

counterfeiter, or the tainted meat of the butcher, or the adulterated food of the grocer. And yet none of these have produced half the amount of evil that strong drink has done. The alarm bell is rung, a fire is pacing its way with rapid strides. If that building be not removed, the entire block will go; orders are given that it be blown up. Can the proprietor reasonably complain or demand compensation? The pestilence is mowing down its victims; the public authorities issue a proclamation that all vegetables and fruits exposed for sale be destroyed; that ships ride at quarantine, and that the most costly freight, if judged to be infected; be summarily thrown overboard. It is warm weather, dogs running wild are seized and shot. In all these cases there is direct interference with private property; far more indeed than the Maine Law sanctions. Would you venture to say, it was wrong? And yet drinking has done far more damage than ever fire, or pestilence, or mad dogs have done. It has been shrewdly asked—"Who would listen to any man" hawking about freedom of trade, when the magistrate was taking means that honest men, who were no soldiers, should not sleep (if sleep they could) above a mine, or make their beds above a powder magazine, neither bomb nor lightning proof; nor be proof against such stupidity as that of the country lass who told her master, on his asking her when she returned from the cellar, what she had done with the candle; that she had left it below, and stuck it into the "caskie with the neep seed," which "caskie with the neep seed" was nothing else than an open keg of gunpowder, sufficient to blow them all into "eternity." Comfortable doctrine assuredly. There are other "kegs" in our own City fully as dangerous. Barnes puts the case very sensibly in another form, "If a man should set up a *Bakery* in this City in which, by the infusion of a deleterious drug into his bread, he will endanger the public health, Society would not hesitate a moment in regarding this as a proper subject for legislation, and would never dream of tolerating it or taxing it, or regulating it, or licensing it. If, from the bakeries of this City, bread of such a character should go forth for a single morning, and there was a general consort and understanding among the bakers, to continue this practice as the regular line of their business—if there was not *law* enough in the community to put a stop to it, there would not be *patience and forbearance* enough to prevent a storm of public indignation that would in a day lay every such bakery in ruins. There are not as many bakeries in this City as there are houses for selling intoxicating liquors." Blackstone, the great British Law Commentator, lays it expressly down that "be a man ever so abandoned in his principles or vicious in his practice, provided he keep his wickedness to himself, and does not offend against the rules of public decency, he is out of the reach of human laws. But if he makes his vices public, though they be such as seem principally to affect himself (*as drunkenness and the like*) they then become, by the bad example they set, of pernicious effect to Society; and therefore it is then the business of human laws to convict them."

Chancellor Kent, the learned expounder of American law, establishes substantially the same principle. "The Government may, by general regulations, interdict such uses of property, as would create nuisances, and become dangerous to the lives, or health, or peace, or comfort of the citizens. Unwholesome trades operations offensive to the senses, the deposit of powder, the building with combustible material, and the burial of the dead, may be interdicted by law in the midst of dense masses of population on the general and natural principle that every person ought so to use his property as not to injure his neighbours, and that private interest must be made subservient to the general interest of the community."

IV. But some niggardly purse-bearer starts up and tauntingly cries, "To what purpose is this waste?" What waste? Why you, cannot but be aware that this is a remunerative traffic. It puts a great deal every year into the public chest. If your views be carried out all this will be lost. Well, what if it should? Why, friend, you look only to one side of the account. For one