THE PEOPLE'S JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY, AND THE DISSEMINATION OF MORALITY, LITERATURE, AND NEWS.

VOL. VIII. COUDERSPORT, POTTER COUNTY, PA., JULY 19, 1855. NO. 9.

THE PEOPLE'S JOURNAL,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING, BY

ADDISON AVERY.

Terms—In Advance:

One copy per annum,	$1.00
Village subscribers,	1.25

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

1 square, of 12 lines or less, 1 insertion,	$0.50
" " " " 3 insertions,	1.50
" every subsequent insertion,	.25
Rule and figure work, per sq., 3 insertions,	3.00
Every subsequent insertion,	.50
1 column, one year,	25.00
1 column, six months,	15.00
Administrators' or Executors' Notices,	2.00
Sheriff's Sales, per tract,	1.50

Professional Cards not exceeding eight lines inserted for $5.00 per annum.

☞ All letters on business, to secure attention, should be addressed (post paid) to the Publisher.

Select Poetry.

BUILDING ON THE SAND

BY ELIZA COOK.

'Tis well to woo, 'tis well to wed,
For so the world has done
Since myrtles grew and roses blew,
And morning brought the sun.

But have a care, ye young and fair,—
Be sure ye pledge with truth:
Be certain that your love will wear
Beyond the days of youth.

For if ye give not heart for heart,
As well as hand for hand,
You'll find you've played the "unwise" part,
And "built upon the sand."

'Tis well to save, 'tis well to have
A good'y store of gold,
And hoard enough of shining stuff—
For charity is cold.

But place not all your hopes and trust
In what the deep mine brings:
We cannot live on yellow dust
Unmixed with purer things.

And he who piles up wealth alone,
With often have to stand
Beside his coffer-chest and own
'Tis "built upon the sand."

'Tis good to speak in kind'y guise,
And soothe where'er we can;
For speech should bind the human mind,
And love link man to man.

But stay not with the gentle words,
Let deeds with language dwell:
The one who pities starving birds
Should scatter crumbs as well.

The Mercy that is warm and true
Must lend a helping hand,
For useless who talk yet fail to do,
Built on the sand.

ADDRESS

OF THE STATE CENTRAL PROHIBITORY COMMITTEE.

To the People of Pennsylvania:

The Legislature of this State, at its last session, passed "An Act to restrain the sale of Intoxicating Liquors" to go into operation on the second of October next. Justice would require, that this law should be tested by its results, after a fair and impartial trial. Instead of permitting this to be done, the tavern-keepers, and other liquor sellers, are organizing in all parts of the State, for the purpose of securing its repeal. This state of things has induced the State Central Prohibitory Committee to address you on the subject, and furnish such information of the history, character, and objects of the law, as is demanded by these circumstances.

HISTORY OF THE LAW.

For the purpose of determining the true state of public sentiment, with regard to the liquor traffic, the friends of Prohibition, in mass meeting assembled,—to the number of one thousand,—proposed to the Legislature of 1854, that "a proper Prohibitory Law should be passed, to go into effect in 1855, and its repeal be submitted to a popular vote, at a special election, to be held on the first Tuesday of September." The same Convention solemnly protested against the submission of the question, in any form, unless the people had the law defined on which they were required to vote. Notice was also given, that we would not abide by any other issue than the one we had proposed. Had this been done, we should have had a fair expression of popular sentiment, and all disputes on that point would have been at an end. With our request, the Legislature not only refused to comply, but with the most contemptuous disregard of our wishes, submitted the very question against which we had protested. They went further, and mingled it with party questions, by taking the vote at the general election.

