

V. Editor:

Sir: The Chairman of the Joint Committee to whom the memorials upon the subject of the License law was referred, has reported unfavorably, and has set forth the reasons for such a Report as follows. The fact that this report comes from the Legislature, veils it in a sort of mystery to the common eye, and gives it a fictitious importance with those who are ignorant of the details of business, and the trickery of Legislation. Such persons seem to be ignorant of the fact, that this Report is, after all, but the production of a single individual, a man, perhaps, for whose opinions as an individual, they have no respect, and to whose authority they at all events, acknowledge no deference. Strip, then of its imaginary importance, I will examine this Report, touching its intrinsic merits. Respect for the source whence it comes, but still more respect for myself, forbid my characterising this Report in the terms which it merits. I shall therefore endeavor to give it a respectful and candid examination.

The Report declares "that any prohibitory legislation upon this subject (retailing) at this time, is not advisable." The reason assigned for this opinion is, that such legislation would produce angry feeling, and party strife, which, in the opinion of the Chairman, would be a greater evil than all the drunkenness, crime and misery growing out of the retail system. And this opinion is based upon the fact, that the Parliament of Great Britain passed an act, in the year 1736, prohibiting the introduction of liquor into the country; and this act could not be enforced, one hundred years ago, in Great Britain! Is this all that our opponents can bring from their laborious research among the laws of nations and the records of antiquity, to answer our memorials? Then, truly, may the friends of reform rejoice. Our efforts, then, have the sanction of antiquity; other ages, and other people, have left a record, on the page of history, of their wisdom and their virtue, which I trust will not be lost upon their descendants in another land.

But what does the very learned argument, from the English statute book, amount to? More than a century ago, the people of Great Britain were so intemperate, that the great moral reform, which was then attempted by the few virtuous and wise, did not succeed! Therefore, the effort to reform, in the opinion of the Chairman, must never again be made.—Less than a century since, Missionaries were sent to preach the gospel to the heathen, some were received with indifference—others were put to death; therefore, (according to the logic of the Chairman,) you should no longer preach the gospel to any one. That my illustration of the Chairman's argument is not forced or unfair, I will refer to an anecdote told by that great man, John Foster, in his work on "Popular Ignorance." About the year 1730, just at the time this law was passed, a Minister of the Gospel, in one of the parish churches in England, curtailed the morning service of the church so much, as to excite the curiosity of his congregation, upon which he explained the circumstance thus: "Brethren, as neighbour Smith's Bull baiting comes on this afternoon, I shortened the service as much as possible, that the congregation might have god time for the sport."—This circumstance actually occurred in England, not more than one hundred years ago! This was the state of morals, and these the people who refused to abandon their dram shops, and their bull baitings on the sabbath. What must have been the morals of that people whose Minister was a Bull-baiter? And these are the people who are held up, by the Chairman, as our prototype. These are the people with whom we are compared, and whose example the Chairman supposes we will follow. The insinuation is an insult to the people of South Carolina.—Does the author of this Report, regard the people of this State, as a set of Bear-baiting—Sabbath breaking heathens?—A semi-barbarous people on another continent, a century ago, refused to submit to the restraints of law; and it is taken for granted by the author of the Report, that the people of south Carolina, whom he regards, I suppose, as equally barbarous, will evince the like resistance to the laws. Is this an argument worthy of the high place whence it comes? Is this the answer the people had a right to expect, from the Chairman of a Legislative Committee? We "asked for bread, and he has given us a stone." Is it the spirit of a man to conceive such an argument? Was it a spirit like this, that actuated the great Reformers of the world, and that has achieved all that is great and glorious in time? In the 16th century, the sublime truths of the reformation burst upon the vision of Martin Luther. Did he cower and quail before the Pope, because John Huss and Jerome of Prague, but the century before, had perished at the stake, for proclaiming the like truths? No. With a heart that loved truth better than life, with a soul that defied the malice of powers and principalities, he burned the cannons, and hurled defiance in the teeth of the Pope. With the craven spirit of the present day, Martin Luther would have died a monk, and the world might still have been buried in dark idolatry and superstition.

