

be first decided by a United States Court? The question was not whether the law of Rhode Island was contrary to the public morality, they ought to be reduced in number by at least one half, and the remainder placed under the strictest surveillance. Until something be done in this direction, we may build schools and multiply churches in vain—our best efforts will but be impeded by a 'superfluity of naughtiness,' disgraceful to any Christian community, and dangerous to the moral welfare of any Christian State."

We commend the above to the notice of our city contemporaries, and bespeak their aid, in another year's crusade against these city liquor shops. The *Herald* takes sweet comfort in reviewing the moral statistics of Montreal. "The apparently large increase has not occurred under the more serious heads of offence." It's only drunkenness and vagrancy—that's all—and these offences have been brought to light in consequence of close watching. But good burly brother would it not be better to stop both the drinking and the watching? The Maine Law would revolutionize Montreal in one year! Would to God we had an opportunity of giving it a fair trial. We might want Mr. McGrath and his police for a year, but after that, Mr. McG. alone would almost suffice to guard us from outward foes and perilous encounters.

We had a notion (but we suppose it is now too late) of suggesting to the temperance public the necessity of making our influence felt in the approaching municipal elections. There are several good temperance men in the different wards who would not only do the cause credit, but serve our citizens faithfully, and who we should rejoice to see in the council. But, as we said, we fear it is too late, we must content ourselves for the present, and keep this matter before the public for future action, and continue to urge unceasing war against the city's greatest curse—the *Liquor Trade*. If we have no sympathy and aid from our big brethren, flourishing or floundering in their commercial quagmires, we shall at least have the satisfaction of knowing that in a time of darkness and danger, we used our best skill in keeping ourselves and others from the dismal regions of intemperance and general degradation.

### Repository of Contemporary Opinions.

In view of contrary decisions and technical evasions of law and justice, coming out of opposition to the Maine Law, many ask the friends of the work, "What shall we do?" The Rhode Island *Temperance Advocate* answered the question some weeks ago. Hear what our vigorous friend says:—

In seriousness, we will tell our enemies what we shall do if the Maine Law, in some of its features, is declared unconstitutional. We shall take what is left, and enforce it, with more zeal and energy than we have ever yet exhibited. The fourth section, all admit, is constitutional; and with that alone, we can, if driven to it, put down this accursed traffic. If nothing is found effective but imprisonment of the trafficker, we shall ask for imprisonment for the first offence,—and shall get it. This would be a blessing to the seller, as well as to our cause; for it would point him at once and with certainty to the penalty of disobedience; whereas he is now tempted to risk the first and second penalty, with the promise to himself that he will quit the business before a third action is brought; and thus sometimes leads himself unwittingly into the jaws of severer punishment than he ever contemplated.

But, if the Maine Law fails—if its constitutional parts are found ineffective, take our word for it, rum-sellers, we will try another, and one that shall tell its story quite as plainly as this. Our object is to put down the traffic. Nobody questions our constitutional right to put it down. We shall ask for a law that will put it down, and we shall accept of nothing that does not promise to do the work. We shall not sit down in idleness. We

shall not cease our denunciation of a murderous business. We shall not stop our ears to the cries of the unfortunate. We shall not fold our arms, while there is work to be done. No, no, gentlemen rum-sellers! you will hear from us! Every day, you will hear from us! And we shall hear from you! We should know something were wrong, if you ceased to abuse us; and we shall look out that you have no occasion to rest from your agreeable labors of hurling invectives against our cause. Rest assured, we shall constantly know of each other's movements, and that the public shall know of all the enormities and miseries attaching to your business. *Revolutions do not go backward!*

When the decision of Judge Curtis was made known against the Rhode Island liquor bill, there was great rejoicing among the rummies and rum-sellers. On this our bold namesake thus speaks, and let Canadians catch his spirit, and carry it through our campaign.

And what did all this shooting and firing of guns amount to? We heard many men, who had opposed the Maine Law, condemn the noisy demonstration as unworthy of rational people, and an insult to the community. Some rum-sellers denounced it. A great many took pains to say that they did not approve of it. And others, who had helped to get it up, whose contributions had purchased the powder which was telling the city of their infamy, shrank into their dens, not wholly lost to shame for their conduct, when the thunder of their cannon began to be heard, and the lurid light of their burning powder flashed across the sky. How many hearts bled, we cannot tell. We know that many mothers listened, as to their own death knell. They remembered the sorrows of other times, and did not need to be told that when the wicked bear rule, the people mourn. They saw before them a winter of wretchedness, and their hearts were rung with bitterness as they contemplated a return of the monster, intemperance, to their quiet dwellings. And many men, too—men who had been aided by a good law to crush, momentarily, an appetite that had been their master for long years, trembled as they began to realize that the grog shops were thrown wide open, and that thereafter temptation would meet them at every corner.

So far as the friends of temperance were concerned, the thundering of the enemy's cannon had no disheartening effect. Men flocked to our office, to renew their pledges of fidelity to the good old cause. They were full of heart, every one of them, and expressed a determination to renew the fight with increased vigor. They had seen worse times than this, and were sure that there was a God, who ruled the storm. We never saw the deep interest of our people in the temperance cause, more beautifully exhibited.—There was an earnestness—a deep, heart-felt, soul-pervading earnestness, in all that was said, which made us wish that the enemy's guns could have been heard all over the State. The powder was not wholly wasted. It waked to new life, scores of our friends who had done nothing since the enactment of the law. They will not soon again desert the field; and the men who fired the guns may thank themselves and their own foolishness, that we have many friends to-day who were not with us two weeks ago.

Now while we admire zealous declamation in a good cause, we also like sound clear reasoning. We therefore place on record for reference and future use, a valuable review of the decision of Judge Curtis. Here is a document we earnestly recommend to all our readers. It is from the pen of an eminent lawyer, and appears in the *Maine Law Advocate*, published at New Haven Connecticut. Don't fail to read every word of it.

The enemies of the Maine Law seem to suppose that they have, gained a signal victory, in the late decision of Judge Curtis assisted by Judge Pitman in the Circuit Court in Rhode Island.—The friends of the law ought therefore to understand the extent of this imaginary triumph.

The decision of any Court, to entitle it to much consideration ought to have been obtained fairly and in the regular course of business. The history of the case in Rhode Island has not been divulged. But there are circumstances attending it which give strong grounds for suspecting that it was the work of design. How happened it that the constitutionality of a State law should