

RELIGIOUS SUMMARY.

From the Gospel Witness.

HOME MISSIONS.

Cheering from Michigan—less speculation—the Convention—ministers—how to do when funds are low.

Brother J. Hall, missionary at Kalamazoo, thus writes the Secretary of the Society:

The cause is gradually strengthening in this vicinity. There is less speculation and worldly mindedness among professors of religion than formerly, and more devotedness to the cause of Christ. Throughout the state the cause is gradually advancing. At our State Convention I was made greatly to rejoice and take courage in view of the numbers of pious and intelligent ministers who have been brought to this State chiefly by your society. Leaving myself out of this account, I think I can truly say that your missionaries are men of God and that their labors will prove a great blessing to Michigan. What is very interesting, they seem to be of one heart and one mind. God has laid broad the foundation for his Zion in Michigan, and I trust the superstructure reared under the direction of the great Master builder, will be magnificent and glorious. We have many important towns yet to be supplied, and we greatly need a few missionaries to travel in some of the newest counties where there are but few or no churches. I could point out an interesting and important field of labor to several.

But when I learn the state of your treasury I have to say to my clerical correspondents at the east, come on with the tide of emigration; place yourself in the midst of some district of country which is rapidly settling, and form a circle whose diameter is fifteen or twenty miles, gather a congregation, organize a Sabbath school and Bible class, and if you can find members, constitute a church—build a meeting house, and earn a competent salary; and though you may have to do without bread in this life, you shall not fail of your reward in the next. Affectionately yours,

JEREMIAH HALL.

From the Petersburg Intelligencer.

Declaration of a Reclaimed Infidel.

Dr. John E. Cooke, professor of the Theory and Practice of Physic in Transylvania University, though once a member of the infidel corps, thus concludes an Introductory Lecture* to a medical class:

"I unhesitatingly say, not only that I am perfectly convinced of the truth of the Christian revelation, from a close and patient examination of its claims on the testimony presented; but that I believe, that better testimony could not be offered, could not be devised in support of it, and that no man is left unconvinced, who has given the subject a thorough investigation, unless he is kept from it by a state of mind the most deplorable which we can conceive—a state of enmity against the God that made him, and the Savior who redeemed him, leading him to refuse to

The work of God is glorious in New-ton. It is beyond description. The oldest people say they never saw such a revival in that place before. To God be all the glory. The work first appeared in power on the 21st ult. Since that time between fifty and sixty have either found peace in believing, or are deeply anxious and have openly declared their determination to seek to become christians. I have baptized four; one of whom is a son of Elder Leavell, of North Hampton.—*Ch. Jour.*

The same paper says:

We rejoice to learn that brother Green of Calais, Vt. is now enjoying a pleasant revival in Bradford, where he has recently baptized 14 persons, and others are soon to obey the same command.

We learn by a christian brother from Bristol, that an interesting work of grace is in progress on Miscongus Island, Bristol. We also learn that 5 were to have been baptized last Lord's day.—*Zion's Advocate.*

We learn by the Advocate that a Baptist church was organized in the North part of Bangor, on the 17th ult. The following is the closing part of the account.—*N. H. Bap. Reg.*

The season was harmonious and delightful. But what gave the greatest interest to the occasion was the presence of the Holy Spirit. A pleasing work of grace had been progressing in that neighborhood for some weeks. Bro. H. H. Smith of Bangor Institution, has been a special instrument in promoting the revival. Last Lord's day I preached in that place to a crowded assembly and baptized 4 willing converts, who were "the same day added" to the Church.

The revival seems to be but in its first stages. May it increase, till this "little one shall become a thousand."

At the late meeting of the Vermont Bap. State Convention, a plain and candid letter was prepared and adopted, addressed to every Baptist Church in the Southern States, on the subject of Slavery. *New Hampshire Baptist Register.*

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, NOV. 25, 1837.

THE CIRCULAR OF THE STATE CONVENTION.

The "Religious Herald," the Baptist paper for Virginia, published at Richmond, in noticing the doings of the Vermont Baptist State Convention, after expressing an opinion that its last anniversary was a "profitable and interesting meeting," has the following remarks in regard to the Anti-Slavery Circular:

"The Committee on the subject of slavery, reported a circular condemning, in strong terms, the sinfulness of slavery, and urging the churches to exclude slaveholders from fellowship. It was ordered by the Convention that the Circular be published in the Vermont Telegraph, and

It leaves the poor sinner to find his own way, and help himself, out of the horrible pit; and Satan, in his own time and way, to overthrow his own kingdom. What could be more anomalous—what more absurd? Who ever thought of leaving it exclusively with the worshippers of the Beast to plan and execute the downfall of Babylon? Did it ever once enter your head, brother Sands, to leave the wretched, benighted pagans to find and apply the remedy for the follies and sins of idolatry?

