

adopted by their spiritual ruler. If he (Dr. C.) belonged to that community, he should certainly wish for an opportunity to propose, at the next meeting of synod, (if such liberty could be granted,) an addition to the litany; and it should be couched in such words as these—"From all rum-protecting bishops, and from their practices. Good Lord, deliver us!"

His Lordship of Fredericton may obtain honours which have been entirely unanticipated. Among the establishments which will spring up when the evil spirits are let loose all over the land, the favourite places of resort, and the scenes of the deepest carousings, may be the "Bishop's Head," or the "Mitre Tavern," or the "Medley Arms" and it may happen to him as it happened to a Baptist minister in England some years ago, who advocated moderate drinking, as it is called, in a public discussion with Dr. F. Lees, a powerful Temperance advocate. What was the result? That minister became literally "the song of the drunkard." He was toasted at pot-houses, and pointed at in the streets by miserable inebriates as one of their best friends. Was not this a melancholy and disgraceful exhibition?

Dr. C. concluded by some observations on the fact that God sometimes suffers evil to run its course in order that it may excite universal disgust and loathing, and that men, beholding its enormity, may at length league together for its overthrow. The friends of temperance must patiently persevere in their efforts. There may be occasional reverses and temporary defeats, but ultimately the cause will triumph.

For the Christian Messenger.

"Prohibition and Anti-Prohibition."

[No. 4.]

MESSRS. EDITORS,

Mr. Bent, in his Reply to my fourth Letter, (C. M., Jan. 23, 1856, p. 29,) does not present the party with which he is associated in a very favourable light, when he suggests, (p. 25,)—doubtless with too much reason—that they will not "submit" to a law constitutionally enacted by the voice of the people, and sanctioned by the Sovereign. When we, the prohibitionists of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, were in the minority, we "submitted" to the old License Law, and passively endured the calamities inflicted by the liquor traffic. After we became the majority, we still yielded quiet submission, and only petitioned the Legislature in a respectful manner to give us a better law. If the doctrine advocated by John Bent, Esquire, that a part of the community may resist any legal enactment which does not suit their taste, be adopted, what can be expected but anarchy and wretchedness?

That, as I stated, (p. 37,) "a fervent desire prevails among a large majority of the inhabitants of this Province, (N. S.) for the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law," has been clearly evinced. The presentation of petitions for it, last winter, with upwards of *thirty-six thousand* signatures, furnishes decisive proof. This number might have been greatly increased, as is well known, had the petitions been fully circulated. Mr. B. speaks contemptuously (p. 37,) of "the signatures of women." Very proper, and highly commendable it was in them to give their voice against the liquor traffic, from which defenceless females have suffered immensely more than from any other evil that can be named. There may have been a few "signatures of children," but in the region where I reside none signed under fourteen years of age.

When the measure was brought before the House of Assembly, notwithstanding the strong political influence at first brought to bear against it, and the early defection of some pledged to their constituents to vote for it, there was a majority in its favour of 27 to 21. By what means the measure was frustrated is well known. It obviously was not because a majority of the people did not desire it.

Such is the depravity of human nature, that every good cause is liable to meet with reverses, and to undergo partial failures. It is not, therefore, matter of surprise, that the powerful principles of the love of money and the love of strong drink, combining with party politics, should occasionally effect the repeal of a prohibitory liquor law. So in New Brunswick, when the voice of the people had been clearly shown to be in its favour, before time was allowed to test it, an outcry was raised of the destruction of the revenue, the loss of the Rail Road, &c., and advan-

tage was taken of untoward political influences to effect an unhappy change.

That much good has resulted from this law in those states that have adopted it, is a fact attested by unquestionable testimony. All the men with whom I have conversed that could speak from personal knowledge, have unitedly and unequivocally declared it, except one; and he was confessedly engaged in the liquor traffic. The persons of whom Mr. B. speaks, (p. 34.) "who have travelled in Maine," and "whose eyes," as he tells us, "are not blinded by their zeal" for the Maine Law, appear, like himself, to have their "eyes so blinded by their zeal" against it, that they can see no good in it, and can scarcely see any evil in any thing else. All who were "once advocates of prohibition" may have been too sanguine in the expectation that it would at once cure the whole evil, and so changed their minds on it: sufficient grounds. An individual stated to me, that he spent some hours at the store of the Liquor Agent in Calais, Maine; and though he acknowledged that applicants for liquors were interrogated, and that one application was refused, yet he alleged that it could be obtained too easily. Subsequently, however, he said, he was informed, that as young men could not obtain intoxicating drink in Calais, numbers of them went across to St. Stephens, and got it there, and so were going to ruin more rapidly! The latter statement plainly contradicted the former, and showed the need of general prohibition.

