

Houses, homesteads, fences, implements—all were destroyed. Where carts had stood, now were only seen two iron tiers lying on the ground. Crops and ricks were consumed, and the whole country left a mere blackened waste. Many persons were burnt to death; others saved themselves by standing in the "water holes," or in the sea, and even there were scorched; for the fires burnt down to the water's edge. Shortly after this dreadful visitation I visited what had been a snug farmhouse near Geelong. It was now a black wreck of roofless walls.—Gardens, vineyards and stables were all destroyed. Camp-ovens, iron pots and crockery were strewn about; and, as a sufferer said to me—"All the property left might be carried away in a wheelbarrow." In the stable were the remains of a burnt horse. A dog and some poultry were the only living thing about the desolated place. The destruction of property on "Black Thursday" was immense, and many of the small farmers lost the fruits of many years of toil and frugality. While the flames were raging over a thousand square leagues of forest, the gale carried the finer cinders over the mountains to Gibb's land, "and across Bass's Straits, entirely obscuring the sun; so that in Gibb's land, according to many eye-witnesses, it was dark as night at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.—But even this was not the limit to which traces of the fire extended. According to credible witnesses, fine charcoal dust fell on board ships lying off New Zealand forty-eight hours after the conflagration in Victoria.

Communications.

MR. END AND THE MAINE LAW.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Dear Sir,—Whatever may be your opinion of the arguments employed by Mr. End upon the Maine Liquor Law, I doubt not, that you will grant me space to make a few remarks in reply.

The Law is declared to be "bad and wrong,"—first historically; and for proof we are referred to the persecutions of Henry and Mary. We readily grant that men cannot be made Christians by compulsion. They may think and desire what they please. But does it follow that laws may not be enacted to prevent acts that are injurious to society?—May not the Legislature declare that I shall not sell poison, or let my house on fire, or rob my neighbours? and executive officers compel me to obey such laws? Was that a wise enactment of our last Assembly, which requires the inspection of Steamboats, and which authorizes the Inspector to prohibit proprietors from running vessels that are not sea-worthy? No person is obliged to sail in them. Sometimes they are decidedly convenient for those who cannot readily find other modes of conveyance. But the law declares, life shall not be exposed; and therefore such boats shall not be used. Is it a wise enactment that empowers a Board of Health to prohibit men from selling unripe fruit, or keeping dirty houses, or filthy animals during the prevalence of Cholera? The parties concerned might ask—"what right have you to say what I shall sell, or what I shall keep?" The reply would be—"we are requested to preserve the health of the city, and you must not sell or keep that which may induce disease."

Why does not Mr. End declare on the floor of the Assembly—as he does in his letter—"the secular arm has never effected a change; you must get at men's hearts and not their backs;" and then introduce a bill to repeal the penal codes, abolish courts, and send the judges and barristers, and mayors, and constables, to persuade men to refrain from theft and robbery, and Boards of Health to persuade men to remove what may pollute the atmosphere or injure the system.

Now for the religion of the law, Mr. End argues,—Christ made wine in Cana, and therefore, the wine that may be imported into this Province, may be sold and used with his approbation; that to the inhabitants of Canaan, it was promised that wine shall increase, therefore the wine that is sold now is a blessing. The Bible does indeed speak of wine as that which "cheers the heart," and "has a blessing in it." But the same volume declares, that "wine is a mocker," and forbids us even to look upon it "when it giveth its colour in the cup, for at last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." Here the "wine" is "the malignant element" not "excess" merely. Scripture must be consistent with itself; therefore, there must be different kinds of wine in use. I might refer you to a host of passages where wines are distinguished according to their qualities, among which are good and bad wine; wine that is a blessing and wine a curse; wine that might be offered in sacrifice, and wine that was not to be drunk in the House of God; wine of which guests drank abundantly, and wine that was not to be drunk at all; wine, the emblem of heavenly joy, and wine the symbol of endless misery. To prove that the pure, unfermented juice of the grape is called wine, refer to Isaiah 18, 19. "Treaders shall tread out no wine in their presses." Joel ii. 24, "the floors shall be full of wheat and the fats shall overflow with wine;" Isaiah xxxiii. 2; Proverbs iii. 10. To prove that unfermented wine was in use among the Ancients, we may refer also to Juvenal, who speaks (lib. x. line 280) of a King as one, who so often drank fresh milk (unfermented juice); and it is said of Corneius that he found "as soon as he could procure fresh grape juice, it presently restored him to the health he had lost while drinking old wine." Such wine as this was doubtless recommended to Timothy for his often infirmities. Horace who lived a few years before Christ, speaks (lib. 1. ode 17) of a wine which was innocent or unfermented, and of which he tells Maccenas elsewhere, that he might drink a hundred cups without danger to his senses. Pliny, contemporary with the Apostles, spoke of a wine in use among the Roman Ladies, because it was unfermented. Varro styles it sweet and unfermented (dulce et inebrians.)