The question submitted amounted to this:—*Shall the license system be continued, or shall it be changed for entire Prohibition?* As this question was submitted *by the advocates of license*, they were bound to poll a majority of all the legal voters in the State, or admit that the people required some radical change in the license system. With everything in their favor, they polled but 168,510 out of 372,512 of the votes cast for Governor,—leaving 209,002, who did not vote for license. Because about 50,000 did not vote on this question, and the liquor party had a majority of 5,168 in the vote actually cast, the Legislature declined to pass a Prohibitory law. At the same time, it was evident that some radical change ought to be made in the license system, because a *majority of counties* had voted for entire Prohibition, and a Governor, *pledged to its support*, had been elected. It was therefore judged expedient to *modify* the license system, and, though a majority in the Legislature were in favor of Prohibition, they compromised, by passing this "Act to *restrain* the sale of intoxicating liquors." Could the friends of license have asked, with propriety, any more; or the friends of Prohibition taken any less?

THE NEW LICENSE SYSTEM.

As has already been intimated, a radical change has been made in our license laws; and for the purpose of having a proper understanding of the present system, we call your attention to the changes thus made. *Three* bills have been recently passed, which now combine to form our license system.

The first is Buckalew's Law, or "An act passed 1854, to protect certain domestic and private rights." The second is the "Sunday Law," and the third, the late "Act to restrain the sale of intoxicating liquors." The provisions of these are as follows:—

BUCKALEW'S LAW.

1. A fine of from $10 to $50, and imprisonment from ten to sixty days, for wilfully furnishing intoxicating liquors, as a beverage, by sale, *gift, or otherwise*, to minors or insane persons—to any one when intoxicated, or to one *known to be intemperate*. The same penalty for thus furnishing such liquors to any intemperate person, for three months after notice from friends forbidding the same.

2. Any person furnishing liquor to another, by gift, sale, or otherwise, in violation of this, or *any other act*, is held responsible for damages, to persons or property, resulting therefrom.

3. A fine of $50, and imprisonment, at the discretion of the Court, for marrying a person when intoxicated.

4. A fine of $50, for the unwholesome adulteration of intoxicating beverages, or the wilful sale of the same. For the second offense, $100 fine, and imprisonment not exceeding sixty days.

5. Expenses, not exceeding $20, to be paid to prosecutor. No action can be maintained for liquor sold contrary to any law, and Courts may revoke license, &c.

SUNDAY LAW.

1. A fine of $50 for *each case* of selling, trading, or bartering of spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider, on Sunday. The same penalty for wilfully permitting them to be drank on, or about, the premises.

2. In cases of conviction for offences on *two separate* Sundays, a fine of from $50 to $100, and imprisonment from three to twelve months, with loss of license.

3. On failure to pay fines and costs, imprisonment, not exceeding three months, or until discharged by due course of law.

4. Constables, Sheriffs, or Prosecuting Attorneys, are fined from $50 to $100 for refusing to inform on and prosecute offenders against this act.

5. Suits for penalties must be brought in the name of the City or County. Any citizen of the county may prosecute—*be a witness, and receive one-half of the penalty*—the other half to be paid over to the Guardians of the Poor. Any Mayor or Judge of the Court of Quarter Sessions, may revoke a license for violations of this act. No compromise of suits allowed.

THE ACT TO RESTRAIN THE SALE, &c.

1. *All Drinking Houses prohibited*, and a fine of not exceeding $50, with imprisonment not exceeding one month, for selling, and affording a place, inducement, or any other convenience, where intoxicating liquor may be sold and drank. For the second offense $100, and not exceeding three months imprisonment. The same penalties when two or more persons combine, the one to sell, and the other to furnish a place for drinking, or for *aiding and abetting*.

2. All sales in less measure than a quart, are prohibited. Courts of Quarter Sessions may —not shall—grant licenses to citizens of the United States, provided they be of temperate habits, and give bond, with two good securities, in the sum of $1000, conditioned for the faithful observance of all laws relating to the sale of said liquors, to be filed in Court, on which bond, fines, and costs may be collected, upon the conviction of the principal. The applicant for license must present his petition, have it lawfully advertised, and the Court shall fix a time when objections may be heard.

