Brattleboro

Windham County Democrat.

Vol. XVII. BRATTLEBORO, Vt. WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1853. No. 15.

THE DEMOCRAT
IS PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY MORNING, BY
GEO. W. NICHOLS.
Office No. 9 Granite Row, opposite the Stage House.

Terms of the New Volume, 1852-3.

To classes $1,50 if paid within the year;—12 1-2 cents will be added if payment is delayed beyond the year. The same amount will be deducted when payments are made strictly in advance.

Clubs of not less than five, paid at once in advance, $1,25.

Single papers by mail $1,50, in all cases to be paid in advance or satisfactory reference given.

Village subscribers who have their papers left at their doors $2,00 per annum, payable at the end of the year.

CARD.

EDUCATION IN OREGON.

On behalf of the Trustees of Tualatin Academy, and Clackamas Co. Female Seminary, Oregon Ty., I would thank the friends and donors to these institutions for their sympathy and aid afforded me in my efforts for the same, during the last six months. We are thus enabled to continue and improve both our schools for a time longer. We still need annual help; and in view of this, the Lawrence St. Church S. School, Lawrence, Mass., have promised to send us sixty dollars yearly, for the support of a teacher in our Seminary. The S. School at Woburn Centre, adopting the suggestion, will send fifty, yearly, for five years. It is hoped that other S. Schools will do the same thing. It is a significant and suggestive fact, that the Jesuit missions of the world are supported by the weekly penny contributions of the papists, chiefly of France. We have about thirty such priests in Oregon, among the Indians and whites, sustained thus. I doubt not their Female Seminaries are supported by the same regular contributions. The first fact was given me by a Jesuit Priest who receives his funds yearly from Lyons, raised as he told me by *penny gifts*. They are wise to plan and execute, and demand our respect and admiration for their zealous exertions, not only in Europe, but in our own country, to sustain and extend the papacy. Let us learn of those who have been longer in the field than ourselves.

It is a well known fact that the educational institutions of our new settlements cannot be sustained by the pupils. Hence we have a Collegiate and theological Education Society to aid such institutions for the present, and until funds can be secured. But no such provision has been made for our Female Seminaries. These decline and cease for want of annual help for their support, chiefly of teachers. This is the danger with ours at Oregon City, while the papal one is vigorously sustained. Unless some agency shall be found to meet this want of the West, not only we but the whole country must suffer forever. A Female Seminary to educate female teachers is one of the mightiest agencies for the good of the country. Its neglect one of the most deplorable evils. We ask for aid now, and for a few years. A lady at Nashua, N. H., agrees to pay the $40 tuition of a pupil yearly in our Seminary. Will others do the same? We prefer, if both cannot be had, the annual aid for teachers, as it accomplishes more to sustain a teacher at $600, than fifteen pupils at $40 each. We will reply and report to any association, or individual from whom we may receive aid. Send to my address, Oregon City, Oregon Ty., and designate the institution to which the money shall be applied.

G. H. ATKINSON, *Agent*.

Public Opinion.

Public opinion is, in the main, composed of the aggregate of private opinion. One thousand persons entertain homogeneous sentiments upon a particular subject. Their private individual opinions substantially agree. These persons brought into sympathetic relations with each other, not only entertain the same views in outline, but they are filled up with stronger colors, and the re-action of thought and feeling through the mass, tends to engender excitement and sometimes extravagance. But the foundation of any considerable movement in the mass, must, after all, be the private conviction of the individuals. Now individuals are not always very careful to examine into the validity of their convictions. They are not only sometimes unable to *give* a reason for the opinion they hold, but they are possibly, utterly destitute of any such reason. This being the case, it is well sometimes, if not always, to examine well the ground upon which any popular nation stands, before we give in our adhesion to it. Judgment should not be enervated by the contagion of sympathy, nor agitated by the throes of passion. It should, in the private individual, be clear, independent and just. That which is approved by a large majority, and becomes a tenet in the creed of the public, deserves careful attention, and is not to be rejected because it is popular, nor is it to be received implicitly because it is backed up by the "people." A man should not isolate himself and cultivate singularity: but he should maintain an intrepid spirit that can, on every proper occasion, stem the popular current, and preserve a state of feeling both tranquil and independent.

