

and very soon the single watchword of temperance men will be—"Prohibition"—the war cry will every where be "down with the traffic." Subjoined is the entire article from the *British Temperance Advocate* :—

The experiment which is now being tried by several States of the great American confederation, in reference to the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, is one which neither philanthropist nor christian can regard with anything like indifference. Having in view the abatement of the greatest curse of the civilised world, it ought to command the unprejudiced consideration of every friend of the human race. That the question has been warmly debated and opposed by others than those who are interested in the traffic, is to us no matter of surprise; especially when we remember that there is an estimable, though small class, among the workers in our onward movements, who are determined to do almost everything by "moral suasion." Their prepossessions in favor of this doctrine are not to be disturbed by a thousand every-day facts; and inasmuch as their position looks so very innocent and christian, it must needs be defended to the last. It is useless to tell them that the logic sequence of their line of argumentation would practically be, the disbanding of all governments, the repeal of all law, and the inauguration of a state of society, a prominent feature of which would be, the illustration of that ever-ready defence of concentrated selfishness—"Have not I a right to do what I will with my own?"

We believe that every person favorable to government of any kind will admit that the one grand fundamental principle involved in all governing arrangements of the human compact, is the surrendering of some supposed abstract individual rights for the attainment of some general good. Various persons have attempted to describe and define what they term "the true province of government," especially those who belong to the "moral suasion" class; but in our humble opinion they have been about as successful in their admittedly difficult task as the discoverers of "perpetual motion," or the finders of the "philosopher's stone."

We are unwilling to charge those who take the "moral suasion" view only in the temperance movement, with intentionally mis-stating the position and arguments of those who are advocates of "government interference." It is, nevertheless, a fact that they do persist in charging those of opposite views to themselves with conduct of which they are not guilty, and in attributing to them opinions which they do not hold. It is invariably assumed that those who ask for government prohibitions have "abandoned moral suasion," and therefore never attempt by pen or tongue to advance the cause of temperance. What is the real, the notorious fact? An experience in temperance operations covering more than twenty years, and with opportunities for observation possessed by few, we do not hesitate to say that those holding Maine Law views are among the most zealous teachers of temperance truth. Their position is, that both "moral suasion" and "legal action" are needed in this great work. Like wise moral husbandmen, having reclaimed a quantity of land from the wild waste of intemperance, they are anxious to fence and protect it from the enemies of progress, who would sow it again with the seeds of those noxious plants whose fruits produce pestilence and death. Having made encouraging advances in the erection of a beautiful structure, they are naturally concerned that it be not pulled down again as fast as they build it up. We repeat that the advocates of the Maine Law have among them a majority of the best writers, the best speakers, and the best workers in the temperance enterprise. Let us, then, hear no more about "abandoning moral suasion."

Another misconception which frequently finds its way into print from the anti-Maine Law quarter is, that those who are friends of the law teach the people to rely upon "government aid"—upon "functionaryism," and other "legal or ecclesiastical" interferences. Ranking ourselves among the number, we say that we teach no such thing. We do not ask government to do anything for the people, in the strict and positive meaning of the phrase; on the contrary, we wish it to cease doing that which is palpably mischievous by license laws, and to take the ground of prohibitions. If government will cease to license pitfalls for the destruction of men, and also forbid under proper penalties the making of such traps by others, that is all we ask relating to the question. We solicit no "government management"; but as there are certain things of government creation which stand in

the way of "self-helpfulness," we ask that they may be removed, just as the man of order and cleanliness appeals to the inspector of nuisances in a case where a reckless, selfish neighbor persists, after several trials at "moral suasion," in keeping a pig-sty close to the complainant's door. The traffic in strong drink is a "nuisance" question, and as such we ask government to deal with it; and so long as it is found necessary to have a Health of Towns' Bill, and numberless other acts relating to slaughter-houses, lodging-houses, burning of smoke, sewers, and streets, so it is equally demanded by the people's physical and moral health that the monster nuisance of the world be placed under ban by all civilised nations. To deny that government does "enact and execute laws for the suppression of crime," is to assert that our statute-books do not say a word against gambling-houses, bribery at elections, theft, forgery, murder, and a hundred other crimes; and notwithstanding that violations of the law in these respects are continually taking place, they do not in the least affect the scope and intentions of those acts of the legislature in which these transgressions are forbidden and condemned. To insist that these acts have been useless because these crimes still exist, would be indeed to affirm, not to prove, that "all law is a farce," and would certainly demonstrate that there are well-meaning people in the world who are more afflicted with the anti-Maine Law mania, than familiar with the great facts and experience of every-day life. The honest way to argue about laws enacted for the suppression and punishment of crime, is to ask, what would have been the state of society had they not been in existence? Would life and property be as secure if all such laws were repealed? It must not be forgotten that the millennium has not yet dawned upon the world; and we ask for arrangements suited to the present condition of human society. And because suppressory and penal laws do not prevent every crime, we shall not jump to the conclusion that they are therefore entirely useless, no more than a sensible man would cast away his umbrella on a wet stormy day, because it did not shelter him from every drop of rain.

An esteemed correspondent, in another column of the present number, writes about the "Maine Law Mania" after a most strange and confused manner. He quotes a saying of Jesus Christ, which has no application whatever to the subject about which he is writing, and he taunts America with being inconsistent in passing this Maine Law, because it chattelizes three millions of human beings." As the writer thus incidentally introduces the subject of slavery, suppose we ask him if the freedom of these three millions is to be left to be accomplished by "moral suasion?" Perhaps our own government made a mistake in emancipating the slaves in our West Indian Colonies against the wishes of the planters, and the work ought to have been left to the snail-paced agency of "moral suasion" alone?—Alas! for the three millions of chattelized human beings in America, if they and the generations following them are to sigh and suffer in "involuntary servitude" until all the Negroes are converted into St. Clairs by "moral suasion." We have just as much hope of "moral suasion" alone inducing the American planters to give freedom to their slaves, as we have, that it will constrain the publicans and beer-sellers to cease "plying their cruel trade."

We cannot endorse the sentiments of the writer when he asks for "free trade" in such vile and abominable things as intoxicating drinks. Our creed is, *free trade in all good and useful things*, and no trade at all, if it can be prevented, in useless and mischievous ones. At all events let us have such restraints upon the selfish and the cruel, that they may do as little harm as possible.—And we are tempted to inquire what kind of charity that can be which can exclaim in the face of so many heart-rending facts as the direct result of the drunk-seller's calling, "Let them do their worst to entrap their victims." Is that christian, or "noxious charity?" and does it look like the manifestation of "gentleness and love?"

The plea on behalf of the young, the inexperienced, and the ignorant, is surely not a very unchristian one. While human beings are susceptible of temptation, and as we think are in greater danger of falling into sin when surrounded by temptation than when there is no such evil influence present, we must recur again and again to this plea, inasmuch as we cannot ignore the great facts of human nature, although our doing so may disturb the "moral suasion" theory of our anti-Maine Law friends.

As we have before intimated, we are in favor of both "moral