Sec. 14. It shall be the duty of any mayor, alderman, or selectman, assessor, city marshal or deputy, or constable, if he shall have information that any intoxicating liquors are kept or sold in any tent, shanty, hut, or place of any kind for selling refreshments in any public place, on or near the ground of any cattle show, agricultural exhibition, military muster or public occasion of any kind, to search such supected place, and if such officer shall find upon the premises any intoxicating drinks, he shall seize them, and arrest the keeper or keepers of such place, and take them forthwith, or as soon as may be, before some justice or judge of a municipal or police court, with the liquors so found and seized, and upon proof that said liquors are intoxicating, that they were found in the possession of the accused, in a tent, shanty, or other place as aforesaid, he or they shall be sentenced to imprisonment in the county jail for thirty days, and the liquors so seized shall be destroyed by order of said justice or judge.

Sec. 15. If any person arrested under the preceding section, and sentenced as aforesaid, shall claim an appeal before his appeal be allowed, he shall give a bond in the sum of one hundred dollars, with two good and sufficient sureties, that he will prosecute his appeal and pay all fines, cost and penalties, which may be awarded against him. And if on such appeal the verdict of the jury shall be against him, he shall, in addition to the penalty awarded by the lower court, pay a fine of twenty dollars. In all cases of appeal under this act from the judgment of a justice or judge of any municipal or police court, to the district court, except where the proceeding is by action of debt, they shall be conducted in said district court by the prosecuting officer of the government—and said officer shall be entitled to receive all costs taxable to the State, in all criminal proceedings under this act, in addition to the salary allowed to such officer by law—but no costs shall be remitted or reduced by the prosecuting officer or the court. In any suit, complaint, indictment, or other proceeding against any person for violation of any of the provisions of this act, other than for the first offence, it shall not be requisite to set forth particularly the record of a former conviction, but it shall be sufficient to alledge briefly, that such person was convicted of a violation of the fourth section of this act, or as a common seller, as the case may be; and such allegation in any civil or criminal process in any stage of the proceedings, before final judgment, may be amended without terms and as a matter of right.

Sec. 16. All payments of compensation for liquors sold in violation of law, whether in money, labor or other property, either real or personal, shall be held and considered to have been received in violation of law, and without consideration, and against law, equity and good conscience; and all sales, transfers, conveyances, mortgages liens, attachments, pledges, and securities of every kind, which either in whole or part, shall have been for or on account of spirituous or intoxicating liquors, shall be utterly null and void against all persons and in all cases, and no rights of any kind shall be acquired thereby; and in any action either at law or equity, touching such real or personal estate, the purchaser of such liquors may be a witness for either party. And no action of any kind shall be maintained in any court in this State, either in whole or in part for intoxicating or spirituous liquors sold in any other State or country whatever, nor shall any action of any kind be had or maintained in any court in this State, for the recovery or possession of intoxicating or spirituous liquors, or the value thereof.

Sec. 17. All the provisions of this act relating to towns shall be applicable to cities and plantations; and those relating to selectmen shall also be applied to the mayor and aldermen of cities, and assessors of plantations.

Sec. 18. The act entitled "an act to restrict the sale of intoxicating drinks," approved August sixth, one thousand, eight hundred and forty-six, is hereby repealed, except the thirteen sections from section ten to section twenty-two, inclusive, saving and reserving all actions or proceedings, which are already commenced by authority of the same, and all other acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act, are hereby repealed. This act to take effect from and after its approval by the governor.—*Approved June 2, 1851.*

Meeting of the Sons of Liberty,

In the Grove near Samuel Rankins, on the 23d ult.

On motion, JAMES J. MURPHEY was appointed President, and DAVID BLAKELY and JAMES GREENELCH, Vice Presidents, and ALFRED LLOYD Sec'y.

On motion, Wilson James, Jacob Ward, Samuel Rankin, Lorenzo Murphey, and Charles Smith, were appointed a committee on Resolutions. It was

Resolved, That the speech spoken by ROBERT HEANEY, be published in both county papers.

The committee on resolutions reported, and the following resolutions were adopted:

When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political connexion that unites them to another, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the reasons that impel them thereto. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are by nature free and equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and for the protection of those rights governments were instituted among men. And whereas, a certain class of men have banded themselves together under the imposing name of Sons of Temperance throughout the length and breadth of this land, who are promulgating political dogmas not in accordance with sound republicanism, and not in accordance with the precepts of christianity. And to prove all which let facts be submitted to a discerning world. They have sought to foster on us unconstitutional laws and ordinances, in direct violation of our reserved rights. They are seeking by legislative enactments to make the manufacture and sale of wine and other alcoholic liquors a penal offence, punishable by fine and imprisonment. Seeking to do what neither Moses or the Prophets ever done. What neither Christ or the Apostles ever done. What no civilized nation on earth ever done; and what no lawgiver, either civilized or savage ever done, save and except Mahomet, he propagated his doctrines at the point of the sword. They wish to propagate theirs by law, fines and the dungeon. They have laid aside the book of Divine revelation, and professed ministers of the Gospel have united with the scoffer at religion, the infidel, the sceptic, the gambler, the profane swearer and the libertine, and are stumping the State to procure a majority in our State councils, pledged to carry out their designs. They have excited mobs to destroy the property of citizens and foreigners, to the disgrace of the American character and to the subversion of law and order.