A HOME FIELD FOR LABOR!—A missionary vessel sailed from this port, Friday, for Smyrna. A great mistake has been made. She should be overhauled, sent back, and her holy men and pious women conveyed Southward, not towards the Orient. With flag at half-mast she should enter the port of New Orleans! For, read what the *Picayune* of that city has put upon record in this *free, Christian* land of ours!—*Com.*

"Chauncey B. Blake was brought before Recorder Baldwin, charged with tampering with slaves. It was proved that he was *seen* conversing with a number of them in the street; that he asked them could they read and write, and *if they would like to have a Bible.* This was the amount of the testimony against him.—In *palliation* of his conduct, it was shown that he was a regular appointed agent of the Bible Society in New Orleans, to distribute the Bible to such as would accept. *The Society, however, disclaimed having the most distant intention of giving the Scriptures to Slaves*, and it was said Blake had exceeded his commission in offering it. But, as it appeared to be a misunderstanding on his part, and not intentional interference, he was discharged with a caution *not to repeat his offence.*"

A BENEVOLENT MAN.—Amos Lawrence, (recently deceased in Boston,) was a truly christian and benevolent man. He used the bounty Providence had blessed him with, as not abusing it. He was constantly searching out new and worthy objects of donations.—A contemporary says, "Mr. Lawrence was *laboriously benevolent*. He would take the most unwearied pains to find out and aid the poor and needy. To this work he devoted his time and income, for nearly twenty years. Though he was for a long period an invalid, yet he could be found at all seasons among the destitute and destressed, distributing that material aid, accompanied with words of kindness and encouragement which made glad the hearts of the recipients. Of the amount which he has so nobly disbursed, no one can tell; but it is known to be more than *Five Hundred Thousand Dollars!* On his pocket-book was inscribed. 'What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul.' The words of the Saviour seemed to cheer his pathway while he systematically discharged his duties."

From the Vermont Chronicle, (Congregationalist.)

Pleasant Thoughts.

THE INHABITANTS OF HEAVEN WILL NOT ALL BE FROM ANY ONE RELIGIOUS SECT.

Whitfield on one occasion was addressed by a Quaker,—"Friend, I have been told thou has said there are no Quakers in heaven; is it true? Delaying his answer the preacher ascended the pulpit. Announcing no text he broke forth in rapid questioning.—"Father Abraham, are there any Episcopalians in heaven? No. Are there any Presbyterians? No.—Any Quakers? No. Any Baptists? No. 'There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.' Col. iii. 11."

1. This anecdote and text illustrate the fact that all denominational prejudices will be sunk, in heaven. That the love of Christ will so absorb all the heart, and mind and soul as to make these points of bitter earthly strife, wholly repulsive there. How does this Christian magnanimity light up that world with attractiveness. We see a glory given to it by this fact. We long to go, that we may find no narrow-mindedness, which will not recognize and admire the indwelling Spirit, because of certain outward differences about rites or doctrinal truths. Heaven could not be heaven if there were to be Congregationalists and Baptists, Churchmen and Dissenters there. For such separations are here always, at least incidentally, productive of walls and church castles. We are thankful that such cannot be "blown sky-high." They are earthly—they cannot reach the skies. I have thought sometimes that when any sect builds up higher walls than ordinary, to shut themselves safely up for heaven, and others safely out for perdition, or perhaps a stray, undiscovered chance of salvation, God comes down to introduce confusion among them, so splitting them up, that they are not quite sure which is left in possession of the "divine right" of the keys and battlements.

There is a leaven of division among Christians—but it is the leaven of wickedness. And it may be called by this name—"exclusive claims." It is always found in sinners—in everbody that has any sin. Whether he is a penitent or an impenitant sinner, it makes no difference. It is the spirit of selfishness which says, "I am right and you must come over to my side." Now in heaven we shall be emptied of self and filled full of Christ. We shall say, you are right, for you are on Christ's side—you have Christ's spirit—you are like him. It reminds us of that scene in Bunyan where every one having unconsciously become very beautiful, wonders at the ravishing beauty of the others,—a beauty which was exceedingly glorious, for it was Christ's beauty shining through.

On that mount of transfiguration we shall be so overpowered by the vision of the glory of Christ, when we "shall *see* Him," that our eyes will behold Him in every follower—every redeemed disciple.—How shall we then love one another, discovering "none but Christ" in each other.

But this was not the chief thought in our caption. We are ready enough to think that there will be no sects or separations in heaven, no other name being known but Christ's there. Now there is another thought included which is not so readily suggested. The other is good to soften asperities among those who call themselves Christians, but this last is still better.

