

THE BEAVER RADICAL.

SMITH CURTIS, EDITOR.

BEAVER, PA.

Friday Morning, March 7th, 1873.

THE BALLOT OPEN OR SECRET—WHICH?

The Constitutional Convention has adopted an article in regard to Suffrage that provides for the numbering and signing of ballots, to guard against fraud at elections. Such a ballot is not as open as *viva voce* voting, nor as secret as the one in present use; it is a cross between the two. We do not think the people are ready to give up the secret ballot. As far as we have heard an expression of opinion on the subject from persons of both of the great parties, there is a general disapproval of the change. The people have become familiar with secret voting; it is a custom that has become almost a second nature, and sooner than be divested of the privilege they would, we are confident, reject the whole work of the Convention. The ballot means the free choice of the citizen, and should express the highest reach of his intellect and the best purpose of his heart, since it is an act with direct reference to the good of the community; it is an individual act, and should be free from all influence that restrict, or in any way limit its freedom, since without such freedom the choice would not be that of the individual, nor the ballot cast express the thought or desire of the voter. Our theory of government rests upon the individual sovereignty of the people. Each citizen is sovereign, and to exercise this sovereignty, as a free man, the act must be his own, not another's, the result of his thought and moral sense. When the ballot is so circumstanced that its character may be determined by fear or favor, or other influences, then just so far is the manner of voting opposed to the fundamental doctrine of individual sovereignty, and tends to concentrate the power of selecting our rulers and determining the public policy of the Government in the hands of the few. The open ballot is liable to be so misused. One can easily imagine the external influences that could be brought to bear, and would be too to secure a vote, and only the men of superior intelligence and iron will could withstand the pressure. Many would stay away from the polls rather than vote an open ballot; others would not like to displease a friend, or an employer, or perhaps the crowd, and would vote contrary to their best judgment on that account. The external motives are too numerous to specify which might subvert the individual choice, if the ballot were open. Voting should be considered a sacred right and a matter of conscience, and if any additional guard of the ballot is necessary, it is such as will secure greater secrecy of its character and prevent the individual from being constrained by outside influences. Any motive that persuades the citizen to vote against his conscience is dangerous to liberty, and such a method of open voting, as the Convention proposes, will certainly prepare the way for the grossest abuses of this kind. The secret ballot possesses a charm that ought not to be rudely dissolved; it is the unseen, silent but authoritative voice of the individual sovereign, and its very secrecy gives it a kind of glory not its own. What is the reason for this change? To guard the ballot from fraud. No such necessity exists. The frauds are comparatively few, and in the end about evenly divided between the contending parties, and for the most part restricted to the large cities, and are possible even there only through the neglect of the citizens, whose duty it is to guard the polls against such danger. There is no fraud committed, of any account, in the country, and the present mode of voting is popular. Must the people be burdened with this vexatious contrivance in order to satisfy the clamor of a few citizens who reside in great cities, and who allow, as is alleged, frauds to be committed under their noses, and one-eighth of the voters to rule seven-eighths? We say no; and, if the Convention can give us nothing better than this advance backwards,

it had better adjourn and allow its members to go home. We stand by the secret ballot, for by such means the freedom and sacredness of individual opinion and preference is alone secured, and upon such foundation in part rests the permanence of representative government.