You say that "all foreign interference will only tend to rivet more strongly the fetters of those the abolitionists profess to benefit." If this were true, it is only proof of the incorrigible wickedness of those whom the abolitionists are laboring to bring to repentance. It is no proof that the abolitionists are not in the way of duty. The fact that Pharaoh "riveted more strongly the fetters of those" whom Moses, the patriarch of abolitionists, required him to emancipate, was no proof that Moses was not obeying the Lord and doing his duty.

To convince abolitionists that they are doing wrong; or to deter them from their present work, it will require better arguments and other truths than the mere fact that modern Pharaohs are engaged, and are increasing the burdens on the suffering victims of their power and lust. The day comes that will search out the matter, and will show to the universe who receives the punishment for the present suffering of the oppressed. To that day, and to the tribunal then to sit, abolitionists have deliberately and fully made up their minds to carry their appeal, and hazard the results.

But it is not true that the labors of abolitionists have been, and are, so fruitless, and worse than fruitless, as you seem to suppose. The slaveholders are not all so foolhardy and incorrigible as you imagine. Hundreds of slaves have already been liberated, as the direct results of the present abolition movements; the consciences of thousands of slaveholders are now on the rack; the foundations of the great deep of American oppression are breaking up; and although the storm of man's wrath may for awhile beat heavily on some devoted heads, the day of deliverance draws near,—for the storm of God's wrath cannot long be stayed from the heads of boasting oppressors,—so that, in the one way or the other, a glorious jubilee will be effected, and that speedily; and, that day of final reckoning will show that abolitionists have obeyed God and done their duty.

You "entreat" us "to confine" our "labors to bringing sinners to a knowledge of the truth." The exhortation, with our own construction upon it, shall not be wholly unheeded. But you must not require us

CONSTITUTION OF THE VERMONT PEACE SOCIETY, ADOPTED AUG. 17, 1837.

I. This Society shall be called the Vermont Peace Society, auxiliary to the American Peace Society.

II. This Society, being founded on the principle that all war is contrary to the spirit of the gospel, shall have for its object to illustrate the inconsistency of war with Christianity, to show its baneful influence on all the great interests of mankind, and to devise means for insuring universal and permanent peace.

III. Any person may become a member of this Society, by signing its constitution, conforming to the spirit of the foregoing article, and paying one dollar at the time of signing, and one dollar annually thereafter.

IV. Every member shall be entitled, without further charge, to some peace periodical, and every contributor to one half the amount of what he contributes to the publications of the American Peace Society.

V. The officers of the society shall be a President, Vice Presidents, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not less than five, with power to supply all vacancies in any office of the Society; and to superintend its general concerns until successors are chosen.

VI. The annual meeting of this Society, for the choice of officers, the hearing of reports from the Secretary and Treasurer, and the transaction of the incidental business, shall be held at such time and place as the Executive Committee may appoint.

VII. The Constitution may be altered on recommendation of the Executive Committee, or of any six members of the Society, by a vote of two-thirds present at any regular meeting.

I now have the same question to put to the Vermont Society, which was before put to the American Society, and I shall not be satisfied and think the consistent friends of Peace generally will not—until it is answered unequivocally.

The question is this: *What is meant, when the constitution of this Society says that "ALL WAR IS CONTRARY TO THE SPIRIT OF THE GOSPEL?"* Does it, or does it not, include war defensive as well as offensive—repulsive as well as aggressive?

Brother Allen says, "The language is plain and intelligible,—and we understand it to mean just what it says and nothing more or less. Any other construction which either you or any other individual may put upon it is *unfair and inadmissible*." No one would have thought—at least I should not—of putting any other construction on the constitution of the American Society

than the inclusion of defensive war, as it seems to read, had it not been otherwise construed by that Society itself, in the mouth of its Corresponding Secretary and authorized agent. If the construction which

pleasure? What, of that *Total Abstinence* society whose members are allowed, by express permission of the society, to drink as much alcohol as they please, *under the name of wine?*

So, friends, I call on you once more, to do yourselves the justice to explain. An intelligent Christian public will not be satisfied, under the circumstances, with barely being told that "the language is plain and intelligible," and by the Executive Committee understood "to mean just what it says and nothing more or less." They would have been satisfied with the constitution as it reads; and no question would have been raised, either by them or by me, as to its meaning—for all would have considered it to be perfectly radical, and all consistent friends of the cause would have viewed it to be perfectly sound, so far as the main principle is concerned—had it not been construed by a part of its signers, with the consent of the other part, at the time of attaching their signatures, to mean "less" than to prohibit even the signers themselves FIGHTING AND SLAYING IN DEFENCE.

