

"A dear-loved lad, convenience snug,
A treacherous inclination?"
No youths pleading, in the intonation of passionate repentance, that even
"The light that led astray
Was light from Heaven?"

Yet would the learned gentleman, in view of all these evils, point to the pretty girls and say, "Touch not, taste not, handle not?" Would he, for fear of mischief, coop them up like cows in a Belgian barn?

The world has come down to the present period from the most remote antiquity with the wine-cup in its hand. David, the man after God's own heart, drank wine. Solomon, the wisest of monarchs and of human beings, drank wine. Our Saviour not only drank it, but commanded Christians to drink it "in remembrance of Him." In strong contrast with our Divine Redeemer's life and practice, we hear of the Scribes and Pharisees who drank it not—who reviled our Saviour as a "wine-bibber," and the companion of publicans and sinners, "who would have voted for the Maine Liquor Law as unanimously as they cried "Crucify Him!"

Such people have existed in all ages of the world. The desire of human beings to dictate to each other what they should eat and drink and wear has been evinced in different countries at different periods. The zealots in the State of Maine are mere plagiarists after all. Sumptuary laws, tried in many countries and at different periods of the world's history, are now universally condemned by the good sense of mankind. Laws restraining drunkenness are nearly as old as drinking. It is curious to see what strange experiments have been tried at times. Zaelucus of Locris, 450 before the Christian era, ordained "that no woman should go attended with more than one maid unless she was drunk; and that she should not wear gold or embroidered apparel unless she intended to act unchastely." This sage law-giver punished adultery with the loss of both eyes. His own son broke the law, and the old gentleman, unwilling to deprive his son of both eyes, compromised the matter by putting out one of his own.

As early as 747, laws were passed in England restraining drunkenness in the clergy: and Constantine, King of the Scots (who was a sort of Neal Dow in his day) punished it with death.

His laws passed away as this law will pass, and a good deal of whiskey has been drunk in Scotland since. In England, in 995, an effort was made to restrain drinking by law, but it failed. Taverns were only introduced in the thirteenth century. In the reign of Edward III. there were only three allowed in all London; now there are thousands. Edward IV. tried to restrain them; forty were then allowed in London, eight in York, and but four in Oxford. They were not licensed till 1752. The history of wine is curious; its invention is attributed to Noah, who certainly had seen enough of the evils of water. The Chinese made wine from rice 2000 years before the birth of Christ; and although it must be allowed that they have tea enough, they make and drink it yet. Wine was but little known in England till the Roman conquest. We are told that it impairs our strength; yet the people who drank it conquered those who did not. It was only sold by the apothecaries (as is now proposed again) in the thirteenth century. In 1427, Henry VI., a sensible king, tried to restrain its adulteration, and we read "that 150 butts and pipes were condemned and emptied into the gutters of London, for being adulterated."

The Stoics denied themselves the use of wine, but their sect soon died out. The Puritans tried the experiment of coercing people into temperance and virtue, but they signally failed. I invite the honourable and learned member for Annapolis to review this period of English history. I refer to the time his followers dispersed; when Cromwell reigned at Whitehall; when his major-generals held military command of all the counties; when the maypoles were struck down, the theatres closed, the taverns shut up; when mirth was restrained, and temperance enforced by the sword. Now what was the effect of all this? No sooner was the Protector in his coffin than the people of England, by a common impulse, threw off a system which they regarded as oppressive. So distasteful had these restraints become that the people restored the Stuarts, forgot their civil wars and sacrifices, and reopened their theatres and taverns; and so disgusted were they with Puritan domination that liberty was forgotten in the general joy which the