But let us return to this act of Parliament, which the Chairman refers to with such a complacent and triumphant air.—Let us see what is the analogy between the act of Parliament which was passed

in the reign of George the II, provides "That upon all spirituous liquors, which any retailer thereof, should, from and after the 24th day of June 1733, be possessed of, there should be granted to his Majesty, a duty of twenty shillings per gallon." I quote the very words of the act as found in Rapin's History of England, Vol. XX. page 302. This act applied to all spirituous liquors as well domestic as foreign. Here then was a duty of one pound sterling, (which in our money amounts to four dollars and forty four cents.) which the consumer had to pay to government, upon every gallon of liquor that he purchased. In other words, the law was, in effect, a total prohibition of the use of ardent spirits. And this is the law which the Chairman gravely referred to, as a measure similar to that proposed by the friends of reform at this day, and from which we are to learn the lesson of experience. "Mark now, how a plain tale has been put down." What are we to infer? Can it be that the Chairman was himself, ignorant of the provisions of that act, with which he was making a puny effort to damn the cause of temperance? Or did he, knowing it himself presume upon the ignorance of others? If the Chairman was acquainted with the whole history of this act, this argument, I am forced to say, was in the highest degree disingenuous and unfair: better becoming the prejudiced advocates of a party, than the dignified position of a Legislator. If he was ignorant, I hope the Chairman will be better informed, when he next undertakes to legislate for the enlightened community of South Carolina. He is a very young man I understand, and I trust, will profit by experience.

If the advocates of reform at this day, had proposed passing a law prohibiting the introduction of all spirituous liquors into the country, or forbidding the use of it in a man's own house, then there would have been some analogy in the law referred to, and some propriety in introducing it in the Report. But what is the fact? We propose, simply, to prohibit, not the selling even of a gill, but the drinking in a public dram shop; not interfering either with the price or quantity sold. Now, is there any similarity between a law prohibiting the use of liquor entirely, and one simply preventing a man from getting drunk in the streets? But I have not yet told the whole story; and I am much indebted to the Chairman, for the opportunity afforded me, of bringing this historical fact before the people of S. Carolina: The Chairman informs his constituents, that the bill became "odious and contemptible," and was repealed, leaving us to infer that it was repealed because it was "odious and contemptible"—omitting, either through ignorance or design, to give the true reason of its repeal. The avowed reason with the Ministry for wishing the repeal of the act of 1736, was to raise supplies for supporting the war which the King was then carrying on, in league with the Queen of Hungary, against France. The historian thus explains the repeal of the act. "The exigency was pressing and it was hard to find out a fund that could supply it time enough for the purposes of government. An alteration, therefore, of the duties upon spirituous liquors was thought of. It was a dangerous expedient &c." "This act (repealing the duty on liquors) in the House of Lords, met with an unusual and vigorous opposition." Again he says, "In the course of the debate the friends of the bill (for repealing the duty,) did not give themselves much trouble to justify it upon principle! But they contended that the government ought to avail itself of the passions which it could not restrain, and that the operations of the war depended upon its success." Here then we have the true cause of the repeal of the duty upon spirituous liquors, given by the Historian himself.—The duty then was not repealed, as the Chairman would leave us to infer, because the law had become "odious and contemptible," but because "the operations of the war depended upon its repeal."

There was still another cause at work which militated against the successful enforcement of the act of 1736, and had much weight in causing it to be repealed. The merchants of Liverpool sent up a petition to Parliament, setting forth that the Muscovado sugars constituted the chief article of trade, with the British West Indies, three fourth parts of which sugars could not be consumed without being refined, and a very large portion, in the refining process, turned out Rum. They proceeded to declare that "a duty of 20 shillings per gallon on Rum would be the inevitable ruin of the sugar plantations, and destruction of the two most valuable branches of our sugar trade to the British colonist and the coast of Africa." We see then that numerous interests were attacked by this law, and opposition was thus aroused on every hand. Here was a law ruinous to the mercantile interest of the country—destroying the value of the W. India plantations—cutting off the revenue of government—and arbitrarily withholding the bottle from the lips of the drunkard. I have now shown, beyond all cavil, that there is not the slightest shadow of resemblance between the act of Parliament of 1736, and the measures proposed in Carolina at this day; and that there is still less similarity if possible, between the moral character of the people of G. Britain in 1733, and the people of South Carolina in 1839. The argument, therefore, attempted to be drawn from the experience of Great Britain on this subject is purile and false, and falls to the ground. The Chairman had as well argue that because Pharaoh and his host

were overwhelmed in the Red sea, we should never again undertake to navigate the ocean.