They have in their zeal excited silly females to disgrace their sex by turning mobocrats, thereby bringing reproach upon the church to which they belong, and to the scandal of female purity. They have had the insolence to stigmatize all who will not subscribe to their dogmas, as Drunkards, Grogsellers, Rumsuckers, Tipplers, Calathumpians, Anarchists, &c., with all the slang and billingsgate ever concocted in Pandamonium itself. Therefore for these reasons, as well as for well-grounded suspicions of the purity of their motives, we, the Sons of Liberty, must of a necessity, dissolve all political connection with such persons, and we do hereby declare ourselves absolved from all obligations connecting us politically, with them, either as Whigs or Democrats. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That while we re-affirm our determination to support no man for office who is not known to be opposed to the passage of the Maine Law, and in favor of the repeal of the law of last winter, giving Trustees of townships power to pass ordinances That we further

Resolved, That we will not support any man for office who is not known to be temperate and worthy of the support of all good citizens.

Resolved, That as we have been misrepresented by both Sons of Temperance and their champions, both cowardly and malignantly, we now declare and do honestly believe, we number as many temperance men in our ranks, pro rata, as the Divisions of the Sons of Temperance do.

Resolved, That while we oppose the passage of the Maine Law, or any law similar thereto, to prohibit the sale of wine and other alcoholic liquors, in this State, we are in favor of Constitutional laws to guard against evils arising from the indiscriminate sale thereof.

Resolved, That we believe that if our so-called temperance friends would apply their time, their talents and their money, to the educational improvement and mental culture, the children and youth under their charge, teaching them the truths of Christianity, their duty to their parents, their neighbors and their God, they would do more good, and be more likely to effect a change in public morals, than by spying out their neighbors' faults and follies.

The meeting then adjourned to meet on Saturday, 13th of August, in the Grove, near Gen. Hoover's in Union township, at 10 o'clock, P. M.

JAMES J. MURPHEY, Pres't.
DAVID BLAKELY,
JAMES GREENELCH, Vice Pres'ts.
ALFRED LLOYD, Sec'y.

ADDRESS

OF ROBERT HEANEY, Sr.,

Delivered at a meeting of the Sons of Liberty, held in the Grove near Samuel Rankins, in Kirkwood township, on Saturday, the 23d of July, 1853.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: I feel that I owe an apology to this audience, you, or the greater portion of you, are well aware I that make no pretensions to being a public speaker; my habits of life have been that of a thinker and not a talker, consequently I have never cultivated the flowers of Oratory, you will therefore have to be the more liberal in your allowances, both as to the matter and the manner in which I shall address you.

We are met in accordance with the call of your central committee, appointed at a previous meeting held in this place, to consult together, & to have an interchange of sentiments in respect to the best means to be adopted to arrest the encroachments of certain would be reformers of the present day, upon our reserved and inalienable rights; the encroachments of men who, by their action clearly demonstrate, that they believe mankind, (or at least that portion of them who do not see through their spectacles,) are not rational intelligencies, and therefore, like animals, they should be yoked and lettered. I say they by their action, yea, they say orally, we cannot govern ourselves—we cannot govern our appetites, thereby giving the lie to the theory and practice of our republican forefathers, as well as to the precepts taught us by our old respected mothers. My position has always been that the force of public opinion, properly directed, is all powerful in correcting the abuses of society, hence my unbelief in legislative enactments to carry out a moral reform. But there are a class of Moralists in these days who are ever striving to make the world believe they are great reformers, and if it were not for them, and their labors, nations would be hurled from existence, and ruin and anarchy prevail; and among these we find some of the weakest and most self-conceited portion of community, yet these do good occasionally, by showing us how dangerous it is to place power in the hands of such individuals, Now I hold you cannot legislate morals into a people, if the moral sense, of a community does not condemn error the statute book cannot eradicate it; laws may restrain but never did reform. There are a great many excesses in life, and many are disposed to indulge in them, liquor, if taken in excess, will do harm, none deny it, so will excess in eating, and so will excess in many other things, and Nature punishes man for all excesses, she speaks to him in the most powerful language; be temperate, be chaste, or excess of intemperance and voluptuousness will destroy thy being. Nature wills that vice and intemperance shall ever be their own punishment, and that virtue and temperance shall never go unrewarded. No one denies that intemperance is the great bane of the human family, but will your ordinance, or your Maine law, put a stop to it? never; so long as there are buyers there will be sellers, this is as clear as any demonstration in Mathematics. I have said you cannot legislate morals into a people, if you can, you can also legislate religion.—If it is effectual in the one case it is equally so in the other, then I would say to you let us legislate religion into all the world, but unfortunately, poor, short sighted Bigotry, and Fanaticism, her twin sister, have tried centuries gone by and failed, just as our would be reformers will ever fail while following in the same paths. What kindled the fires of Smithfield? What erected the Inquisition with all its horrors? In a word what shed the blood of all the Martyrs?—It was all the effect of legislating morals and religion into the people. Witness the blue laws of Connecticut, the laughing stock of all who read them, which fined a man for kissing his wife on the sabbath day, or for taking a chew of tobacco; which punished women for scolding by ducking them; these had their origin from all the ridiculous attempts to legislate morals into that community. But our reformers are more blind than they for these have the example of their failure before them. And by whom were these sanguinary and absurd laws concocted? Shall I say it, by Bigots, Demagogues, Fanatics and Fools, both in Morals, Religion and Politics.—But I will do justice to the temperance reform movement. While it had for its only weapon moral suasion it was all powerful in doing good I witnessed its operation; many of my neighbors who used to keep their barrel of Whiskey by them, and furnish it to their laboring hands who thought they could not treat a friend with proper hospitality unless they set the bottle before them all silently and quietly laid aside the custom, thereby paying due respect to public opinion. And what say these same men now, when temperance men have abandoned the old ground and adopted the harsh doctrine of legal suasion? Why these same men say: you may lead us but drive us never; we now behold in this your course the first step towards despotism, while you profess only to be aiming a blow at the unscrupulous vender, you are striking at the very roots of the tree of liberty, which we cherish and adore; in the name of common sense cannot you reach the venal and corrupt without breaking the shins of the upright and honest.