II. There are followers and disciples of Christ among all sects—i. e., we are to believe this if we follow Bible suggestions. How easy it is to "forbid him because he followeth not with us"—but how wrong. What makes a Christian? This is the pith and core of the whole matter. What is it that brings one into a salvable state? Is it holding the doctrine of the Trinity? Is it holding to the proper divinity of Christ? Is it believing in eternal decrees? or the eternal punishment of some? Is it any doctrinal belief which thus far has given a name to any sect? If so then no man can be saved who is a Unitarian—none who is an Arminian—no one who is a Universalist. If we could venture on saying this we should be mad. It is not then a belief of any such doctrine which makes or unmakes a Christian. Again, who will affirm this of any mode of Baptism or other rite? You are an Episcopalian of the highest order; but you dare not say that dissenting Robert Hall did not enter heaven, or that Christ has no chosen ones among the unbaptized, unconfirmed martyrs of Madagascar, whose dying witness is yet fresh. No, no! Neither forms nor rites, neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, neither priestly baptism or lay baptism, neither plunging nor sprinkling, is anything in this matter of salvation.—One man is saved unbaptized, another having been immersed or sprinkled. There are hypocrites among those whom the Bishop has consecrated, who are good church members; and there are pure hearts, humble, trusting souls, who have never spoken with priest, pastor or church about their eternal life. Church membership, or the want of it, does not make a man Christ's. He may be a truly God-praising man, like Cornelius, the Centurion, who has never heard of Christ the Savior. And they may have been baptized already by the Holy Ghost, who "have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." And the Christian missionary reports "a man waiting for the coming of light," whose heart had evidently outrun his head on the way to God and heaven.

What then is it that makes a Christian, if it be neither belief of doctrine, technically so called, nor rites of any kind, nor membership in any visible church? What is that which enables us to predict of any man,—"he will *see* God"—which raises good expectation of his eternal life—which stamps him a Christian—a disciple?

A penitent heart before God. It is brokenness of spirit which in every case is the fitting for heaven.—A man may have grown up in Central Africa. The very name of God is unknown to him. It is not in his language. Will you say he cannot be saved? Is it certain he cannot see the Kingdom of God? Is it sure that he will be shut out? Go ye and learn what that meaneth. The Lord "dwelleth with him that is of an humble and contrite spirit." "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," and "the sacrifices of God are a broken heart and contrite spirit." Ah, Christians! the greatest faith in Christ's time came out of Syrophenicia, and out of the Roman army.

I love to think that the crowds of humble spirits that go up yearly are gathered from farthest India—from Central Africa, where some broken-spirited, sad eyed woman kneels, unseen by all but God, in "ignorant worship,"—as well as from civilized Europe and missionary America. I love to think that Christ has friends among all the children of earth, redeemed by His blood and sanctified by his Spirit; and that in heaven we shall trace the work of God on the hearts which felt and obeyed, but knew not the voice that spake. And when I meet a Baptist, or a Methodist, or an Episcopalian, or a Universalist, I will love him if he have the broken spirit. Difference of doctrine, of rite, shall not separate. "Let no man trouble me" or him, if only we "bear about in our body and spirit the dying of the Lord Jesus." I expect to meet him in heaven. Christ loves him; has not perhaps given him *all* knowledge; perhaps He has not given it all to me; but loves him. I will not be shut away from him whom my Lord has visited. Tell me not of his narrow prejudices, of his bigotry. I point to his brokenness of heart—this is my brother—we shall spend eternity together. I will try to teach and to learn with him of God. Inside that bigotry, there is a rich treasure of Christian love and Christian experience. Christ has made that heart his home—and Christ will be eternally the home of that heart.

"Has doctrine then no place? and rite no place?" Yes; in *winning* men, not in judging them. Some forms of truth are better calculated to win men than others to Christ, and they are to be taught; but doctrines and creedal beliefs will not be the dividing line at the Judgment.

What a large brotherhood have I! All who are in Christ Jesus—all who are broken-hearted before God—of whatever name, or if without name. For *from all sects*, from all tribes, from all languages, a great multitude shall be gathered. I will love them all.

