

TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE,

DEVOTED TO TEMPERANCE, EDUCATION, AGRICULTURE & NEWS.

PLEDGE.—We, the undersigned, do agree, that we will not use Intoxicating Liquors as a Beverage, nor Traffic in them; that we will not provide them as an article of Entertainment, nor for persons in our Employment; and that in all suitable ways we will discountenance their use throughout the community.

Vol. XIX.]

MONTREAL, MAY 16, 1853.

No. 10.

Repository of Contemporary Opinions.

The prohibitory bill was lost in New Jersey a few weeks ago. The Reformer prepares to do battle still onward to victory. They of New Jersey must be further off than ourselves, but are not discouraged. Thus writes the editor of the Reformer:

Mr. Demott, of Somerset, said a few manly words in favor of the Law. Then one Lambert—the president of the Beebe Convention of rum-sellers last fall—moved the previous question. The vote was taken. Not a word was uttered by the enemies of the bill. Not an argument was offered. Not even a joke or a sneer. They just laid hold of the bill with a fixed gloomy determination, and silently strangled it. The house was as still as the tomb, as the vote was announced. Forty-five nays; and nine good men and true stood alone on the side of God and humanity. Not a cheer was raised. Not one smiled. Many a woman's heart in the crowded gallery sank at the melancholy announcement—“the bill is lost.”

The crowd moved homeward through the rain, and left the scene of carnage. Among those who voted against the bill, we observed several church members who looked dismally troubled, and had a bad *Iscairiot* expression about the eyes as they timidly answered “No.” We would not like to sit too near their pews in church—we should be afraid that the sight of a dying drunkard might haunt the spot during “sermon time,” and disturb the worship. Those men's fame we do not envy, when on their tombstones it shall be written—**VOTED TO SUSTAIN Grog SHOPS, DRUNKENNESS AND CRIME!**

But is the glorious measure dead? No!—“The Deluge gave out; the ark never did.”—Not one friend of the beneficent law is discouraged. Not one is convinced by the late vote that New Jersey does not need that same protective law. Friends of Prohibition! stand to your posts. God and truth are with us.—From this time forward let us work harder than ever. The welfare of our beloved land is at stake. Close up the ranks, and pass the signal to **ADVANCE!**

Advance, that is the word, and will be—no retreat to be sounded from our ranks. The subject is being well discussed in England. We give the annexed from the British Temperance Advocate for April; it is from a correspondent who signs himself “Excelsior.”

“This is a question—(Ought law to sanction or suppress the Traffic.)—the question which British philanthropists must now prepare themselves to ponder, and ere long to answer. And who that has soberly reflected upon, or taken any pains to investigate, the character, tendency, and results of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, but will be at once prepared to form and declare their emphatic decision? For ourselves, speaking most advisedly, we unreservedly and earnestly pronounce a deep and decided conviction, that the legalized sale of intoxicating drinks as beverages

is an anomaly in legislation as unwise, unjust, and unpatriotic as any law-framed mischief ever known or conceived of. We therefore, are for suppression—the total, legal, penal suppression of the entire traffic, as speedily and effectually as possible.

Having explicitly avowed the side we take in the controversy and coming struggle, we would respectfully offer a few friendly observations by way of anticipating some of the possible forms in which objection, if not opposition, will be sure to confront us even from the ranks of our esteemed temperance friends.

The first form of objection we shall notice may be couched in such a phrase as this:—“Although I am an abstainer myself, and most anxious to persuade all others to follow my example and refrain from poisonous drinks, yet as some good people are not quite convinced that they can do without them, I cannot make my conscience the rule of their life; and therefore I cannot vote for the suppression of the traffic, however ruinous and destructive and demoralizing its results may be.

In reply to this objection—No. 1 we will call it, to distinguish it from others in the same category—we must be allowed to say that if valid for the purpose for which we now suppose it to be adduced, it would equally justify an abstainer in keeping his wine-cellar well stored and his hospitable board well supplied with every kind of intoxicating drink; for though he would doubtless do his tetotal endeavor to persuade his friends from using such dangerous enemies, yet as we fear some of them would not be quite up to the standard of his short pledge convictions, how could he make his pliant conscience the rigid rule of their practice even at his own table? But the objection, we hold, is irrelevant and wide of the point and drift of the question at issue. We are not considering a case of individual conscience, but a measure of social, political, and national expediency. It is not what some good people think is good for them, but what do thinking; intelligent, and patriotic men and statesmen think is good for the nation, in its economical resources and social arrangements,—in its educational, moral, and religious interests. When the late Chancellor of the Exchequer made his famous financial statement in the British House of Commons, and asserted, as a reason for reducing the Malt Tax, that beer was one of the prime necessities of life, and should therefore be cheapened under a free-trade regimen—a dictum with which, doubtless, some good men, and women too, would cordially agree—our objector, although an abstainer himself, and conscious of the fallacy, not to say falseness, of the position laid down had he been present in that legislative assembly, and determined to be consistent with himself, would have acquiesced in the statement, and given his senatorial support to the famous beer budget; for why should he coerce others by a public utterance of his own private convictions, or seek to make his conscience the rule of their lives? The amiability of spirit in which such liberality of sentiment is engendered we do not fail to duly appreciate; but we cannot help suspecting that were all our law-makers, law-administrators, and law-reformers actuated by the same conscientious flexibility and accommodative docility, it would be long before the dawn of that political millennium, when Right shall be the rule and Equity the chief ruler, and when the Public Good shall be the ultimatum of all legislative action.

Another form in which essentially the same objection will present itself, may be thus expressed:—“I admit that intemperance is a fearful and prevalent evil, and I pray for blessings on all efforts well and wisely directed for its suppression; but I have