But temperance men, professed reformers I mean, have abandoned their old platform, as I always believed they would. I have been often solicited to join the old Washingtonians, so called, but I always kept aloof & when strong & plausible arguments were used to induce me to join to add my influence to theirs, my reply invariably was, the world here had the influence of my example, I was a rigid temperance man before your reform began; though I have all confidence in your honesty of purpose now, I doubt not the time will come when you will be asking for legislation to aid you in your purposes. This was utterly disclaimed. I said, unprincipled men will get among you who will take the lead. Who regarding nothing else but their own aggrandizement will make it a hobby to ride into office and power and will rush you and your cause into the abyss that will destroy all the bright prospects you have pictured to your view. Is not that prediction being verified? I also promised that so long as they continued on their then proposed platform, (moral suasion,) though I would not become a member I would not lay a straw in their way, but so soon as they began to ask for legislation to coerce men, I undoubtedly would oppose them, and I now feel it obligatory on me to redeem that pledge, but have procrastinated the time longer than I should have done, for I will confess I felt reluctant, lest I should say or do something that would have a tendency to appear as though I sanctioned intemperance, or at least give occasion for zealots to say so. But when legislators yield to the importunities of those who would move Heaven and earth to acomplish their designs, whose zeal is without knowledge. When legislators I say yield to such importunities, and pass laws of such doubtful authority, and of such doubtful tendencies—as the law of last winter, giving legislative powers to Trustees of Townships, (which brings to mind the saying; if you put a Monkey in a china shop it can do no good and may do much harm,) and they, like the Trustees of Kirkwood township, or I should have said a majority of them mistaking the word may for must, have entered upon the duties with a zest only known to those, (who like the swearer who changed coats with the old Quaker, he did not swear any while he had it on, but he had an eternal itching to cheat somebody,) our Trustees entered upon the duty with a gusto only known to those who felt an eternal itching to have the world, and all the rest of mankind to know that such shining lights, such brilliant scholars, such profound legislators as John H Johnson and Jesse C. Cowgill, hailed from Kirkwood Township, and that they could not only enact an ordinance, but could say what should be deemed the meaning of the statute, also,—hence I believe the time has come that, I with every other man who is opposed to such legislation, should lay aside all scruples and unite and say to those who advocate such legislations: if you have a right by law to say to us what we shall drink, you have the same right to say to us what we shall eat, what we shall wear and what we shall believe, from all of which we beg leave to dissent. It is to the principle of the thing we object, we are not the advocates of intemperence no more than they are, yet we have some confidence in our abilities to keep sober.—And I wo'ld respectfully ask if there are any here who are advocates of legal sussion; what induced you to forego, to renounce the use of spirituous or fermented liquor? Was it the effect of laws and ordinances passed, either by the general assembly, or by trustees of townships, or was it of your own free volition, an effort of the will guided in its decision by reason, that Heavenly attribute that distinguishes men from the brute.

