

Rare Bk.

HV

5297

N7

T4

1854

3415584-1001

TEMPERANCE TRACTS
FOR THE PEOPLE.

NEW YORK STATE TEMPERANCE
SOCIETY.

1854.

With respects of
E. C. Delavan.

Rare Bk.

HV

5297

N7

T4

1854

3145584-1001

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 1.] Is Dealing in intoxicating Liquors, as a beverage, Immoral?

I. Any action, practice or business may be justly *suspected* of being immoral when it does no human being any good. Its immorality may be suspected, because any action, practice or business known and admitted to be moral, has always an unequivocal tendency to the advantage of the individual and of society.

II. When an action, practice or business, not only does no human being any good, but is positively injurious to the individual and to society, its immorality is not merely suspected, but *known*. A hurtful tendency is the criterion of immorality, because so far as we know, an immoral action, practice or business never has any other tendency. It is always safe to say, "That is wrong which injures the mind, morals, health, or estate of any member of the human family."

III. Any action, &c., may be known to be immoral when it violates the Golden Rule: "As ye would that men would do unto you, do ye also unto them likewise." No man can deem that moral when done to another, which done to himself, he would deem immoral.

IV. A given action, practice or business is immoral which tends to dishonor God. No one can doubt that God has rights as well as man; nor that those rights are quite as sacred, to say the least, as those of man; and among these rights, the one less likely than any other to be questioned is that which makes it the imperative duty of men to esteem, honor, worship and glorify Him.

V. Any action, practice or business is immoral when God forbids it. Who believes that God ever forbade what is right?

VI. Any action, practice or business is immoral, when we can not conscientiously ask God's blessing on it. That we can not do this, is an admission of its immorality.

VII. Any action, practice or business is *grossly* immoral in proportion to the degree in which it injures the individual or the community: in the degree in which it dishonors God: in the degree in which God has manifested his displeasure against it: in the degree in which men recoil from asking a blessing upon it.

None of these tests of an immoral action, practice or business, or of the extent of its criminality, will, we believe, be called in question by any sane man; for the reason, that a denial of these principles of moral discrimination would be equivalent to denying that there is any morality or immorality in the world. Sweep these signs away, and a knowledge of right and wrong would be impossible.

Admitting then the reality and infallibility of these tests of immorality, let us apply them, in the order in which we have enumerated them, to the sale of intoxicating drinks as a beverage.

I. Is any body benefited by the sale of intoxicating drinks? Is the buyer who consumes them? Observation and experience both say, No: chemists say, No: physicians say, No. Is the seller benefited? Again, observation and experience both say, No. No man since the creation of the world, was ever made a better citizen, son, father, husband, friend or Christian by selling rum, or any other intoxicating drink, to his fellow-man. All that can be said is, that possibly, (though of this in the long run there may be a doubt,) he may make some money by the business; to which we reply, so

may the thief, and the highway robber: so may the dishonest tradesman: so may the borrower who never pays: so especially may the corrupt politician who fleeces his country, or the keeper of a bawdy house or gambling shop. But money so gained is not a blessing, but a curse. Evidently, therefore, the immorality of the liquor traffic may be *suspected*.

II. Is the sale of intoxicating drinks an injury to the individual, or the community, or both?

The answer to this question comes from every part of our country and of the world, like the roar of the ocean, and the roll and reverberation of innumerable thunders, declaring it the source of all drunkenness, one half of the diseases, three-fourths of the rowdyism, three-fourths of the idleness, three-fourths of the pauperism, three-fourths of the crime, three-fourths of the taxes,—which destroy the guilty, and rob the innocent the world over.

Will it be said that these evils are the consequences, not of the sale of intoxicating drinks, but of their purchase and use? We reply, if these drinks were not sold, they would not be bought, and of course would not be used; and we reply further, that if there were no tempters, there would be no betrayed: if the serpent had not been in Eden, Adam and Eve would not have fallen from "the state in which they were created."

In fine, if "the receiver is as bad as the thief," the seller of intoxicating drinks is as criminal as the user.

But again, the seller is injured as well as the buyer and an outraged community. The man who lives upon the vices of his fellow-men, must be the worse for so living. The eternal laws of God render impossible any other result. It brings him, and keeps him, in perpetual contact with the worst characters and the worst morals in the community; and the man never yet lived, that did not suffer from such contact. Accordingly the annals of the trade prove, that of the multitude who have been engaged in selling intoxicating drinks, a very large proportion have themselves become drunkards, and died drunkards, besides losing sons or daughters by drunkenness; while a still larger proportion, as if conscious of the tendency of their business, have withdrawn from the sacred influences of the sanctuary—scarcely ever putting a foot within its doors,—of the blessed Book of God—scarcely ever taking it from the shelf, if indeed they have one there—and of moral and Christian society; where they feel they are out of place, and where indeed they are not readily admitted.

In short, who can doubt that there is a brutalizing tendency in this business? a tendency to impair conscience, to blunt and destroy the moral sensibilities on which all the beauty and the fragrance of life depend, and to make a man indifferent to the welfare of his fellow-creatures, the interests, moral and eternal, of his own soul and the glory of God? No one. If the sale of intoxicating drinks injures—grievously injures society, it injures the seller as well; and his business is therefore *hæc un* to be immoral.

III. Does the sale of intoxicating drinks violate the GOLDEN RULE?

After the remarks already made, this question scarcely calls for a separate reply. Nevertheless we add, that if the seller were in the place of a wife who has a husband becoming or being already a confirmed drunkard; or if he were in the place of a father or mother or both, plunged in affliction by the dissipated habits of a fondly cherished son;—would he wish, if he were in their place and they in his, that they would continue to sell to the beings dearest to his heart, and so render their destruction inevitable? Let him answer to his conscience and his God! There is no need of multiplying examples: if he can not wish that they should deal so with him; (and he would be a monster of wickedness and brutality, if he could;) if he would regard himself as a deeply-injured and outraged man if treated so by them; then he is guilty of violating the Golden Rule—the fundamental

principle of morals; and his business is a perpetual crime against man and God. From this conclusion there is no escape.

IV. Does the sale of intoxicating drinks dishonor God? We answer by asking another question: does any cause, which produces disease, impairs the intellect and the morals of men, and sends them to a premature grave and to hell; breaks the bands which should unite families in love, and entails degradation and misery upon wives and children and parents; leads to pauperism and incalculable crime, and burdens honest men with taxation to support the wicked or the victims of the wicked;—does a cause like this dishonor God? If it does, the sale of intoxicating drinks dishonors God: if it does not, then he is dishonored by no wickedness in the world.

V. Does God forbid the sale of intoxicating drinks?

What God says on this point, is briefly as follows:

1. "As ye would that men would do unto you, do ye also unto them likewise." This, we have already seen, forbids the sale of these drinks.

2. "Thou shalt not kill." Whoever puts a sharp knife in the hands of a child, knowing that he *may* kill himself with it, or in the hands of a criminal in his cell, knowing that he *will* kill himself with it,—the man who does this, if death ensues, is a murderer; and this is exactly what is done by the seller of rum and other intoxicating drinks. He places in the hands of a young man, inexperienced and suspecting no harm—in exchange for money, that which he knows *may* be the cause of death; and places in the hands of older men, whose bloated visages and trembling limbs betray their condition, that which he knows *will* be the cause of death. Is not this murder? and has not God forbidden it when he says, THOU SHALT NOT KILL.

3. "Judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block, or an occasion to fall, in his brother's way."

What does this forbid, if not the very thing which the seller of intoxicating drinks habitually does?

4. "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink! that putteth thy bottle to him, and maketh him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness!"

Woe to whom, if not to the dram-seller who, from behind his counter, deals out strong drink to all comers, knowing that it will destroy their self-government and self-respect, and, as to modesty or any other virtue, make beasts of them? And what is this but in terms forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage?

It is plain enough, therefore, that God forbids this business, and consequently that it is immoral.

VI. Can those, who are engaged in this business, ask, with propriety, God's blessing on it? What is the meaning of this? When a farmer asks God's blessing upon *his* business, he prays that God would give him a plentiful harvest, safe gathering, ready customers and good prices. What does the dram-seller mean? If the same, as the farmer means, this: that he may be able to sell an increased quantity of all kinds of intoxicating drinks: that he may have numerous customers, and increasingly numerous, to drink in increasing quantities the contents of his decanters, demi-johns and barrels: in short, that drinkers and drunkards shall multiply like frogs and flies in Egypt. Then he will have a flourishing business; and this is the blessing which he asks—which he asks? But will he ask it? We doubt whether even a rum-seller can ask such a blessing as that. He can not—he dare not so blaspheme God and man! Could he summon the hardihood to do it, he should be deemed capable of eating his victims after he had killed them with rum! How immoral then this business must be!

VII. Is the sale of intoxicating drinks slightly or *grossly* immoral? All will acknowledge, that, measuring immorality by effects, stealing is the less

and murder the greater crime. By the same standard of measurement what is the relative rank of this business of selling intoxicating drinks—as an immorality: as a crime? Considering the evils of which it is the direct or incidental cause, there is not an intelligent and impartial man who will not declare it the most immoral and demoralizing business that is pursued on earth. The injury it inflicts on the buyer, the seller and society, is in fact, immeasurable and incalculable. It is wide-spread, overwhelming, appalling. Terms are too weak to express it: the reality exceeds any epithets which can be employed to describe it: the earth groans under it: man cries to man and to Heaven for deliverance from it. Hell itself shudders to engulf the innumerable victims of it. AND A BUSINESS WHICH PRODUCES SUCH EFFECTS IS NOT MERELY A CRIME, BUT AMONG THE GREATEST OF CRIMES WHICH MAN CAN COMMIT AGAINST MAN, AND THROUGH MAN, AGAINST GOD.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE PRECEDING PREMISES.

1. If we have spoken the truth, men who sell intoxicating liquors as a beverage should be classed with thieves, burglars, murderers, pirates, and all who are rendered infamous by their criminal pursuits.

2. The interests of a man—temporal and eternal—and if he has a family, their interests should deter him from engaging in this business; or if already engaged in it, should constrain him to abandon it, at any sacrifice, immediately.

3. For a moral community to license the sale of intoxicating drinks, is precisely equivalent in principle to licensing thieves, burglars, murderers, pirates, &c., &c. It is licensing men to commit an atrocious crime.

4. The law should prohibit the sale, and punish the seller, for the same reason that it prohibits and punishes stealing, burglary, murder, piracy, &c., viz. to protect individuals and society.

The Rev. Dr. WAYLAND says: "Can it be right for me to derive my living from that which is debasing the minds, ruining the souls, destroying for ever the happiness of the domestic circle, filling the land with women and children in a condition far more deplorable than that of widows and orphans; which is the cause of nine-tenths of all the crimes which are perpetrated in society, and brings upon it nine-tenths of all the pauperism which exists; which accomplishes all these at once, and does it *without ceasing*? Do you say you are not responsible for the acts of your neighbors? Is this clearly so? IS NOT HE WHO NAVIGATES A SLAVE SHIP A PIRATE?"

The Rev. Dr. J. EDWARDS says: "Can that traffic be justified by an enlightened and virtuous people which holds out the chief temptation to intemperance and strews the land with beggars, with widows and crimes, which breaks up the foundation of social happiness, consigns millions prematurely to their graves, and fills the world with wailings, lamentations and woe?—I answer NO! *Policy, Religion, Morality, Patriotism condemn it.*"

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle, by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!!!

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar.

O. SCOVILL, Albany, Agent.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 2.] Legal Coercion.

Personal liberty is a sacred thing; human life is worth little without it; human development depends on it; manhood, womanhood, expanded intellect, force of character, enterprise, progress in science and the arts, safe and happy homes, wealth, power, the greatness and goodness of the individual and the glory of the nation;—all have their roots in personal liberty, and shoot up and spread more or less luxuriantly, according as personal liberty, within the limits of human right, is enlarged or abridged.

We are not surprised, then, that in a country like ours, where this personal liberty of the citizen is an object of almost idolatrous veneration and worship; men should regard any measure which seems to restrain it with great jealousy; and even where manifest evil is the fruit of license, that they should hesitate to restrain it, lest they should infringe upon rights guaranteed by nature and the constitution; and especially lest the infringement, in one instance, should lead to infringement in another, and finally in all.

Not merely are we not surprised at this; it gives us positive satisfaction. Such jealousy of encroachment is the best safeguard of personal liberty; which may be invaded by legislatures with their parchments and forms of law, as well as by despots with flashing swords and exploding cannon; and our satisfaction is the greater, because it does not appear that this jealousy at all indisposes just men of any party, to lay restraints on the liberty of the citizen when this is evidently necessary to the public welfare.

Our people are indeed just as remarkable for their devotion to the common good, as for their respect for the personal rights of every individual. For proof of this, we need only to refer to numerous existing laws against nuisances of all kinds; laws against gambling, lotteries, prostitution, the exposure of indecent pictures, the sale of licentious books, and of stale meats; laws against smuggling and coining money, and many other things,—too many to be enumerated,—which, being deemed inconsistent with public interests, have been suppressed, and the parties afterwards guilty of engaging in them, however loudly they may have exclaimed or stoutly they may have resisted, have been COERCED by summary punishment into obedience.

What then is the special work which the advocates of the Maine Law have before them? Is it to prove that coercion may be justly employed to suppress a business or practice incompatible with the public good? Not at all. That would be useless. Liberty itself is not a more unquestionable right than coercion to restrain it, when it passes the bounds prescribed by the public good. If this cannot be taken for granted, nothing under the blue cope of heaven can. No, the propriety of coercion as a means of suppression, is already beyond dispute; it is admitted by all our constitutions and laws—state, national and international. Our courts are temples of coercion; our judges are oracles of coercion; our sheriffs and constables, agents, and our prisons, means of coercion. The proper definition of liberty is PERMISSION CIRCUMSCRIBED AND LIMITED BY COERCION. The work which the advocates of the Maine Law have before them is simply this: *they must convince the good men and true of the state and nation that the suppression of the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage by coercion of law, like the suppression of gambling establishments, lotteries, and other evils, is necessary to protect the interests of the community.* Nothing more, and certainly nothing less. Let this be done, and the law is safe. The people will act in this case, as they have acted in others. The rights of the public

are as dear to them as the rights of the individual; and nothing that may be said in favor of moral suasion, or against the propriety of coercion, will deter them doing what they have done a thousand times before; from putting a ring in the nose that roots up and destroys the vegetation and bloom which the community needs to sustain and adorn life; in other words, from suppressing a traffic that lays waste the dearest interests of the public at large. We shall have the Maine Law with all the moral force which the deliberate approval and stern purposes of the people, can impart to its provisions. If our remarks have any weight, we can expect no other result.

The importance, then, of enlightening the public mind, if indeed more light is needed, will be perceived and duly estimated by those who maintain that coercion is necessary; and as we are among these, we shall offer no apology for pushing the discussion a little further, and stating the grounds for believing it necessary. To do justice to the subject we must direct our attention:

1. To the magnitude of the evils which we aim to remove. The extent to which intemperance prevails in the state; the destruction of property, health and life caused by it; the amount of taxation for the support of paupers, reduced to destitution by it; and for defraying expenses incidental to police and judicial proceedings against criminals, made such by it; the injury to mind and morals which flows from it; the infinite misery of families produced by it;—let any man compute and weigh all this, and he will acknowledge, if candid, that the sum total of evil of which the use of intoxicating drinks is the occasion or the direct cause, exceeds that flowing from all other social disorders combined; and what is more, every man knows this; and every man, who has the soul of a man in him, must desire, equally for the sake of the individual, the state and the nation, and if he fears God, cannot but pray—earnestly pray for—a speedy deliverance from it. But how effect this deliverance?

2. It was thought that if those who used intoxicating drinks could be persuaded to abandon their use, drunkards would soon die out; and it was fondly hoped by the christian and the philanthropic portion of the community, that in one or two generations, we should be a temperate people. Hence the origin of the pledge system; a system based upon the belief that drunkenness could be banished from the land by moral suasion; first by effecting the disuse of intoxicating liquors, and then secondly, as a consequence of this, putting an end to the traffic. What is the result? At the end of twenty-five years, after an expenditure of time, labor and money, equal in value to the whole cost of the original Erie canal, the evil is no nearer suppression, than at the beginning; nor have we any evidence to assure us that if this system should be continued, and moral suasion exclusively should be employed for a century to come, with even greater diligence and enthusiasm than it has been, we would be any nearer success than we are at the present moment. And is it to be expected that good men, deploring the evil, shall go on, hopelessly expending time, labor and money at the same rate for ever? doing this too for an object in which the whole nation is as deeply interested as they? doing it too in the face of opposition, and misrepresentation and not seldom of abuse? This surely is asking a little too much.

3. Moral suasion alone, then, though effecting much, having failed to secure success, the appetites of men stimulated by the unscrupulous avarice of manufacturers and sellers, being as usual too powerful to be overcome by any motives however strong which it is able to present, what next? what next, we say, on the supposition that any body desires to remove, and is bent on removing, the evils of intemperance from the midst of us? **MANIFESTLY COERCION OR NOTHING.** We must either put an end to the use of

intoxicating drinks by law, or, despairing of remedy, let it continue and increase in degree and consequences to the end of the world. As the second of these alternatives is not, it may be hoped for the sake of humanity, the choice of any one, the first must be regarded by reasonable men, as an **ABSOLUTE NECESSITY.**

4. If coercion must be used, it may be applied either to the drinker or to the seller or to both. A moment's reflection will convince any one that, if applied to either, it should be applied to the seller; for the tempter is the more guilty person; and if applied to him, it is unnecessary to apply it to another, for the moment intoxicating liquors cease to be sold, they cease to be drunk.

