

NAMBY-PAMBY.

SIR,—In the February issue of the *Journal* there appears an article on what is supposed to be one of our failings as a body.

I think we should be all thankful to your correspondent for the interest he takes in us. But, Mr. Editor, are either you or your correspondent consistent in the matter? In one sentence your correspondent says, “Can you do nothing, etc., etc.?” in nearly the next sentence he says, “I do not believe in total abstinence, but he has the greatest contempt, etc., etc.” You, yourself, Sir, are making the same cry throughout your article. You say “We.” I presume the We, in this case, means I, the Editor, “like him, are no namby-pamby total abstainers, neither do we hold a brief for them.”

One question I should like to ask you and your correspondent? Would these six trials have taken place for this offence if the principals had belonged to the ranks of the namby-pambyists? The day has gone by, Sir, in the Navy, when it was customary to look on a total abstainer as a half-and-half kind of a man. I thought you knew this, Sir!

We hear a good deal about the moral courage required to say, "No, thanks; I have had enough." But in my opinion, it requires as much moral courage to say, "No, I will have none," and thus become a namby-pambyist.

In conclusion, if your correspondent with a few other naval officers, including yourself, were to give practical proof of your earnestness in this matter, by joining the ranks of namby-pambyists, you will have gone a long way on the road to be able to say, "Something has been done."

HYPERACME.

SIR,—In your article entitled "Difficult and Delicate," in your last issue, you endeavoured to deal with the question how to reduce or abolish altogether cases of Court-Martial upon Warrant Officers for excessive drinking.

This is the first time in my recollection (I may be mistaken) upon which you have set forth as a temperance reformer, and I can well understand how "difficult" you must have found it. Although so late in the day, I feel you are to be congratulated that you have thought it necessary to speak out against the drink traffic with our class, even though it was at the instigation of an outsider. I cannot, however, congratulate you upon the *remedy* you offer to the state of things you deplore; for, anyone, who has seriously considered the question of intemperance, knows well that your specific is one which has so lamentably failed in the past, that to-day scarcely anyone can be found to advocate it. Neither do I congratulate you upon the *tact* you have displayed by gratuitously insulting a number (alas, a not too numerous one) of our class, who, above all others, shew by their daily living and self-restraint how to effectually avoid the calamity you have drawn attention to; I refer to those described by you as the "*namby-pamby total-abstainers*."

I rather thought that the age of ridicule upon total abstinence had long passed away, but I regretfully see it still lingers in the breast of the Editor of this *Journal*. It is well for our Service that there are some, at least, who, year in and year out, have the power of self-restraint sufficiently strong to resist the tide of human customs, and so to show to their fellows an absolutely-safe (the only safe) remedy for drunkenness, viz., total abstinence.

Do not cease with this attempt to deal with a "delicate" question, but grapple with it, as you advise others to do, and my only desire is that you may effectually rescue many from the risk and degradation of the Court-Martial.

Your expressed desire is to advise the members of your class to escape court-martial by drinking only in moderation, the amount to be taken is to depend, I suppose, upon opportunities found and an individual's capacity for drinking? But, imagine one giving similar advice to one addicted to stealing! If you knew a lad or a young man showing a propensity for that vice, would you think it reasonable to advise him to *steal a little less*, to be satisfied with stealing *only in small quantities* and that *only occasionally*? Or to one given to lying, would you prescribe *lying in moderation*? The same plan that you would think would alone be effectual in the cases of the thief and the liar, viz., that of *total abstinence*, you may depend upon it is the only known cure for drunkenness, and any other thing offered is but a quack and a nostrum.

Do not, I beseech you, in your desire to save your fellows from professional and social degradation, take it to be a fitting opportunity to so belittle the stand already taken by some of your fellows as teetotallers; but, rather, enlist their sympathetic assistance, or, at least, acknowledge that they are now doing what you would wish *all* to do, i.e., keeping clear of Court-Martial for excessive drinking.

J. H. PALMER.