

A cloud of witnesses : success of prohibition in Maine.

Publication/Creation

Manchester : United Kingdom Alliance, [1872?]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/ngtpsygs>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

A CLOUD OF WITNESSES:

SUCCESS OF PROHIBITION IN MAINE.

(From the Alliance News, June 22nd, 1872.)

We have been favoured with a large batch of testimonies to the working and results of the Prohibitory Liquor Laws of Maine. These have been called forth by the adverse statements recently made in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and also in the London and provincial press, especially in connection with the recent debate on the motion for the second reading of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Permissive Bill. In placing these testimonies before our readers, we only wish to make one or two brief remarks.

(1.) Even had the adverse statements of Mr. Powell, Mr. Plimsoll, and those who echo their croakings, been absolutely true; and had the Maine Liquor Law proved an entire failure, causing more drinking and drunkenness than ever in the States of Maine, Massachusetts, etc., this would have been utterly insufficient as a basis for argument or opposition to Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Permissive Bill, which can only take effect when and where the great majority of the sober, thoughtful, and moral part of the community determine to give effect to it, and to sustain it.

(2.) On the other hand, if it is proved that the Maine Liquor Law is, on the whole, well received by the people and well enforced by the authorities, and that it proves to be, whenever and wherever enforced, more and more popular, as well as more and more effective in the repression of drink selling, drinking, and drunkenness, and all the concomitants and results thereof, this broad fact, once established, lends vast sanction and support to all efforts in the same direction. Hence the friends of temperance cannot but watch the workings and results of prohibition in Maine and the other prohibitory States with deep interest, and take encouragement from every wave of progress and every sign of success in Maine Law States.

(3.) These testimonies, as will be seen, are not from casual visitors—travellers who enter Portland or Boston one night and leave the next day—receiving their information and impression from the loafers and fast-goers who are ever on the alert to cram strangers with apochryphal facts and amusing anecdotes, or to lead them into secret dens of infamy, where all laws, human and divine, are defied, and all the decencies of life more or less set at naught and outraged. But the testimonies are from the highest, the most authoritative, and unimpeachable sources—including His Excellency the Governor of the State; all the Senators, Representatives of the State in Congress; the Judge of the Supreme Court of Maine; the Judge of the Municipal Court (Portland); the Judge of the Probate Court; Professor in Theological Seminary; Mayors and many ex-Mayors, aldermen, and city clerks of Portland and Bangor—the two leading cities of the State; the Sheriff, the Clerk, and Registrar of Cumberland County (which includes Portland); the pastors of the leading churches of all denominations, and many others.

(4.) It will be observed that the uniform testimony is that the Prohibitory Liquor Law of Maine has produced a great and marvellous effect in reducing the quantity of liquor sold and consumed in the State. The general testimony is that there is not more than *one-tenth* the quantity sold and used in the State of what there was before the Prohibitory Liquor Law came into force; that, as a general thing, where the trade in liquor is carried on at all, it is with great secrecy and caution, as other unlawful practices are; and that the benefits of this state of things are obvious and very great.

FROM HIS EXCELLENCY, SIDNEY PERHAM, GOVERNOR OF MAINE, U.S.

Executive Department, Augusta, Maine, June 3, 1872.

My dear Sir,—In answer to your inquiry in regard to the effect of the Maine Law upon the liquor trade in this State, I think it safe to say that it is very much less than before the enactment of the law—probably not one-tenth as large. In some places liquor is sold secretly in violation of law as many other offences are committed against the statutes, and the peace and good order of society; but in large districts of the State, the liquor traffic is nearly or quite unknown, where formerly it was carried on like any other trade.—Very respectfully yours,
To General Neal Dow. SIDNEY PERHAM, Governor of Maine.

FROM THE SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF MAINE, U.S.

Forty-second Congress, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., May 29th, 1872.

My dear Sir,—Your favour of the 26th instant, containing an inquiry as to the effect of the Maine Liquor Law in restraining the sale of liquors in our State, &c., is before me; and in reply, while I am unable to state any exact percentage of decrease in the business, I can and do, from my own personal observation, unhesitatingly affirm that the consumption of intoxicating liquors in Maine is not to-day one-fourth so great as it was twenty years ago; that, in the country portions of the State, the sale and use have almost entirely ceased; that the law of itself, under a vigorous enforcement of its provisions, has created a temperance sentiment which is marvellous, and to which opposition is powerless. In my opinion our remarkable temperance reform of to-day is the legitimate child of the law.