S. C.

We find the following notice of the Rhode Island decision on their new Liquor Law, in the Greenfield Courier. We commend it to our readers:

MAINE LIQUOR LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL.—*Editors of Gazette and Courier*:—I saw in your paper of the 3d inst., an article headed 'The Rhode Island ('Maine') Liquor Law decided Unconstitutional.'" The article purported to be taken from the "Daily Republican." I was surprised that the Republican, a paper which is very well edited and is generally reliable, should suffer such an article to escape from their office. The conclusion to which the Republican arrives is not justified by the decision in that case; but is a word of encouragement in the ears of the enemies of the Maine Law in this State, and urging them to be of good cheer. Now what was the case tried and what was the decison. William H. Green, of New York, claimed to be the owner of a considerable quantity of intoxicating liquors deposited in Providence, and that Nathaniel M. Briggs, et. al., held possession of them unlawfully. The plaintiff brought his replevin and the defendants to justify under a complaint made and certain proceedings had before magistrates in Providence; to the record thus plead, the plaintiff demurs and the court decided the complaint *insufficient*. The judges decided the order of forfeiture invalid "because there was no sufficient complaint." The complaint being insufficient, as a matter of course, rendered all after proceedings void, *ab initio*. The court having decided the complaint insufficient, all further enquiries were at an end. If the complaint is void all proceedings had thereon are *coram non judice*. The judges say the complaint is defective "because the accused was not informed of the nature and cause of his accusation." And second, because of the "want of certainty in specifying the liquors to be seized." All other points decided in the case were *extra judicial* and not binding on that court or any other. I wonder how the Republican should suppose the court decided the Rhode Island law a violation of the Constitution of the United States. I am unable to learn from any report of that case that the Constitution of the United States was at all discussed or considered on that trial. The Constitution of Rhode Island was very fully and unnecessarily discussed. Allusions were made to usages before the Constitution was adopted. Even the *ghost* of the *old charter of Charles the Second* was called up from the *vasty deep* of the *Dorr rebellion*, and was invoked to testify to the *exalted privileges* enjoyed under its auspicious reign. The old charter having had the benefit of an airing and performed its mission was permitted to return to its lowly abode.—The conclusion of the Republican, "The Maine Liquor Law, so called, must be *abandoned*," is not justified by this decision, and the liquor law of Massachusetts is not necessarily affected. That the Maine law of Massachusetts will retain its principal features and have an abiding influence and increasing usefulness in the Commonwealth, I have no doubt.

Jan. 5th, 1853. MAINE LAW.

"THE LAWS OF LIFE," by Elizabeth Blackwell, M. D.—A series of lectures delivered to a class of Ladies during the past Spring, devoted to physical education, the conditions of health, and the correction of vicious habits. The subjects treated of in this volume are of the utmost importance. They relate to the moral and physical well being of the community.—Too often they are kept out of sight through negligence, or false delicacy. Quite as often are they discussed in a manner that repels intelligent readers by its grossness and charlatany. The present work is not only unexceptionable in this respect, but is a model of dignified and refined discussion. It evinces a thorough, scientific education, rare practical sense, and great breadth of observation, on the part of the distinguished authoress. Her statements are lucid and comprehensive, her counsels uniformly judicious, and her manner calm and self-possessed. She thinks clearly and writes well. We seldom meet with a scientific treatise that is more remarkable for clearness of method, soundness of reasoning, and profuseness and beauty of illustration. The work is presented as "the first fruits of the medical studies" of the authoress, who we predict will triumphantly substantiate her claims to an honored place in the medical profession. (12 mo. pp. 18g. George B. Putnam.)—*N. Y. Trib.*

WHY OUR TAXES ARE SO HIGH.—The following paragraph from the *Lowell Courier* may throw some light upon this important matter. Read it, citizens, tax-payers!—*Commonwealth.*

How to get up a Dinner without Regard to Expense.—The delegation from the city of Boston, who visited Gen. Pierce at Concord, a few days since, gave him a dinner at the new Eagle Hotel. A member of the New Hampshire Legislature writes, "Major Gibson had been notified by the Boston Committee a few days previous, to get up a dinner in the best style he could for eight or ten, without regard to the expense."

Now the Major is not to be outdone in a matter of this kind, and as the city of Boston was to foot the bill he thought he would let them know what could be done in New Hampshire. He accordingly took measures to procure all kinds of game, and every rare luxury that could be obtained, and after completing the department of the dinner, he went into the fancy line, spending about seventy-five dollars in the purchase of boquets of flowers, a single one of which was prized at ten dollars; the bill of fare provided for each one was eloborately adorned and printed on some very nice satin, and cost two dollars apiece, and everything else was of course on the same magnificent scale.—The bill for the whole dinner amounted to *four hundred dollars*, or fifty dollars apiece, and this is said to be exclusive of the wines used on the occasion, which probably amounted to fifty or a hundred dollars more.