The Economites have answered the citizens of Beaver Falls, which answer may be found in an other column. It is a carefully prepared paper, and bears the finger marks of a lawyer. The Economites confine their answer to the consideration of the local difficulties connected with the introduction of Chinese into the Cutlery, and studiously avoid the discussion of the question from a national point of view. They say that formerly with white workmen, the cutlery did not pay expenses, but with Chinese labor it is now in a flourishing condition, and self sustaining; that the Chinese were introduced without their knowledge or consent, but that now they approve of the change; that as a Society they are not responsible for what the company does, although they are by far the largest share holders of the stock; that they desire to redress any wrongs that the company may have done to any of the citizens, yet refer such sufferers to the courts and the tender mercies of the lawyers; that they will give for benevolent and charitable purposes, with especial reference to Beaver Falls, their profits accruing from the Cutlery for eight years, or, if Chinese labor is not tolerated, they threaten to withdraw their capital from the place, and do what they can, by such means, to ruin the prosperity of the village. We deplore the necessity of opposing this movement, but we believe that it promises no good to Beaver Falls in the end, and besides is full of danger to the whole country. A few years ago the sight of a Chinaman was a curiosity, now his presence is familiar. How long, when the tide of importation sets in, in earnest, will it be before the country is flooded with Chinese? If a few create disturbance now, what will take place then? The working men of this country conceal in their breasts a magazine of wrath that will surely explode by too close contact with imported coolies, and such a conflict as would then convulse the land, every patriot should wish to avert. The Chinese will not become citizens, we would not make them slaves, what shall we do with them? If we hire them to displace American laborers, the suffering and injustice done will create mobs and disorder. If our people mingle with them, the associations will degenerate rather than elevate their manners and morals. The two races, for the present at least, are better separated than commingled. By the natural increase of population and emigration from Europe, America will grow in numbers as rapidly as safety will permit. We can not dispose of, and we do not need the Chinese, especially since they would soon become a disturbing element in society here.

The Credit Mobilier scandal has passed into history. Messrs. Ames and Brooks escaped expulsion, Vice President Colfax impeachment, and the others implicated, censure. The Poland Committee, like the mountain in labor, brought forth a ridiculous result, and the action of the House thereon shocks the moral sense of the people, and establishes a precedent that cannot fail to produce evil in the future. The people will believe that the House has whitewashed its guilty members and shielded them from the punishment they richly deserve, that it has one code of laws for public men and quite another for private citizens. The least that ought to have been done was to expel Messrs. Ames and Brooks, and severely censure the rest. Some of these guilty men are now returned to private life to mourn over the stains upon their otherwise fair records; others of them will have another opportunity to redeem their characters by rendering faithful service in the future. The lesson which this investigation teaches is, that the servants of the people should refrain from dealing in stocks, the value of which depends

upon legislation, in which they are engaged, or to be engaged, and so avoid all appearance of evil.

THE RESULT SO FAR.

FOR LICENSE.—Forest, Schuykill, Northumberland, Elk, Cambria, AGAINST LICENSE.—Clearfield, Bradford, Blair, Tioga, Jefferson, Cameron, Lycoming, Wayne, Centre, Susquehanna.

The counties in the balance of the State vote on the third Friday in March.

OAKES AMES threatened that, if the House took his scalp, there would be a good many bald-headed men about, which threat probably had its effect, and like a well directed blow, hit the nail on the head.

FROM HARRISBURG.

George O. Evans's Trial—Local Option Supplement—Dilatation in the House—Strength and Character of the Senate—Political Predictions—McClure's Railroad Bill—Rev. W. H. Locke.

Correspondence of the Radical.

HARRISBURG, March 3, 1873.

The case of the Commonwealth against George O. Evans is on trial in the Court of Common Pleas of this county to-day. The suit is to recover three hundred thousand dollars appropriated by Evans out of money collected from the General Government. Evans is here and will be examined to-night, but it is not probable that anything new will be elicited. The State will get judgment for the money, and that will be the end of it, as he has spent his portion of the money and will not tell with whom he divided. The Attorney General, Hon. Samuel E. Dimmick, and Wayne McVeigh, ably represent the Commonwealth, while Evans is defended by Hon. J. S. Black, Hon. R. A. Lambertson and L. W. Hall Esq. What because of the money will always be a mystery to some extent, although the public long since were enabled to form conclusions that were doubtless just.