In view of the fact that such was the construction at the time of organization, what must be thought of, or what shall be done with, your assertion that "any other construction," (except as the Executive Committee "understand it to mean,") put upon the constitution by "any other individual," is "unfair and inadmissible?" Here, for aught that appears—you "understanding it to mean" the prohibition of killing in defense—you are your own accusers: for "other individuals" did give it "another construction," when they signed it; and, what is more, you consented to the deed!

I am perfectly content that the "public judge of the fairness and justice of" my "remarks appended to the late Circular."—Furthermore, I am greatly mistaken if the public do not join with me in reiterating my call on the Executive Committee for explanation. The question yet unanswered is, *does, or does not, the Vermont Peace Society condemn, as sinful, in its own members and all others, fighting and killing in defence?* Answer this question which way you will, you owe it to yourselves to explain. And you certainly owe it to yourselves, to the Society in whose behalf you speak, and to the public, to answer the question, explicitly, unequivocally, and unequivocally.

For the Vermont Telegraph.

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

Mr. Editor:—I was much pleased at noticing in your last number a brief article on brother Wm. Miller's doctrine concerning the second coming of Christ, and with your remarks on the same. Especially am I pleased to learn from yourself, that a review

For the Telegraph.

The Vermont Legislature vs. the interdiction of the rum-traffic.

Mr. Murray, Sir:—With your permission, I will send Mr. Dee, of Georgia, a (left-handed) compliment for his perseverance in his labors to further the cause of rum-selling and ruin. Should you give this a place in your paper, I would first let the readers of the Telegraph know what I refer to. It is a resolution offered by Mr. Dee, at the last sitting of the Vermont Legislature, which is in substance as follows:

"Resolved, That the Legislature has no constitutional right to abolish the traffic in ardent spirit."

I will now ask Mr. Dee, were you, as the Vermont Watchman and Journal supposes, honestly of the opinion that the case is as the resolution represents? If you were, I will ask you whether you ever studied the ground work of a republican governmental compact? If you have, I wish you to tell me what you did, with common sense while you were studying it? If those who are appointed by the many, to make laws for the benefit of the many, do not have a constitutional right to do it, I should say it is high time the constitution was altered. How long, Sir, do you suppose a physician would be permitted to spread the small pox, or any other loathsome and dangerous disease, for his own benefit, before the Legislature would say to him, go no farther? I suppose no one doubts its constitutional right to say thus; and to such an act, the people would respond, *Amen*.

Some, and perhaps yourself would say that the spreading of the small pox, and the vending of ardent spirit as a drink by individuals for their own benefit, are not analogous. If so, I beg leave to say in return, that in a number of points they are analogous. 1. The drinking of ardent spirit, by a person in perfect health, is no more a real benefit to him than to have the small pox. 2. He will be as liable to die with the disease of intemperance, as he would with the small pox. 3. The disease of intemperance is as contagious as the other; and, as a preventive of small pox, vaccination is more salutary, than any preventive, or remedy, can be for intemperance, short of interdicting the traffic.

And yet you say the Legislature has no constitutional right, to go to the fountain head and stop the poisonous streams which sweep so many thousands to an untimely grave. You in effect say to the wife and children of the maniac, (made so by rum,) when they have in vain requested the venter to cease holding out the temptation to their once kind natural protector, and appeal to you (as their last resort) for assistance, you say, no,—we have no constitutional right to assist you. No,—you must go on in your unhappy pilgrimage of beggary, grief, and despair, until death shall close the scene—until the once loved, and kind husband and father shall be laid in the drunkard's grave—not until you, driven by despair are hastened to a premature death. I ask you, Sir, is this right? Is it doing the business you

that better testimony could not be offered, could not be devised in support of it, and that no man is left unconvinced, who has given the subject a thorough investigation, unless he is kept from it by a state of mind the most deplorable which we can conceive—a state of enmity against the God that made him, and the Savior who redeemed him, leading him to refuse to come to the light, because his deeds are evil.