I have devoted much more time to this part of the Report than it deserves, or should have received, but from the fact, already alluded to, that it comes forth under the imposing name of a committee of the Legislature. I shall close my comments upon this part of the Report with the words of that wise and sagacious statesman, Lord Chesterfield—a man most profoundly learned in all human knowledge, and above all in the human heart. Upon the discussion of the bill in House of Lords, to repeal the act of 1736.—Lord Chesterfield delivered this noble sentiment, "For my own part, my Lords, I think the bill now proposed, (the bill to repeal the duty on liquors) much worse than the tax invented by Vespasian's ways and means men; it is not only mean and sordid, but it is vicious to the last degree: because it will encourage and promote that vice which is the parent of every other vice. If your Lordships, therefore, should reject that motion, and proceed in the committee, when you come to the preamble. I shall propose an amendment, which I think a very necessary one. for the sake of truth as well as religion. In that part of the preamble where it is said "By and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal," I hope your Lordships will leave out the word "spiritual;" for it will bring a scandal upon the religion of the age to have it recorded in our law books that the reverend bench gave their consent to such a wicked bill. Besides, it is false in fact, for some of them have appeared openly and avowedly against it; and I do not find that any one of them will advise or consent to it."

I must defer further comment on this Report till another day. JEROME.

* Since writing the above I have ascertained that this remark is peculiarly applicable to the Report in question. The report was drawn by the Chairman, without consultation with, and in opposition to the known opinion of several members of the Committee; and, contrary to all usage in such cases, the Chairman moved to lay his own report upon the table. These are the facts, I leave the people to draw their own inferences. This statement is made upon the authority of a member of the Committee.

† Before the act of 1736 the enormous amount of £70,000 (about \$310,000) a year went to the civil list from the duties on spirituous liquors.

Tindal's Hist. of England.

From the Charleston Courier.

GEN. HARRISON.

In compliance with our determination to deal fairly with this distinguished citizen, now again regularly presented to the people of the U. S., as a candidate for the Presidency, and in order that the South especially may judge of every thing connected with his position on the slave question, we publish the following evidence of abolition hostility to him from a recent number of the *Emancipator*. We are glad to perceive this movement, and trust that Gen. Harrison will take an early opportunity to declare his present sentiments on the subject of slavery, to do away all suspicion arising out of the exceedingly objectionable passage in his Cheviot speech, which we cited a few days since, and to confirm the abolitionists in their opposition to him. By so doing, he may not promote his elevation to the Presidency; but he will certainly fulfil the duty of a true patriot, alive to the best interests and anxious for the continued harmony of the Union. We hope the abolitionists will perform their threat of complete isolation from both political parties, and thus no longer have any shield against the unmingled scorn and detestation of the whole

From the *Emancipator*.

GENERAL HARRISON.—Many have supposed that it might be expedient for the Executive Committee to interrogate Gen. Harrison, now that he is the recognised candidate for the Presidency, with some prospect of election, to learn his views with respect to the abolition of slavery.—But where is the use? It is true we rejoice in the rejection of Henry Clay, because he is a slave-holder, and a defender of slavery. Gen. Harrison, we know, is not a slave-holder, neither is Mr. Van Buren. But no one thinks it necessary to interrogate Mr. Van Buren. Why? Because his principles are known to be in favor of the ascendancy of the slave power. But are those of Gen. Harrison any less so? He is the man of his party, and that party have shown the absoluteness of their subservency, by nominating a slaveholder, a peculiarly bigoted devotee of slavery, on the same ticket with Gen. Harrison, and now by electing a nullifying slave-holder, from slave-breeding Virginia, for Speaker.