5. Is there any reason in the world why the seller should not be coerced into an abandonment of the traffic? any which does not apply with equal force to gambling establishments, to lotteries, &c., to which coercion has been applied? The only one we have heard, which deserves consideration, is this: the amount of capital invested in the manufacture and sale of these liquors, it is said is very great; while the amount invested in gambling establishments or lotteries, &c., is or was comparatively small. Be it so. But we reply, that the amount of evil produced by the manufacture and sale of these liquors is more than proportionately great. What we ask is the evil produced by gambling or any other social vice compared with those which flow from intemperance? What the puncture of a pin is to the amputation of a man's four limbs. There *ought* to be, indeed, a large amount of capital invested to produce such evil; and if it were a hundred or a thousand times more than it is, its destruction, to get rid of the evil, would be a cheap remedy. After all, however, when the question lies between the possible, but not certain loss of a few millions, and the ruin, intellectually and morally, temporarily and eternally, of thousands of men annually; between these few millions employed in creating intoxicating liquors, and these thousands of men ruined by using them; are we so brutalized that we can say, "*Save the millions; let the men go!*" We cannot mistake in believing that nine out of every ten of our fellow citizens will exclaim, when brought to look at this matter strait in the face, "**TO PERDITION WITH THE MILLIONS, BUT SAVE THE MEN FROM IT.**" That is the outspoken sentiment of a genuine human heart. "**TO PERDITION WITH THE MILLIONS, BUT SAVE THE MEN FROM IT.**" The public good is not to be sacrificed—thousands of men are not to be delivered over remorselessly to ruin in body, soul and estate, and their families to misery unspeakable—merely to save,—if really there were any danger of losing, which we do not believe,—a few millions of money. But,

6. The coercion of these men into an abandonment of the debasing traffic, is merely counteracting coercion: *coercion employed to put down coercion on their part wholly inoleable in a free country.* There are at least sixty thousand families in this state alone, and eight times that number in the nation, that have each a son or father or husband, known by them to be forming or to have already formed the habit of intoxication. Any man can form a conception of the feelings of these families, as they look on these dearest of objects on earth and see them steadily advancing to ruin; any one can guess what they would be willing to give, if intoxicating liquors were no where accessible; any one can imagine how intense and tearful would be the earnestness of their desire that not a drop existed; we think we hear them exclaim, "*O if of these detestable liquors, there were none, our son, our father, my husband would be saved!*"—Again, there are more than sixty thousand families in this state, and a proportionate number in the nation, that have each a son or husband or father exposed dangerously to the temptations of intemperance. It is not difficult to imagine how they feel;

what anxieties fill their hearts; how many sleepless nights are passed by them; with what regret they see these loved ones leaving home, and with what apprehensions, watchful affection listens for their return. And every year from the beginning to the end, this is going on. Constantly is this incalculable suffering pleading with streaming eyes for deliverance. And what answer is given by the manufacturers and sellers? "Pooh," say these Shylocks, "WE HAVE SOME MILLIONS OF MONEY INVESTED IN OUR TRADE, WHICH YIELD US A HANDSOME PROFIT; AND DO YOU THINK YOUR WHINING AND WEEPING, CAN INDUCE US TO ABANDON THIS TRADE? YOUR SONS, FATHERS AND HUSBANDS ARE NOT OBLIGED TO DRINK. IF THEY WILL DRINK WHAT IS THAT TO US. MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS." Nor is this all; these men, through their wealth and their influence over the drunkards they make, and over better, but interested men, manage to control legislation, and thus ride rough-shod over these helpless suppliants, crying in pitiable distress for mercy. Now we call this coercion with a vengeance: coercion that makes the blood boil in our veins. Should a man open a well in the street into which unwary passengers constantly fall, and should the friends of the sufferers and of others who are liable to fall in, beg him in vain to close it,—the monster deriding them perhaps, and having sufficient influence with pliable authorities to deter them from interfering, what would be thought of it? Would not every man, worthy of the name, pronounce it execrable coercion! coercion compelling lamentable injuries and misery, to gratify a vile lust for gain? And would not every such man unite with every other, to hang this worse than bandit, as high as Haman? But in what is this case different from that of the maker and seller of rum, who turns a deaf ear to the misery of so many thousands, and uses all the power he possesses and all the power he can purchase, or without purchasing, control, to perpetuate the cause of that misery? There surely is no coercion like this.

The coercion we propose to apply to these men by means of the Maine Law, is inconsiderable in comparison with this unscrupulous and gigantic coercion which they apply to others; others, hanging broken-hearted over sons, brothers, husbands and fathers, destroyed or rapidly hastening to destruction through the agency of these men! "You talk of coercion, you brazen oppressors of humanity!" we seem to hear these say; "you talk of coercion; it is *we*, *we* who are coerced, beaten down, trampled under foot;—our cries and tears, your scoff and derision;—but be assured, we shall be coerced, beaten down and trampled under foot no longer. If there be justice in man, 'the poisoned chalice' you have so long put to our lips, shall be put to your own; and the retribution of heaven, you have so long defied, be felt!"

Reader, will you say, laying your hand on your heart, and looking reverently up to heaven, where sits, throned, the righteous judge,—that this is not right? that coercion to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, is not absolutely necessary?

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!!!

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar.

O. SCOVILL, Albany, Agent.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 3.] Moral Suasion and Legal Coercion relatively considered.

Moral suasion is generally used in opposition to legal coercion. Of its nature, however, as distinguished from legal coercion, and of its proper use and province, nine men out of every ten in the community, from whose lips it is daily dropping, have, we believe, very inadequate and beyond narrow limits confused ideas. The knowledge even of temperance men, on these points, is not as full, clear and precise as it should be; and among others—their opponents—there seems to be scarcely a vestige of any knowledge whatever: so wildly, vaguely, foolishly and falsely, do they both speak and write on this subject.

Evidently we need light. We should know precisely when and where—and to what classes of subjects or classes of men—moral suasion should be applied; and we should know also precisely when and where and with what classes of subjects or of men, moral suasion should give place to legal coercion. While these important points remain undetermined, it is obvious that any two men who contend, the one for the sufficiency of moral suasion, and the other for the necessity of legal coercion, must talk very much at random. Unless it should be understood by both what is precisely the distinction between these two things, and what the province and proper application of each, how can they ever come to a common conclusion? The one may keep on saying, "moral suasion is sufficient," and the other, "legal coercion is necessary," world without end, and they will neither convince one another nor any one else. Here is a building: this man says, "it is too large;" that man says, "it is too small." How shall we ever know whether it is too large or too small, unless we ascertain in the first place, the purpose for which it was built? But let us learn this, and, supposing the builder to have been a man of sense, we shall probably decide in five minutes that the building is just large enough.

Just so with moral suasion and legal coercion. Let us understand what the one is and what the other; what the proper object of the one is and what the proper object of the other, when the one is to be used and when the other,—determine these points, and there surely can be no difficulty in deciding whether the one is sufficient or insufficient, or whether the one is necessary or unnecessary.

For ourselves, we have no doubt that, for the want of some such fixed and acknowledged principles of judging, the arguments in favor of a prohibitory law, have been very seriously enfeebled; and on the other hand, that the arguments against a prohibitory law—arguments which would simply excite laughter by their absurdity, were it previously determined when moral suasion should be employed and when legal coercion, have gained weight and importance from the fog of uncertainty in which these two points have been hitherto enveloped. In the dark, the cane of an enemy may be made to look much like a gun; and if he but roll up three fingers of his right hand, and point the fourth at you, you may easily mistake it for a pistol. Bring a light, however, or let the sun dawn, and you will smile at the bugaboo which night and your imagination alone made formidable. Just so with these arguments against a prohibitory law. They have force only while all parties are in the dark as to first principles; that is to say, while the nature, due place and use of moral suasion and legal coercion remain undetermined.

If we have made ourselves intelligible to our readers, it must be clear to them, that we need—just now greatly need—a candid and sound exposition of doctrine on these points; and as we are aware of no writer who has attempted such an exposition, and as we believe it would materially subserve the temperance cause, if we had one, we shall offer no apology for attempting,—however imperfectly we may succeed,—to supply it.

Moral Suasion and Legal Coercion Defined.

1. We begin with definitions. What is meant by moral suasion? We reply, "A process of changing the belief or practice of a man or both, which consists in employing arguments addressed to his understanding, and motives

2

addressed to his conscience, self-love, desires and passions; or as we usually and briefly say, his heart."

What is meant by legal coercion. We reply again, "A process of deterring a man, or making him desist, from doing a specified act, or following a specified pursuit, which consists in the enactment and enforcement of a law for that purpose." As thus defined, some remarkable differences between the two are disclosed which deserve our attention.

Mark, for instance, the difference in their objects respectively. Both aim, indeed, at a man's conduct; but moral suasion aims primarily at changing a man's belief or principles; hoping that his conduct will undergo a corresponding change in consequence. On the other hand, legal coercion aims exclusively at a man's conduct, letting his belief or principles alone: taking no notice of them whatever. The one strikes *indirectly* at the conduct by going behind it, and endeavoring to produce a new state of mind antagonistic to it, or a new man intellectually and morally considered; and the other strikes *directly* at the conduct, without inquiring whether the mind and feelings are favorable or unfavorable to the measure. In fine, moral suasion aims to tear up a vice by the roots; legal coercion to keep it from growing above ground.

This difference in the object contemplated by moral suasion and legal coercion respectively, possesses the very highest importance with reference to a prohibitory law, and enables us to give a striking illustration of the wretched sophistry of those who through ignorance of fundamental principles oppose that law.

One of the strongest objections which these men urge against the propriety or expediency of a prohibitory law is, generally speaking, that men can not be made moral by law; and specifically, that habits of intemperance can not be extirpated by law. Observe one of the minority reports—that of Messrs. Odell and Dewey of the N. Y. Legislature.

"THE UNRESIGNED WILL NOT NOW DISCUSS THE QUESTION, WHETHER A MAN CAN BE MADE MORAL, CHARITABLE, TEMPERATE OR HONEST BY LAW; THEY SUPPOSE THIS TO HAVE BEEN DECIDED LONG SINCE;" decided, that is, that he can not.

Says Gov. Seymour in his veto of the law passed by the same legislature,

"I EXPRESS MY BELIEF THAT HABITS OF INTEMPERANCE CAN NOT BE EXTIRPATED BY LAW."

Now it is obvious that men who employ language like this, wholly mistake (we will not say, misrepresent,) the proper object of a prohibitory law. Who affirms that men *can* be made moral by law; or that intemperance, so far as it is a moral habit, can be extirpated by law? Legal coercion, which is but another name for a prohibitory law, contemplates no such thing: it simply declares authoritatively that a given act shall not be done; a given business shall not be followed. With the inclination to do that act, with the desire to engage in that business, with a man's belief in the right or wrong of either, it does not meddle. It simply declares that you shall not do it: you shall not engage in it. What an objection then is this to bring against a law, that it cannot do what it never contemplated doing—that it can not make men moral when no one expects that it can—that it can not extirpate the habit of intemperance when no one dreams even that it can produce that effect? What law of the code, or who by means of such a law, claims this marvellous power to make men moral or to extirpate a vice? Is it the law which forbids and punishes theft? Does any man suppose, much more affirm that it will eradicate the propensity to steal? Is it the law against perjury or forgery? Is it claimed that by these, the moral state in which these crimes have their origin, can be changed? Is it the law against murder? Does any one affirm, or even expect that the propensity to kill shall be extinguished by this law? No man affirms or expects or supposes any thing of the kind. Each of these laws and every other is intended to suppress the external outbreak by adequate penalties. Nor is it any imputation on their necessity, utility or efficiency that the crimes they forbid are occasionally committed. No just man in the community doubts that, did not these laws exist, such is the strength of the propensities to wrong in men, and such the pressure of temptation to indulge them, the crimes they forbid, would so multiply that life and property would not be anywhere safe a moment.

We claim no more than this for a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating

3

drinks; that is, not to make men moral, but simply to deter them from doing a wrong thing; and if such a law, passed and enforced, should effect only what these have effected, and continue to effect—there is not a temperance man in the world that would not be content.

Another difference.

A second difference which should be noticed between moral suasion and legal coercion, is the fact disclosed by the definitions given, that the change sought in a man's conduct by the former will be the result of a conviction of duty, or a perception of a natural tendency in it to advance his welfare, or both; and by the latter, it will be the result, not improbably as before of duty and a perception of interest, but also superadded to these if they exist, else exclusively, of a fear of the consequences of disobeying the law.

This difference again is an important one; since if thoughtfully considered, it must convince every man of the absolute necessity of a prohibitory law, or legal coercion, to suppress the sale of intoxicating drinks. The love of gain is one of the strongest passions of the human heart. Let a crime be tolerated by which this passion can be gratified, and how long will it be before the land will be filled with transgressors of this class? Let it be theft, and how long will it be before the land will be filled with thieves? Possibly it may be thought that men might be deterred from thieving by moral suasion. Why then is it not relied on to deter the few thieves that now infest society? Ah, my friend, you believe no such thing. Abolish the legal coercion of thieves, and employ only moral suasion to restrain them, and you and I and every other man, are as sure as we are of any thing in the world, that innumerable men would care as little for it, and be affected as little by it, as the tempest by a feather thrown in its path. Why? Because the love of gain is an overmastering passion; and although thieves might have, (and what thief has not?) as clear a perception and deep a conviction of the wrong they do, as an apostle could have, they would go on stealing, and multiplying to steal. The case supposed, is precisely the case with the sale of intoxicating drinks. We have proved, in another tract of this series, that such sale is a crime—a great crime; a large proportion, if not a majority, of the people deem it a crime; and no man living deems it a virtue. The commission of this crime gratifies the passionate love of gain.

Now if we have said any thing to the purpose in our preceding remarks, what must be inevitably the consequence? Just what we see: the multiplication of wholesale and retail dealers, with license and without it, to a degree that makes every decent man blush and tremble for his country, and weep for his kind. And you will employ moral suasion to stop these dealers: will you? Abolish your laws against theft, and stop thieves, as well, by the same means.

There never was a greater absurdity broached under heaven than this supposition of using moral suasion successfully with liquor dealers. Nothing but legal coercion can do this. Though convinced of its wickedness, and hence offering the most favorable subjects for moral suasion, they will continue selling in spite of it, until the law makes the business at once hazardous and disgraceful. Fear only is a stronger passion than the love of money.

There are minor differences, additional to the two we have noticed, between moral suasion and legal coercion, disclosed by our definitions, but we pass by these, for the want of space and time, to state:

II. Some general principles to guide the judgment in deciding when we should rely on moral suasion to restrain men or change them, and when on legal coercion.

When moral suasion.

In the first place it is universally conceded, and the concession is embodied in our fundamental laws, that moral suasion is exclusively to be used to induce men to receive or reject a belief, or to express or refrain from expressing it. The proper antagonist of error is not force, but truth; and truth, in the long run, as experience proves, is more than a match for it. The human judgment, moreover, is fallible. What is deemed truth in one age, is convicted error in another; and to employ force to suppress what we call error, exposes us to the hazard of crucifying a Jesus and letting a Barabbas go free; or of doing for a seeming truth, but a real lie, what Paul did before his conversion in the name of God for the devil: persecute reason and religion in the persons of their suffering disciples.

It is further to be observed that whatever differences of opinion may exist among men, they are, in the main agreed on the laws of morality; and upon these rest the great pillars of civil and social prosperity and happiness.

In the second place, it should be employed in all cases when we would have a man do what he is under no obligation of justice to do; as, for example, to bestow a charity, or to hazard his life to save that of any other man, or any number of men. His property and his life are his own, and neither can be taken from him without an equivalent. You may reason with him, chide him, for not doing as you wish; in other words, you may employ moral suasion; but you cannot rightly do no more. You cannot legally coerce him, because he is under no obligation of justice to do as you require; he does no human being any wrong by refusing; and besides, if you could coerce him for such a cause, so could another; and in this case a man's life and property would be at the mercy of every vagabond in community.

Every act of benevolence therefore, so far as it is produced by the influence of one man, or any number of men, upon another, must be the result exclusively of moral suasion.

In the third place, moral suasion is the only means to be used to restrain men when they injure none but themselves. Thus, it may injure a man to eat too much, to wear expensive clothes, to keep a coach, to be idle when he should work, to expose himself thinly clad in cold and damp weather, and to do a thousand things of the same kind. But he injures no one but himself, and he cannot be meddled with in any way except by moral suasion. Every man is deemed the best judge of his own interests; and besides, to interfere with him legally would lead to endless inquisition, confusion and injustice. Every wise government therefore leaves all such things to the discretion of the individual; nor will it allow any other individual to interfere with him, except to counsel and advise him; to employ, that is, moral suasion.

When legal coercion should be used.

LEGAL COERCION, ON THE OTHER HAND, IS, IN ALL CASES, ALLOWABLE AND NECESSARY TO RESTRAIN MEN FROM DOING AN ACT, OR INDULGING A PRACTICE OR PURSUING A BUSINESS WHICH INJURES ANY OTHER MAN, OR CLASS OR COMMUNITY OF MEN. The very moment that we come where one man inflicts injury upon another, we have passed the line where moral suasion ends and legal coercion begins. We have left the province of the one and have entered that of the other. Christianity may still teach forbearance and forgiveness, and inculcate reliance on God for vindication or redress, but human governments are not founded on the principles of benevolence, but on those of justice; and their primary object is to protect the citizen, doing no harm, from molestation, and to secure redress for him when injured. We may add, that a government which does not do this, is to the extent in which it does not, a sham, and rather a curse to the people who live under it, than a blessing. We may add further, that a government which does not protect and redress, in small things as well as great, to the full extent in which it takes from the citizen the power to protect and redress himself, is in the degree in which it falls short of this, no better. It is an imposition and an intolerable tyranny.