RASCALITY.—A gang of rogues have recently been through the town of Northfield and Canterbury, N. H., buying butter at 28 cents per pound, and paying in bad money. They went from house to house, and when they found themselves in a family who appeared too sharp for their operations, they would get off by offering less than market prices. They scoured through the region for one day, took their load of butter to the Northfield depot, and when, on the next day, it turned up that they had given the unsuspecting farmers' wives large prices and small gains for their butter, it was found that both butter and purchasers had gone to parts unknown.—*Greenfield Courier.*

And so they Turned him Out.

Not because he was not a good teacher, but because he was a good one. His rules for government were just and wholesome. He had the whole school so classed that each scholar had his proper proportion of time and attention. At such a minute all attended to writing; and it was an offence to write at any other time. If one was three minutes too late for recitation, it was a dead loss to him never to be recovered. In short he had but two rules—*order and improvement*. But it was all new to the scholars. They said the teacher was precise, notional, rigid, contrary, independent, and they talked the matter over and got themselves united, strong and headlong. And the parents thought he had lost his influence; and so they turned him out.

The next teacher heard what their objections were to his predecessor, and took the opposite course. He was a sloven, and had no order. And what was worse, he could not work the examples in common arithmetic without a *key*. He was so unfortunate one day as to leave his key where the scholars got hold of it.—Soon the parents found it out. Some laughed about him, and others scolded. The teacher lost his influence; and so they cast *him* out.

The third teacher taught one month, and by that time the term was up and he went clear.

The next winter matters went on very much in the same way. The scholars grew confident and self-important. So one would get dissatisfied and talk the matter over with others. And when the parents saw there was disorder, and the scholars were united against the teacher, they would think the time and money of the district wasted; and so they turned them out.

But this year they have turned over a new leaf.—At their school meeting they put in but one Committee man. When the other proper business of the meeting was over, a Quaker arose and addressed the moderator something in the following style. "Moderator, it is well known here that we have got a bad year. We have all missed more than we ever did any year than we have kept. Ye know it; and I know it. But perhaps all are not aware of the reason.—For one I am perfectly satisfied of the cause of so much uproar about our schools and school teachers. And if ye will all be patient, I will reveal the secret.—*The scholars govern us.* I am persuaded there is more family government at the present day, much more than there was forty years ago. But, moderator, I must confess that this kind of government is chiefly in the hands of the children.

"Now I propose this winter that we take the government into our own hands. Let the committee exercise his own good discretion in the selection of a teacher. Let him set up a school as usual. And then the first scholar that rises up against the teacher, and is likely to make him any trouble, on being made known to the committee, let him cast *him* out of school. And I begin with my own scholars. I hereby call on the committee to see to it that if one of my sons or daughters becomes insubordinate or insurrectionary, turn him out, before the contagion spreads."

He sat down. Another man said, "Do just so to my children." And so it went round. Each for himself said—"Let us turn out no more teachers;—but if any question about turning out arises, first turn out the refractory scholar."

And now, though the committee have employed a female teacher, contrary to former practice, the school is going on well. Though there is nothing extraordinary in the teacher, yet all respect her. All the scholars are obedient, and speak a good word for her wherever they go. Nobody has been turned out, and nobody deserves it.—*Vt. Chronicle.*

Our sister Bloomer—whose nice little semi-monthly by the way is, 50 cents a year instead of $1—has come in a new form and put on a new head dress, on which occasion she speaks as follows:—

We take great pleasure in telling our readers that the neat head which adorns our first page was engraved by a *woman*. It is the work of Miss OLIVIA H. FRASER, of Elmira, N. Y., and we think will compare favorably with any similar work done by men. It does our heart good to see women thus competing with man in various occupation which he has hitherto considered exclusively his own. We doubt not Miss Olivia appears quite as modest while handling the engraver's tools, as she would idly lounging on a sofa in the parlor, weeping over the last new novel. And it is quite probable she feels as well satisfied with earning a man's wages at this business, as she would with the two or three shillings a day which she might earn by plying the needle within "her own appropriate sphere."

We now have women printers, women engravers, women daguerreotypists, women telegraph operators, and women priests—and we know not what else.—May their numbers increase.

