THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 7005. MORNING EDITION—FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1855. PRICE TWO CENTS.

ADVERTISEMENTS RENEWED EVERY DAY

THE LIQUOR DEALERS AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS PARTY.

STATE TICKET—
For Secretary of State.....Aaron Ward.
For Comptroller.....Lemuel Stetson.
For Treasurer.....Joseph M. Lyon.
For Attorney General.....Samuel J. Tilden.
For State Engineer.....John D. Fay.
For Canal Commissioner.....Frederick Follett.
For State Prison Inspector.....Patrick H. Agan.
Judges Court Appeals—Long term.....Samuel Selden.
Short term.....Nicholas Hill, Jr.

The Committee of the Liquor Dealers' Society, appointed for the purpose of appropriating funds to the support of our State ticket and candidates for representative officers, will hold a meeting at Odd Fellows' Hall this afternoon from 4 to 6 o'clock.

At a meeting of the Liquor Dealers' Society, held at Odd Fellows' Hall on the 31st ult., it was decided to make no nomination for city, county and judicial officers. This decision was based upon the general rule of the organization, under which nominations are only made when it becomes absolutely necessary to secure the objects in view.

BUT FIVE DAYS MORE!

But five days more before election. Does every man in the liberal ranks understand that? Does it go home to him in its true sense? We think so. But five days. Let every man go to work and keep to work. Not an hour should be lost. Not one idle, but labor. Lead your good faith with earnest works. Find out how every man in your neighborhood, district, ward, is going. If any one is wavering, just steady them upon the constitutional rights platform. Take advantage of the fears and doubts of our opponents. The liquor dealers' ticket is the only one that has a chance of election; therefore, give it your support.

Five days more, recollect! Election next Tuesday. Work! work! work!

CRYING DOWN THE MAINE LAW.

The Tribune is constantly lamenting the attempt of the liberal party to "cry down" the Maine law; but it may rest assured we do not intend to waste a great deal of time in such occupation. The natural union of that law, so far as public opinion is concerned, has been downwards, and ever downwards, since it first made its appearance. When left to itself, it has gravitated downwards with a constantly accelerated velocity, until finally it has reached a point in the abyss of pub ic contempt, where gravitation ceases to operate. Of one thing the fanatics may rest assured, that the future action of the liberal party, while it will strike at the root of unconstitutional legislation, will be temperate, rational, practicable, and, above all, constitutional. Of this the boozy hypocrites, and their votaries who passed the Maine law, may remain satisfied. As for "the principle of prohibition," it will be thrown to the pigs, like any other offal. It is a desecration of the respectable word "principle" to use it in any such connection. If there is any one thing which is as much in the nostrils of the public—if there is any one thing which is more than any other an object of public contempt and disgust—it there is any one thing which has seen tried in the balance and found wanting—if there is any doctrine which has been utterly exploded and blown into fragments impalpably small, it is this same "principle of prohibition!"

We say again let the Tribune be patient and self possessed. Whatever the liberal party do in the premises will be well done, considerately done, and for the public good. A new era will be inaugurated. The laws generally, under liberal rule, will regain the respect which they have lost under the sway of fanaticism, and the tarnished reputation of the Empire State will be restored to its original and proper lustre.

TRIBUNE LOGIC.

"If the act is inoperative, why do they work so hard for its repeal? If it is unconstitutional, why wish its repeal? An unconstitutional act is dead—powerless—still born; you might as sensibly repeal last winter'—N. Y. Tribune.

This is most singularly stupid reasoning. The Prohibitory Liquor act is, for the most part inoperative, because it is regarded as unconstitutional, and the liberal party desire its repeal because it is unconstitutional, and because its existence in our statute books is a disgrace to the State. When a jury refuses to find an indictment under a law, and a judge refuses to sentence a person convicted under it, we have proof that it is thus such a law should be not only "dead and powerless" but buried and disowned. And yet the Tribune asserts that the law is constitutional and right, and that it would have been operative "but for the conspiracies of Mayors, Judges, District Attorneys, &c., to embarrass its execution and nullify its provisions." The community at large believe a large proportion of the best temperance men, and our Judges, who are entirely above a suspicion of conspiracy against the laws they are sworn to interpret and enforce to the letter, differ from the Tribune, and inasmuch as they desire laws to be respected as such, and as they are lovers of temperance in legislation and in thinking, and in writing, and in speaking, insist that a law so unjust and oppressive should be amended by one more in accordance with the requirements of an enlightened age, and a temperate people.

THE CONTEST.