Little more need be said. Admitting that we have correctly designated and described the appropriate place and sphere of moral suasion, on the one hand, and of legal coercion, on the other; it can not be difficult to decide which should be employed to suppress the sale of intoxicating drinks. The question on which the decision turns is simply this: Is such sale a mere case of belief, of benevolence or of injury wholly personal to the seller, or does it inflict injury on other men? If it injures a single human being, it is beyond the limits of moral suasion, except in so far as its victim may be willing to endure a deprivation of his rights, and falls in the province of legal coercion; and if it injures greatly, and the injury extends to the community at large, so much the more certainly is it a fit object of legal coercion. We repeat, the only question we have to consider, in order that we may decide whether the sale of intoxicating liquors, as a beverage, should be suppressed by legal coercion or not, is, does the seller inflict injury on his fellow citizens? Get the answer,—get it from starving children and broken-hearted wives,—get it from sorrowing parents and friends,—get it from the courts and prisons and the penitentiary,—get it from the poor-houses and the records of taxation,—get it from the chapter of accidents to capitalists, travelers, insurers and laborers,—get it from a thousand sources of mournful and harrowing information;—and the man who says that we must deal with the seller of intoxicating drinks by approaching him with moral suasion and not with legal coercion, can have bestowed very little attention on the first principles of government and law.

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 504,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!! O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, Monthly; 8 pages. Folio. 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar. O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 4.] Objections to a Prohibitory Law considered.

After reading the first, second and third tract of this series, there are few, it is believed, who will doubt the immorality of the traffic in intoxicating liquors as a beverage, or the rightness and necessity of a law to suppress it.

We might, therefore, safely dismiss the subject at this point to the calm judgment of every conscientious inquirer in pursuit of truth.

As, however, several objections have been urged against a prohibitory law, which we have noticed incidentally only, if we have noticed them at all, we propose in the present tract to give them due attention.

Obj. 1.—The leading objection, hitherto advanced against a prohibitory law, we need scarcely say, has been its alleged unconstitutionality.

That this is the leading objection is a significant fact; for it shows that our opponents, instead of placing their cause on the broad ground of common and indisputable rights, choose rather to avail themselves mainly of the difficulties which past legislation may have thrown in our way: they meet us precisely as every desirable reform, both in church and state, has always been met by those who think, or feign to think, that wisdom was confined to the dark ages, and deem it a sufficient reason to worship and perpetuate an abuse, because it is old.

But coming at once to the merits of the objection, it is said,

In the first place, that the law is incompatible with the constitution of the United States. The objection rests on two grounds: 1—that the importer of liquors, having paid duties on them, has a right to sell: 2—that if he sells, no State has a right to seize, confiscate and destroy his property.

On both of these points, the Supreme Court of the United States has pronounced opinions; and these opinions are decisive against the claims so urged.

As to the power of a State to prohibit the sale by law, hear Chief Justice Taney:

“Every State may regulate its own internal traffic, according to its own judgment, and upon its own views of the interest and well-being of its citizens. I am not aware that these principles have ever been questioned. If any State deems the retail and internal traffic in ardent spirits injurious to its citizens, and calculated to produce idleness, vice or debauchery, I see nothing in the CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES to prevent it from regulating and restraining the traffic, or from prohibiting it altogether if it thinks proper.”

As to the power of a State to order the seizure, confiscation and destruction of property of any kind for the public good, hear Justice McLean:

“The acknowledged police power of a State often extends to the destruction of property. A nuisance may be abated.”

Hear also Justice Grier:

“All laws for the restraint or punishment of crime, for the preservation of the public peace, health and morals, are, from their very nature, of primary importance, and lie at the foundation of social existence. The exigencies of the social compact require that such laws be executed before and above all others. It is for this reason that quarantine laws, which protect health, compel mere commercial regulations to submit to their control. They restrain the liberty of the passengers; they operate on the ship, which is the instrument of commerce, and on its officers and crew and the rights of navigation. They seize the infected cargo and cast it overboard.”

These authorities place the power of any State to enact a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks beyond dispute: it places beyond dispute also, the power of a State to provide in such a law, if necessary for the public good, for the seizure, confiscation and destruction of property.

But in the second place, the United States not only have a constitution, but the States separately, each have one. Have the States claimed and ex-

exercised this power under their respective constitutions? We might as well ask, whether the States have claimed and exercised any power. The whole penal code is an illustration of the exercise of this prohibitory power; and the various laws relating to quarantine, gambling establishments, coining spurious money, and to a thousand other things, show the exercise of this power carried to the extent of seizing, confiscating and destroying private property. Indeed, the power to prohibit and destroy, if necessary for the public good, is not questioned by any one. Where a prohibitory law has been in any State, adjudged unconstitutional, as being in conflict with the constitution of that State, the decision has been uniformly founded, not upon a want of power in the State to enact such a law, but upon the alleged incompatibility with the constitution of some minor provision, intended only to secure its execution and efficiency.

In vain, therefore, do our opponents urge the unconstitutionality of a prohibitory law.

Obj. II.—A prohibitory law, it is said, is a violation of personal liberty. What right, it is asked, has any man or any body of men, or even the State, to say what I shall not sell or what I shall not buy?

The question is answered by determining precisely what is meant by personal liberty. Does personal liberty consist in doing, without molestation, *any thing* a man may choose to do? any thing *whatever*? This is not liberty; it is lawlessness. Liberty is power to do what we please, while we do no harm to others; or nothing inconsistent with the public good. Do we complain of this? No; and yet observe how this limits, restrains and shackles our freedom of action! We cannot injure a man's person, nor strike his children, nor take his purse, nor enter his house, nor put our feet upon his field, without permission: we cannot set fire to our own premises, nor put any kind of picture we please in our own windows, nor go naked into the street: we cannot lead any kind of life we please, on our own premises: we cannot legally even sell rum, unless we get a license, without being liable to punishment. We might occupy a whole day in enumerating things, we cannot do, and the work would not be done. Well, do we complain of this? Do we say it is a violation of personal liberty? Not at all. What then is meant by this assertion that a prohibitory law violates personal liberty? Nothing more than this, we believe; of right, certainly nothing more: *it takes from a man the liberty of doing, what he has been, hitherto, wrongfully permitted to do.* Had he been always prohibited from selling intoxicating liquors as a beverage as he has been prohibited from stealing, not a word would we have ever heard about this violation of personal liberty!

Obj. III.—This law deprives a man of his property and destroys it; which righteously cannot be done. It is the hate-fullest oppression. Yet it is done, and both Judge McLean and Judge Grier declare that any State may do it. It is done every day. Whether it is done justly or not, depends on the fact whether the public good demands it. If it does, there is no more to be said.

Obj. IV.—It is objected that a prohibitory law will be injurious to the farming interest of the country; by stopping the manufacture of distilled and fermented liquors, you will diminish the demand for corn, and consequently reduce the price.

This objection has been answered by another so well, at least in part, that we cannot do better than to quote his words. He says,

“The quantity of corn used in the manufacture of liquors, compared with the entire amount raised, is so small that if the whole work of distillation were arrested, the effect upon the price of grain would be almost imperceptible. According to the last census, the

corn crop of the United States in the year 1850, was 592,326,612 bushels, of which eleven millions of bushels were consumed in the manufacture of malt and spirituous liquors. From this it will be seen that of every fifty-four bushels raised, only one was used in distillation. Should every distillery in the United States be suppressed, and the extra bushels be turned along with the fifty-three into the usual channels, for home consumption and export, the price of corn would not be affected thereby more than one fifty-third part, or about one cent in the bushel.

“But this is too large an estimate. It must be reduced in proportion as our State is less than the Union. A prohibitory law is not a National but a State measure; and our action in securing it affects only our own State. With our numerous railroads and increasing facilities for intercommunication, the demand and supply will be pretty well balanced, all over the grain-growing States. On the extravagant supposition that the Maine Law would shut up all the distilleries in the State, there is scarcely a State in the Union in which the price of corn would be affected by it, on an average, one mill per bushel.

“But even this is too large an estimate. For it is not the design of the Maine Law, as adapted to the wants of our State, to put an end to the distillation of alcohol. We shall not cease to need alcohol for medicinal and mechanical purposes. The demand for this article in the manufacture of ‘burning fluid,’ of which it is the principal ingredient, is increasing from year to year. To supply this and similar demands, the distilleries, in all probability, will find enough to do.

“Is it not plain that the farmer, who believed the Maine Law reduced the price of his corn, was deceived?”

We can scarcely expect to increase the force of this reply, yet we must add,

1. That the farmer possesses the power of consuming, upon his own premises, in fattening cattle and hogs for the market, that portion of his corn which has hitherto been sold to the distillery, and thereby making, as satisfactory experiments have proved, greater profits than he ever made by its conversion into intoxicating drinks.

2. We should add also, that while no loss can be incurred by the farmer through the operation of a prohibitory law, his gains will be actually increased to the extent in which his taxes shall be reduced by diminished pauperism and crime. Hence, should we suppose that the suppression of distilleries might make a difference of one cent per bushel in the price of his corn, his lessened taxation would be a fair equivalent. If his taxes, for example, are now \$24, they would be reduced by a prohibitory law to at most \$8; saving \$16; which would be the same as an advance of one cent per bushel on 1600 bushels of corn. How little then, has the farmer to fear from the operation of a prohibitory law!

Obj. V.—It is still further objected, that a prohibitory law, enforced, would do great injustice to those who are engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks, inasmuch as they have invested a large amount of capital in the business, and cannot withdraw and reinvest it in any other business without subjecting them to ruinous losses.

To this we reply in the first place, that the greater the amount of capital invested, the greater is the amount of evil inflicted on the people of the State; and we never yet heard the magnitude of an evil, assigned as a reason for its continuance.

We reply in the second place, that the losses which these men are likely to incur in consequence of the operation of a prohibitory law, are grossly exaggerated for effect. Their consciences will not probably hinder them from shipping their entire stock in liquors on hand beyond the limits of the State; and if they should, we have no reason to believe, they would suffer any loss. Their lands and tenements, devoted to liquor manufacture and traffic, will not sink into the earth and disappear under operation of a prohibitory law; they will stand where they always stood, and may be converted to other and less objectionable uses, and, we have the best reasons for believing, without serious loss. This further should be added; that the demand for alcohol will not cease under a prohibitory law. It may be

doubted whether the demand will be diminished. It must be used as hitherto in medicine, and in the different branches of the arts, and in the manufacture especially of burning fluids, of which it is the principal constituent. A legal and profitable business in alcohol, may therefore be continued by the greater number of these men when by the operation of a prohibitory law they shall no longer be permitted to manufacture and sell intoxicating drinks.

Taking this and much more that might be said on this point, if necessary, into consideration, it must be obvious that, notwithstanding all the representations of manufacturers and dealers, we have no certainty of the loss by them of a single dollar; while the rest of their fellow citizens would cease to be robbed annually in the form of taxation, to an amount which would pay the interest at six per cent, on ten times the capital now invested in the liquor traffic.

Obj. VI.—The last objection we shall notice is a very strange one; it is this: a prohibitory law cannot be enforced. Cannot be enforced! Why? Because it ought not to be? No; if any law should be enforced, surely should this. Because no one will be benefited by its enforcement? No; never did any law bring such great and general good to a people, as this would. Because no one will desire its enforcement? No; a majority of the people will desire this; and at least a third of them with such intensity as no law was ever desired before. Because no one will attempt to enforce it? No; for look at Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont and elsewhere, and be sure that as the people have done in these, they will do in any other State. Why then cannot the law be enforced? Ah! we understand. You say, the enemies of the law will resist its execution. But how? we ask. By legal measures? This may be vexatious, but it may also be best. The law being in harmony, as to its essential features, with the constitution of the United States and with the constitutions of the several States; it being also founded in the principles of justice, and the acknowledged right of any people to protect themselves when their moral and material interests are invaded; legal resistance can only vindicate its justice and necessity, and remove from it such features of doubtful propriety as inexperience in an untrodden path of legislation, may have incorporated in it. We are, therefore, not alarmed by the prospect of such resistance. Let it come: on broad principles of justice and expediency, we would rather have it come than not. Legal conflicts are in the end always favorable to virtue and liberty: let them come.

But our opponents mean something more. The resistance they speak of, is the resistance of force and violence carried to the length, possibly, of bloodshed.

Now as we have already said, this is a very strange objection to a law. It is really an objection to the fundamental theory and practice of our government, that a majority of the people shall rule; not a minority; still less a minority of wickedness; and if that theory and practice are questionable, and if there are people who claim, when they please, to set them aside, the sooner the propriety of these is tested the better. We do not fear the result; we have had one Whiskey rebellion already; and—it was put down. We do not fear any general resistance to the law. A few cases here and there may occur; but these will only bring strength to it; for the very moment such cases occur, the manufacturers and dealers will be abandoned by every judicious man in the community, whose support they had, while they appealed to reason and justice before the legal tribunals of their country. A resort to violence will destroy them sooner than any other measure; and were we more zealous than benevolent, we could scarcely wish for an event more propitious to the law.

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!! O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, Monthly; 8 pages. Folio. 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar. O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 5.] Facts from the Poor-House and the Prison.

Suppose a portion of our fellow citizens should engage in the sale of a drug which was found unduly to excite the nervous system, sometimes to produce madness, and often to disturb the peace of families and communities, what should we say of the morality of those thus engaged? And what of the humanity, or even common sense of those who, having the power to prevent, yet authorize the traffic? And suppose the use of this drug was the known occasion of a great proportion—say *four-fifths* of the crimes committed in the country, while it never improved the morals of those who used it, was never a peacemaker, or conferred a substantial benefit on individuals or communities, how ought the traffic in it then to be looked upon, and how treated?

The exact and melancholy parallel of the case here supposed, actually exists among us. It is the traffic in intoxicating liquors. And as the actual case is the one now to be treated, we begin by asking: Where should we naturally look for the effects of a business so pregnant of crime, but to our jails? These have been examined, and with results equal to all anticipation—the investigation having been extended to every jail in the State of New-York, and to many in other States; and having been conducted in the most minute and careful manner. The process was this: the names of all committed to any jail, in the course of the year, were taken up in detail, and classified according to the information of the jailer. Those known to have been temperate were placed in one column, the intemperate in another. Those of a third, and obviously a very numerous class, concerning whom nothing definite could be ascertained in regard to their use of liquor, were placed in another column as doubtful, and the official signature of the jailer affixed to the certificate. A great mass of explanatory facts, showing the degree of debasement, the utter wreck of property, standing, and character was also given, which in this article must necessarily be omitted. Of the doubtful, the explanation frequently settled the fact that they must have been intemperate. In one case, the sheriff who was also jailer, and one of more than ordinary respectability, said: "Of the temperate, one was imprisoned for a riot in which he was engaged, and at the time was under the influence of ardent spirits." Of the doubtful, it was generally found that they used liquor, sometimes it was added, "very freely." The result of this examination we will now give:

CRIME.

Whole number committed in the year was,.....	10,176
Temperate,.....	641
Doubtful,.....	1,003
Intemperate,.....	8,532

Whether the number found in our jails would have been as large, had not the sale of liquor been licensed, will be shown by facts in another place.

PAUPERISM.

Of the evils of poverty and the suffering often consequent upon it, every town, city, village, and almost every neighborhood can exhibit its living witnesses; and as we shall show in the proper place every grave yard its dead witnesses, yet "although dead they speak," and that too, with more force and eloquence than they could while living. And where shall we go

for the most satisfactory testimony on this point? Where, but to the Poor Houses? There, too, we have been and gathered the facts in the same way—have made the same careful scrutiny as at the jails; classifying in the same way, and adding explanatory facts, so that, as far as possible, the real effects of liquor might be seen in reducing our fellow men to poverty and consequent suffering. Of this part of our examinations, the following will show the result, so far as *figures* can do it; but to give any thing like a just view of this subject, the decrepitude, the insanity, the imbecility, the miserable wrecks of families, the mothers reduced from affluence and respectability to abject want and degradation, children deprived of the affectionate kindness and care of their natural guardians—transferred from the abundance of home and the peace of the domestic hearth, to the public guardianship and the degrading associations of the poor house. These things, and much more that neither tongue nor pen can describe, should be seen, to give any thing like an adequate idea of the blasting effects of alcoholic drinks. All this we have seen—we have examined it in detail, and it has left an impression on our mind that never can be effaced:

The number sent to the poor houses of this State in the year was, . . .	8,434
Not from intemperance,	1,158
Doubtful,	1,402
From intemperance,	5,874

TAXES.

It is obvious that such a mass of crime and poverty must occasion a great addition to the pecuniary burthens of the community. This, too, we resolved to investigate. And to let figures tell this part of the doings of alcohol, we went to the clerk of the board of supervisors in every county of the State, ascertained from his books the amount of tax levied on the tax payer for county expenses, and then, by a process that we have often given in detail, and the accuracy of which has never to our knowledge been questioned, the portion chargeable to the support of paupers, and the punishment of criminals was brought out. The result was as follows. The amount would probably at this day be four or five times larger:

The amount of county tax in the State was,	\$495,486 50
Pauperism and crime,	363,386 70
Balance left for all other purposes,	132,099 80

We can not go into detail, but we would just say that alcohol was ALWAYS CREDITED the amount of license money paid in the year.

DOMESTIC DISCORD.

Hearing at nearly every jail, and not unfrequently a number of times, the remark, "He was sent here for whipping his wife," we were led to inquire for such cases, and regret that we did not commence doing so, until we had examined, perhaps, one third of them; but those we did examine afforded an exhibition of family discord too sickening to contemplate. To the credit of human nature, however, not one case was found where a temperate man had been thus guilty. It seemed to require the maddening and brutalizing influence of intoxicating drinks to perpetrate such an outrage. In the jails examined on this point, we found 389 imprisoned for this offence. In casting an eye over our statistics, we see that at one jail where there were only 10 committed, two were for whipping their wives, one for robbing a hen roost, one for burning the barn of a tavern keeper, and as an appropriate termination of such a life he afterwards committed suicide in jail. In another, of 145 committed, 16 were for this offence, and one woman for whipping her husband. In one case the poor creature manifested an unusual

degree of depravity by using a *dog* to whip with instead of the stick or the lash. In another jail of three committed, (Lycoming Co., Pa.) two were for the same offence, and the other for assault and battery; and he had previously been imprisoned a year and a half for abuse to his wife. In Albany, of the 114 committed in a month, 20 were for abuse to their families.