I have now before me "Results of Prohibition in Connecticut," edited by Henry S. Clubb, Esquire, containing testimonials to the efficiency and great utility of the Maine Law in that State, from the Governor and upwards of fifty ministers of the gospel, Judges, &c. It is stated, (p. 136,) that in New Haven, where the commitments for crimes and misdemeanors in July, 1854, one month before this Law went into operation, were 246, in August, one month after, they were only 61—not quite one fourth of the number. These testimonies are unexceptionable and decisive.

Even in the State of Maine, where the enemies of the law claim a triumph, they are evidently constrained, through the labours of prohibitionists, to adopt a law which affirms the principle of prohibition, admitting the great evil of the free use of intoxicating liquors by restricting the sale of them to a very small number of persons, and forbidding these to sell to any minor, Indian, soldier, or drunkard, and holding the vender responsible for all injuries done under the influence of liquors sold by him. Let such a law be carried into effect, and, deficient and exceptionable as it is, it nevertheless contains enough of prohibition to accomplish a great amount of good. But it obviously would not have been enacted, had not the Maine Law preceded it, and the beneficial tendency of a prohibitory enactment been ascertained from the experiment.

It remains to be seen in New Brunswick, whether the new House will adopt Mr. Bent's anti-prohibitory scheme of the free and unrestricted sale of alcoholic drinks by all who choose to sell them, or recognize the principle of prohibition by restricting the sale within narrower limits than formerly. If the latter, all the benefit that may result from such prohibitory measures, will evidently be the fruit of the labours of prohibitionists.

There is obviously no harm in secrecy, or (p. 35,) "private societies," where no evil is meditated. But the institution of the Sons of Temperance is a benevolent institution, designed and adapted to promote the general welfare, without injuring any. Mr. B. blames the Sons, (p. 35, 36,) for their activity in endeavouring to enforce the Prohibitory Law in N. B. According to his own statement, however, (p. 36,) the reason why this law has not accomplished more good than it has, is because it has not been obeyed or enforced. It is evident, then, that the Law itself is good. Were it universally observed, no man can be so blind as not to see, that the vice of drunkenness with its innumerable attendant ills, would be eradicated. How, then, can men be blamed for the diligence of their efforts to have a law so manifestly beneficial carried into effect?

Mr. B. cannot question the notorious fact, that Laws requiring duties to be paid on spirituous liquors and a charge for license to retail them; occasion smuggling and illicit sale, and as he says of a Prohibitory Law, (p. 35.) "tend to promote perjury, and to lead to endless litigations," and necessarily "give every encouragement to informers." Mr. B. knows full well that these enactments have never been thoroughly carried

into effect in either of these Provinces; but have been continually violated with impunity; and that not by my friends but by great numbers of the party with which he has chosen to identify himself. Whether "the constituted authorities are avowedly too weak to carry out" these enactments are not, it is certain they have not carried them out; and it is obvious they never can, so long as the importation and sale of inebriating beverages are legalized. The payment of duty on a few puncheons, paves the way for the smuggling of many. When any of these are occasionally seized and sold at auction, the liquor is still drunk in the country, and consequently it does as much harm as if it had escaped detection. Those who retail illegally find out numerous ways to evade the law; and have too many, even in authority, ready to assist them. Some are so poor that fines cannot be collected from them; and others so reckless that people are afraid to lodge complaints against them. In no case do these Laws make provision for preventing liquors that are being either imported or sold illegally, from producing their usual ruinous effects.

It is evident, therefore, that a law prohibiting the importation and sale of intoxicating beverages, and subjecting such as may be discovered to destruction, or devotion to some useful purpose, is the only effectual remedy. That passed by the Assembly of N. S. in 1856, contrary to the course usually pursued under the license system, expressly specifies, (Section 46,) "No judgment shall be reversed on appeal for any mere matter of informality." It is not to be imagined that such a law will be universally obeyed or enforced immediately; but it obviously can be carried into effect much more readily than the former, which, were it done, would produce comparatively little benefit. It is manifestly inconsistent for Mr. B. to talk, (p. 36,) of the "inefficiency" of the Prohibitory Law being "apparent," before it had time for trial, and while the Province of N. B. was full of intoxicating liquors previously imported, when the former Law had been found notoriously inefficient after a trial of many years.

I do not, (p. 37,) "deny the disinterestedness of all who oppose my views." There doubtless are well-meaning men who, through prejudice and misapprehension, are adverse to a prohibitory law; but indubitably the great mass of its opposers are actuated either by self-interest, party zeal, or an inclination to drink intoxicating liquors. Among its numerous advocates there may be unprincipled men; and both individuals and societies may adopt indiscreet measures. The object, however, is one of pure philanthropy; and the truly pious and benevolent are usually foremost in the ranks of its supporters. Influenced by that "love" which "worketh no ill to his neighbour," they desire the enactment of a law by which they can neither obtain any pecuniary advantage, nor gratify any evil inclination, but which is adapted to promote the happiness of their fellow-men in general.

