

inclined to think that in Church matters, there are some rights which are not ours, merely because we do not assert them. The bulk of every congregation in the land is composed of women, and by far the greater part of these women wear the cross on their foreheads, and are sworn followers of the Crucified. Now suppose St. Mary, or St. Martha, or any of the holy women of old, could look out from their calm haven in Paradise, upon this troubled sea of hoops, and flounces, and laces, and plumes, think you they would believe it? Suppose they could witness the round of worldliness, and frivolity, and downright folly, which makes up the most of our daily life, would they not blush to call us sisters? The sweet rest of the saints, is not disturbed, let us hope, by any such visions: but is the Eye of our Master less surely upon us? Are we not wounding Him sorely in the house of His friends?

Just think what an army we are! Why! the Churchwomen of America, if they had but a tithe of the primitive spirit, could evangelize the world! What daughters, what mothers, what wives, ought not Churchwomen to be? If we led such lives as Mary, and Martha, and Salome, and Eunice, and Dorcas led, how many of our fathers, and brothers, and sons, think you, could resist such silent preaching?

I have known women (God bless them! they make me proud of my sex, though ashamed of myself), who by the patient, faithful, consistent performance of the duties of a Christian wife and mother, have won their husbands to Christ, and trained their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and I have known others (and God pity them, for they are past man's help) who, by weak yielding to the influence of a worldly husband, have lost faith in the religion of their youth, and fairly outstripped him in pursuit of the world. Suppose every Christian mother should set herself to train, from among her brave, beautiful boys, one Timothy for Christ's service, think you the God of Eunice, and Lois, would not add His blessing to her labors?

And we who have no Timothys to offer, no family ties to bind us—does the Lord of the vineyard mean us to be idle? I heard a wise and good pastor say, once, that "where man furnished the will to work, God always furnished the opportunity," and he was right. While we are killing time with crochet work and embroidery, just round the corner in that alley, men and women are fainting under the burden of poverty and toil. Sweet young children are there, who have never heard a heavenly Father's name, except in blasphemy: and beds of the sick and dying, to which the sweet story of Jesus' love has never come. We could go there, as the Master went of old, and surely He would go with us.

Dear sister, is not here a blessed right unclaimed? And shall not some of us, in this holy season of Lent, assert it, that the pastors of day, in numbering the laborers, may count, as did an Apostle of old, "and devout and honorable women, not a few?"

Provincial Legislature.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY,
SATURDAY, March 21.

The house met at three o'clock—and immediately resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means. Mr. Dimock in the chair.

Mr. Eason said that certain duties collected upon articles imported from England and elsewhere, now admitted, when imported from the United States under the Reciprocity treaty duty free, should be struck off. The amount realized was very small. For instance the sum collected on imported onions was only about £20 per annum. He moved that the duty on that article be struck off.

Mr. Henry opposed the alteration unless the countries from which these articles were imported reciprocated and allowed our exports to go in duty free; there was also a principle acted upon when the Reciprocity treaty passed by which it was tacitly agreed that certain mutual privileges should be conceded. To admit imports from foreign countries duty free would amount to a violation of the compact.

Mr. Tobin thought it was competent for us to take the duty off any article without violating the Reciprocity Treaty.

Mr. C. Campbell said it was clear that the only parties to derive benefit from taking off the duty on onions were the citizens of Halifax.

Mr. Wier. Coals go into the United States duty free; would it be fair for us to take the duty off this or any other article included in the Treaty imported from other countries,—where the basis of that Treaty was that certain articles should be admitted by each free of duty.

Mr. Killam thought if the subject were touched at all it should be dealt with as a whole,—but he did not think the removal of this duty would be any violation of the treaty. The American Government were about to reduce the duty on coals, the effect of which would be equal to its entire removal.

The question was then taken and the Resolution passed in the negative.

Mr. Henry moved the following Resolution:—
Resolved, That the duty of six and a quarter per cent. ad valorem, now payable on goods under Cap. 12. of the Revised Statutes, be increased to 10 per cent. with the exception of Cotton Yarn, on which the duty shall be 2½ per cent. ad valorem.

He argued that the increased expenditure for interest upon monies laid out on the Railway would amount to £20,000—that the increase from 6½ to 10 per cent. would only give about £21,000 currency—and that if the ad valorem duties were only raised by 1½ per cent. at the end of the year the province would be in debt—and the Railway Bonds depreciated in the English money market.

Mr. McLellan controverted the statement that the country would be in debt, and read a statement to show that if increased to 7½ per cent., the Revenue realized would be quite sufficient to meet the requirements of the country.

Mr. Wier took the same view; he thought that as the Russian war had created a slight deficit in the amount collected; but as that war was over, no apprehension need be entertained on that score, but on the contrary, there would in all probability, be an increase in the amount collected this year.

Mr. John Tobin argued in favor of the 10 per cent. duty—he thought it strange that members of the late Government should be divided upon the question, as they had supported the increase when in power. He did not think there would be more smuggling than at present.

Mr. Locke—It is admitted on all hands that the revenue must be raised. I think the duties should be raised to ten per cent.

Mr. Morrison thought that the ad valorem duty should not be increased to more than 8 per cent., and advocated the imposition of 25 per cent. increased duty on imported liquors.

Mr. C. Campbell, and Mr. Chipman also supported the Resolution.

The question was then put and passed without division.

Mr. Henry then moved the following Resolution,
Resolved, That the duty on Maderia, Port, and Sherry Wines, of which the first cost is £30 per pipe or upwards, be 2s. 6d. per gallon.

The effect of the rise in price of Wines amounted to a prohibition—he therefore thought the imports should be placed upon the footing they formerly occupied.

The Resolution was put and carried 14 to 10.

