

License or no License.—The Family Visitor of this week contains a very severe and uncalled for stricture on us, for our article on this subject last week, and it goes far out of the way to do this. We ask our readers to look at our article again, and see if it should call forth language like the following:

"The large sum of *two hundred* dollars to the city treasury, is given as an inducement by the Editor to vote for license."

The Visitor must know that the revenue that would accrue from license is variously estimated from \$500 to \$1500, seldom less than \$900 a year; we had it on good authority that it would not exceed \$200, and we stated this as a *fact*, not to induce people to vote for that sum, but to give the correct amount, so that they could vote with a full knowledge of it. The language or connection in our article could not be distorted into an inducement, by anybody but the Visitor, to vote for license; for if it could, the language did not convey our meaning—we wished to decide for no man, to induce no man, and we distinctly said so. Those disposed to cavil on any subject can easily do so—it is done every day on the *bible*. Again,

"The Editor says that the revenue, if license be granted, will be about 'two hundred dollars,' and 'that many good men will vote license.' To this opinion we most positively dissent. No good man can vote to give permission to individuals to perpetrate murder and crime of every description! No good man can vote to license individuals to steal and rob!!!"

We are not disposed to denounce every man that honestly differs from us, and call them murderers, and associate them with convicts of every class, as *particeps criminis* before the fact; we think men may differ from us, even on the subject of temperance, without being past all hope of redemption. The Visitor does not think so. We think that honest, upright men, old settlers, and pioneers to this city, who have had the confidence of their fellow citizens, and filled offices of honor and trust with credit, are *good men*, even if they do vote "license." The Visitor does not think so. We think every man is entitled to his own opinion on this subject; that he, not us, takes the responsibility, and that even his voting "license," (if right in other respects) should not place him in the same rank with convicts and felons. But I, the Visitor, am right—all else are wrong—so it would have us believe.

We believe these good men (that the Visitor sneers at,) care as little for the \$200 as the Visitor man. There are two sides to every question—men will honestly differ—and the decisions by the Superior Courts on the license question have given great room for this difference. These men have a right to differ from the editor of the Visitor, and to express that right at the ballot box, but that paper has no right to vilify and abuse them as it does for it—even if it had the right, it is not the way to carry its point, as by doing so it injures itself and the cause it advocates.

The article in the Visitor has compelled us to say this much, whether we would or no. On next Monday we expect to vote "no license;" we do it honestly, and we have every reason to believe that many of those that will vote against us are equally honest—with this view, those good men (or good citizens, if you please,) do not deserve the opprobrious epithets applied to them by the Visitor over our shoulders.

Dust.—The Dust on Washington street is now 4 inches deep—if the Fathers will only have it taken off the citizens will have it sprinkled.

Law and Order.—The law and order meeting on last Monday evening was organized by appointing JAMES M. RAY President, JAMES GILLESPIE and ADAM HAUGH Vice Presidents, and Esquires KETCHAM and TAYLOR Secretaries.

After a few opening remarks by the President, defining the object of the meeting, and giving a brief account of the troubles of the early settlers in maintaining law and good order, and a prayer by Rev. P. D. GURLEY, the following resolution was presented by Mr. SECREST.

Resolved, That the crime and ruin which, following naturally in the wake of liquor selling in any of its forms, whether in a city saloon, coffee house, grocery or cellar, or treats at pretended dry goods stores, forbid that the authority of law should be given, in the way of license, to the disposal of liquor in any form in this city.

In support of this resolution Mr. SECREST made a few very sensible and pithy remarks. He said that crimes or outrages committed by a foreign nation on the Union were immediately followed by a declaration of war to redress those wrongs, and yet evils of a far worse character were permitted in our midst with little notice. He alluded to the many murders that had been committed within the last year, and said the cause that produced them still existed, without any decided effort on our part to be rid of them. He referred to the right of every man to express himself at the ballot box, and hoped it would be done in a decided manner.

In taking the vote on the resolution but one man voted in the negative.

Mr. CALVIN FLETCHER then offered the following:

Resolved, That the preservation of the public peace, the good order and the prosperity of the city and townships, are intimately connected with the election and appointment of decided friends of morality and temperance to every public office; and to effect such selections, it is the duty of every citizen, in preference to mere party politics, or other interests, to unite in every proper and faithful exertion at the approaching township and city election.