But we submit, further, that Gen. Harrison's principles are already well known by his deeds, of which we find the following summary in the *Rocheater Freeman*: In December, 1802, while Governor of Indiana Territory, he was President of a Convention of the people of that Territory, held at Vincennes, and transmitted to Congress a memorial of the Convention, praying that the sixth article of the "Ordinance of '87," which prohibited slavery there, might be suspended. (See Am. State papers, 1803.) His efforts to make Indiana a slave state were prosecuted for years while he was Governor of that Territory.

In 1819, Feb. 16, Gen. Harrison voted, as a member of the House of Representatives, against a clause prohibiting the further introduction of slavery in Missouri, and against a clause for the further emancipation (at 25) of slaves born within that State. Two days afterwards, he voted

against a clause prohibiting the future introduction of slavery into Arkansas, and against the future emancipation of slaves born in Arkansas.

So basely did he bow to slavery, that even Ohio was shocked. He was indignantly rejected at the next Congressional election in 1822. The *National Intelligencer* of October 20, 1822, says:—"It is confirmed to us, that Mr. Gazely is elected in opposition to Gen. Harrison.—A friend informs us, which we are sorry to learn, that he was opposed particularly on account of his adherence to that principle of the Constitution which secures to the people of the South their pre-existing rights." It seems, then, that Gen. Harrison claimed for the South the right to fasten slavery upon any soil which the nation might have or purchase.

He has had but little opportunity to act in a public capacity, upon the subject of slavery since that time; but, an address from his political friends in Virginia, in 1836, says: "he is sound to the core, on the subject of slavery."

Under these circumstances, we submit that conscientious abolitionists are bound to regard the two parties and their candidates, as standing precisely on the same ground—that of unlimited subservency to the dominion of the Slavocracy. It is true—Gen. Harrison's personal demonstrations are less recent than Mr. Van Buren's. But, they are much stronger, for Mr. Van Buren helped to send Rufus King to the U. S. Senate, to oppose slavery in Missouri, and he has never attempted to extend slavery to regions where it was already abolished. And further, the demonstrations of the Harrison party are more recent, than those of the other.—And, it is said, that we should give the old General a chance to repent of his proslavery, we reply: that it belongs to the man who repents to exhibit his own repentance. Certainly, there are no circumstances in the case, which warrant the slightest presumptions in favor of his repentance. Let him, or his friends, if they choose, show wherein his views now differ from his actions in 1802, and 1819, and 1836. And, in default of this, let the friends of human rights come at once to the conviction that the cause they have espoused, is, by Divine Providence, entrusted their own guardianship, and that for its success or failure, their country and posterity will hold them responsible.

THE JOURNAL.

CAMDEN:

SATURDAY MORNING, JANUARY 18, 1840.

WANTED,

A Journeyman Printer, of sober and industrious habits to whom liberal wages will be given, if immediate application is made.

THE HON. JOHN P. RICHARDSON, Has been nominated in the *Charleston Mercury*, as a candidate for Governor, to succeed Governor NOBLE. The *Charleston Courier* and *Patriot* both warmly approve of the nomination.

DESPATCH EXTRAORDINARY.—A considerable sensation was produced in our community on Monday last, by the arrival from Charleston, of Boyd's Boat, *Belle*, Capt. JACK, in the unprecedented time of one hundred and forty days, having left the city on the 23d of August last.

CONGRESS.

The Senate have been employed principally in discussing Col. BENTON'S Resolution against the assumption by the General Government, of the State debts; and the Bill for the armed occupation of Florida. Mr. WRIGHT, from the Committee on Finance, had also reported a Bill to provide for the collection, safe keeping & transfer of the public money, in other words, the Sub-Treasury Bill. No doubt is entertained of its passage early in the session. In the House, the New Jersey Question is still the engrossing subject, and has occupied nearly all its time, with the exception of the passage of a Bill making appropriations to pay the members. The immediate passage of this Bill was urged by Mr. EVANS, of Me., on the ground that they were out of funds and had not enough to pay for their board and washing!