3. No hotel, tavern, eating-house, or oyster house; no theater, nor any other place of refreshment or amusement, can receive license to sell by *any measure whatever*, and no *intemperate* person, under any circumstances.

4. Druggists are prohibited from selling intoxicating beverages, except when *mixed with other medicines*.

5. Clerks of Quarter Sessions cannot issue a license until the bond has been filed, fees paid, and the certificate furnished. Fees for license, *three times the present amount*; but no licenses granted for less than $50.

6. Persons licensed to sell by the quart and greater measure, must frame their license, and place it conspicuously in their chief place of business, or forfeit it; and all sales contrary to this act, punished according to the second section.

7. Constables, for wilfully failing to return names kept in violation of this act, are fined not exceeding $50, and imprisoned from one to three months.

8. Importers may sell the original package, without appraisement and license; commissioned auctioneers are also exempted; domestic producers, brewers, and distillers, may sell liquor made by them, in quantities of not less than *five gallons*.

9. Appraisers of licenses, under this act, are appointed according to former laws, except in Philadelphia, where three reputable and temperate citizens, in no way connected with, nor interested in, the liquor business, shall be appointed annually by the Court of Quarter Sessions.

(NOTE.—As a proper understanding of the above law is of great importance at this time, we have added at the close of this address, the very able explanation given by Judge Pearson, of its provisions, to the Grand Jury of Harrisburg.)

From the foregoing synopsis of these laws, the reader will perceive that, combined, they produce the following result:

1. Entire Prohibition on Sunday.

2. The abolition of all drinking houses, and sale by the *small*.

3. Entire Prohibition of sale to all persons, except *temperate adults*.

4. The transfer of liquor-selling from hotels and eating-houses, to stores and other places of business.

5. No liquor sold by *unnaturalized* citizens.

6. The declaration by GOVERNMENT, that "intoxicating liquor is no part of entertainment for man or horse," and the holding of persons legally responsible for the damages resulting from either gift or sale.

OPPOSITION—CHARACTER OF.

Had the Legislature passed a Prohibitory Law, the advocates of license could have consistently opposed it. But this act is a LICENSE *law*, and identical, in *principle* with the very system they advocate. The only difference is, that it transfers the license from one class of citizens to another. The old laws licensed about one in every hundred; this may result in licensing a few less.

Their position is therefore a most singular one, and their ingenuity is sorely taxed to find objections to this law, which will not apply with equal force to the whole license system. Opposition to this law, is therefore *action in favor of a Prohibitory one*. Not only so, but this law is the natural result of their own course. The popular vote which *they* ordered, compelled the Legislature to make some change, and as they would not allow of Prohibition—as we desired—they should be content. The work is theirs, not ours, and "in the net which they set, are their own feet taken."

OBJECTIONS TO THE LAW.

In considering objections to this law, it is important to keep in mind several facts. 1. This law does not interfere with the *manufacture*, nor does it prohibit the *sale, as a beverage*. Men may make it, sell it, buy it, and drink it. 2. It is free from all the obnoxious features of the Maine Law. It contains no "search, seizure, or confiscation clause." 3. No question of a *constitutional* character can be raised against it by them, as they advocate the license system. 4. *Old* objections are therefore exploded, and *new* ones must be invented. These inventions we will now consider.

1. *It is opposed to popular sentiment, as expressed in the late vote.* This has already been shown to be false: but as this is their favorite argument, we will meet it in another form. There was no popular expression of opition on this law, the only question being the old license system, or Prohibition. They failed to obtain a majority of the legal voters for any license, while Prohibition secured a majority of counties, members in both Houses, and the Governor. If public sentiment did not quite come up to Prohibition, it most certainly demanded a radical change in the old system, and this law is in accordance with it.

2. *It will lessen the value of tavern property.* If this be true, then the question stands thus: Shall the 500,000 taxable citizens of Pennsylvania be assessed annually to sustain the fictitious value of taverns, owned by about one thousand? or shall tavern owners, like others, be required to comply with that rule of common law, which requires "a man not to use his property to the injury of another!"