If, therefore, there was in use a beverage called wine, healthful, nutritious, and unfermented, and another causing "sorrow" and "biting like a serpent" can we doubt of which the Bible approves and which it condemns? Or even if it is assumed for us to say that God's word never recommends intoxicating wine, it is certainly no less for our opponents to say that it does recommend it. It must at least be an open question, to be decided according to the effect upon health and morals.

But Christ made wine. So he did; but can Mr.

End prove that it was intoxicating wine? Consider all the circumstances, the company, the lateness of the hour, the fact that the guests had well drunk, the character of the Maker, and is it not reasonable to conclude the wine was nutritious and unfermented, of which they might partake fully at that late hour, because it would refresh and cheer; but not demoralize? What a charm is there in a name! Because Christ made what was then called wine, we may with safety use what is now called wine. Oil was used by Abraham's wife in making bread, but may we employ oil for the same purpose without discrimination? Would lamp oil or oil of vitriol make healthful food. Milk and bread are sanctioned by the Bible, but shall we use bread that has become mouldy, or milk that has become sour by fermentation? Flesh and herbs were granted to man as good things; but shall we partake of horse flesh, or the flesh of reptiles? or even of the ox, after it has become putrescent?— Shall we eat the deadly night shade, or even garden vegetables after they are decayed? With wines, as well as with meats and herbs, some were good and some were bad. Some that had been good had become bad by fermentation by some other process.—God treats man as a rational creature. He opens the storehouse of nature, not to eat without discrimination, but to use that which is suited to his constitution.

Even if fermented wine is countenanced by Scripture—does not Mr. End know that wines now in use are almost universally brandied? that the most deadly poisons are dissolved in them? In the wine merchant's companion, published in London, A. D. 1835 page 15, "the size of a walnut of sugar of lead, with asiderum is mentioned as a cleansing for wine." And is he not aware that in his adopted city, every kind of wine is made of New England rum and cider? But admitting that the wine imported into this Province is sanctioned by the Bible—does it follow that all the liquors sold by the bar keepers are countenanced. Men are licensed to sell Brandy, Whiskey, Gin, Rum and White Eye, with all the noxious articles, the avarice of the vender may put into them; and when we proposed to withhold such license, we are charged with blasphemy and profanity, because Christ made wine and the Scripture allows the use of wine.

But the law is said to be politically bad; because "it leads to tyranny, to error, droppings, to creating and maintaining a crew of vile and base informers, fattening on their fellow men." It does prohibit a traffic that ruins men for time and eternity. But is this tyranny? For what was Government instituted, but to protect the interests of society? and its institution implies the necessity of every individual regulating his business, his pleasures, his conduct, in reference to the good of the whole. The use of firearms in the street may be to me a source of pleasure, but the law may forbid it, because it imperils human life. To trade in slaves may be lucrative, but British law prohibits it, because it makes my fellow creature wretched. Many may endeavour to have the penalties of the law inflicted upon those who violate it. Persons may be employed for that purpose, are they therefore "vile and base." Then are those who will bring offenders to justice, who have quite as nice a sense of honor and propriety, as the member for Gloucester, or any of his condignators in opposition to the Maine Law. If I should inform of another gunpowder plot, by which the parliament was to be destroyed, would I be "vile and base?" Those who deal in intoxicating liquors do not wish, generally speaking, to destroy their fellows. But they are doing it, and they know it, if more slowly than Grey Pawkes designed, none the less certainly. How many thousands have been ruined, eternally ruined, in our own Province, by this traffic! If I bring the law to bear upon those who will persist in selling, not for the purpose of injuring them, but to protect my fellow men, am I "vile and base," or am I philanthropic and benevolent?