There is now but a brief time left for our friends to complete their labors, after which they will be at liberty to rest. During these few days they should work, giving up all their time to the cause of liberalism, in the fullest confidence that their labors will not be thrown away. Victory will be theirs, but victory, like all other good and great things, is not to be had for the asking, but must be won—must be striven for. The contest though not so confident and full of assurance as they were at first, nevertheless hard a work, and will leave no effort untempted which shall promise to do their cause good. They will strive earnestly, for this is all depending upon the result. Having broken up the party of freedom success must be their sole justification, and that they mean to have if possible. They must be met and conquered. A victory now will make matters easy for the future. The men who have striven to circumscribe the limits of liberty for the people, and to rob them of their constitutional rights, should be rebuked. Their arbitrariousness should not be allowed to go unpunished. They should be taught that the people are not to be trifled with. They have exhibited a determination to ride over everybody and everything, and to arrogate to themselves the right to command all the elements of politics. Their arrogance alone would render them worthy of being made an example of were there no other cause for putting them down, or rather for preventing them from ever getting up. The liquor dealers and constitutional rights parties have only to make a good use of the time that is yet left to them to accomplish a brilliant triumph, and to show the fallacy of the Maine law hopes and predictions. Let the true spirit animate them, and the day will be their own.

HOW HAVE THE MAINE LAWYERS DISPOSED OF THE BRANDY?

This pertinent question has been asked by the Boston Chronicle which adds:—

Great excitement has been created in Bangor by the discovery that some of the liquors seized in that city under the Maine law are missing. The houses of the policemen have been searched, but without success. It does not appear thus far that Neal Dow has anything to do with the matter. Perhaps an astounding discovery might be made, should an active committee be chosen to smell the breath of certain Maine law advocates, who have gained an unenviable notoriety by their zeal in enforcing that unjust and wicked law.

COERCION AND MORAL SUASION.

We have more than once taken occasion to advert to the different results that flow from the two systems of coercion and moral suasion, for the accomplishment of great moral reforms. Persons who view such subjects calmly, by the light of history, and with a philosophic eye, are not long in coming to a conclusion on this point. Those who have discussed the abstract question have universally concurred in repudiating coercion as an instrument of reform. No political philosopher has ever ventured to maintain the doctrine that force is either desirable or an efficacious method of inculcating and establishing truth. Those who reason for themselves, and whose minds are capable of appreciating truth as enforced by reason, are willing to employ the same means with others. But there is a natural tendency to haste in human nature which renders most men impatient of the slow process of argument, and anxious to avail themselves of any means that are presented for the realization of their theories and opinions. If they can use the power which the law places in their hands, they will probably seize upon it with avidity as an efficient instrument for the accomplishment of their designs. We do not intend here to discuss the right thus to divest government from its legitimate objects and make it subservient to purposes which are foreign to its nature; we desire only to say a few words concerning the policy of pursuing such a course.

We take it for granted that the prohibitionists are sincere in the expression of a desire to banish intemperance from this community. They say that they are anxious to make people temperate, and we are bound to believe them. We may doubt their sanity, but we cannot justly accuse them of hypocrisy. Of course we speak of the masses, not of the leaders. The masses may be honest, when the leaders are quite the reverse. It is with the former we have to do, not with the latter. We repeat, then, that we are justified in believing that the prohibitionists are actually desirous of accomplishing the object they profess to have at heart. We are bound to suppose that they want prohibition merely for the love of prohibition. They do not wish to pass a coercive law, merely for the love of coercion. They have an object in view, to the attainment of which the system of prohibition or coercion is simply an accessory or an instrument. Now, if the instrument fail of accomplishing the purpose it is to be discarded. A truly philosophic mind would examine the question more profoundly, and would reject the instrument if it were productive of evils surpassing in magnitude any benefits that could be derived from its use. But we cannot expect the prohibitionists to bring themselves to any such comparison of evils and benefits. We can only hope to show them that their favorite measures must fail of producing the results they expect to derive from it. If convinced of this, they ought, as sensible men, to abandon it. In order to arrive at this conclusion, it is only necessary to recur to the teachings of history and experience. The history of society from its earliest foundation shows that efforts to establish, by force of law, particular theories of morality, of philosophy, or of religion, have either absolutely failed, or if successful have destroyed that mental independence which is necessary to the elucidation of truth. It is scarcely necessary to produce facts in illustration of this position. They will immediately crowd upon the mind of every careful student of history. Persecution, which is the ally of coercion, and without which coercion would lose its efficacy, has never succeeded in carrying conviction to the minds of men. There is no fact more well established than that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." The Christian faith continued to flourish and grow, while its votaries were broiled by Nero and roasted by Diocletian. Christians succeeded in promulgating their doctrines even when driven to the catacombs for refuge from the persecuting fires of the heathen. For every martyr there were a hundred converts. Even the mild and peaceable tenets of the Saviour finally triumphed over the faggot and the sword of the pagan. This is perhaps the most forcible illustration of our position, but history furnishes numbers of similar evidences. In a former article on the same subject we referred to some of them, which are striking and convincing. We showed that the Puritans in England had attempted the same thing that the prohibitionists are attempting in America. It is true that there is some difference of form between the two, but the essence of the measures is the same. They both endeavor to compel society to live and act according to certain moral theories which are repugnant to the previous habits of the community, instead of trying to convince them of the truth of those theories. We showed, also, that the effort was a failure in England, and only produced a reaction which exaggerated all the evils that previously existed. In more recent times we have seen exemplification of the same principle. Everybody knows that wine is prohibited by the Koran, and yet the products of the vineyards of Shiraz find a ready sale among the Persian and Turkish followers of the Prophet. We know, too, that every effort of the Mahommedan rulers to enforce the prohibition by legal enactments met with decided failure, and increased, instead of diminishing, the consumption of wine. The Turkish government once undertook to prohibit the use of tobacco, and from that moment the chibouque was continually in the mouth of every inhabitant of the empire. Many European governments, likewise, tried to prevent the introduction of the Virginian weed among their people, and the august sovereign of England, himself, issued a "counter blast" against it. But the objectionable plant defied persecution, and made its way into public favor just in proportion to the strength of the efforts to prohibit its use. The persistent, but unavailing attempts of the Chinese government to prevent the use of opium are familiar to all. The more the government exerted itself to suppress the habit—the more severe the penalties it imposed—the more assiduously the Celestials smoked and chewed. When we turn our attention to the present time, and examine the effects of the much vaunted Maine Law in those States where it has been tried and proved, we find the same results. In the State of Maine, where the law was born, it is about to find its grave. A trial of five years has convinced the people of that State that the law is not only oppressive and anti-republican, but that it does not and cannot achieve the objects which it purports to effect. The champions of the law may say what they please, but everybody knows that the consumption of liquor has not been decreased by the Prohibitory law. Neal Dow himself, in a letter published by us yesterday, relates that he had in one day broken into three houses, and seized in each a quantity of jugs and bottles. Now we cannot see the object of this seizure, unless we admit that the jugs and bottles which excited the apprehensions of the temperance Mayor, either then contained liquor to be drunk, or had contained liquor already drunk. In either case the law had evidently failed to prevent people either from wishing to drink, or from finding the means of gratifying their desire.