DEATHS.

But suppose it could be proved that intoxicating liquors are constantly destroying our fellow men, and that too without ever having a contrary effect; that is, never prolonging life, except in counteracting or curing disease, as other poisons do when properly administered; and suppose that while a large class of the more respectable and moral portion of the community had been led to abandon their use, yet multitudes still continued to use them for the mere purpose of daily stimulation, and although facts were daily presented proving their tendency to produce disease, madden the brain, lead to death by violence, and to self destruction, would not wise legislators enact laws for their suppression as a beverage, and punish with severe penalties those who should still, in defiance of law, deal out the pernicious poison merely for the sake of gain? We should suppose that in regard to the measures which would be adopted, there could be no question, that all which could be required as preliminary to such an enactment would be to bring home the charge of homicide to this supposed agent of ruin and death. Can this be done? Let us see. The present writer has attempted it—with what success he leaves the reader to judge. And the course pursued was this: He went to the physicians, ministers, sextons, undertakers, and all who might be supposed to have the knowledge requisite to enable them to answer—obtained from them the names of *all* the men, twenty-one years old and upward, who had died in the year, both the temperate and intemperate, arranged them in separate columns for the convenience of counting, in order to ascertain the proportion that were intemperate. But after examining one county in this way, Dr. Nott, President of Union College, suggested that to prove that the use of intoxicating drinks destroyed human life, it was necessary to show that the intemperate died sooner than the temperate. The difficulty in determining who should be called intemperate we can not now explain—whether, as at the poor house of Lewis county, in this State, the woman who drinks six quarts of cider in the day, by way of medicine, is to be put down temperate, or doubtful—whether to agree with the jailer at Louisville, Ky., who, having marked nearly every prisoner as doubtful, being told that the information he gave was so indefinite it would be of little value in our investigation, at once remarked that all those he spoke of as doubtful came to the jail when drunk, but he could not say whether they were *intemperate* or not. In this matter we could take only the standard which the common sense of the community has adopted as our guide, and call those intemperate who were called so by the people generally. Let it be borne in mind, however, that a great many died prematurely from the use of intoxicating drinks, who were never called intemperate. Of this class were those who, having drunk only to the point of exhilaration, undertook some exploit, ran some risk to which they never would have exposed themselves in perfectly cool blood, and were killed, or so injured that death, sooner or later, ensued. Such deaths are not charged to intemperance often. Very often the doctor has said to us, "That man was not generally known to have been intemperate, and you must not class him as such; but I have no doubt if he had practiced on total abstinence principles, he might have been alive now, and a healthy man."

Another large class we do not reach in this examination—those who, by an habitual or free use of liquor, have so impaired the recuperative energies

of the system, that when attacked by a disease that the doctor might easily have controlled but for the previous habits of the patient, now baffles his skill, and death ensues. We could not, or did not, put such individuals among the intemperate. On these principles we examined Broome, Onondaga, Cayuga and Ontario counties. In Onondaga the number of deaths, of men over 21 years, was 167, of whom 39 per cent were put down intemperate. In Cayuga, the proportion was exactly the same. In Broome, 35, and in Ontario, 40 per cent. In the village of Canandaigua, 20 men had died in the year, 10 of whom were intemperate. As to the average ages of the two classes, it turned out that in two counties the temperate had on an average lived ten years longer than the intemperate, and in the third, eleven years.

That the evils, which we have now considered, are and always have been the common results of using alcoholic drinks, is conceded; and therefore it is but reasonable and humane to inquire:

IS THERE A REMEDY?

In answer, let us once more appeal to facts. But where shall we look for them? Where, but again to the jails? To them we *have* looked. The difference in the number confined in them, in the year before the prohibitory law of 1845, and the number during the operation of that law, will enable us to come to a satisfactory conclusion on this great, engrossing and agitating question: *IS PROHIBITION to be relied on as the REMEDY in this case?*

After the repeal of the law of '45, we examined the jails of (we think) 17 counties—ascertained the number committed to each one the year before the law, and then the number during its existence. To be as brief as possible: In Ontario jail, the year before that law, the number of prisoners was 125; the year of its operation, 53; the year after the repeal, 132!!! That jail was probably built in 1790, and was never without a tenant until 1846, during which year it was empty about three months. And let it be particularly noticed, that in the year when the number of prisoners was greatly diminished, there was a corresponding diminution in jail expenses. Mr. Murray, clerk of the board of supervisors, certifies that the number of weeks' board for prisoners during prohibition was NINETY-EIGHT, and the year after the repeal, FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-TWO.

In Monroe county, the year before prohibition, the number in jail was 953; during that year it was 666;—and what the year after when the tide of intemperance had rolled back, the legal restraint having been removed? Ponder the answer! It was 947, or 287 more than the previous year. Is there any efficacy in legislating against the sale of liquor? The expenses of the poor at the poor house, were nearly SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS less while the law existed, than they were the previous year. The number of weeks' board for prisoners was 561 weeks less. Genesee county jail had never been without a tenant, except once—a day or two, until 1846, when it was so for some weeks. In the other of the seventeen counties examined, a mass of facts of the same kind, and to the same effect, was obtained, showing that the number of commitments was greatly diminished, and that some other jails were unoccupied for longer or shorter periods for the very first time. Drunkenness in the streets of the city where we are now writing, and especially in surrounding villages, was diminished, according to the deliberate opinion of our most observing and judicious citizens who were especially questioned on the subject, *five-sixths*—we think more. Facts like these might be given to an indefinite extent, all looking in the same direction, all PROVING, if facts can prove anything, *that prohibitory legislation does greatly diminish the evils of intemperance.*

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!!!

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, Monthly; 8 pages. Folio. 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 4 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 6.] The Political Economy of the Maine Law.

I rejoice in your success, said a merchant of the city of Portland, to a warm friend of the Maine Law, on the day of its approval by the Governor—“I rejoice in your success, though the measure will ruin my business.” He was an importer of molasses, and extensively engaged in the West India trade. Molasses was used in great quantities for distillation, and the Maine Law prohibits the manufacture as well as sale of intoxicating drinks. It was explained to him, that his fears were unfounded, and that the law would be a benefit and not an injury to his business.

Before the Maine Law, molasses was consumed in great quantities at the bar and in the grog shop, in the form of New England rum, which was purchased by the poor laboring man with the money which ought to have been expended for necessaries and comforts for his family; and which, but for the bar room and grog shop, would have been devoted to such purposes. It would seem, at first view, that if the manufacture and sale of New England rum should be annihilated by the law, that the raw material of which that liquor was made, would become a drug in the market. This would have been the certain result, if molasses could be employed for no other purpose; but it is a healthful and useful article of food.

While the rum trade was freely carried on, the families by which it was encouraged, consumed but small quantities of molasses in its original form, because their means were devoted to the purchase of rum. But after the suppression of the grog shops, molasses was carried into the dwellings of these families as an article of diet, and contributed to the health, comfort and sustenance of those who were before debased by it under its disguise. A family which would consume each year, a given quantity of molasses in the form of rum, would use a much greater quantity in its original form, for food, if the facilities for spending its means for intoxicating drinks, were no longer permitted to exist.

Such was the explanation given to the importer of molasses, of the operation which the faithful execution of the Maine Law would have upon his business; and such in fact, it proved to be; for that business immediately improved, and has continued to be flourishing until the present time.

And the enactment and rigorous execution of the Maine Law in every State of the Union, would have the same effect upon every branch of legitimate trade. The provision dealer, grocer, hatter, shoemaker, tailor, and every other craftsman and dealer, whose trade is necessary or useful, in feeding, clothing, educating or sheltering the people, would receive among them all the money now squandered for strong drinks, with a very great sum additional, which would be earned by the improved habits of industry of the people. And this additional amount thus earned, would at least equal the sum spent for intoxicating liquors.

In the State of New-York for example, the sum annually squandered for strong drinks, cannot be less than forty millions of dollars. Any one acquainted with the subject will admit this to be a moderate computation. An equal amount is lost and wasted in various ways, directly and indirectly, in consequence of the consumption of this vast quantity of intoxicating liquors. We have, then, a loss to the Empire State, by the rum traffic, of the enormous amount of eighty millions of dollars annually. Nothing useful results to the State, or to individuals, from the expenditure of this vast sum for such a purpose. But it may be objected, that many persons accu-

mulate fortunes in the trade, and that the State as well as these traders, are benefited thereby. Fortunes may be obtained also, by robbery, gambling, piracy or murder, and the State and the winning parties will be as much gainers in the one case as in the other. In neither case, is any property added to the general stock. In both cases, the accumulation is achieved, only by transferring property from the pockets of those who have earned it by honest and useful labor, to those of unscrupulous persons who give no just equivalent for it, while the gainers are demoralized by the business, and the losers are not only deprived of their means, but in many cases of health, reputation, happiness and life.

The State is in no sense a gainer by the accumulation of property in individual cases by the rum traffic. Such property has simply changed hands, from the many to the few; while the many have been rendered in the process, worse citizens, less industrious, and less able to earn more, and less able and willing to bear their share of the public burdens; while in a vast number of cases, they become themselves with their children, public burdens, to be supported by the temperate and industrious part of the community, either as paupers or as criminals.

The effect of the rum traffic upon the public welfare in the aggregate, may be perfectly illustrated to the comprehension of every man, by a single case. Two young men commenced business together, as mechanics, in a profitable and flourishing trade. They were both active, industrious and intelligent, and both drank strong liquors moderately. One saw his danger in time, ceased entirely from the practice, and warned his friend, in vain, to do the same. The one is now living at a good old age, honored and respected, with a handsome fortune accumulated by honest industry, and a respectable family now settled around him; while the other died intemperate and poor, leaving his family to be supported by the charity of his friends. Such is the inevitable effect of the rum trade upon public and private prosperity.

Take another case, which illustrates perfectly the advantages to the public and to the people, which will result from the suppression of the rum traffic. I met in the street a few days ago, a man whom I knew very well, who was formerly very intemperate and poor. Master of an excellent trade, he had lived to the age of fifty, squandering everything as he earned it, for strong drink. But the Maine Law came, like an angel of mercy to him. The grog shops were suppressed; the temptation to drink was put far away from him, by the paternal action of the government; his earnings now began rapidly to accumulate. As I met him, he greeted me warmly, and immediately began to give me an account of his affairs.

"Where do you live?" said I. "Come here," said he; "I'll show you." Moving a few rods, by the end of a block of buildings, he pointed to his house, a short way off—a neat white cottage with Venetian blinds—and with pride, he added, "it's mine, all paid for, and two lots by its side, also paid for, and my wife has got *three hundred dollars in cash in the house*, all my earnings; *three years ago, I had'n't a dollar in the world*!"

This incident illustrates the actual working of the Maine Law, and its effects have been the same in thousands of similar cases, in changing into good and useful citizens, men who were before, worthless, and burdens to society. Under the grog shop system, the wages of this man's labor, which he had thus accumulated, and invested in house and lands and cash, would have been squandered day by day, for strong drink, and he must have died at last, a drunkard and a pauper, leaving to his family an inheritance of poverty and shame, and to his country, the burden of their support.

The first duty of the State, is to protect its people from any and every cause of evil and suffering, as far as it is practicable to do so; to provide for their welfare and happiness in all the relations of life, and to foster and

encourage industry and good morals. Now all men are agreed in this, that the grog shops occasion evils more numerous and intense, than all other causes of evil combined; that their tendency is, necessarily and inevitably, to impoverish and demoralize the people. The government has not only the right to suppress them, but it is clearly its duty to do so.

But it is not the design of this tract so much to demonstrate the justice of the Maine Law, as to show its effects on the prosperity of the State.

It is said that important interests must be sacrificed, if the Maine Law shall generally prevail. Great quantities of grain and hops are consumed in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors, and it is thought that the Maine Law would throw these upon the market, and occasion a general reduction in the price, and thus the agricultural interest be made to suffer.

The results of the Maine Law in Maine upon the molasses trade, were regarded with the same apprehension; and in the case of the grain market, the fear is as groundless as it was in the other. The same reasoning applies to both, to precisely the same extent.

Whiskey is consumed in vast quantities by those whose families suffer for bread, because the means with which it should be purchased are squandered on strong drink. Suppress the distilleries and the whiskey shops, and the wages of labor, would no longer flow in these channels, but would be spent for food instead of liquor, and thus a demand would immediately exist for the grain, which before was destroyed by distillation. With the hops, the case would be different, in case of the suppression of the breweries. A limited quantity only, of that article would be wanted, and the land now devoted to its production, would be converted to the culture of articles of food, for which there would be a demand almost unlimited.

Look at the families, the horses, oxen, cows and swine of the whiskey drinkers; they are pinched for food to such an extent, that the whole quantity of grains consumed by the distilleries—and more—would be required to make up the deficiency. If the whiskey trade should be stopped, there would be an immediate demand for this quantity, and the money now devoted to the purchase of whiskey, would be *more than sufficient* to pay for it. At present, the whiskey drinkers pay for all that grain, with the addition thereto, of all the cost of distillation, and the heavy profits of the distiller, the middle-man and the retailer; and this requires so much of their wages, that they have not the means left to provide sufficient food, fuel, raiment and shelter for their dependents. All this is so obvious to every observer, that it is sufficient, merely to state the argument.

But if the price of grain should suffer a decline in the market, from the suppression of the whiskey trade, and food, consequently, should be more abundant, and more within the reach of persons of humble means, what then? Would any farmer of good principles—a patriot and christian—oppose the suppression of that trade from such a consideration? In that event, his position would be precisely like that of the gambler; the manufacturer and vender of improper books and pictures; the keeper of the house of ill-fame; the manufacturer of bowie knives and pistols; the men of every grade living by violence or fraud, who should oppose measures calculated to reform society and bring men under gospel influences, because they would tend to diminish their profits and to break up their trade.

So far as grain is converted into intoxicating drinks, it is absolutely wasted; it is lost to the world, for all useful purposes, as truly as if the whole quantity were destroyed by flood or fire. Nay, it is much worse than lost, because the consumption of this product of the grain is not only of no benefit to society, directly or indirectly, but is the certain cause of evils innumerable and intense, such as society endures from no other source. No good man then can possibly advocate and sustain the whiskey trade.

PROFIT AND LOSS.

Our artizans were being expatriated, rushing to our ports for the purpose of going to America and Australia; but he would tell the artizans of this kingdom that there was no need to go gold digging abroad. Only let them persuade the government of the country to suppress the traffic in alcoholic drinks, and they might dig gold at home. There would be such a demand for labor that, to use a very common place expression, artizans would not be got for love or money. But now they had discussed this question on a very low ground—simply on that of the employment of so much capital and labor. Let them look a little further into it. The manufacture of alcoholic drinks entailed the prodigious loss of 50 millions of money in this country, in the way of the loss of labor. Now this was a round assertion, and it would be asked could it be proved? It could to perfect demonstration. If this were the subject of his address, and not the whole question, it would be easy to do so. It was well known that a great change was produced in the social habits of Ireland by the labors of Father Matthew. In Waterford a great mass of the people became total abstainers, and the result was found to be this: An estimate was made of their goods at the time they became total abstainers, and the value was found to be about £100,000, or \$500,000. Two years after they gave over drinking, they were found to be worth £200,000, or \$1,000,000, having thus doubled. In a mine near there a thousand people were employed, and they earned £1,900, or \$9,500 per month. They expended £500, or \$2,500 in drink, leaving £1,400, or \$7,000 available for their families and their homes. When they ceased drinking, instead of earning £1,900, or \$9,500, they earned £2,300, or \$11,500. They did not spend the £500, or \$2,500, so that there was a clear gain to their families, their children and wives, of £900, or \$4,500 per month. So that they need not wonder for a single moment that their goods and chattels should have doubled.—*Rev. James Bardsley: Speech at Hull, (Eng.)*

In this brief paragraph, we have a striking illustration of the two leading propositions in the preceding tract; of which the first is this: that the operation of a prohibitory law not merely effects a saving of money previously wasted upon intoxicating drinks, but increases the production. Thus, at Waterford, we are told \$500,000 became in two years \$1,000,000—a prodigious increase, that cannot be accounted for by supposing it the saving merely of what had been previously spent for rum. Then again at the mine; it will be observed that the whole sum of their earnings while the miners indulged in drinking, amounted only to \$9,500 per month: when they became total abstainers, it amounted to \$11,500 per month: an increase of \$2,000 per month, or \$12,000 per year, resulting, not from saving what was before spent, but from clear additional earnings.

The second proposition of the author of the tract is, that though the liquor dealers may suffer loss by the prohibition of their traffic, the community at large will, in a pecuniary form, be more than compensated for such loss; i. e., every other man in the community, will gain increased prosperity by the suppression of the liquor traffic. To perceive that this is true, turn again to the examples given above. The last will answer our purpose. While the miners drank intoxicating drinks, they had but \$7,000 per month among them all with which to provide food, clothing and shelter for their families. As soon as they ceased drinking, they had \$11,500: the difference being \$4,500 per month, or \$54,000 per year!

Now what became of this large sum? The larger proportion was unquestionably spent in buying furniture from the cabinet makers, shoes from the shoe makers, hats from the hatters, clothing from the merchant and the tailor, and meats and bread and vegetables from the butcher and the grocer. If they expended for such comforts, no more than they previously wasted on intoxicating drinks, (the least we can suppose, i. e., \$30,000 per annum,) the whole community received just what was previously pocketed by the liquor dealer; while these poor men had, deposited in the savings bank or elsewhere, an additional sum of \$24,000, against a rainy day! a sum that never would have existed but for the influence of total abstinence!