With profound gratitude for your earnest and persistent efforts in the promotion of this cause, I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
Hon Neal Dow. WM. P. FRYE, M.C. of Maine,
And ex-Attorney General of same State.

I have the honour unhesitatingly to concur in the opinions expressed in the foregoing, by my colleague, Hon. Mr. Frye. LOT M. MORRILL.

United States Senate, May 29, 1872.

I concur in the foregoing statements; and on the point of the relative amount of liquors sold at present in Maine and in those States where a system of licence prevails, I am very sure from personal knowledge and observation that the sales are immeasurably less in Maine.

E. Y. BLAINE.

Senate Chamber, May 29, 1872.

I concur in the statements made by Mr. Frye. In the great good produced by the Prohibitory Liquor Law, of Maine, no man can doubt, who has seen its result. It has been of immense value.

H. HAMLIN.

House of Representatives.

We are satisfied that there is much less intemperance in Maine than formerly, and that the result is largely produced by what is termed prohibitory legislation.

JOHN A. PETERS, M.C. of Maine.

EUGENE HALL, M.C. of Maine.

I fully concur in the statement of my colleague Mr. Frye, in regard to the effect of the enforcement of the Liquor Law in the State of Maine. JOHN LYNCH, M. C. of Maine.

[These certificates are from both the Maine Senators and all the Maine representatives in Congress, Mr. Blaine being speaker, and holding really the second position in the Government.]

FROM MAYOR, EX-MAYORS, ETC., PORTLAND, MAINE, U.S.

Portland, May 28, 1872.

In reply to your request to us to state our impression as to the diminution of the liquor traffic in the State of Maine and particularly in this city, as the result of the adoption of the policy of prohibition, we have to say that the traffic has fallen off very largely. In relation to that there cannot possibly be any doubt.

Many persons with the best means of judging believe that the liquor trade now is not one-

tenth as large as it was formerly. We do not know but such an opinion is correct, but we content ourselves with saying that the diminution of the trade is very great, and the favourable effects of the policy of prohibition are manifest to the most casual observer.

BENJ. KINGSBURY, Jr., Mayor.
W. M. THOMAS, Ex-Mayor.
AUG. E. STEVENS, Ex-Mayor.
J. T. M'COBB, Ex-Mayor.
JACOB M'LELLAN, Ex-Mayor.

We are sure that the liquor trade is greatly diminished.

JOSEPH HOWARD, Ex-Mayor.
D. W. FESSINDEN, Clerk of all the Judicial Courts for Cumberland County.
EBEN. PERRY, Sheriff of Cumberland County.
WM. E. MORRIS, Judge of the Municipal Court.
WM. SENTER, Ex-Alderman.

We are of the decided opinion that the liquor trade is not one-tenth of what it was prior to the adoption of the Maine Law.

EBEN. LEACH, Register, Cumberland Co.
H. J. ROBINSON, City Clerk.
H. W. HERSEY, City Treasurer.
M. D. LANE, Judge, Sup. Court.

To Genl. Neal Dow.

FROM PASTORS OF VARIOUS CHURCHES IN PORTLAND.

Portland, May 31, 1872.

In answer to your question as to the effect of the Maine Law upon the traffic in strong drinks, we say, without hesitation, that the trade in intoxicating liquors has been greatly reduced by it.

In this city, the quantity sold now is but a small fraction of what we remember the sales to have been, and we believe the results are the same, or nearly so, throughout the State. If the trade exists at all here, it is carried on with secrecy and caution as other unlawful practices are. All our people must agree that the benefits of this state of things are obvious and very great.