Then in the name of liberty, in the name of common sense, in the name of all that is dear to freemen, and in the name of God himself, leave us to be guided in our choice as you have been. We are rational creatures, fashioned by the same almighty hand that you were, endowed with all those heavenly aspirations that makes man immortal; then why arrogate to yourselves the especial guardianship of the public morals—why in effect say to us, as we have constituted ourselves your especial guardians we will hedge you in lest you do something hurtful to yourselves, your neighbor, or corrupt the morals of the rising generation. And who, I pray, you, are those who set themselves up as the special friends of temperance—how many of them my friends, have you beheld what the sailors call three sheets in the wind—how many of them have been engaged in the manufacture or sale of this life destroying poison, (as they call it,) and yet will have the arrogance to set themselves up as models of temperance, and who have the impudence, not to call it by any harsher name, to call all those (who do not subscribe to their creed,) Drunkards, Tipplers, Grogsellers, Rumsuckers, Anarchists, High priests of Bacchus, Calathumpians, with all the epithets that the lowest billingsgate slang can invent—to call men by those names, men who never breathed any thing else but sober breath all their days, yet because these men see or at least honestly believe they do, a blow aimed at both civil and religious liberty, covertly aimed by a class of men banded together under the imposing name of Sons of Temperance, and because they feel it to be their right and duty as freemen, to point to where they believe they see the danger and to ask for a strict regard to be had to their reserved rights, and to warn the public that they will not suffer those rights to be trampled on with impunity. Why sirs, all the malignancy that was ever concocted in Hell itself must be poured out on them.

But let me say to you that it is my firm conviction that all the human legislation enactments can ever be passed will not lessen the quantity of intoxicating liquors drank. The spirit of hostility implanted in the breast of every man to anything like an impertinent interference of one part of community, with the conventional notions of the balance, no matter how pure their motives, no matter from whence it emanates, it will meet with that contempt it justly deserves; it has a tendency to awaken hostility to its authors and their purposes, and reaction is the consequence, and your temperance cause will retrograde more rapidly than it ever advanced, and I will say to you now, the present step so far overleaping the bounds of prudence has placed the temperance cause far behind what it was one year ago. Now there are a large portion of our citizens who drink wine, beer, or other liquors, who are yet to be convinced they are doing any hurt, either to themselves or neighbors; they know the ablest and most talented men in the land drink, the most shining lights of all ages drank in moderation, and I will neither justify or condemn them for it, but one thing is certain, men will drink and no power on earth can prevent it; then I would say to you all—confine your efforts to mitigate the evil which I do believe it is vain, yea childish, to seek to destroy. What effect will your ordinance or your Maine law either have on community? Those of us who are yet to be convinced that the temperate use of wine or, alcholic liquors is wrong, and are not willing to be gagged: why sirs we will needs bring it home by the quantity to our domestic firesides, and there familiarize our wives and children to its use. I tell you, my temperance friends, men will not suffer themselves to be choked out of even a mere folly. But while man had faith in man, the principles of moral suasion were considered all sufficient to reform the basest Drunkard, or the most determined dealer, all must admit the arm of intemperance was palsied—distilleries vanished before that truly christian remedy.—But men; christians have not only lost faith in man, but faith in God and his revelation. They now tell us we must have something else, what that something else is, the Kirkwood township ordinance discloses—the Statute book—whose principles are coercion and of man's originating. Think ye professing christians of laying aside, the command to overcome evil with good, and of adopting the doctrine that if thy brother err imprison him. Is this the doctrine of christian temperance men—men who have given up the command of God and the Bible as having spent its force, and embraced the law of man and the Statute book, fines and the dungeons as the most potent remedy for sin. But we live in a great age, the age of Spiritual rapping and spiritual manifestation. The age of temperance reformers, and I may add; the age of ordinances. We have outlived the age of good old fashioned Republicanism, the days of old fashioned christianity, when they believed it to be their right and enjoyed the privilege of worshipping God according to the dictates of their own conscience, when men looked upon the word of divine revelation as the only rule of faith and practice; when men considered the Bible as all sufficient to guide and direct them in all truth, and the preaching of the gospel of Jesus as all powerful in the conversion of sinners. But it is written, God made man upright; but he has sought out many inventions, (wonder if the Kirkwood ordinance be one of them,) ever since the time old Noah drank too freely of the juice of the grape, alcoholic liquors have injured society, now Noah was the first man we have any record of getting tipsy, yet he was the only man thought fit to be saved from the general deluge and although he got drunk God never forbid the manufacture of wine. And there was Lot, Abraham's brother's son, the only man saved at the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah to whom Angels were sent that his life might be spared—he no sooner got to a secure place than he got drunk, yet the God of Noah and of Lot, never passed a Maine law, or a Kirkwood township ordinance either. And I will say to my temperance friends the advocates of the Maine law I mean, that within the lids of the Bible they cannot point to one passage where the temperate use of Wine is forbidden, yea ever forbidden as a beverage.

Now I wish it to be clearly understood by this audience, and I wish the Sons of Temperance to mark the fact, that we Sons of Liberty do not advocate intemperance no more than they are, tho' we do not profess to be as self-righteous.—We hold the doctrine as taught by Christ and his Apostles be temperate in all things, (even when we persecute our neighbors,) we also hold that the Legislature of the State have the right to pass laws to guard against the evils resulting from the indiscriminate sale of spirituous, and fermented liquors, but not to delegate legislative powers to trustees of townships. We also believe the power to pass a Maine law or any law to prohibit the sale of said liquors is not given in that instrument the Constitution.—And I as a Son of Liberty, do honestly believe that if the vender deserves punishment, the drinker to excess is doubly so.

