

beverage is a superfluous indulgence, neither required for the healthful existence or the happiness of man. We might go farther, and assert that the use of intoxicating drinks is in itself injurious to the human system; but we desire to advance on undisputed premises, and we presume no one will hazard the assertion that man's physical existence, or his happiness as an intellectual or moral being, are in any degree dependent on the use of stimulating liquors.

Thirdly.—We believe that benevolence, patriotism and religion unite to demand the sacrifice of a superfluous indulgence—if by that sacrifice a just prospect exist of checking and eradicating evils so extensive and momentous as those of intemperance.

Fourthly.—We presume that if the men raised to high stations—the men on whom Providence has conferred education, refinement, and wealth—still more, if the men separated to teach the truths and obligations of religion; and if they who profess those truths and acknowledge those obligations—were universally to abandon voluntarily the indulgence of intoxicating drinks—the business of the importer and retailer would be so curtailed, and the influences that would encircle the inebriates would be so extended and potential, that comparatively little aid would be required from legislative enactments, and what was required would be accorded without hesitation, and would be effective.

Fifthly.—Believing that societies and government should exist for the general good, and that a supreme authority in the state is created for the purpose of prohibiting what is generally injurious, although at the expense of individual interest; and believing that the sale of intoxicating drinks inflicts evils on the commonwealth of an extended and serious nature, without returning to society compensating benefits; we see nothing in the right to sell or to drink intoxicating liquors, that should form an exception to the general rule.

Lastly.—We know of no class of persons entitled to complain of the prohibition, if the propositions we have affirmed are correct. Not they who upon the principles of religion and the obligations of benevolence and patriotism, are required voluntarily to abandon like the traffic and the use; still less they who are the victims for whose deliverance this remedy is applied—and, least of all, they who make a cruel profit by a traffic that offers to men the materials for their self-destruction, which too many are ready eagerly to accept.

We, your Committee, therefore, unanimously and unhesitatingly report to your Honorable House our opinion, that the evils of intemperance are of a nature to justify for their repression the highest exercise of legislative power—that it falls within the legitimate and just functions and authority of the legislature of this Province, to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for use as a beverage—and that it consequently becomes its bounden duty to do so, if legislative enactments can be made efficacious for the object.

The most difficult question here arises: Can legislative enactments for the prohibition be carried into effective operation?

A wide range is opened by this inquiry. The moral influence of law and the coercive restraints of constituted authority on the one side, and the opposing power of pecuniary interest, animal appetite, and the fashions of society on the other, are to be estimated in their comparative strength and antagonism. How far the former would be weakened and the latter aided, by the indisposition of men to surrender by compulsion for a general good, no unimportant element in the argument: nor would any inquiry be brought to a sound and practical conclusion, which had not embraced a consideration of the insular formation which gives to this Province a great extent of coast, increasing the expense, and the obstacles in contending against contraband trade.

Against these considerations, the following reasons may be opposed:

First.—While the danger and the mischiefs of smuggling are urged and admitted, it must not be forgotten that the illicit traffic is now carried on; and that a total prohibitory law would be less liable to evasion than a system only partially prohibitory. The evidence would be simple, for the offending article in most cases would testify to its own conviction, and the condemnation be easy and certain. Obstacles that now obstruct conviction would disappear; reluctant witnesses would no longer require to be discovered

and forced forward—nor justice be defeated by their evasions, or by refined technicalities on trials.

Secondly.—The law would be universal, and would emanate from the highest source, and that a Representative Legislature.—Now, neighbouring counties are governed on contradictory principles, enforced by authorities of feeble influence, and over which the masses of the people have little control.

Thirdly.—The injurious effects on the popular mind of the license system would be removed—a legal sanction to sell, granted to a few for a pecuniary consideration, must place the trade in a false aspect, and entrench it against assaults aimed at its moral character and effects.

So strongly is this sentiment entertained by some of the committee, as to induce the belief that the experiment can never fairly be tested, of "moral suasion" against the drinking habits, while the license system continues; and that if moral power and not legal coercion, must be the instrument of conflict, there must be a free field on which the seller of intoxicating drinks shall stand alike unprivileged and unrestricted, as the seller of flour, of opium, or of arsenic.

Fourthly.—There seems no alternative but in coercive action. Looking at the progress of the cause for twenty years, while we rejoice that large portions of the yeomanry, traders, and mechanics of the province have cast from them the pollutions of intemperance, it is yet obvious that influences exist too powerful for the elements of reform that have yet been brought to bear. In support of this view, we may adduce the state of society in the metropolis—the extent of the liquor traffic in all its departments—the numerous and influential names on the petition referred to, and which in effect declares that the present liquor law is incapable of improvement.

Temperance Anniversaries.

We give the following brief accounts, from the N. Y. Organ. When the full printed reports reach us, we shall have pleasure in condensing their contents for the information of Canadian readers.

The American Temperance Union met at the Tabernacle on Thursday evening, May 13, Chancellor Walworth presiding. The report notices in detail the workings of the Maine Law, and the increase of petitioners in States where it is not yet adopted, and says that they have issued thousands of publications in preparing the public for the law. Speeches were made by Rev. J. S. Peck, Mr. Marsh, R. W. Clark, F. Brainard, D. D., of Philadelphia; L. Beecher, D. D., of Boston, and Rev. Dr. Tyng.

THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.—The second annual meeting, and 7th quarterly, was held at Metropolitan Hall on Wednesday evening, May 12. John Falconer, Esq., President, in the chair. Although the weather was most unfavorable, there was a large and respectable audience present on the occasion. The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. R. S. Crampton, and the Annual Report read by Rev. Mr. Warren. It mentioned the effort of the Society to get a prohibitory measure passed by the Legislature of the State in regard to the sale of intoxicating drinks, and referred to the vote taken at the last session, as a proof of the strength of the temperance movement; it referred to the late presentation of the Grand Jury in relation to unlicensed rum-shops and liquor-selling on the Sabbath, and recommended energetic action on the part of the friends of temperance in getting up petitions, and devising the means for the effectual abolition of the liquor traffic. Addresses were made by Rev. Messrs. Clarke, Willis and Cuyler, and Col. Snow.

Grand Division of Canada West.

We perceive from a correspondent in the *Canada Christian Advocate*, that this large and influential body has just closed its semi-annual session, which seems to have been one of deep interest and immense importance to the cause in Canada. We cannot withhold our high appreciation of the decision to which they have come on some of the points that have been brought before them, and regard this as an index of the good that the country may fairly look for from this organization. We pass over at present all else connected with the meeting but the following:—

The main feature of the session was the Maine Law, and I