*The design of this lecture was to show that the study of medicine has no sceptical tendency.

Good News.—We feel very much rejoiced to be able to state, that there is now in some congregations, a very interesting state of things, in regard to the prosperity of Zion. God appears to be showering down in copious effusions, the influences of his Holy Spirit, and large accessions are made to the hosts that are walking heavenward.

We learn from letters received in this place, and other sources, that Paxton, Pepperell, Mass., and New Market in this State, have been wonderfully blessed of God. Rich and signal displays of Divine mercy have been shown to the people in these towns.

In Paxton, upwards of forty have been brought to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. One very encouraging fact is, that most of the subjects of this work of renewing grace, are in the morning of life, and bid fair to become pillars in the church. The work is still progressing.

In Pepperell, a writer says, "that the school in this place, which has so often been blessed by the powerful influences of God's holy Spirit, seems not to have passed thro' this term without a renewal of his mercies. There has been quite a revival, chiefly in the school. Many who were groping their way in the darkness of sin, have had their eyes opened to the greatness of their former danger, and lay hold of the promises which are offered to those who seek the Lord."

In New Market, the work of regeneration has been confined principally to the Methodist Society. Twenty already give evidence that they have been born, again, and great seriousness prevails among sinners.—*Sabbath-School Advocate.*

REVIVALS, BAPTISMS, &c.—We have just learnt from a ministering brother that an interesting revival of religion has recently commenced in Woolwich. Some have already begun to rejoice in the pardoning mercy of God, and others are anxiously enquiring what they shall do to be saved. We are happy to state that the good work is still progressing.

We have also been informed that the Lord is reviving his work in Bristol, and that several have recently been buried with their Savior in baptism.—*Eastern Bap.*

The New-York Baptist State Convention received during the past year \$10,335.40. Fifty-four churches have been assisted, 19 missionaries employed, and 520 converts baptized.—*N. H. Bap. Reg.*

'Tis the glory of a Christian to live so much above the world, that nothing in it may make him either fond of life, or weary of it.—*Hoive.*

Slavery Circular:

"The Committee on the subject of slavery, reported a circular condemning, in strong terms, the sinfulness of slavery, and urging the churches to exclude slaveholders from fellowship. It was ordered by the Convention that the Circular be published in the Vermont Telegraph, and sent to all the Baptist churches in the Southern States.

We deeply regret the adoption of such a course by this body. It can accomplish no good whatever, and will only tend to sever asunder the bonds of union between our Northern and Southern churches. The subject of slavery is one in which the South is alone concerned, and any measure touching it must emanate within our own bounds. All foreign interference will only tend to rivet more strongly the fetters of those the abolitionists profess to benefit. We entreat our brethren to confine their labors to bringing sinners to a knowledge of the truth, and leave this exciting subject to those more immediately connected."

"The subject of slavery is one in which the South is alone concerned" [!] The subject of idolatry is one in which the heathen are alone concerned! The subject of Islamism is one in which the followers of the False Prophet are alone concerned! The subject of popery is one in which the worshipers of the Beast are alone concerned! The subject of theft, and lying, and drunkenness, and debauchery, and incest, and treason, and piracy, and cannibalism, and murder, and every other foul and flagrant sin, are subjects in which the followers of Satan are alone concerned!! Why not?

Brother Sands, suppose that the Baptist churches in Vermont were filling up with polygamy and infanticide,—the fact being notorious, could the Baptist churches in Virginia, or any other Baptist churches of the same faith and order with us, knowing our anti christian practices, remain silent and be innocent. And if the churches in Virginia, or elsewhere, should address us "a circular condemning, in strong terms, the sinfulness of" our practices, "and urging the churches to exclude" the guilty "from fellowship,"—would there be any propriety or truth in my asserting that Vermont is alone concerned in these sins; and that "any measure touching them must emanate within our own limits?" No, my brother,—public sins concern every christian; and public inhumanities concern every human being.

The other part of the doctrine—that no measures for the removal of a sin may emanate from without the borders of those who are immediately implicated or concerned in the sin—is of one piece, and equally heretical, with the part already exposed. This doctrine, carried out, would shut up the mouth of every preacher of righteousness, and turn off the power from every wheel of reform now in successful motion.

and, that day of final reckoning will show that abolitionists have obeyed God and done their duty.