J. J. CARRUTHERS, D.D., Pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Portland, Maine.
A. K. P. SMALL, Pastor of Free-street Baptist Church, Portland, Maine.
A. DALTON, Rector of St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal Church.
ISRAEL LUCE, Pastor of Chesnut-street Methodist Episcopal Church.
A. H. WRIGHT, Pastor of the St. Laurence-street Congregational Church.
W. E. GIBBS, Pastor of the First Universalist Church.
A. A. SMITH, Pastor of Casco-street Free Baptist Church.
BENJAMIN H. BAILEY, of the First Parish, Unitarian.
CHARLES W. BUCK, Second Unitarian Society.
D. H. HANABURGH, Pastor of the Pine-street M. E. Church.
GEORGE W. BICKNELL, Pastor of India-street Universalist Church.
W. H. SHAILER, D.D., Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Portland, Maine.

To General Dow.

FROM EX-MAYOR PUTNAM, PORTLAND, MAINE.

Portland, Maine, May 29, 1872.

My Dear Sir,—In reply to your inquiry, although never yet able to approve the principles of Prohibitory Liquor Laws, I must in candour state:—

I have had good opportunity to observe the condition of this State in the matter of the use and sale of intoxicating liquors for several years past, as compared with some other States where there are no prohibitory laws, and am certain that the rural portions of Maine are, and have been, in an infinitely better condition with reference to the sale and use of such liquors than similar portions of other States referred to; and are, and have been, moreover, comparatively free from both the sale and use; and this must fairly be considered the result of prohibitory legislation.

In the large towns and cities I have not observed, for the most part, any substantial difference in the above respects between this State and other States.

At the present time, however, the law is probably enforced even in large towns and cities as thoroughly, at least, as any other penal statute.

Any discussion as to whether as much could be accomplished by some other system, to my fancy more in accordance with that of a Republican people, is not called for by your inquiry.—
Very truly,
WILLIAM S. PUTNAM.

Hon. Neal Dow.

[Mr. Putnam was Mayor four years ago—a Democratic Mayor—and the Democratic party always went for license. Hence this testimony is specially valuable and significant.]

Mayor's Office, City of Bangor, May 30th, 1872.

Sir,—Your note is received, asking my opinion of the effect of the Maine Law upon the liquor trade in Bangor and in the State generally.

The various conflicting opinions often expressed arise from the fact that in some places, and at some times, there has been a lax administration of the law.

The yearly changes in town and city governments tempt politicians to use the law for their own advantage, permitting the sale more or less secretly in spite of the statute.

Last year the law was seldom enforced in our city; this year it has been.

The records of our police court show only about one-fifth the number of cases before it as compared with last year. For a portion of the year the *weekly* number of commitments to the station is about the same as the *daily* was last year.

The law is being enforced throughout the State as never before, and with wonderful success.

No resident of our State can have any doubt that the liquor traffic has been greatly repressed and reduced.

It is safe to say that in our city not one-tenth part as much is sold now as in years past, when the law was not enforced.—Your obedient servant,

J. S. WHEELWRIGHT, Mayor.

We fully concur in the above statement.

W. C. CROSBY and CHARLES HAYWARD, Aldermen for 1871 and 1872.

JOHN H. HAYES, City Clerk.

ENOCH POND, Professor in the Theological Seminary.

ALPHEUS LYON, Recorder of the Police Court of Bangor.

A. G. WAKEFIELD, ex-Mayor.

JOHN E. GODFREY, Judge of Probate.

JEREMIAH FENNO, Collector of Internal Revenues, 4th District Maine.

FROM THE SUPERVISOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE, DISTRICT MAINE, &c
Dover, N. H., May 31, 1872.

In answer to your inquiry, I have to say, that in the course of my duty as an Internal Revenue officer, I have become thoroughly acquainted with the state and extent of the liquor traffic in Maine, and I have no hesitation in saying that the beer trade is not more than 1 per cent of what I remember it to have been, and the trade in distilled liquors is not more than 10 per cent of what it was formerly.

The enforcement of the Prohibitory Law has pretty thoroughly suppressed the liquor traffic in this city. Where liquor is sold at all, it is done secretly, through fear of the law.—Yours truly,

WOLCOTT HAMLIN,

Supervisor of Int. Rev. Dist. of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

To Gen. Neal Dow.

FROM COL. ELLIOT, BRUNSWICK, MAINE, U.S.

Brunswick, Maine, June 3rd, 1872.