We all remember the great progress made by the temperance cause previous to the year 1848, when it was first rescued from its legitimate sphere and made to assume a political character. We candidly affirm that more men were reclaimed from drunkenness during that period, by the efforts of lecturers, and by appeals to reason, than could be rescued by the Maine law in a thousand years. The reason is obvious. The aim of the temperance men was to convince, and when conviction follows argument men generally regulate, or try to regulate, their conduct in accordance with its dictates. The aim of the Maine law is to coerce, and men naturally rebel against coercion. They refuse to be made temperate by compulsion. They think they are the best judges of their own private affairs, and repel interference, whether of the law or of individuals.

During the time of which we speak the temperance cause was deservedly popular. It had the countenance and the approbation of the wise and the good of all parties, and the example was not unfrequent of even liquor dealers giving money to aid the temperance societies in the accomplishment of their noble design. In an evil hour, politicians were allowed to take the control of the movement, and to make it a party question instead of a moral question. In 1845 the Legislature passed the first Prohibitory law, and since that time the temperance question has been made the sport and the instrument of designing politicians. The people no longer discuss the benefits of temperance, and the evils of drunkenness, but are engaged only in arguing whether one part of the community has a right to impose its peculiar moral views on the other part, by means of coercive laws. Men who would be willing to listen to a temperance lecture, and who acknowledge the evils of drunkenness, are unwilling that the intervention of the law should be invoked to constrain them to temperate habits. If the majority succeeds, for a time, in passing and enforcing a coercive law, the minority, who think their rights assailed, will keep up against it a perpetual agitation, and will, unless popular opinion is possessed of that immutability which has never yet been attributed to it, inevitably succeed in rescinding the objectionable enactment. Thus we should have "Free Liquor" one year, and "No Liquor" the next year, and people who had been made temperate by force would assuredly plunge into the opposite excess, as soon as constraint might be removed. This is the certain effect of prohibitory laws. They cannot accomplish the object of those who advocate them; but on the contrary, exciting, as they do, that spirit of independence, and opposition to restraint which characterizes human nature, their tendency must be just the reverse.

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

PROHIBITION AND THE FARMERS.—No public journal has labored more assiduously, or shaped its course more sagaciously to secure the patronage of the great agricultural interest of this State, than the New York Tribune; and none, perhaps, has succeeded in its special object to a greater extent. But, lately, its very success seems to have emboldened it to continue its extraordinary experiments upon rural simplicity with much less than its usual specious respect for agricultural intelligence. Fair play toward the farmers, who, next to the liquor dealers themselves, are more deeply interested in the pending controversy upon the Prohibitory law than any other class in the State, demands that one at least of these bold experiments upon their credulity should be recalled to their memory, if only to remind them of the sort of argument in behalf of their ruinous and despotic law, which its leading advocate has considered good enough for their sagacity. In an editorial article of the Tribune, headed the "Cost of the Rum Traffic," published on the 20th of April last, when agricultural products were nearly as high as they had been during the previous winter, occurs the following statement:—

"Corn is selling in the market for one dollar and sixteen cents per bushel, and superfine flour for twelve dollars a barrel on the average. If the various grains which are consumed in our distilleries were not so used, but were ground for human consumption, or fed to animals to make beef, pork, poultry and other meats, it is perfectly safe to assume that we should to-day be buying flour at five dollars a barrel, and corn at fifty cents, and butcher's meats in proportion."

