

THE
MAINE LAW ILLUSTRATED:

BEING

THE RESULT OF AN INVESTIGATION

MADE IN

THE MAINE LAW STATES;

BY

A. FAREWELL AND G. P. URE,

PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY

OF THE

CANADIAN PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW LEAGUE,

DURING THE MONTH OF

FEBRUARY, 1855.

Toronto:

PRINTED FOR THE CANADIAN PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW LEAGUE;

SOLD FOR THEM BY

J. C. GEIKIE, 70, AND C. FLETCHER, 54, YONGE STREET.

LOVELL & GIBSON, PRINTERS.

TO EDITORS.

As the Executive Committee of the League have resolved to send a copy of this Report to all Newspaper Editors in Canada, as well as to several papers in the States and in Britain, it is particularly requested that those Editors who may have time or inclination to refer to it, will be kind enough to transmit to the Secretary of the League, a copy of their paper containing such notice.

G. P. URE,
Secretary,
Toronto.

THE
MAINE LAW ILLUSTRATED:

BEING

THE RESULT OF AN INVESTIGATION

MADE IN

THE MAINE LAW STATES;

BY

A. FAREWELL AND G. P. URE,

PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY

OF THE

CANADIAN PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW LEAGUE

DURING THE MONTH OF

FEBRUARY, 1855.

Toronto:

PRINTED FOR THE CANADIAN PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW LEAGUE;

SOLD FOR THEM BY

J. C. GEIKIE, 70, AND C. FLETCHER, 54, YONGE STREET.

LOVELL & GIBSON, PRINTERS,
CORNER OF YONGE AND MELINDA STREETS,
TORONTO.

TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE
CANADIAN PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW LEAGUE.

GENTLEMEN,—

Commissioned as we were by you to visit New England, to ascertain the practical effects of the Maine Law in those States in which it had been enacted, we have much pleasure in herewith furnishing an accurate Report of our mission in connexion with that great movement, which is now engrossing the attention of nearly every State in the Union. We listened with an impartial ear to the remarks of friends and foes of the Maine Law, and from all we saw and heard, have no hesitation in declaring, that the virtue, the intelligence, the industry, and the worth, of the New England States, are pledged to a thorough enforcement of that Law, as the only antidote to intemperance,—the prolific source of the vice, the crime, and the pauperism, which afflict Society. The Law has made friends for itself wherever it has been vigorously enforced; and, although evaded in some instances, and violated in others, it is almost universally acknowledged to be as successful in its operations as any other penal law that was ever enacted. Nor has its most vigorous enforcement led, in any one instance that we could ascertain, to the frightful results, so boldly predicted, and pathetically conjured up, by those who were nervously apprehensive that the

sanctity of the domestic hearth would be invaded by the operations of this law. Under no circumstances has the home of the peaceful citizen been more secure, for in this, as in every other case, while the law is a terror to evil-doers, it is a bulwark of strength to them that do well.

To the many kind friends, who so cheerfully aided us in our work, we here respectfully tender our most cordial thanks. As the mere repetition of our acknowledgments, so justly due to each, would, of itself, fill a large space in our Report, we prefer being thus general, and we trust that this, our only reason for not being more specific, will be accepted in good faith by all.

REPORT.

Left in a measure to take whatever course we deemed best for the successful accomplishment of our mission, we proceeded to Albany, as the New York State Legislature was then in Session, to confer with the Committee who had charge of the new bill prepared to supersede the one vetoed by Governor Seymour, and to ascertain what remedies they had provided for the defects which were felt to exist in the laws passed by other States. We found that a bill much more stringent than the one vetoed by their late Governor had passed its second reading, and had been referred to a committee to report it for final action by the Legislature. This committee was composed of six gentlemen from the majority, and three from the minority of those who had voted upon the bill, viz.: John W. Stebbins, Charles C. Leigh, L. S. May, Levi Miller, N. M. Masters, and C. P. Johnson from the majority, and William B. Aitken, F. S. Dumont, and George H. Searing from the minority.

Mr. Stebbins, the Chairman of the Committee, and one of the most prominent members of the Assembly, very frankly explained to us the position of matters in the Legislature, "Our former law," he said, "was not so well drawn as we could have wished, but the veto put upon it has given us an opportunity to prepare one much more stringent in its provisions. My own experience is, that the laws which have operated best, are those which are the most stringent in their details. Laws which have been drawn in part to please the rum-seller, or the timid temperance man, who wished to make a sort of compromise with the traffic, have failed in their aim, while laws such as that of Connecticut can be enforced successfully. The Michigan Law was well drawn, and being very stringent, the respectable portion of the people made up their minds to obey it, and its immediate effects were very beneficial. It went into operation on the 1st of December, 1853, but having been submitted to the people, it was decided by some of the Courts unconstitutional, in consequence of that submission,

and its enforcement has been retarded. An instance of its success in that State was related to me by a friend who shortly before the passing of the Law travelled through that State about 96 miles by stage. Every few miles there was a tavern at which the stage stopped, that the passengers might get some refreshment. A few months after the law went into operation, he travelled the same route, and every liquor establishment was shut up except one, and not a passenger thought of leaving the stage in quest of liquors.

"In Massachusetts the Courts decided the seizure clause unconstitutional at the very commencement of the operations of the Law, and the liquor sellers who had taken alarm at its threatened enforcement, and left off their peculiar calling, summoned up new courage, and the larger cities were again flooded with liquor. To show that the people have the utmost confidence in the principle of prohibition, not a State that has passed a Maine Law, perfect or imperfect, has by any subsequent popular vote receded from it. More than that, every political party which has dared to array itself against the Maine Law, has been entirely overwhelmed by it. Old Maine, a Democratic State, from time immemorial, put herself in opposition to that law, and her democracy has been entirely crushed.

"Our bill has been referred to a committee to make such amendments as they deem advisable, and from the favor with which it was received by a great majority of the representatives, I have no doubt that our report will be adopted without much discussion. I shall have pleasure in introducing you to Mr. Aitken, who has drawn up a report from the minority of the committee against the law. He will be able to tell you for himself the grounds of his opposition. This one thing I wish the friends of Temperance in Canada to keep before their minds,—Let them endeavor to get a Law as stringent as it can be made, but at the same time as simple as possible. We cannot deal with the transit from one State to another, and we do not attempt to interfere with the manufacturer. What we aim at is to prohibit the sale, and the giving away, of liquors by any person, except for mechanical or medicinal purposes, and for these purposes we do not allow it to be kept anywhere unless in one of the places appointed as the agency of the locality. In a private dwelling house, or during transit from one State to another, or while stored for transit, we do not wish to exert any control, and any family may have in their house whatever quantity of liquors they may choose, unless they attach a store or grocery to such dwelling house. Whatever is kept for sale as a beverage is declared contraband, and if discovered will be destroyed.

"The majority of the Committee to which was referred so much of the Governor's Message as related to the subject of intemperance and

the sale of intoxicating liquors, introduced the present bill, accompanied with a brief report on the principle of prohibition. We stated, to the effect, that we entirely concurred with the Governor in his views as expressed in that portion of his Message referred to us. We are also satisfied that the time has arrived when sound and wholesome legislation, which shall effectually put a stop to the sale and public use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, is demanded alike by the voice of the people and the highest interests of the State. After referring to various opinions given regarding the immorality of the traffic in ardent spirits, the committee say, 'we are aware the bill now submitted, although prepared with much care, has imperfections, for all human laws are imperfect. We are aware, too, that its imperfections, viewed through the colored medium of self-interest, will be magnified and distorted if possible into hideous spectral forms to stalk the State and terrify the people, yet we confidently believe that should the bill we submit become a law, it will prove effectual in suppressing by much the larger proportion of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. We have called to our aid the experience of the past, and some of the ablest in legal ability, and wisest in practical knowledge. Nor have we been unmindful of the opinions of the opponents of prohibition. Those we have received and carefully weighed, and in the light of all sought to frame a bill, not unnecessarily stringent in its provisions, and yet sufficiently so to secure obedience, and accomplish the great end in view. To aim at less than this would be folly, to seek more, tyranny.' "

Having had a little conversation of a general nature with Mr. Stebbins, he resumed his seat in the Assembly, as he was at that sitting to move the postponement of the Report of the Committee, on the Orders of the day, until the end of the following week. He proposed his motion, but unfortunately it was so close upon the hour of adjournment, that we were deprived of what threatened to be a very fiery speech in opposition to the bill.

Mr. O'Keefe, one of the representatives for the city of New York, rose to speak to Mr. Stebbins' motion. He said, "The motion now submitted was simply to the effect that those gentlemen, the majority of the representatives on the floor of this House, would grant to you, the minority, the helpless, miserable minority on this temperance question, the glorious privilege of discussing the subject. We wish to shew you how magnanimous we are to give you such a privilege. But so far as I am concerned I ask no concessions from them whatever. If they are determined by force and by ingenuity to cram down the throats of the minority, this most infamous bill, then in God Almighty's name, let them do it. I only ask " [here the

Speaker's hammer checked the torrent that was about to burst, and the House was declared adjourned,] a circumstance which we very much regretted.

After the adjournment we had an interview with Mr. Aitken, but could not learn much from him in a tangible form in regard to his opposition to the bill. He, however, kindly furnished us with several documents on the question, one of which was a copy of a report, which he, as the chairman of the opposition committee, had submitted to the House. This report, he stated, contained the grounds of his opposition, and might be used by us as if drawn up in answer to our enquiries.

After an allusion to the vetoed Bill, the committee proceed to review the Bill now before the House, and they say,

"But while the undersigned acknowledge in the altered language of the bill and its subtle modifications, a concession to public opinion and a desire not directly to confront and assail the Constitution, they recognize in the bill the same intrinsic errors, and the same dangerous consequences that distinguished the condemned and repudiated bill of 1854. The same summary processes are authorized, the same dictation and perversion of evidence, the same trifling with the obligations of contracts, the same endowment of the lowest class of magistracy with arbitrary powers, the same tampering with the right of jury trial, and the same subornation of informers and prosecutors. The theory of absolute prohibition is retained, while the right of search is ostensibly more guarded, when conducted upon the warrant of a magistrate, yet section twenty-five of the act which declares that 'all liquor kept in violation of any provision or provisions of this Act, shall be deemed and is hereby declared to be a public nuisance,' re-opens the door for still more fearful abuses. The undersigned cannot but believe that the philanthropic men under whose superintendence this measure has been brought forward, were ignorant of the purport and of the scope of this sweeping clause. It breaks down all the guards which protect property and the privacy of dwellings and individual rights, and gives up the privilege of search and seizure, and destruction of property to the arbitrary will and unregulated violence of a mob. * * * Much misunderstanding of the relation of the State to the business of the people has grown out of the term 'license,' which is used to define a pecuniary fine or tax, but which in its more general acceptation signifies a special permission and approval granted by a superior to an inferior. The several statutes which authorize the issuing of licenses to auctioneers, pedlars, victuallers, pawnbrokers, cart and hackmen, and the exhibitors of public shows, do not intend to imply that the class of dealings which

these persons pursue is injurious to the public welfare, or that the State, by licensing them, connects itself with them or becomes morally, or in any way responsible for them. The 'license' is intended, first, as a tax imposed in a mode easily collectable ; and second, as a method of remuneration and identification which greatly facilitates the operations of police. The tax contributed from these sources is large, and cannot well be dispensed with, now that the pressure of municipal, county and State taxes has been so largely increased. The bill reported to your House, however, does acknowledge the principle, and establish the practice of 'licenses' in the more obnoxious meaning of the term. It first outlaws the traffic in spirits, wines and ales, and provides sweeping processes against all engaged in it, and summary modes of executing them by search, seizure, confiscation, fine and imprisonment ; and then it authorizes two thousand persons to be specially appointed to deal in liquor, without fees, tax or reward. The parties who appoint them are the Judges of the Courts, and the qualification for the office is an affidavit that the applicant does not use intoxicating liquor as a beverage, and will not infringe the limitations of the law. These limitations are, that he shall sell such liquor only for mechanical, chemical and medicinal purposes, and pure wine for sacramental use ; and it is enacted that the seller must have good reason to believe, and must believe, that the same are purchased with the intent to be used for one of the purposes mentioned. How far the law can be enforced, which declares that one man shall believe in the intention of another, or that the other shall do as he intended, is a question which has never yet been practically solved. * * The provisions of this Act will have the effect of bringing before the Courts the question not only of what is a medical use of wines, &c., but what is a Sacrament, and what are its characteristics and its limitations. The undersigned cannot conceal how deeply they deprecate a result, which, by bringing in the tribunals of State as interpreters of the Word of God, has always in other lands and under less favoured governments, where it has been attempted, proved equally disastrous to religion and to liberty. * * It is also to be noticed that in this bill all the provisions are so contrived to work together, as to discriminate against certain classes of society, and to interpose barriers against the poor and humble, which the rich are afforded facilities to overleap. The barrel of cider is not prohibited, though the single glass is. The wine grower may raise his own wines, and sell them to the authorized purchasers. The epicure in foreign liquors may import brandies and rare old wines from abroad, in the original package. The owner or renter of a single dwelling may revel in the possession of an unlimited supply of intoxicating drink, while

the citizens who live in houses, which in part are occupied as stores, offices, or work-rooms, &c., are not legally permitted to retain in their houses the smallest quantity of any admixture of the liquors prohibited by the Act. * * It may be regarded as one of the peculiarities of modern legislation on this subject, that this law, after declaring an article of nearly universal consumption for centuries, "a nuisance," yet makes special provision for its use as a sacrament of religion, and connives at the means by which the so-called better class of society shall have the freest access to it ! Such characteristics of a law are not calculated to conciliate towards it that respect and that loyal obedience which a republican people should at all times extend to laws passed by their representatives."

"These are the main features of a bill which, in many other respects, especially in its attempts to regulate the transportation of goods between States, and to obstruct the reception of imported goods, conflicts not only with the laws of trade and the rights of citizens, but with the provisions of the United States Constitution. These arbitrary provisions ; this seizure of property ; this search of houses ; this perversion of evidence ; this disorganization of the jury ; are, perhaps, necessary steps to enforce the provisions of the law, which assumes to prohibit, absolutely, a traffic not forbidden by religion, and in itself not injurious to public morals, or the well-being of society. * * * In a republican system, the introduction of force is always more dangerous, because the theory of such government rests upon the assumption of man's capacity for self-government and its administration should always be directed to the elevation of the citizen to his true dignity, by education ; by the amelioration of his condition ; and by the guarantee of his individual liberty of action.

The efforts of the teachers of temperance, by moral suasion, to lead men to abstinence from intoxicating drinks, directed as they were in appeals to the intellects and the hearts of men, had more success than any teachings not of divine inspiration. The customs and habits of society were changed. The influence of woman was brought to aid in the discountenance of intoxicating drinks. Liquors were excluded from the family board, and temperate fathers inculcated the virtue of self-restraint to their children. The example of such a reform, founded upon the judgment of men and their moral and religious convictions, gave evidence of a race of sturdy-minded people. It was a part of their intellectual training, which promised the most gratifying developement. It was most unfortunate that this system of persuasion to virtue and prudence, was ever abandoned for statutory restraints. Thus far the practical consequences of the change have been, that the efforts of good men to resist the spread of habits of

vicious indulgence have been relaxed, and the evil has become of wider influence. It is to be feared that the transfer of this moral question into the hands of the sheriffs and constabulary and police of the State, will, without effecting its end, tend indirectly to degrade the cause of temperance and discourage its true friends, by identifying it with the idea of violence and coercion, and staining it with the suspicion of hostility to individual freedom!"

On the day following this interview with the gentlemen named, we had the pleasure of attending a caucus meeting of upwards of fifty members of the Legislature, friendly to the bill, and met to discuss its various provisions in order to avoid discussion, when it came to be reported by the Committee. We spent from four to five hours very agreeably in that caucus. They differed now and again upon the phraseology of some of the sections of the bill, but all united in one harmonious declaration of adhesion to the principle of prohibition,—and that the traffic in intoxicating liquors is a crime against society. We spent a short time with O. Scovill, Esq., the publisher of the "Prohibitionist," and received from him several documents connected with the movement, and also an outline of its progress in the several States.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

From Albany we proceeded to Springfield, Massachusetts, which we reached on Saturday evening about 8 o'clock. In the cars from Albany we met with the Hon. H. W. Bishop, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, Massachusetts, on his way to Boston, to open his term in that neighbourhood. As every opportunity of gaining information of the Law was turned to account, we soon fell into conversation on that question, with Judge Bishop. His answers to our preliminary enquiries were:—

The criminal business has very much increased under the new Law. It is accounted for in this way: the violations of the Law itself add, very materially, to the criminal business. I had, in my last term in the County of Middlesex, no fewer than 104 indictments under the new Law; I should think that five-sixths of the whole were convicted. The operation of this new Law has diminished the other class of criminal business very much. It is accounted for in this way: the majority of other criminal business proceeded from intemperance. I say, without fear of contradiction, that nine-tenths of all crimes of personal violence—assaults in their various forms,—are committed in a state of intoxication. Crimes of personal violence have hitherto constituted, at least, two-thirds of all our criminal business, and if the source of the evil is dried up by this new Law, it is easy to see that

Judges, by and by, will have very little criminal business to attend to."

"As regards the Law itself, I am not sure that the temperance people acted wisely in bringing forward a new Law. Had they added two or three sections to the old Law of 1836, giving the right of search and seizure, and making the instruments of sale *prima facie* evidence in certain cases, so as not to interfere with Common Law precedent they would have acted more judiciously. For this reason: the old law was thoroughly construed in every word, and the Courts were satisfied as to its meaning, but several years will pass before the Courts are satisfied as to the bearing of this new law, and quibbles and objections will constantly be raised against it."

On Monday morning we waited upon Dr. Holland, Editor of the Springfield *Republican*, and having opened to him the purport of our visit, he pointed out some of the difficulties which they had to encounter in enforcing the Law in Springfield, but expressed his firm conviction that its operations would be highly beneficial to society. Accompanied by Dr. Holland we called upon the Rev. Mr. Seeley, who entered very warmly into the spirit of our mission, and urged us to prosecute it with energy, as the more narrowly we enquired into the workings of the Maine law, the more fully would we be assured that it had already gained the favour of all whose opinion or influence was worth having. We had prepared a series of questions to cover pretty much the field of enquiry regarding the Law, and having put several of these to Mr. Seeley, we received the following answers, which we give as nearly as may be in the Rev. gentleman's own words :

"The Maine Law has not operated so well in Springfield during the past year, because our local authorities, apparently, have not been disposed to enforce it. When the Law first went into operation, its beneficial effects were very remarkable indeed. It evidently made a very great change in the moral aspect of the entire city. Within the past year, the sale of liquors has increased again. After the decision of the Supreme Court against the seizure clause, the rum-seller has become emboldened, and the friends of temperance have been somewhat discouraged; and the rowdyism and noise which liquor produces, although nothing like what it was formerly, has increased amongst a certain class of our population of late. We have recently elected a new city government, and they are determined to maintain the supremacy of the Law. The present law, imperfect as it is in some of its provisions, will work well, and our new local authorities are disposed to enforce it; and I am convinced there will be no great difficulty in doing so. It is a law well adapted to gain favour among

the people when once thoroughly established. I have no doubt that its effects will be to supersede almost entirely the use of liquors among our people. I have witnessed its favourable effects upon many working people connected with my own congregation. I could mention several instances. One very interesting case came to my knowledge very recently. In making my accustomed rounds, I called at a house, which formerly presented rather a distressing appearance. I was astonished at the wonderful reform which had taken place, and suspecting the cause, I expressed the pleasure I felt at the happy change, when the good woman said, with an overflowing heart, in something like the following words: 'All this is the effect of the Maine law! My husband was not a drunkard, and would not drink for the mere love of drinking; but he was very sociable; and when he went in of a Saturday evening with his companions into the tavern, he would sometimes spend all his wages and come home intoxicated! But he now comes home sober—the temptation is removed out of his way, and he has provided for us all very comfortably ever since the Maine Law was put in operation. We have got a new carpet to our room; and he purchased this little singing canary bird for our little boy, who has begun to attend the Sunday School.'

"Many such instances could be given of the very happy effects of the Law, and I think it will thus ensure its own perpetuity when once fairly established.

"Its effects are very marked upon our young men. Since the fashionable saloons were shut up, they have formed a Young Men's Literary Association, where they meet regularly to read essays, and for general mutual improvement. Our Lyceum lectures were never half so well attended as they have been this winter. In addition to our usual lectures two or three evenings a week, we have recently had two courses, of six lectures each, on Geology, by Dr. Boynton, and they were thronged every evening. The first course was so crowded that he was prevailed upon to give a second, that those who had not heard him might have an opportunity of doing so; and our hall, capable of containing one thousand people, was crowded all the evenings. You saw there precisely the same class of people, that in Montreal you will see at the theatre."

"Our young men now feel that a ticket to the Lyceum lectures is an absolute necessary of life. This feeling has increased so much that we have no building large enough to contain the applicants. I believe that three thousand tickets could have been sold as easily as one thousand. To meet so far the demand, an extra course is intended to

be given on a different evening for those who could not get tickets for the regular course.

"Most of our drinking places were kept by foreigners,—the lowest class of Irish emigrants,—before the law went into operation. These people come here with all their vicious habits confirmed, and it is almost impossible to check them. How many of these houses were open, I cannot say, but there is no open house now; although it is sold secretly by that class, who have it concealed in their shanties.

"This is a contest between moral sentiment and self-interest, but you will find as you proceed, that a sound, healthy public sentiment, not only in those States where the Law has passed, but in the States where it is in agitation, is decidedly in favour of a prohibitory law. It is not expected that persons resolutely bent on drinking will not get liquor. The great point aimed at is to destroy the dram-drinking, and declare the traffic contraband. This done, the battle is won. One instance of the power of public sentiment you may relate if you please. The Messrs. Chapin, the proprietors of the Massasoit House, where you are now staying, had a lower establishment in the ground floor of their hotel, where they sold meals at half price; here also they sold liquors of all sorts. But when the Maine law went into operation, they banished that part of their establishment, and with it about three thousand dollars of yearly profits.

"Your last question I answer without hesitation. I think the Maine law is the ripened fruit of the Temperance Reformation. What has been done hitherto has gradually led us up to this point, and I have no doubt whatever we will be sustained by the people."

Accompanied by Mr. Seeley we called upon the Rev. H. B. Ide, D. D. His answers to many of our questions were similar in spirit to those already given. "It strikes me" said the Dr., "that the law is especially beneficial on the rural population. There is a difficulty in enforcing the Law in large cities,—a difficulty in getting a moral sentiment in cities and large towns so sufficiently high as to enforce it. When once the law is amended in some of its provisions, I have no doubt it will thoroughly destroy the vice of intemperance. Our late city government do not seem to have been in favour of enforcing the law; but we expect something better from our new government.

"An interesting instance of the efficacy of the Law came under my own observation, one year ago last summer. I was in Boothbay, a small sea port town of some 3,000 inhabitants, in the State of Maine, where, at certain periods of the year, immense fleets of mackerel fishers come with their boats, sometimes from 300 to 400 at a time. One Sunday morning I was passing by the head of the pier where about 300 of these fishermen were seated. Everything was perfectly quiet

as I passed by. Some had out their bibles and were reading. As I passed one group I said, "Had you not better go to church ship-mates? Some remarks were made, and simultaneously they all rose and accompanied me to the church where I intended to preach that morning. The scene was so very gratifying that I could not help saying to the landlord of the hotel that he must have a curious class of fishermen in that quarter. 'Ah!' said he, 'if you had been here before the Maine law passed, you would, on such a day as this, have seen these rocks all along covered with blood. No female dared venture out of the house at such a time. I opposed the law with all my might, because I thought it was going to injure my trade; but now I make much more money when these men are on shore than I did by supplying them with liquor. When they go away they take with them whole canoe loads of eggs and hams, and other necessities.