Perhaps there is no person in this community so well qualified to give the progress of law and good order, and to state the advantages derived from the one and disadvantages from the other, from the first settling of this country to the present day, as Mr. Fletcher. On this occasion he contrasted Columbus with Franklin, and other places, in respect to this. Columbus has always been a disorderly, whiskey selling place (unless, perhaps, within a few years,) and the citizens, Professional men and Mechanics, have never prospered—the most of them died poor, many of them drunkards. Franklin, with a poorer country around, farther from the river, and less advantages, has always been a law abiding place, and its citizens and mechanics are all prosperous; many of the old settlers are now living independent, and the property in and around the town is more valuable than in the other place. The one place has churches and schools, the other has not; the citizens in one place are upright, law and order men, governed by a strict moral rectitude, while the other place has been a whiskey drinking disorderly hole, under the sway of grocery men and their influence. So it is with Pendleton and Andersontown, and so it is with different townships in our own county. All this went to show that no place could be prosperous that permitted riot and disorder to rule.

He showed the object of municipal regulations; compared them to family government; that each member of a family or city has certain rights and privileges that others should not encroach on. That idle members of a family live off the industry of the others, and so in cities; that vicious animals or men are an injury to the community and should be brought under subjection. To do this laws were made, and to make these laws effective faithful men must administer them. That the city and its property was common property purchased by taxes paid by every citizen, and to protect this men of "moral force" must be placed in charge of it; that no man should have charge of the common property that was not trustworthy as an individual. The result of all this was that the right kind of men must be placed in charge of the city. We cannot do Mr. F. justice

in this short notice, for his remarks were a relation of facts that were highly interesting. The resolution was then unanimously adopted.

The following was offered by Mr. KETCHAM.

Resolved, That, owing to the influence which groceries have always exerted in elections, the laws, on the subject of grocery license have always been below the public sentiment. And although our present laws are greatly in advance of former laws, yet they are much below the great public sentiment, and need to be revised in some important respects.

Mr. K. made some very apt remarks in support of the resolution, giving a brief account of the different laws that had been passed on the subject of temperance, noting their progress, step by step, up to the present time. In the course of his remarks he made allusion to an article that appeared in the Locomotive last week on the subject of license, calling it a "back handed stroke at temperance."

[The object of that article was to make a plain statement of what we believed the facts in the case, giving the proper revenue derived from license and the amount of liquor brought here—if that is striking at temperance, so be it. That 3000 barrels of whiskey were brought over the railroad within the last year is a *fact*; that about \$200 will be derived for license is a *fact*; that liquor is now sold without license is a *fact*, and that many good men will vote for license is a *fact*—this is all we said, and we have nothing to correct or take back. Gentlemen who live in the suburbs of the city have no idea of the drinking and carousing that has been going on here for the last year; they hear no noises and think the city is quiet, but they can be correctly informed on this subject if they inquire of those living near Washington and Meridian streets.]

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Mr. RAY offered the following.

Resolved, That the Judges of the Circuit Court of this county, be and they are hereby requested in view of the crime and ruin which are promoted by the sale of liquors, to inflict the highest penalty of the law in every case of conviction for selling liquor without license; and also to refuse to defeat the just penalty of broken law in such cases by consolidating indictments; and that the friends of good order in this county be requested to investigate the consequences of nominal fines by the officers of law in such cases.

In support of it he alluded to the course pursued by the Judge on the bench and the prosecuting attorney in consolidating indictments, said it had a direct tendency to defeat justice, as the liquor seller could compromise the matter with these parties by paying a nominal fine. The resolution was adopted, and then the meeting adjourned.

Fire Company.—A new fire company has been organized in this city and a committee appointed to procure an engine and hose carriage. The name of the engine will be "Hand in Hand," and the hose carriage "Friendship." The motto "Friendship goes Hand in Hand."

Mary Smithers, was acquitted before the Court of Magistrates, from the charge of poisoning her husband. We noticed this in part of our edition last week.

The trial of MERRITT YOUNG will not take place until the next Court, which meets on the last Monday in April. He prefers to remain in jail until that time, to having a public trial.

Constables.—On next Monday the Constables for this township are to be elected. S. A. Colley and S. T. Woollen have made good officers—they are candidates for re-election.

To-day at 10 o'clock the Democrats of this township meet at the Court House to nominate delegates to the county convention on the 12th ult.

5th Ward—A majority of voters in this ward have their candidate (James Sulgrave) and will not attend at the Brewery to-day.

We see that H. S. NEWCOMB, Esq., has been announced a candidate for Mayor.

License.—Remember to go to the polls on Monday, and vote either for or against License.