That this estimate was not offered inconsiderately, in the mental muddlement of teetotal enthusiasm, is evident from its deliberate repetition in a subsequent part of the same article:—

"The scarcity and high prices of both bread and meats in the country are fairly chargeable, to a very great extent, to the rum and whiskey dealers and their supporters. If it were not for the distilleries, these comparatively cheap articles would undoubtedly now be buying, as we have said, flour at five dollars, and corn at fifty cents, in this market."

Now it is not for us to dispute, or even to doubt, the absolute accuracy of an agricultural estimate thus considerately given and reiterated in a journal which practically assumes the glorious authority of all such subjects, but readily yield to it our profoundest respect and assent. We merely claim the common privilege of rationality, in deducing from it two or three important inferences, axiomatic and irresistible and of the gravest possible importance to the farmers of this State, in relation to the suppression of the liquor traffic. If it is true that the suppression of the liquor traffic would have the effect to reduce the market value of all agricultural products more than fifty or sixty per cent even in a year of extreme general scarcity, the conclusion is inevitable that it would reduce them still more ruinously and permanently in years of comparative plenty. And as every farm is valuable in the direct ratio of the value of its products, it as undeniably follows that the value of every man's farm would be reduced in the same destructive proportion. With this desolating depreciation of the value of farms would come first, a corresponding increase of oppression from mortgages; and secondly, a proportionate depreciation in the value of mortgage investments. Every species of agricultural investment, from the farm, yielding to the barn, from the barn to the horse to the plowshare, from the threshing machine to the labor of hands, would be crushed in the same relative degree, and foreign conquest and confiscation hardly ever produced in our unhappy country a wider field of devastation than would be presented in the now prosperous State of New York, provided the Prohibitory liquor law could fully accomplish its calculated results. Such, at least, would be the results as calculated by the Tribune, whose data we have fairly adopted.

The Tribune, however, is unusually modest in its pretensions to authentic statistical information upon this subject, resting, or at any rate expecting its country dealers to rely, upon the proverbial accuracy of its unperverted judgment. It says:—

"We have not consulted the census tables to see what proportion of our product of grain is distilled into spirits, but the quantity is enormous. There are single distilleries in the country that consume one thousand bushels of corn every day; and the manufacture of whiskey alone. Millions upon millions of bushels are thus annually worse than wasted, by being converted into intoxicating drinks."

But referring to the statistical facts upon this question that relate especially to the State of New York, we arrive at conclusions of really substantial importance. These facts are of a character so truly remarkable, and so little known, as to be well calculated to arouse the energetic action not only of the agriculturists of this State, but of every class of citizens whose business interests are in the remotest degree dependent upon theirs; and it is not more certainly true that the earth is the parent of all products used for the support and comfort of man, than that every other business interest is vitally dependent upon the agricultural. These facts are:—

1. That nearly one-half of all the barley grown in the United States is grown in the State of New York. The evidence from the census tables is as follows:—

Bushels of barley grown in all the States	5,167,615
Grown in the State of New York	2,520,068
In all the other States	2,646,947

2. That nearly two thirds of all the barley consumed in the United States in the manufacture of liquors is grown in the State of New York:

Bushels of barley thus used	3,787,196
Grown in New York	2,520,068
In all the other States	1,267,127

III. That considerably more than one-fourth of all the liquors brewed and distilled in the United States is manufactured in the State of New York. The following figures represent the number of gallons of each kind thus made:—

In the United States, brewed liquors	42,461,820
Whiskey and alcohol	41,364,224
Rum	6,500,500
Total gallons	90,325,544
In the State of New York, brewed liquors	15,190,200
Whiskey and alcohol	9,233,700
Rum	2,488,800
New York, total gallons	24,826,700
United States, total, one fourth	22,581,636
New York, excess of one-fourth	2,248,064

IV. That considerably more than two-thirds of all the hops grown in the United States—a product used exclusively in brewed liquors—is grown in the State of New York. The figures give the number of pounds:—

In the United States, hops	3,497,929
In New York State	2,536,299
In all the other States	969,730

It is thus authentically demonstrated that while greatly more than one-fourth of the wholesale price and profit, agricultural and manufacturing, of all the American liquors drank in the United States flows into the State of New York, there is also a considerable addition, for the special benefit of our agriculturists, arising from their large supply of products manufactured into liquors in other States, and which may be considered a surplus upon the products steadily raised in this State for its own manufacture. What the amount of this inflowing capital and these profits may be we have no statistics to show, but as it must be in direct proportion to the amount of drinking wholesomely, and not destructively, achieved to this and the other States of the Union, we deem it, in the confident language of the Tribune, "perfectly safe to assume" that the whole sum "must be enormous."

