

TERMS \$8.00

THE PRESS.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, MAY 26, 1874

Gossip and Gleanings.

Haute Epress: A young lady, on street, k. writing a poem, embodying the loss of her verberna, the gift of an end, and broken by a spade-handle.

Thematically hotel clerks are practicing on response, "Esteado," for the benefit of other guests who object to climbing five light of stairs to their rooms.

I saved 10 cents today from my drinks," a late old Rednose, "it will be \$36.50 a week and in fifty years it will be \$1,835, and I can marry Mary. Dear Mary!"

one of
for
ought
penal
what
that
that
input
with
as
as
as
aggr
fetter
ness
ness

The
E
Hous
men
Hous

[illegible]

leader to watering company: "Well, I mean, we all know it's bad post-war good points; but what I say is, there's deception about it! Bad points—we can see. But we can't none of us tell 'em no good points he may 'ave till we come 'em." The party took time to con-

ghost of a colored murderer, who died
scandal, is levitating about Nashville,
the great reality of the Resurrection
to the great majority of people. The ap-
pearance encountered recently by the
night, and the old "war-horse" just
at on his back, and did nothing but
for Andrew Jackson.

"I told my little Ezra," said a fond moth-
er on West Hill, "like to be a misanthrope
go preach to the poor, suffering little
ones." Tears—bright, pearl drops
in the big blue eyes of her little son
replied: "Now, I wouldn't; but I'd like
on the perfect long enough to put a tin
in the big bunnies the shoeblack
ax on my seat day today. You hear me."

PORTLAND MAY 2, 1874.

During long been of opinion that the penalties inflicted for drunkenness have been sufficiently effective, particularly in which have led to brutal assaults on men as well as men, I have been much surprised to find that the following extract which I have taken from a London paper of a very high character and which may also have some interest to our readers.

"It is therefore, that laws which prohibit drinking are a necessity, the law itself promises to be an improvement on the present state of the matter. My experiments in this direction during the last year have been so successful that I have asserted as positively, and to all appearances as true, that drunkenness is the main cause of crime, and that the law should be made more effective in dealing with a suspicion whether we have not been misled on a wrong scent. The necessity of legislation is not a representation of legislative power, but, instead of attempting to restrict the power of representation by restricting drinking. If this attempt has succeeded it might be wise to accede to the suggestion."

[illegible]

does lead, to the commission of crimes
 as, when a man who is ordinarily
 temperate takes a drink, and his
 wife with the poker or all but mur-
 der policeman. This is a matter of which
 no man can talk in the abstract, but
 will bear in mind the reasonable rule
 crimes which are committed with ex-
 cessive facility, and the repetition of
 rational severity. The deterrent influence
 to be increased in proportion to the
 increase in the temptation. If
 thousand men say, there are
 who commit crimes, assaults on
 property, and when they are
 drunk they commit violent assaults when
 they are drunk, the law as at present ad-
 ministers punishment usually is not
 much lighter punishment because they
 are drunk. The natural effect of this illogi-
 cal rule is to encourage men
 to get drunk lest they should be led on
 to crimes of violence, they go on drinking
 until they are in a state of complete
 violence they may be betrayed into, the
 fact that they were drunk will ensure them a
 more lenient sentence than if they were
 sober. It is this: You know that if you drink
 you will probably assault someone; don't
 you know that if you are drunk you are
 liable for what you do when you are
 drunk? What the law ought to say them is

A man who, rather than foregoing any pleasures, runs the risk of committing a crime, is really a more dangerous because a far common criminal than the man who is a simple drunkard. The influence of the law is more effective on the first or good, and if the second is not deterred by the law it is not in favor of him from whom society has the most to expect. In fact, if the man who is a ruffian only when he is drunk is ordinarily a kinder-hearted and more obedient man than the man who is a ruffian at all times. Laws designed not to range against a natural inclination, in order of which the inclination is a more prolific source of crime than the law, are not only unwise but also unjustly. Further, a man more heavily burdened with the obligation to abstain from drinking is more likely to be a ruffian if he desists this, and goes on as though drunkenness was more likely to make him a ruffian than if he abstains. It makes very or less, the law may fairly treat him as a drunkard in intention of the crime he is committing. So, therefore, that two men are brought

...at this time.