In conclusion Mr. B. professes to "join heartily with me in the desire that intemperance, with all its ruinous consequences, may be eradicated from our land." Can he be so blinded as to imagine that his "Replies," in which he advocates the sale and common use of intoxicating drinks, manifestly the sources of all drunkenness—are adapted to aid in eradicating it from our land? Is it to be doubted for a moment, that if Satan had the entire disposal of a thousand men in these Provinces, he would employ a large proportion of them in the vending of inebriating beverages? Can any way be suggested by which they would be likely to be more successful in plunging men into sin and misery, and excluding them from the kingdom of heaven?

By whom will Mr. Bent's "Replies" be extolled? Unquestionably, in general, by the vendors and the lovers of alcoholic liquors. Such persons usually decline to "hear both sides," and will not read arguments that are opposed to their avarice or their inclinations. If they do read or hear them, their minds are so perverted that they are incapable of perceiving the force of the most convincing proofs, while the most flimsy arguments that accord with their wishes, will be quite satisfactory, and be regarded by them as *unanswerable*. I entertain no doubt, however, that well-disposed and intelligent persons, who are neither prepossessed by the desire of base gain, the love of strong drink, nor invincible party spirit, will, on attentively comparing the whole of our communications, regard the efforts put forth—evinced adroitness in main-

taining a bad cause,—whoever the *writer* may be,—to meet my arguments in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, as utterly futile.

The combined influences of the numerous and powerful forces antagonistic to such a law, may for a time, as in the case of the British law prohibiting slavery, retard its enactment; but I rest assured that the more carefully it is examined in all its aspects, the more clearly will its propriety and desirableness appear; and that ultimately, through the divine blessing accompanying the faithful and persevering labours of the friends of humanity, it will be secured and firmly established, and will prove effectual in the accomplishment of an incalculable amount of good.

Yours in Gospel bonds,

C. TUPPER.

Amherst, July 12, '56.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

ENGLISH MEMORANDA

[Concluded.]

THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

Enfeebled by disease, tendered his resignation of that see whose revenues have become enormous to a proverb. But another piece of circumlocution arose here. It was found that a bishop could not resign; and so an act is about to be passed providing for the difficulty. The opinions dissenters entertain concerning Dr. Bloomfield personally are not very favourable; and his resignation will lead to one peice of reform—the divisions of the see into two—London and Westminster, with a prelate to each. Thus the revenues will be more fairly proportioned—if fairness can be, in a division of riches which are thought by dissenters to be extorted unjustly. Whether the new Bishops will be an improvement upon the former is doubtful; for, with that expediency which a false system finds so convenient, it is said that Lord Palmerster will select a Tractarian and an Evangelical; "to preserve the balance of the Church." "A Church that needs such bolstering and balancing is in a sorry state. If it be of God it will balance itself; if not, all the finesse of statesmanship and worldly government can but sustain for a time its artificial position. When will England learn to "render to God the things that are God's, and to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's"—"not mixing them together in a solemn mockery? Surely, to say the least, dissent is as Scriptural in its practice as the Establishment, and as well sustained. If, then, the one can do without State-paid pastors, cannot the other, and thereby remove the scandal that now arises from the worldly-paid, grudgingly-supported ecclesiastics? But we must wait: the leaven is working, and, though not perhaps in our day, yet, ultimately, what is true in the State Church will separate itself from the false, and become more worthy its mission and name.

This brings me to notice Mr. Spooner's victory and defeat on his annual crusade against

MAYNOOTH CATHOLIC ENDOWMENT.

Early in the session, Mr. Spooner succeeded, after a hard fight, in obtaining leave to bring in a Bill revoking the endowment of Maynooth; and last week it was read a second time. The division on second reading is generally conclusive as to future progress; and in order to avoid it, a Catholic and Irish member "spoke against time" till the rules of the house compelled an adjournment. He only talked nonsense, and the House was divided between laughter at the "dodge" and anger at its success; for Mr. Herbert would not be put down, the clock at last struck six, and he remained in possession of the House when the subject should be resumed; but everyone knew that could not be this Session, and so a Parliamentary trick has saved Maynooth for a time. The grant to this Catholic College is defended mainly on the ground of expediency. It is said, "the sum is but small; the Catholics of Ireland are numerous; the country is Popish, and the Protestant Establishment a mockery to nine tenths of the people. This, therefore, is a small set-off."

Two blacks make no white. Of course the protestant church is a rampant injustice: it is so *in esse*, and from principle; therefore how can it be amended by a still further extension of the very principle that makes it unjust—state support? It is an injustice for Catholics to pay for Protestantism; and is it not the same *vice versa*?

But there is another ground, beyond this com-