It is unnecessary to say that our teetotal philosophers and coercionists, were it in their power, as it is in their intention, would shut up this immense source of wealth and prosperity to the State of New York, and transfer its copious tide for the benefit of the farmers, brewers and distillers of Great Britain, France and Holland. That they ever sincerely expect to chain down the American people—of all others in the world—by stern tyrannous laws, imposing dungeons, fines and confiscations, as to prevent their partaking of these agreeable and generous beverages which, in common with all mankind, they have immemorially enjoyed, we at least find it impossible to believe.

The practical result, therefore, of their utmost point of success would be the transfer of the agricultural and manufacturing profits of the liquor trade to foreign countries—in exemplification, we presume, of the great doctrine of American protection! The farmers, however, of the State of New York, at least, whatever may be the Tribune's estimate of their intelligence, will have common sense enough to ask each other the question: "Since this drinking must and will be done from some source or other, why ought not we to share its profits while we inequitably incur its burdens? and why enhance its burdens by sending those profits to foreign lands?"

PROHIBITION COURTESY.

As a specimen of Prohibition courtesy we quote the following from the Albany Prohibitionist:—

"Those who drink beer," said Dr. Johnson, "talk beer." Judges who drink champagne or brandy, write champagne and brandy arguments, make champagne and brandy charges to juries, and pronounce champagne and brandy judgments. We have already remarked, as a circumstance pregnant with meaning, that of all the distinguished lawyers and judges who have published opinions against the New York Prohibitory law, we have yet to hear of one who is himself a total abstainer from intoxicating drinks. But solemn and significant as this circumstance may be, it is only a condensation of the philosophy inculcated thousands of years since by Holy Writ. Hearken once again to the words of inspired wisdom, as recorded in the 4th and 5th verses of the 31st chapter of Proverbs: "It is not for Kings, O Lemuel, it is not for Kings to drink wine; nor for princes strong drink; lest they drink and forget the law and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted."

"Behold a still more palpable and literal confirmation of this philosophy of the Bible in the case of the decision against the law for the prevention of intemperance, pauperism and crime, by the Supreme Court of the Second Judicial district of the State of New York. The Cayuga Chief is our authority:—

"In connection with the decision of the Supreme Court of the Second Judicial district, we wish to state one fact: at the time the case was argued before the Court, the session was held in Poughkeepsie. One of the judges had his bottle of liquor by him every day at the table."

The comments of the same paper, in this connection, we most heartily endorse as not more forcible than just:—

"Is it any wonder that an 'opinion' is promulgated, more thoroughly rum than even liquor sellers send forth? for we believe they have never attempted to build up the rum traffic on physiological grounds. We may pass the most perfect prohibitory law in the world, but so long as judges are elected shameless enough to drink at the table of a hotel—openly setting at defiance the very statute under which a case is being argued—so long shall we have decisions of 'unconstitutionality,' &c.

"And here is a point for temperance people to bring home and act upon at the coming election. Elect men who are true on this question. Purify the courts from the stench of rum. Let us have officials who regard God, humanity, and all the best interests of society, instead of tippling rowdies, ever ready to stoop to debase and degrade their fellow men by truckling to an accursed traffic."

We would advise our prohibitionist brethren to learn politeness before they undertake to teach temperance. We seldom open a prohibitionist paper that we do not find some such elegant expression as "rum fiend" and "accursed poisons" applied to all who do not happen to think exactly as these model editors would wish to have them think. Were the supposition not uncharitable, we should be inclined to imagine that they are continually laboring under the effects of the article they profess to hold in such abhorrence. As it is, we can only account for their language on the theory that there are other kinds of intemperance than that involved in the abuse of stimulating liquors. For our part we are opposed to intemperance of every species; intemperance in words as well as intemperance in drinking.

The prohibitionists have already enlightened us sufficiently on the evil effects of hard drinking, and we propose that they now turn their attention to the evils of hard writing and hard talking.

If they persist in trying to make people sober by law, we are justified in trying to make them politely law. At present they seem to be laboring under a species of insanity which, if not mania a potu, is some other mania equally as disagreeable—perhaps we might call it the mania a scribendo. Its effects are exceedingly deleterious, and sometimes dangerous. It arouses the passions and frequently involves persons in quarrels and collisions. Thus, on the theory of the prohibitionists, it is a legitimate object for government to interfere. We think civility and courtesy of almost as much importance as temperance and sobriety, and as such equally deserving of legal encouragement and protection. At all events the Albany editor is an example to a man who has got deadly drunk on temperance, and we therefore recommend him to the especial attention of his prohibitionist friends.