The House meets this evening, and there will be an effort to pass the Local Option supplement. Nothing but the fear of popular indignation restrains a majority of the House from defeating this bill. That it will pass when reached, there is no doubt, but this is entirely owing to the fact that the people are aroused and will not be trifled with.

There will be an effort to adjourn until after the inauguration, which may prevail, as there never was such a House probably since the organization of the Commonwealth. Thus far nothing has been done of any importance, and there is little disposition to work. The Appropriation bill has not only not been reported but hardly considered, and the same is true of the Apportionment bill. Unless new leaders come to the front, or Speaker Elliott leaves the chair and assumes the leadership of the House, the session will last until July. The Republicans are in want of a new leader, not only of ability, but especially energy, industry and business tact. Some of the new members are better qualified to lead than those who occupy that position, but their modesty prevents them from assuming the place. The ablest man in the House is Orvis, the Democratic member from Centre, and among the new members, Cross, of your county, Brown, of Erie, McCormick and Newmyer of Allegheny, and Bullard of Delaware, stand deservedly high, and next year will assume the leadership and fill the position more acceptably than some do now.

The Senate gained largely in strength and character by the result of last Fall's election. Senator Alexander of Philadelphia, who succeeded Deckert, is a young man of ability and character, one of the most popular men in the Senate, and in every way a credit to the city he represents. Findley of Somerset, is succeeded by Lemon of Blair, a whole-souled, honorable man, who was a popular at home that he had no opposition, and in his own county received the entire vote of both parties. Cutler of Erie, is an able lawyer and an estimable gentleman. The contrast between Lowry and Cutler is so great, that men wonder how a county that now sends such a superior representative should ever have sent Lowry to the Senate. Maclay of Clarion, McKinley of Lawrence, and Heilman of Lebanon, Republicans; and Playford of Fayette, Chalfant of Montour, and Rowland of Pike, all new men, complete the list of new Senators elected last fall, and are all fair men and faithful representatives. Playford will prove one of the ablest men on the Democratic side, and may yet dispute the leadership with Wallace. The eleven Senators who go out at the close of the session, are Nagle of Philadelphia, Davis of Berks, Knight of Bucks, Albright of Lehigh, Randall of Schuylkill, Crawford of Juniata, Petriken of Huntingdon, and Dill of Union, all Democrats, and Anderson of Allegheny, Delemater of Crawford, and Waddell of Chester, Republicans. Of the Democrats, Nagle of Philadelphia, Davis of Berks and Albright of Lehigh will be re-elected, as will Speaker Anderson, Republican of Allegheny. Dill, Democrat of Union, will be succeeded by a Republican, and Randall by a workingman or possibly a Republican. Petriken and Crawford are both in the same district, and will both

be candidates for nomination. As the district is close it may be counted by the Republicans also.

Delemater will not be a candidate for re-election as he does not desire to come back, and his place will be filled by George K. Anderson, Esq. formerly of your county. If Waddell of Chester is not renominated, Cooper of Delaware, editor of the Delaware American, will succeed him, and in either event a good Senator will be chosen. The three out-going Republicans, Delemater, Anderson and Waddell are all good men, having made the right kind of records, and all deserving well of their constituents. The Democrats can't do better than re-elect Davis, Nagle and Albright, and one almost regrets some of the rest can't be chosen, but their places must be filled by Republicans. The Republicans should have two-thirds of the Senate next year, and will if there is harmony in the party. Col. Davis of Philadelphia announces that he will not be a candidate for Speaker, and so far as known now, Senator Strang will have no opposition.

A number of delegations have been here in opposition to McClure's bill, repealing a part of the Free Railroad law of 1868. The bill has created intense excitement in some parts of the State where roads are being constructed under it. But there is no danger of its passing in its present form, or in any form that will effect the whole State, or any considerable portion of it. It is said the bill is intended to hit a New Jersey road, and will be limited to that object only. Large delegations of manufacturers were here also asking the repeal of the tax on net earnings. This tax should have been taken off long since, and doubtless will be now.

