

Whether the Editor of the *Abstainer* has "mistaken his avocation" or not, is for others to decide. Whether it is impertinent or otherwise in the *Sun* to undertake to "remind him of his duty" we will not stop to inquire. Nor shall we hereafter pay any attention to such small matters. We shall walk on quietly in the path of duty. If the dogs bark at us—why—let them bark.

Our Cape Breton correspondent refers to the recent action of the Legislature by which an alteration has been made in the duties on wines. As we understand it the duty on Port, Madeira, and Sherry, was two shillings and six pence per gallon when the cost price was £20 and upwards per pipe, and one shilling and three pence per gallon when the price was under £20. The higher duty is not now to be levied except when the cost price is £30 and upwards. In defence of this change, it is alleged that there has been a rise in the price of wines, so that what cost £20 last year costs £30 now, and that if two shillings and sixpence per gallon were now to be levied on wines that cost £20 per pipe, it would operate as a prohibition. That is just what we wish. We desire a tariff that should operate as a prohibition. If men want to enjoy luxuries, they should be willing to pay a luxury price, and not petition *in forma pauperis* for a low duty. Their request ought not to have been granted.

As to the refusal of the House to raise the price of licences to sell intoxicating liquors, we have only to say that as we have no faith in any licence law whatever, we care but little how it is managed. We cannot sympathise with a system which draws a revenue from the vices and crimes of the people.

The dissolution of the Imperial Parliament affords an opportunity to our temperance friends at home to take action, and bring a new power into the political field. The policy of the United Kingdom Alliance is thus indicated in the *Weekly News* :—

"For the Alliance the dissolution comes a year too soon. But our friends must still be firm-hearted, resolute, and at work. The Alliance must be felt and acknowledged in the hustings and polling-booth, though we fear our organisation is hardly sufficiently coherent, and our political experience sufficiently matured to return to parliament any of our

more wealthy and prominent leaders, yet great progress may be made, and experience gained with such power as we have.

"In some boroughs, perhaps a contest of principle may be fought—to end, it may be, in temporary defeat, but resulting in immense benefit to the cause, as fixing political attention on its claims. In every borough in the kingdom the question must as the Americans say, "crop up." Let every candidate be forced to give a definite assent or refusal to the following questions :—

"I. Will you vote in the House of Commons for a motion for a committee of the house to inquire into, and report upon, the operation and results of intoxicating drinks in the United Kingdom, the British Colonies, America, and elsewhere ?

"II. In the event of A BILL being introduced into the House of Commons (founded on satisfactory evidence, and supported by popular sympathy) involving the principle of prohibition of the sale of strong drink, but leaving its adoption in each and any district, to be decided (as in the Health of Towns Act, the Public Libraries Act, and other acts of parliament) by the votes of a certain majority of the inhabitants of that districts ;—Will you support it, if unobjectionable in its mere details ?

"Such questions must meet the assent of every rational politician. Sounder in principle than any mere partial legislation against beershops, or dramshops, or any other class or circumstance of the trade—such a policy as indicated would be, at the same time, infinitely less coercive and open to the objection of class legislation, for it would refer the whole matter to the people on this direct and simple issue ;—an inquiry to disseminate information and to open up the question—a law to enable the people to decide the whole question for themselves."

This is suggestive. We recommend it to the consideration of our readers.—Perhaps it might be wise to attempt something of the kind here.

The Address to Judge Marshall, and his reply, which will be found in another part of our journal, will be read with interest and satisfaction. It is gratifying to learn that our venerable friend's disinterested zeal is duly appreciated in the mother country.

Several of our friends have sent us copies of Sermons or Lectures on Temperance. We must ask them to exercise patience and forbearance with us. The expediency of printing such addresses is often very doubtful, unless they contain some novelty in argument, or are distinguished by peculiar excellence of style or illustration. At present, we beg leave to hold these papers under advisement. If we find that they can be advantageously made use of, we will act accordingly.—The writers will please accept our thanks, and confide in our discretion.

It is cheering to observe the activity that prevails among some of the Divisions. In various parts of the country the brethren have been thoroughly roused up, and considerable accessions of members have been realized. Garland Division has been doubled in numbers. A new Division has been instituted in Yarmouth County, at Beaver River. It is expected that another will soon be formed in King's County. There has been quite a revival of the temperance cause in Hant's County since the Quarterly Session of the Grand Division at South Pawdon. Keep it going, brethren !

PROGRESS.—An exchange paper says :

The new liquor law passed in the New York Assembly, is very stringent in some particulars. For instance, one section directs Magistrates or Overseers of the Poor, on complaint or satisfactory proof by a wife that her husband is an habitual drunkard, to issue notices to vendors of ardent spirits forbidding them to sell to such a person for a term of six months under penalty of fifty dollars and costs for every sale or giving away of liquor. The same provision is applicable to wives and sons who are drunkards.

It seems very good. The new liquor law might be improved, notwithstanding. One short clause would be sufficient : "No intoxicating liquor shall be sold as a beverage in this State." All the pains and penalties might be adapted to it.

The next notice is better :—

The Lowell police are now notifying the owners of buildings where intoxicating liquors are sold in the city, to stop the same. There is a penalty of \$1000 for letting buildings for this business.

Massachusetts is clearly ahead of New York.

We have received a copy of the Rev R. Sedgewick's excellent lecture on "The proper sphere and influence of Woman in christian society." An extract has been marked for insertion, but there is no room for it this month.

POLICE OFFICE.

From the 2d of March to the 3th of April, both inclusive, 33 men, 20 women, and 1 boy, were taken to the police office for drunkenness. One of the men died in Bridewell the same day, of delirium tremens. Some of them were fined, and several sent to Bridewell for thirty days.