"That Sunday I assure you was as orderly as any Sunday could be; and there was not a bottle to be seen in the whole company when they left in the evening, but one bottle of vinegar.

"I cannot say that I have known any change upon my own congregation since the passing of the Law. Our people have been pretty well drilled into temperance for many years past, so that in a congregational way it is not new to them. The public sentiment in favour of temperance is here so high that it is marked as an offence for any one either to sell or drink spirits; whereas in olden times every deacon and nearly every Pastor too, could keep his side-board well filled and no one thought it wrong. Now if the veriest loafer is seen drunk in the streets, it strikes the community with horror."

Accompanied by Mr. Seeley we called upon Messrs Chapman and Chamberlain, Counsellors at Law, gentlemen of high standing in the community.

In answer to some enquiries as to the working of the Maine Law, Mr. Chapman said: "There is not the one-hundredth part of the drinking in Springfield, that there was before the temperance movement commenced. You will however find persons even here, who will tell you that prohibitory laws will increase drinking. But those who say so are invariably persons, who desire to sell, and commonly the lowest dealers; or persons who are hard drinkers; or politicians who court the rum-seller's vote and influence and pander to them for it. The religious and moral part of the community, without exception, you will find of a contrary opinion. Even those who in their own families use their wine give their influence in favour of the Maine Law. After seeing the effects of the Maine Law the public sentiment of this country has got to be such, that it is now certain that within a short time a law embodying the substance of the Maine Law, with

perhaps some variation in its details, will become the law of every State in the Union. It is in fact destined to be *the law* of this country. I am convinced there is no reaction in the public mind. The feeling of the community is stronger to-day than it was a year ago, and it was stronger a year ago than it was two years since. That such laws are necessary is evident by observing their beneficial operations upon the jails and poor houses, and their reformatory effects upon society generally. They diminish vastly the amount of crime and vice of every description.

"That class of crimes against the person, to which you refer, assaults in their various forms, were almost always committed under the influence of drink, and already that class of crimes has nearly ceased.

"There is another feature in the character which the working of the Maine Law has brought out. Those who are mean enough to purchase or sell liquor in violation of the law, will not scruple to perjure themselves to escape the penalty. The Judges in our criminal courts, all express their abhorrence, that those who are called as witnesses to the purchase of liquor, will as a general thing commit perjury, and deny all knowledge of the purchase, and those who sell will countenance and encourage and even hire such gross perjurers to screen themselves from the penalty of the law. Judge Hoare told me recently that down in Worcester county, a very respectable man was known to come out of a hotel a little affected with drink,—The hotel keeper was brought up for selling, and this man when called to testify, swore that he had not purchased any kind of liquor there for several months past. They called up the bar-keeper and asked if he ever sold liquor to that man. He said—Yes, I have sold liquor to him every day for some time past.

"This is an evil we have to contend against at present, but it will work its own cure.

"We shall be greatly aided by the passing of the law in the neighbouring state of New York, as then there will be more difficulty in obtaining liquor. I think the effects of the law in Berkshire county where I have witnessed its operations personally, are similar to those manifested here. The law is even more popular there than here and is more fully enforced.

I concur in the opinion which you say was expressed by Judge Bishop that three or four new sections engrafted upon our old law of 1836 would have been as useful to us as the new law. That old law of '36 was so thoroughly understood in the courts that no difficulty could have been felt in carrying it out. No man was more thoroughly acquainted with the old law than Judge Bishop, for while a Counsellor he defended more prosecutions for its violation than perhaps any other

man in the State, and now he has fully studied the other side by enforcing it as a Judge."

"An instance of the traffic in liquors came before me very recently. One of the members of the firm of Trull & Co., distillers, Boston, while giving evidence in regard to some railroad crossing that was obstructing their business, incidentally stated, as of itself showing the extent of their trade, that they had a contract with one house in Constantinople, for 150,000 gallons of new rum a month, and that that house sold it to the French Commissariat."

"At a recent meeting of the Berkshire County Temperance Society, H. L. Dawes, of North Adams, the present State's Attorney of this District, stated that at the time the law was passed he had no faith in it, that he proposed a substitute which the rum-sellers had ever since applauded; that he gave the law a reluctant vote because he was convinced the people would not be satisfied until they had tried the Maine Law. The law passed, and he resolved to give it a fair trial, and he had come that evening to give his full testimony in its favour. It had worked well where it had been fairly tried. It had shown the integrity of the jury box. He had yet to find a jury who had hesitated to convict under clear evidence. Prohibition has now become a settled principle, and the Law a part of our criminal code. Public sentiment places rum-selling with other crimes, and its criminals with other criminals. There is no way but to go forward steadily and firmly. Spasmodic efforts would not do it. Sleepless vigilance alone would suffice. Legal and moral agencies should be combined. They are like the soul and body, and in the present state of existence cannot well act separately."

We visited the establishment of the Messrs Merriam extensive publishers, and received from both gentlemen an unhesitating testimony in favor of the Law. "When the authorities," they said, "undertook to carry out the law it was obvious to every unprejudiced mind that it worked well, and there was little difficulty in carrying it out until the seizure clause was pronounced unconstitutional. We have sometimes been very much disappointed by having our work delayed in consequence of the workmen drinking, but we have not been annoyed with that of late. There is no doubt that its effects upon the working classes will be highly beneficial."

Mr. Police Justice Morton of Springfield said, "The law has not yet had a fair trial with us. There was a question came before the Superior Courts as to whether the Police Courts had Jurisdiction, and the Police Justices had direct information from the Judges not to try a case until this question was decided. In December 1853 the issue was determined; but during all the fol-

lowing year, 1854 we had a city government opposed to enforcing the law. The case is different now, but as yet we have no fair criterion of the beneficial operations of the law, especially amongst that degraded class who seem to set all law at defiance. It is a fact that the city is much more quiet than it used to be. Those opposed to the law say that this result is owing entirely to the change in the city authorities and not to the law. Public sentiment throughout the city is in favour of the enforcement of the law. There are a number of old fusion politicians, opposed to it in sentiment, but even their prejudices are fast wearing away. In regard to the trials, I would say that a large proportion of all the witnesses that have appeared before me, I am satisfied, have committed perjury and did it with a view to clear the parties engaged in the sale of intoxicating liquor. The police books will give no correct information at present in regard to the working of the law, because persons now seen intoxicated are arrested, which was not the case before, and persons who sell in violation of the law are brought up to the police court for trial. In this way the criminal business appears to have considerably increased under the new law, but as the other class of offences which formerly constituted the chief business in the police court, has almost entirely disappeared, this new class will soon be worked out. It is a certain fact that nearly all the cases, 45 in number, brought before me during the past month, January 1855, have been under the new law, either for drunkenness or for selling liquor."

Mr. Brannan, City Marshall, Springfield. "You will find that wherever our law is enforced it works well. I have passed through several States during the past year where the law is in operation and from my own experience I can state that there is no class of men, as a class opposed to the law unless those engaged in the traffic. Even parties who never had any connexion with the temperance movement are now convinced that the enforcement of the law will be very beneficial to the best interests of the community."

Hon. E. Trask, Mayor, Springfield. "Here the law has not been carried out so effectively as we could have wished, but so far as it has been carried out its effects upon the city have been very beneficial. I am not aware that it has made much difference upon my own establishment. For the last 20 years I have adhered to the principle of keeping no man about me addicted to drinking. I have paid my men weekly for the last 14 or 15 years, and whenever any signs of drinking appeared, I parted with the man at once, no matter though he was the best workman I had. The large businesses here have been conducted pretty much upon the temperance principle. I have men with me now, who have been with me for the last twelve years at least. I am

convinced that the public sentiment of this city is every day becoming stronger in favor of the Maine Law."

We visited the Armoury, an extensive establishment, on the hill overlooking the town, and known familiarly as "Uncle Sam's House." Here we found upwards of 150 men busy at work making fire-arms for the nation. The whole work is carried on, on strictly temperance principles and no liquor of any kind is ever admitted. All was cleanly and comfortable looking. The men all work by the piece, but are close and regular in their attendance, and few if any use intoxicating liquors at all, even when beyond Sam's massive gates.

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT.

From Springfield we proceeded to Hartford, Connecticut. On the following morning we joined several gentlemen in the parlour of the hotel discussing some statistics which had appeared in that morning's *Hartford Times*. These statistics purported to be the commitments to the Hartford jail, for drunkenness from 1850 to 1854 inclusive, shewing that drunkenness was very greatly on the increase. We had not yet seen the morning paper, but the statistics were pronounced by nearly all the gentlemen present to be a mere *ex-parte ruse* for a political purpose. In answer to some enquiries put to H. Y. Phelps, Esq., of New York, he said: "I have lived now more than 60 years in the world, and from observation and experience I am convinced that 95 per cent. of all the evils which afflict society are caused by rum and intemperance. Talk about invasion of rights by the Maine law!—Intemperance invades ten thousand times more rights than ever the Maine law could do. I do think it is tasking one's credulity too much to parade these statistics before him. They are utterly and entirely fallacious. The man who says that the Maine Law has produced more drunkenness amongst the people, says what is utterly false, and knows it to be false at the time he says so. I have no doubt that Governor Dutton's speech on this subject is true to the very letter. Prior to the passing of the Law, I have seen people rolling drunk through the streets,—for we have as bad a population here as in the city of New York. But the quarrelling, and fighting, and rioting which were before so common, have entirely disappeared. I have resided here some years, although I am not a voter in this State. I give you my opinion as an onlooker. The Law has not entirely relieved the city from drunkenness, but it has diminished it. The genteel drinker can drink at home, and there are many violations of the Law, but the open drinking is entirely stopped."

Rev'd. Dr. Clarke, of Hartford, said: "The Law is creating friends for itself every day here. It is more easily executed now than it was at first. The general effects produced are all good. The good people of Connecticut would no more consent to go back to their old License laws, than they would consent to repeal the laws against gambling, counterfeiting, or murder. One remarkable feature of our Connecticut law is, we can enforce it in this city against its most respectable violators. We have frequent violations, but the parties are speedily snatched up. The good fruits of the Law are very apparent in connexion with the labours of our city mission. There is no sensible man, unless he has some private reason for deceiving himself, will say that the Law has produced more drunkenness than there was before it went into operation."

Accompanied by Dr. Clarke we called upon the Hon. T. S. Williams, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Conn., a benevolent, hale looking old gentleman, 75 years of age, who had the honour of drawing up the Connecticut Law. In answer to our enquiries regarding its operation, and to its producing more drunkenness, the Judge said: "I cannot imagine there is any foundation for such remarks. I have no hesitation in saying that the accounts these people give are entirely erroneous; they either make them for a political purpose, or pick them up from people who are entirely inimical to the operations of the law. The *Times* newspaper here, for example, has taken up an opposition to the law, as a political movement. They say there is more intemperance now than there was before. But I see there is no ground for the assertion, but this,—there are more prosecutions for drunkenness than there were. The fact is, that under the old Law persons who were in the streets drunk were paid no notice to. I have seen it myself frequently. The practice was growing very bad amongst us. Since the 1st of August last (when our Law went into operation,) I have not seen more than one or two instances of intemperance in the streets. The instances are now, indeed, rare. The quiet in our city is altogether undisturbed. I live in a place in town where I have frequently heard persons pass who, from their conversation, it was evident, had been drinking. Since the 1st of August I have seldom heard any such language. Our streets are now comparatively quiet. I have no doubt that the effect in this city has been exceedingly good. If drinkers go to the liquor shops,—and I believe some of them go yet,—they are particularly careful to come away before they are so tipsy as to make a noise in the streets. To say that there is as much drinking now as there was, is to assert an impossibility—because the houses are nearly all given up; and those who do sell must do it in darkness. There are, however, several par-

ties who have formed clubs in the city, and they get their liquors from New York. These parties may, perhaps, drink more freely than before, but that is but a small part of the drinking which we had to contend against. A dozen of men, say, join together and form a club, they send to New York for a supply of liquor to their club-room, and then they may drink freely ; but if a club-room-man is found drunk in the streets, he is immediately proceeded against, and fined in \$20 and costs. This, so far as I can learn, is the only foundation for the remark regarding the increase of drinking. But these club-men form but a small part of the community. One of these club-room-men was taken up in the streets drunk recently : he acknowledged before the Justice of the Peace where he got his drink, and paid his fine. If a person found drunk says he got his liquor at such and such a store, then the owner of the store is prosecuted for the sale :—But if he says he got it in a club-room, he pays the fine himself, or is committed in default. All the drinking places are shut up. Now and again, however, in the recesses of some private den, concealed with trap doors, and all that sort of thing, it is sold. But it is only in this secret manner that the thing can be done ; just the same as if the parties were making counterfeit money, or doing any other illegal act. The very fact that it must be sold illegally, if sold at all, will prevent many a one from going in who otherwise would.”

“Every person of good moral character who, in former times, applied for a license, might, at the discretion of the select men, be licensed. It was more a matter of form than anything else. I presume there were as many as 200 shops in this city where liquor was openly sold before the passing of the law. These houses have all given up the open sale ; if any still sell it must be in secret.”

“In regard to the Law, I think we must have some clause to attach the liquor in club-rooms. We must also have a clause to attach common carriers, and such like persons from carrying it. While it remains in the hands of the importer, and with the mark of the importer on it, it is protected by the Constitution of the United States. But my impression is that as soon as it is broken up, that constitutional question ceases.”

“So far as I can learn, the law is gaining in the affections of the people, and if we could separate it from politics, two-thirds, at least, of the people of Connecticut would at once come out in favour of it. But it is so mixed up with political matters that many men who love politics better than they love their children, will vote for a particular man who takes up some political measure strongly, even though he is opposed to this law. Here the leading Democratic papers, without exception almost, have taken active ground against the law. The

object is transparent. As the Law was passed by the Whigs, they would fain bring discredit upon it, in order to get the party injured. In this city however, the *Times*, the Democratic organ, is even more hostile than either prudence or his party would dictate ; and there is a talk of starting a more respectable Democratic organ, which I have no doubt will be effected."

Mr. Judge Bulkeley, of Hartford, said : " The rumours to which you allude are, in my opinion, without foundation. It is true there are many more commitments for drunkenness now than there was formerly. Why ? Because under the former law there were no prosecutions, comparatively speaking, for drunkenness, and no one was committed for drunkenness simply, or unless there was some offence committed while drunk. But there is much less drunkenness ; much less intemperance ; much less liquor sold now. It is not sold openly at all, but is driven into secret places."

" I think there can be no controversy that the community have been essentially benefitted by the Law. The number of misdemeanors is far less. We are not rid of them altogether, and do not expect to be, but the city is much more quiet, both by day and night. The increase in the number of criminal actions has all been, or nearly all, in consequence of violations of this new Law.

" It was only in the grosser kinds of cases where an officer stumbled upon a man drunk, that he felt compelled to take any notice of it. Now wherever a man is seen drunk he is taken up. I was not very zealous to have such a law. I stood rather for the enforcement of the old law ; but the community were desirous to have the law, and I, and others who joined in with them to give it a trial, see now its wholesome and beneficial results. So high was the state of feeling in favour of the law, that in our town-meeting last November, for the choice of select men, seven men were elected, every one of whom was in favour of enforcing the law ; and elected not by a meagre majority, but almost two to one. Native Americans, Whigs, and Temperance men, all voted together, opposed chiefly by the Democratic party."

Mr. Benning Mann, Counsellor at Law, City Police Clerk " I have been Police Justice here for the last 20 years, and I know a very great difference since this law went into operation. I think that when the people become tired of selling in violation of the law, my occupation will be pretty nearly gone. If you stop drinking you stop the cause of all the quarrels and fights. It is perfect nonsense,—it is a perfect falsehood, to say that the law has increased drunkenness. That drinking is totally stopped, nobody claims ; but it is stopped at least three-fourths. I have known some of our constables here have as high as \$90 in a quarter for fines for breaches of the peace ; if they reach \$25

now it is the head. The parties brought before the police court will average eight out of ten Irish. The Irish are our only foreign population, with a few Germans.

L. S. Cowles—I have been a policeman here since the 1st of May, 1854. I have seen ten men drunk on the streets before this law passed for one that I have seen since. These men, although they would have been liable for prosecution under the new law, were not taken up under the old law. It was only when a drunken man was making some assault that he was taken up formerly. On one Sunday, before the law was passed, I arrested seven men for breaches of the peace while in drink. Since the 1st of August, I have only arrested two men on Sunday for being drunk. There are eight night watchmen, and seldom a night passed without some man being taken up by them for beating his wife or children while in a state of intoxication. Now it is a rare thing to take up one. This law has taken, at least, \$6 a month right out of my pocket, for we have no fines now. It would be almost impossible to make any one believe the difference in the quiet of our city."

David Hawley, City Missionary, Hartford—"I have been in the field as City Missionary for three years and a half. I have a Mission Sabbath School, established after the Five Points School of New York. Since the first of August, it has increased more than one-third in numbers. Before that time there was hardly a Sabbath but there was some one there the worse for liquor. Since the 1st of August there has been but one instance that even the smell of liquor was in the school. Before the law passed, I could, many a day have gathered up a waggon load of intemperate men, almost indeed, any day: since the 1st of August I have seldom met with an instance. I have many times seen, in passing my rounds, wives and mothers, and even young women the worse for liquor; but all that has changed, and in my conversations with the poor people, many of them say that the law must have come from Heaven—it is too good to have been framed by man. The little children that used to run and hide from their fathers when they came home drunk, are now well dressed and run out to meet them. These, I assure you, are not isolated cases—I could put my finger upon dozens of instances.

"We have had a good deal of distress amongst the labouring classes of our city this winter, and a charitable fund has been raised, by means of which we have aided about 500 families. Since the commencement of the fund about 2,500 persons have been aided; not more than one or two applicants have had the least appearance of liquor about them—many of these individuals were, a year ago, constantly under the influence of liquor.

“The causes that have operated to require this aid, are—1st. The direct result of a past intemperate life, especially among the foreigners, which with us are chiefly Irish with a mixture of German. 2nd. From the pressure of the times, the manufacturing business has depressed very much. The consequence was, that persons who hitherto made a living for themselves are now getting assistance from this fund. One principal reason for the scarcity of work amongst that class was the stopping of the works at Colville. Col. Colt is erecting new works in the neighbourhood, and since last spring has had more than a thousand labourers, Irish and German, constantly employed—his expenditure has been over \$2,000 a day ; but since the 1st December, when the frost became severe, this outside work was stopped, and hundreds of these poor creatures had nothing else to depend upon.

“The fund originated in this way : a gentleman—whose name I give you in confidence, although you will not publish it—met with some of the wealthy citizens and said he would give \$500 to alleviate the distress if they would subscribe liberally and get others to do so. The result was that \$3,700 were raised, and from that fund we are supporting as many as are really destitute. I am satisfied that had liquor been as freely got this winter as it was last winter, the number of people applying for charity would have been four-fold. In my rounds I have fallen in with instances of families selling even their bed-clothes for liquor, but I have not seen a solitary case of that sort this winter. The quarrelling, and fighting, and drinking, and black eyes, and so forth, hitherto so common, are now unknown. No one can witness the happy effects of this law amongst these poor people without feelings of the intensest gratitude to God, that in His good providence, such a law has been enacted.”

John W. Bull, Hartford, Con.—“I have been engaged for the last twenty-five years in the importation and sale of earthenware here. I was opposed to the Maine Law when it passed, and when the selectmen called a meeting for the purpose of appointing agents to sell liquors for the purposes mentioned in the law, I and my friends opposed the appointment of agents, thinking thereby to render the law obnoxious to the people so as to make them demand its repeal. The agents were however, appointed, and we determined to let the law get a trial,—and from that time to this it has been growing in public favour. The friends with whom I acted in endeavoring to resist the law, are now all decidedly in favour of its enforcement. From personal observation, I state unhesitatingly that much good has been done by the enforcement of the law. The city is much more quiet both by day and night : property is considered more

secure, and property holders take a deep interest in maintaining the law.

"There is some drinking in the city still, but nothing like what it was formerly. Every case of drunkenness is now noticed, whereas formerly a drunken man was not molested if he kept quiet. There is no danger of the law being repealed,—any change will be to make it more stringent. Public opinion demands that all defects be remedied, in order to secure its thorough enforcement. I know many persons now anxious for the triumph of the law, who were violently opposed to it when it was enacted."

A. Dunham, of Dunham & Co., Commission Merchants, Hartford —"I have listened to the statements which Mr. Bull has just made, and am satisfied they are correct in every particular. The law is gradually making friends throughout the State. It is doing all its most sanguine friends expected; drunkenness and crime are decreasing rapidly; *peace* has visited many families where it has long been a stranger, and *plenty*, notwithstanding the "hard times," has in many cases, driven want from the poor man's door. No sane community would think of repealing such a law, and when the political demagogues who are now clamouring against it, fail—as fail they must—there will be no trouble in confining alcohol to its legitimate place on the shelf of the apothecary."

W. D. Minor, Stamford, Judge of County Court, Fairfield County —"Drunkenness was rife in the village of Stamford previous to the passing of the law,—since then very few cases have come under my notice. The law is decidedly beneficial, and property-holders everywhere are becoming more and more in favour of its strict enforcement. So strong is its hold upon the community already, that no political or other combination, in my opinion, could be entered into to repeal the law. Any change will be to make it more stringent in order to its more thorough enforcement. The opposition to it is chiefly based on the assumption that it interferes with the natural rights of the citizens, and the danger of the poor man's castle being invaded. But not a single case of hardship, from the right of search has ever been heard of: in fact search cannot be made in a private dwelling unless there are very good grounds for the authorities to entertain the belief that the owner has invaded the *sacredness* of his own house with the rum bottle, and turned it into a dram shop. Public opinion is bearing in strongly in favour of the law, and I have no doubt that in a few years it will be as easily and as thoroughly enforced as the laws against theft, licentiousness and gambling.

THE *TIMES*' STATISTICS.

As the statistics of the Hartford *Morning Times* had caused some little stir amongst temperance people in that city during the day, we deemed it advisable to consult the jail records for ourselves, and having done so we were convinced of the correctness of Mr. Phelps' remark, that the jail statistics of the *Times* were got up to suit a purpose. Without an explanation, the figures taken by themselves represented a state of things entirely different from what existed, and the absence of this explanation when the nature of the statistics demanded it, showed very conclusively, and must have done so, to every honest-minded man, that they were printed to create a false impression, and were as essentially false in fact, as if the figures themselves had been forged for the occasion. The statistics were to the following effect:

Commitments to the Hartford County Jail for Drunkenness.

Month of January,	1850,	1851,	1852,	1853,	1854,	1855.
	5	1	2	1	2	15

So the tide of drunkenness rolls on. The Maine law does not check it. We believe its tendency is to increase drunkenness — *Daily Times*.