Lucy Stone related an incident when here last fall, which it will not be amiss to relate in this connexion: She entered a cabinet shop somewhere in Mass., not long previous, and was surprised to see two women at work there. One was working at a turning lathe, getting out table legs—the other making draws for tables. She watched them for a time, "and," said she, "I did not see but the woman at the lathe turned the legs as neatly, and smoothly, as a man could do it. And the woman who made the drawers, struck the nail on the head as true, and finished her work as well, as a man could do it. I asked her if she liked the business. She said she did.', "To be sure," said she, "it makes our hands larger and harder, but I had rather have a hard hand with ten shillings a day in it, than a soft, delicate hand with two shillings a day."

This sentiment is being adopted by many women in our country. A hard hand and ten shillings a day, is a thing to be proud of. Let it prevail, and woman will not long be the dependent creature of former days, or be forced to marry for a home and support.—*Lily.*

SITTING ON A BLOCK IN CHURCH.—A young man was seen to enter church during service. He paused at the entrance; the congregation stared; he advanced a few steps, and calmly surveying the whole assembly, he commenced a deliberate march up the broad aisle. Not a pew-door was opened; the audience were too busy for civility. He wheeled, and in the same manner performed a march, stepping as if to Roslyn Castle, or to time of the Dead March in Saul, and disappeared. A few minutes after, he re-entered with a large block upon his shoulder, as much as he could well stagger under. His countenance was immovable. Again the good people stared, and half rose from their seats, with their books in their hands. At length he placed the block in the very centre of the principal passage, and seated himself upon it.—Then for the first time the reproach was felt. Every pew door in the house was instantly thrown open.—But no, the stranger was a gentleman, he came not there for disturbance; he moved not, he smiled not, but preserved the utmost decorum till the service was concluded; when he deliberately shouldered his block, and to the same low step bore it off, and placed it where he had found it. The congregation is now the most polite and attentive to strangers of any in America.—*Baltimore paper.*

State Temperance Society.

REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

JANUARY, 1823.

The Central Committee congratulate the members of this Society and the friends of the temperance cause, on the continued progress of this good work. The last annual meeting was characterized by earnest zeal to see the principles of the Maine Law—then comparatively new—incorporated with the laws of this State. We then saw other States moving toward the same object. In two of these the result has been attained. Other States, in the midst of defeat, are still confident of victory; and others still are waking to effort.

As the one great object of this Society was to secure the passage of a law similar to that of Maine, the Central Committee have directed their efforts to this single point. They early procured and circulated some twenty thousand copies of the Maine Law in all the Counties in the State. Efforts were made to secure the services of an efficient agent; and agreeably to instructions, application was made to Dr. Jewett, but the season was far advanced before a decided answer was obtained from him; and his constant services could *then* be secured for three or four weeks only previous to the session of the Legislature. As it seemed doubtful whether the Committee could make any general arrangements for so short a period, at that late day, they resolved to leave it to the several counties and towns to employ his services at their discretion, and gave notice accordingly. The Committee found no other lecturer at liberty whom they thought best to employ, and have commissioned no one.

The Committee appointed to draft a Bill to be presented to the Legislature, did not make their report to us until the last of August. This delay arose in part from a desire to see the result of efforts in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and to gain all the light which might result from action in those States. The Committee from the several Counties to revise this Bill were early called together, and had the Bill under consideration until the meeting of the Legislature. Of course your Committee had no opportunity to publish it.

A large number of forms of petitions were printed, and diligent effort made to furnish copies to every town and school district. Circulars were also sent out, calling attention to the duty of circulating these petitions diligently. The result was not all that your Committee had anticipated, but it has clearly indicated an earnest public sentiment in favor of prohibitory legislation.

The result of all is, that a law has been enacted, embracing the principles of the "Maine Law,"—conditioned, however, that it shall take effect on the second Tuesday in March next, unless a majority of the freemen of the State shall by their vote on the second Tuesday in February declare against it.

We have now a distinct issue before us: Shall the new law go into effect in March next, or shall it wait another opportunity for discussion before the Legislature? In the circumstances we do not regret this issue. Considering the feeble vote by which the Bill passed one branch of the Legislature—the uncandid and improper efforts to defeat it while the question was pending in the House—the opportunity now given to make a better showing for it at the ballot-box, ought not to be regretted. Add to this, the public mind is not so far enlightened and settled but that great good may result from the further agitation which will attend the approaching trial. A strong vote in February next will have great importance in fixing the new law upon a firm basis.