Dear General,—I think you can assure your English friends that the Maine Law is not a failure; but, on the contrary, almost a complete success. We are doing finely here. Scarce the least evidence of strong drink in town.—With much esteem, your obedient servant,

To General Neal Dow.

DANL. ELLIOT.

[Brunswick is a manufacturing town with a great water power—the seat of Bowdoin College—a railway centre—a most flourishing and beautiful place.—N. D.]

FROM GENERAL CHAMBERLAINE, EX-GOVERNOR OF MAINE, U.S.

Brunswick, Maine, June 3rd, 1872.

Sir,—Colonel Elliot has shown to us your request for a certificate from us as to the condition of the liquor traffic in Maine, under the operation of the Maine Law—the certificate to be sent to England.

The declaration made by many persons that the Maine Law is inoperative, and that liquors are sold freely and in large quantities in this State, is not true. The liquor traffic has been greatly repressed and diminished here and throughout the State, and in many places has been entirely swept away. The law is as well executed generally in the State as other criminal laws are.

Many persons think that there is not one-tenth so much liquor sold in the State as there was formerly. While we prefer not to certify to any particular degree of repression of the traffic, we say without reserve that if liquors are sold at all, it is in very small quantities compared with the old times, and in a secret way, as other unlawful things are done.

JOSHUA L. CHAMBERLAINE.

To General Neal Dow.

GEO. C. CRAWFORD, Postmaster.

[General Chamberlaine was Governor of this State for four years preceding the term of the present governor. He is now President of Bowdoin College, at Brunswick.]

FROM CONVENTION OF PASTORS OF FREE BAPTIST CHURCHES,
IN MAINE, UNITED STATES.

Portland, May 31st, 1872.

To whom it may concern. It is often said by persons—unfriendly to the temperance cause, and to the policy of Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic—that the Maine Law has failed to accomplish its purpose, and that intoxicating drinks are as freely and as largely sold in Maine as they were formerly, and as they now are in States where the traffic is licensed by law.

Now we, the undersigned, Pastors of Free Baptist Churches, in various parts of Maine, assembled at a denominational convention in Portland, state that the liquor traffic is very greatly diminished under the repressive power of the Maine Law. It cannot be one tithe of what it was formerly; and where it is continued at all, it is with secrecy and caution, as other unlawful practices are.

The grog shops are by the law put into the same category with gambling houses and brothels, and are prohibited because they are at war with the interests of the State and the people.

Approved by vote of Conference unanimously,
(Signed),

A. A. SMITH, Chairman.

N. F. EATON, Clerk.

H. WHITCHER, Laccorappa.

A. F. HUTCHINSON, New Gloucester.

J. M. BAILEY, Laco.

A. G. HILL, Buxton.

A. A. SMITH, Portland.

C. F. PENNEY, Augusta.

E. H. COOKE, Gorham.

G. C. ANDREWS, Lewiston.

C. B. PECKHAM, South Parsonsfield.

A. REDLON, Dexter.

O. BARTLETT, Cornish.

A. S. MCLEAN, Gray.

G. W. HORNE, Harrison.

[These signers are all ministers of religion from different parts of the State of Maine, distant from each other.]

FROM THE RECTOR ST. STEPHEN'S PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
PORTLAND.

Portland, Maine, June 4, 1872.

My dear General,—I was surprised to learn from you that the cause of temperance is damaged in England by an impression that it has been retarded here from the Maine Law and similar enactments.

That the contrary is true I feel sure and am certain that it is, within the sphere of my observation for the past fifteen years.

Many, in the humble classes of society particularly, have correct views, and form good resolutions, which they carry out successfully when not solicited to drink by the open bar.

Many wives have assured me of the improved condition of their families through the greater restraints put upon their husbands.

Families whose homes are in drinking neighbourhoods, or in streets where formerly were many drunken brawls, have gratefully acknowledged the happy change wrought by the due administration of the law suppressing tippling shops.

To make this law a still greater blessing all that is needed is to enforce it as faithfully in the future as at the present time.—Truly yours,

Hon. Neal Dow.

A. DALTON.

FROM CONVENTION OF GOOD TEMPLARS, MAINE, U.S.