These statistics, taken by themselves, only prove that there were more commitments to the jail in 1855 for drunkenness than there were in 1850,—but the inference drawn by the *Times* would fain prove something more. Under the old law the commitments were nearly all to the Work-house, and not to the Jail, while the new law requires the commitments to be to the Jail. Under the old law there were few or no commitments for drunkenness, simply, as the fine when a prosecution for that offence was made, was only two dollars, and unless there was some breach of the peace growing out of the drunkenness, the sot was allowed to lie down or go on unpunished. Now, however, every man found drunk in the streets, no matter how quiet and harmless he may be, is taken up and punished for this as a criminal offence. In the subjoined list of commitments from 1850 to 1854 inclusive, it will be seen that as the commitments for drunkenness increase, the commitments for assault decrease. The parties are either picked up before they have time to give vent to their evil passions inflamed by drink, or else the law pounces upon a different class of persons from the mere drunken loafer or street fighter:

ASSAULTS.						DRUNKENNESS.					
	1850,	'51,	'52,	'53,	'54.		1850,	'51,	'52,	'53,	'54.
August..	5	6	2	10	1		5	0	2	2	2
Sept.....	5	8	2	1	3		2	3	3	2	15
Oct.....	3	1	0	3	1		1	2	3	0	16
Nov.....	1	1	1	1	5		1	0	1	2	17
Dec.....	5	2	3	3	0		3	2	1	1	11
	19	18	8	18	10		12	7	10	7	61

We have been thus specific in regard to these statistics,—although in themselves of little moment,—because other statistics from other quarters have been cooked in the same way, with a view to deceive the public. Such short-sighted policy does not wear well—it will not stand the test.

The following extract from the *Hartford Courant* of the 21st December, 1854, gives a more correct idea of the workings of the Maine Law, than do the jail statistics of the *Times*. We had a very pleasant interview with Mr. Day, the Editor of the *Courant*, and therefore give the paragraph as coming from his own lips. “In the month of July there were twenty commitments to the Work house; in the month of August only eight. In the month of August 1853, sixteen. There have been twenty-three persons discharged from the Work-house since the 1st of August, 1854; and on Saturday, September 9th, there was not a single male person in the Work-house, which, except for two females, would have been tenantless. There has not been a parallel to this state of things, at any season of the year, for eight years at least, for how much longer we do not know, but we presume there never was. Is there a sane person who doubts for an instant what has caused this result?”

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.

Having satisfied ourselves that the law was making itself felt in Hartford, we proceeded to New Haven, the alternating capital of Connecticut. Our first interview here was with the Rev.'d Leonard Bacon, D.D. The Dr. said: “It may be a question with some whether the Law is really executed in New Haven,—a city of not far from 30,000 inhabitants, among whom are fully 5,000 Irish Roman Catholics. There is no connivance at any violation of the Law, and there is no slackness, so far as I know, on the part of any officer entrusted with its administration. I believe the same thing may be said of the State generally. Even in towns where the municipal power is wielded by the adverse party, offenders are prosecuted, convicted, and punished. The complaint against the Law, by those who are opposed to it, is not that it is impracticable, but that it is vigorously and unsparingly executed.

“As to the effect of the execution of the law, certain it is that there is not an open dram shop in the city of New Haven. Wholesale and retail traders made arrangement beforehand to relinquish entirely that branch of their business on the appointed day—1st August—in deference to the Law. The only place known to the public, or the police, at which anybody can purchase any intoxicating beverage, or even pure alcohol, is the town agency, where it is sold only for

legitimate purposes, manufacturing, medicinal, and religious. No doubt there are persons who sell in violation of the law, just as there are thieves ; but we do not, therefore, say that the law which punishes petty larceny is ineffectual.

“As to the ulterior purpose of the law,—the preventing intemperance ; of course it does not entirely suppress intemperance. No man in his senses ever thought it would, in the present state of things. Liquor can be purchased in New York, only three hours distant from us, and all who are desirous can supply themselves in that way. But whoever is found drunk is arrested,—*without respect of persons*,—and if the liquor which made him drunk was purchased here, the vender is very sure to be convicted as soon as the purchaser is sober enough to testify.

“My belief is, that the Law has many more friends now than it had when it became operative. I did not take an active part in promoting the Law, for I did believe that our people in Connecticut would not agree to such a law ; which proposed to set aside some of the old English safeguards, as to a man’s house being his castle, and so forth. I said I did not believe our people would submit to it ; but the result has proved that I was wrong, and the fears I entertained have not been realized in any one instance. So far as I know, the general feeling is one of increased satisfaction with the law. It is recognized by all respectable people : I mean by respectable people, those who make it a point to belong to religious congregations. Our Sundays are much more quiet than they were ; although for many years past our authorities have been very rigid in enforcing an external respect for the Sabbath.

“For two months after the law passed, there was no town agent appointed, and then it was impossible to get any wine or liquor at all, without a violation of law. But this matter was speedily remedied.

The Dr. related to us an instance of arrest for intoxication, shortly after the law went into operation, which caused some stir in the city. The master of a coal vessel,—who had been in the habit of taking a little drop when he got ashore,—discharged a cargo of coals at the wharf ; and having transacted his business on shore, started to go down to his vessel. He dropped into one of his old places, they told him the danger of acceding to his request, but gave him a little grog. He stepped into another, and after the same remonstrance, received an additional supply. In this way he made some half dozen calls, thinking that things were taking a strange turn when a sailor was not allowed to take a little grog openly, when he wished to pay for it. Unfortunately, however, the last drop was too many for him ; and moving along towards the wharf rather top-heavy, he was picked up

by a policeman, for being more than half-seas over. He felt, when sobered a little, the awkward predicament into which he had got, and when taken before the Police Justice, frankly told the names of all the parties who had given him drink ; and some half dozen arrests and convictions were forthwith made.

One other point stated by the Dr. was,—“Parties who stood aloof from the Temperance Reformation, now give in their adhesion, to the Maine Law. They consider that the question has assumed a new form. It is now no longer simply a question of Temperance, but a Governmental question, one of Legislative foresight and morality and, therefore, they wish to abide by the Law. According to the testimony of our city missionary,—who has the best opportunity of knowing,—families that were suffering last winter from destitution, are this winter provided with necessities, notwithstanding the “hard times,” because the dram shops are no longer open.

Rev'd. S. W. S. Dutton, New Haven ; a gentleman who aided us very much in our mission, related a very pleasing instance of reformation in his own congregation, as the result of the law :—

“A young man of a respectable family, kind, pleasant and agreeable, who earned good wages as a mechanic,—the only support of a widowed mother and an only sister,—had got into dissipated habits ; and for four or five years past would have gone on a drunken spree for weeks together ; and was, consequently, a great source of affliction to his friends. Reasoning and remonstrance were in vain. But the Law came to his aid. The temptation was removed, and he has since done well. He has recently purchased a small house for his mother and sister, and furnished it comfortably. He is a regular attender at church ; and expresses very feelingly his gratification at the enforcement of the law.”

“There is much more hope of such a person standing, because no one could sell him liquor without very great danger. The penalty of a violation of our law is such, that it comes to be a question with sellers,—those who do so in secret,—whether the person is likely to get drunk or not. Mr. Smith, our City missionary, has told me that in his visits among the poor this winter he finds a great difference indeed. Men who, last year, left their families in want by their intemperance, who were accustomed to spend all their earnings upon drink, have, since the operation of the Law, spent their earnings upon their families ; and those families who, last winter, were badly off, are this winter, even with the depression of business, comfortably supported. Our cases of destitution this winter are almost all of that class who were reduced to the lowest verge, by intemperance, before the passing of the Law. The officers of our benevolent associations

say that they have a different class of persons to support this winter. And our grocers tell us that many of those families who bought little else but rum at their stores, are now supplied with healthful and comfortable food. If they do get drink, they get it at other places.

"There is no kind of question as to the very beneficial workings of the Law in this city. The statement that it has produced more drunkenness, is most entirely untrue. No man would say so, but one who intentionally meant to deceive. Such is not the case in any of our cities where the Law is enforced. Unfortunately, in some of our cities, certain political parties have taken ground against the law. In this city, generally, the Democratic party have set themselves against the Law, and they are apt to make reckless assertions sometimes to serve a political purpose. Their great theory is that you will not, by legislation, make men moral or virtuous. They seem to forget that the first end of government is the protection of the citizens.

E. M. Gorham, Esq., editor of the *Maine Law Advocate*, New Haven, expressed himself very warmly in favour of the Law, and shewed very conclusively that in the mere matter of criminal punishment, the City of New Haven would be a gainer of upwards of \$8000 annually by the enforcement of the law. These arguments we need not here repeat.

"The arrests, by the night watchmen of New Haven, for assaults and breaches of the peace have fallen off more than two-thirds; although you will find that here, as in Hartford, the arrests for drunkenness have greatly increased. But this is easily explained. All parties are now arrested, who are in any way intoxicated; whereas before they were only taken up when they had committed some offence against the peace of the community. Intemperance has greatly diminished in this city, and that, too, amongst our Irish or foreign population; and family comforts have, amongst them, greatly increased. Many of those who were supported with coal last winter by the town, have not applied for such aid this winter. Their answer invariably is, now that rum is gone, everything is pleasant and comfortable at home. Many such instances have come to my own knowledge.

J. J. Waite, Esq., of Norwich, whom we met in New Haven, said: "The Law is working admirably in Norwich. Its effects upon the community are very good. The village was formerly noted for drunkenness, but now an intoxicated man is seldom met with. The Law has gained the good will of the better classes of the community. I know many persons there who went against the Law, because they were told it would infringe their rights as citizens, who, now that they have seen it enforced, are decidedly in favour of it. Many

of the working people of Norwich were against it ; but now that they are deprived of an opportunity of getting liquor, their money is expended in providing necessities and comforts for their families, and they now find the great advantage it has conferred upon them. The general effect of the Law has been to give a higher tone to morality, and a keener sense of religious feeling than was manifested in Norwich previous to its passing. Liquor is no where sold openly in the village. If it is got, it must be secretly.

Rev'd. Mr. Sill, Episcopal Church City Missionary, New Haven. " I was called here especially to look after that class of persons who do not go any where to church. Amongst that class the Maine Law has produced a very comfortable state of things. Heads of families who formerly spent all their wages in intemperance, have begun to provide comfortably for their families. That class of persons who this winter,—had the old state of things continued,—would have come upon us for support,—have some little to give themselves to our mission funds. The Law has diminished drinking amongst that class. Its good effects are decisive :—It works to admiration. Many poor families who, for want of clothing, were prevented from attending church, now look forward with delight to the prospect of attending some place of worship."

Professor Silliman.—" My impression is, that the Law has worked very favourably. I am not now in the college, and cannot say so much from actual experience there, but I have heard several of the students speak of the Law as having produced a very decidedly good effect upon the students generally. Not a quart of wine or liquor is drunk now, where before gallons were used. I am decidedly of opinion that it has produced a very marked change in the college. There are at present about 400 students. It has also produced a great change in the general customs of Society. My wife has been in the habit of visiting amongst the poor, and in houses where before she used to find misery and vice, she now finds happiness and comfort."

Mr. Mathieson Freshman, Yale College.—" All our classes are free from the use of liquors. I think if they were inclined to intemperance I should have heard of it. There are no places about college that I know of where liquor of any sort can be got."

Professor Thacher, Yale College.—" I am convinced that the Law has made a very great difference amongst our students. Formerly some of them used to drink so as to be affected by it. They got the liquors at the Medical Halls, nicely labelled as cordials, and kept it in their own rooms. Such a thing is now entirely unknown. We have had no case of intemperance in the college since the Law passed, that I know of. It was whispered about that the Chief of Police had escorted

two young gentlemen to their lodgings recently, who, but for his kindness, might have been arrested. It is believed that he has frequently made himself serviceable in this way. But we have no outward indications now amongst the students, that drink is used. There is none of that noise and uproar amongst them that used to be. The only objection we can have to the Law is that it does not stretch far enough. Persons can send to New York for a basket of champagne, and get it delivered at their houses without any difficulty. It has been reported that some of the students have done this, but I have seen no instance of it myself."

Mr. Dwight, resident Tutor, Yale College.—"The results of the Law have been much more favorable on the Institution than I had any idea they possibly could be. The Law has made a very decided difference in the College. I have no doubt there is some drinking still, but it must be greatly diminished, for its outside developments are entirely done away. I live in the College, and have an opportunity of seeing what goes on; and I am satisfied that College Government is now much more easy than it was before the operations of the Maine Law.

Rev. Dr. Kennaday, New Haven.—"I can only say that at a very early period I engaged in the temperance reformation. I formed the first temperance society in the State of Maryland, and have been in the field a good deal. I find now, however, that since this law went into operation I have hardly anything to do. The work seems to be pretty well all done up. As far as I am acquainted with the State—and I have visited many parts of it, and have met with men from all parts of it—the law has produced the happiest results. I know personally, several gentlemen who have a large number of men in their employ, and their united testimony is decidedly in favour of the law. I think there is a great improvement in the sabbath school attendance since the law went into operation. I think that in this city and in the city of Philadelphia, (where I resided seven years,) we have reached the greater part of our own congregations by moral suasion. I think you will find that it is the people generally who belong to the Catholic Church who are in the traffic, and who do all the drinking. I find that these people, wherever you may go, are a constant barrier in the way of progress. I am sufficiently acquainted with all the Methodist churches in the State to say that the opinion I have given would be universally endorsed by them."

His Excellency the Hon. Governor Dutton.—"I believe you already know my sentiments pretty well in regard to the operations of the law. I am exceedingly gratified to find the friends of temperance in Canada so deeply interested in our movements. Were I to say that

the law was not even exceeding the most sanguine anticipations of its friends, I would state what is contrary to my firmest convictions. I have recently returned from Boston, where I had the pleasure of addressing the State Temperance Convention. I there gave my opinion of the working of the law. So much of that speech as you require to convey to your friends in Canada, my decided conviction of the beneficial results, of the law, you may use, as if you had it from my own lips. In a letter to Mr. Delavan, of Albany, I said :—

“I hazard nothing by asserting that no candid enemy of the law will deny, that it has proved more efficient than its most sanguine friends anticipated. It has completely swept the pernicious traffic, as a business, from the State. An open groggery cannot be found. I have not seen a person here in a state of intoxication since the first of August. In our cities and manufacturing villages, streets that were formerly constantly disturbed by drunken brawls, are now as quiet as any other.

“The change is so palpable, that many who have been strongly opposed to such a law have been forced to acknowledge the efficacy of this. At the late State Agricultural Fair it was estimated that on one day from 20,000 to 30,000 persons of every condition in life were assembled, and not a solitary drunkard was seen, and not the slightest disturbance was made—the effect was so manifest, that the law has been regarded with more favor since than it was before. The statistics of our courts and prisons prove that criminal prosecutions are rapidly diminishing in number. Some Jails are almost tenantless.

“The law has been thoroughly executed with much less difficulty and opposition than was anticipated. In no instance has a seizure produced any general excitement. Resistance to the law would be unpopular; and it has been found in vain to set it at defiance. The longer the beneficial results of the law are seen and felt, the more firmly it becomes established. The ridiculous idea, so industriously circulated, that the sanctity of domestic life would be invaded, has been shown to be a mere bugbear. *The home of the peaceful citizen was never before so secure.* The officers of the law have no occasion to break into his dwelling, and he is now free from the intrusion of the lawless victims of intemperance.”

GOVERNOR DUTTON'S SPEECH.

Gov. DUTTON, on being presented, was received with hearty applause. He said he had come hither without the license of *all* his constituents. There were some of them who would object to his going abroad to enlighten the citizens of other States, but many of them preferred he should do it abroad,—if on this subject,—rather than at

home. (Applause.) Some had even said that for this, his time was short; if this were so, he thought he must work while the day lasts. (Renewed applause.) He might possibly be regarded as a fugitive; if so he knew they would take good care of him. (Laughter.) He knew the assembly did not expect a temperance address from him, but simply to learn how the prohibitory law operated in Connecticut. (Applause.) He therefore proposed to make some statements merely in this regard for the benefit of this State.

And, first, he would say, that, in his judgment, that law been fully operative and beneficial. The absence of crime, the order which everywhere prevailed, the diminution of rowdyism, the quietude which generally obtained, all proved that the law worked its mission, and was a blessing to the community. In New Haven, where he had his walks, and knew its people, he did not hesitate to say, that you might search as with a candle, and it would be almost impossible to find even the amount of a gallon of intoxicating liquor except at the town agency. He would not say that it might not be found in some out-of-the-way, obscure and hidden hole. Where is the place where laws, even the best and most popular, are not violated--the law against burglary, against theft, and other crimes. It was expected here in Boston; and what was true in regard to violations of law here, was doubtless also true in regard to the prohibitory law in his city. But, generally speaking, the law was most successfully and triumphantly sustained in New Haven. And what was true of New Haven, was also true of other towns in Connecticut. He had the means, from his official position, as well as from other sources, of learning the operation of that law, and he was prepared to say that it had been most complete. Gentlemen engaged in shipping, in mechanical pursuits, in trade, in all the parts of the State, bore the same testimony—that the law was being carried into effect and had a most beneficial result upon their respective communities.

The correspondence which he had, as well with the newspaper press, as in letters from prominent individuals, all tended to the same indisputable conclusion. Now, he was a lawyer, accustomed to look at evidence, and he knew not what interpretation to put on all this mass of evidence, save this, that it was conclusive that the law was most successful in removing intemperance, crime and immorality. Quoting the statements of the *Hartford Times*, that the law had not been successful, that crime had increased under it in Hartford, New Haven, and other places, and that the assertions of the Governor, at a meeting in New York, were not correct in relation to the operation of the law, &c., he showed their utter fallacy, and the impotency of the so called facts which that paper adduced in support of its statements. He ex-

amined "the statistics," also, put forth by the *Times*, and showed them to be totally unreliable and even fictitious. It really seemed strange that the editor of that sheet did not see that he was risking his well earned reputation for mendacity, in putting forth such bald statements, which carried no probability whatever, in them. (Great laughter.)

Gov. DUTTON passed to say that before the law went into operation, it was customary to see things in New Haven as they were in the city of New York. There was rowdyism, intoxication, riding out on Sunday, &c. Since then nothing of the kind was noticed. The last time he was in New York, he was nearly jostled off the side-walk by a drunken man; but he *had not seen a drunken man in Connecticut since the passage of the law*. (Applause.) What caused this great difference? What made New Haven different from New York? It was solely and only because Connecticut had a prohibitory liquor law. (Renewed applause.) Quoting further some remarks of the *Times*, that he was "a greedy office seeker," the Governor said that formerly an office seeker had to stand upon a rum barrel; but now if he wished office he must promote virtue rather than vice; he must stand up firm for all that promotes benevolence and humanity. He should now let it pass that the audience took it for granted that the prohibitory liquor law *was* successful, and had accomplished its mission.

That law in Connecticut was drawn up with a great deal of care by those who had had experience in such matters. The laws of Massachusetts, and Maine, and other States, were examined; and keen men, who knew the shifts and subterfuges to which men under conviction of rumselling would resort to, to escape, passed upon its every provision. Their law had many good features. It was a *simple* law, in all its parts. When it took hold of a man for drunkenness, it dealt with him for that offence. The complaint for that was coupled with no other misdemeanor. So in regard to other particulars. It did one thing at a time. The accused had a distinct trial on the charge; and he was fully tried, having every opportunity to be heard, while the case was patiently considered. He did not hesitate to say that at the time the law was passed *it was the most effective and perfect law for the subject then in existence*. (Applause.) Another great and effective feature of the law was its seizure clause—which struck at the root of the matter, and did much to render the enactment popular with the masses, who saw the source of the trouble, and who like to see a thing done up "brown," or not at all. (Laughter and applause.) Another feature of the law, which gave it popularity and efficiency, was the provision that if a man was found publicly, drunk, he should

be detained till he told where he got drunk, or was punished for being drunk. (Applause.) It cools off a man's appetite wonderfully if he has the prospect of a prison ahead; and, on the other hand, it serves to make the dealer consider how many doses he can administer to a man before *he* is compromised—he learns just how long it is before a toper will reveal a secret; for it did not take a great while for the cold walls of a prison to loosen the tongue of a drinker, and make him tell where he got his potion. (Laughter and applause.)

“The result of these two principles had given the law of Connecticut a great amount of its efficiency. Without them, nothing would make the law popular with the people. Yet it would be very strange if their law was without its defects. There was one clause that towns *might* appoint agents; and it was found that some places all of a sudden became wonderfully teetotal; every voter would march up to the polls and vote against any agent at all, the enemies of the law supposing that if no agency was established, a great inconvenience would be experienced by temperance men. But they found that temperance men could do without liquor as long as any body else, and longer too; and those who were not friends of the law were soon glad to go in for the agencies, and they now existed, suitably regulated, in nearly all the towns. The law wanted a provision that would break up the practice of buying liquors by the quantity and their conveyance to club rooms, where they were dealt out to young men. It also wanted a provision preventing the transportation of liquors over the State by common carriers. He was glad to learn that it was probable these important features would be incorporated into the law soon to be submitted to the Massachusetts Legislature. They were essential to a perfect and efficient statute.

“Gov. Dutton passed some congratulatory remarks on the position of Massachusetts, and what the rest of the Union hoped and expected from her example. He trusted she would be true to her ancient fame. He alluded to the interest felt by other States in the Connecticut law, and the numerous applications he received for copies of that law, some of the States receiving them, following out its provisions in their prohibitory laws. He cited Michigan as an instance, whose new Governor was as strong a Maine Law man as himself. He ventured the prediction that not many years would pass before every State north of the Potomac would have a stringent liquor law. (Applause.) He concluded with some peculiarly happy and felicitous remarks appropriate to the State and the occasion, which were warmly applauded.”

In our transit from New Haven to Hartford, we had a very interesting discussion with Judge Huntingdon of Hartford, and several other gentlemen of the democratic faith who had been attending a democratic

Convention at New Haven. The Judge expressed himself warmly against the law, as interfering with the right which every citizen of the United States had, to seek his own comfort in the way that seemed to him best. Some of his remarks were taken down, but as he expressed a wish to write out his opinions carefully when he got home, and promised faithfully to transmit them to our address at Boston, we fully expected to have had the pleasure of incorporating his opposition in our Report. But the document never reached us, and although we were assured by friends that the Judge would not write, we will not violate our pledge by giving any of his statements, for they might place him in a less favourable light than that in which a gentleman holding so high a position in society would wish to be placed.

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.