"Temperance Societies," Mr. E. admits, "have done much good." Why? because they have prohibited excess, what he considers the only malignant element, or because they have prohibited wine, that we regard as a malignant element. They tried the former, and signally failed. They tried the latter, and have blessings throughout the world. We must "be temperate in all things," he quotes.—Certainly not in the use of bad meats or arsenic.—Temperance requires total abstinence from what is injurious.

"I care not how severely drunkenness and habitual prostration to drink are punished, and how stringently the sale of liquor is guarded, let the drunkard be in law, his lands and goods be placed under guardianship enact the most stringent license law;" so says Mr. E. And are not these strange sayings for one who has just told us, that "the secular arm has never effected a change; that you must get at men's hearts, and not at their backs." Can he hope to reform the drunkard by the powers of law? And would it not be better to prevent men from selling him that which makes him insane? and to guard his own property? "Enact the most stringent license law." What right has Mr. E. to say, that a man shall not sell liquor without a license, if Christ made it, and the Bible pronounced it a blessing?

But he has seen "too much of the operations of the Maine Law elsewhere, to desire its introduction here." Now Sir, others have as good eyes as he, and are quite as capable of forming an opinion.—Let me just refer you to what the Governor of the State of Maine has seen: he says—"those men who state that there is more liquor sold now than before state what they know to be false. Into Augusta, parties would bring enough to freight a schooner, and now in a year, there is not so much brought as a single house would bring in one cargo."

Rev. Mr. Still, Episcopal Missionary, New Haven, Conn. says—"a class of men, who would, but for the Maine Law, have come upon us for support, are now contributing to our funds. Its good effects are decisive. It works to admiration. Many families, who could not attend church for want of clearing, now look forward with delight to the prospect of attending some place of worship." Is a law that can produce such effects "politically and religiously wrong, barren of good, and fruitful in evil?"

But we are told by the very respectable writer of the communication, that people—and we are certainly inclined to conclude, that he means the Maine Law advocates—"in their zeal to root out the evils of drunkenness, seem to think that it is proper to use any sort of means, to break down any principle to subvert any right." I have had some opportunity of knowing the wishes and principles of Temperance men from personal intercourse, as well as from their writings and speeches, and although the assertion made by Mr. End has a tendency to provoke a harsh expression, I will only say, that the charge is undeserved. All they ask is that society be protected from the traffic of intoxicating liquors, just as it is protected from other evils by law. We, who advocate such a law, desire to interfere with no rights; at the same time we hesitate not to say that our own rights are trampled upon. Do you

ask how? Men are licensed to conduct a business that makes paupers, and we have to pay for their support, that makes lunatics, and our brand is taxed to sustain an asylum; that prepares men to quarrel and murder, and we have to spend our time as jurymen to try them for these crimes, and fits them for incendiarism, and our property is in danger; that makes them fit subjects to receive and perpetuate cholera, and our lives are in danger; that presents temptation to our dearest relatives, exposing them to the disgrace of a drunkard's grave, and the torments of a drunkard's hell. And we demand, as British subjects, we demand that our rights be not subverted; we demand protection from the enactments of law and the officers of justice. And the day has come, when our demands are to be regarded! The majority has hitherto been against us—and the majority has a right to rule—now it is in our favour. We "conjure up no nebulous phantom." By the only test a British Constitution recognizes—a vote of the Legislature—public opinion is declared to be for prohibition, thanks to those who voted for the law. To say that it is the creature of a fevered imagination, is sheer nonsense. It is the production of men with as clear heads and benevolent hearts as any in the opposition; not those who have stood aloof from Temperance Societies, and who are now willing to bespeak their praise; but men who have expended their time, their labour, their money, in carrying on their operations; who have adopted the example of St. Paul, who said that it was good "neither to eat meat, nor drink wine, nor do anything that caused a brother to stumble." Sir, we have the Maine Law as a matter of fact. It has never been repealed wherever it has been enacted.—It never will be repealed here.