In convention of the Good Templars, held at Cape Elizabeth, Maine, May 29, 1872, it was unanimously

Resolved,—That the Chairman of this convention certify, in the name of the convention, to the friends of temperance in Great Britain—

That, by the operation of the Maine Law, in this State, the traffic in intoxicating drinks has been greatly diminished, and that the happy effects of this change are everywhere apparent.

That, in this town, where formerly the people were great sufferers from strong drink, there are none now sold at all, either openly or secretly; and generally throughout the state, where the liquor traffic yet lingers, it is covertly, as other offences against the law do; and that the quantity of liquors now sold in this State cannot be one-tenth as much as it was formerly.

Signed in and on behalf of the convention,

DANIEL R. DRESSER, Chairman.

[This convention was held in a Wesleyan Church, which was packed full, and many were standing for want of seats.]

We append to the foregoing a letter from General Neal Dow, through whose kind courtesy these testimonials have been forwarded to the Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance. Mr. Dow's own testimony is amply sufficient, seeing that no one is better acquainted with facts, or better able to observe and describe the workings and results of the Prohibitory Liquor Laws of Maine. But seeing that certain honourable gentlemen in Parliament persistently misrepresent the facts, Mr. Dow deemed it proper, in the interests of the noble cause he has devotedly and disinterestedly aided for so many years, to procure the written and deliberate testimony of the highest officials and public men of the State. Will Mr. Bruce or Lord Kimberley refuse to listen to these witnesses?

LETTER FROM GENERAL NEAL DOW.

Portland, June, 1872.

My dear Mr. Barker,—Thanks for the London papers containing a report of the debate of May 8th, in the House of Commons, on the Permissive Bill of Sir Wilfrid Lawson. I was greatly interested in all the speeches, especially in that of the junior member for Derby—Mr. Bass, the great brewer, being the senior member. The speech of Dr. Magee, bishop of Peterborough, I had seen and wondered at before. I admired it for its admirable logic, and especially for the noble sentiment—that he had rather see England drunk and free, than sober and not free; which, being rendered into plain English, means that he had rather England would be drunk with plenty of public-houses all through the country, than to be sober, the people having themselves put away the grog shops! That, coming from a bishop, must be all right, but from a licensed victualler it would be horrible. Grog shops and liberty, I know is the publican's idea of freedom; but now it is consecrated by a bishop! The member for Derby made a very rapid run through this country. He came here to find out about us—all about us. To a man of ordinary intelligence and ordinary powers of observation and perception, the time he gave to us was hardly sufficient to enable him to understand us and our institutions thoroughly, but I believe he accomplished that.

He was one night in Washington, I think, but that was sufficient, and he knows all about us and our institutions. The President, Heads of Departments, the Senate and House of Representatives were not presented to him; however eager they may have been for the honour, he did not give them time—he came away suddenly as he went, but not before he had mastered the whole subject. He thinks our Government a failure, and our institutions bad—not but something might be made of them, if only we had “public men of ability” and character. Our “great want is public men.” I wonder if we could not import a few? Could not you spare some from your abundance? Not those in favour of grog-shops; we've enough of them.

Yes, we are a sad lot altogether. It is something in our favour, to be sure, that we come of English blood, and in time, that may bring us through, but at present we seem to be going to the dogs very fast. We have a great country to be sure, a country capable of great things, if only we had “public men”—such as—a-hem!

Mr. Plimsoll came to Portland to embark for home, and stayed here two nights and a day, I believe, and improved the day in making explorations about the operation of the Maine Law. He did not come to me until that work was done and finished, as I saw at once when we met. He went to the “city agency” and bought a pint of whisky, which he thinks the agent should not have sold to him. That pint of whisky being from Portland, made more of a show in his speech, than a ship-load of English whisky would have done. How the honourable members did gloat over that poor pint of whisky, or that pint of poor whisky, whichever it was. And so he made a great “to-do” about that pint of drink.

Now, it happens that some time before, a gentleman—a stranger—went to the agency for some liquor and was refused. He declared that it was for medicine, he had a sick child who must have it, or die, he said, but the drink was refused. And so he made a great row in the public papers because he did not get his liquor, just as the member for Derby has on the floor of the Commons because he did get it. What is the explanation? In the first case the customer looked like a drinking man, and so the agent did not believe him, and would not let him have the drink. In the second case the customer did not look like a drinking man, the agent did believe him and let him have the drink. In both cases the customers went for the same purpose, to find subject of fault in the establishment, and found it. The one, because he could not get the liquor, the other because he could and did. I wonder if these people ever read the fable of “The Man and the Ass?”