From New Haven we proceeded to Providence, Rhode Island, returning by Hartford. Here we met the Hon. A. C. Barstow, Mayor of Providence, and promoter of the Maine Law in Rhode Island. Mr. Barstow said, "In my inaugural address as Mayor of Providence, shortly after the passing of the law, I thus indicated to the Council my feelings in regard to it. At the last session of our Legislature, a law was passed for the suppression of drinking houses and tippling shops, which is to go into operation on the third Monday of July next (1852.) Our present laws prohibit the sale of spirituous liquors as a beverage, except when the freemen of the towns, by vote, allow their town council to license the traffic; but the penalty for their violation is so light as to render them entirely worthless in this city or in the densely populated towns. The law which is soon to go into operation, contains a variety of features more stringent than were ever embodied in any former legislation upon this subject. Heretofore we have sought to regulate this traffic by law—now we seek to suppress it. It is believed that a wise and firm enforcement of this law will soon suppress the traffic in these liquors to a great extent, and thus rid our city of much of the alarming amount of evil resulting therefrom. As it is better, and in the experience of a sister State (where a similar law is in operation) cheaper, to prevent the evils resulting from this traffic, than to punish the crimes, and alleviate the poverty and distress occasioned by it, I shall deem it my duty to see that this, as well as every other law, is justly and impartially enforced. I trust that those who have been engaged in this traffic, will deem it a matter of policy and duty to yield a quiet submission to the law, and thus save the magistrate the necessity of performing a disagreeable duty. The law must be honoured, either in its observance, or in the infliction of its penal sanctions. Every interest of society demands it—every senti-

ment of my heart approves it. I deem it my duty, thus early to make the announcement, that all may have timely warning. The execution of this law may seem hard and oppressive to a few who are engaged in this traffic, but they must bear in mind that the want of such a law has been esteemed a greater hardship by a multitude who either directly or indirectly have suffered by it. Under our happy government, Law, is the will of the people, constitutionally expressed. All government necessarily abridges individual liberty. Living in a state of nature, a man's rights may be measured by his might; but, in voluntarily entering a state of society, he agrees to unite with others in fixing rules for the government of the whole. If any of these rules in their operation bear with undue severity upon himself, he has a legal remedy, or if in their just execution, they limit or restrain his liberty too far, to suit his taste, or supposed interests, he may choose another society more congenial to his feelings. If, however, he continues in the society, he is bound, as a good citizen, to respect its rules, and bow with proper submission to its decrees. Private interest must yield when the public good requires it; and the individual who resists the law in any other than a constitutional way, on the ground of private right, commits treason against the State, shows himself unworthy of the society which has hitherto sheltered and protected him, and as a transgressor of one law, cuts himself off from all claim for protection under any other."

"These were my opinions prior to the enforcement of the law. After it had been in operation three months, I published the following statistics, showing that the law in that short time had made a reduction of nearly 60 per cent. in our monthly committals, while the number of insane paupers in Butler Hospital was reduced about one-fifth:—

Committals to the watch-house for drunkenness, and small assaults growing out of drunkenness, from July 19, to October 19, 1852, (the first three months under the new liquor law).....	177
Committals to the watch-house for corresponding months of last year	282
Committals to the watch house for one month immediately preceding the operation of the new law	153
Committals to the county jail from July 19 to October 19, 1852, (the first three months under the new liquor law), for State offences.....	77
For city offences	22—99
Do do for the corresponding months of last year, for State offences	110
For city offences	51—161

For city offences for one month preceding the operation of the new liquor law, for State offences	40
For city offences	32— 72

“Our law is well sustained by the people. The leading men in the State have sustained it, some from policy, but I have no doubt the great majority from principle. We feel that the law is so thoroughly established on our Statute Book that no party or combination dare attempt to repeal it. Our Legislature, which are now in session here, are strongly in favor of it, and I have no doubt its good results will be more felt when we have had a longer trial of it. I shall have much pleasure in introducing you to some of our representatives.”

Hon. W. R. Watson, Secretary of State for Rhode Island. “I have just prepared a statement in reply to a circular from the State Office at Washington. In that I express as fully as possible my views of the beneficial results of the Maine Law in Rhode Island. I stated in effect—The Prohibitory Liquor Law, generally known as the Maine Law, has been in operation in this State about two years and a-half. Its effects I cannot doubt have been greatly to diminish crime, pauperism, misery, and that long and dark catalogue of moral, social and physical evils which result from intemperance. The statistics of State prisons, Poor-houses and Lunatic Asylums, here as well as everywhere else, conclusively show that a very large proportion of the inmates of those abodes of misery, are the sad victims of this, the greatest of the evils that afflict our country. Whatever, therefore, operates to diminish intemperance must necessarily largely and efficiently contribute to relieve society from its terrible consequences. As intemperance diminishes, the number of State offences decreases, and the money worse than wasted by individuals in intoxicating drinks, goes to purchase the necessities of life. The cases of abject poverty, broken constitutions, ruined reputations and blasted hopes, in many instances the immediate exciting causes of insanity and raving madness, are proportionally lessened. The moral and social condition of the community is thus improved and elevated. The Sabbath is better observed, the attendance upon public worship is increased, and individual comfort and public prosperity promoted. Such have been the salutary effects of the enforcement of the Maine Liquor Law in this State. Its FRUITS HAVE BEEN GOOD, and the blessings of health, happiness and peace; of drunkards redeemed and restored to their friends; of scattered families re-united and made happy; of neighborhoods riotous and disorderly made quiet,—which flow from it, would seem to attest the sanction of a higher power, and demonstrate its accordance with natural and Divine Laws. It is true that this law has had to contend

against severe and various opposition in this State, as it has done and must do everywhere else. It has had to combat long and inveterate individual habits and old time-honored customs. It has had to encounter the heartless avarice of those who are engaged in the liquor traffic. It has had to work its way through all the formulas and technicalities of the old imported English Common Law, and all the delays, quibbles and subtleties of those whose business it is to interpose between violated laws and merited punishment. But it has generally triumphed, and its course is now, as it has been from the first—*onward*, CONQUERING and to conquer. There is one remarkable fact which stands out prominently in the history of this Law, wherever it has been tried, and that is,—it never recedes. Its onward course has ever been steady and sure. It holds every inch of ground it gains in public opinion, and in the face of the strongest opposition, works its way quietly but certainly to general adoption and final acquiescence. This fact clearly proves that its appeal to the moral sense of men and communities is irresistible.

“The general feeling of respectable citizens in this State is decidedly favorable to the Law. It has been repeatedly subjected to all kinds of popular tests, and has always commanded large majorities in its favor. It was enacted by our Legislature in January, 1852, by a decided majority. The question has been since submitted to a direct vote of the qualified electors of the State, whether this law should be continued or not? which resulted in an overwhelming majority in favor of its continuance, and in the two Legislatures which have been elected since its passage, there has been such large majorities favorable to it, that no attempt even has been made to effect its repeal. I have always been in favor of this law. I advocated it when it was first enacted by our General Assembly; I voted to continue it in operation when that question was submitted to the popular vote; I am still decidedly in favor of it, and of its firm, faithful and efficient enforcement. I believe this law is destined to achieve very great and beneficial results, moral, social and political to this State, and to every State which shall be wise enough to adopt it. When it has been adopted by, and done its good work in, a large majority of the States of the Union, as I believe it ultimately will, its friends will then be prepared to march upon the Capital and demand of Congress that the importation of all wines and other liquors, whether in large or small packages, shall be wholly and for ever prohibited. When this shall have been accomplished, as accomplished I trust it shall be, the last fortress of the greatest foe to individual happiness and the public peace in our country, will have fallen.”

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

From Providence we proceeded to Boston, where we met with Rev.^d Dr. Beecher, Deacon Grant, Dr. Stone, Mr. Slack, Mr. Morse, and several other devoted friends of the cause.

Dr. James Stone, one of the representatives for the City of Boston, whom, along with Mr. Slack, we met in the House of Assembly, said, "I have recently given my opinion in regard to the operations of the Law, at some length, to a gentleman resident in Birmingham, lately a member of the British Parliament. I do not know that I could at present add much to these statements, further than this, that longer experience only confirms me in the beneficial results of the Law wherever it is enforced. Use, therefore, as much of that document as you require to convey to your friends my candid testimony in favor of the Law. Our amended Law has passed this House by a large majority, and we have very little fears for it in the Senate."

The previous part of the Dr.'s communication, which refers chiefly to the passage of the Law in the various states, and the arguments in regard to its constitutionality, we need not here repeat. We commence then at Ans. No. 6:—

6. There is a difference of opinion concerning the working of the Law, but its friends generally control the Temperance organizations of this State and throughout the country. Clergymen, anti-slavery, and total abstinence men, are almost unanimously friendly to the Law. Hotel keepers, liquor sellers, grocers, apothecaries, and regular drinkers are about as unanimously opposed to it. Moderate drinkers are divided in sentiment. My own opinion can be very briefly expressed. Naturally shrinking with aversion from some of the more stringent portions of the Law, in consequence of an early and unrepressed feeling in favor of the largest phase of personal liberty, which includes an opposition to general sumptuary Legislation, I looked upon the Law, when first enacted in our sister State, with some suspicion. But the statistics exhibiting its remarkable effects in securing the diminution of crime, of intemperance and of pauperism, early compelled me to waive all my scruples. I therefore believe it to be, in the main, widely beneficent in its operation, at the same time that I regard it to be subject, as is all other human legislation, to such amendment and improvement, as the course of time and the wisdom of experience shall best evince their necessity, in order the better to accomplish its important objects. The statistics concerning the diminution of pauperism and crime are in the accompanying papers. I know no reason why such diminution should not continue permanent.

From time immemorial, persons charged with crime, and whose principles are not firmly fixed, have endeavored to avoid the conse-

quences thereof, by evasions and subterfuges. As in the past, so it will be in the future, until human nature undergoes transformation. The Law in question was early subject to this criticism. Yet I know not why it should be more properly amenable to it than any other law has been or would be, which has exerted, or which can exert over the passions and follies of men, an equal control.

It is one of the peculiarities of this Law, whatever theories drawing a different conclusion, we might in advance apply to it, that where it has been most efficiently executed, there the greatest results in the suppression of crime and pauperism have been most satisfactorily achieved, and it has seized with such strong hold on the hearts of the people, that its popularity has in those places become invincible.

7. From the best evidence that I can gather concerning the influence of unaided moral measures, the average effect of pledges to total abstinence, is that fifty per cent. adhere for a single year, thirty-three per cent for five years, and twenty-five per cent permanently. In procuring the most decisive results from moral suasion, organization into permanent associations has undoubtedly been productive of much good. And the Temperance Societies of the country have generally long since given up as a failure the early efforts of organization for the sake of partial abstinence, and now strenuously advocate total abstinence only.

8. There can be little doubt that the moral means resorted to for the purpose of repressing intemperance have at once produced good results, and at the same time prepared the public mind for compulsory measures.

9. The opposition of those previously engaged in the traffic, where the Law has been thoroughly executed, has been sometimes removed by a very simple process. Many, acting as law-abiding citizens among a law-loving people in a law-maintaining State, have at once relinquished their sales, and commenced other occupations. Others have been indicted and the liquors destroyed. They have resumed business and the enactment has been again enforced. Then, deterred either by the prospect of the loss of means or the nearer vision of the State Prison, they have transferred their capital into other branches of industry, and thereupon a two-fold object induces them to maintain the Law; first, their interests are no longer absorbed in its infraction; and second, being themselves prevented from violating the Law, they are naturally desirous of prohibiting others from exercising privileges which they do not themselves possess.

So far as the first two questions in your letter of the twentieth are concerned, there is a uniformity of opinion. No considerable class of our citizens maintain that *beneficial* results accrue from the constant

use of alcoholic drinks as a beverage. The radical difference between the Temperance men and their opponents, is rather upon the question, "Do *injurious* results follow such use?" one class of the community contending for the affirmative, and another class for the negative of the proposition; while the latter class do not generally go so far as to maintain the absolute improvement of the health and strength from such use.

The answer to the third question deserves more consideration. Having relation to the habitual use of alcohol, medicinally, it demands a professional and scientific investigation and decision.

Within the last few years, a careful scrutiny into autoptical results has appeared to justify scientific medical gentlemen in the conclusion that there exist two natural antagonists to tubercular disease. The first of these antagonists is cancer; malignant disease seizing hold of some one of the tissues or vital organs, and continually increasing, accompanied with severe pain, until it results in death from *carcinoma*. The second of these antagonists is alcohol; that is, cases of death ensuing from drunkenness or *delirium tremens*. In both these classes of cases, scientific research has apparently shown that tubercular disease is not progressing actively in the lungs; and in accordance with the theory of Louis, which is deemed to be correct, that whenever tubercular disease exists in the brain, the liver, the mesenteric glands, the kidneys, or in any part of the system, it exists also in the lungs, so conversely, if it does not exist in the lungs, as in the instances adduced, it does not exist in any part of the system. But in giving a response affirmatively in favor of a very small class of invalids using alcohol in some shape, strictly under medical prescriptions, it is only just to add that the attempt, even if successful, to avoid consumption by the unrestrained use of alcoholic stimulants, substitutes, equally with the avoidance of the same disease by means of cancer, a far more horrible and painful death, and thereby becomes manifold worse than a desertion of Scylla to perish by Charybdis. The Maine Law, however, provides for the legitimate use of alcohol for chemical, mechanical, sacramental, and medicinal purposes.

The fourth question of this date refers to the climate and its necessary influence over our habits in the use of wines, &c. As a general rule, in different parts of the country, the character of the water exercises a greater ostensible control than the climate. West of the principal Atlantic cities, the water is, in many places, either impregnated with lime, discolored by the soil, or offensive to the taste, and it is the custom of many, seeking an excuse for their luxurious habits, to attribute the cause to the water, rather than to their own perverted appetites.

To allude to my own experience, allow me to say that while travelling in different parts of the country many of my acquaintances, particularly in parts of New York State, South Carolina, Kentucky, Missouri, and Canada, have insisted that it was unhealthy to drink the water of the place, and have therefore strongly urged the use of wines and brandies; but it was observed that, while refusing myself to follow their kind advice, those of my travelling companions who were more fearless or less scrupulous, were also much more liable to temporary illness than myself. The fourth question is answered in the negative.

But why, after all the efforts that have been made, do drunkenness and the crime and pauperism consequent thereon, still continue? The answer is, The Law has not yet been carried into complete effect. The cases have not yet been adjudicated before our highest Courts. Obstructions have been constantly placed in the way. Great improvement of morals has, however, been made.

Not many years since, many artisans and employeés, such as shoemakers, stage-drivers, &c., were habitually accustomed to drink freely. *Now*, the practice has much abated, and we even hear of stage-drivers' Temperance Conventions; while the money formerly devoted to the purchase of liquor is now used to elevate them into a higher position in society, and to satisfy those wants which that higher position originates.

No branch of the Temperance Reform has more thoroughly succeeded than that which has had reference to public entertainments. It is only, I think, since the time of Mayor Quincy, jr., now about eight years, that the public dinners of this city have been prepared upon a temperance plan. And at this time, nearly all the great public festivals and entertainments in this vicinity, at which several hundred people are expected to be present, including the time-honored Commencement Dinner of Harvard University, are conducted upon temperance principles, no beverage being provided but lemonade, water, and coffee. The transformation of public opinion that would allow of this change has only been gradually achieved. But its accomplishment has been the result of the expenditure of much labor, time and money.

The questions that you have forwarded have been, in a measure, answered. I would greatly have preferred that they should have been presented to others far better able than myself, from their experience in such matters and from their knowledge of the subject, to communicate important facts, and deduce therefrom correct inferences. If, however, what has been written is of any value, it is at your service."

We attended a meeting of the State Temperance Committee, whose

Head-quarters is in Boston. After they had transacted some routine business, we expressed a desire to hear the opinions of Dr. Beecher on the Law, and its tendencies. The reverend and worthy old gentleman, —who has long since passed his three score years and ten, but still hale and fresh looking—threw aside his overcoat, and having given us a rapid and graphic outline of the temperance movement from its commencement in 1810 to the present time, he said: “This thing is of God. You may stave it off by law, until you have got a majority of the people to force it through; but carry it you must, and no man so foolish as not to see its success is greater than could have been conceived. It is God’s Work, every step of the way perfect as we go along. When at the early commencement we got advanced one stage, we came to a stand, and then we were inspired, in a certain sense, to see what to do next. But we never went back, although we slept on our arms sometimes. Public sentiment somehow got prepared for another step. I have the same confidence that God has done this, as I have that He planted the Gospel in the times of the Apostles, and carried it forward against fire and sword. With two or three exceptions, all the Clergymen in this city are with us in the movement; we are all as one in this great question. We are in the hardest place, perhaps, in this Continent, but we have done great things even here, and now we are about to reap the fruits of all our labours. Our great opposition has come from politicians, and from the rum-sellers themselves. We could have put the thing down in a fortnight, but for politicians; but public sentiment here, notwithstanding all our disadvantages, is decidedly in our favour. Nobody believes we are going back. Some people say there is more liquor drunk in Boston than there was before; few people believe it. The impulse in favor of prohibition is very strong, it is rapidly gaining ground, and will speedily prevail.”

Mr. W. B. Spooner, one of the committee, said:—“The present state of public opinion is very strongly set in favour of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, and the Legislature is such at present that the temperance committee can get such a law as they please. It is rather difficult to restrain them from making it more stringent than we wish it to be. The principle of prohibition has gained ground very rapidly within these two years past. Last year in the house of representatives there was a majority of 40 in favour of the law. The Senate had a small majority. This year I believe that more than three fourths of both branches of the Legislature are in favour of it. Even the newspapers which have hitherto opposed the movement, say there is no doubt that you will get the Law, but you will never stop intemperance in that way. That remains to be seen; the mass of the people are in favour of it, and there is no doubt it will be carried out. The present law

eliminated of the right of seizure and the destruction of the liquor is already in operation in a large share of the country towns and has suppressed the open traffic in the majority of them.

"In Worcester, Cambridge, Roxbury and many other such places the law is very well carried out this year.

"In Lowell, a considerable difficulty arose, as to which court should have jurisdiction, and many of the cases that were prosecuted stood over for more than a twelvemonth. When the law went into force there, two years last July, Mr. Huntingdon was Mayor, and he went right about the law and put it in force, and shut up 275 public houses. During that year, pauperism and crime were reduced at least two-thirds. Next year Mayor Huntingdon was promoted to an office in the Government, and his successor lacked the energy necessary to carry through the law. Many of the cases that were carried through the courts, were quashed in consequence of some informality, and the people got somewhat discouraged, and are waiting on for the new law. It was a singular fact that Judge Merrick one of the Judges of the Superior Court gave as his decision that the police Justice of Lowell had no jurisdiction, and in consequence of this decision upwards of 100 cases were broken down. The Supreme Court afterwards decided that Judge Merrick's decision was unsound and this broke down some 100 more cases. But the operations of the law during Mayor Huntingdon's rule show the following satisfactory results :—'The effect of the law thus far has been to annihilate many hundreds of drinking shops ; while thousands have been compelled to suspend or secrete their operations. More than two hundred have been suppressed in Lowell alone. In various parts of the State,—Newton, Taunton, Springfield, Pittsfield, there have been held musters, cattle-shows, public celebrations, at which the peace and order have surprised all spectators, and opened a new era in the history of such assemblages. During the first two months of the law's operation, the diminution of the arrests for drunkenness in Salem was seventy-seven per cent. If there has since been a relapse, it is from no defect in the law ; it was enforced long enough to show its power.'

Charles W. Morse, Esq., proprietor of the *Boston Telegraph* :—
 "You will find this to be a fact in connexion with Boston at the present time, that there are double the number of liquor houses here that there was a year ago, for this reason : They have been driven from all the country places, from Cambridge, from Roxbury, from Charleston, and many other places, and they have found a resting place in Boston for a short time, because the law was not here enforced.

Mr. D. W. Alvord of Greenfield 108 miles from Boston said :—"About a year ago there were between 20 and 30 grog shops in Greenfield,

I don't think there is one now in the village. The enforcement of the law broke them up entirely. Within two years past there were open grog shops in very many of the towns in the county of Franklin; at this moment I do not think there are 10 in the whole county. The decrease is owing entirely to the enforcement of the Law. It has been a blessing beyond anything we ever have had, and I am satisfied that wherever it is enforced it will prove a blessing to the community. Its effects in lessening rowdyism are very marked. Before the law passed, our streets were noisy and riotous, and it was unsafe for any female to venture out in the evening unprotected. I was afraid to send my own child, a boy 10 years of age into the streets unprotected a year ago. Now I have no hesitation in doing so, and females are perfectly safe to go out alone. At any public show, or on a training day our streets used to be filled with drunkenness, now such a day passes over very quietly, and scarcely a drunken man will be seen.

PORTLAND, MAINE.

Having satisfied ourselves as to the cause in Boston, we proceeded to Portland with feelings somewhat of despondency. Our whole course, so far, had been cheered with the Jubilant song of triumph. The Law had worked to admiration wherever enforced with energy, was working, and was effectual. But in Portland, we expected to see every second shop a dram-shop, and every other man intoxicated. Portland! which a few years ago could boast of five distilleries in full blast,—Portland! which, before the Law, with a population of 20,000, had upwards of 300 places for the open sale of intoxicating liquors, was now, since the Law, according to the published statements of John Neal and the Editor of the *State of Maine*, reliable authorities no doubt, transformed into a huge grog-shop, where drunkenness had nearly doubled, and crime had enormously increased.

It was no wonder though we did feel rather nervous at the thought, that all the sweet pictures of domestic felicity daguerreotyped on the mind as we had journeyed along, were now to be rudely replaced by scenes of misery, desolation and woe. But the work must be accomplished. There was no use trying to console ourselves with the reflection that John Neal, a literary gentleman of some celebrity, who had written some twenty or thirty volumes of novels, and nearly as much poetry, might in his more mellow moments, have mixed up his statements with moonshine, and given them just a *little* spice of romance. That could not be, because although they had been flatly and publicly denounced as false, by some 400 of the most respectable merchants in Portland, they had been endorsed by the Editor of the *State of Maine*, and he! ah! here we were in the dark—though now we see clearly

But judge of our surprise, when instead of going into a modern Sodom streaming with drunkenness, and reeking with all manner of impurities, we wandered from one end of the beautiful city to the other, and never yet saw one place where liquor was openly sold.

It could not be that we had got into the *wrong State*, we had traced our way too closely for that. And yet; this could not be that Portland, which the luxuriant fancy of John Neal and the Editor of the *State of Maine* had conjured up as one of the most ungainly spots on earth's wide surface. It was even so, and so far as we could learn there is not one house in Portland where drink can be openly had.

"There," said Neal Dow, as we drove down the streets with him on the following day,—“there, where that Harness maker's shop is, was a large grog shop; there, the next door but one was another, and in a stone's throw I could point you to twenty in the line of this street; but these places are now filled by honest industrious tradesmen.”

Rev. D. B. Peck, Portland.—“I know a number of cases of reclamation from intemperance, as a direct result of the Maine Law, men who were intemperate previous to the passing of the law and have since become sober men. Four instances have come under my own observation, and there are many others in the city of which I have been credibly informed. One of these is a very interesting case. He was a miserable drunken creature before the passage of the law. During Mr. Dow's Mayoralty, he could not get a drop of liquor, and was from absolute necessity forced to go without it. He found after a trial that he could do without it, and he has since become an industrious man, and accumulated some little money. He and his wife are now regular in attendance at the church, and his family, wretched and miserable before, are now comfortably clothed. He has purchased the house in which they now live, and a great part of the purchase money is paid. The other three to whom I alluded have become sober respectable men.

“Since the passing of the law, five new churches have been erected in this city. I remember at the time these churches were commenced, objections were raised by some that it would draw off the people from the old congregations. But such has not been the case. Every old congregation has increased, and our new churches are well filled. The fact is we require one or two more churches.

“With regard to Sabbath schools, I know of many children now attending Sabbath school, who, before the passing of the law, were children of intemperate parents, and were never to be seen at a Sunday school.

“There were about three hundred places here for the open sale of

liquor before the passing of the law. There is at present no place for the open sale. I am satisfied there are several places where liquor can be got, but it must be sold in secret; except in hotels, where it can be had, only by travellers, the others who sell it are vile, unprincipled men, men of low vulgar habits.

"The feeling in regard to the principle of prohibition is gradually increasing. The law has not by any means effected what it is capable of doing, and what it would do in the hands of its friends, if they had it to execute. In almost all our country towns, such as Saco, Rockland and others, it would be very hard work to get liquor in any of them, except from the town agent who keeps it for purposes mentioned in the law.