You "entreat" us "to confine" our "labors to bringing sinners to a knowledge of the truth." This exhortation, with our own construction upon it, shall not be wholly unheeded. But you must not require us always to be limited by your own judgment—which is liable to be warped by feelings, habits, or associations—in our inquiries as to who the "sinners" are that are to be "brought to a knowledge of the truth." We must be allowed to consult the word of God, in this matter. That being our guide, we are constrained to lift up the voice of warning and rebuke to those, especially in the church, "who build their houses by unrighteousness, and their chambers by wrong; who use their neighbor's service without wages, and give him not for his work"—those who have "kept back by fraud the hire of the laborers who have reaped down their fields," and "have condemned and killed the just"—those who "build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity." This is a class of "sinners" of no ordinary dye, in our estimation, and not to be overlooked in our "labors to bring sinners to a knowledge of the truth."

FOR THE TELEGRAPH.

My Friend Murray:—That the public may be better enabled to judge of the fairness and justice of your remarks appended to the late Circular of the Executive Committee of the Vermont Peace Society, you are requested to publish the Constitution of the Society, as adopted Aug. 17th, 1837.—Although you have once published it, a compliance with this request appears to be demanded in justice to the Committee, and the public, at the present time.

We invite your attention and that of the public, especially, to the second and third articles of the Constitution. The language is plain and intelligible,—and we understand it to mean just what it says, and nothing more or less. Any other construction which either you or any other individual may put on it, is *unfair and inadmissible*. Both our Circular and the Constitution of our Society, we wish and expect will be construed to mean what the language used expresses. Between the two, we have as yet to learn that there is any discrepancy.—Each we believe to be consistent with the other and with the sacred volume upon which they are founded. If there be any disparity between them let it be shown.—The principles which were finally adopted are those upon which the decision is to be determined. Yours, in the good cause of peace,

JONATHAN A. ALLEN,

In behalf of the Executive Committee of the Vermont Peace Society.

Middlebury, Nov. 16th, 1837.

The constitution is given again, most cheerfully. Here it is:

not—of putting any other construction on the constitution of the American Society than the inclusion of defensive war, as it seems to read; had it not been otherwise construed by that Society itself, in the mouth of its Corresponding Secretary and authorized agent. If the construction which he put upon it be "unfair and inadmissible," it is a matter to be settled between the Executive Committee of the Vermont Society and him—or between the auxiliary and the parent—and not between the Executive Committee and me. Again: If the construction which the members themselves of the Vermont Society put upon their own constitution, at the time they signed it, be "unfair and inadmissible," this too is a matter to be settled between the Executive Committee and the members of the Society, and not between the Executive Committee and me. For the Executive Committee will not deny—what every one who was present knows to be true—that as many of the signers of that constitution as wished to reserve to themselves the privilege of *fighting and slaying in defence*, did sign the constitution reserving to themselves that privilege; and that all the others signed it *granting them that privilege*; and, moreover, that the *fighting part* was comparatively neither few nor small.*

Now, friends, have it which way you will. If you will have it understood that the constitution of your Society *does not* condemn *defensive* war, as sinful, say so, in explicit terms, and retract of course, your accusation against me, of any "unfairness." On the contrary, if you would have it understood that the constitution of your Society *does* condemn *defensive* war as sinful, then I have a weightier charge than before to bring against the Society, viz: *self-contradiction approximated to hypocrisy*. For what can be more perfectly contradictory—more perfectly soulless—than for a Society to organize for the suppression of any sin; and in one breath to condemn that sin as such, *in all*; and in the next breath to *allow* and *sanction* that very sin, *in the practice of its own members*? What would be thought of that Church, professing to be built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, which should, *in its written creed*, explicitly declare that theft and adultery are sinful, and yet should admit to membership, to any and every extent, those who join with the express and stipulated understanding that they shall have the privilege of stealing and committing adultery, *ad libitum*—at

*If the *fighting part* were not the majority of those who signed the constitution, it was the form of a preamble and constitution, recognizing explicitly the non-resistance principle, so peremptorily rejected? It cannot be forgotten that they were voted out to give place to one that could be subscribed to by warriors as well as others.

For the Vermont Telegraph.

