the evil, or of the cause that produces it. The product of your drinking shops is as certain and as visible as that of any other shops in your city. It is, in every respect, an ordinary practical business operation, the result of which can be estimated before hand with reasonable accuracy. From a knowledge of the amount of liquor sold you can calculate very nearly the number of its victims. The liquor sold in your 180 licensed drinking houses, and your 131 licensed shops, yields 4,800 subjects for your correction or charity, at an actual cost of about \$54,000 over and above all they pay for the privilege and their victims for penalty. Double the liquor would give about double the product. Half the liquor would give about half the product. No other popular habit or vice has ever been so correctly gauged, and it is found that no human wisdom, no possible arrangement, ever did or ever can, materially change the proportion between the amount of liquor sold and the evil it produces.* On the 28th of April, 1865, a very large meeting was held in Dublin, for the total suppression of the liquor traffic. After dwelling upon the statement that the traffic is immoral in its tendency and criminal in its results, the mover of the first resolution stated among other things the following startling facts: "When they consumed in Ireland in four years, two million gallons less of spirits, they had 22,000 less paupers, and £214,000 less poor rates; when 2s a gallon was added to the duty, they had 19,300 less committals to prison than when the duty was low. In Scotland the Sunday closing reduced the committals in Edinburgh by three fourths, and a new gaol projected was never erected because it ceased to be necessary. In Glasgow with all its drunkenness, while its population increased by 67,000, its criminals decreased by 18,500 under the operation of Sunday closing of public houses. Oliver Goldsmith their own countryman, who was no teetotaler, said: In all the towns and counties I have ever seen, I never saw a city or village where miseries were not in proportion to the number of public-houses."

The traffic would be easier suppressed but for the belief that the most

*When in 1826 the consumption of spirits became doubled, as a consequence of reduced duty, the *deaths* in England and Wales increased 13,143.

From June, 1808, to December, 1809, the distilling of whiskey from corn was prohibited in Ireland, and of course the consumption greatly decreased. What followed in Dublin? In those years, the patients admitted into the fever Hospital in Cork street, were 1,071 and 1,051; but in 1810, when the prohibition ceased, the patients increased to 1,744. At the Sick Poor Institution, in Meath street, there were in 1808-9 respectively, 8,139 and 8,069 patients admitted, but in 1810 the admissions rose to 9,075.

In the city of Glasgow, in 1821 and 1822, the average deaths were 3,690, but in 1823, when the duty on spirits were greatly reduced, the deaths rose to 4,670. In other words, the mere expansion of the traffic in that year slaughtered 980 people in one single city of Christendom!

wealthy and respectable houses were the least injurious. This belief is a great mistake. The highest houses are as bad as the lowest, or indeed even worse in one respect for they reach the temptation to a higher class of society and prepare it for a lower, while they cloak over the lurking evil with the glare of respectability, and thereby seduce thousands, who, but for that glare would have been repelled rather than attracted. On this point, two facts will give illustration. The United States Senate found it necessary to prohibit the sale of liquors in the Saloon near the Senate Chamber. The reason as stated by the press was that it produced drunken quarrels among the members and interfered with the transaction of public business. The effect of that *first class, respectable* liquor bar not only on the army of contractors and lobby members but also on the members and officers of the National Government at Washington is a matter of public notoriety and regret. To T. D. McConkey, Esq., M.P.P., we owe it that our own parliament last session ordered the prohibition of liquor selling in the splendid refreshment place attached to their premises for the reason that it promoted drunkenness, immorality and neglect of public duty amongst our legislators. Surely these men are fair representatives of those who drink at the *highest houses* in the first cities. The truth is that the liquor sold to men in the highest positions is just as hurtful to them and quite as injurious to public and private interest as that sold by the penny or two-pence worth to the inhabitants of our back streets and lanes, and inasmuch as the interests entrusted to men in high position are of more importance, the injury is just so much the greater.

Yes, each one of your 311 licensed liquor sellers, no matter what the class may be, is as truly a minister of intemperance as any pastor of your churches is a minister of religion. They lead your people downward as plainly and as certainly as your ministers of religion lead them upward, inasmuch as their business tends perniciously against every interest you should most value and cherish.