"I am fully convinced that a rigid enforcement of the law is the only course that can be adopted to accomplish the end in view. The class of men engaged in the rum-selling are men devoid of principle, who are ready to sell, provided they can make money out of it. That class of men must be reached by the penalties of the law. The parties who violate the Law are foreigners, chiefly from Ireland. We have no other foreign population here. They come here, with all their vicious habits and grovelling tastes uncontrolled, and they think they can make money at this thing, and they set to work. They have had no previous training in habits of temperance, and they die out before they are reclaimed. They don't live on an average more than seven years here.

"Notwithstanding all that has been said about the law not having been carried out in this city, I am convinced that there is a strong healthy public feeling in favour of its enforcement. We had two distilleries working when the law passed, and one in process of erection. The one then in progress, is converted into a gas work. The fires of the other two are blown out.

"Our prospect in regard to a new Mayor is good. I have not the least doubt Mr. Dow will be elected by a large majority. One gentleman, Mr. Sawyer, told me the other day that he was determinedly opposed to the Maine Law when it passed, and had spent \$300 to help to defeat Neal Dow's re-election as Mayor. Now he would cheerfully give as much to get him elected, as he had witnessed the beneficial operations of the law upon the city."

Mr. Alderman Thomas, one of the Representatives of the City of Portland.—"I think that there is no question that the feeling in favor of prohibition is increasing in this city. Hundreds of men who, to my own knowledge opposed the law at its first enactment, are now in favour of it. They long to have a law that they can put fully in force, and they are determined to have such a law.

"Well you may not understand why Neal Dow was not re-elected, and it will take some time to make you acquainted with all the kinds of opposition brought against him. One thing, however, you will keep in mind at the outset,—Mr. Dow had a majority of the legal votes. Many people were brought up to the poll who had no right to vote, but they swore that they were so-and-so. Some of them were rejected at the poll. There were hundreds of naturalization tickets brought from Boston, and handed to parties who came up and swore on these tickets, and thus the list was raised. It was understood that these tickets were borrowed for the occasion in Boston, and given to people who lived in the country and had no kind of title to vote in Portland.

"Two men, two leaders of a party, who told me they were determined to hazard any amount of money to defeat Mr. Dow's election, said they were prepared to expend from \$3,000 to \$4,000 to accomplish that object. It was shrewdly suspected where that money came from.

"Then Mr. Dow's opponent was no mean man. He was the most popular man in the whole State of Maine, and was a friend of the temperance movement. It was not Rum *versus* Maine Law, as it was in the election of our Governor; but rather the Maine Law mildly enforced *versus* the Maine Law put right through, as they say.

"I think there is more drink used in the city at present than there was when Mr. Dow was Mayor. There could not be much fewer than 300 grog-shops in the City of Portland when the law was passed, now there is no such thing as an open grog shop. There are several places where it is said they sell drink, but it is chiefly among the low emigrants. That is the class we have to contend with. Even amongst that class drinking was much greater before the law passed than now. There are no clubs, that I know of where young men go to get drink.

"The representatives of the City of Portland are all temperance men. No other than a temperance man could be elected to represent the city. You cannot at the present time elect a rum man for any office in the city whatever by popular vote. There has not been a time in the history of Portland when the Temperance party has been so strong in all respects,—in numbers, in intellect and in wealth, as at this present moment. No party in the city would think of putting up any man for election to any office whatever in the city who was not a *bona fide* temperance man.

"I do not think there has been in this city one single instance of resistance to the law, and I am fully convinced that no sort of combination whatever could be formed by any party to prevent the passing of a more stringent law. Our ministers of all denominations are united in favour of the Law.

"I have had a good deal of business with the lumbering Districts, and I can say that drink is not furnished at all to these Districts, unless in the medicine chest. There was formerly a great quantity of liquer used in all the camps; but, even those opposed to the Temperance movement, do not now furnish liquor to their men. I know one or two gentlemen in that business, who are not with us as Temperance men, but they will not furnish any liquor to their men upon any account whatever.

AUGUSTA, MAINE.

We proceeded to Augusta, as the Legislature was in Session, to ascertain the kind of feeling which pervaded the Legislature in regard to the working of the Law, and to have a few minutes conversation with the Governor upon the subject. On our way down Mr. Ald. Thomas, who was returning to his Legislative duties, introduced us to Allen Haines, Esq., of Portland, a gentleman who took the deepest interest in our mission, who devoted the greater part of the day to us, to facilitate our enquiries, and gave us a full insight into the political state of the question. The following condensed statement we give from his lips.

Mr. Allen Haines.—"My own impression is, that personally, Mr. Dow has made a good many enemies, as every man who undertakes to reform a great abuse, invariably will. Mr. Dow is ardent, impulsive, and fearless. At the time the question came up in Portland, the people had not got up to the point, that the principle of prohibition and the Maine Law should take precedence of all other movements. It was on the eve of a Presidential election, and the Democratic party felt it was necessary to adhere to their old party organization. But, as an evidence of the amount of popular feeling in favour of the Maine Law, they did not dare to take up a man in opposition to Mr. Dow who was not a thorough Maine Law man. I voted for Judge Paris. There is no man in the State of Maine who has held so many responsible offices, as Judge Paris. I remember, when I was a boy, he was Judge in the United States Court, and Judge of Probate at the same time. He was elected Governor of the State of Maine, at an age younger than any other man ever was made Governor in this State. He was then elected United States Senator—elected and re-elected; and while Senator was appointed Judge of our Supreme Court. While Judge of the Supreme Court, he was transferred to Washington—under the administration, I think, of General Jackson—as Comptroller of the Treasury. Here he remained in this office until after the accession of General Taylor, and being of a different political faith he was left out in the nominations of the party in power.

He then came back to Portland. He has always been a consistent member of the Orthodox Church—always a consistent temperance man, and a Maine law man, when the question was brought up. As a man he is amiable and courteous. He has no enemies, and I am not aware that he ever had one, which is a very singular thing for a politician.

"I am free to say, that when the question of the nomination of Judge Paris was taken up, we came to the conclusion that there was no other man in the Democratic party we could elect as Mayor of Portland, in opposition to Neal Dow. I was one of the party who insisted upon putting up Judge Paris. I voted for him, as did nearly all the Democratic party, purely, however, on party political grounds.

"Our present Mayor—Mr. Cahoun—is a very worthy man. He has been unfortunate in business, and as the office of Mayor has a salary attached to it, he was elected simply out of respect for him in his misfortune. He has at present no other means of support. He is a Maine Law man, there is no doubt about that, but he has not got fire and energy enough to carry it out. He is, however, highly respected by all. He is an excellent man, and an excellent Mayor; and if he were supported by his Marshal and deputies, he would be much more efficient. The Marshal is said to be favorable to the law, but the Deputies are not only inefficient, they are indisposed to carry the Law out.

"Judge Paris was in the same predicament. He said he was not sustained by his executive officers. There were four of his Aldermen which were appropriately termed, "Rum Aldermen."

"There was another influence at work against the Law. About three years ago a paper called the *Expositor* was started in Portland, to oppose the Maine Law. My own impression is, that it was started directly in the rum interest. The paper never supported itself, nor half supported itself, and the general belief is, that a great portion of the money that supported it, came from Boston. Before it was started, the person who did so came to consult me on the subject. I had, in my capacity as President of one of the City Banks, befriended him now and again, as well as in other ways. He came and told me that he had a proposition from some parties in Boston to start a paper to oppose the Law. I told him very frankly if he did so, our intercourse was at an end. I urged him against it, but the bait was too tempting, seemingly, to be resisted. The paper was started, and dragged out a brief existence.

"When the Hon. Shepard Cary started in his canvas for Governor, he went through all the State directing his attacks against the Maine Law, and was accompanied by the Editor of this same *Expositor*. Mr.

Cary was a member of Congress for several years, a member of the Senate House, and had been a leading Democrat for several years. But he was brought out on the Rum ticket, directly in opposition to the Maine Law; and, notwithstanding that he stumped the State, and had the Editor of the rum paper with him heralding his praises; and notwithstanding all his *prestige* as a man, he received only something like 4,000 votes out of a representative vote of 90,000.

"Here again the democratic party stood forward as a party, in direct opposition to the Maine Law, and were defeated. I voted for Governor Paris the regular democratic candidate, and he never was beaten at an election in his life before. Governor Morrill's brother, one of the most eminent lawyers in the State, voted with the democratic party, and consequently against his own brother. We thought it necessary to keep party lines distinct.

"Although we have suffered for the last year or two by the law not being fully enforced,—yet there is nothing like the drinking in the city that there was. We have no open houses for the sale of liquor, but people get it in from Boston in milk cans, and various sorts of packages; but the new Law will sweep all that away. There is no question that the city is much quieter than it was before the passing of the Law, and the sentiment in favour of the principle of entire prohibition is nearly universal."

Leonard Andrews, Esq., representative from Biddeford: County of York, a manufacturing town with a population of about 8,000. "The Law has not been so strictly enforced in our town, in consequence of some little difference in feeling among the town officers. We commenced soon after the passing of the law to enforce it, and in a very short time, we closed up every grog shop in the place. There have been no open shops since. It is however to be had in some low places kept by emigrants. So far as my own knowledge goes, the law has worked to a charm in Biddeford. When the population was not more than 2,000, I have seen as many as 30 places for the open sale of rum. Drunkenness was very prevalent. But now the scene is changed. Ever since the law was enacted the feeling of respectable citizens has been increasing in its favour, and no combination of political parties could defeat it if a popular vote was taken on the question. From my connexion with the city affairs previous to the passing of the law I had a good opportunity of witnessing the crime and drunkenness that existed and can now speak of the very great change which was speedily effected. We love the law in Biddeford."

J. D. Prescott, Esq., of Franklin County; Librarian of the House. "At the time the Maine Law was enacted the county of Franklin was strongly democratic and the democratic party were accounted as

the opponents of the Law. The friends of Temperance consequently organized upon the Law and succeeded by a majority of several hundreds in returning every member to this House and to the Senate upon this issue alone. There were five Maine Law men sent to the Assembly and one to the Senate, so that the delegates from that County are entirely Maine Law. The Law is enforced successfully in every town in the county, and the effects are most salutary; peace and order and everything desirable is the result. I know a great many instances of reclamation from intemperance in consequence of the enforcement of the Law amongst the labouring and mechanical classes. Before the Law, some of their families were living in wretchedness, now they are surrounded by comfort. We have very many such instances in our county.

"The attendance upon public worship has gradually increased since the law was passed. I don't think that its effects upon the attendance at our common schools is so great, as the children even of those parents who were intemperate, were brought out to school, but then there is a marked difference upon the comfortable appearance of some of the children.

Enoch Goodale, representative of Wells, County of York, introduced to us as elected in opposition to the Law, and chiefly on the rum-interest, said:—"The principle of prohibition is very generally acknowledged in Wells. But I think that there is a majority of those whom I represent opposed to the Law in some of its features. Some of them think that a stringent License Law would be more beneficial than the Maine Law, while others of them are opposed to the Maine Law because it does not go far enough and prohibit the sale of liquors entirely and not allow them to be sold even by town agents. Both of these parties voted for me at last election. But there was a strong political feeling manifested. My opponent was strongly Anti-Nebraska and Maine Law. So far as my experience goes I think the operations of the law have not decreased drunkenness, because it has taken the sale out of the hands of responsible parties and put it into the hands of irresponsible parties. We did not appoint town agents in Wells, because the majority of our people were opposed to the enforcement of the law. There were several licensed houses before the passing of the law. Now there are no houses for the open sale of liquor; but I have no doubt there are places where it can be had."

Governor Merrill:—"I think the law is working very well in Maine. We have never had an opportunity to give it a fair trial, for the truth is, since this law was enforced the executive officers have been very much against us. Those not opposed to us have, to say the least, been indifferent to us, and consequently, with indifference on one hand

and opposition on the other the law has not been generally enforced, and no law can be beneficial or otherwise, if not enforced. But wherever it has been enforced it has worked well. In Portland when it was enforced by Mr. Dow, it was potent enough to drive the traffic entirely from the city. Mr. Dow published some valuable statistics of the operations of the law during his Mayoralty which will fully show its happy effects. These Statistics you must obtain as they tell powerfully in favour of the law. Mr. Dow will furnish you with a copy. Since the Mayoralty of Portland was changed, the traffic has revived a little. In all our cities and towns where the governments have been favourable to the law and have been disposed to enforce it, it has done the work admirably. I do not say that you can extinguish intemperance by such a law all at once. It was too much to expect that. But I do say that it certainly most wonderfully circumscribes the traffic and will finally drive it out. We have penal enactments against larceny, but although you hear of thefts, you do not say that these are the result of the penal laws. But unreasonable men when they see that drink can still be obtained in some places say, this is all in consequence of the law. I do not hesitate to say from personal observation that the evil has been greatly curtailed by this present law. The people now absolutely demand that it be made more stringent. But even where the present law has been enforced I can give you a list of towns where rum-selling has been absolutely extinguished.

“In the little town of Readfield, where I reside, a place of some 2000 inhabitants, we had five or six grog shops at the time of the passing of the Law. It was a border town where people came in from a distance, and bought to a large extent. When the law went into operation, we got a Board of select men, who obeyed the instructions of the town, and we succeeded in shutting up every grog shop. In ten days every one was closed, and there has not been one open since; nor can it stay there in the public gaze, any more than a thief could before his victim.

“We chose a town agent, and the select men furnished him with liquor. The amount bought by the select men cost \$198; and this has served for the last two years for all mechanical and medicinal purposes whatever; and I think I would be safe in saying that for 20 years prior to the passage of the Law, the annual expenditure would not be less than from \$8,000 to \$10,000. From the peculiar situation of the town, it was noted as a great place for selling liquor, but now we have cleared it all out, and there is not a drop to be had.

“From observation I can say that wherever the Law has been enforced, such has been the result, and such will invariably be the result of this Law, wherever the people take hold of it.

"The Law was passed by the Legislature in 1851, and the feeling in its favour has been growing stronger every year. The public feeling in favour of the Law was very fully manifested in the overwhelming vote on the election of Governor. There were four candidates in the field. Mr. Cary was the rum candidate, nominated in direct opposition to the Law.—A man long in public life; a Senator for many years, and a very good debater. He took the stump and stumped the State. And yet out of a vote of 90,000 only received from 3000 to 4000 votes. Opposition to the Maine Law was made the prominent feature in all his stump addresses, and yet the votes he received will show how far he had miscalculated. The fact is, no man dare enter the field, as a member for Congress, or any other important office in this State, and openly say that he is opposed to the Maine Law, and have the remotest chance of success. I doubt very much whether public sentiment was prepared for this Law when it was passed, it seemed so stringent,—but that sentiment has been growing stronger and stronger every day, and now we carry everything in favour of the Law by acclamation. It operates upon every interest, and I say, with the greatest confidence, that it has swept all strong opposition away.

"Well, I can only say that all those men who say there is more liquor sold now than before the passing of the Law, state what they know to be false.

"Here, in Augusta, parties would go to Boston and buy drink enough to freight a little schooner; and now there is not as much brought to this place in a twelve-month altogether, as any one house was in the habit of bringing in one single cargo.

"Last year the Stanley House was flooded, where you see one bottle of champagne now, you would have seen fifty. We have a different house now. The Augusta House, now filled with members of the Legislature, was formerly overflowing with rum. No decent man could stay there without being annoyed with the effects of rum. But everything has been so thoroughly swept, that I am stopping there this year; all our temperance men are there, and we have not been able to trace a drop of liquor in that house. And so it is with the people who are here to do business, they find the house quiet and comfortable. When I say this, I may state that Augusta is considered the worst place in the State of Maine.

"We are now making our Law more stringent. In the Senate I do not think there is one vote against the Law. The House stands upon that question in private feeling more than three to one, but they dare not even show that feeling. In the whole House, of 151 members, I do not think there will be 30 votes in opposition to the Law.

Ques.—How do you account for John Neal's recent opposition to the Law ?

Ans.—I account for it, and all intelligent men account for it, simply in his personal hostility to Neal Dow, his own cousin. John Neal was ambitious to be Mayor of Portland, and was defeated by Neal Dow, and from that time a violent personal hostility commenced; I have never heard any other opinion given.

Ques.—Are his statements in regard to the working of the Law endorsed by any respectable number of the citizens of Portland?

Ans.—My own impression is, that his opinions on that subject are repudiated by almost every respectable man in Portland. I know that not one of the 1700 of a representative vote which I received in Portland, would endorse his opinions on that question. Even those who voted against me, in order to keep in their own political organizations, the members of the Whig party and of the Democratic party, the hundreds who voted for Governor Paris and for Mr. Reed, would be the foremost to repudiate John Neal's statements on the workings of the Law.

Ques.—How do you account for the virulent opposition of the *State of Maine* newspaper ?

Ans.—I account for it by saying, that John A. Poor's affinities have always been with the rum party.

Ques.—Are the statements made in that paper, in regard to the working of the Law, to be relied on ?

Ans.—His paper is not at all relied on in Maine, it has neither circulation nor influence in Portland. It is the reputed Canada Grand Trunk organ ; is in the Jackson interest, and is said to be supported by some of the members of your own Canadian Legislature, to advocate the interests of that Road in connexion with Portland. Some of the Whigs, connected in the rum interest, who did not like the old Whig paper, the *Advertiser*, conducted by Mr. Carter, in consequence of his taking strong Temperance grounds, started this paper, and in came John A. Poor to the Editorial Chair, with strong pro-slavery and rum proclivities—while our Temperance people, to a man, are anti-slavery. The *State of Maine* was started since the Law was passed.

“In regard to Mr. Dow ; he is one of the best men that ever lived ; he is warm-hearted, generous and candid ; he is, however, impulsive, and sometimes does things which even his friends object to ; but you will find him at all times guided by the purest motives.

“I predict that that man will be elected to be Mayor of Portland at next election. No man enters this Legislative Hall, no man goes to a mass meeting, and is received with such enthusiasm as Mr. Dow is. Whatever he says is listened to with profound respect.

ELECTORAL ASPECT OF THE LAW.

Satisfied from the remarks of the Governor that the returns of his election would show somewhat the feeling of the State of Maine so far as the electoral body was concerned, on the great point at issue, we found ourselves quietly seated at the desk of the Secretary of State, who furnished us a few of the more prominent figures connected with the election. We have already said that the old Democratic party, as it is termed, which has ruled in Maine—with the exception of some four or five years—ever since it was a State—this old party thought proper to array itself against the Maine Law, or rather to stand upon their old democracy, irrespective of the inroad which this principle of prohibition had made on the general feeling of the State. Their party name was dearer to them than the principle of prohibition, and in saying so we include in that list such men as Mr. Allen Haines, one of the most amiable, generous-hearted men that ever lived. Yet, they chose their party line, and in order to succeed they selected one of the most popular men in the State,—a man superior in every sense of the word, and one who had never been beaten in a long political career.—Judge Paris was just the man they conceived to crown their party with success. Isaac Reed, Esq. was selected as the regular Whig candidate; while Shepard Cary came out the Anti-Maine Law and Rum candidate. In this state of matters Anson P. Morrill, a man of considerable business capacity, took the field as the advocate of the Maine Law. He took his stand upon the Maine Law, and the result proved that he had not miscalculated the strength of the public sentiment in regard to the principle of a prohibitory Liquor Law.

The Candidates were Anson P. Morrill, Maine Law; Albion K. Paris, Democrat; Isaac Reed, Whig; Shepard Cary, Anti-Maine Law :

COLLECTIVE VOTE OF THE STATE:			
Morrill.....	44,565	Reed.....	14,000
Cary.....	3,478	Paris	28,462
			Total votes..... 90,633
PORTLAND.			
Morrill.....	1,723	Reed.....	490
Cary	43	Paris.....	809
BANGOR.			
Morrill.....	1,275	Reed	320
Cary	6	Paris	556
BATH.			
Morrill	936	Reed	139
Cary	3	Paris.....	154
BIDDEFORD.			
Morrill.....	721	Reed.....	107
Cary.....	27	Paris.....	153
SACO.			
Morrill.....	548	Reed.....	159
Cary	13	Paris.....	234

ROCKLAND.			
Morrill.....	454	Reed.....	211
Cary	0	Paris	274
AROOSTOOK.			
Morrill.....	344	Reed.....	613
Cary	468	Paris	735

Here then we have a glimpse at the electoral feeling of the State of Maine, and it exhibits anything but a favour for Rum. Even in the County in which Mr. Cary resides, in which all his property is situated, and his influence centred,—the County of Aroostook—the regular Whig and Democratic parties beat him nearly two to one, while the Maine Law candidate, in a wild tract of country where the voice of Neal Dow was never heard, and where all they knew of the Maine Law was through the opposition of the Rum candidate—Mr. Cary,—even in that wild region the Maine Law candidate comes up within a respectable distance, on the naked issue of Rum or no Rum for the plantations. We proceed to give the opinion of several of the Representatives :

Noah Smith, Junior,—In the Executive Council:—"I reside, in Calais, a place of some 6,000 inhabitants. I was a member of the Legislature for five or six years, and was Speaker of the House last Session. I have taken a good deal of interest in the Maine Law. I introduced the Bill in the House when it was passed. Its operations have exceeded the anticipations of its friends, and it is daily increasing in public favour. Public sentiment was never so decidedly in its favour as at this present moment, and no organization could be successfully brought against it. Where it has been enforced the results have been good without exception, and the only places where it can be said to have failed in its operations, are, where they have had Anti-Maine Law Justices. Our Justices are appointed for seven years and are removed only by impeachment, and such a thing as an impeachment never came within my knowledge. There are to be found Justices hostile to the operations of the Law, but that will remedy itself. The delightful working of the Law is a matter about which there is no question in the minds of those who have given the subject the least attention. Each succeeding Legislature since its enactment has been stronger than the preceding in favour of the Law, and never was so strong as at present. I have not known the operations of the Law produce any harsh feeling, or any alienation of feeling in any neighbourhood, not more so I am certain than the execution of any other penal law. I do not think its tendency is to produce that alienation of feeling to which you refer. There is no man who is at all acquainted with the workings of the Law will say that it has operated injuriously.

"The sale of liquors in Calais is entirely abolished, there is no

place where it can be had openly, I know of none where we even suspect it can be had covertly.

"We are connected with New Brunswick by a bridge, and it is supposed that the parties who want liquor cross by the bridge to New Brunswick where it can be obtained, but it cannot be had in Calais. Liquors were sold to a large amount in Calais before the passing of the Law; and on its passing many people there spoke openly against it, because as they said its provisions were oppressive. Now, no one is found to speak against the Law. Many of those opposed to it, and who did not believe it would work well are obliged to confess that its operations have done good to the community. All good men of all sects of religion unite in sentiment in favour of the Law. This in Calais includes both Episcopalians and Catholics, although in some places these two denominations are either hostile or indifferent. The low classes of Irish with us will drink; but the respectable portion of the Irish are with us.

"One of the earliest seizures and one of the largest ever made in Maine was made in Calais sometime in 1851, when 50 barrels of liquor were seized and destroyed. If any operation of the law was calculated to excite hostility of feeling this was; but even upon that occasion there was no hostility of feeling manifested. The law was enforced and its principles were more confirmed, for the people saw that there was a determination on the part of its friends to execute it. It is believed generally that wherever that is the case there is no danger whatever. Many of those who sold liquor have turned their attention to their other business, and are now better off than when selling liquor. They have far fewer bad debts, and much more reliable customers. The other dealers have given up or gone to parts unknown.

