

of our streets, in the concourse of the people, much more cognizable offences in its *tableaux vivants*?

If prohibitory laws protect the very stone at our grave from ruthless fingers, how much more ought they to defend from that, which destroys the image of God in the soul, blots out conscience and throws down the only monument of our immortality.

If the stupid ox, which indeed knoweth its owner, is protected from inhuman treatment, under a penalty of \$200, how much more need of the protection of 'prohibitory' law has the fool, whom "though thou shouldst bray in a mortar, among wheat with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him."

If the cognomen *prohibitory* or *sumptuary*, when attached to laws, constitutes a valid objection to their enactment, then society has not the means of self-preservation. Of all subjects for legislation, we conceive intemperance a fair one,—and the multiform evils growing out of it, make it 'a heinous crime; yea, it is an iniquity to be punished by the Judge's Law.'

[From Quarterly Report, July 2d, 1852, of W. H. Hadley, Minister at Large.]

"For six months past I have given much attention to the subject of temperance. Intemperance being the great inducing cause of almost all the suffering, poverty, and vice among the poor, with which I have come in contact in exercising the duties of my office, I cannot consider this subject as foreign to my appropriate calling.

Previous to the passage of the recent Liquor Bill, I assisted in finding out 170 places where intoxicating liquors were illegally sold and drunk. We obtained a great amount of statistics of the traffic and its effects, which the peerless Liquor Bill in question is likely to render useless. We have persuaded many to sign the pledge, which they will find little difficulty in keeping when there are no intoxicating drinks to be obtained, I deem it worthy of remark that all the *lower class* of drunkards of my acquaintance are in favor of the law and anxious to have it thoroughly executed. They say, "only take away the temptation and we shall do well enough." One of these unfortunate men, who lives within a stone's cast of nine liquor shops, said to me yesterday, exultingly, "they are all closed now—not a drop is to be had at one of them—but such long faces as their owners wear, especially on Sundays, I never saw before." If the poor inebriates are praying for the execution of the law—and many of them most assurdly are—we cannot view the "putting of the bottle to such men and making them drink," but with redoubled abhorrence. Under such circumstances, nothing but the most reckless disregard of God and man, could induce any one to do anything to favour this most nefarious traffic, or to violate a law the most salutary and needful to human progress, ever enacted on earth. I should consider its repeal without a substitute equally salutary and stringent, a greater calamity than all the plagues of Egypt poured upon our land at once.

The Throne of Iniquity.

We are happy to know that Mr. Barnes' sermon, entitled "The Throne of Iniquity," has been preached and printed in England. It will do great good. An abridgement of it has also been published in America, and we here insert it. Let it be read with attention, and then get the whole sermon as soon as you can. It is a masterly and eloquent production. The text is—

"Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law?"—Psalm 94, 20.

A "throne of iniquity" is a throne of government that is founded on iniquity, or that sustains iniquity. Such a throne or government "frames mischief by a law," when by its laws it protects or patronises that which is evil, or when those who practise evil may plead that what they do is legal, and may take refuge under the laws of the land. God makes no law to protect or prohibit and condemn.

A law framed to protect evil, is a method of framing mischief by a law. A law which assumes that a thing is wrong, and yet tolerates it; which attempts only to check and regulate it without utterly prohibiting it! which makes that which is morally wrong, legal, is one of those things in human affairs with which the throne of God can have no fellowship. A law, for instance,

which should assume that lotteries, gaming establishments or brothels, are evil, and of pernicious tendency in a community, and which should nevertheless authorize them, though under any restrictions, would be such a form of "framing mischief by a law," as could have no "fellowship" with the "throne of God."

An evil always becomes worse by being sustained by the laws of the land. The good are deterred from opposing it, for they do not wish to seem to be arrayed against the laws. The bad are confirmed in their course, for they feel that they are sustained by the laws of the land, and for them that is enough.

The same thing is true when there is an attempt, not directly to sustain and countenance the evil as such, but to regulate it.—God never does this in his government; for his laws lends no sanction to that which is wrong, does nothing to regulate it, has no provisions for deriving a benefit from it. It prohibits and condemns; and that is all. But much is done to countenance the evil when the law seeks to regulate it; to check it but not to remove it; to tax it; to derive a revenue from it; and to make supplemental provisions for the mischiefs which grow up under its own enactments.

The laws in relation to the traffic in intoxicating drinks in this country have been, in the main, enacted on the principles just alluded to. The traffic has been admitted to be so full of peril that it needed to be checked and regulated, and the laws have been made on the supposition that it could not be thrown open indiscriminately to all classes of citizens. Hence it has been supposed that a special permission or "license" was necessary in order to guard the traffic, and that not a license, as in the case of dry goods and tin-ware, on the sole ground of raising a revenue, but on the ground that it was dangerous, and that, therefore, it should be entrusted only to those to whom the community could confide with the additional idea that the State had a right to raise a revenue from it, as a compensation for the protection extended to it. There was once such legislation about lotteries; there has been such, in some countries, about licentiousness; but with none few exceptions, it is believed there is no such legislation on any other subject now in the world.

The time has come when it is improper to inquire whether this is the true principle on the subject of the traffic in strong drinks; whether a great and acknowledged evil can ever be suppressed in this way; or, whether it should be wholly prohibited by law, accompanied with suitable penalties. The evils of intemperance are in all respects so great, and are, in spite of all the legal enactments now existing in most of the States, so far spread and spreading in the land; the loss to the nation in its moral character, and in its productive industry, is so great; the costs of prosecuting for crime committed under the influence of intoxicating drinks, and the tax to support paupers made by intemperance, are so great; the failure of the appeals made by argument and moral persuasion are, in painful respects, so manifest; the woes and lamentations caused by intemperance come up still so loud and so piercing from all parts of the land; the ruin of the body and the soul of a human being is so dreadful; and the fact that tens of thousands of our countrymen are annually sent to a dishonorable grave as the result of the "drinking usages of society"—these things are forcing the inquiry upon the public mind, whether it is or is not proper and practicable to prohibit the traffic altogether, and whether this is not the point which legislation must reach, and should reach, in regard to this great evil.

We have not now the point to argue that it is right and proper to legislate in regard to this traffic. That point is acted on by all the legislatures in the land, and acquiesced in by the people. It is assumed in all the laws which pertain to the importation of spirituous liquor; by all the statutes which relate to "licensing" public houses to sell it; by all the enactments in the several States to regulate the sale.

We have not now the point to argue that it is right to make laws, in certain cases, prohibiting the sale. The laws have always assumed that it is right to prohibit the sale by large classes of the citizens, for the laws entrusted the sale to a selected few, and restrained all others.

We have not now the point to argue that the Maine Law is conformable to the Constitution of the United States, for this point has been settled by the highest judicial authority in the land. In the celebrated "License cases," involving the constitutionality of laws passed by the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire, for "discouraging the use of ardent