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

Mr. Editor:—I was much pleased at noticing in your last number a brief article on brother Wm. Miller's doctrine concerning the second coming of Christ, and with your remarks on the same. Especially am I pleased to learn from yourself, that a review of his system of interpreting the prophecies is about to be undertaken through the medium of the Telegraph. I hope the work is in Good hands, and that it will be forth coming without delay. Not that I attach more importance to brother Miller's book than your correspondent or yourself have done. But I have observed that in addition to his printed book, brother M. has also in some sections of the State given public lectures on the same subject, and I have been led to inquire how far our ministers ought to throw open their pulpits to the promulgation of sentiments which they have never examined, and seem prepared neither to embrace nor deny. If the opinions advanced are in accordance with truth, and calculated to do good, and meet the aspect of the times in which we live; why not side with the preacher and help him forward in his labors of love among us? But if the doctrine is *new*, or if it be *another gospel* which is brought unto us, he ought not to be received into the churches, nor bid God speed.*

Should Mr. Miller's interpretation prove true his name will go down in the annals of the regenerated heavens and earth, to the latest period of the Millennial jubilee, or a second John Baptist—as the distinguished individual raised up of God to announce to man the second coming of Christ to judge the world in righteousness. But should the author have erred in his exposition of the prophecies, the time being so near at hand, will soon expose his folly, and his name as long as it survives, will be consigned to no enviable niche in the temple of fame.

I wait anxiously for the promised review, and have some thoughts myself to offer, should it not meet my views of the subject.

Rutland, Nov. 11, 1837. C.

*Free discussion, brother—free discussion.—Shutting pulpits against moral or religious lecturer is generally a bad argument, unless it be in a case of impeached moral character. Merely allowing him to speak is not necessarily sanctioning his views and doctrines. On the contrary, disallowing him will be construed into a fear to give him a fair hearing. Wm. Goodell has some very valuable thoughts, on the subject of shutting pulpits, to be found on the first page of this paper.—[Ed. TEL.]

CORRECTION.—There is not so much money in Brandon, as some may have been led to suppose from the advertisement last week, respecting the terms of board at the Vt. Lit. & Sci. Institution. If the composer and the compositor will consent to place the matter about half way between themselves, the proof reader will stand under and take the whole upon his own shoulders. The advertisement will be found on the last page to-day, corrected.

have no constitutional right to assist you. No,—you must go on in your unhappy pilgrimage of beggary, grief, and despair, until death shall close the eyes of the once loved, and kind husband and father shall be laid in the drunkard's grave—or until you, driven by despair are hastened to a premature death. I ask you, Sir, is this right? Is it doing the business you were appointed to do? Were you not appointed to act *under oath*, for the benefit of the *many*? But some of our wise Legislators say *each man must govern his appetite*, and the vendors must not sell to the drunkard, &c. I ask why is it if all can govern their appetites, why is it that so many of first rate talents have fallen a prey to the fell destroyer Intemperance, and thus deprived society of some of its best ornaments? You may fine vendors for selling to drunkards, and you may inflict what punishment you please for drunkenness, yet as long as you permit persons to sell under a license, and sanction of statute—you may as well talk to a boat poised on the brink of Niagara falls, thinking to stay its downward course into the gulph below; or say to the rumbling noise which is a sure precursor of a volcanic eruption, be thou still, thinking your injunction will prevent the earthquake; or stand on one of the peaks of the Greenland mountains and whistle, thinking to stay the northern blast, as if you think that anything short of the interdiction of the traffic will stay the progress of intemperance. It ever has been the case, and ever will be the case, that where the temperate drinking of intoxicating liquors has been practiced, drunkenness has been its handmaid and sure companion.

I will now say a few words to the sixty-three men, who, *under oath*, voted in favor of the foregoing resolution. I was surely surprised to find that sixty-three men could be found in this State, who could be elected to the office of legislators, and who would, at this enlightened day, say, on oath, they believed it unconstitutional to prohibit the traffic in ardent spirit. I am a little fearful that some or all of you like a drop or two occasionally. I am not in the habit of betting, but will wager a commentary on the passage of the resolution, and on the conduct of some of the members while it was under discussion, that it is the case, or that you acted under the influence of rum-sellers, or rum-drinkers, on that question. If any of you wish to accept the challenge, let me know soon. Now if I was a No. 1 administration man, I would advise the members of the next legislature, to play Bentonism with the record of the resolution—draw the *black lines* around it and write on it, *EXPUNGED*; but as I am not, I would say, enact a law which shall shed forth such a splendor as to banish that resolution into the shade of forgetfulness; one that will cheer the down-cast; one that will benefit the present generation, and will cause the coming one, while reading the history of your proceedings, to call you blessed!

Respectfully,
J. HOLCOMB.

Brandon, Nov. 20, 1837.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—Two or three communications deferred till next week.