Again.—If there be any force in this argument, it belongs to the other side. Tavern stands lessen the value of other property. A private dwelling along side of, or near to a liquor tavern, will not generally sell or rent for near as much as if there were no tavern there. Take away the liquor from taverns, and property will increase in value all around them. Is society to be cursed merely to fill the coffers of a few tavern owners!—Surely, men are not serious when they reason after this fashion.

3. *It will increase the price of boarding.* Well, be it so, if it must be: but men will be better able to pay for it, as there will be no rum bill to settle. Hotels will be more quiet and orderly, and there will be fewer paupers and criminals to support. Seriously, however, such arguments are a farce. It will have no such effect. Take away the liquor, and there will be no more hotels than the wants of society require. Honorable competition, as in other business, will place board at a proper price, and no one wants it for less. Men will then be fed, not poisoned, and be able, as well as willing, to pay for it.

4. *The revenue from license will be cut off.* This is also false. The amount may be reduced somewhat, but it is by no means certain that such will be the result. The license is hereafter to be three times the present amount—none less than $30. One license will then pay for three, tnp if the Courts license one third as many stores as there are taverns and stores now, the difference will not be great, if any. But, suppose all is lost, are the woes of the liquor traffic to be paid for in dollars and cents! If the argument be worth anything, we should license every body, as the more licenses the more revenue.

5. *It will promote intemperance.* As this is relied on as the strongest objection to the law, and some friends of our cause fear it will prove true, we will give the entire argument by which it is sustained, viz:—"Men cannot buy less than a quart, and cannot drink that at the store; they will therefore keep it in their houses and shops, and drink more than they do now." This reasoning, though, it is thought plausible by some, is absolutely absurd. 1. It is contrary to experience. Our rural population is the most temperate, and why? Because they drink at home. Where drinking houses are fewest, there is the least intemperance: and communities are sober, in proportion as they are removed from the temptation of liquor by the glass. This is experience, universal experience, and must continue to be. The reason is obvious—there is not the same temptation to drink. Men will not meet in crowds at home, as they do at public houses; and social drinking will be almost entirely abandoned. There are thousands who never drink anywhere but at taverns, who will cease altogether when they cease to sell.

6. *This result predicted is impossible.* Drinking men are composed of two classes,—moderate drinkers and drunkards. Drunkards cannot buy, beg or borrow, to any great extent, under this law. Mr. Buckalew forgot both himself and his law "to protect domestic rights," when he, in the Senate, baptized this act with the title of "The Jug Law." The jug of the drunkard was broken, when his law passed, and woe to him who either fills the man or his jug hereafter. With civil damages, fine and imprisonment, for either giving or selling, the intemperate will find it impossible to drink as much as formerly. Many of them cannot keep it home, for their wives, mothers or sisters, would not permit it. With the present state of public sentiment, the women will break the bottles at home, and see that the law is enforced, which protects their rights from invasion. We shall be greatly mistaken, if the jug of the drunkard does not *leak* under this law.

With regard to moderate drinkers, the result will be nearly the same. Men are not at home to drink. In towns and cities, where there is the most drinking, the business of men is principally from home. As they have no drinking houses, they must either keep it at their business places, or go without it. Keeping it there would result in the intemperance of their workmen, and the derangement of their business. It would, therefore, be done, but to a limited extent.

Again.—In view of the present state of public sentiment, this whole argument concerning the increase of home-drinking is preposterous. The time has gone by when parents are willing to expose their children to such temptations. Very few are found drinking at home now, as they are unwilling that their sons shall follow their example. Hence they go from home to indulge the appetite. Give them no alternative but to drink in the presence of their families, and there is no mistaking the result. This home-drinking argument is a gross libel on our citizens. It affirms that respectable men will prostitute the domestic sanctuary into a drinking saloon, and invite their wives and children to the revel. Shame on the men who thus asperse the character of their neighbors! The effect of this law was well stated by a tavern keeper, who the other day said, "It will prevent gentlemen from going to the bar to drink, and they will not keep it at home." This is not only the truth, but it contains the secret of their opposition, viz: the tavern keeper cannot sell.