I will now pay slight notice to a communication signed A. O. Z. published in the Chronicle of the 1st ult. It is headed in large letters "The liquor meeting at Hendrysburgh." A lie to begin with. And what might not be expected from such beginning, and that lie told willfully, knowing it to be such. I speak plain, I always try to do so. There was no meeting with in three miles of Hendrysburgh on that day, unless the Sons of Temperance met. I believe they did meet that evening. I am really glad the author had so much sense of shame left as to hide his real name, and to skulk behind a fictitious cognomen; but like the Ass in the fable, who dressed himself in the Lion's skin, still the ears would stick out. What a Mares nest he found, and how he cackled over the eggs. This is a phrase we old backwoods folks used when men laugh at their own conceits, or when they have nothing to laugh at.) Now if Mr. A. O. Z. had cast his eye over the proceedings of our meeting, as published in the Gazette & Citizen, he there would have made the discovery that what tickled his fun so much was nothing more nor less than an error or omission of the typesetters of the Chronicle, that would not only have dissipated all his joys, but it would have saved him of making that foolish egotistical and ungentlemanly remark: "We are not guilty of the folly of expecting entire accuracy of expression from the advocates of the liquor traffic." Now, fellow citizens, this "same said A. O. Z, (as Squire Johnson would express it.) is, I am informed, a citizen of Hendrysburgh, and a merchant whom many of us patronize, who has not only set himself up as a critic but a stigmatizer of all those who attended the meeting here on the 18th of last month, as fighting for the privilege of getting drunk. And then what criticism—what garbling—what misconstruction, and what false issues he makes. But when the beginning is deliberate falsehood we could expect no less. He says what you resolve is more important, well, perhaps it is. We have resolved that we will support no man for office who is in favor of the Maine law; now it so happens that A. O. Z. is a Son of Temperance, and in favor of said law, and perhaps aspires to the office of Grogmaster general, as he is an old hand at the retail business. It is not my intention to obey the old proverb of: "Answer a fool according to his folly," but I will say that when A. O. Z., penned his article he must have been one of two things: either drunk or insane, for I can hardly believe any man who was sane and sober, could or would have penned it. Hear what he says, and then judge. Ye "Worthy sons of revolutionary sires how discerning is your perception of parallel cases, your fathers rebelled against foreign legislation, you rebel against the legislation of your Township, and State, who in all this age of wonders ever heard of townships legislating. Well, Mr. A. O. Z, we are indebted to you for a new wrinkle. Again he says, you fight for the privilege of getting drunk. What gentlemanly what sublime language to come from such a refined Son of Temperance.—Could Pope have the counterpart of A. O. Z, before him when he wrote his Dunciad. Hear what he says of such critics:

"Nonsense precipitate like running lead
Then slipped through crags and zigzags through his head,
Or if, to wit a coxcomb makes pretence,
Guard the sure barrier between that and common sense,
Or quite unravel all the reasoning thread
And hang some curious cobwebs in its stead."

Pope then describes the goddess dullness addressing the critics, her children at a place called fleet ditch, where all the filth from the sewers of London were carried off:

"Here strip my children, here at once leap in,
Here from who best can dash through thick and thin,
Here prove who most in love of dirt excel
Or dark dexterity of groping well,
Who flings more filth and wide polutes around,
The stream be his, the weekly journa's bound."

It would seem from the quotation taken from our school books as though A. O. Z. had read some account of the French revolution. Cannot his beclouded understanding take a lesson therefrom, what did the French do? They beheaded a King and crowned an Emperor. Cannot these bigotted reformers there behold their own face as in a glass? But A. O. Z. finds a terrible bugbear in that resolution where we resolve to oppose at the ballot box all laws and ordinances whether gotten up by bigots, demagogues, fanatics or fools, having for their object the abridgement of our personal liberties. "Do you mean gentlemen that you will have no abridgement of your personal liberties? Yes friend, we most earnestly meant all that, do you on all occasions utter such nonsense as that, or is it only when advocating the liquor traffic you lose your senses? Do you respect the rights of property? Do you happen to know of such a relation as husband and wife, and does that relation impose any abridgment of your personal liberties?"—Poor fellow, how I pity him, yet as I am an old Bachelor it cannot be expected that I could as fully sympathize with him as one who is placed in similar circumstances, for I can still sing

Funny and free are a bachelors reveries,
Cherrily, merrily passes his life,
Nothing knows he of connubial devilries,
Troublesome children or clamorous wife.