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!! O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, Monthly; 8 pages. Folio. 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar. O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 7.] Politics and Temperance.

It has been urged by the opponents of the temperance movement, that it upheaves parties, overthrows political organizations. Well, what of that? And this gives rise to another question, viz.: What is meant by the term POLITICS so often used by men, with whom we come in contact every day? Politics in the true sense of the word is that science which, carried out into practice, confers the greatest amount of good upon the greatest number of people. It dictates the largest liberty compatible with social order, and the security of individual rights. It searches out the direction in which the greatest amount of blessings lies, and follows it. It teaches the building up of the individual man, and the giving of prosperity to the whole community of a State. Whatever is hurtful to either, it discards. Its aim is to make each citizen separately, and all the citizens collectively, wiser, happier, freer, more virtuous every day and every year. It looks always beyond the present. The State, in theory, never dies. Government, in theory, is immortal. The science of politics, while it watches over the present, is provident of the future. It knows no such thing as temporary expedients, unless as a means of securing ultimate and permanent good. It calculates, not what is best for the day alone, but for all the future; what is best for the present generation and for all future generations. Such is the true and legitimate meaning of the term POLITICS; and it will at once be seen that every real reform, having for its object the social, intellectual or moral improvement of Man, must of necessity enter more or less into the politics of every free country.

There is however another and a spurious sense in which the term is used by hundreds and thousands of petty politicians, who flourish in ward caucuses, in town, county, and even State conventions. Such men, when they talk about political interests, mean the interests of the party to which they belong. By politics, they mean adherence to this or that party organization. One man claims to be a whig and talks about whig principles; another claims to be a democrat and talks about democratic principles. This would be all very well, if there were any such tangible things as whig or democratic principles, as the term is now used, extant. Men array themselves into a political party, give a blind obedience to its dictates without pausing to inquire where it is to lead them, or what is to be the end of their action. With such the science of politics is the mere strategy, the cunning of the demagogue, having reference not to the general good, not to the progress of the masses, not to the prosperity of the whole people, but to the supremacy of party; to the elevation of individuals to office, not as representing the interests of the whole people, not to forward the good of the whole people, but of the party. To this end the machinery, the discipline and the tactics of party were instituted, and have been applied until the whole science of politics in its true and legitimate sense has been superseded by a base counterfeit, passed upon the people as true coin. Now it is perfectly true that this temperance movement is at war with the strategy, the cunning, the corruptions of party politics. If carried vigorously forward, it will be very likely to upheave political organizations and overthrow parties as they now exist. It may very likely happen that in its onward flow it will swamp partizans, and thwart the designs of demagogues. But what of that? we ask again. Let us look into the object of this temperance movement and forward to its results, in view of the science of politics, as we have before defined it. There is a great evil in the world. It is right

under the observation and within full view of every man. It stalks into every family; it invades every domestic hearth—pervades every social circle—looms up in every community all over this State, all over the United States, all over the civilized world. It peoples the grave yards with its victims, and recruits the armies of eternity with lost souls. It breaks the hearts of parents—blasts the hopes of children—gives brothers to destruction and sisters to shame. It hangs like an incubus upon labor, and robs industry of its reward. It is the great source of pauperism—the great fountain of crime. It fills the almshouses and peoples the jails. It strikes at the root of all religion, and is utterly destructive of all Christian morality. It is an enemy to public tranquility, and overturns social order. Such being the evil, pervading as we all know it to be, What is wisdom, in view of the true science of politics? It should be remembered, moreover, that the effects of intemperance are not limited to the subject of it; it is not a mere personal matter. Were the drunkard away off on some solitary island, all alone by himself, with nobody to be disturbed by his revelries or injured by their results, we might advise reform, but he might well question our right to coerce his action in regard to his means of indulgence. But intemperance disturbs the public; it interferes with the great body politic. It is a public evil, affecting every community and every body; interfering with every man's happiness, and coming into collision with every man's rights.

The true science of politics would dictate the expulsion of this great disturbing evil from the world, if its expulsion is within the range of governmental powers. It would do so because the general good, the prosperity of the people as a whole, require it; because the aggregate of human happiness would be increased by it; because men would be made wiser, more moral, more virtuous, better citizens by its expulsion; because they would be better fed, better clothed, have better houses, would enjoy more peace, would be more secure in their rights; because there would be less sorrow—fewer afflictions visited upon them; because it would lessen the number of widows and orphans, diminish the amount of pauperism, reduce taxation, lessen crime. As all these things are the very elements of progress, of prosperity of a nation, it follows that the true science of politics would dictate their promotion by sweeping away every thing that conflicts with them. Suppose it be true then that to accomplish the good contemplated by the temperance movement, political organizations as they at present exist should be overthrown, what harm will be done? What great beneficial interest will be affected by it? Individual hopes may be disappointed; personal ambition thwarted; one set of politicians may lose their influence, and one set of political leaders be superceded; but others will take their places quite as wise, quite as honest, fully as patriotic, and as able to administer the laws; while the great object accomplished will add infinitely to the sum of individual and collective prosperity and happiness of the people of the State. To carry temperance into politics then, will be but substituting the true for the counterfeit of the science of politics, bringing it back to its original position, and making it accomplish its real mission, viz: the promotion of the greatest good of the greatest number.

We, of the State of New-York carried the canal question into politics. Why? Because many of the statesmen of the day thought that the prosperity of the people and the honor of the State would be promoted by the speedy completion of the canals. Will anybody tell us that the prosperity of the people and the honor of the State will not be promoted by the suppression of intemperance? The question of a protective tariff was carried into politics and made a cardinal principle in the creed of one of the great political parties of the State and the Union. Why? Because the

statesmen of that party insisted that a protective tariff benefits labor, gives a higher reward to industry, promotes the happiness of the working masses, and contributes largely to the general prosperity. Will anybody, of any party, tell us that the suppression of intemperance will not benefit labor, give a higher reward to industry, promote the happiness of the working masses, and contribute beyond the power of computation to the general prosperity?

It will in fact be seen that the principle which carried any or all of the great issues of the past or the present into politics, admits the temperance movement as a legitimate subject for true political action; and no man need be frightened by the idea of violating any rule of the true science of politics, by participating in that movement. It may not be wisdom to attempt to organize a separate and distinct party, based upon temperance alone; that might be too narrow a basis for a great political organization; but it should be made a distinct and prominent article in the creed of any party that receives the support of temperance men, and it should be clearly avowed by every candidate who receives their vote.

If such a course breaks up present political organizations, be it so. If those organizations are so weak that they can not stand up for the right, for the interests of humanity and the promotion of the greatest good ever tendered to man, let them go down. If such is their organic imperfections, they have already existed too long. If a citizen can not be a good whig or a good democrat and a straight forward temperance man too, let him sink the whig or the democrat, and follow where temperance leads. Let him hold fast his temperance principles, and carry them with him to the polls. They will be triumphant at last. The right will prevail, and the good he has been instrumental in accomplishing will be a pleasant memory when his head rests on the pillow of death, and the world is passing from his view.

We have thus far considered the question of temperance as connected with political action, only with reference to the expediency of making it one of the issues to be decided by the ballot box. We have simply endeavored to show that to carry it into politics is no violation of political duty, no perversion of the right of suffrage. But there is a higher consideration remaining which every just man should lay to heart. The right of suffrage was given for a lofty and a noble purpose, and connected with it are responsibilities of a nature that all men should understand and appreciate. The right of voting for those who are to make or administer the laws, implies the duty of exercising it, not with a selfish purpose, not to promote individual ends alone, but with reference to the good of the great body politic, the interests of all who are joined together by the same social compact and live under the same institutions. It was given not only as a shield against oppression, a preventive and a guard against tyranny in those who wield the power of government, but it was intended as a check upon the growth of social evils that disturb the happiness of man. A religious man will not and should not vote for a bold and shameless blasphemer against God and the Christian religion. An honest man will not and should not vote for a thief or a robber. A just man will not and should not vote for one who oppresses the poor, who withholds from labor its reward, or plunders his neighbor under the forms of law. A man of generous sympathies will not and should not vote for a cold and selfish aristocrat, who has no feeling in common with the masses of the people whom he would represent. A republican will not and should not vote for one who avows opinions against a representative government, and in favor of monarchical rule. And why? Because there would be danger that such men would practice in office the views and the crimes which mark their private life, or give official sanction

to practices and principles the tendencies of which would be to corrupt public morality, disturb social order, or overthrow the government itself. A sense of political duty would withhold from such men the vote of every right-minded intelligent citizen. That same imperious sense of political duty should control the vote of every temperance man in the State and in the Union.

That intemperance is the greatest moral, social, and political evil that ever afflicted the world, needs no demonstration here. That it is beyond the reach of moral suasion, the efforts of a quarter of a century have proved. That the power of law must be evoked to stay its progress has become one of the fixed facts of the times. Legal suasion can be secured only by the election of legislators who will pass laws for its suppression, and wipe out the traffic in intoxicating drinks by penal enactments against it. The only way to secure such results is through the ballot box. And will any temperance man in the State or in the Union, who has the right to vote, hesitate as to what his duty as a citizen is? Will he weigh the claims of his party against his duty to his God, to his country, to his fellow men, to humanity and the great cause of human progress? Will he falsify his principles, give the lie to his professions, and stand among the champions of rum, for fear of encountering the frowns of demagogues, or the sneer of political tricksters?

Suppose, as we have already said, that this temperance movement should upheave present political organizations and topple down parties, what then? A new party organization will follow. One, more promotive of public morality, more in accordance with political purity, serving the interests of the masses of the people infinitely better than the old ones have done. An organization in which good men, patriotic men, christian men, men of social virtue and high political honor can take a part. An organization that will not patronize or lean upon corruption for support, that will give no prominence to the vicious, that will not confer honor upon the brutality, the licentiousness, the debauchery and degradation that burrow in the dens of intemperance to be drawn out, paraded, smiled upon, courted and paid as often as an election occurs. Just such an organization would be productive of a vast amount of good. It would not only carry out and perfect the temperance movement, but would work another reform very much needed just now. It would baffle the cunning and dissipate the schemes of demagogues, who, through the patronage and by the aid of corner groceries and subterranean influences, carry caucuses and conventions, whose power is exercised through agencies that shock every moral sense and violate all the proprieties of life. In this view of the matter, good instead of evil would result from the wreck of present party organizations. Politics would go back towards their ancient purity, when good men for candidates and the use of honorable means to secure their election, were regarded as primary principles of political ethics. When the question to be decided was, not what strength the candidate could bring to the party by drafts upon the dregs that lay away down in the depths of society to be seen only when stirred to the surface by the excitement of a political contest, but whether he was capable and honest. Such a reform in our judgment, looking to the purity and perpetuity of our institutions, is next in importance to the temperance reform; and if both can be accomplished by breaking the present political organizations to pieces, we say in God's name let them be broken.

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars !!!]

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, Monthly; 8 pages. Folio. 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar.

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 8.] Farmers and Temperance.

Somebody has said that "God made the Country but man made the Town." Whether this saying be true or false, one thing is entirely certain, that the conservative elements—the sober and staid virtues that sustain human institutions—are more highly developed in the country than in cities. The farmers, as a class, are more thoughtful, less given to fanaticism, less easily led astray by delusions, less easily deceived by the pretensions of hypocrisy, less given to excitement, more accustomed to judging calmly and impartially and to acting upon convictions of right and duty, than is any other class of people in this country at least. Moreover, they are more independent in thought, in opinion, in speech and in action, than is any other class, and being so, they are more jealous of sinister influences and less easily led astray than any other. It is a pleasant thing to know that in the main, the temperance movement has taken a deep root in "the country," that the necessity for reform on the subject of temperance is appreciated, and that however the people of the cities may cling to abuses that have so long darkened human destiny, however unwilling they may be to surrender customs and habits which have multiplied crime, rolled up the vast amount of pauperism, swelled the burthens of taxation and disturbed social order, yet in the country among those who till the earth, who live among the natural and beautiful things of God, there is a readiness and an earnestness in carrying forward the great work that bear with them the prestige and promise of triumph.

It is entirely natural that this should be so. When the tax gatherer calls upon the farmer for the tribute due from him towards the expenses of the government, the latter will be very likely to inquire what creates the necessity that compels him to hand over to the treasury the dollars he has earned by the sweat of his brow. He will be very likely to inquire into the cause of this yearly increase of the ratio of taxation. He finds that two great sources of public expenditure are pauperism and crime. He finds that to build almshouses and to support their inmates and the officers connected with them a large sum is raised by taxation and expended every year. He finds that the administration of criminal justice, the support of jails and prisoners confined in them, the arrest of offenders against the law, the expenses of the courts and the fees of officers roll up another large amount to be paid by taxation. These two sources of taxation he ascertains make up the larger portion of the burthens that bear so heavily on his class; and he institutes an inquiry into the causes which produce such a vast amount of pauperism and crime. In his search after truth he meets in every direction a single answer. It comes from the jails and the almshouses—from the destitute and suffering poor who are yet just beyond the necessity for public charity—from the dissolute and the idle who have not yet crossed the threshold of crime—from every bar room and grocery where drunkenness holds its revels. He sees it in the bloated and distorted countenances—the inflamed eyes—the tottering gait—the rags and filth of the devotees of strong drink. He sees it in the pale and haggard faces, the stunted growth of barefooted, ill clad and hungry children—in the sad and desolate countenances of wives and mothers. He hears it in the shout, the hurrah, the obscene speech, the blasphemies that shame our language, and make night hideous. That answer is only and always INTEMPERANCE. He ascertains that pauperism and crime are its sure results.

Regarding his own interests in the light of these discoveries, the farmer naturally and for self-protection, becomes a reformer on the subject of temperance.

But in pursuing his inquiries the farmer makes another discovery equally important; one which appeals directly to his heart, to his humanity, to every noble and philanthropic sentiment of his nature, marking out before him in lines of living light the path of duty. He finds that intemperance is the greatest cause of human suffering, affliction and sorrow; nay, that it occasions more hours of hopeless desolation, crushes more hopes, causes the shedding of more tears, breaks more hearts and ruins more souls than all the other evils that darken

around human destiny. It hurries young men in their strength, in the pride and glory of manhood to premature graves: it beggars children in their helplessness: it gives wives to destitution and daughters to shame: it peoples the grave yards faster than famine, pestilence and the sword.

Seeing all this, the question comes home to his heart, and he is entirely in earnest when he asks, is there no remedy for this monstrous evil that heaps such a burthen of taxation upon the shoulders of labor, that causes such a vast amount of suffering and sorrow, that crushes so many hopes, breaks so many hearts, ruins so many souls and recruits with such fearful rapidity, and such prodigious numbers the ranks of death?

It was at one time thought that an exposition of the terrible consequences, the fearful results of intemperance would banish it from the world: that to place before men the certain ruin that follows the use of intoxicating drinks, would make them turn with all the alacrity of horror from indulgence. In following out this idea, philanthropy set itself to work in collecting facts, in gathering statistics, and when the horrible testimonials were brought together and exhibited to the world in their terrible distinctness, men were everywhere admonished and persuaded to look upon them and dash from their lips the fire that would consume them. Moral suasion did much. It saved thousands upon thousands from ruin, but such is human folly, such the power of habit, such the cunning of cupidity, that in spite of the persuasive arguments of good men, in spite of the logic of facts and the demonstrations of experience and observation, the tide of intemperance rolled and rolled on, and came surging up higher and higher, until the painful conviction was forced upon all that moral suasion alone could not arrest the progress of the destroyer, that it could at best only snatch here and there a victim from destruction, a few brands from the terrible burning.

From all these demonstrations was deduced the great fact that the strong arm of the law alone could arrest the career of intemperance, and by making the traffic in intoxicating drinks a penal offence, strike at the root of this greatest evil of modern times. We know not where this suggestion first originated, but this we do know, that the people of "the country," if they did not originate, promptly adopted it; and it is to their earnest support and advocacy that the idea of a prohibitory law has become at last the paramount social idea of the times in which we live. They have stood firmly by it from the beginning. In our legislature the men who did most towards the enactment of such a law represented mostly if not altogether, a farming constituency. Its opponents were mainly from the cities and large towns.

That the farmers of the country should support this great measure is entirely natural. Its support comports strictly with the highest requirements of duty: duty to themselves, to their class, to the great interests of society, to the welfare of the people—the working millions—to whom they belong. Such support too, clearly comports with their own interests. The burthen of taxation rests most heavily upon them. They contribute vastly more, in proportion to their income, towards the expenses of government than does any other class of citizens. Of every dollar of taxation levied upon the property of the country, when the real value of the property taxed and the income derived from it are considered, the farmers pay seven-tenths. Any system, therefore, which reduces the aggregate of taxation appeals directly to their interests. A prohibitory law would produce that result. It would vastly reduce the amount of pauperism. It would greatly lessen crime. It would, in truth, almost banish these two causes of public expenditure and relieve the property of the country from the support of the one and the punishment of the other. Does anybody doubt this? Let him visit the alms houses, and inquire into the origin of the destitution that made their inmates homeless, and threw them upon the public charity for support; and he will find that out of every ten cases of pauperism eight at least have their origin, directly or indirectly, in intemperance. Let him look over the records of the criminal courts, examine the statistics of crime, inquire of the prisoners in the jails, in the penitentiaries, and the state prisons, and he will learn that eight out of every ten offences against the law have their origin, directly or indirectly, in intemperance. So far as taxation is concerned, then, the farmers have a direct interest in the suppression of intemperance through a prohibitory law.