There are few local bills from your district this session. In the Senate the Fish bill was passed to third reading, and postponed on account of large remonstrances received, as was the bill to prevent cattle from running at large in Hanover township, the remonstrance more than doubling the petition. The bill introduced by your Senator, compelling railroads to fence part of their tracks, is still in the hands of the Committee, and will be reported negatively, as the railroads are too powerful here to permit such bills to pass. Leading lawyers say such bills are unconstitutional, and the courts have so decided in a case in Warren county. The railroads having purchased the right of way, can't be compelled, it is contended, by subsequent legislation, to fence their tracks, and can't be anyhow unless the charter requires it, or the contract was made to do so when the right of way was secured. The courts have gone so far as to declare that owners of cattle were liable for damages resulting from accidents caused by cattle going upon the railroad tracks. At every session an effort is made by some one to pass bills compelling railroads to fence their tracks, and that is as far as they ever get, or are ever likely to.

Rev. W. H. Locke, of your town, was here over Sabbath, and preached in the Methodist Church in this city. He had a fine audience and delivered an able and eloquent sermon, which was highly commended by those who heard it.

REPLY TO "OBSERVER."

BEAVER FALLS, February 26th.

To the Editor of the Radical: Is alcoholic medication necessary in the treatment of disease? The friendly challenge to discuss the above question has elicited a prompt response from "Observer." While "Observer" is disposed to take the affirmative of the question he seems to be more ready to criticize my brief article, in which the proposition for a discussion was contained, than to produce arguments to sustain his views. "Observer" starts out with the presumption that his previous communication "Does not sit well on the stomach of 'T. G.'" I am happy to inform "Observer" that his communication does not distress my stomach in the least. In the first four paragraphs of "Observer's" article, there is nothing pertinent to the question under discussion, therefore I need not lengthen this by any special reference to them.

I have said that "upon the proper solution of this question turns the great issue of temperance." I have been led to make the assertion from the belief that alcoholic medication, sanctioned by the medical profession, is the cause, directly and indirectly, of the greater part of intemperance that prevails in the world at the present day. The people look to the medical profession for instruction on all that pertains to the preservation of health and cure of disease. The doctors prescribe alcohol in various conditions of the system and for various purposes. To one he prescribes it as a stimulant, to another as a tonic, to another as a nutrient, to another as respiratory food, &c., &c. Alcohol is prescribed by physicians (so called) for all real and imaginary conditions of the human system as a remedy for disease and a prophylactic against it. If physicians are wise in thus prescribing alcohol the people act rationally in so using it; but whether the prescribing is wise or otherwise, upon this professional authority is found a pretext for its common and indiscriminate use by those who are either ignorant or careless of the injury they are doing themselves. "Observer" fears that I use temperance (the word) as synonymously with total abstinence, and "kindly refers me to Webster." "Observer" has my thanks for the suggestion.

My Webster is almost worn out. Webster was a great lexicographer, and I think his definition of temperance is a very correct one. Webster says temperance is the moderate indulgence of the appetites or passions. I would ask "Observer" to what appetites and passions has Mr. Webster reference? Is it the natural appetites and passions implanted by the Creator, the moderate or restrained indulgence of which constitutes temperance, or is it the false and perverted appetites and passions of men to which he refers? The appetites and passions which God has given us are all for good, and if indulged with proper restraint or moderation, conduce very materially to our happiness, and in this is true temperance; but to indulge ever so moderately in that which is unnatural and harmful is intemperance. Therefore we may adopt the definition of Socrates: "He who knows what is good and chooses it, who knows what is bad and avoids it, is learned and temperate." Or that of Aristotle: "A proper and moderate desire for all those things which conduce to health." Thomas DeQuincy says "temperance is adaptation to the organism." Dr. Samuel Brown, of Edinburgh, defines temperance "as being obedience to the laws of man's nature. I can endorse any and all of the above definitions of temperance, but that "Observer" may know just what I mean by the word temperance as used in my former article, and in all other places in which I may use it, I define temperance as being the proper and judicious use of whatever conduces to our good, and abstinence from whatever is injurious or baneful. "Observer's" assumption that St. Paul prescribed alcoholic medicine for Timothy is in my estimation without any reasonable foundation. When "Observer" attempts to prove his assumption we will offer some arguments in the negative; for the present we content ourselves with a simple denial that there was any alcohol in the wine prescribed by St. Paul; ergo St. Paul was not opposed to temperance.