But the hon. member for Derby went to a public office to learn more about the shortcomings of the Maine Law, and learned it. There were several officials in the office at the time, all of them but one, temperance men and warm friends of the Maine Law. The one was pronounced in his unfriendliness, not only to the law but to the cause of temperance as we understand it. Upon a perfectly flat and smooth surface, if two globules of quicksilver be put in motion, they will soon find each other out and coalesce. So it was with the Derby M.P. and the official. Each seemed to have found his “affinity” instantly in the other. And so these two gentlemen had a good time—a downright good time.

I have an admirable photographic account of that wonderful and satisfactory interview from one of the officials who was present, and who is a master in mimicry. He has set a roomful in a roar many a time in acting out that interview between the “sucker” and the member for Derby. To hear him and not see him, any one who is at all familiar with the great speakers in the House of Commons, would think he was himself a member of that august body—sure. Mr. Disraeli himself is not a more perfect master of the parliamentary stammer than this wag of an official, when he plays off that meeting of two kindred souls; it is as good as Lord Dundreary at Covent Garden.

There are a great many of us who have lived much longer in Portland and Maine than your honourable member did, and who know much more about our condition than he can. I send you testimonials from some of these, which will be satisfactory to all who wish to know what the facts really are. I could have multiplied these certificates to any extent, and from every part of the state, but it was hardly worth the while to trouble you with more of them. The member for Derby told what was told to him; these testimonials are from persons living on the spot and certifying to the facts as they know them to be, personally.

But of course your noble lords, spiritual and temporal, and your Commons who stand by the grogshops—those ancient landmarks—always and at all events will dislike the Maine Law and the Permissive Bill more than ever. Under the glowing and mellifluous periods of the member they professed to dislike the Maine Law because it didn't suppress the grogshops, and they opposed the Permissive Bill because it wouldn't and couldn't put down the traffic in intoxicants. Now, I'm sure they'll dislike both law and bill more than ever, for the opposite reasons.

Well, you'll correct all that, by-and-by, at the ballot-box—by voting resolutely against any man who will not represent your convictions on this subject, as the publicans will against those who will not stand by their interests as against the interests of the country. You have on your hands an "irrepressible conflict" between the public welfare and the liquor traffic, as we had a few years ago between slavery and freedom. It is not difficult to predict as to which of these interests will triumph in the end. The controversy is incapable of settlement except on principles in accordance with the general interests.—Most truly yours,
NEAL DOW.

MORE TESTIMONIES FROM MAINE.

(From the Alliance News, June 29th, 1872.)

We have this week to present to our readers several more very valuable testimonies from Maine, declaratory of the successful working of the Prohibitory Liquor Laws of the State. These testimonies, it will be observed, are all from public men in responsible positions, who must know whereof they affirm, and whose testimony must be taken as evidence of the most weighty and conclusive kind. The Secretary of State, a member of the Executive Council of the State Legislature, the late State Constable of Maine, the Mayor of Augusta (Maine), an Adjutant General, and the members of the Board of Overseers of the Poor of Portland, all testify to the same effect—the diminution of drinking, drunkenness, crime, pauperism, &c.—under the operation of the Maine Liquor Law in the State of Maine. The county gaol—the only gaol in the entire county of Oxford, Maine—is entirely empty. Mr. Dow, in sending these testimonies to the Secretary of the Alliance, says: "I could easily have obtained similar certificates and better from every town in the State. Many persons signing them said they 'would go much further than that,' but I thought it best to put it so moderate that no one could object." We think that no one, after reading these testimonies, will have the recklessness to quote with approval the loose and cursory reports of Mr. Powell, Mr. Plimsoll, or any other casual visitor to America.

HON. E. G. HARLOW, MAINE.

Dixfield, Oxford County, Maine, June 4th, 1872.

I take pleasure in answering your inquiry as to the present extent of the traffic in intoxicating liquors in Maine. I have been travelling over the State considerably this spring, and am satisfied the traffic has been very much reduced.