But there are other considerations appealing to the farmers in favor of a prohibitory law. They furnish food for the millions of non-producers who congregate in the cities and towns, upon the canals, on the ocean, in the factories and workshops; and the prices paid, and the quantity of agricultural products consumed, depend upon the prosperity of those consumers. Intemperance is the great source of poverty: the pregnant reason why so many of the laboring masses of the cities and large towns, indeed everywhere, live in poor tenements, huddled together like sheep; why they are poorly fed and scantily clothed; why children are barefooted and half naked; why the laboring poor eat but little bread, meat, butter, cheese, fruits, and those of the poorest; why they have such small amount of furniture in their houses; why so many of them have neither credit to purchase nor money to pay for the higher comforts and conveniences of life. There are to-day, in the State of New-York, one hundred thousand men, women and children who are pinched for the absolute necessities to sustain life; who can command only the simplest elements of a bare existence: there are twenty thousand dwellings into which want stalks through the doors, looks in at the windows, and nestles in cold, and hunger, and desolation around the hearth. Banish intemperance, shut up the grog shops, and the millions that labor pay into these absorbents of the wages of toil, would be turned to the furnishing of better homes, better clothing and more of it; better food and more of it; better furniture and more of it; better every thing that adds to the comforts and conveniences of life. It would put money in the purse of the laboring masses, and by promoting industry and building up their prosperity, furnish a vastly more abundant market and better prices for all the various productions of agriculture. All this the intelligent farmers of this country have come to understand and appreciate. They see that their interest and duty, their patriotism and personal gain all unite in urging them to carry forward the temperance movement.

Still it is a fact not to be disguised, that there are farmers who oppose this great measure of reform, though they are few in comparison with the great mass of agriculturists, and are influenced by mistaken considerations of personal advantage. Hop growers imagine that a prohibitory law will damage their prosperity and interfere with their interests. Let us reason with them in a spirit of kindness, and trace if we can the path of duty in which we assume they desire to walk. Here is a great and overshadowing evil: one that scatters desolation and death all over the land—one that pervades every neighborhood, prevails in every class, liable to visit every social circle, may take its seat by every fireside—one against which example is no protection, religious admonition no safeguard, moral teachings no barrier—one that revels in the disappointment of the hopes of fathers and in breaking the hearts of mothers—that beggars wives and children in their helplessness, and carries sorrow and anguish and death everywhere. To banish such a terrible evil from the world, every citizen who loves his country, every philanthropist who loves his kind, every honest man who would hold fast the golden rule of doing to others as he would have others do to him, should be willing to make some sacrifice. Will the hop grower rather see this mighty evil marching on always, spreading wider and wider, and growing more and more gigantic every year, than to change his manner of tilling his land to some other quite as productive, and at small inconvenience to himself in making the change? Will he stand in the way of this great reform? Will he join the ranks of intemperance and become a champion of intoxicating drinks, rather than turn his attention to the raising of grain fit for food for man or beast, or to the productions of the dairy, or the culture of fruits or vegetables that sustain life and go to make up the food of the millions? Will he not be happier when life is running to its dregs and he makes up his accounts for the great reckoning of eternity, to know that he has not set his own gain against the suffering and sorrow of others—that he has not assisted, by clinging to his own selfish interests, to spread the greatest curse that ever afflicted humanity?

But will such change be after all a sacrifice on the part of the hop grower? Will he be the loser by turning his attention to the raising of grain, of stock, or vegetables, or fruits, or the productions of the dairy? Experience has demonstrated that the hop is one of the most exhausting crops, that it wastes the productive qualities of land faster than almost any other. Wherever hops will

flourish, grain of all kinds will flourish, or grass for dairies may be produced in abundance. Look around and see if the hop growers flourish more than other classes of farmers. Take the hop growing farm, and the grain or the dairy farm laying side by side: which flourishes most? Which has the best buildings? Which farmer the largest income? Which the most money at interest? After years of cultivation, which farm will bring the highest price per acre when offered for sale in the market? It is entirely true that a prohibitory law would render it necessary for the hop grower to change his mode of farming, but what, we ask in all kindness, of that? The inconvenience at most would be for a single season. His farm will remain ready to answer with abundance his labor bestowed upon it; its productiveness is the same; it will bring forth grain, grass, fruit, or whatever seed he may choose to plant; not an acre or the productiveness of an acre will be lost to him; where hops grew, wheat, corn, oats, grass, any thing will grow and flourish; why then should the hop grower stand in the way of the temperance movement?

Other farmers, whose attention has been given to the culture of *barley*, oppose a prohibitory law. What we have said of the hop growers applies with equal force to them. We would add here our solemn conviction, that if intemperance or a tithe of it, as it now exists, could be banished from the land, they would find that the change, rendered by such banishment necessary in the mode of tilling their farms, would bring to them a higher degree of prosperity.

We appeal then to the farmers, to the people of the rural districts, to give their influence in aid of this great reform. It is the cause of virtue, of religion, of morality, of social order, of humanity itself. In the cities we are surrounded by influences against which it is difficult to stand up. We have thousands upon thousands of shops in which intoxicating drinks are dealt out, in each one of which is a voter and all are against us. Connected with each one of these shops is one or more inebriates, lost alike to the hope and the desire of reformation, whose families have been beggared, who have become dead to every manly sentiment, and who are going down to the drunkard's grave. Most of these are voters and all are against us. We have hundreds of brewers, distillers, liquor merchants and hotel keepers, all men of more or less influence, and all are against us. We are surrounded by political aspirants, demagogues who love the spoils and covet the honors of office, and they gather these elements of opposition to the cause of temperance—these brewers, distillers, liquor merchants and hotel keepers—these keepers of the thousand grog shops, and the hosts of miserable and lost inebriates that hang around them, and hurl them all against us. Under all these circumstances it is not singular that in the cities the cause of temperance should make small progress. It is not singular that the redemption of the State from the bitter curse of intemperance should be sought for in the country: nay, should absolutely depend upon the generous efforts of the country; upon the great conservative masses, the millions, that stand fast in their integrity between the festering corruptions, the moral pollutions, the political venality of the cities, and the licentiousness, the moral desolation, the social degradation and ruin that would result from their sway.

We appeal then to the men of the country; we appeal to them as christian men, as patriotic men, as philanthropic men, as men who love their country and its institutions, who have at heart the great interests of humanity, who would promote public virtue and perpetuate social order, who would relieve industry from taxation and give labor its just reward, who would banish from the world the most prolific cause of sorrow, of degradation, of pauperism, crime and death, to carry forward this great work of reform; we entreat them to relax not one effort—surrender not one inch of ground, but to press forward earnestly, fearlessly, energetically, till the great struggle shall be ended in a glorious triumph.

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!! O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, Monthly; 8 pages. Folio. 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar. O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 9.] Drinking Usages.

What is the cause of moderate or temperate drinking? Is it the force of natural appetite? Rarely. Nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine hundredths of those who use alcoholic stimulants, do it in the first instance and often for a long time, *not from appetite, but from deference to custom or fashion.* Usage has associated intoxicating drinks with good fellowship; with offices of hospitality and friendship. However false and dangerous such an association may be, it is not surprising that when once established, it continually gathered strength; with some, through appetite—with others, through interest. It is in this way that what we term *Drinking Usages* have become incorporated with every pursuit in life, with the tastes and habits of every grade and class of society. In the drawing-room and dining-room of the affluent, in the public room of the hotel, in every place of refreshment, in the social gatherings of the poor, in the harvest field and the workshop, alcoholic liquor was at one time deemed essential. Too often it is deemed so still. Many a host and employer—many a young companion shrinks even now, from the idea of exchanging the kind offices of life without the aid of intoxicating liquors, as he would shrink from some sore offence against taste and propriety. Not to put the cup to your neighbor's lip, in one word, is to sin against that most absolute of earthly sovereigns—*fashion.*

Now what is there in these usages to entitle them to the patronage of the wise and good? Are they necessary? Are they safe or useful?

Unless they can show some offset to the vast amount of evil which they occasion, they ought, surely, to be ruled out of court. But is any one prepared to maintain that these DRINKING USAGES are *necessary*—that it is necessary or even *useful*, that men should use intoxicating liquors as a beverage? Do they add vigor to muscle, or strength to intellect, or warmth to the heart, or rectitude to the conscience? The experience of thousands, and even millions, has answered this question. In almost every age and quarter of the world, but especially within the last twenty-five years, and in our own land, many have made trial of entire abstinence from all that can intoxicate. How few of them will confess that they have suffered from it, either in health of body, or elasticity of spirits, or energy and activity of mind! How many will testify, that in each of these respects, they were sensible gainers from the time they renounced the use of all alcoholic stimulants.

But, if neither useful nor necessary, can it be contended that these drinking customs are harmless? Are they not *expensive*? Many a moderate drinker, did he reckon up accurately the cost of this indulgence, would discover that it forms one of his heaviest burdens. No taxes, says Franklin, are so oppressive as those which men levy on themselves. Appetite and fashion—vanity and ostentation—constitute our most rapacious tax-gatherers. It is computed by Mr. Porter, an English statistician of distinguished ability, but of no special interest in the subject which we are now discussing, that the *laboring people* of Great Britain, exclusive of the middle and higher classes, expend no less than £53,000,000 (\$250,000,000) every year, on alcoholic liquors and tobacco!! There is little doubt that the amount, directly or indirectly, consumed in Pennsylvania annually, for the same indulgence, equals \$10,000,000—a sum which, could it be saved for four successive years, would pay the debt which now hangs, like an incubus, on the energies of the Commonwealth. In wasting \$250,000,000

every year, the laboring population of Britain put it beyond the power of any government to avert, from multitudes of them, the miseries of want. Were but a tithe of that sum wrenched from the hands of toil-worn labor, and buried in the Thames or the Ocean, we should all regard it as an act of stupendous folly and guilt. Yet it were infinitely better that such a sum should be cast into the depths of the sea, than that it should be expended in a way which must debauch the morals, and destroy the health, and lay waste the personal and domestic happiness of thousands. If the question be narrowed down to one of mere *material wealth*, no policy can be more suicidal than that which upholds usages, the inevitable effect of which is to paralyze the *productive* powers of a people, and to derange the proper and natural *distribution* of property. Remember then that he who sustains these usages, sustains the most prolific source of improvidence and want. He makes, at the same time, an inroad upon his own personal income, which is but a loan from God, entrusted to him for his own and others' good.

But these drinking usages are not only expensive, *they are unreasonable*. What is their practical effect? It is that others shall decide for us, a question which ought, most clearly, to be referred only to our own taste and sense of duty. We are to drink, whether it be agreeable to us or not; whether we think it right or not; whether we think it safe or not. Moreover—and this is sufficiently humiliating—we are to drink precisely *when*, and precisely *where*, others prescribe. It has been said that, in some parts of our country, one must either drink with a man who invites him, or fight. It is not long since, in every part of it, one must either drink, when invited, or incur the frowns and jeers of those who claimed to be arbiters of propriety. And even now, he or she who will not drink at all, or will drink only when their own reason and inclination bid, must not be surprised if they provoke invective or ridicule. And is a bondage like this to be upheld? Does it become free-born Americans, who boast so much of liberty, to bow down their necks to a servitude so unrelenting and yet so absurd?

A German nobleman once paid a visit to Great Britain, when the practice of toasting and drinking healths was at its height. Wherever he went, during a six months' tour, he found himself obliged to drink, though never so loath. He must pledge his host and his hostess. He must drink with every one who would be civil to him, and with every one, too, who wished a convenient pretext for taking another glass. He must drink a bumper in honor of the king and queen—in honor of church and state, in honor of the army and navy. How often did he find himself retiring, with throbbing temples and burning cheek, from these scenes of intrusive hospitality! At length his visit drew to a close, and to requite in some measure the attentions which had been lavished upon him, he made a grand entertainment. Assembling those who had done him honor, he gathered them round a most sumptuous banquet, and feasted them to their utmost content. The tables were then cleared. Servants entered with two enormous hams; one was placed at each end; slices were cut and passed round to each guest—when the host rose, and with all gravity said, "Gentlemen, I give you the king! please eat to his honor." His guests protested. They had dined; they were Jews; they were already surcharged through his too generous cheer. But he was inflexible. "Gentlemen," said he, "for six months you have compelled me to *drink* at your bidding. Is it too much that you should now *eat* at mine? I have been submissive; why should you not follow my example? You will please do honor to your king! You shall then be served with another slice in honor of the queen; another to the prosperity of the royal family, and so on to the end of the chapter!"

But waiving the *absurdity* and *costliness* of these usages, let me ask if they are *safe*? No one who drinks can be perfectly certain that he may not

die a drunkard. Numbers, which defy all computation, have gone this road, who were once as self-confident as any of us can be. No one, again, who drinks, can be certain that he may not, in some unguarded hour, fall into a debauch, in which he shall commit some error or perpetrate some crime, that will follow him with shame and sorrow all his days. How many a young man, by one such indiscretion, has cast a cloud over all his prospects for life!

It is not the opinion of "temperance fanatics" merely, that adjudges drinking to be *hazardous*. It is so in their estimation who are close, practical observers and actors in life. Mr. Jefferson is said to have expressed his conviction—the result of long and various experience—that no man should be entrusted with office who drank. I have now before me evidence still more definite, in the twofold system of rates proposed to be applied, in one of our largest cities, by the same Life Insurance Company. The one set of rates is adapted to those who use intoxicating liquors; the other, to those who do not use them at all. Suppose that you wish your life to be assured to the extent of \$1,000, and that you are twenty years of age. If you practice total abstinence, the rate will be \$11.60 per annum; if you use intoxicating drinks, it will be \$14.70. At twenty-five years of age, the rates will be as \$13.30 to \$17.00; at thirty years of age, as \$15.40 to \$19.60. I have also before me the returns of two Beneficial Societies, in one of which the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors was observed, while in the other it was not. The result has been that, with the same number of members in each, the deaths in one, during a given period, were but *seventy-seven*, whereas in the other they were *one hundred and ten!* making the chances of life as ten to seven, in their favor who practice *total abstinence*. This result need not so much astonish us, when we are told on the authority of persons who are said to have made careful and conscientious inquiry, that of all males who use intoxicating liquors, one in thirteen becomes intemperate.

But let us admit—for one moment, and for the sake of argument—to admit it on other ground would be culpable)—let us admit that *you can drink with safety to you self!* Can you drink with safety to your neighbor? Are you charged with no responsibility in respect to him? You drink, as you think, within the limits of safety. He, in imitation of your example, drinks also—but passes that unseen, unknown line, within which, for him, safety lies. Is not your indulgence, then, a stumbling block—aye, perchance a fatal stumbling block in his way? Is it not, in principle, the very case contemplated by St. Paul, when he said, *it is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak!* Yonder are the young and inexperienced, without habits of self-control, and with fiery appetites. Would you have them do as you do? Yonder is one who is just on the verge of the precipice that will plunge him into shame and woe unutterable! Are you willing that he should find in your daily potations a specious apology for his own? Or yonder is one who is already a bondman to this fearful vice, but who feels his debasement, and would gladly be once more free. Will you do that, in his presence, which will discourage him from striking boldly for emancipation? Nay, it may be that he is even now, struggling bravely to be free. He has dashed away the cup of sorcery, and is practising that which, to him, is the only alternative to ruin. Is it well, Christian—follower of Him who sought not His own, and went about doing good—is it well that from *you* should proceed an influence to press him back to his cups? that *you*, by your example, should proclaim, that not to drink is to be over-scrupulous and mean-spirited—that at *your* table, in *your* drawing-room,

ne should encounter the fascination which he finds it so hard to withstand so fatal to yield to?

DRINKING HEALTHS.

The fashion of drinking healths is exceedingly absurd, and it is only because we have been taught this fashion from our infancy that we are blind to the truth. If it were now abolished and any one were to make use of the ordinary arguments in favor of its re-introduction, you might answer him somewhat after this manner:

"How, Sir, in the name of sense and reason, do I show an affection and regard for my friend, by pouring into my own stomach that which oppresses and distresses nature, and which nature does not want? or what sense is there in my drinking his health while I am destroying my own? Drinking his health! why the very words are silly upon the face of them, if a man will but stop to consider their meaning. How can I possibly *drink* another man's health? I may wish his health, or I may pray for his health, but that has no rational connection with my drinking. *I might as well dance his health, or whistle his health, for any real connection there is between the means and the end.* But no; this is not my object at all: my object is to stimulate the stomach, and to persuade him to do the same, in order that, by artificial and factitious spirits thus excited, I may add another enjoyment to that which I already derive from his company. And I may call it good fellowship or regard for my friend; or by whatever name I may try to disguise it from myself; but my real object is present gratification and self-indulgence. But, like all present gratification and self-indulgence, it is done at the expense of the future, and forestalling that happiness, and that joyous flow of spirits, which nature had in reserve to gild my future hour. And I am borrowing at a heavy rate of interest; for the whole quantity of happiness and joyfulness of heart, which we both shall experience will be far greater in the long run, if we will suffer nature to take her own course, and let these foolish drinking customs alone. These customs are so exquisitely *silly*, that they would be mere matter of laughter at the folly of them, if it were not for the serious end that they often come to."

"Sir, this is one of those silly devices of the fool that is perpetually beginning in a farce, and ending in a tragedy. Many a man, from these foolish beginnings, has gone on from bad to worse, till his prospects have been ruined, the hopes and happiness of his family blasted, and he himself murdered both in body and in soul. It is fearful to reflect what a dreadful train of evils have followed from these silly beginnings."

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars !!!

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist; Monthly: Eight pages. Folio. Fifty cents, 1 copy; One dollar, 3 copies; Two dollars, 7 copies. Every additional 4 copies, one dollar.

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 10.] The use of Intoxicating Liquors as a Beverage, never Beneficial, but always Injurious to a Person in Health: proved by Medical Testimony.