EFFICIENCY AND RESULTS.

The efficiency and results of this law are established by the opposition of liquor sellers. They are good judges of what will change the drinking usages of society, and their hostility to the late act is a guarantee of its success. But as the question of efficiency is one of great importance, we will point out some of the features which will render it efficient and secure its enforcement.

1. *It protects the young, and prevents the formation of intemperate habits.* Should the confirmed drinker continue to indulge, by drinking at home or other places, those who drink but seldom or not at all, will have the temptation removed out of their way. It is at drinking houses that men learn the habit, and these being abolished, temptation will cease and "this act," says Judge Pearson, "will go far to protect the rising generation."

2. *It admits of no evasion.* It prohibits the giving or furnishing of liquor, so as to receive any "price, profit, or advantage" by persons not licensed. It also imposes penalties for furnishing liquor to intemperate persons, minors or insane, under any circumstances. Judge Pearson says, "The law is so framed as to permit no escape under any pretext or evasion, and the only safe method for persons not licensed, is to keep no liquor on their premises."

3. *It changes the* CHARACTER *of licensed dealers.* The restrictions laid upon the Courts, and the bond and security required, will prevent the licensing of any but the better class of liquor sellers. These will be more disposed to keep the law, while the fear of imprisonment will deter any who may be disposed to violate it.

4. *It limits the power of Courts.*—Heretofore the entire responsibility of saying who, and how many should be licensed, has been given to the Courts. This was not only unwise, but it was unjust. Judges could not be expected to assume all the odium and opposition of liquor sellers, for refusing to license. Hence, many have declined the exercise of discretion, while others have contended that they had no right to refuse.

Now the case is widely different. The Courts are absolutely prohibited from granting license to any house of refreshment or amusement, and confined to stores or other places of ordinary business. This fact will abolish at least two-thirds of the places where liquor is sold. How, then, is it possible for as much to be either sold or drank!

5. *It divides the responsibility of executing the law.* While the responsibility of judges is diminished, that of the police is greatly increased. Constables are liable to fine and imprisonment for willfully failing to return, under oath, all violations of this act. Not only so, but they are required to "receive information from others." It will, therefore, be only necessary for persons knowing of any violation of the law, to give information to a police officer, and with the prison before his eyes, he will hardly neglect his duty. The liberal fee allowed in certain cases, will be a further inducement for its enforcement. Tavern keepers say, *"it is worse than Prohibition."*

WARNING TO POLITICIANS.

As the hue and cry of the tavern keepers for the repeal of this late law, has frightened some of the political leaders, it will not be amiss to remind these gentlemen of the following facts.

The liquor party is constantly growing less, and that of Prohibition constantly increasing. The temperance question defeated Gov. Bigler, and elected Mr. Pollock, besides a majority in the last Legislature, because they were friendly to Prohibition. No party which advocates repeal, can receive the temperance vote, either in county or State. Should both the Democratic and American parties advocate repeal, an *independent* ticket will be formed; the American vote divided, to the history of the past, and the following rule of action *unanimously* adopted by the Prohibition Convention in Harrisburg, Jan. 17th, 1855.

"Resolved, That we will support our cause: and under no circumstances *will we adhere to any party*, which either abandons or opposes the principle of Prohibition."

It would be well for politicians to note these facts, and *be governed by them.*

A WORD TO OUR FRIENDS.

Friends of Prohibition, *sustain this law.* It is not exactly what we wanted, but a change of a few words will make it so. It is a great step in advance of former legislation. It is a victory on our side. Government has *begun* to act *with* us. Up to this time, we have had the State to contend with. Now it is with us, and we must not lose our advantage. This law must not be repealed, except by one *more stringent.* See, then, that it is enforced, especially that part which prohibits the "sale or gift" to the *intemperate.* For this purpose, get up meetings, make speeches, circulate documents, and *pour out your money, like the liquor party*, to pay expenses. This "half of the loaf" will sharpen the appetite of the people, and the other half will come before long. Let the tavern keepers oppose it. They are only fighting for Prohibition. If they cannot sell, they will soon stop the stores; then the contest will be ended, and the victory won.

