TEMPERANCE CAUCUS.

At a meeting of the Boston Temperance Association, regularly called and held on Friday evening last, at the Marlboro' Chapel, Moses Grant in the chair, the object of the meeting was explained to be to consider what the Association ought to do with respect to the coming municipal election.

It was stated, generally assented to, and denied by none, that it had always been understood in the Association and among temperance men, that when the municipal election came on, all minor considerations should be disregarded, and a strong and united effort be made to secure a city government, and more especially a Board of Aldermen, friendly to temperance, and to the temperance law of 1838.

Some objection, however, being made to using the Association for election purposes, a motion was made for the Association to adjourn, with the understanding that the members should instantly reorganize themselves into a Temperance Caucus. This motion prevailed. The Association adjourned, and the Temperance Caucus was organized by the choice of John Benson as chairman, and James C. Converse as secretary.

A discussion arose in the caucus, as to the duties of temperance men in the present emergency, and as to the sentiments in respect to enforcing the law of 1838, entertained by the several candidates nominated for Mayor and Aldermen.

It was publicly stated, and not denied, that taking the two regular tickets together, there were to be found upon them, five warm and decided friends of the law of 1838, viz: two on the Whig ticket, and three on the Van Buren ticket; but that taking either ticket separately, the majority of either were opposed to the enforcement of that law.

After a considerable discussion, a motion was made and carried, that a committee be appointed to propose and report to the meeting, a Temperance ticket. The following gentlemen were appointed upon this committee, viz: Richard Hildreth, Robert E. Ruthven, John H. Sweet, Francis Jackson, Samuel Cutler, G. W. F. Mellen, Abel Baker, Joseph Hayes, John R. Manley, A. J. Wright. After an absence of a few minutes, the committee returned and reported that they had been unable to agree upon any candidate for Mayor. That both the regular candidates, according to the evidence furnished to the meeting, that evening, seemed tolerably well disposed to the temperance cause and that either of the candidates, if elected, and surrounded by a Board of Aldermen, would, doubtless, answer the purposes of the temperance men. If surrounded, however, by a Board of Aldermen hostile to the
law, or lukewarm about it, nothing was to from either candidate. The committee had therefore to report nothing on the subject of Mayor, but to leave each to act for himself, according to his own partialities and . They had devoted all their energies to the production for Aldermen, a decided majority of whom should be in favor of the law of 1838. Such a ticket they had been fortunate enough to agree upon, and if the temperance men would give it a cordial support, it could not fail to be elected. That ticket the committee reported as follows;

JAMES CLARKE,

STEPHEN CHILD,

ALPHEUS STETSON,

MOSES MELLEN,

N. P. RUSSELL,

NATHAN GURNEY,

CHARLES AMORY,

ABRAHAM T. LOWE.

Of these candidates, five are borne on the regular Whig ticket, and three on the regular Van Buren ticket. The report was accepted, and the committee of nominations were ordered to print tickets, and make all necessary preparations for the election. It was voted, that part of the tickets should be printed with Mr. Chapman's name for mayor, and part with Mr. Sumner's.

Friends of Temperance —In discharge of the duty imposed upon us, of making all necessary preparations for the election, the undersigned beg leave to address a few plain words to you.

All friends of Temperance in this city, know how totally the existing city government has neglected to carry into effect the Temperance law of 1838.

The bad effects of that neglect have not only exhibited themselves in every street and alley of this city, in the frightful shape of drunkenness, crime, disease, and death, but they have spread into the country, and throughout the State. In many country towns, in which the grog-shops had been closed out of respect to the law of 1838, they have since been re-opened—because it was seen, that the law was not enforced in Boston. Boston is the great example, and it is not to be expected that country
magistrates will be more vigilant and active, than the trained police, the Mayor and Aldermen of this city. But even this is not the worst of it. That neglect to enforce the law, for which the municipal government of this city is so deeply responsible, is now in the mouths of all the opponents of the law, a principal argument why it ought to be repealed. It has not been enforced, they say—it is a dead letter—and, therefore, it ought to be repealed.

This question then comes, plainly and directly, before the Temperance men of this city. They now have it fully within their power to choose a city government that will enforce the law. They have nothing to do to accomplish this great and glorious object, but simply to drop into the ballot boxes the Temperance Ticket, which will be offered them at the polls. That ticket is composed of gentlemen of irreproachable characters, excellent qualifications—a decided majority of whom are firm friends of the law of 1838. That ticket is so made up from the names borne on the two regular party tickets, that if the Temperance men will but vote for it, it cannot fail to be elected by a decided majority. On the other hand, if Temperance men refuse to vote this Temperance ticket, and put into the ballot box one of the regular party tickets, in that case, we are sure to have a board of Aldermen, so far as the Temperance question is concerned, just like the present—a board that will sit placidly with five hundred illegal grog-shops under its nose, and snuff up their fumes with a smiling countenance.