I am thoroughly acquainted with my own county (Oxford), and do not hesitate to say there is not now a gallon of liquor sold where there was a barrel before the Maine Law of 1851.

At our last term of Supreme Judicial Court, in March, not a single indictment for any crime was found. Our [county] jail is empty; our workhouse greatly reduced; and the improvement wonderful.—Truly your friend,

General Dow.

E. G. HARLOW,
Member of Executive Council in Maine.

FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE, MAINE, &c.

Augusta, June, 1872.

Your request is received, asking us to state an opinion as to the present extent of the liquor traffic in Maine as compared with its condition in former times. There cannot be any difference of opinion among intelligent citizens of the State as to the fact that the traffic is greatly less than we remember it to have been.

If we were to say that the quantity of liquors sold here is not one-tenth so large as formerly, we think it would be within the truth; and the favourable effects of the change upon all the interests of the State are plainly seen everywhere.

J. J. EVELETH, Mayor of Augusta, Maine.
JOSHUA NYE, Augusta, late State Constable.
G. G. STACY, Secretary of State.
B. B. MURRAY, Adjutant-General.

General Dow.

FROM CITY MARSHAL, EX-MAYORS, &c.

Saco, Maine, June 10, 1872.

Sir,—Mr. Hill, of this city, has presented to us your request for a certificate as to the fact whether there has been or not a diminution of the liquor trade under the operation of the Maine Law.

We reply that the decrease of that traffic has been very great. In many parts of the State it has been entirely suppressed; and, so far as we know and believe, it does not exist anywhere in the State, except covertly, as a thing under the ban of the law.

JOSEPH HOBSON, ex-Mayor.
MOSES LOWELL, ex-Mayor.
OBADIAH DURGIN, City Marshal.
CHAS. HILL, late Member of Legislature.

To General Neal Dow.

FROM THE OVERSEERS OF THE POOR OF PORTLAND.

Office of Overseers of the Poor, Portland, June 4, 1872.

We reply to your inquiry as to the condition of the liquor traffic "in this city," as compared with what we remember it to have been formerly, that it is very much less than it was before the Maine Law.

It liquor shops exist at all in this city it is with secrecy and great caution, and the same thing is true generally throughout the State.

The favourable effect of this policy is very evident, particularly in the department of pauperism and crime. While the population of the city increases, pauperism and crime diminish, and in the department of police the number of arrests and commitments is very much less than formerly.

JOHN BRADFORD, Chairman.	
J. C. SHIRLEY	} Overseers of the Poor of Portland.
F. E. PRAY	
ISAAC JACKSON	
HENRY H. BURGESS	
S. C. CHACE	
CHAS. HOLDEN	
JOHN TRUE	

To General Neal Dow.

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH OF HON. WM. P. FRYE, EX-ATTORNEY-GENERAL, MAINE.

The following is from a speech recently delivered by the Hon. Mr. Frye, M.C., Maine, at a public meeting in New Jersey:—"Mr. Frye said the law was thoroughly enforced to-day in every town of 5,000 inhabitants or under. In the two cities in his district of 10,000 each, not a drop of liquor could be bought in any of the hotels. Possibly in some low den some of the vile stuff may be obtained, but no stranger could find it. It has been enforced all over the State, but not to the same extent. In some large cities liquor is sold, but so are robberies and murders committed. It is enforced as well in proportion as are other laws, and when men say, 'The Maine liquor law is a failure,' they are greatly mistaken, or tell a deliberate lie. There is peace, and plenty, and happiness, there are tens of thousands of happy homes all over the State, because of this law. Its influence is not confined to Maine. The Maine law compels you to meet here to-day. The growing feeling all over the country is due principally to the Maine law. It assured public sentiment all over the land. Law will create public sentiment, and, before you know it, public sentiment will come up to law. The law had taken hold of the people of Maine, and lifted them up to the level with the law. All the public men in the State are in favour of the law. It is a crime to sell. And when it is made a crime to sell, people will begin to think it is time not to participate in the drinking of liquor. There is no trouble in executing a law with such a public sentiment. Of sixty indictments in one court in his county, all pleaded guilty, because they knew the juries would convict."