The *Charleston Courier*, of Monday last, boasts of an assortment of handsome flowers, which have been preserved in that city from the "pinching frosts of winter." As a preservation equally remarkable, we noticed in our streets the other day, a number of fine large water melons for sale.—They were sold at twenty-five cents each.

THE TEMPERANCE MEMORIALS.

We promised some two three weeks since, to notice in what respect we differed from the Report of the Special Committee. We begin, however, to repent having made the promise, as the Committee have been so severely handled by others. The Temperance Advocate, at Columbia, has reviewed the Re-

port in a most luminous and masterly manner, and exhibited the fallacy of its assertions and arguments, in such a light as must, we think, prevent their repetition at any succeeding session. Our object in referring to the subject now, is to beg the attention of our readers to the article from the *Edgefield Advertiser*, under the signature of *Jerome*, which will be found in our columns to-day—the whole argument of the Report is here stated, and ably met and refuted. Read it.

The scenes which are sometimes enacted, in both Houses of Congress, would be very amusing, if it were not for their humiliating character. On the 3d instant, in referring to the subject now, is to beg the attention of our readers to the article from the *Edgefield Advertiser*, under the signature of *Jerome*, which will be found in our columns to-day—the whole argument of the Report is here stated, and ably met and refuted. Read it.

The scenes which are sometimes enacted, in both Houses of Congress, would be very amusing, if it were not for their humiliating character. On the 3d instant, in referring to the subject now, is to beg the attention of our readers to the article from the *Edgefield Advertiser*, under the signature of *Jerome*, which will be found in our columns to-day—the whole argument of the Report is here stated, and ably met and refuted. Read it.

In the House of Representatives, on the same day the proceedings were of a most disgraceful and mortifying character.—Messrs: JENIFER, of Md., and BYNUM and STANLY, of N. C., each indulged themselves in strains of abuse, more becoming such a bar room as the town authorities would refuse to grant license to keep open, than such a body as the American Congress ought to be.

Humiliating as these scenes must have been, we could not avoid a smile at the self-complacency with which Mr. STANLY, in the course of his remarks, says: "when I came here, sir, a little more than two years ago, I brought with me the determination to be civil and courteous to every member of the House. I resolved never to be guilty of using offensive language unless provoked."

We have no knowledge of the character and disposition of Mr. S. except as exhibited by the few speeches he has made in Congress, but it certainly argues a very mild and amiable temper, that he should be civil and courteous unless he was provoked. To be serious, however, such a resolution by any one, making the slightest pretensions to the amiability which should characterize a gentleman, appears to us about as wise, as to resolve that he would not eat unless he was hungry.

A LARGE DIVIDEND.—The Merchant's Bank at Cheraw, has declared a dividend of six dollars per share for the last six months—equal to 12 per cent per annum. Her Majesty, Queen VICTORIA, on the 23d of November, formally announced to her privy council, her intended marriage. The following extract from the announcement, shows that her Majesty understands precision and perspicuity:—"It is my intention to ally myself in marriage, with the Prince ALBERT of Saxe Coburg and Gotha."

LADIES' COMPANION.

We have received the January number of this beautiful and interesting publication. It is embellished with an elegantly executed engraving of WASHINGTON'S House, at Mount Vernon. We cannot say more in its praise, in relation to its literary contents, than that it fully sustains the high character which it has made for itself.

Confession of a Murderess.—A wretched female, named Phæbe Ann Simonson, who stands charged with the murder of John Floor, a butcher in New York, on Sunday week, has, we learn from the *Courier* and *Enquirer*, made a confession. "She was met in the police office by her father and mother, when a scene ensued which baffles description. She fell on her knees before the magistrate, and in all the agony of despair shrieked out, I will confess all!—I am a murderer!—She then, as if relieved from an oppressive burden, became comparatively calm, and detailed all the circumstances of the heinous transaction.

She said that she had read her Bible during the whole of Sunday, from which she had been convinced that she must die, and that it was better for her, as a preparatory step to such an event, to make a full disclosure.

She then went on to state that she had been married to Floor for about two years; that during that time he had neglected her, and had often kept company with other women, which had excited in her an unconquerable jealousy; that she had till re-