"Take the votes of Maine throughout, and I hazard nothing in saying that there never was a public act upon any controverted subject enacted which has been so harmoniously sustained by the people as this Maine Law."

Sydney Perham, Esq., of Woodstock, Speaker of the House of Representatives.—"My knowledge of the workings of the Law extends over a large section of the State, and I can assure you that the Law works well. In many places where, prior to 1851, there was much drunkenness, a person in a state of intoxication is now seldom seen. The Law passed in 1851, and in 1853 the people asked for a more stringent measure, and it was granted. Still there are some loop holes in the Law which prevent that rigid enforcement which is desired, and now the people desire,—and the present Assembly has been elected to pass, a measure which cannot easily be

dodged—and such a law will be passed. The Governor—every member of the Senate, and a large majority of the House, are in favour of making the first offence against the Law, imprisonment,—a course which they think will completely break up the traffic. I do not know any place where liquor is now sold openly; but the arrests for drunkenness that are now and again made, prove that it can be got somewhere, slyly. In many sections, when the Law was first passed, the people doubted whether it could be enforced, but from that time to this the Law has made friends, and has taken so deep a root in the public mind, that I think no town or locality in the State would be found to vote for its repeal. Every where the cry is—Let the Law be enforced.

“Several of the towns go so far as to refuse to sell it at all. They say it is not needed either for chemical or medicinal purposes, and, therefore, ought not to be kept. They have no objections to pure alcohol being kept, but liquors they object to. Since this Session commenced, various medical men have been consulted, and they are nearly unanimous in opinion, that liquor can be dispensed with as a medicine. I am satisfied the public mind is coming rapidly to that conclusion.”

Dr. Oakes, representative for Auburn, a town of upwards of 3,500 inhabitants.—“The Law has been enforced pretty well in Auburn, and the result has been very favourable. Public sentiment there was rather against it at its passage, because they considered some of its features oppressive—particularly the right of search and seizure. Since the Law was enforced the opposition has gradually diminished, and public sentiment among all the better classes is in its favour. We have no place for the open sale of liquor in Auburn. We have not even an agent at the present time. There were several seizures of liquors made, and almost all the cases were successful in leading to conviction; yet, notwithstanding that, the feeling in favour of the Law has increased. The sellers generally had this branch connected with some other business, and they have turned their attention to that business. So far as my medical practice goes, I think liquor can be dispensed with even as a medicine. I have always been of opinion that it does more harm than good, even as a medicine. I do not say that it is never useful, but I do say that the balances are against its use as a medicine. If a strictly prohibitory law were introduced into the House, restricting its use as a medicine, I would most certainly vote for it.”

Seth May, Esq., Counsellor at Law, representative for Winthrop—a town with about 2,200 inhabitants.—“At first we were unsuccessful in the appointment of our Town Agent, but at the last annual

meeting a new Board of select men was elected, and a new Agent has been appointed. We have no place for the open sale of liquor. Before the Law there were four or five houses, but the parties have quit the business. I do not think it can be obtained any where in Winthrop, except at the agency. Drunkenness is exceedingly rare. Four or five years ago, in my professional capacity, I used to have a Justice trial every week nearly, but now my docket will show about three cases annually. Almost all our people are satisfied with the enforcement of the Law."

Timothy Sudden, Judge of probate, resident in Turner—population in 1850, 2573.—"There were seven grog shops in Turner at the passing of the Law. The sale was very great for the size of the place. We have no open shops now, nor have we had for some time. These grog-sellers were grocers as well, and they continue the one business. Some of them were taken up at first for violating the Law, but they were deterred from selling again. There was a struggle at the election of our municipal officers, but the Temperance party prevailed. Public feeling is favorable to the Law. We have taken great pains in regard to education in Turner, and the Law has helped us wonderfully in that department. On Sabbath observance, too, I am convinced it has had a very beneficial effect. Prior to the passing of the Law, two of our most valuable citizens were great drunkards. They are now reformed since the passing of the Law, and are both of them members of a Christian Church. There are several other instances of a similar nature although not so marked as these two.

"I was a member of the Legislature, and gave my vote for the Law when it was passed. In consequence of that I failed to be returned. Having received an appointment in the Judiciary afterwards, I was not so much before the public; yet I know that others holding the same opinion as strongly as I did were elected, and public opinion now sustains the stand that I then took.

"In the town of Buckfield, six miles from Turner,—the adjoining town—we have one of the most marked instances of the good work of the Law perhaps of any town in our section. Before the passage of the Law, there were in Buckfield five regular rum establishments; there are now none. And although there have been great exertions made by the enemies of the Law still they have not been successful in sustaining one house for the sale of liquor. In every municipal election since the Law passed there has been a struggle between the friends and foes of temperance. Last year—for the first time—the temperance party succeeded in electing the entire temperance ticket. Such is now the state of things there, that I think we may reasonably

expect the law to be carried out effectively. The sentiment of the people is now pretty much in favour of the Law.

"I have no doubt that the election of our Chief Magistrate, identified as he is with the cause of temperance, has promoted that cause very much. In the County of Oxford, in which I make circuit three times a year, we have had a struggle in the election of County Officers. Until the present year we have never been able to elect temperance men. Last election we elected a County Commissioner, strictly upon temperance principles, and two Senators and one-half of the Representatives, and gave a plurality of votes for those who were friendly to the cause of temperance. So far as my practice as an attorney goes, I know that actions for personal violence are far fewer than they were before. I don't think I have seen in that town one man intoxicated since the Law was enforced.

Edmund Kent, Esq., Counsellor at Law.—Was Governor of the State of Maine in 1838 to 1841, and was States' Consul to Rio Janeiro.—"Before I went to South America I have witnessed the evils of intemperance in Bangor, where I reside. I know a very marked change upon the place. The Law seems to be enforced there with a good deal of determination. There are no open places for the sale of liquor, although it can, undoubtedly, be obtained. I felt somewhat doubtful in regard to the principle of prohibition. I had a good deal of hesitancy about it, and while absent as I was during the time the Law was enacted, I did not think it could be enforced. But the longer I am in the State, the more I am convinced, that by energy and determination the Law can be enforced, and be attended with very beneficial consequences. It will be much more easily enforced in rural districts than in large towns; but my opinion decidedly is that the experiment ought to be fully tried; and I see no reason why an offence against the Law ought not to be punished as a very serious offence. I cannot understand why a man should step up and say, because I do not think the violation of the Law an offence, that therefore he is at liberty to violate it. If it is the Law of the State I do not see why the first offence should not even be severely punished,—that is to say,—if sufficient notice has been given that the Law was to be enforced. I do think that a large proportion of the people of Bangor are favorable to the Law. Even those, not strictly Temperance men, are favorable to its enforcement, and the feeling is gradually increasing. I am satisfied that if the authorities desire to enforce the Law, public sentiment will sustain them in it.

"While in South America, I met with several English people, and the general impression with them was, that the Law permitted the officers to go through all the houses and search for liquor. Of course this

was a misapprehension, because the Law does not contemplate any thing of the kind. My own private opinion is now decidedly in favour of the Law."

J. T. Leavitt, representative from Skowhegan, was introduced to us as one of the strongest opponents of the law in the House. He said—"I was in the Legislature when the Maine Law was passed, and I voted against it, because I am opposed to the principle of prohibition. I would not, however, vote to repeal the Law, I am disposed to allow it to get a fair trial, because I think it will work itself out. I do not think that you can abolish the traffic in liquors by legislation. I think, therefore, that the Law will gradually die out, and that its supporters will cease to enforce it. I think it has done a great deal of good in that part of the country to which I belong. I use no liquor myself. I believe it has a direct tendency to decrease the traffic in liquor, although it will not stop it. The open sale of liquor in Skowhegan was almost entirely abolished by the Law of 1846. There is no open sale at present,—and I do not know that there is any sold secretly. There is none sold openly, and very much to our gratification too, for the only class that drink was what we call our foreign population. The native citizens of our place are decidedly favorable to the Law, and are desirous that it be most stringently carried out. I think, in some cases, it has not been enforced with much discretion. There was one particular instance of that sort came to my own knowledge, but only one. The right of seizure, if properly managed, I don't disapprove of, because it broke up several places I was glad to see broken up. I am inclined to think that the majority of our people desire a more stringent measure. I want intemperance suppressed, but I doubt very much whether this Maine Law will suppress it; and I think its friends are of the same opinion, because they are continually tinkering at it."

Joseph Eaton, of Winslow, Senator.—"We have no open sale of liquor in Winslow. The effects of the enforcement of the Law have been very beneficial there; and they are strikingly manifested in the comfortable appearance of the citizens—in their dress and in their attendance at church. No doubt liquor can be got, but no native citizen that I know drinks. Those who drink with us are chiefly our foreign population. Formerly we used to sell \$100,000 at least of liquor annually, on the Kennebec River. Now we do not sell in the whole \$3,000 worth."

J. B. Hill, Counsellor at Law, representative for Bangor.—"I am at present Chairman of the Maine Law Committee, to whom the new Bill has been referred to be printed and introduced. I have drawn up this bill with a view to supply some deficiencies in the bill

of 1853, by making some of its provisions a little more stringent, and guarding, as far as may be, against those points in the former Law which our opponents were ingenious enough to take advantage of, by protracting the suits and appealing from judgment and so on. This, we think, the present bill will guard against in a great measure. We have now the benefit of experience, and have found where the rum sellers,—by the assistance of the best talent in the Courts, and the utmost ability and ingenuity,—have been able to prevent the execution of the law. In some places the law has been very efficient—in other places it has not.

“We have also, in the new bill, put very stringent penalties upon apothecaries and artists who would take undue advantage of the privilege they have of obtaining liquor, and allow it to be used as a beverage. We have also prepared very stringent penalties in regard to Express men and common Carriers, and will not allow them to carry it upon any pretence whatever. We don’t prevent the citizen from supplying himself, but we could not contrive any way in which Express men and common Carriers could be controlled, and we just cut them off entirely and say you shall not carry it at all.

“The principal difficulty our people have had in executing the law of 1853, is in the destruction of liquors when the owner is not arrested. The officer seizes the liquor but does not find the owner; and the law of 1853 provides that the officer advertise a reasonable time, and if not claimed, the liquors must be destroyed. Our courts may possibly come to the conclusion that this is not constitutional. A case has been argued, but it is not yet decided, although it is believed that the provisions on that point were not sufficient. To remove any difficulty, in the new Bill it is provided that all liquors, when seized, and the owner is not brought before the court, shall be proceeded against in the same manner as smuggled goods, giving the owner liberty to come before the court and claim his goods, and if he does so and defends his case successfully, he shall get his property again, but if he fails to do so, then he shall be subjected to the penalty of keeping liquors in violation of the law. The form of process for seizure of the liquors, and every other form of process, is embodied in this bill and will be enacted in the Statute, and all forms of procedure in courts, and in the service of warrants, indictments and bonds, are embodied in the law, and we shall declare that all proceedings under these forms are valid.

“One provision I consider a very important one—the provision for the regulation of the agency. I find in many instances that the agents have been great scoundrels and have done all they could to pervert their office. We have now provided that they shall keep an

account of every sale they make, and for what purpose the sale was made, date of sale and the name of the party who made the purchase, and have this book open for the inspection of any Justice of the Peace who wishes to consult it.

"In relation to Bangor, I have lived there since 1835—formerly I lived in Penobscot. From personal experience I can say that the law has operated very beneficially in Bangor and its vicinity. I do not say that the sale of liquor is entirely stopped; there are some men who drink still, but there is no open sale—it must all be done very secretly. The chief reason why I think the law of 1853 was not so efficient as was contemplated, is that it did not impose imprisonment for the first offence. The present bill imposes imprisonment for the first offence, and in all cases the first offence will be followed with 30 days imprisonment and a fine of \$20; the second, 60 days imprisonment and a fine of \$20; the third, 90 days imprisonment and a fine of \$20, and the fourth offence (I don't think we shall have many fourth offences) is six months imprisonment and a fine of \$200. All this our legislature is prepared to enact, and I think it will be successful in abolishing the detestable vice entirely from the State. When the bill of 1853 passed, there was a pretty equal balance between rum and anti-rum, but the feeling in regard to prohibition has greatly increased.

"There is much less drink used now than formerly. Our lumberers are very anxious to have efficient men to go into the woods with them, and for several years past they have scrupulously prevented any liquor from going into the camp with them, unless in the medicine chest.

"I have paid for labour, on the Penobscot River, many thousand dollars, and I have never had any difficulty in procuring men to labour, although I have never furnished liquor of any sort to them. All the statistics of our towns and cities shew that crime has greatly decreased since the passing of the Law."

Danville, County of Cumberland, Calvin Record, Counsellor and Attorney at law.—"In the practice of my profession previous to, and since, the passing of the Law, I have had a favorable opportunity of witnessing the change which has taken place in the public mind, not only in Danville, but throughout a considerable extent of country, in favour of the Law. When the Law passed, the prevailing opinion in Danville was, that it could not be enforced, and many of the first attempts to enforce it were fruitless. It was difficult to get a jury to convict the accused; but the enforcement of the Law in other places produced a favorable impression upon us, and now, when the Law requires it, conviction is easily obtained. There is no public

sale of liquor in the town of Danville, and the only request the majority of the people make is, that the Law be made a little more stringent, so as to ensure its enforcement."

Dr. E. Holmes, Editor of the *Maine Farmer*, published in Augusta. "The change which has taken place in respect to drinking, since the passing of the Maine Law, is no less striking than gratifying to all well regulated minds. In many places, to my own knowledge, much drinking and drunkenness existed previous to the passing of the Law, but nothing of the kind is to be seen there now.

"There was a good deal of feeling against the Law in Winthrop when it was enacted, but almost all not only acquiesce, but have become interested in its rigid enforcement. In my opinion, no sane man in the State of Maine would think of repealing the Law. There are those who object to some of its provisions, but the general feeling is, that the prohibition of the sale of liquors, as a beverage, is essential to the welfare and prosperity of the State.

"I think public opinion will very soon demand that no agent shall be appointed in any town for the sale, even for mechanical purposes, but that nothing but pure alcohol shall be allowed, and that only at the Apothecary's.

W. H. McElrith.—"There have been a number of violations of the Law in Bangor; but drunkenness has decreased very much, and nearly all whose opinion is worth asking, have become convinced that the Law has proved a great blessing to Bangor, and that it only requires to be made a little more stringent, in some of its provisions, to banish drinking and drunkenness entirely from the State.

"The Firm to which I belong employed 700 men in the lumbering business last winter. We supplied no liquor to the camp, nor was any used by the men, and both employers and employed were delighted with the workings of the Law. The men work better without it, and the winter passes away much more pleasantly and cheerfully.

"Last winter there were on the Aroostook River a large number of men waiting on to be engaged for the season, and the quiet way in which they conducted themselves was a general subject of remark. It was, indeed, gratifying to see scores of our hardy lumbermen, who formerly were in the habit of drinking very freely, spending their leisure days,—which with all that class are days of temptation,—soberly and orderly.

"This winter our Firm has 500 men out, and they endure fatigue, perform more work, and do it better, than in former years when spirits were freely supplied. With all the lumber merchants, great

and small, the Law works well, and has already secured the favour of both employer and employed."

We give the following graphic answers from the pen of Professor Pond, of Bangor :—

Q. 1. "To what extent has the Law been carried into operation?"

Ans.—*Very generally*, as I have reason to believe.

Q. 2. "Has what has been done so far been done without violence?"

Ans.—Altogether without violence in this city, and I think in our towns and cities generally. There have been a few cases of resistance, and but a few. The Law can be as well executed as most other prohibitory laws.

Q. 3. "What has been done with the liquor seized?" Ans.—

There has been a trial upon it, and if it appears that it was kept for sale, it is poured out. The earth drinks it; and this certainly is a better disposal of it than to have it poured down the throats of men, robbing them of their senses, and destroying their lives.

Q. 4. "What effect has the Law produced already?" Ans.—It

has put an end to rum selling for drinking purposes, except in the lowest places, and in the most private, sneaking, contemptible way. It has greatly diminished drunkenness. I have not seen a drunken man in our streets for the last six months. At this season of the year, with all our lumbermen from the woods, our Irish and Indians, I have not seen one intoxicated. The Law has made our streets quiet through the night. Very few, comparatively, get into the watch-house. The house of correction has been, at times, almost empty; I know not but it is so now. The expense of paupers is greatly diminished; also the expense of litigation. Hundreds and thousands throughout the State, who but for the Law had been miserable drunkards, and whose homes had been the abode of the extremest wretchedness, are now industrious sober citizens, and their families are living in comparative comfort.

Q. 5. "Has the Law been injurious to the friendly relations of society, so as to be injurious rather than beneficial, on the whole?" Ans. Not at all. There is as much friendship among families and neighbors, under the operation of the Law, as there was before, and probably more so. The Law does not interfere with families. Dwelling-houses are not liable to be searched, unless there is strong presumptive evidence that liquor is kept in them for sale.

Q. 6. "Will the Law, in your opinion, be repealed?" Ans.—I

think not. I hope not. It is a good Law for us. Its influence is good—all good; and so I think our people understand it. I see not why it should be repealed, nor do I believe it can be."

The following interesting and valuable answers from the Rev. Dr. Burgess, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maine, will be read by many with sincere pleasure. In writing to the Rev. Dr. Andrews, under date, Gardiner, Maine, August 22, 1853, he says :

"REV. AND DEAR SIR :—To your enquiries I reply briefly, in their order.

"Q. 1. Did this prohibitory law originate in the schemes of politicians for other purposes, or did it stand in the Legislature upon its own merits ?

"A. I have very little knowledge of the operation of politicians amongst us ; and, undoubtedly, individual leaders or others, members of parties, may have been influenced by their political interests in sustaining or opposing this measure. But I suppose that, beyond all question, the law originated with persons who were solely concerned for the suppression of intemperance : and that it was passed because it was believed to be demanded by a great majority of the people for its own merits.

"Q. 2. 'Has it justified the expectations entertained in it by its friends at the time of its passage ?'

"A. What were their actual expectations, I cannot venture to say ; but every reasonable expectation must have been more than satisfied. Whatever it is in the power of a prohibitory law to accomplish without extreme severity or inquisitorial scrutiny, this law has generally, in my opinion, accomplished. Those who are bent upon obtaining liquor can and do succeed ; but it has ceased to be an article of traffic ; it has ceased to present any open temptation : the young are comparatively safe ; and all the evils of public drinking-shops and bars are removed, together with the interest of a large body of men in upholding them for their own pecuniary advantage.

"Q. 3. 'Have there been any reactions in public opinion, so as to induce the belief that, at a future day, it might be repealed ?'

"A. In my opinion quite the contrary. Should the law be repealed, which seems in the highest degree improbable, it will be the result merely of political arrangements ; but I do not believe that any political party would venture on a measure so hazardous to its own prospects. Undoubtedly many discreet and conscientious persons saw strong objections to some features of the law, and still feel their force. But multitudes who doubted the expediency of adopting it, would, I believe, regret and resist its repeal.

"Q. 4. 'Has the law been generally executed, and the amount of intoxication been speedily diminished in the State in consequence ?'

"A. 'The law has been, I believe, generally executed, though not everywhere with equal energy ; and the amount of intoxication has

been, in consequence, most evidently striking, and even, I think I may say wonderfully diminished.

“ Q. 5. ‘ Has the health, wealth, morality, and general prosperity of the State been promoted by it ?’

“ A. Unquestionably.

“ Q. 6. ‘ Has the law been found in its operation to be oppressive to any citizens not guilty of its violation ?’

“ A. So far as I know, not in the least.

“ In thus answering your inquiries, I would avoid everything like the intrusion of an opinion respecting the practicability or wisdom of such a measure elsewhere. I never appeared here as its public advocate ; and I am not blind to such arguments as may be urged against legislation, which, though it is peculiarly humane in its operation upon *persons*, is so sweeping with reference to *things*. Nevertheless, I am most devoutly grateful for the practical working of the law ; and believe that, to every family in Maine, it is of more value than can easily be computed.

PORTLAND.

Neal Dow.—“ I have already explained to you several of the forces which were at work to accomplish my defeat, as Mayor, in 1852 ; and I need not dwell longer upon that subject, as your desire is to ascertain how the Maine Law has worked hitherto, and what are our prospects in regard to it. I have so much confidence in the Law to accomplish, effectually, the object aimed at,—I am so pleased with its working wherever it has been enforced, and I am so enamoured with the prospect before us, that perhaps my testimony is all too sanguine, for I am very decidedly in favour of its thorough and most stringent enforcement.

“ You cannot well imagine all the tricks that have been resorted to by the rum sellers in Boston to defeat the Law in Portland. Of course they thought that if my re-election was defeated, the Maine Law was at an end. I am confidently assured that \$17,000 were expended by the rum sellers of Boston to defeat my election as Mayor. During the time I have been engaged in the Temperance movement, I have come into contact with our conservative men sometimes rather sharply, and the consequence was that many of those men, good, honest, worthy men, were rather alarmed at the way in which the Law had been enforced, and they gave their vote and influence in favour of Governor Paris ; but even with all that influence if it had not been for the 400 naturalization certificates which were sent from Boston and sworn to by parties brought in from the country for that purpose,

the election would have gone in my favour. The votes stood for Governor Paris, 1,900, while over 1,500 votes were recorded for me. All sorts of stories were published and circulated, about private houses having being searched for liquor at my instigation, and great quantities of property destroyed by the officers while they were searching about for liquor, piercing with their spears through bales of dry goods, and all such nonsense, but even with all that, had a Rum candidate appeared he would have been defeated.

“The statement of John Neal, made in October, 1853, from what motives I will not say, was, in substance, that there was more intemperance, more liquor sold, and more drinking in Portland, than any time before the passage of the Law. He even asserted that there was more intemperance throughout the whole State of Maine—with here and there a doubtful exception—than there had been at any other time for the past 20 years. The opinions he gave of the condition of things in Portland, were calculated—if believed—to affect very injuriously the fair reputation which our city had heretofore sustained. The statements were circulated extensively not only through this city and through the State, but thousands of them were circulated in other States.

“It was deemed necessary for the honour of Portland that something should be done, and a paper was drawn up and signed by the Mayor of Portland, and 433 of the most respectable of the citizens, Clergymen, merchants, and business men generally, denying in the most unqualified terms the whole statement of John Neal, as being most egregiously and palpably erroneous and false, and that this was evident to every candid and unprejudiced citizen. The following is a copy of the paper drawn up at the time.

“Our attention has been recently called to statements made by two citizens of Portland, in relation to the operation of the liquor law in this city and State. These statements are, in substance, that there is more intemperance, and more liquor sold and drunk in this city and State, at the present time, than before the passage of our existing liquor law. One of them goes even so far as to say that there is more intemperance in this city and neighbourhood, and probably throughout the whole State—with here and there a doubtful exception, than there has been *at any other time for twenty years!*—and both give representations of the condition of things in Portland, calculated, if believed, to affect injuriously the fair reputation which our city has heretofore sustained abroad. If these statements had been published and circulated only in this city and State, we should not feel called upon to notice them. But having been circulated abroad, to the injury of the reputation of our city and State, and in a manner calculated to work serious mischief, we feel it our duty to unite in saying—as we do in

the most unqualified terms—that we deem these, and all similar statements, as most grossly and palpably erroneous and unfounded. That they are erroneous and unfounded must be manifest to every candid and unprejudiced citizen of our city, not only from the apparent condition of things, but from that very sure test as to the existence of intemperance, the records of pauperism and crime.