If a prohibitory law deprived men of a necessary of life, or of a healthful luxury, it might still be expedient to have one; it might still be imperatively demanded by the public good; but yet there would be at least a show of reason in urging the hardship of taking from most men the privilege of using, or the ability to buy for the purpose of using, a good thing, because a few men by abusing, convert it into a bad one. If intoxicating drinks were "the good creatures of God," as some insist upon calling them, and perhaps honestly deem them, there might be little philanthropy, little patriotism, little christianity, shown in opposing a law prohibiting the sale of these drinks—a law necessary to protect the community from the consequences of their intemperate use; but it might be justified in a degree by urging that the law takes from men what God gives for their good, and makes that a crime—selling these drinks—which in itself is no more a crime than selling fruits or vegetables or meats in the market.

We say, a prohibitory law might in this case be expedient, might be demanded by the public welfare; for the use of a thing good in itself by one man, may be the cause of deplorable injury to others; and when it is, its goodness cannot and does not protect it from prohibition in a well governed community. For example, a framed house is a good thing; and on abstract principles of right, why a man should not be at liberty to build one, two or three or ten stories high, wherever he owned a lot, and whenever he had the means of so doing, it would be difficult to say. Yet the erection of such a building is in most cities within certain limits, prohibited altogether, and we believe in all prohibited, except under certain conditions; as that it shall not be more than a story and a half high, or if higher, that it shall be separated widely by vacant spaces from other buildings. The reason all know.

It is not enough then, that a thing is good in itself, to exempt its sale or use from prohibition; its sale and use must not threaten or inflict injury on others. Still, as we have already said, the prohibition of a thing good in itself, does look somewhat like an encroachment and a hardship; and an ingenious and earnest man could frame a very plausible argument against it. He could say much that would sound like reason about "the good creature of God;" he could enlarge on the sacredness of personal and private rights, in connection with the blue laws of Connecticut, the superstition of the dark ages, and the tyranny of Billy Bowlegs, king of Timbuctoo, until verily you might doubt whether a prohibitory law be not an eye-tooth or toe-nail of the great dragon and a premonitory sign of the general judgment.

This we need scarcely say, has been the course pursued by our opponents with reference to a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks. The press has groaned under dissertations on these "good creatures;" legislative halls have rung with vehement eloquence against any abridgment of their use because "good creatures;" and solemn committees have sung through their noses and with tears in their eyes, in poor prose and worse poetry, to the tune "Old Grimes is dead that good old man," the wickedness of the age in attempting to deprive men of these "congenial" and "exhilarating beverages."

But that our opponents may not be able to shelter themselves under even this pretence, that intoxicating drinks are good in themselves and become bad only by abuse, we proceed to show in the remainder of this tract, by the explicit testimony of those who above all men should know—medical men, and medical men too of the highest reputation and authority—*first*, that these drinks are poisons; *secondly*, that, being poisons, their use as a beverage, is always, as we might expect it to be, injurious to a person in health.

I. These intoxicating drinks are poisons.

DR. KIRK—"What is the nature of ardent spirits? All of them contain as their basis, alcohol: a narcotic stimulant, possessing properties of the kind that opium does, (which you know to be a poison,) with this addition, that it is more immediately irritating to the tissues of the body to which it is applied, than opium is."

DR. E. JOHNSON—"What is poison? It is any substance which, when taken into the system, has the effect of disordering some of the actions which make up the sum of human life. You may say, it is only poisonous when taken in sufficient quantity. True, as regards the immediate destruction of human life; but neither is prussic acid, nor arsenic, nor mercury, nor opium. Prussic acid, therefore, and spirit are equally poisonous, though neither will destroy life unless in sufficient quantity.

"We have irrefragable proof that spirit is a poison of the same nature as prussic acid: producing the same effects; killing by the same means; paralyzing the muscles of respiration; and so preventing the necessary change of black into vermilion blood."

DR. FARRE—On reading to him, before the committee of the House of Commons, the testimony of nearly five hundred distinguished medical men, who certify "that ardent spirit is ascertained by medical science to be in a strict sense a poison, and that its use as an article of diet is the direct cause of an appalling amount of disease and death," he said: "It is strictly so in regard to the destruction of life."

DR. R. D. MUSSEY—"What is a poison? It is that substance, in whatever form it may be, which, when applied to a living surface, disconcerts and disturbs life's healthy movements."

"Such a poison is alcohol: such in all its forms, mix it up in what you may."

"That a person may be in the habit of taking it, and may yet survive and enjoy tolerable health, is no proof that it is not a poison. Will any man pretend to deny that arsenic is a poison, and a very strong poison? Yet there are in Germany a number of farmers who are in the habit of making a daily use of arsenic. One man carried this habit so far, as to take two grains of arsenic into his system every day, and said that he could by no means dispense with it. Yet does any man believe that an individual may indulge in such a habit, and not have his life shortened by it?"

These testimonies derived from distinguished physicians "who know whereof they speak and what they affirm," should satisfy every one that alcohol is a poison; and consequently that all those drinks which contain alcohol, whether called brandy, gin, rum, whiskey, wine or beer, are poisonous to the extent in which they contain alcohol, or the intoxicating property.

NOTE.—The word "intoxicate" is derived from *toxicum*, the Latin for *poison*. Our very language, therefore, as well as the doctors, testifies that "intoxicating drinks" are poisonous drinks.

II. We shall now prove by similar testimonies, that, being poisonous, the use of these drinks, in any quantity, is always, as we might expect it to be, injurious to a person in health.

DR. FRANK—"Their tendency, when used even moderately, is to induce disease, premature old age and death."

DR. EMLEN—"All use of ardent spirits, i. e. as a drink, is an abuse. They are mischievous under all circumstances."

DR. JULIUS JEFFREYS—"Moderation in the use of these liquors is in fact inapplicable; and total abstinence is the only step."

DR. ALDEN—"To a man in health, there is no such thing as a temperate use of ardent spirits. In any quantity they are an enemy to the human constitution. Their influence upon the physical organs, is unfavorable to health and life. They produce weakness, and not strength; sickness, and not health; death and not life."

DR. E. JOHNSON—"Are ardent spirits, wines and strong ales, necessary or pernicious or neither? I assert that they are in every instance, as articles of diet, pernicious."

DR. GARNETT—"Most persons have so indulged themselves in this pernicious habit of drinking wine, that they imagine they cannot live without a little every day."

DR. KIRK—"Men who were never considered intemperate, by daily drinking have often shortened life more than twenty years; and the respectable use of this poison kills more than even drunkenness."

DR. GORDON—"Leaving drunkenness out of the question, the frequent consumption of a small quantity of spirits, gradually increased, is as surely destructive of life as more habitual intoxication."

SIR ASTLEY COOPER—"No person has a greater hostility to dram drinking than myself; inasmuch that I never suffer any ardent spirits in my house, thinking them evil spirits; and if the poor could witness the white livers, the dropsical, the shattered nervous systems which I have seen, as the consequences of drinking, they would be aware, that spirits and poisons are synonymous terms."

DR. BATTY, lecturer at the medical school, Royal institution, Liverpool, and SIXTY-NINE OTHER PHYSICIANS—"Man in ordinary health requires not any stimulants, as wine, beer or spirits, and cannot be benefited by the habitual quantity of them, large or small. Their use can do no good to him in the most moderate quantities; which sooner or later prove injurious to the human constitution."

DR. CHEYNE—"Should ten young men begin, at twenty-one years of age, to use but one glass of two ounces a day, and never increase the quantity, nine out of the ten would shorten life more than ten years."

BROUSSAIS—"By the repeated use of alcohol, heating wines, &c., an inflammatory modification may be kept up in the capillaries of the mucous membrane of the stomach, which will ultimately degenerate into phlogosis."

DR. CARPENTER—This distinguished physician, whose works take rank with the best in our language, recently delivered a lecture in London on the "relation of abstinence from alcoholic drinks to health," of which the following is a condensed report, as published by the *London Morning Post*:

"The point throughout maintained by the lecturer was, that health instead of being sustained, was impaired in its activity by the use of alcoholic liquors. Taking as the ground of his argument that nothing more was requisite to keep the frame in its muscular vigor than good food, good air, and a necessary amount of sleep, Dr. Carpenter showed that alcohol led to important deteriorations in the body. It stopped the process of expelling everything that ought to be carried away, impeded the body from getting rid of its effete and used-up matters, curdled albumen, which was one of the greatest constituents of the blood, and prevented the removal from the tissues of the inert fatty matter which accumulates about them. Among the many instances which Dr. Carpenter gave to prove the inefficiency of alcohol to sustain bodily exertions, he quoted a remarkable circumstance, which had been told him by a friend, who had commanded a ship from Sidney. Shortly after leaving Australia, a leak was discovered in the vessel, and, unable to put in at the Cape of Good Hope, they were obliged to sail homewards, keeping the men night and day at the pump. When each man's work was over, he was allowed a good quantity of grog for his extraordinary physical endurance. But, as the men would not take their proper quantity of food and fell off, the captain stopped their grog, and ordered them a mess of cocoa, biscuit and meat. They turned in hearty, awoke fresh, regained the flesh they had lost, and came into port as fine a crew as ever was seen. In noticing the effects that alcohol had upon the mind, the lecturer said that it weakened the power of the will; and though, by stimulating the automatic tendency of the mind, it produced extraordinary activity for the time, yet it weakened, and if continued, destroyed external control; that no man who had taken to a habit of drinking could concentrate his mind on a subject as he used to do, nor could he even properly direct his mental powers to any object in which he wished to exercise them. Many instances were given of this; and it was stated that men noted for mental activity were remarkable for abstaining from alcoholic liquors. The lecturer concluded by showing that alcohol, even when taken in small quantities, weakened the powers of digestion, particularly among people living in warm climates, and that those who were thus addicted, died of diseases which did not generally attack those of different habits."

THE RESULT.

The authorities we have quoted prove,

1. That alcohol is a poison, whether pure, or diluted in so called distilled or fermented liquors: brandy, gin, rum, whiskey, &c., on the one hand, or the various wines and beer on the other.

2. It is a poison, nothing but a poison in whatever quantity it may be taken into the system.

3. As a poison its tendency is to destroy life. If taken in a sufficient quantity, it will produce death immediately; in less than such a quantity, and in proportion as it is less, it will produce this effect more slowly; but taken in any quantity habitually, it shortens life.

4. The authorities we have quoted do not positively assert, but they imply, that the use of these intoxicating or poisonous drinks, even where it does not directly cause disease and death, undermines the constitution, and predisposes it to fatal attacks from other diseases. As this is an important point, we will introduce a few testimonies of medical men bearing directly upon it.

DR. SEWALL—"From a careful observation of this subject during many years, I am persuaded that tens of thousands of temperate drinkers die annually of diseases which the abstemious would pass in safety."

DR. EMLEN—"Half the men every year who die of fevers might recover, had they not been in the habit of using ardent spirits; and many a man who was never intoxicated, might, when visited by a fever, be raised up as well as not, were it not for that state of the system which daily moderate drinking occasions; who now, in spite of all that can be done, sinks down and dies."

DR. J. JEFFREYS—"Extensive opportunities of observing the habits of various classes and of different races among the inhabitants of Hindostan, have brought before me abundant evidence that in using no alcoholic drinks, they are exempted from the more complicated forms of disease."

DR. J. N. CARNOCHAN—"As a surgeon having vast opportunities of experience in hospital and private practice. I must declare that I always look upon patients who have been in the habit of using spirituous beverages, as least likely to recover from serious maladies, or from the shock following capital operations, and, also, as those most likely to require longer time for the cure of diseases of a more simple character."

DR. J. W. FRANCIS—"Every one at all conversant with the history of epidemics, knows full well the greater ravages which pestilence makes upon those individuals who indulge largely in spirituous potations; witness the accounts of the several visitations of yellow fever in different ports and towns of the United States, and the records of the malignant cholera in New-York, and elsewhere in numerous sections of the Union, in 1832 and 1834. It is forcibly imprinted on the memory of every medical man who studied the characteristics of this peculiar disorder, at our several cholera hospitals, and in private practice, that, of the whole number who sickened and died by it, a vast majority were composed of those who had been addicted to the inordinate use of alcoholic liquors."

Conclusion.

What is the conclusion to be drawn from all these testimonies: testimonies, with which we might fill a volume instead of this brief tract of four pages? Is it, that these intoxicating drinks are "congenial" to the human constitution? Is it, that they are "the good creatures of God," and as such to be used with thanksgiving? or are they inventions of the devil to waste health, happiness and life, and ruin men body and soul, through time and ages without end? Reader, judge! The witnesses have been heard; the evidence is before you. Judge!

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!! O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist, Monthly; 8 pages. Folio. 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional 4 copies one dollar. O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 11.] Adulteration of Brandy, Gin, Wine, Beer, &c., &c.

THERE are many reasons why every State and Nation should prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks to be used as a beverage; but waiving every other consideration, the known adulteration of all kinds of liquors that intoxicate, should be reason enough for the most stringent laws to prohibit their sale.

BRANDY.

This liquor is almost universally a base imposition. The imported article, as a general fact, is adulterated. Unadulterated brandy can not be sold at less than about \$2.50 the gallon: the adulterated can be made at about 30 cents per gallon; and so disguised that no one can tell the difference. The dealers can not, nor do they, resist the temptation to adulterate, where the gain is so enormous. Chemical compounds are now made and sold to fabricators for making spurious brandy out of common whiskey: the whiskey itself often drugged with arsenic.

A dealer in spurious brandy recently imported enough of these compounds to manufacture 800 hogsheads of the forged article. He sold it for pure, and at \$2.50 the gallon: making a clear profit, as he confessed, of \$100,000 on the speculation; the fabricated article costing him only about 30 cents a gallon. The fabricator having used up his compound to his samples, took these to a chemist in Massachusetts, for analysis, and for the purpose of having them made in this country, if possible. The chemist made the examination, and found one of the samples a deadly poison: he could not be tempted to have a hand in producing the mixtures. Whether the fabricator found a chemist less honest, or had to wait for a new importation, will not, probably, be made known until the day of Judgment, when all such secrets will be made manifest. Who can begin to estimate the results of the use of the contents of these 800 casks, on those who, before this time, have probably drunk them?

Another man who had either imported or purchased the same kind of compounds, is now in California with them, and he boasted to a gentleman who mentioned it to the writer, that he should make \$100,000 out of the operation.

A quantity of French brandy was imported into New-York, and advertised for sale at auction, on a given day; it was landed on the wharf. A brandy fabricator purchased the whole lot, of the importer, on the condition that the sale should take place as advertised, and on his account. During the night it was all removed to his Brandy Brewery, underwent the process of adulteration, was carted back, and sold next day, pure as imported.

A large dealer in Albany declared that when he purchased foreign liquors in New-York, on shipboard, he had no confidence in getting the article purchased, unless he watched the casks from the ship to the boat on the river. In former years it was supposed that imported liquors were generally pure; but now this opinion has exploded. The process of adulteration is carried on to a vast extent in Europe, and it is doubtful whether one gallon in one hundred is now landed on our shores in a pure state; and if in a pure state, just so far as it is intoxicating it is worthless and injurious, as a beverage; and none should be drank as such by any human being valuing long life or a healthful body. In a work published by the celebrated chemist, Frederick

Accum, on adulteration, London, and dedicated to the Duke of Northumberland, the practices of brandy, gin, beer and wine fabricators were pretty fully exposed; but as we live in an age of *great progress*, the fabricators of the present day have doubtless entirely eclipsed those of the past. Accum gives the following method of compounding, or *making up*, as it is technically called, *brandy* for retail:

"To 10 puncheons of brandy,.....	1,081	gall.
Add flavored raisin spirit;.....	118	"
Tincture of grains of Paradise,.....	4	"
Cherry laurel water,.....	2	"
Spirit of almond cake,.....	2	"
	1,207	"

Add also 10 handfuls of oak saw-dust; and give it *complexion* with burnt sugar." The same author, speaking of

GIN,

Says, "To prepare and sweeten Gin, &c., oil of vitriol, oil of almonds, oil of turpentine, oil of juniper berries, lime water, alum, salt of tartar, subacetate of lead, are used. Sulphate of lead is poisonous. I have reason to believe the use of it is frequent, because its action is more rapid, and it imparts to the liquor a fine *complexion*; hence some vestiges of lead may often be detected in malt liquor." As with brandy and gin, so with

RUM.

If whiskey will sell for more money under the name of *rum* than under the name of *whiskey*, it is as easy to turn whiskey into rum as into brandy, gin or wine. We now come to

WINE.

Here the fabricators make their greatest profits, exercise their greatest skill, and probably do the greatest amount of injury. Unadulterated wine, according to its name and quality, must command a certain price, to make it worth dealing in. The fabricator's ingenuity is put to the greatest trial, to produce an article resembling the pure, so as to obtain, as near as possible, the price of pure; and, as it is impossible to distinguish the pure from impure; and as the impure can be made at one-tenth to one-quarter of the value of the pure; the impure, as a natural consequence, *takes the place* of the pure, the same as the bogus dollar would take the place of the pure silver dollar, provided it was settled by common consent a dollar was a dollar, whether bogus or not.

Says Dr. Nott, "I had a friend, who had been once a wine dealer, and having read the startling statements made public, in relation to the brewing of wines, and the adulterations of other liquors, generally, I inquired of that friend as to the verity of those statements. His reply was, 'GOD FORGIVE what has passed in MY OWN cellar, but the statements MADE are true and ALL TRUE, I assure you.'"

The process of adulteration is carried on in wine countries, as well as in this country, with regard to Madeira, Sherry, Claret, and all other kinds of wine.

The Rev. Dr. Baird has stated that "little or no wine is drank in France in a pure state, except it may be at the wine press. The dealers purchase it at the vineyards in a pure state, but in their hands it is entirely changed, by adding drugs or distilled spirit."

Says Horatio Greenough, the eminent sculptor, "that although wine can

be had in Florence at one cent a bottle, the dealers do not hesitate to add drugs and water, to gain a fraction more of profit."

CHAMPAIGN.