The Liquor Traffic, the curse of the province, will not be annihilated at once, but it must yield; and drunkenness and its consequent evils will be a subject for the historian's pen.

I am, Sir, with much respect, yours truly,
THOMAS B. SMITH.
Richibucto, 1st May, 1855.

Mr. Pierce,

Sir,—As I have so often been asked the question, Why do you not go to the training school? I cannot any longer refrain from giving my reasons. I did intend to go to the Training School, but thought I would wait and see how it was likely to work. I had a conversation with some of the first class Teachers after they returned from it, one of whom told me that for his own part, he knew very little about Arithmetic, and nothing of any other part of Mathematics, but said, that such candidates as were considered capable of communicating instruction to others, and of improving themselves, were allowed a first class certificate. Another told me he had seen some Candidates there, one of whom in particular, was superior to any other in that time, who answered every question was asked him, and as far as he could judge was an excellent Mathematician, but nevertheless could not get a first class certificate, so I concluded it was as well for me to stop at home, as the Mathematics were not wanted there: I see likewise, that the system has not been productive of good, nor is it likely to be, until great changes are made at the head of the department.—I think Sir the person whose business it is to examine Candidates and grant Certificates, should give every one his merit, that is if he be not capable of teaching a first class school let him get a second, and if not qualified to teach a second let him get a third; but if he be qualified to teach a first class school, let him get it, and no person to get a first class till he is first qualified to teach it. Mr. Pierce, you know, and the most of people know, that it is quite absurd to grant a first class certificate to any candidate who knows nothing of the Mathematics, on the supposition that he will improve himself in those branches which law requires he must be able to teach; you know, quite well Sir, that not one out of ten thousand is able to study the Mathematics without a teacher, therefore it is folly in the extreme, to leave the thing to the discretion of the teacher whether he will afterwards learn those requisites or not. It is evident he will not, nor can he do it. It is very natural then to suppose, that when a person applies to him to have his son taught any one of those branches, he will tell him that his son is not qualified to learn it, whatever it be, as he does not know Arithmetic well enough, which is very likely to be the case if he has been brought up at any of the schools I speak of, nor will he ever know it sufficiently, as long as the present system is continued. If instead of rejecting the Mathematics and employing the man who has got a little knowledge of History, Geography, and English Grammar only, in the first class schools, I say if they would reverse the requisites, it would be more becoming, as a pupil could study History, Geography, &c. at home, without a Teacher, but cannot attempt the others, and there are many who dare not, and having a good teacher. The fundamental part of both are very much neglected throughout the Province. I mean Orthography and Arithmetic. Mr. Pierce, these are a part of the reasons why I did not attend the Training School. I will give the rest another time. I beg you will excuse me for having trespassed so far.

I remain, your obliged, and devoted servant,
P. FLANAGAN.
Chatham, 3rd May, 1855.

GARDEN SEEDS.

The subscriber has on hand, and now offers for sale, a well selected lot of
PRIME GARDEN SEEDS,
the growth of 1854, among which are the following:
Swedish, Yellow, Purple and Green Top Turnip Seeds; early horn and orange Carrot, early frame, charlton and marrowfat Peas, broad Windsor Beans, Red Beet; early york, sugar loaf, dumbar, and cape savoy Cabbage, Spinnach, Radish, Curled Parsley, solid Celery, and curled Cress; with a variety of Flower and other Seeds; also, a few superior Dutch Hoes, an excellent article for the use of Gardeners.
M. M. SARGEANT.
Newcastle, 26th April, 1855.

GARDEN SEEDS.

For Sale, at the Stationary Store, adjoining the Gleaner Office, a small stock of GARDEN SEEDS. A further supply is expected by the first vessel from Boston. Also Garden Pots.
Chatham, April 28, 1855.