Can such a vote be secured? Is the law too far in advance of the public mind? Is it just? Is it constitutional? Is it extreme and tyranical legislation?—These are questions we must meet. Such things are affirmed of the new law. We are confidently told that this law presents a new feature in legislation—embodies new principles—is oppressive, unjust, and tyrannical, and in direct antagonism with the Constitution. We are not prepared for efficient action until we have fairly considered these charges and shown them to be unfounded and false.

The principles at the foundation of the law recently enacted, are these:

1st. The right to legislate in regard to the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

2d. The right to make laws entirely prohibiting the sale within certain prescribed limits.

3d. The right to enforce such prohibitory enactments, by adequate powers and penalties, the same as provided in other cases.

The law embraces no principles beyond or contrary to these, as we shall attempt to show in its place.—The principles above are most certainly involved in the law; and the question first to be considered is, Are they wrong, or liable to valid objection?

The first, viz: that this traffic is a proper subject for legislation, will not be called in question, any more by sober men. No one whose opinion is worth regarding, will so far stultify himself as to contest a point which is settled by every Legislature in the land, and universally acquiesced in by the people. It is acknowledged by all the laws which pertain to the importation of spirituous liquor; by all the statutes which relate to "licensing" public houses to sell it; and by all the enactments in the several States regulating the sale.

2. The second principle contained in this law is,—the right to make laws entirely prohibiting the sale within specified limits. This is certainly no new principle. It is old as the first enactment authorizing "licenses." Every such law has prohibited the sale within certain specified limits, and granted the right only to a certain few, and this for lawful purposes only. More than this the law in question does not propose to do. It provides amply for the sale for all needful purposes, and prohibits all the rest; and further, it does not prohibit the *use*, but only the *sale*.

The principle in its application to this subject has been declared right and conformable to the Constitution of the United States, by the highest judicial authority. In this all the judges of the Supreme Court are unanimous—that, "If any State deems the retail and internal traffic in ardent spirits injurious to its citizens, and calculated to produce illeness, vice, or debauchery, there is nothing to prevent it from *prohibiting it altogether*, if it thinks proper.

This principle is just and righteous. "Society has a right to protect itself—has a right to put a stop to any evil. The right is inherent in the organization. It is always acted on. If it were not so, the attempt to organize civil society would be a farce." The enactment of laws, the affixing of penalties to laws, the institution of courts, the establishment of police and military force, all proceed on the principle that society has the right to protect itself so as to secure the ends of organization. And this right clearly extends to every thing where injury or wrong would be done; to everything that would affect the good order of society, its safety, its prosperity, its existence. It is on this principle that society legislates against lotteries, against gaming, against counterfeiting the public coin, against drunkenness, against poisonous or corrupted drugs, against any employment that in its nature tends to endanger the public health, peace, or morals.

Such legislation should always be *against* evil, never *for* it. Society has no right to protect evil by law. The law is designed to suppress evil, not to protect it.

So also society has no right to attempt to *regulate* evil by law. This is not the province of law: to *remove* evil is its purpose. That such attempts have been made is not denied; but the adoption of such a principle in legislation, is the extreme of absurdity. What would this community say, if the Legislature in their wisdom should frame laws on the principle that murder, and adultery, and theft were only to be *regulated*, not *suppressed*, by law? Murder to be prohibited except in certain circumstances, and adultery permitted by a certain privileged few, under proper restrictions! And on the same principle that the evil of licentiousness was to be so *regulated* by law as to allow but one house of infamy in a town, licensed under proper checks and with suitable security in regard to the moral character of those engaged in the business! Apply the principle to any acknowledged evil, and its absurdity appears. Admit a thing to be wrong and evil, and the law can do nothing rightfully but suppress it. And this is what is now done in regard to lotteries, and horse-racing, and gaming, and arson, and murder, and adultery, and polygamy; and why should not the same *be* done in relation to the sale of intoxicating liquors? which is, confessedly, productive of more evil than all these combined.

Society has the right to abate nuisances, to prohibit property from being used so as to create them, and if need be, to destroy property when it is so used.

It is laid down by Kent in his Commentary on American law, that "the government may by general regulation, interdict such uses of property as would create nuisances, and become dangerous to the lives, or health, or peace, or comfort of the citizens. Unwholesome trades, slaughter-houses, operations offensive to the senses," (rumselling, is surely all these) "the deposit of gunpowder, the building with combustible materials, and the burial of the dead, may be interdicted by law, in the midst of dense masses of population, on the general and national principle, that every person ought so to use his property as not to injure his neighbor, and that private interest must be made subservient to the general interest of community."