A man who once worked in the office where this tract is printed, *is now* engaged in making champaign, for the ladies and gentlemen of the country, at a cost to him of two dollars the dozen. Some cider or whiskey, some water, some fixed air, some sugar of lead, &c., &c., form the compound. When this fabricated mixture circulates in the country, it is generally sold as pure, and our young men often quaff it, at two dollars the bottle, and an advance on the original cost of only 1100 per cent!!

A physician in New-York purchased a bottle of what was called genuine champaign, of the importers, had it subjected to chemical tests; it was found to contain a *quarter of an ounce of sugar of lead*. Who would like to drink a mixture of sugar of lead and water?

A gentleman in New-York, who made champaign, purchased some, of the regular importer, wishing to give his friends some of the genuine article. At a convivial party, he produced his *pure as imported*; when the corks began to fly, one dropped near him; on examining it, he found it was his own fabrication. The supposed importer had purchased it, and by his French tinsel and French labels, sold it back, as pure, to the original fabricator—*bring the biter*. But enough of champaign: we now come to

PORT.

An Episcopal Clergyman, recently returned from the continent of Europe, visited an immense manufactory of all kinds of wine. Logwood came in as a great ingredient—so great that the proprietors kept a vessel in their employ for its importation.

The dyers in Manchester (England) say, "the wine brewers are running away with all the best logwood;" and the London people say, "If you wish to get genuine *Port*, you must go yourself to Oporto, *make your own wine*, and ride outside of the barrel all the way home."

We end our statements, as to the brandy, gin, rum, whiskey and wine fabrications, and close with the last, the most filthy and most disgusting of the whole tribe of intoxicating drinks.

BEER

The very name of it creates a loathing in the stomach of the writer, a kind of upheaving of disgust, not unlike that of sea-sickness: the celebrated Beer Trial between John Taylor and Edward C. Delavan, sheds some light on the filthy materials used in its manufacture. We give, for the benefit of beer drinkers, some of the testimony.

Hon. JOHN SAVAGE, late *Chief Justice* of the State, testified thus:—"The water was always dirty; never saw it otherwise. My horse refused to drink it. I have seen dead animals there; and I believe I have seen dogs, cats and hogs. The filth from the slaughter house yard was then running and oozing into the creek; the snow was going off; at any rate the slaughter house was wet, and I could see filth and water mixed running into the stream."

THOMAS COULSON, (class leader in the Methodist church,) testifies:—"The water in the pond was always bad; in a putrid state, in the fall of the year. What was in the water—any thing to make it bad? Different kinds of animal floating in the water. In the warmth of the weather the water was green. Dogs and cats and hogs, I've seen. Did you ever try to make glue of that water? It would not do for that. Why not? It was what I call rotten water. Have you seen that water dipped up and carried any where? I have seen it taken in hogsheads into the malt-house—poured through at the end of the malt-house."

C. W. HARVEY, who had dipped water from the pond for the malt-house, testifies:—"Were there any puddles in front of the grave yards, that you got water from? Yes. Any thing offensive that drained into the puddles near Judson's slaughter-house? Part of the

offal of the slaughter-house drained into the pond from which the water was taken, near the slaughter-house. You drew water from the big pond? Yes. How long? Four or five seasons. The pond in the vicinity of the malt-house? Yes. What was the character of the water in that pond? Very bad. How so? Bad, from the fact that it was receiving almost all the offal from the hill; dead hogs and dogs and cats, horses and all drawn very near the pond, and with sun on it, making them exceedingly foul, so that drawing it, frequently made me sick.

ISRAEL SMITH, (elder in Rev. Mr. Kirk's church) testifies:—"Witness knew the pond called the big pond. Generally when witness had seen it, the water looked filthy. (Had frequently seen dead animals in it, as he was riding by—dogs, hogs and cats. Had frequently seen carcasses of dead horses lying on the margin of it.)

GARRET MIDDLETON, testifies:—"Saw the water go in through the gutter to the steep tub. It was very dirty water—stagnant—all turned green. Have seen dead dogs and cats in this pond.

AMOS FASSETT, (elder in Rev. Dr. J. N. Campbell's church,) testifies:—"Have seen the poor-house creek frequently. Some seasons of the year very unwholesome. Particularly while the slaughter house was employed. The offal and blood, &c., were thrown out, and the creek being lower, it all descended of course into the creek. Have seen also dead animals on the creek. Should think that the wash of some of the grave yards drained into the creek. Have seen water drawn from the pond to the malt house previous to '35—seen it deposited in the malt house, at the north end. The water I should call very impure. It has always been bad. I have known it for a great number of years. It was a place of general deposit for all kinds of dead animals, at all seasons of the year.

FROM A LONDON WORK.—"All the water in one of the largest breweries in London was pumped up from the Thames at low water, at that time when all the filth of all London is poured down her great sewers, and finds its way into the river. Here all the washing of the sculleries, all the drainings of the stables, all the offal of the slaughter houses, the rejecta^mentum of all the citizens of the metropolis—all mixing at the same time, in the same place!—Who can say how much richer London Porter and Ale is for all this?"

DRUGS IN BEER.

Years since the brewers made a grand demonstration in Albany; procured an appointment of a committee of the Senate to examine into a false charge said to be made against them, with regard to the use of drugs; and to protect one of the most vital and important branches of industry in the State. The prayer of the brewers was answered, a committee was appointed, and the "defamer" called upon to answer. He did answer by a letter, asking of the committee to obtain the power "to send for persons and papers." This was the last of this celebrated inquiry. The brewers went home; the "defamer" heard no more of the matter. Had the inquiry gone on, and witnesses compelled to appear, the truth of the use of drugs, by a part at least, of those very brewers, would have been made manifest; it would have been proven, as surely that Nux Vomica and Coculus Indicus were used by them, in the manufacture of beer, as was proven that the most disgusting, filthy and "rotten" water was used in the making of their vile and disgusting, stupefying, besotting liquors.

In fine, it is believed by those who are competent judges, that there is scarcely a drop of intoxicating liquors, whether brandy, gin, rum, whiskey, wine or beer, sold or drunk in this country, which is not adulterated or drugged. Always injurious to a person in health when pure—how destructive must they be when thus poisoned!

No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid, One Dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!!!

[Prohibitionist, 50 cents 1 copy; 1 dollar 3 copies; 2 dollars 7 copies; every additional .4 copies one dollar.]

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]
O. SCOVILL, Albany, Agent.]

TEMPERANCE TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

[FIRST SERIES OF 12 TRACTS, PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.]

[No. 12.] The difference between Regulating and Prohibiting the Sale of Intoxicating Drinks.

The advocates of a law prohibiting entirely the sale of intoxicating drinks, are obliged to contend not merely with those who have a pecuniary interest in opposing it, nor yet merely with those whose habits of so called temperate or excessive use of intoxicating drinks, array them against it, but with the deep-rooted prejudices of perhaps a still larger class of men than either, who, having grown up and lived long and indeed all their days under a system which aims merely at regulating the sale of these drinks, show the usual effects of custom in predisposing them to misconceive, misjudge, dislike and oppose an innovation simply because it is one. They do not mean to be unjust; there is no malice in their hostility; there is no selfishness in their opposition; they are well-meaning men, and many of them very intelligent men; but like those who have looked long at the sun and see an image of it everywhere when they turn away, or who have looked long through colored spectacles, and see all nature clothed in the same hue when they take them off, their views of a prohibitory law are tinged and distorted by the influence of old, cherished and habitual ideas on the subject of regulating the liquor traffic. Many of the objections which are urged against a prohibitory law by this class of men, and the whole of their adverse feeling, originate, we have no doubt, in this source; and hence it may be well to attempt, in at least one tract of our series, to counteract an influence so injurious to a good cause, by placing regulation and prohibition side by side, and pointing out, as accurately and impartially as we can, the differences between them. Nothing more is necessary, we think, to vindicate prohibition as the more reasonable, just, expedient, safe and efficient measure.

To perceive clearly these differences between the two, we must, first of all, remind our readers of the fact—the announcement of which may perhaps startle them—that, in principle, they agree: are precisely and incontrovertibly one and the same thing.

A prohibitory law allows those only to sell intoxicating liquors, who sell for mechanical, medicinal, culinary and sacramental purposes: a law regulating the sale, grants a license to sell for any purpose to those only who have a given character, pay a given price for the privilege, and sell under varying restrictions of time, place, circumstances and quantity. A prohibitory law forbids the sale except for the purposes specified: a law regulating the sale, forbids all persons to sell except those who have purchased a license. A prohibitory law punishes all parties who violate its provisions: a law regulating the sale by license, punishes all parties violating its provisions. In a word, both allow the sale under given conditions; both prohibit the sale beyond these conditions; and both punish all persons who violate these conditions; that is to say, COMPEL THEM BY LEGAL COERCION, to refrain from selling intoxicating liquors except in conformity with those conditions.

In principle, then, the one is a prohibitory law as well as the other; so far there is no difference between them; and any one can perceive, that however objectionable the one may be, because it deprives men of liberty, the other is equally so. To empower one, two or three persons in a given community to sell these liquors and deprive every other man in the same community of the privilege of doing the same thing, if such is pleasure,—is

there a man who believes that liberty is less invaded, freedom of action less curtailed by this, than by empowering all to sell for specified uses and no others? All the opponents of a prohibitory law, usually so called, are, we believe, advocates of a regulating license system; but why they should be, if they object to the former—a prohibitory law—on the ground that it deprives a citizen of liberty, we confess ourselves unable to comprehend; since what they receive is, on this score, quite as objectionable as what they reject—what they favor, as what they oppose. We can account for it only on the supposition, that their long familiarity with the system of regulating the sale of intoxicating drinks by license, has blinded them to the characteristic peculiarities in it, which they are quick to perceive, for the opposite reason, in a prohibitory law.

But while the “regulating” and “prohibiting” system, as we have shown, are in principle the same, there are important differences between them which now demand our attention.

The *first* of these to present itself is suggested by our remarks just made. The term “regulating,” as well as the process which it describes, is deceptive: it speaks falsely; or at least, it does what is equivalent to this, it studiously conceals the real nature and true intent of a license law: it professes not to be prohibitory, when it is quite as much so as any law, so called, that was ever enacted by a legislature. The consequence is, that men do not perceive the encroachment on what they term their “liberty,” which it really makes. On the other hand, the word “prohibitory” is an honest little word: it tells the simple and the naked truth. It calls things by their right names; and hence it is, that as soon as men hear it, they prick up their ears, see tyranny, fly to their arms, and give battle; when the very cause of their doing this, existed long ago and exists yet in the license laws, and was not and is not seen by them, only, because they have been and still are blinded to its existence, and duped by the fraud practised on their understandings by means of the word “regulate:” an absurdity not exceeded by the man who flies in a rage, doubles his fists, and falls to cursing, on being whipped with a cowhide, while he patiently suffers himself to be belabored with a broom-stick, and says he likes it.

The first advantage on the side of a prohibitory law, then, is its straightforwardness and honesty: nobody is deceived by it: everybody knows what it means.

Secondly, “regulation” not merely misrepresents itself, but it also misrepresents the liquor traffic with which it deals. In some one or another of this series of tracts, this traffic is proved to be a gross immorality,—a gross imposition upon the honest labor of the country in the shape of taxation to support the poor and to prosecute and punish criminals, in amount equal to three-fourths of the sum paid for these purposes,—a prolific source of crime of all grades against property and life,—and a cause of incalculable misery through all the domestic and social relations. Does regulation tell us all this about the liquor traffic? Does it say, directly or indirectly, to the liquor dealer, “You are addicted to an immoral practice, and being so are a criminal in the sight of good men and God?” Does it say to him, “You rob the honest and destroy the weak?—you fill our hospitals, poor-houses and prisons with tenants?—you cause the anguish and desolation of our families?—your business, therefore, is detestable and not to be tolerated?” Does it say this? this, which is nothing but the truth, though far, very far, from being the whole truth? It says no such thing? It pronounces him an honest, well-doing, well-deserving man; it declares his calling legitimate, and necessary to the wants and interests of society; it authorises him to proceed in it; it extends over him the shield of its pro-

tection; and, in short, it leaves nothing undone to give him position, character and respectability, and represent him and his business as the very reverse of what they are before the tribunal of right, reason, virtue and truth. Such is regulation by license: such its endorsement of the liquor dealer and his abominable trade: such the prodigious falsehood it tells to every man in particular and to all men in general.

Now observe the difference between this and prohibition.

Prohibition stamps the liquor traffic as an immorality to be denounced, as a nuisance to be abated, as a crime to be punished. It separates the liquor dealer from the circle of useful and respectable citizens, and pointing to him says: “This man lives upon the vices and misery of his fellow men: he tempts and debauches them: he deprives them of reason, health, property, character and life: he wrongs honest industry and hard earned capital by subjecting them to grievous burdens: he stimulates depravity to commit crime: in fine, he corrupts the morals, tramples upon the rights, disturbs the peace, and jeopardises the welfare alike of the individual and of society. He can no longer be deemed, therefore, a fit associate of respectable citizens. He is a wrong-doer, and the law shall treat him as such. He shall no longer be protected in his calling as if he were a good man and a useful member of the community; he shall be punished as the author of a great crime against man and God.”

It will be observed, then, that while “regulation” calls good, evil; and evil, good; “prohibition” deals with things as they are: calls him a criminal who is one; calls that a crime which is one; and instead of disguising the wolf in sheep’s clothing, and holding over him the shield of law that he may more effectually lay waste, without molestation, the unsuspecting flock, strips him of his borrowed garments, unlooses the pack upon his heels, and calls upon every good citizen to hunt him down as an enemy of the common welfare, that can no longer be suffered to exist. So doing, prohibition is in conformity with virtue, truth, right. It permits iniquity no longer to walk in the dark, and under false pretences to deceive the simple and entrap the unwary. It stamps the liquor dealer with his true moral value, and it denounces and punishes the liquor traffic as we denounce and punish any other crime.

Thirdly. “Regulation” not merely misrepresents itself, not merely misrepresents the liquor dealer and liquor traffic with which it deals, but also the proper nature of the articles of traffic. It calls intoxicating drinks “healthful beverages”—“good creatures of God:” as such it provides for their sale and use. It endorses the sentiment, and publishes it to the world under the sanction and by the authority of the State, that these drinks, as such, are healthful and useful, safe to all in due quantity, made dangerous only by abuse! Was there ever a greater falsehood told by living man? or a more stupendous deception embodied in public law? In another tract of this series, we have adduced the testimony of a host of eminent chemists and physicians, who unanimously declare the principal and the intoxicating or exhilarating ingredient of these drinks a deadly poison, capable of producing speedy death in a given quantity, and in any quantity, (and, whether diluted or undiluted,) injurious to a person in health: its habitual use certain to undermine the constitution, and shorten life. Numerous as the testimonies are, we might multiply them to any extent. Few physicians or chemists in this country or in Europe, will hazard their reputation by giving any other testimony. Both experiment and experience have so fortified the fact affirmed—that these intoxicating drinks are poisonous, and destructive to health and life—that the man who calls it

in question, will find it difficult to sustain before the community, a high character for science and professional ability.

Yet "regulation by license"—by supposition, the collective wisdom, and righteousness of the State—says, "Pooh! I know better: healthful beverages! good creatures of God!" and this, yes this directly in the face of science, sage experience and common sense!

"Prohibition," on the other hand, we need scarcely say, rises on this testimony of science, experience and common sense, as the pyramid rises on its base. It treats all alcoholic drinks as our laws treat other poisons—labels them as poisons, and confines their sale to medicine and the arts, and is thus in harmony with the knowledge of the age.

Finally, though far from exhausting the subject, "regulation" is a gross and shameful example of inconsistent legislation. Intoxicating drinks are either good or evil, healthful or injurious. If they are good, healthful, the State has no more right to impose restrictions on their sale than on the sale of bread or meats or vegetables or milk or lemonade or soda water: if they are evil, injurious, it is guilty of a detestable perversion of the sovereign power, when it authorises their sale, still more when it grants to some and denies to most the privilege of selling them, and more than all when it bestows this privilege for an equivalent in money, and thus derives a revenue from vice.

"Regulation" adopts the first of these suppositions: intoxicating drinks, it says, are "congenial," "healthful," "exhilarating," "the good creatures of God," "necessary and useful articles of diet;" and yet it proceeds, as men do not in any other case, to declare, under a menace of punishment, that they shall not be sold except by certain parties forming an insignificant fraction of the community, and then only when they have paid a specified sum for the privilege of so doing!! Did legislation ever play the fool more absurdly?

"Prohibition," on the other hand, is guilty of no such outrage on common sense. It brands intoxicating drinks as poisons; and as drinks, forbids their sale. It brands the liquor dealer as a wrong-doer, and bids him desist: if he will not, it seizes him and applies the lash of a righteous retribution.

We have done. If you have followed us thoughtfully, reader, you must be convinced, that "prohibition"—not "regulation"—is the principle which reason sanctions, justly represents the nature of alcoholic drinks, truthfully declares the immoral character of the liquor dealer and liquor traffic, and meets, therefore, the demands of the Temperance cause and of an enlightened age. Prohibition is a just principle consistently applied: regulation is in principle false; in application absurd: prohibition is transparent good; regulation, disguised evil: prohibition, externally attractive, is internally the same—"swept and garnished;" regulation is a whited sepulchre, fair-seeming without, but within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.

[No. 1 to 12 in a wrapper—then 42 of the series, or 504 tracts, making 2016 pages in a bundle by mail, post paid. One dollar—at the same rate for any larger quantity. 100 bundles, making 50,000 tracts, for 100 Dollars!!!

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]

[Prohibitionist; Monthly: Eight pages. Folio. Fifty cents, 1 copy; One dollar, 3 copies; Two dollars, 7 copies. Every additional 4 copies, one dollar.

O. SCOVILL, Agent, Albany.]