"Observer's" assumption number two is on a par with his first. We do not believe that Christ ever miraculously or otherwise made alcoholic wine. We call for the proof. We think we have very good reasons for disbelieving the assumption, which we can present at the proper time; ergo, "the blessed Jesus was not opposed to temperance." "Observer" modestly says "it won't do to have but one idea at a time." I would inquire what system of mental philosophy has "Observer" studied? I would gladly be informed how many ideas can occupy the mind at one time. Does "Observer" intend to insinuate that "T. G." is a man of one idea? If he does, he unthinkingly places "T. G." where he does not deserve to be, among the most useful and most successful men the world ever knew. I propose to "Observer" that he retrospect the history of the past. Who have been the leading spirits in the world? Men who had but one idea, at least at a time. But perhaps "Observer" wishes to convey the impression that he possesses enlarged and liberal views. He cannot mean that he has numerous ideas at the same time. Such a redundancy of ideas would create a stagnation of thought, and produce that confusion and blindness of mind that would surely "run the cause we espouse upon the breakers." "Observer" says "we are commanded to be temperate in all things." This is a command of Holy Writ. Does "Observer" believe that the "all things" spoken of includes evil things as well as good things; if it does then the Scriptures sanctions moderate indulgence in evil things. "Observer" says "we are cautioned against the abuse of anything." Does this mean the abuse of anything good, or does it mean the abuse of anything bad? I take it to mean that we should not abuse that which is good, else by such abuse it may become an evil. "Observer" asks "how can we be temperate in the use of alcoholic liquors?" and answers by saying, "certainly not by total abstinence when needed as a medicine." The question is "is alcoholic medication necessary?" "Observer" assumes or rather affirms that it is. Will he please tell us why. In what way is it remedial? What special medicinal property has alcohol that makes it indispensable? What peculiar power for good has it that no other medicinal agent contains? What are its peculiar remedial effects, and what is the mode of its operation? "Observer" will please answer these interrogatories. "Observer" is surprised that any enlightened man can be found to take the negative of this question. "T. G." claims to be enlightened "more than he was." He used to prescribe alcoholic liquors in just such cases as "Observer" now recommends it; but has learned from reason and experience to act more wisely. When stimulants are demanded we administer those that are equally efficacious and much less noxious in their effects than such an acrid narcotic poison as alcohol. "Observer" supposes a few cases. No. 1.—Suppose Mr. A. is bitten by a venomous serpent, how is his system to eliminate the poison unless buoyed up by a diffusible stimulant such as I have recommended? "Observer" recommends alcohol, one among the most active poisons, to sustain the system while it eliminates another poison. We are reminded of the adage, "set a thief to catch a thief;" also of the medical fallacy, "*similia similibus curantur*." I suggest that "Observer" try the effects of ammonia in his next case of snake bite. Case No. 2.—"Mr. B. falls under the cars and has his knee crushed; the shock of the nervous system will produce death unless you can produce a re-

action of the arterial system, and that speedily. What are you going to substitute for pure rye whiskey?" I presume that "Observer," and those that think as he does, usually substitute what is popularly known by the classical name of "rot-gut," "T. G." would prefer hot coffee, ginger, capsicum, ammonia, or even hot water, especially if Mr. B. had been anticipating the happy effects of the "good rye whiskey," and had taken it in liberal quantities previous to falling under the cars, as is usually the case in such accidents.