It follows incontestibly, from these principles, that the traffic in intoxicating liquors to be used for drink—being fraught with evil and danger at all times and in all places, may of right, and should in all justice, be entirely prohibited.

3d. We come now to the third principle, which embraces all that is peculiar to the new Law—the right to enforce prohibitory enactments by adequate powers and penalties, the same as provided in other cases. The essential defect in the law now in force is, that it wants the power and efficiency which are necessary, and such as are granted by other statutes. The law against counterfeiting, for example, gives authority to search for counterfeit money, and tools and implements; it makes the presence of these in suspicious circumstances, *prima facia* evidence of guilt; and it authorizes the breaking up of counterfeiting establishmentss by the seizure of all which belongs to the unlawful trade. Without such authority the law would be a nullity, and counterfeiting would be as common as rumselling. Suppose the law against counterfeiting modeled after the pattern of the existing law on the subject of temperance, giving authority to apprehend and punish only such as are convicted of making or passing their goods, and then only by a fine of ten dollars;—and suppose the principle carried out, making the counterfeiter's establishment safe from search or seizure; what would be the effect? A man might be fined every day in the year, and still find a lucrative business. Such fines would be regarded as a mere mockery of justice, so long as he was protected in the undisturbed possession of his implements, and enjoyed the opportunity to manufacture as much as he pleases. It would hardly occur to him—or to any one in fact—that such a law was really meant to be prohibitory; and all can see that, practically, it never could be prohibitory. Power to search and seize and confiscate, is granted by the law for the simple purpose of making it prohibitory, and because these were deemed indispensible to such a result.

But no such power is granted by the "Liquor Law" now in force. If a man is convicted of selling, he can be fined ten dollars, but his establishment may not be touched, and when he has paid his fine, he is all furnished to proceed with his unlawful business as before. Now is it right that the same power to search and seize and confiscate be granted by this law as by the law against counterfeiting? The answer to this question must depend upon two things—*the importance of the law—and the necessity of such power to make it effective.* For, since the right to make a prohibitory law on this subject is clearly established, it is but simple justice to give it equal efficiency with other laws of like importance.

Is it then so important to prohibit the manufacture and sale of spirituous liquors for drinking purposes, as it is to prohibit "smuggling goods;" or making counterfeit money; or pocket picking? The proper rule by which to judge the importance of a law, is by the evil it is adapted to prevent, and the benefit it is designed to secure. That "smuggling goods" is an evil, no one denies. It deprives the state of a portion of her revenue. The public are consequently satisfied that such goods should be searched for, seized and confiscated, and this too without warrant, dwelling houses excepted. Counterfeiting, also, is an evil, because it tends to depreciate the established currency. It endangers no man's life, but it weakens the public confidence. It is therefore *perfectly right* to enter the house of a counterfeiter, search his premises, seize and confiscate his tools and implements, and to imprison the offender. These stringent measures are abundantly justified by the evils resulting from the business.

But are the evils resulting from the manufacture and sale of spirituous liquors, as great as those resulting from smuggling goods? Are they as great as the counterfeiter produces? If so the law is as important, and should furnish as great powers and penalties. What then is the fact?

Does it not seem like insulting your understandings to institute a comparison? What! compare the loss of a little revenue with the loss of thirty thousand American citizens annually, together with the evils arising from three hundred thousand living drunkards, with all the wretchedness, and crime of every name, and poverty and vagrancy that belong to them! There is no comparison. All the revenue of the land, would not tempt one of us to suffer what a single drunkard suffers. The *sum* of the evil defies computation.—"There is no property that so certainly and so uniformly works evil in community, as that which is employed in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks; and all the capital on the face of the earth, invested in contraband goods, and counterfeiter's tools, and damaged hides, and corrupted drugs, and tainted butcher's meat, is not doing an appreciable quantity of the mischief that is done by the property which is invested in this business." Measured by the evil to society which this law is designed to remove, and the good it would accomplish by removing this evil, it has no parallel in importance. And by what other standard shall we measure its importance? Not surely by the degree of malice in him who breaks it.—He may be as free from malicious intent as the smuggler, and yet the evil be as great, and call as loudly for removal. It is the evil actually done, which gives