Now it may be that A. O. Z. has lost his pants, and that the grey mare is the better horse, which is the occasion of that idea of abridgment of personal liberty entering into his mind, and I would here bespeak for him the sympathies of this audience. Now I would say to this learned critic that we were sane men when we passed that resolution, and that he may rest easy on that score, and when men of sense judge us we will at least bear comparision with A. O. Z. or the learned Squire. Are his perceptive faculties so small or is his understanding so much perverted, that he cannot discriminate between those rights we have surrendered and those retained.—Well then let me say to him & all who are likely to be led astray by his sophistry: all those rights & privileges which we the people of the State of Ohio have delegated to the State government for the express purpose of having those retained, protected, are ours personally, no longer, but belong to the body politic to the public collectively. But those retained are ours personally and against any abridgment of these we war, and will defend, personally and collectively defend, and neither bigots, demagogues, fanatics or fools, shall filch them from us; no matter what the pretext is made to hide the usurpation, no matter what garb its authors see fit to clothe the banding in. But he says we have regulations, and still the ruin runs, yes and so it will run; if you could dry up the sources of the Mississippi you might cut off the stream below, our professed temperance reformers begin to dam the stream in the middle and all the effect they produce is to inundate the surrounding country, would they not do more good by guiding the stream by canals and ditches, removing the drift and let the stream flow smoothly along, doing the least possible injury until such times as the scales are removed from their blinded understandings, and then they will be enabled to discover the fault and fruitful source of all the mischief lies at their and our own doors.

In our failing to give the proper bias and discretion to the will and understanding of the rising generation, you all recollect what the wise man said: "train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it; but I suppose A. O. Z. believes he is a greater giant in intellect than Solomon, and that he and those who act with him, can like Botts of Virginia, who tried to head John Tyler, they believe they can head God Almighty.

I will give A. O. Z. credit for one truth, one only, that is we were not bigots, demagogues, fanatics or fools for which we feel thankful, and hope we never may be. I ought to give him some praise as a preacher, but then I recollect 'tis said the Devil can preach; I believe he did once to old Mother Eve, and for the same end—deception. I would advise A. O. Z. to leave the Z off from his signature, and substitute the letters L. S. it would then stand A. O. L. S. the initials of an old liquor seller.

I now if you will bear with me a little longer pay a passing compliment to the article in the same paper signed John H. Johnson, lest he should feel jealous and think that he was slighted, and I have no desire that he should have any occasion to let his ebenezer rise. Now we have a man of that name who hails from Kirkwood, Justice of the Peace, (God save the mark,) Trustee and Pettifogger, whom you recollect attended our meeting here on the 18th of last month, and who was so big with speech that he was in pain to be delivered, and when like the mountain in labor all looked for a giant to come forth behold out crept a mouse. I suppose this to be "that same said Johnson who came here to intimidate, yea, to annihilate us poor Sons of Liberty who had the audacious temerity to meet, and dare to express our disapprobation of the doings of the majority of the board of Trustees of Kirkwood township, of which this "same said Johnson is a member. You recollect he would not wait for the committee on resolutions to report, or until he was censured by the meeting for the part he took in the passage of his celebrated Ordinance, of whom he is the reputed father, (worthy child of such a father) though some express their doubts of its legitimacy. He like one who is self-condemned, asks to be heard speak, to be heard speak too at what he calls a grogseller's meeting, and O, what thundering, what towering eloquence, as the old Dutch woman said: "how he tid make his fists town—Peeples might tout he was quarrelling and fighting," and most assuredly if the celebrated Don Quixote had passed along, about that time, he would have taken him for another windmill. I am truly thankful there were none killed and but few badly scared, for I discover we are not afraid to appear on the old battle ground again. Will you hear what the learned Squire says:

I see published in the Chronicle a number of resolutions purporting to have been passed [one would take it from this he was going to dispute the authencity of their passage, the words implys doubt,] purporting to have been passed at a meeting of the citizens of Kirkwood township and vicinity. There was a meeting (and sure enough there was,) gotten up by John Shepherd and John Miller, posting up notices "and he says they circulated a report that Judge Kennon and Peter Tallman would address the meeting thereby inducing a number to attend said meeting." Wonder if that report induced the Squire to attend; this appears to convey the idea that if it had not been for that report the meeting would have been a failure. Well that idea may console him a little, let him enjoy it. What next—"this was an indignation meeting for the grogsellers to express their malignancy against Jesse C. Cowgill and myself (big man me squire, trustee and pettifoger,) does he expect to raise sympathy by this; now I would just ask the Squire how many grogsellers were at the meeting and how many spoke and expressed their malignancy. I believe there were but four who spoke, to wit: General Hoover, that "same said Johnson," Dr. Chapman, and "that same said Heaney," as the Squire says. How many of these were grogsellers? I can speak for myself, I never was engaged either in the manufacture or sale of the ardent. Can the learned Squire say as much? Oh Johnny H. my Joe, did not John H. Johnson, when he came to sojourn among the good people of Kirkwood, come out of a Stillhouse, from being engaged in the manufacture and sale of this "soul destroying poison." How long is it since he left off tippling? I ask for information. But he has made a discovery he ought to seek a patent right for it. The Democrats in this township are divided. What a pity they were so few in numbers compared to the Whigs, and few as there are of them, the poor fellows are divided: "a part," he says, "are in favor of law and order." I suppose that means his ordinance, "the residue are in favor of anarchy and misrule." Squire be careful of your veracity. Now if he means by this that those who are opposed to his ordinance are all in favor of anarchy and misrule let me tell him he will find the whole phalanx of the democrats in Kirkwood, with but few exceptions and not only so but the great body of the Whigs are arrayed, shoulder to shoulder under the banner of the Sons of Liberty This is what haunts like Banquos ghost, the learned Squires imagination.—But the Democrats are divided, and only to think that to those divided Democrats the Squire is indebted for all his official honors. Is not this the "same said" Johnson who formed a coalition with these divided Democrats to defeat two of his Whig friends, to wit: David McCoy and Wm. Pack, and received the office of Assessor as a reward for treason to his party friends, and now like John Tyler, he must repudiate those to whom he owes his elevation; but that's the way with all traitors.