TO MEN OF LIBERAL PRINCIPLES.

This year there is an independent liberal organization in this State—a liberal party with candidates of its own; an opportunity is offered for all liberal minded men to give expression to their opinions through the ballot box—to cast a vote where they know it will tell. This year the liberal can be in no sort of doubt as to the course which he ought to pursue. For once he can strike a blow directly at the cause of his grievance. Such an opportunity is not to be slighted. Whoever does not avail himself of it must not complain if it does not recur for many years. The importance of taking advantage of the present liquor dealers' and constitutional rights' organization cannot be over estimated. Unorganized, the liberals have hitherto been cajoled and deceived by the old parties, and there is present such a formidable force that their demands will be heard and complied with. Unfortunately, there is so much excitement about "paramount issues" and other things of that sort that there is danger that many really liberal-minded men whose hearts are with us may be blinded, confused and led astray.

Let all liberals turn a deaf ear to "paramount issues," remembering that they are devices of the enemy. There is no safety in casting a vote for anybody for the state offices but the regularly nominated liberal candidate. The political atmosphere is now so clouded with vapors and mists. The State is full of agitation. The Maine law is scarcely alluded to by the former advocates. They cunningly skip it at this particular time. They would fain convince the public that they have abandoned it. Again many liberals who may be slightly touched with the Nebraska fever, may argue, from the fact that the tribe of immigrants are just now quiet, and apparently disposed to give up the pursuit of their game, that it will be well enough if the present prohibitory statute is suffered to stand unrepealed; that it will be nugatory and a nullity, harming no one, and remaining nothing but a dead letter. But we say, be not deceived by appearances. The present lull in the Maine law agitation is temporary. The agitation will be renewed again in a quietus is not speedily put upon the free soil movement by the next Legislature. All such sedative as repeal will rue it, if they suffer themselves to be led a way by old party leaders and political wirepullers.

Through the confused din and hubbub of warring factions, let every liberal voter march to the ballot box, keeping steadily in his mind the great polar fact, that what is wanted here in dishonored, fanatic ridden New York is a thorough cleansing and purification of our statute book, which has finally come to be a foul Augean stable, a dense jungle, an undigested mass of treason, nonsense and contradiction, hateful to lawyers, judges, litigants, and humanity in general.

A LIBERAL SPEECH IN FANEUIL HALL.

We have read with much pleasure the speech of the Hon. J. T. Stevenson, which he delivered on Friday last, in Faneuil Hall, Boston. We are obliged to the eloquent gentleman for this splendid tribute to the correctness of liberal principles, and for the able, clear, and conclusive argument of the objects and aims of the constitutional rights party. Massachusetts is in need of a few more such men as Mr. Stevenson. We subjoin an extract from his speech:—

"I tell you, sir, that the idea which seems to have taken possession of the minds of some, that the three hundred men who, for a session in the State House are empowered to determine for each individual in Massachusetts whether or not he may use that, which, if intemperately used, will injure and degrade him, is an idea which, if firmly rooted and fully developed, would convert this government of ours into an absolute despotism.

"This government has no right to determine whether a free citizen may consume that which, if used, will injure him. Any government which may determine, at its will, what a man may temperately use, is a despotism.

"You may call it by what name you choose—autocracy, or monarchy, or oligarchy, or aristocracy, or republic, or democracy—still, if it possesses such a power over the individual, it is a pure despotism.

"Search for a tyranny; examine the records of the past; ransack the dynasties of the old world; and if a government possessing that, and kindred powers, be not a tyranny, acknowledge that your search has been in vain.

"I do not believe that this government of ours possesses any such power; and I, for one, would like to see it undertake the exercise of it and fail, as fail it must.

"Any government which undertakes, by criminal law, to prevent that which the same government dares not by law forbid, exposes to the gaze of the world the unsoundness of the principles upon which its action is based.

"What is the purpose of the law? Is it not to prevent the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage? Then why not, manfashion, forbid that use? If it be a vice which they seek to eradicate, why do they not make that vice a crime? Why leave it legal for all to do that which they deem it wicked for any one to do, and at the same time make a criminal of him who is accessory to this lawful performance?

"I just urge the many considerations which, if time permitted, might be urged; I allude only to the fact that the law itself recognizes the prescribed articles as necessary articles of commerce—necessary for many and useful purposes, and yet that it empowers officers of the government to determine which of your citizens may and which may not manufacture this prescribed article of commerce.

"I ask you to consider whether such a power of creating monopolies ought to be conferred upon municipal officers.

"And I ask the sincere friends of this measure, if they believe men ought not to consume intoxicating liquors, and that law will prevent their doing so, why they do not forbid the practice, instead of attempting indirectly to prevent it?

"Any government which undertakes by indirection to prevent that which it has not the courage to forbid, degrades itself.