Case No. 3.—"Suppose Mr. C. has been worn down to the very verge of the grave by typhoid fever, where is your substitute for good whiskey punch?" Now according to "Observer" Mr. C. is very low, just at "the verge of the grave," his stock of vital power is just about exhausted, scarcely enough vital force left to keep in operation the functions essential to life. Now what does "Observer" propose to do? To restore Mr. C.'s exhausted vitality? To increase his little remaining stock of life force? Oh, no! nothing of the kind. "Observer" is going to excite Mr. C. He will give him stimulants, yes, diffusible stimulants, to irritate and excite the entire system to increased activity. Action is necessarily productive of waste; the store is almost exhausted now; stimulants produce excitement, these increase functioned action, increased action causes increased consumption of vital force, the faster the vital force is expended the sooner the supply will be completely exhausted, and Mr. C. will no longer be on the verge of the grave, he will have passed the verge and will now be in it. How much more rational it would be in Mr. C.'s case to husband his little bit of strength, and economize the remaining vitality not used up by disease, until the supply can be increased by nourishment. Alcohol is not food; it adds nothing to C.'s exhausted vitality; it only compels the system to use more lavishly and more rapidly the supply already on hand; when this supply is already almost gone, how unwise it is to spur on the lagged energies to increased consumption.

If "Observer's" horse is lazy "Observer" may stimulate him with (not a good "whisky punch") but by a good "punch" with the spur; but if the poor beast is exhausted give him rest and oats. As to being "a novice in physiology," I would only say: to some extent is a physiological question, and its further discussion may show who the "novice" is.

I know not whom "Observer" may regard as being "the best physicians in the land," and I care but little whether I argue with or against their theory and practice. While I am not an Esau, with my "hand against every man, and every man's hand against me," yet I shall never be willing to surrender the right of independent thought. "Observer" says "he could enumerate scores of circumstances in which the physician finds his patients placed when no substitute for alcohol will avail." If "Observer" will enumerate one or two cases at a time, I will volunteer to help him find (if not a substitute) a better remedy.

Every toper believes there are "scores of circumstances in which he finds himself placed where no substitute will avail." Toper's opinion is second handed; he got it from the physician. The only difference between the doctor's and the toper's prescription is, the one is the result of irrational intelligence and the other of rational ignorance.

"Observer" says we have nothing in the *Materia Medica* that will make such an immediate impression on the stomach. If this were true it would be no recommendation to alcohol, but the fact is that any very active irritant will make an immediate impression on the stomach, if it is taken into it.

"Observer's" overpowered army illustration is not a very apt one. If the reinforcements spoken of were not real, but merely imaginary, "putting forth another effort" would only result in further loss to this already "overpowered army." "Observer's" mistake is in assuming that alcohol contains, or is in itself, a reinforcement to exhausted nature, while in fact alcohol does not contain any element of strength.

"Observer's" object in continuing this discussion is to set the public mind right upon this question. "T. G." has precisely the same object. For this purpose he invited discussion, and for this purpose only will he be willing to continue it. "Observer" observes that "the public mind has been poisoned by men so jealous in the temperance cause that they are not satisfied with dispensing with alcohol as a beverage; nothing short of prohibiting its use as a beverage will fill up the measure of their mission." Well, there is one consolation in it: this poison that is getting into the public mind is not nearly so fatal in its effects as that other poison that has so long been getting into their stomachs.

To "Observer" I would say that I have no disposition to persecute either "witches" or Quakers, or anybody else, for opinion's sake. My only object is to do good to the mind and body of my fellow men. I hope that the subsequent discussion of this subject will be confined strictly to the question: "Is alcoholic medication necessary in the treatment of disease?"

T. G.  
—In the McEnery Legislature, at New Orleans the Governor has been empowered to reinstate the district judges recently removed from office, and to use all the civil and military force at his command to do so, if necessary.