Now fellow citizens, the subject is of the plainest and most practical nature, as well as of the most vital importance. Here stands your army of tipplers, drunkards, paupers, and criminals, there stands your enlisting agency—the liquor traffic. The question is whether you want this army kept up or not, if not, and if you would *begin right* shut up your 311 enlisting offices and discharge the officers. Give no more \$53,776 yearly grant to the school of discipline, no more \$187 annual bounties to your 131 recruiting corporals and your 180 drill sergeants, and they and their army will disband to useful pursuits. But, if you will continue the rights to these people to enlist your children you may with certainty look for another 5,000 of them next year being brought as cattle to the slaughter into unequal combat against man's mighty foe,—Hell's great champion—Alcohol.

To our friends in the good cause of temperance—a word. We do not think or pretend to say that the suppression of the liquor traffic or of the bar drinking system is free from difficulty. On the contrary, like every other great work it requires all our determination, energy and patience.

IN consequence of the immense influences and the enormous amounts invested, as well as the multitude of interests arraigned on the side of the Liquor Traffic—amongst which appear the very existence and motive power of national governments—the influence and example of the talented, the noble, the wealthy, yes, and of the pious and good of the land. In consequence of all this our hopes for the total suppression of that traffic may seem visionary, and our schemes futile, but, pray remember that not many years ago the same powers were all woven up with human slavery, and arraigned on its side, while the theories of those who dared to advocate its suppression were treated with contempt. Let us reply to our opponents by pointing to the strides that intellect has made in many departments of progress, and in this, to British Emancipation, to Russian Liberation, and to American Abolition. Let us point with justifiable pride to the wonderful revolution accomplished in the popular tolerance of fashionable intoxication so prevalent but a very few years ago. What was then a pride is now a disgrace. Thanks to the workers in the temperance movement. As obstacle after obstacle is removed let us on each fresh vantage ground take fresh courage, keeping our hearts and hands in the encounter until we have gained the day. However great our sacrifice may be in the cause let us each feel the spirit of the following closing line:

“ONE FIRESIDE MADE HAPPY REPAYS US FOR ALL.”



A FEW CHIPS TO FILL UP!

FROM A VERY LARGE HEAP.

Statement exhibiting the whole Number of Prisoners committed to Gaol in the United Counties of York and Peel, for the Years 1856, 1857, and 1858, and also shewing those who were committed especially for Drunkenness:—

1856,	Total	Number of Commitments,	1979
“	“	“ of these for Drunkenness,	1511
1857,	“	“ of Commitments,	1906
“	“	“ of these for Drunkenness,	1530
1858,	“	“ of Commitments,	1941
“	“	“ of these for Drunkenness,	1482

Extract from report of committee appointed by Canadian Parliament, February 24, 1859.—

1. That indulgence in the use of intoxicating Liquors is the cause of most of the suffering and sorrow, the poverty and crime which afflict Upper Canada; and,

2. That it is the duty of Parliament to mitigate, diminish, and, if possible to extirpate the cause of these evils.

Extract from reply of G. L. Allen. Esq., Governor of Toronto Gaol to queries addressed to same Committee.—

From my experience in such matters, having been now going on 14 years dealing with them, I unhesitatingly assert, that were the criminals, not actually committed for drunkenness analysed, it would be found that three fourths of them committed the offences with which they were charged, through the agency, directly or indirectly, of intoxicating drinks.

A. M. Adams, Esq., M. D., Inspector of Poor in Glasgow City Parish:—‘I consider every public-house a moral nuisance—a hot-bed of disease, crime and destitution.’

Archibald Alison, Esq., LL. D., F. R. S. Sheriff of Lanarkshire:—‘I am decidedly of opinion that it [drunkenness] is the cause of two-thirds of the crime, and one-half of the distress existing among the working classes at this moment.’

William Collins, Esq., Publisher, Glasgow:—‘It is chiefly the intemperate and drunkards, who spend their money and leave their families in want and starvation, that are a burthen on the community.’

Andrew Woodrow, Esq., a Director of the Glasgow Night Asylum for the Houseless:—‘Were it possible to banish drunkenness from the land I believe that little of the misery which our Asylum is open to alleviate would be known.’

Mr. Fleming, Superintendent of the Glasgow Old Man's Friend Society, states that ‘nine-tenths’ of the inmates of that institution have been ‘injured in their worldly circumstances by intemperance.’

The late Rev. Dr. Chalmers:—‘The public-house is the most deleterious, and by far the most abundant source of pauperism.’

John Hay, Esq., Inspector of Poor in Edinburgh City Parish:—‘I do not hesitate to state my conviction, that fully 6-10ths of the pauperism brought under the notice of this Board, is produced by intemperance and dissipation: that rarely indeed do we find any temperate individuals compelled to seek relief here, until the infirmities of age or attacks of disease render it necessary on their part to do so.’