Let me say to my friend Johnson, (for I believe he is my friend, though not intentionally,) if you wish to dissolve the partnership, and to set up on your own hook, or to sell out to the Sons of Temperance, [perhaps they bid higher than the Democrats,] I am content, and the Democratic party in Kirkwood, and the great body of the Whigs too will say amen to it. Facts sir, facts must exist. This "same said" Johnson, in his wrath must turn Ishmaelite, his hand must be against every one, he must have a fling at Gen. Hooover, and at Dr. Chapman; and I, poor defeated candidate, must suffer under his malignant lash. O how I did smart and squirm. Ah Johnny, your shaft was too blunt and came from too weak a bow to hurt any body; it jist played, deil upo' the bane, "it did namair," as death is made to say in Burn's poems. Well hear him: Heaney appeared very tenacious of his reserved rights." Well what was wrong in that, Mr. Pettifoger; it is nothing more than every lover of liberty ought to be;—encroachments on those rights are the first steps toward despotism, and the most easy arrested before they take the form of precedent. Have you not heard it said that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

He says further, that I "attacked the statute, the ordinance, the Legislature, and the Trustees indiscriminately," and he thought I would storm the fort and murder the garrison; for I said, "fellow-citizens stand firm, prepare for defence, as for me, my gun is wiped out and greased." Permit me to say to this learned Squire: Be careful of your veracity, its more than doubted now, I may be under the disagreeable necessity of changing the word learned—do you take Squire.

Now my fellow-citizens, you who heard me can recollect as well as I can what I did say. I said, amongst other things, that the law, in my opinion, was not in accordance with the Constitution, and that the ordinance was not in accordance with the law, and of no binding force on us. I also referred you to the fact that temperance reformers not only advocated unconstitutional laws and ordinances, but had excited mobs, and referred you to the attempt to mob Mrs. Cowan, and the Barnesville mob that destroyed the liquor belonging to the railroad laborers. And against this I warned you to be prepared, for I was, and I do believe I can hold my rifle steady when pointed at any mobocrat who would enter my yard with no other authority than the midnight robbers have when seeking plunder.

But the Squire has enlightened all the world "and the rest of mankind." He says "that same said Heaney received the nomination from the Democratic party for a seat in the legislature, but fortunately the people suffered him to stay at home." This is what some people call John Johnson's news, which means what everybody knows. We will in future call it John Johnson's news. The readers of the Chronicle read all that years ago; and what did he expect to effect by it? Why I can say to him, better men than I ever had the arrogance to believe I was, have been defeated when running for office. Why the Squire's political deities, Clay, Webster, and Scott, were all three defeated, and who ever thought either of them was inferior to John H. Johnson in talents or patriotism. But hear him again: "To the resolution condemning the course of the Trustees I wo'd make this reply: If the ordinance is in accordance with the law, the Trustees have simply done their duty, if not, it will not be necessary to meet it with force and arms, it will fall itself." Now does not John H. Johnson know—does not every one who reads it know, that it is not, and that to explain the meaning of the statute was not one of the duties conferred by that act. What a profound expounder of the law this same said Johnson is. I must say he has placed himself in the predicament of the monkey climbing the pole.

Again he says: "If the law is not in accordance with the Constitution, it is only the Constitution in the hands of its friends, and only a Locofoco family quarrel in which I do not feel free to enter." So you let the cat out of the bag, did you Squire? Did he take a lesson at St. Clairsville, when on his return home he, instead of leaving word for Samuel Boden, the locofoco Trustee, at his brother's, within less than a mile of said Trustee's house, he drove two miles further and left the word for said Boden to meet him and his worthy coadjutor Jesse C. Cowgill, to meet with them to consummate the damning purpose of endeavoring to make the law of last winter as odious as possible; and then to say its only the Constitution in the hands of its friends, thereby endeavoring to cast reproach on the Democratic majority in the last legislature; but let me tell him, he has raised up like Haman of old, a gallows on which to hang his political enemies, but the people of Kirkwood are going to hang him thereon. The time has gone by when a legislative minority and their minions can cast reproach on the majority for acts in which they themselves participate. All have now to make their mark so the people can know them. Was that law passed by a party vote? I have not the journal but am informed both the Representatives from this county voted for it. Were they Locofocos? Mr. Pettifogger, you overshot the mark that time.