“We deem it proper to add, that the personal position which most or all of us occupy in regard to the practical business and pursuits of this city, enables us to speak in this matter from actual personal knowledge of facts.

“Among the names appended to this statement published by the citizens of Portland, you will find the name of Mr. Alderman Thomas, one of our present city Representatives, and President of the Canal Bank, and Nathan Cummings, one of our oldest citizens, and formerly Secretary of the Port, John B. Osgood, formerly President of the Canal Bank, Mr. Jewett, formerly Secretary of the Port, General Fessenden, a man extensively known throughout the country, and many others of our most worthy men.

“The progress of the cause is not only apparent in the election of the Maine Law Governor, but also in the election of a representative to Congress. John M. Wood, a whig in politics took the field on the Maine Law ticket against Judge Wells, a very popular democratic candidate, and in a Congressional district strongly democratic defeated him upon this issue by from 3,000 to 4,000 of a majority. Mr. Wood is a bold, outspoken, determined man, and well known throughout the community to contribute largely in money as well as in influence to the enforcement of the Maine Law. No man I am convinced will be elected to any office in the State who is opposed to the Maine Law.

“The statistics which as Mayor I published, after the Law had been in operation nine months, will give you a very fair idea of the beneficial effects of the law when enforced.

Extracts from the Mayor's Annual Report :

“At the commencement of the year, the number of open rum shops in full operation in the city, was supposed to be from 300 to 400 ; 300 was the lowest estimate ; *at present there is not one.* The receipts of these places per day, at the lowest figure, may be reckoned to average three dollars ; this for 300 days excluding Sundays,—and Sundays were the best days for such places—would give \$270,000 per year !

It may be thought that this sum is much too large to have been expended annually by the people of this city for intoxicating drinks, but it is believed that the number of grog shops set down at 300, and the sum received by each per day, at \$3, is within the fact. But if

we consider the expenditure in this way to have been only \$200,000, or about \$2.22 per day for each of the 300 shops, the fact will be sufficiently important to arrest the attention of every man who has any regard for the prosperity of the city and the welfare of the citizens.

“The whole of this sum, or of whatever sum may have been expended in this way, was entirely lost to the city ; no valuable return was obtained from it. This amount will purchase 40,000 barrels of flour at \$5 each, *or about five barrels of flour and five cords of wood to every family in the city*, estimating the number of families at 4,000. It is true some persons accumulated wealth by this traffic, but it was not by paying a fair equivalent, or any equivalent for property so gained ; but the process was simply the transferring the hard earnings of the labouring man to the coffers of the dealers in spirits—while the victims of their trade were sent to their desolate homes to abuse wives and children who were suffering for the common necessities of life, which might have been purchased with the money squandered on strong drinks.

“A great many families in this city situated thus a year since, are now comfortable and happy, being entirely relieved by the suppression of the grog shops from their former troubles. The extinguishment of the traffic in intoxicating drinks will not only be the means of saving this great amount of money to the poorest part of the people, but the productive industry of the country will be stimulated to an extent that we cannot at present foresee. The whole of the great sum which was formerly expended for strong drinks by the people of this city and State, will henceforth be expended for the necessities and comforts of life, with the additional amount which will accrue from the more industrious habits of the people, or will be added year by year to the accumulating wealth of the State.”

In another part of his report, Mr. Dow says :—

“There were committed to the Alms House from June 1, 1850, to March 20, 1851, (before the Law,) 252 ; from June 1, 1851, to March 20, 1852, (after the Law,) 146—difference in nine months, 106. Number in Alms House March 20, 1851, 112 ; number in Alms House March 20, 1852, 90—difference, 22. Number of families assisted out of the Alms House from June 1, 1850, to March 20, 1851, 135 ; from June 1, 1851, to March 20, 1852, 90—difference in nine months, just one third, 45. Seventy-five of the ninety in the Alms House March 20, 1852, came there through intemperance—four of the ninety were not brought there through that cause ; the history of the remaining eleven is not known.

“Committed to the House of Correction for intemperance from

June 1, 1850, to March 20, 1851, 46 ; for larceny, etc. etc. 12—in all 58 ; from June 1, 1851, to March 20, 1852, for intemperance, 10 ; for larceny, etc. etc., 3—in all 13 ; *a difference in nine months of more than three fourths !* Committed in April, 1851, 9 ; in May, 10—19. The “Maine Law” was enacted June 2, 1851, and from the first of that month to March 20, 1852, 10 months, the number committed was only 10, although great activity was displayed by the police in arresting all offenders.

“At the term of the District Court in Portland, March, 1852, but *one indictment* was found for larceny, and that was the result of mistake ; while at the March Term of 1851, *seventeen indictments* were found. These results have been obtained, notwithstanding an increased vigilance in arresting persons found under the influence of strong drinks.”

The Mayor continues :—“Committed to the Jail for drunkenness, larceny, etc., from June 1, 1850, to March 20, 1851, 279—for corresponding period of 1851–2, 135 ; difference, 144. Deduct liquor sellers (72) imprisoned in the latter term, and we have 63 for drunkenness, larceny, etc. etc., against 279 for the corresponding period before the enactment of the “Maine Law,” *a deduction of almost seven ninths* in the short period of nine months ! There were in Jail on the 20th March, 1851, 25 persons ; on the 20th March, 1852, 7 persons, 3 of whom were liquor sellers—without them the number would be 4 against 25 of the corresponding day of 1851, a falling off of more than 83 per cent. in the short period of nine months.

“There were committed to the Watch House from June 1, 1850, to, and including March, 1851, 431 persons. For the corresponding period of 1851–2, after the enactment of the “Maine Law” the number was 180, a deduction of almost three fifths, notwithstanding the increased vigilance of the police in the latter period, in arresting persons found in the streets in a state of intoxication.”

“Such were the effects of the “Maine Law” in Portland in the short period of nine months, and such will be its effects throughout the State, to dry up the tide of poverty, pauperism, crime and suffering which swept over us ; to empty our alms houses and prisons of their miserable tenants, and to scatter peace, plenty and happiness over the land. On the other hand not the slightest evil of any kind has resulted to any body, from the execution of the law.

“Is this a good work or a bad one ? Men of Maine, do you wish it to continue or not ? It is for you to answer the question by your votes.”

HOUSE OF CORRECTION, PORTLAND.

Extract from the Overseers' Report, for the year ending June, 1854.

"We felt much encouraged when we were enabled to report that there had been but forty-nine commitments for the year, or less than one a week. But how much pleasure it gives us you may judge, and will undoubtedly participate in, as all human hearts will, to state that the commitments for the year ending with June, 1854, are but nineteen! diminution of thirty. And better still, that for the last six months there have been but seven. This is certainly a most cheering account. With but one exception, these were sentenced to the house for that devastating sin, drunkenness. Remove that evil from our midst, and the cells would be solitary. It seems by the comparison of the two years to be fast diminishing. We trust another year may present a purer docket."

Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, in an Address to the people of Maine, says :—"People of Maine! The God of Heaven bless you for achieving such a victory. Many triumphs have been achieved in the good cause, but none like yours. Others have more or less fought with the drunkards, and the liquor sellers, in the way of arguments and moral suasion, and indirect and inefficient, and temporizing legislation. You have followed the most adroit conqueror the world has ever seen, in your scheme of policy, or struggle. You have steered for the capital itself, with all its magazines, and material of war; and these once in your hands, you know the contest cannot long continue. Whence are the arms, and ammunition and rations to come, when all the deposits are seized? You have the unspeakable advantage of *making war upon all the supplies of war*, and not directly upon the *men* who take the field against you. You combat with the body of sin and death itself and not with those who are deceived and misled. You do not purpose to destroy those who are misled and drawn to ruin, but to cripple and annihilate the power that misleads them. It is an elevated and noble purpose. When mighty conquerors, and crafty politicians will be forgotten, the laurel on your brows will be freshening and blooming, with a beauty and glory that will be immortal.

* * * * *

I know well what liquor dealers and distillers will say. They allege that their property is taken away, and their means of living prohibited. Very well; but what is your property? It has been applied to procure means to corrupt and destroy the community. Counterfeiters lay out large sums to procure dies for stamping coins, and plates for imitating the best bank bills. Are their establishments to be protected? The ereetors of those dreadful places (rightly called) *Hells*, expend very large sums, and adorn them with magnifi-

cence. Must the community respect this property? If an honest man erect a slaughter-house, or a manufactory with noisome gases issuing from it in the midst of a city or town; is this property to be protected? Men adulterate medicines, and Congress rises up to a man, and forbids it, not only by legislation, but by active inspecting officers. Are they not in the right? But—are they consistent? There are hundreds of thousands of hogsheads of adulterated liquor, much of it containing rank poison, over which they exercise no inspection, and submit it to no examination. Is this a due protection of the ignorant and unsuspecting part of the community? Scores of thousands die every year, through the influence of these poisons. * *

And have society no remedy against all this? Maine has nobly said, *THEY HAVE*. She has spoken with trumpet-tongue, that which eternal truth will sanction. Talk of *property* in the means of corrupting and destroying the community! Why then the robber's cave, and the counterfeiter's shop, where his expensive work is done, is property to be respected! Even the innocent and industrious man, if he undertakes a business which poisons the air, and endangers the life of the citizens, is at once compelled to relinquish his station. How can any man rightly own that as property, which sends forth pestilence and death through a whole community? The plea for property is idle. It is unworthy a moment's regard.

So long as Legislatures pursued the criminals personally, so long they were sure to be met with false testimony to screen them, and abundance of sympathy with them because of their penalties. It took them longer than one would imagine to find out and believe that drunkards, and the makers of drunkards will lie. The discovery is made at last. Maine has now laid its hand on that which can tell no lies, and that with which no honest man can sympathize.

Yes,—destroy it as you would a poisonous well, or a hyena, or a tiger, without remorse and without mercy. Stand between the living and the dead, and stay the plague. Say, thus far hast thou come, with wasting and desolation in thy train, but not a step farther shalt thou advance. Nor is this all. *Retreat* forthwith. Abandon the ground, thou foul fiend, which thou hast occupied, yea, make a speedy and final retreat. We will bear thy presence no longer; and if thou delayest, we will sweep thee away with the besom of destruction.

* * * * * Give no more room for timidity and skulking in this all important business. The people should send no man to the Legislature for them, who is a coward, or a heretic here. Let all the excuses be taken away, and every man be brought to feel, that he will never lay down arms, until the camp, and the

very citadel of the enemy are taken, and all his arsenals and magazines blown skyhigh.

May the shadow of Maine never be less! May she live more than a thousand years, twice told! This is my toast for the *Dirrigo State*, drunk in pure cold water, but more cheering than all that were ever drunk in wine or brandy.

CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Rev. E. W. Jackson. "Our election comes off in about three weeks, and we have every confidence that we will be able to carry the State for prohibition. The Maine Law has passed the Lower House twice; but the Senate has hitherto opposed it. We have a law here similar to the old Law of Massachusetts of '36, and the Maine Law of '46. It is a prohibitory Law, but its penalties are such as to make it inoperative. Our Mayor, the Hon. Joseph Low, is Chairman of the State Temperance Committee, and is a most devoted friend to the cause of Temperance. The feeling in regard to the principle of prohibition is very strong, and if we could separate it entirely from party politics, we would have no difficulty in carrying the Law. But the old democracy of this State has hitherto been very strong, and here as in Maine they have arrayed themselves against the Law. I have no doubt they will share the same fate if they persist in their opposition; for the old Whig party, the Know-Nothings, and the Anti-Slavery party, have united with the temperance party on this issue. We have already made a very good preparation for the Law, for through the noble exertions of our worthy Mayor, we have no house in Concord for the open sale of liquors."

Hon. Salma Hale—formerly Congressional member for New Hampshire.—"It may be looked upon as a trifling boast to be sure, but I was the first man who carried round the Temperance pledge in New Hampshire. In 1816 I carried the pledge round, and the first day I got about 12 names to it. I have been connected with the movement ever since. We have made a great advance since that time. The first pledge was to the effect that we would not use spirits in our families, nor present it to our visitors, nor give it to our workmen. Now we go for a thorough prohibition. I have no doubt that at the ensuing election the temperance candidates will prevail, because the feeling of the respectable portion of society is altogether in favor of prohibition. The old democratic party, it is true, are pretty much against it, but there have been various inroads upon that party, and many of them have changed their views upon this question, and will help us to secure this measure."

Hon. Joseph Low, Mayor, Concord. "Two years ago the town

organization of Concord was changed and it was constituted a city. At that time liquor houses sold openly and freely in various places. But the city government have succeeded in shutting up all the groggeries, and there is no drink sold publicly that we know of. You may, as travellers, get it in the hotels, but even there you will not get it openly. We have the power to do this under the old Law. Our jail since the suppression of the sale of liquors has been entirely free of tenantry; our pauper accounts have been reduced more than one half within the last two years, and there are no nightly brawls in the city. We have five policemen and a marshal for a city of 10,000 inhabitants, and they have a pretty easy time of it. The state of feeling in Concord is decidedly in favor of a prohibitory Law. Last year my election was put upon that issue solely, and I carried it by a respectable majority. I have no doubt whatever that the next Legislature will pass a Law similar to that of Connecticut or Maine. Our professional men, our men of influence and our wealthy men; our clergy and our judges, are all on the side of temperance; our police records will show that crime has been reduced more than one-half within the last two years, and our Poor House accounts are considerably less. We have a pretty large Catholic population here, but our reformatory measures don't reach them, and we are at great expense in reaching them, for this reason, they go to Manchester where rum is still sold and bring it into their families, and then we cannot touch them. Our new Law will give Manchester a lift."

Mr. H. A. Newhall, Dry Goods Merchant—"I have been connected with the temperance movement for many years. I am satisfied the feeling in favor of a Maine Law is very general in Concord. In fact we will be forced to enact a law to protect ourselves. We are very desirous to forego the privilege of being the grog-shop for all the other States. We are already taunted with this distinction. There is a general movement here among the 'New Order' or 'Know Nothings,' and from all I can learn it is strongly in favor of temperance. The leading men in it are controlled by temperance principles. This, aided by the whig, anti-slavery and temperance parties, will, I have not the slightest doubt, give us such a legislature as shall pass a prohibitory law next session."

BURLINGTON, VERMONT.

Mr. Moses L. Church—"I have resided in Burlington for the last fifteen years, and have been most of the time connected with the town affairs. I have seen in this city somewhere about fifty places for the open sale of intoxicating liquors, and now we have not one open house. There are several low Irish dens where I believe liquor

is still got, but we catch them up pretty quick. We made a seizure the other day of nine barrels at the railway depot, labelled to four or five different Irish houses in town, that we had reason to suspect sold liquor. The trial has not yet come on; but one of the Irishmen stated that as it was 'hard times' if they could make a little money selling rum it was nobody's business—he will likely get a different lesson by-and-by. We have four or five persons in jail at present for violation of the law: they were tried, convicted and fined, and in default committed. About a year ago we had a public meeting and appointed a vigilance committee to go round and raise money for the enforcement of the law, to pay Counsel and all other necessary expenses, and you may judge of the feeling in favour of the law, when in a short time we had 1000 names on the subscription list. I was never a strictly Temperance man, but I became satisfied that it was necessary to do something to check the spread of intemperance, and that to get a good wholesome state of society in Burlington we must shut up all the grogeries. I must say that I am very much pleased with the Law, and the more stringent you make it the better will it be received by the community. You will not find a respectable man in Burlington who is opposed to the effective enforcement of the Law. I am one of the Select-men and we have concluded that when this law is thoroughly carried out our poor taxes will be reduced about \$1,000 a year. This winter as provisions are very high, we have not saved so much as that, but if it had been an ordinary year we would. There is one thing that presses a little upon that fund that we will bye and by get quit of. If a man is committed for violating the law we have to support his family. But we tell them that we will rather support them and their families too, than have to support other 40 who would be sent to Jail through their instrumentality. All parties who open a house for the accommodation of the public pay a license of \$15 a year. You might stay here for a month and you would not see a drunk man in this city. Burlington was in my day one of the most drunken places in Vermont, and now it is one of the most sober law abiding places you can enter.

J. L. Adams, County Clerk.—“I was one of the first friends, and the first advocates of the Law in this State, and in New York State, and I am pretty well acquainted with its workings. In this town, a year ago this winter, the Law was well enforced, and the town was never before so quiet and so orderly as it was last summer. The difference was so great as to excite remark both among the friends and foes of the Law. The Grand Jury,—not composed of friends of the Law,—but a body appointed to note offences against the Laws generally, in their last report say: “We would also say that we feel

highly gratified to find the Jail destitute of inmates ; a circumstance attributable, in a very great measure, we believe, to the suppression of the sale of intoxicating liquors."

"One of the strongest and best evidences that can be given in favor of the Law is the fact, that many men who were not only opposed to the Law in feeling, but publicly advocated the other side, have conquered their prejudices and are now among the highest contributors to the fund for its enforcement. We were told that the Law could not be enforced, and that whoever attempted to do so would subject himself to loss, and to the hatred of Society, and every other thing conceivably bad. A few of us, however, took hold of it, and although we met with considerable opposition at first, we found no difficulty in enforcing it ultimately. Five energetic men can enforce the Law in any locality whatever in our State."

"A very painful instance occurred here about a year ago :—A gentleman of respectable standing in Society, but addicted to intemperance, was found dead one morning in front of his own door, in a little ditch with just as much water as would suffocate him. It was believed, from the attendant circumstances, that coming home to his own house late in the night, in a state of intoxication,—as he was too much in the habit of doing,—he had stumbled and fallen into the ditch face downwards, and not having sufficient strength to rise, had thus closed a miserable existence."

"This melancholy circumstance caused considerable excitement in the city, and roused the friends of Temperance to a sense of their duty in regard to the Law. A public meeting was called, and numerous attended, and a series of stringent resolutions passed, pledging the meeting to use every exertion to get the Law enforced. These resolutions were approved of by nearly all the respectable people in Burlington, and they determined to use both money and influence to make the Law effective. Having obtained a long list of names and subscriptions, we said to the officers,—Now these persons have pledged themselves to support the Law by all honorable means ; if you don't enforce it we shall show you, at the ballot box, whether we think you are entitled to the position you hold. If you have any extra trouble we will pay you for it ; if any one attempts to bring odium upon you for discharging your duty, we will stand by you. In consequence of this stand we have had no further trouble, and every where the Law is popular in proportion as it is effectively carried out. Last week I was through several places in the County, and I found the Law working well. I may say that there is no place in this State where a re-action has taken place against the Law ; and there is no danger of a re-action against the law, for its friends are gradually

increasing, and its beneficial effects are becoming generally felt. These will secure its enforcement. We had one or two houses in this city whose annual sale of liquor was, five years ago, supposed to average \$50,000. This last year the town agent of Burlington reports sales for all purposes to the amount of \$4,000. In this city the Roman Catholic Bishop participates heartily in the progress of the movement. He is in favor of enforcing it stringently, and thunders against those who oppose it. A year ago, when the law was much less enforced, the overseer of the poor told me it had reduced the poor tax at least \$500. It will be more this year, although provisions are very high this winter. Our returns of this kind have hitherto been made in the gross, so that strangers would not be benefitted by merely glancing over the figures; but in a few years the good effects of the law will speak for themselves.

"The law has already rid us of some incorrigible rum-sellers; the lowest of that low class seem to have become resigned to their fate. Some of the members of what has been for the last twenty-five years, the largest liquor house in Burlington, are now contributors to the fund for the enforcement of the Maine Law.

"When the law adopts the principle of regulating the traffic, it becomes with such persons, a matter of dollars and cents; but the moment you make the sale a violation of law, self-respect steps in and the business must be given up. The large house of Peck & Co., said 'We wish to be honourable men and good citizens, and the moment you pass this law we will give up the traffic.' Men of standing in society cannot take any other course. The moment you say to a respectable man that 'Pat Grogger and you stand upon the same plank'—you are not sheep-stealers it is true, but you are law-breakers—you touch his self-respect, and he is forced to say 'I can stand it no longer.'"

Rev. Mr. Young—"I am of opinion that the law is wise and efficient, and as far as one can reasonably expect, effectual. So far as my observation goes, I am persuaded that its operations are highly beneficial—in fact it is accomplishing as rapidly as could be expected the work intended to be accomplished. I think the longer it is in operation the more numerous are its friends. I have no doubt at all of the better observance of the Sabbath, in consequence of the enforcement of the Law, and I am quite satisfied of the greater peace of the community. I have not heard of any instance of hardship by the privacy of any dwelling house being invaded by the officers of the Law. I do not believe that any instance of this kind has occurred for it is well known, as a general thing where liquor is sold. The

feeling of the respectable classes is decidedly in favor of the law. About a year ago I preached a rather plain spoken discourse, urging, as strongly as I could, the enforcement of the law. The sermon was much better received by my congregation than I had anticipated. Several gentlemen of prominence in my congregation declared their feelings in regard to it very strongly, and in such a way as I had not been accustomed to. I have no fears whatever that the enforcement of the law will be detrimental to the peace and happiness of the community. I entertain feelings the very reverse. I am convinced that public peace and domestic comfort will be greatly promoted wherever the Law is strictly enforced. We are annoyed here a little at present by our border States, New Hampshire and New York, but that will soon cease.

Professor Pease, Burlington University.—“The sentiment of the most respectable classes of society is uniform both in regard to the practicability and the desirableness of the Law. We all agree in thinking that the practicability of the Law has been tested here. Our particular location, with a rum depôt on the other side of the lake, has placed us somewhat in unfavourable circumstances; but even with that drawback, the effects of the Law are manifested in the diminution of intemperance and in the strengthening of the hands of temperance men, and encouraging them in their work. I think the sentiment is gaining ground in favour of the Law. A few years ago most people thought the Law was likely to be received with prejudice by one class of the community, those who only occasionally indulged in liquor; yet that class have assented to the favourable working of the Law, throughout the community. There are few exceptions to prevent this remark being universally applicable. Drinking where it is still continued will be confined to the class of secret indulgences which some people will now and again practise, but it will be ranked by the community with licentiousness and every other vice. With respect to its effects upon our own Institution, I can safely say there is a very great diminution in the use of liquors by the students. Some five or six years ago we were much troubled with cases of intemperance among our students. Since the Law passed there has been a great improvement. Though we have no doubt it is still used in a secret manner by some of the students, from the effects which sometimes manifest themselves, yet there is none of it used openly. We find the results of the law in that respect highly beneficial. We have not had for a year past any of that kind of rowdiness which is sometimes manifested among students in such an Institution as this. These noises grow mostly out of intemperance, for if students drink they will be noisy in some shape or other.

"I do not know a man within the circle of my own acquaintance who is at all doubtful as to the useful tendency and beneficial results of the Law. I have never heard of any case of hardship by a seizure of liquors in any dwelling house. There can be no conceivable hardship of that kind unless the man is a very suspicious character. No upright citizen is afraid of such a contingency, and even if his liquor was seized the law would restore it."

RUTLAND, VERMONT.