"I know that the casuists, whose minds seem to be charred by an overheated zeal, say that the laws punish the manufacture and sale of burglars' tools, for the purpose of preventing burglary. But the law first treats burglary as a crime, so with the manufacture and sale of counterfeiters' instruments; but it first treats the use of these implements as a crime.

"So, when the time shall come when you are ready to treat the temperate use of liquors as a crime, it will be time enough to convert the manufacture and sale of them into crimes.

"I hope that the law will be repealed. I believe that the sincere friends of temperance are tired of this attempt to use all the machinery of government to pump cold water down men's throats by law."

THE LIQUOR QUESTION.

ALFRED PACKHAUSER, 199 WILLIAM STREET.—Offers for sale at reasonable prices, French wines, in wood and glass, red and white, comprising St. Julien, St. Emilion, Medoc, Chateau Latite, Chateau Larose, Chateau Margaux, Chateau Leoville, Haut Sauternes, Haut-Barzac, Chateau Yquem, &c. German and Rhenish wines, in wood and glass; Burgundy wine, in wood and glass, comprising Chambertin, Ermitage red and white, cote-notie St. Joseph, Clos de St. George, St. Peray, mousseux and non mousseux, in bond and duly paid. Cognac brandy of sundry brands; champagne and all other liquors, as gin, Scotch whiskey, rum, arak, Curacoa, bitters, &c., &c.

AMERICAN BRANDY, PUT UP IN BEAUTIFUL packages of ¼, ½, and ⅓ pipes; gin, New England rum, Monongahela and rectified rye whiskey, older brandy, pure spirits, &c. Great inducements to cash buyers, who will do well to give us a call. C. WARD & CO.
Agents for the distillers, 110 Murray street.

BRANDIES, FRENCH AND OTHER FOREIGN WINES, consisting of port, sherry, Madeira, muscat, Malaga, &c.; Jamaica rum, Scotch and Irish whiskey, older brandy, pure porter, Scotch and other ales, unequalled in quality and at the lowest possible price. UNDERHILL & MATTERSON, 430 Broome street, corner Crosby, near Broadway.

LIQUOR DEALERS.—10 PUNCHEONS STEWART'S celebrated Paisley whiskey, two years old, for sale, from U. S. bonded warehouse. Apply to
JAMES AINSLIE, 93 Beaver street.

PORTER AND ALE.—THE CELEBRATED EAST INDIA tonic pale ale, in pints and quarts; London and Dublin porter, Scotch ale, &c., delivered in the city or suburbs, without extra charge, from the old wine vault No. 18 Wall street.
G. E. MENDUM.

TO WHOLESALE GROCERS AND LIQUOR DEALERS.—Best green and yellow grape and cognac oils, essences, warranted to imitate Jamaica and St. Croix rum; peach, cherry, apple, and raspberry brandies; Holland gin; whiskey, port and Madeira wines; best French coloring, for sale by DR. L. FEUCHTWANGER, 98 Maiden lane.

NEWSPAPERS.

HERALD FILES FOR SALE—FOR 1853-4 AND 55, TO date, bound in four volumes. Apply to E. BELMAN, wood engraver, No. 102 Nassau street, corner Ann, room No. 4, second floor. Price $22.

PREPARE TO GRIN.—LOOK OUT FOR YE LAMENtable pome of ye
WILLIKINS AND HIS DINAH,
Fully illustrated with twenty four original comic cuts, in the New York Picayune, published on Saturday. Price 5 cents. Sold everywhere. Office 114 Nassau street.

THE CRITERION—A NEW WEEKLY JOURNAL OF literature, science and art. The first number is now ready, and can be had of the news agents and at the office, No. 115 Nassau street. 6 cents per copy.
CHARLES R. RODE, Publisher.

REWARDS.

$25 REWARD.—STOLEN FROM NO. 6 WILLOW street, Brooklyn, on the 11th inst., a large gold English watch, open face, Pennington maker, No. 3,153, with a lady's belt chain, a square locket, and a large gold key attached. Any person by delivering the above to Mrs. Sarah Nabb, 57 High street, Brooklyn, or Mr. M. C. Ogden, 87 Beekman st., New York, will receive the above reward, and no questions asked.

$25 REWARD.—LOST, A DIAMOND PIN, (IN THE form of a crescent). The above reward will be paid on leaving it at 211 10th street.

$20 REWARD.—LOST, BETWEEN 313 AND 315 Broadway, one gold watch case, marked H. Y., inside, with an eagle, and the numbers 70, 73, or 70, 74; the case was engraved; basket style. Inquire at 119 Nassau street, room 22, where the reward will be paid.

$5 REWARD.—LOST, YESTERDAY AFTERNOON, IN the vicinity of Greenwich avenue and Twelfth street, a child's necklace, made of very large sized red coral beads. The finder will confer a great favor, and receive the above reward, by returning the necklace to 82 Greenwich avenue.