TO LET.

The BUILDING, lately occupied by Kelly and Gallagher, containing SHOP, Hall entrance, and Three Rooms up stairs. The house is new, neatly fitted up for business, in the best locality in Chatham. If required, the Shop will be Let separate to a good tenant. Possession given on the 27th May. Apply to
PATRICK GARRETT.
Chatham, April 27, 1855.

Editor's Department.

MIRAMICHI:

CHATHAM, SATURDAY, MAY 12, 1855

TERMS.—New subscribers Twelve Shillings and Six Pence, per annum, in all cases in advance. Old subscribers 12s. 6d. in advance, or 17s. 6d. at the end of the year. We prefer the advance price, and as it effects a large saving, we hope soon to see all our subscribers avail themselves of it.

This Paper is filed, and may be seen free of charge, at Holloway's Pill and Ointment Establishment, 24, Strand, London, where Advertisements and Subscriptions will be received for this Periodical.

TRAVELLING FEES OF MEMBERS.

THE New Brunswick of the 28th April, has a long leader intitled "The Mileage of the Member from Boston," evidently designed to place certain members of the Government in a false position. We do not object to the opposition Press exposing any inconsistencies or improper votes of reform members, but desire that this should be fairly done. On the 11th of April, Mr. Ryan moved—"That members shall in future only receive expenses to and from the Assembly and their residence within the County they represent; and further, that those members not residing within the County by them represented, be allowed expenses only to and from the shire town of such County."

To which the Hon. Mr. Johnson moved an amendment—"That members shall in future receive only expenses or travelling charges to and from their places of residence, and in case of any member residing out of the Province, the distance shall be taken to the Province line on the road to his residence, by the ordinary mail route;" and if the New Brunswicker will refer to page 356 of the Journals, he will find that Messrs. Johnson and Tilley voted for this amendment, while Messrs. Wilmot and Partelow voted against it; that Messrs. Ritchie, Brown, Fisher and Street were absent. The amendment was lost, as was also the original resolution, Mr. Wilmot voting for and Messrs. Tilley and Brown against it.—It will be seen that Mr. Ryan's resolution gave travelling fees to members who represented distant counties, though they resided in Fredericton, and did not travel. The New Brunswicker takes no notice of these resolutions, but begins with Mr. Ryan's resolution moved and carried without a division, on the 12th April, as follows:—

"Resolved, as the opinion of this House, that no member thereof should be allowed his travelling expenses to and from the Legislature, beyond the limits of this Province."

He then states that Mr. End afterwards moved a re-consideration of this resolution, and that the House divided as follows—for re-considering, Hon. Messrs. Ritchie, Fisher, Tilley, Johnson, Brown, and Messrs. Botsford, M'Pherson, End, Tibbits, Gilmour, and Connell:—and against it—Hon. Mr. Smith, Messrs. Partelow, Street, Wilmot, Taylor, Steadman, Ryan, Gilbert, Boyd, M'Pherson, and M'Clellan. The division being equal, the Speaker decided in the negative. He says that "every member of the Government except Mr. Smith, voted for a re-consideration, evidently with a view of helping Mr. End to pocket the much coveted mileage."

Now we conceive this statement unfair, because Mr. Johnson's amendment moved on the 11th, and for which Mr. Tilley also voted, would go to deprive Mr. End of fees beyond the Province line quite as much as Mr. Ryan's resolution; and we believe Johnson, Ritchie and others, stated that they voted to re-consider, because they would vote for a resolution which Mr. Johnson read to the same effect, as his former amendment. We next find Mr. Johnson moving an additional resolution as follows:—

"That in future no member of the Legislature residing in the Province, should be allowed travelling expenses for any greater distance than from the place of his actual residence to the seat of Government."—But our friend of the New Brunswicker, does not give the division on this resolution—it was as follows—Yeas—Hon. Messrs. Ritchie, Tilley, Brown, Johnson, Steadman, Tibbits, M'Clellan, and Gilbert. Nays—Hon. Messrs. Fisher, Smith, Partelow, Botsford, End, M'Pherson, Wilmot, Connell,