James Barritt, merchant.—"The Law is working well here, and we have done a good deal in the way of seizure. There are some points of the Law, however, that would require to be remedied, if the neighboring States do not pass a Law, because it is landed here by Railway and by Express-men, although we have no place for the open traffic. I think there were upwards of 20 houses for selling liquor in Rutland before the passing of the Law; now we have no place whatever for open sale, although there are places where it is said to be sold privately, though we have no proof as to where they are. The feeling of the community is with us. We are put to a good deal of trouble by the low classes of Irish that are here. We have destroyed as many as 20 places of sale among their shanties, but still they persist in keeping it, and they dig holes in the earth during the night and hide it. We have had about 40 cases before the county court within the last six months. Our select men are all temperance men, and when we have a vote of any kind in any town meeting upon the temperance ticket, we have always over three-fourths of the voters with us. The town of Rutland contains about 6,000 inhabitants."

Hon. Zimri Howe, Castleton, Vermont.—"Our Law has performed all that its warmest friends could expect. Intoxication is like other crimes. We pass a law against stealing, still there will be stealing, and you can only punish the culprit when you have proved it against him. So with intoxicating liquors. You may pass a very stringent law, but it will be evaded. But if once public sentiment is thoroughly roused on the subject, there will be no difficulty, for every honest man will feel that it is his duty to help to bring the culprit to justice, in the same way that he would if he saw an urchin picking your pocket. The Law is evaded, privately, but it has really done wonders here. Our Irish population—some of them at least—go to the State of New York, and get quantities of five gallons or so, and deal it out amongst one another. They are a class of people that you can make nothing of, and they have nothing to lose. Rutland has been, perhaps, as hard a place as in the State; but they are doing a

great work there, and there is now no difficulty in enforcing the law. A great many offered resistance; a man who kept a public house in Rutland prior to the passing of the law, swore that they should never search his house; but it was all braggadocio, he was brought up and fined, and made no resistance whatever; now he has left the tavern and *cleared out*. Public sentiment in this place is altogether in favour of the law. There is no opposition among the respectable portion of the community; the only opposition is among that low class of foreigners who get the liquor into their shanties and drink with one another. I am satisfied that a direct temperance issue throughout the State would give a two-thirds vote in favour of prohibition. We have made several seizures here, and spilled a good deal of liquor, but we have had no occasion to make a seizure for nearly twelve months; the people have somehow made up their minds to obey the law. Take our own native population, and the law is adhered to as strictly in this place as anywhere in the State; but these foreigners slip over to the State of New York and get their liquor, and then come back and trouble us.

“One point in which our Law is defective is—while it authorises the seizure of the liquor, you shall not take the cask or vessel in which the liquor is contained; we cannot take the liquor well without the vessel, but if we take that, we are liable to an action; but that part will be amended. In consequence of Judge Pierpont deciding that one part of our law was unconstitutional, one of our Justices was served with a warrant for causing some liquor to be destroyed, and had to pay something like \$40; but I have no doubt this decision will be overruled.

“Our Central Committee in endeavouring to impress upon the people the importance of carrying out the law, after referring to some of its provisions, say,—‘if it be said that the liquor traffic differs from other things which, it is admitted, require stringent legislation, we fully agree to it; but the difference, *in every particular*, goes to show the need of increased stringency here; because the evil to be remedied is, beyond comparison, greater; because it is one of long standing; because men are slow to admit the criminality of the business, and because the temptations to pursue it are a thousand times more. Can any man, in his senses, believe that power to search, and seize, and confiscate, is *necessary* to the efficiency of the law against smuggling, and that such power is *unnecessary* to the efficiency of the law against vending ardent spirits. We think not. No man thinks so who really believes the law is to be enforced. The objection that such measures are unnecessary and extreme, comes not

from those who are sanguine in the expectation that a less stringent law will be executed, and remove the evils in question ; but from those who have no thought of seeing them removed, and who would prefer the fountains should be kept open, and the evil be merely *regulated* not *removed*.

“ With confidence, and without fear of contradiction, we come to the conclusion that the principles which lie at the foundation of the Law recently enacted, *of right ought to be embodied in such a Law* ; and that it is the imperative *duty* of every community to sustain it, because it is a duty to give protection against one of the greatest—if not the very greatest—evils ever inflicted on humanity ; because it is wrong in principle to attempt to *regulate* rather than seek to *suppress* such an evil, and because it is right, and it is a sacred duty to use all proper means to suppress an evil which can be removed in no other way. Not one of these principles is new in legislation. The most violent objector cannot point to one. Only one of them is new in its application to this subject ; and that is the one which puts *this* evil on the same ground with other evils which it is the purpose to *restrain*, and not merely to *regulate*. The *propriety* of such application we fearlessly submit to candid men.’ ”

Mr. Truebridge, Conductor of the Castleton and Washington Railroad.—“ The law is producing a good effect upon our labourers on the road. We had a brakesman, one of the best men we ever employed for such a purpose, but unfortunately he was addicted to drinking. It being a danger to ourselves as well as a violation of the law to keep such a man on the road, he was discharged. Recently they have enforced the law with some determination in Rutland, and as liquor cannot now be easily obtained, this brakesman made urgent application for his old situation ; he was refused upon the ground that his drinking habits were such that the company could not with safety employ him. He said the temptation is now entirely removed ; the cars remain at Rutland over night, and there I cannot get a drop of liquor ; ‘ I can, and I will be sober if you give me one more trial.’ He was taken on, and has kept his word ; for the last six months I do not think he has tasted intoxicating liquor.”

ALBANY, NEW YORK.

From Castleton we proceeded to Albany, and there had a very pleasant interview with the Hon. C. E. Delavan ; that gentleman—who, as Dr. Beecher so enthusiastically stated to us in Boston—‘ had carried the whole Temperance cause on his own shoulders, since 1836.’ Mr.

Delavan is in close correspondence with every gentleman at all prominent in the Temperance cause throughout the States, as well as in Britain and Canada; and after many years of active, zealous labour, looks back with an agreeable astonishment at the wonderful success which the cause has had, notwithstanding the inveterate opposition with which it has had to contend. 'We have had to fight,' he said, 'every inch of ground with the enemy. Oftentimes we stood still as if further advance were impossible; but we never retreated, and new light dawned upon us to show the outlines of the yet untrodden path. Our struggle has been onward, ever onward, and now the last fortress of the enemy is besieged. Every renewed victory has given us renewed courage and animation to prosecute the struggle with zeal; and with firm step and undaunted heart, we press forward to the final contest, assured that our labours will be crowned with a glorious triumph.'

GENTLEMEN OF THE EXECUTIVE:—

A brief Report of our investigations is now before you. We need not say that our time was closely applied. Duty, patriotism, philanthropy, alike urged us onward,—and the mass of testimony here presented, will, of itself, evince the interest we took in our mission. Imposing, however, as is that array of testimony,—conclusively as it demonstrates the successful operation, and the highly beneficial results of the Maine Law,—it is but a tithe of what we might have submitted. We deemed it prudent to restrict ourselves to a certain space, and, in aiming at brevity, selected the evidence of men well known in Society, so that if the question were tauntingly put—Who is the Rev.'d Mr. Seeley? or the Rev.'d Mr. Dutton? Who is Chief Justice Williams? or Allen Haines? or Zimri Howe?—to say nothing of those high in power and distinction—that we should put faith in their statements?—Ten thousand voices will join in echoing back the answer: These are men whom we delight to honour.

It is due to the gentlemen, whose names appear in our Report, to say that their testimony,—with the exceptions therein stated,—was all given extemporaneously. Not only was it spontaneous, but there was no studied effort to weigh the words, to see how nicely they would catch the public ear, or whether their authors would be compromised thereby. The questions,—many of them suggested on the spur of the moment, by surrounding circumstances—were put, and answered off-hand. The answers welled up as the overflowings of a full heart, and were taken down, in short hand, as they fell from the speaker's lips. This will, so far, explain the evident defect in

grouping and arrangement,—a defect rendered more apparent by the absence of the interrogatories, nearly all of which, to save space, have been withheld.

So fully does this Report, in our estimation, exhibit the successful operations of the Maine Law,—so abundantly conclusive is the array of testimony, that we deem comment or application unnecessary; and, pointing to this trophy raised to Temperance,—to domestic felicity and eternal bliss,—did we consult our own feelings only, we would here close our labours with the simple but suggestive inscription—*Circumspice!*

But something more, we are assured is expected from us, by those, who will not peruse this compilation, and draw from it for themselves, encouragement and determination to banish for ever that cup, which brings with it neither a healthy body, nor a sound head, a pure heart nor a peaceful mind. Our own opinion of the progress of the cause, and the appearance which these respective localities present, may be looked for, and we shrink not from so pleasing a task. We have many prejudices to overcome in Canada, in regard to a Prohibitory Liquor Law, and if we succeed in removing any of these, our labour will have been well bestowed.

In so far as the custom of common tipping is concerned, one single remark will convey our impression of the whole affair. We saw more drinking in the City Hotel, in the City of Hamilton, in the space of from 5 to 7 minutes, one morning before 8 o'clock, than we had seen in all our perambulations through the seven States to which we have referred. It had never once in any form crossed our path, from the time we cleared that dizzy height,—

“Where Niagara stuns with thundering sound,”

until in our homeward course we halted at the City Hotel in Hamilton. Even after so short a tour in these Maine Law States, so very striking was the contrast, that we blushed for our country's honour, to see from eight to ten men deliberately and individually gulping down a portion of brandy and water in the few minutes we stood in the public hall chafing our fingers at the stove, waiting the breakfast gong to sound. Yet such was the lamentable fact, and it will explain better than a thousand arguments the precise difference there is between a Canadian City Hotel, and a Hotel in a Maine Law State. No wonder the bar-keeper, as he handed the tenth man the bottle from which to help himself, made the remark, that “they did not force their drink upon any one. If they did not ask for it they would not get it.” Perhaps he felt that there was another eye than that of the All-Seeing Jehovah,

bent upon him, and that while he could fearlessly brave the powerful glance of the One, he quailed before the feeble gaze of the other. Such at all events seemed the fact, but the pitiable salvo will not long avail.

For a solution of the doubts entertained, even by well meaning persons, regarding the practicability of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, and the tendency and effects of its stringent enforcement, we refer to Maine. From Maine we select Portland as an example, from the fact that the Law was conceived there, and there had its first vigorous enforcement, and because its operations there have been most bitterly maligned. And we say with confidence that what it is in Portland may safely be relied on, as even an inferior sample of the entire State of Maine. In Portland before the Law passed there were at least 300 houses open for the sale of intoxicating liquors, to a population of 20,000 inhabitants. There were two distilleries in full blast in the city, and so great was the demand that a third was in process of erection. So impressed were we with the idea that there was some shadow of truth in the statements so industriously circulated, to the effect that drunkenness and crime had greatly increased in Portland since the passing of the Law, that we were prepared to realize a picture such as that so powerfully depicted by Cowper where:—

—Every twentieth pace
Conducts th' unguarded nose to such a whiff
Of stale debauch, forth issuing from the styes,
That Law has licensed, as makes Temp'rance reel.
There sit, involved and lost in curling clouds
Of Indian fume, and guzzling deep, the boor,
The lackey and the groom; the craftsman there
Takes a Lethæan leave of all his toil;
Smith, cobbler, joiner, he that plies the shears,
And he that kneads the dough; all loud alike,
All learned and all drunk."

Such was, undoubtedly, our gloomy foreboding in regard to Portland; but in that city at this present moment, with a population estimated at 25,000, there is not one open house for the sale of liquor. The enforcement of the Maine Law has swept them from the face of society, and their devastating stream has been completely dried up. What, though five, or ten, or even twenty houses, in a secret, sneaking way, continue to pander to the appetite, which even the fear of punishment cannot restrain? Is that at all to be compared with the sale which 300 houses, in the open light of day, and under the sanction of law daily effected?—No more than is the mountain to the molehill at its base. One would almost have been led to believe, from the declarations so oracularly made, as to the pernicious effects of the Maine Law on Portland, that it had actually produced

a scene of things, similar to that so graphically grouped by the Rev. Sidney Smith, as the result of the New Beer Bill in England,—“The New Bill,” says the divine, “has begun its operations; every body is drunk; those who are not singing are sprawling; the sovereign people are in a beastly state.” But will ten or twenty miserable, wretched, outlawed dens ever produce such a picture?—we think not. It is only under the smile and sanction of law that such depravity can prevail. It is said there are such clandestine houses: but if so, they are not numerous, nor numerously attended, and their sale must be very secretly effected, for the vigilance committee have not yet discovered their respective localities. The two distilleries have long since ceased their operations, and the one in process of erection has been converted into a gasometer; the citizens wisely preferring the spirit of light to the spirit of darkness. So much for the practicability of the law.

The Law has ingratiated itself with by far the majority of the citizens of Portland. Public sentiment was not generally agreed upon it, even there, at its enactment. The seizure and destruction of liquor, the making contraband a sale which law had formerly sanctioned, and received a revenue for so doing, were points upon which the people had not made up their minds fully. But the law was enforced, and vigorously too, yet none of these evils resulted therefrom, which even good men dreaded, and the necessary consequence is, that now nearly all classes in the City of Portland are in favour of its perpetuation. We could not, perhaps, present a more striking demonstration of this feeling than that manifested in the electoral vote at the recent election of a Governor for the State. Rum and Water were respectively represented by Mr. Shepard Cary, and Mr. Anson P. Morrill; while the two political parties were represented by Governor Paris, Democrat, and Mr. Isaac Reed, Whig. The result was, that while the combined vote for the political candidates was 1,209, the direct and independent vote for Water was 1,728, and the demonstration in favour of Rum was only 43,—that too in the City of Portland, the residence of Neal Dow, to whom was reserved the undying honour of drafting the law, and giving it a few months enforcement. It is apparent from this that the direct tendency of the law is to insinuate itself into the favour of all whose favour is worth coveting.

The good effects of the law manifest themselves in a hundred varied ways. Active industry has supplied the place formerly occupied by the mere consumers of the city's wealth. The streets are now quiet and orderly by day and night; the Sabbath is tranquil, and observed throughout with becoming decorum. Five new churches

have been built since the passing of the law, and they are well filled, while the attendance at the old has also very materially increased. Business of all kinds has been benefited. The grocer who formerly supplied to many a cadaverous-looking customer, a small quantity of tea or coffee, and a large quantity of rum, now promptly meets the cheerful demand for a healthful supply of the necessaries of life. The dry goods merchant finds that sundry carpets and blankets, and warm clothing, and the numberless incidentals to a comfortable home are in requisition, and he complacently bows to the request; for the money, formerly worse than squandered, now goes to make the family respectable and the home happy. In this way have the beneficial results of the law been felt in a pecuniary view by the citizens of Portland. What pen could unfold the unfathomable agonies of wretched despair, daily poured forth from these 300 sluices of woe and death? or pourtray the horrors of remorse and anguish wrung from the bleeding heart of many a poor wanderer from virtue and society, while tottering near the brink of a drunkard's grave?—yet all these gloomy, unutterable horrors, have been assuaged by the blissful operations of this beneficent law. Nor have these blessings been confined to Portland alone; every village, town and city in the State, feels the dread incubus of misery lifted from its heart. Bangor, noted for its rum traffic, gave an electoral vote of 1,275 for the Maine Law, and 6 for Rum. Bath, where rum used to flow freely, gave 936 votes for the Maine Law, and 3 for Rum, while in these places a material improvement has taken place in the peace, order and comfort of the people. If these are facts,—and we vouch for them,—how is it possible that there is more liquor sold in Maine than before the adoption of the law? Or that drunkenness, with its attendant evils, is more rife in Portland than it ever was? It is simply an unblushing falsehood, a libel on humanity.

The reason of the increase in criminal business, and the apparent increase in drunkenness, so zealously and cordially vaunted by Rum Papers, we have explained in the body of the Report. That one incidental remark of Judge Bishop furnishes a key to the whole affair: "Criminal business has very largely increased under the new Law," said the Judge;—and a rum commissioner would at once have put that down as established and indisputable evidence of the failure of the law; from the highest authority too—for Judge Bishop is no mean man. But we saw in the Judge's 104 cases, one hundred and four separate and individual testimonies in favour of the Law. "I had," said the Judge, "in my last term in the County of Middlesex, no fewer than 104 indictments under the new law, and I should think

five-sixths of the whole were convicted. I say, without fear of contradiction, that nine-tenths of all crimes of personal violence are committed in a state of intoxication, and if the source of the evil is dried up by this new law, it is easy to see that Judges by and by will have little criminal business to attend to." This accounts, and very satisfactorily too, for the increase in commitments under the new Law, for the selling of liquor for purposes of a beverage, is now a criminal offence against the State, and severely punished as such; and drunkenness, which before, in many cases, only furnished an occasion for a ribald jest, is now punished as a criminal offence. The statistics of the increase of drunkenness and commitments under the Maine Law, pawned upon the public, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, are, when fairly understood, just so many irrefragable proofs of the efficiency of the Law. If it was contemplated that the mere enactment of a law against larceny or burglary, was to prevent the possible recurrence of such crimes—why the waste of money in building jails? Why the appointment of police magistrates, and judges, and all the paraphernalia of a criminal court? And if such laws have not rid society of its plague spots, why so unreasonable as to expect that a law punishing drunkenness as a crime, was all at once to check the depraved appetite in its dreamy pursuit after stimulants, or eradicate vicious habits, too firmly rooted, or allay the fiendish passions which the intoxicating cup had aroused. The Divine law says, Thou shalt do no murder: Thou shalt not steal. If the law of God is daily violated, is it not too much to expect that the mere enactment of man should be omnipotent. But the Law has already saved hundreds from a drunkard's grave; it has made many happy household homes, and poured the balm of consolation into many a bleeding heart. It has restored rights long infringed, and social peace destroyed. It has already rebuilt many a domestic altar, prostrated by intemperance, and fanned the dying embers of domestic love, and it needs only time and a willing, helping hand, to make these blessings as wide-spread as the curse which intemperance has inflicted.

Nor is the Maine Law exclusive in its operations. Wherever there is a community groaning under the scathing evils of intemperance, the Maine Law is happily adapted to the wants of that community. It breathes the "two great laws of revealed religion, called by moral philosophers, the law of reciprocity, and the law of benevolence," and is consequently adapted to all mankind. In no other way could its rapid spread be accounted for. It has been already enacted by the legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, Rhode Island, Michigan, New York, Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and

Iowa, and is seriously contemplated by New Hampshire. The friends of temperance in England, have pledged themselves to raise £10,000 Sterling during the year to carry on their movement in favour of a Maine Law for Britain; and we much mistake the spirit that has dared the struggle hitherto, if Canada alone, be left to lag behind. The practicability and beneficial results of the Law, its adaptation to all the States of the Union, and to Canada as well, are points beyond all matter of doubt; and it is the imperative duty of all who desire the good of society more than the questionable aggrandizement of a few, to endeavor to secure its enactment. We boast of our noble country; of our extensive resources, and our unexampled prosperity.—Not these alone, nor all that art or industry could furnish form the true constitution of a State,—

“No—men, high minded men—
With powers as far above dull brutes endued
In forest, brake or den
As beasts excel cold rocks, and brambles rude,
Men,—who their duties know
But know their rights, and knowing dare maintain,
Prevent the long aimed blow
And crush the tyrant, while they rend the chain.”

The principle of a Prohibitory Liquor Law is not so new a feature in legislation as we are sometimes requested to believe. It bursts upon us amid the wise laws of that sagacious Spartan Legislator,—Lycurgus—who ordered all the vines in the kingdom to be destroyed, in order to arrest the ravages of intemperance. Nor is it unknown to the British Parliament. The fourth Earl of Chesterfield, a man distinguished for sound judgment and force of intellect, said, in his place in the House of Lords, a hundred and thirty years ago—“The use of those things which are simply hurtful, hurtful in their own nature, and in every degree, is to be prohibited. * * If those liquors are so delicious that the people are tempted to their own destruction, let us, my Lords, secure them from these fatal draughts, by bursting the vials that contain them—let us crush at once these artists in slaughter, who have reconciled their countrymen to sickness and to ruin, and spread over the pitfalls of debauchery such baits as cannot be resisted.” Such was the deliberate opinion of an English nobleman, who filled with honor many of the highest offices under the reign of George II., and had the evils here so eloquently portrayed, pressed as severely upon the Peer as they did upon the poverty-stricken plebeian, there would have been another meeting at Runnymede rather than endure them.

The same prohibitory principle is recognised religiously by about one-third of the whole human family. “There are exceptions, of course, every-

where, but from the shores of the Atlantic, and the burning sands of Barbary, across more than a hundred degrees of longitude, on to the wall of China, south to Cape Comorin in India, and north into the Steppes of Tartary, there is a vast surface of the earth which is neither cursed by a drunkard's home, nor dishonoured by a drunkard's grave; where the clusters of the grape are gathered to be manufactured only into raisins, and men sow not barley but to feed their horses: Buddh, Brama, and Mahomed have banished intoxicating liquors from their dominions. And must the Cross thus pale before the Crescent, and the lie of Mahomed prove itself mightier than the truth of God." *

We are gravely told that such a legislative enactment restrains the liberty of the subject, and breaks down those ancient safeguards which the law has thrown around him. In civilized life, the welfare of society is the supreme law. Whatever fancied rights a man in a nomad state may have, it is simply an axiom of every-day life, that in society, no man has a *right to do what he pleases*, except when he *pleases to do what is right*. The principle of the utter merging of individual right, in the collective rights, and for the common welfare of society, has its ramifications through all our social system, and seldom is either its justice or its propriety questioned. Let any one who doubts the correctness of this remark, just sit down and consider how much he could do for his own individual gratification, altogether irrespective of the interests of society, before he found himself in the hands of the police.

But such a law will so diminish the revenue that the machinery of government will be stopped in consequence. The objection fortunately is not a new one. "Surely," says Chesterfield, "surely, it never before was conceived by any man entrusted with the administration of public affairs, to raise taxes by the destruction of the people * * This liquor corrupts the mind, and enervates the body, and destroys vigour and virtue, at the same time that it makes those who drink it too idle and feeble for work." Let us endeavour to keep the well-springs of humanity pure, and there will be little fear of the revenue. An honest, healthy, hearty people, are more likely to provide a generous revenue, than a people dissipated by indulgence and debased by vice. A similar lachrymose objection was made in the House of Commons to the emancipation of the Blacks in India, to that made in the Canadian Parliament to the emancipation of the Whites in Canada. "Such a step," said Col. Carlton, in the House of Commons, "would annihilate a trade whose exports amount to £800,000 annually, and which employs 160 vessels and more than 500 seamen. It would destroy the West India trade, which is of the annual value of £6,000,000,

* Guthrie's plea.

and"—oh! doleful thought—"London would be a heap of ruins." Will ye abolish this time-honoured traffic? asked the timid legislator; and humanity nobly responded—yes, we shall sweep it all away. The good of society demands it; and in like manner the good of our Canadian community demands the immediate abolition of the liquor traffic, whatever the fate of the revenue. "O! God!" says Shakespeare's Cassio, "that men should put an enemy in their mouths, to steal away their brains!—that we should, with joy, revel, pleasance and applause, transform ourselves into beasts!"

We have thus endeavoured to fulfil the important, but very pleasing duty which you devolved upon us. It is unnecessary to say, that it will give us additional gratification to know that our labours, and their results, meet with your approval,—that this one cluster from Eschol, borne home between us, so pleasant to the eye, so redolent of joy, and cheering to the heart, will only increase and intensify your ardour to reach the Land of Prohibition.

We are respectfully,

A. FAREWELL,
G. P. URE.