$2 REWARD.—LOST, SUPPOSED IN HENRY, BUTgers, Monroe, Pike, Cherry or Pearl street, two packages of foolscap paper, covered with columns of figures. The above reward will be paid for their return at 187 Cherry st.

TRAVELLERS' GUIDE.

CHEAP FARE FOR ALBANY.—PASSAGE TWENTY five cents; passage and berth, seventy five cents; passage in state room $1; on the new and splendid steamer FRANCIS SPIDDY, the fastest boat in the world, Capt. J. W. Hancox, will leave the north side of pier foot of Robinson street, every Monday, Wednesday and Friday, at 6 P. M., arriving by 4 A. M.

BILLIARDS.

2 BILLIARD TABLES FOR SALE—ARE OF THE VERY best manufacture—have been but very little used, and will be sold low to close the business. Apply to H. D. Feber, No. 549 Broadway, corner Prince street.

Call for a Meeting of the Democratic National Committee.

[From the Washington Union, Nov. 1.]

The gentlemen composing this committee are requested to meet at the National Hotel in Washington city, on Tuesday, the 8th day of January next, at 12 o'clock, M. The committee, as constituted by the last Democratic National Convention, consists of the following gentlemen:—

Maine	Hasting Strickland.
New Hampshire	G. C. Atherton (dead).
Vermont	David A. Smalley.
Massachusetts	B. F. Hallett.
Rhode Island	Welcome B. Sayles.
Connecticut	James T. Pratt.
New York	John P. Beekman.
New Jersey	Joseph C. Potts.
Pennsylvania	James Campbell.
Delaware	George R. Riddle.
Maryland	Robert M. McLane.
Virginia	William H. Clark.
N. Carolina	Warren Winslow.
Georgia	S. T. Bailey.
Alabama	Edward C. Betts.
Mississippi	S. R. Adams.
Louisiana	A. G. Penn.
Ohio	Alfred P. Edgerton.
Kentucky	Francis P. Stone.
Tennessee	George W. Jones.
Indiana	Alexander F. Morrison.
Illinois	Isaac Cook.
Missouri	Ferdinand Kennett.
Arkansas	N. B. Burrow.
Michigan	T. T. Bredhead.
Florida	Thomas Baltzell.
Texas	James W. Scott.
Iowa	Joseph C. K. Nagle.
Wisconsin	Benj. L. Henning.
California	William M. Gwin.

The above call has been inserted at the request of Hon. George Read Riddle, of Delaware, whose letter upon the subject is as follows:—

WILMINGTON, Del., Oct. 29, 1855.

SIR—As the Democratic National Committee have heretofore assembled early in the month of January preceding the Presidential election, I thought it proper, as an old member, to address those whose post offices were by me known, (embracing a majority,) and from their replies authorize you to announce that said committee will meet at the National Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Monday, the 8th day of January next, at 12 o'clock M.

Please publish the call upon receipt of this, that it may reach the distant members in time for them to attend the meeting, and oblige your obedient servant,
GEO. READ RIDDLE,
Member of Committee for Delaware.

City Politics.

HARD SHELL GENERAL COMMITTEE.

This committee met at the headquarters, St. John's Hall, John H. Williams in the chair. A committee was appointed to recommend a proper person as Judge of the Supreme Court, in place of Robert H. Morris, deceased, and E. B. Hart made a report from the Finance Committee, from which it appeared the funds were in a good condition. The committee adjourned at a late hour, to meet again on Saturday night, when tickets for the several wards will be distributed.

SOFT SHELL JUDICIARY CONVENTION.

This Convention assembled at Tammany Hall last evening, pursuant to the recommendation of the general committee of Tammany Hall, and organized by electing C. Swackhamer, President, and Joseph L. Benedict, Secretary. Henry Hilton was nominated on the first ballot, for Judge of the Supreme Court, in place of Herbert N. Morris, deceased.

A committee of five were appointed to draft resolutions expressive of the sense of the convention on the occasion of the death of the late Judge Morris, and a committee to notify Mr. Hilton of his nomination, after which the convention adjourned.

HARD SHELL JUDICIARY CONVENTION.

The delegates convened last evening, at their room, 663 Broadway, for the purpose of nominating a candidate for the Supreme Court, to fill a vacancy occasioned by the death of the late Justice Morris. Fred. R. Lee assumed the chair at 8 o'clock, and called the meeting to order, when a vote for the nomination, viva voce, was immediately entered into, and resulted thus:—

Wm. H. Leonard	50
Ralph Lockwood	4
Peter Y. Cutter	1

Wm. H. Leonard is therefore the nomination, and on motion it was made unanimous.

WHIG JUDICIARY CONVENTION.

The convention met at the Broadway House last night to nominate a person for the Supreme Court to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Morris. Theo. Sluyvesant was in the chair, and Mr. E. B. Schafer of Bristed as Secretary. Mr. Charles Peabody was nominated. The ballot stood:—

Charles A. Peabody	18 votes
Hiram P. Kellogam	4 do.
W. B.