In such a case as this, can any Temperance man doubt for a moment, what his duty to himself, his principles, his consistency, his country, and his God, implicitly demands? We ask, can any Temperance man doubt, or hesitate, in a case like this?

There is but one single objection which any Temperance man can possibly urge against voting the Temperance ticket, and that is, that it contains upon it the names of persons who entertain political sentiments different from his own.

To all who make this objection, and more especially to all Whigs who make this objection, we beg to call to mind some circumstances which transpired not long since.

It is not a great many years, since a meeting was called in this city, of the friends of Theodore Lyman, Jr., in order to take measures to secure his election as Mayor. Mr. Lyman at that time was a known and avowed Van Buren man. At that meeting William Sturgis presided as chairman, that same William Sturgis, whom the Whig Nominating Committee this year nominated for Mayor, previous to the nomination of Mr. Chapman, but who declined to stand. At that same meeting Mr. Jonathan Chapman, now the Whig candidate for Mayor, delivered a speech, which most who heard it must recollect to this day, and must recollect, too, as having done no little honor to Mr. Chapman, whether as an orator or an independent man. In that speech, in a style of good humored raillery, in which he excels. Mr. Chapman ridiculed the infantile simplicity of those who deliver themselves up blind-fold,
to the sole and exclusive direction of a nominating committee. “We are of age,” said Mr. Chapman, “we are able to act for ourselves, if we try, we may perhaps succeed in going alone; and if we fail, we can easily relapse again into the tender embraces of our dry nurse, who will no doubt take us back again affectionately to her arms.” Then rising into a strain of noble eloquence, he added, We are not here, sir, as Democrats or as Federalists, as National Republicans or Van Buren men, as Masons or Anti-masons, Scythians, Barbarians, bond, —no, but thank God, as FREE, free, to choose, to act, to decide for ourselves, as good citizens and independent men!

Mr. Lyman professedly a Van Buren man, was elected Mayor of this city through the exertions of Mr. Jonathan Chapman, Mr. Franklin Dexter, and his other anti-Van Buren friends, and having been elected, he was adopted by the Whig nominating committee, as their regular candidate, and was reelected, at their recommendation.

More yet. It is but a few years since the Whigs of this city, at the instance, request and nomination of the Whig nominating committee, voted for and elected Josiah Dunham, of South Boston, a noted Van Buren man, as one of the Aldermen of this city. Let no Temperance Whig, then, who at the recommendation of the Whig nominating committee, voted for Theodore Lyman, Jr., as Mayor, and Josiah Dunham as Alderman, both known and acknowledged Van Buren men, undertake to say that it is contrary to Whig principles to vote for any Van Buren man for a Municipal office. Let no Temperance Whig, who voted for Josiah Dunham as Alderman, because the Whig committee nominated him, refuse to vote for Stephen Child, Alpheus Stetson and Moses Mellen, whose election is called for by the cries and lamentations of thousands of men, women and children, made wretched and miserable by rum.

It is useless and vain to deny that the number of votes which the Temperance Ticket will receive on Monday next, be it more or less, will and must show explicitly how many friends of the Law of 1838 there are in this city. It must be agreed, by every candid man, that no professed friend of that Law can fail to vote the Temperance Ticket, without a disgraceful abandonment of his principles, his professions and his temperance friends, at a most important and momentous crisis. It is actions, not words, that are the rest of men. This is a plain case. There is no room for evasion or equivocation. The simple act of depositing the Temperance Ticket in the ballot-box will now establish, beyond dispute, the temperance character of those who vote it—while on the other hand, whatever man, high or low, rich or poor, learned or ignorant, saint or sinner, shall deliberately give his vote for a Board of Aldermen that will not enforce the Law of 1838, when he might have voted for and might have elected a Board of Alderman who would have enforced it—whatever man does this, though he may talk and talk, and with the tongue of ten angels—no man who thus votes, be he who he
may, can ever hereafter be regarded as any better than a piece of sounding brass, a tinkling cymbal, empty and false.

By their acts shall ye know them.

Richard Hildret,

Robert E. Ruthven,

John H. Sweet,

Francis Jackson,

Samuel Cutler,

G. W. F. Mellen,

Abel Baker,

Joseph K. Hayes,

John R. Manley,

A. J. Wright.