

and eloquent appeals.—His facts and arguments, his anecdotes, his gestures, his earnestness and energy, and his fine voice, which he well knows how to modulate, altogether render him one of the most interesting speakers of the age, or, perhaps, of any age. His indefatigable labours in the cause of suffering, down-trodden humanity, entitle him to the lasting gratitude of all classes of the community, and it must be a source of unmingled gratification to him, as it is to hundreds of thousands of others, to witness every where the brightest indications of the final triumph of the Temperance cause.

From the *Guelph Herald* we also gather encouraging information respecting Mr. Gough's Lectures. The *Herald* says:—

The two addresses delivered in the Temperance Hall last week by this eloquent and popular advocate of Total Abstinence, were attended by large, deeply attentive, and delighted audiences, and the arguments and illustrations advanced, and delivered with all the pathos, the vivid representation of character, and the withering sarcasm, which the lecturer so fully commands, could not fail to carry conviction of the propriety—the absolute necessity of the Temperance Movement—to the hearts and consciences of all in a position to be acted on by the remonstrances of moral suasion. If there are those obdurate from interest or appetite to such efforts, it but furnishes another argument in behalf of stringent legislative enactment. Mr. Gough gave a highly gratifying statement of the results of the Prohibitory Law in Maine. If there is truth in the Poet's apothegm, "For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight, His must be the true whose life is in the right,"

Temperance men may well point their opponents away from the sophistries and quibbles of which these are redolent, to the results of the Law in Maine. In refutation of the calumny that the Law is losing its adherents in that State, Mr. Gough read the following note, enclosed in a letter received by him when going on the platform on Tuesday:—

Cataract Office, Sept. 29.

BROTHER GOUGH:—By your good lady's permission, I will just say that the "Maine Law" is *right side up* in Maine. The Senate will stand at least 29 to 6—and the House 121 to 30! and it is a Legislature composed of very wrong men. Gov. Hubbard has over 12,000 plurality, and will certainly be elected by the Legislature. "Glory enough for one day!" Good luck to you, friend Gough!

As ever,

F. YATES.

On conclusion of the lecture on Wednesday, the following resolution was moved by the Rev. J. G. McGregor, and seconded by the Rev. G. Goodson.

"That this meeting having heard Mr. Gough's eloquent exposure of the evils arising from drunkenness, and the habit of moderate drinking, pledges itself to persevere in the most strenuous efforts to remove the blighting curse of intemperance from the land, until it shall please God to crown our exertions with complete success."

When the resolution was put to the Meeting by the venerable Chairman—C. J. Mickle, Esq.—nearly the whole body rose up simultaneously, while on the question being put against the proposition, not a solitary hand was held up. The only abatement to the gratification derived from the lectures arose from the futile attempt of certain interested parties to get up a little drunken row outside the hall, elicited from the lecturer the remark, that during five years travelling he had not previously been exposed to such interruption, and that while he had not frequently addressed a more respectable audience within doors, he had never been subjected to the annoyance of a more rowdy and ruffianly set without.

Prohibitory Laws.

Are not most laws, of this character, *prohibitory*, for which the 'Maine Law' is condemned? From the last Code Napoleon to Sinai's, a majority of the laws will be found *prohibitory*—and most likely a Pandect of civil law would show that majority to be as great as is found in the Decalogue.

What, but prohibitory laws, makes the difference between a state of civilization and barbarism? So far as any element of social constituency goes, what better is a *lawless* biped (though a man) than a gregarious quadruped?

Prohibitory laws began with man; they are interwoven in the texture of his social organization; they are the warp and woof of the civil fabric; a part and parcel of our inheritance here; co-existent as well as coeval with humanity.

Neither are such laws antagonistic to liberty; it cannot exist without them; they are its life; the very soul of the people; *civil liberty consists in not being restrained by any laws which are not conducive to the public welfare.*

No matter what names you give such laws; while they are required by the public good, they afford no reasonable ground for complaint, as a restraint on civil liberty. Has the distiller in years gone by, been forbidden, under a penalty of \$300, to use *lead* pipes? Does the State of Maine, under a penalty of \$1000 and imprisonment, prohibit the sale in the shambles of the ox that has died of disease. May not our Board of Health prohibit both the sale and purchase of fish, fruit and vegetables, as long as public health may require it: and who will withhold obedience to such ordinances, because they are *sumptuary, dietetic or prohibitory*? Should an article be sold in our shops or administered, like that Eugene Sue has described as used in the 17th century in France—*le poudre de succession*—for securing death by a slow poison, would it not be an offence cognizable by law? And how else could it be kept out of society and shops, than by *prohibitory* enactments? Such laws as we have already intimated begin with our being; their *Ægean* shield is thrown around us, before mortal arms embrace us; infancy, childhood, youth, manhood, old age are alike their care; they accompany us all along the pathway of life; nor do they cease with our breath; having protected us to the grave, they even there, after buried away from sight of friends, keep silent watch by our tomb. Nor will any dare, but under severest forfeiture, to disturb the inanimate body, or mar, with ruthless finger, our marble slab. Such an office do 'prohibitory' laws discharge. If we examine the digest of our own State, we shall there find, line upon line, and precept upon precept, of a 'prohibitory' character.

It would be a libel on society to suppose it too imbecile to thus have the means of self-preservation. The constitution of society is based on foundations deep and broad enough to resist the storms of human passions. Prohibitory restraints are our protection; whoever would avoid them must leave society at least, if not the world.

Life, character, and morals; commercial credit, pecuniary interests and bodily health, are under their protection; any discredit cast upon laws necessary for public good; any disparaging of their influence, are wounds on the body politic; for these laws are the staff of society—if we weaken this prop, we break the only support whercon we lean, and must, in turn, be pierced through with many sorrows.

Prohibitory laws regulate the style, height and material of our tenements. They even enter our stores and kitchens, and prescribe what cannot be allowed in the one and the other; they descend to all the minutæ of life; the details of trade; they show us where powder shall be kept, and how pork must be packed; where hay can be sold, and the manner scythes are to be carried; how shad and salmon may be caught, and when only moose and deer may be killed; nor can a sparrow fall to the ground without their notice. So omniscient are prohibitory laws, they

"Live through all life, extend through all extent,
Spread undivided, and operate unspent."

The fish of the sea, fowl of the air, and the beast of the field fall within the empire of law—and if these smaller matters are heeded by it, how much more weighty subjects for its exercise, are the rational members of society.

Our very senses are protected by 'prohibitory' laws—noxious exhalations, indecent prints, obscene and blasphemous language are all *prohibited*; does not intemperance produce, at the corners