In behalf of the State Central Prohibitory Committee.

PENNELL COOMBE, *Chairman.*
JOHN P. SIMONS, *Sec'ry.*

From the Religious Telescope.

A GLIMPSE OF CHILDHOOD.

BY THE LONE WANDERER.

I am alone! Cold and dark is the void around me! The shadows of the past fall over my soul and shroud it in gloom as with a dark mantle. I think of the sunny hours of childhood that are gone, never, never to return. O, ye sweet hours of innocent unmingled joy, why are ye so gone, and gone forever! Ye brought me peace and happiness more than I can tell; ye brought me innocence untarnished by care and sorrow! Ye brought me the unbounded fullness of a mother's love, the best of all blessings from heaven sent down! O, ye sweet hours of joy which seem but moments in the dim, misty past; what would I give? aye, what would I *not* give to be restored again to your happy visions and your joyous dreams! What would I not give to gambol once more in your beautiful meadows and flowery fields, and to rest in the deep cool shade of the grand old woods, where played a thousand echoes of warbling songsters and whispering zephyrs! O, ye joyous hours, ye are gone, gone; and your sweet gentle voices animate me no more, save by an occasional echo that comes looming up from the past, but the sweet memories of the days that are gone are stamped on this heart in characters of fire that can never grow dim!

O, childhood, childhood; sweet, pure, untarnished by deceit and wickedness! Let me forever be a worshiper at thy shrine; let me evet bow submissively to thy teachings, and though I must claim to be a man in the eye of the world, let me still be a child in all simplicity in the sight of God. Though I *am* a man, let me still love, in childish simplicity, the beauty and grandeur of God's divine creation; though I have ripened to maturity, let me still strive to retain the unpretending innocence of those happy days when my greatest joy was to clamber on a fond mother's knee.

But alas, what a difference between then and now; for then it was possible to find a friend, true, faithful, and interested; but now they are gone, all gone! A mother's voice is heard no more, for her loved form calmly sleeps in the cold embrace of death, and the little friends whom I used to love, and who so often cheered my heart with their love and their little acts of kindness, have grown to manhood, and (alas!) are so much engrossed with things of this world that they can spare no time for aught else! I am a wanderer, a *Lone Wanderer* over earth's dreary wastes, without a friend save occasionally a "voice of years that are gone," as they "roll before me with all their deeds." O; who would not fain be a child again to revel once more in the boundless fullness of his morning life and drink of that sweet cup of bliss that is ever full and overflowing! I look back on the past, I see my childhood's home,—that beautiful home in the country, where a good father, by the sweat of his brow earned the bread wherewith to feed his children, that clear cold spring whence the cool waters issued in the hot summer time to refresh and gladden the weary ones. I see the orchard trees with their loads of fruit inviting all to "rise and eat." I see the "old homestead," rising modestly to greet the eye of the happy school-boy, and above all I see a fond mother ever ready and waiting to greet her loved ones with a smile, and to give a word of encouragement in the hour of childish trouble and sorrow. All these I see in the distant past, but the substance has departed forever, and the shadow falls mournfully over my soul like the mist of the evening on some lonely mountain height. "My bark is on the billow," and I am floating down the rough and rapid stream of life; but may I so live that my virtues shall aid to bear me up and save me from destruction!

Dayton, June 14th, 1855.

There is an opinion prevalent among many ignorant people that, in case of death by murder, or other violent causes, it is against the law to lay hands on the body of the deceased until a coroner is present, and that any one so doing subjects himself to a penalty. Many a human being has been suffered to die, whose life might have been saved but for this foolish notion.