Again he says: "Did the Whigs on that committee feel their dignity in fathering a set of anarchial resolutions carried to said meeting in the breeches pocket of the locofoco presiding officer." I would just say to the learned Squire: you barked up the wrong tree that time, and he will have to do as good coon dogs do, go back and bring up the trail again. I would have naturally supposed that the Squire had made himself better acquainted with the habits of the coon, in 1840, than to have made such a foil. I am afraid his scent is not good, his nasal proturberance is rather short for the characteristics of a good hound, but perhaps he belongs to another species of animals, I mean those who bray instead of bark. What next? "Were there not tipplers enough in Kirkwood township to form said committee, that they should place a Wm. Davis of Union township on said committee?" Now he must have been jealous that he was overlooked in the appointment of that committee. Well Squire, console yourself, when we want an ordinance written or the meaning of the statute given, we may then call on you. "Did the ordinance of Kirkwood township interfere with Gen. Hoover or Eli Davis of Union township, that they should come as missionaries, the first as orator, and the second as committeeman, to call the Trustees bigots, demagogues, fanatics or fools." Well, if the Squire put on the shoe and it fit, let him wear it; the resolution that grates so harsh in the ears of the learned Squire reads:

"Resolved, That we will oppose, at the ballot-box, all laws and ordinances concocted by bigots, demagogues, fanatics or fools, having for their object the abridgement of our personal liberties."

Now if that ordinance was not passed through a spirit of party zeal and intolerance, and not with a design to court popular favor, and to throw reproach on political rivals, not through a mistaken religious zeal and enthusiasm, not from folly or buffoonery, then you, John H. Johnson, and Jesse C. Cowgill, are not obnoxious to any of those epithets. On the contrary, if you acknowledge yourselves actuated in the passage of said or linance by any of those motives, then don't find fault with the committee, they hit upon the right names.

In conclusion, I would say to all those who manifest so much false Philanthropy, who so piously profess to have nothing else but the good of the human family in view: Why exhibit so much intolerance—why call us such opprobrious names—why misrepresent our views and intentions—why not accord to us the same honesty of purpose that you claim to yourselves? Cannot you be charitable enough to believe we are honest, and actuated from as pure motives as you are? and while you believe that we are wrong, cannot you admit the possibility that you are as liable to err as others? We honestly believe that your doctrine of legal suasion cannot be consummated without infringing upon our rights as freemen. You raise the cry of anarchists, friend and advocate of drunkards,—but you professed reformers are so self-righteous, so Pharasaical, that there is no other course but to style you fanatics, of which the poet Mead says:

"Man's dearest rights to liberty and laws
Are lost where'er the hungry harpies meet,
Hell's fiercest demons labor in thy cause,
And foes to reason bow beneath thy feet;
Look 'round the world, and ponder o'er each deed
Of infamy that springs from anti-christian zeal,
The best of men are often caused to bleed,
The wisest man dare not his thoughts reveal."

From the Louisville Courier.

The New York Democracy, in response to Gen. Pierce's Inaugural.

With a view to show the Democratic vote on the three resolutions of the Hon. D. B. Taylor, introduced by him in the New York Legislature in response to the doctrine and principles of Pierce's inaugural, we make a correct analysis of a vote given. It is important as a "show of hands" of the "United Democracy" of that State, as it undeniably proclaims that there are among them those who professing to have abandoned the freesoilism and abolitionism of 1848, still cling to those mischevious and dangerous heresies.

It shows that there are those pretending to be Democrats, who repudiate and spit upon the great measures of Conciliation and Peace, known as "the Compromise Measures," with which the National Administration stands identified before the American People—and who, sympathising still with the freesoil and anti-slavery sentiment of the North are ready and eager to unite with the natural enemies of the Democracy, in a crusade against the constitutional rights of the South and the integrity of the Union, whenever the occasion presents itself.

The resolutions were originally introduced by D. B. Taylor, an ultra Hunker, from New York city, at an early day of the present session of the Legislature, but were allowed to slumber in quiet until Friday last, when they were called up by a Whig member. The Whigs regarded the transaction as one wherein "the Hunkers were holding the noses of the Barnburners to the gridstone, while the Whigs turned the crank."

The first resolution is in these words:

Resolved, That the State of New York congratulates her sister States of the Union on the doctrines avowed by President Pierce in his inaugural address to his countrymen, believing that the doctrines are sound expositions of our duty as one of the powers of the civilized world, and of the duties of the several States to each other under the constitution of the United States.

Which was adopted by fifty-nine Democrats voting for it; nine Whigs and sixteen Democrats "dodged" by not voting.

The second resolution reads:

Resolved, That the people of the State of New York