The Light House duty of last year was re-enacted.

Mr. Morrison moved that the License duty for the sale of ardent spirits should be raised from £6 to £20.

Mr. Parker thought there was a general feeling in the country favorable to an increase, but thought £20 too high; in his opinion £10 was a moderate sum.

Mr. Tobin would move that it be increased from £6 to £10.

Mr. Morrison. The hon. gentleman has been always opposed to me on this question; he defeated the Maine Law last session.

Mr. Wade said the licenses had been granted in November. To increase the duty so much now would create some inconvenience. This question should, in his opinion, be discussed when the whole subject was considered.

Mr. Henry.—This is the Prohibitory Bill in another form; the right to refuse licenses combined with a £20 tax, would drive vendors to sell illicitly.

Mr. Tobin was sorry to differ with the hon. member for North Colchester, but could not help regarding with pride his action in defeating the Maine Law last session, as he felt confident it would have thrown the country into confusion.

Mr. Morrison.—It was in behalf of the rising generation that he pleaded for the rise in the price of licenses.

Mr. Geldert thought it would be better for the country to lower the price of license than to raise them. He did not think there were 3 counties in the Province that would pay £20.

Mr. Henry remarked upon the inconsistencies of the member for Colchester, who said his object was to break up the small groggeries—his intention is good, but he thought he would fail. For instance, a respectable man pays his £20 for a license and perhaps sells £100 a year—this is a tax of 50 per cent. Another man opens a low grog shop without any license, and sells as much or more than the other. Does the member for Colchester think that by raising the price of license such characters as the last kind supposed will be affected. He thought the present license law stringent enough. The effect of the motion would be that no licenses would be taken out.

Mr. Bailey thought the discussion out of place; the price of licenses was a matter for each county to consider.

Mr. Parker moved in amendment that the sum be £12 instead of £20.

Mr. Moses said if the Licenses were fixed too high none would be taken out. He would be glad to see the present system put a stop to. He was in favor of prohibition, but was afraid it could not be carried out successfully. He was inclined to think moral suasion the true principle.

Hon. Charles Campbell thought the law had better remain as it was.

Mr. Morrison withdrew his motion.
Mr. Churchill did the same.

Mr. M. L. Pan moved that the license be raised to £12, which was lost, 20 to 12.

Mr. Chipman moved that the price be raised to £10, which was lost.

The original resolution was then moved and passed.

The Committee then adjourned.—House resumed and passed the several resolutions, which also passed to committee.

Upon motion it was resolved that the duty on refined sugar be reduced from 14s. to 10s. 6d. per cwt.

Mr. McLellan moved that the report of the committee as to the duty on Sherry and Port Wines be not received, and the duties remain as heretofore.

For the motion, 12. Against, 17.

Mr. Henry moved that a committee be appointed to prepare revenue Bill. The following gentlemen were appointed:

Messrs Henry, Wade, and Killam.

Mr. McLellan gave notice to rescind the resolution relating to license duty.

TUESDAY, March 24.

House met at 3 o'clock.

The Revenue Bills were taken up for the third reading.

Upon the Act relating to Light House Duty, Mr. Killam moved that the following clause should be added:

"All vessels shall pay their light duties on their clearance and not on their entrance."

He thought it wrong for vessels to pay light duties twice in one voyage, as they were liable to under the present law.

Mr. Morrison thought there was no need for any alteration, as he could not conceive how any vessel could be made to pay twice.

Mr. Henry said there would be danger of fraud in the alteration proposed, as vessels might escape paying altogether by leaving in the night. He thought under the present law vessels were not liable to pay twice.

Mr. Chipman agreed with the last speaker.

Mr. Killam was also of opinion that by the law vessels need not pay light duty twice, but the Collectors thought differently, and were so instructed by the heads of their departments.

Mr. McLellan could not see how vessels could be made to pay on entering and clearing also.

Mr. Henry explained the operation of the law—vessels registered in the Province on clearing out—others on entering.

Mr. Killam consented to withdraw his motion in deference to the legal opinion of Mr. Henry.

Mr. Wier suggested that the light duties with regard to large ships coming into the harbor in distress, should be reduced one fourth.

Mr. Tobin thought it would lead to fraud.

Mr. Whitman was afraid if we reduced the duties the light houses could not be sustained—the revenue could not bear it.

Mr. Martell said if the duty was raised at all, it should be raised on the large steamers which only pay 6d. per ton for one voyage, and pay nothing more during the year, and not on the coasters.

Mr. Morrison thought it would not be advisable to admit vessels in distress free from duty.

Mr. Killam approved of the suggestion of the member for Halifax with regard to vessels in distress.

Mr. McLellan thought vessels coming into port in distress received benefit from the light houses, and therefore should pay for it.

Mr. Wier said it was not his intention to raise the duties on our vessels, but to reduce them. He differed from the member for Londonderry as to the duties in the United States; he thought they were not so heavy there as here, as there was no light duty to be paid there. He moved that all ships coming into the harbor in distress, not being bound from one port in this province to another, should pay 3d. per ton Light duty, instead of 6d.

Mr. Killam seconded.

Mr. Henry was of opinion that a great many questions would arise under that clause as to whether the vessels were actually driven in in distress or not. He thought this the very class of ships that should pay the duty, as they derived the most benefit from the lights. This was not the time to move such a question, after the committee had reported the bills; it should have been moved in committee of ways and means.

Mr. Wier—Every ship owner agrees with me that it is hard to have to pay the duty when vessels are obliged to seek shelter in a harbor from storms.

Mr. Morrison—In the United States, altho' ships pay no light duty, they have many other charges to bear, while in our ports ships pay no other duties but this one. So I was right in saying that the port charges in the United States are higher than here.

Mr. Wier said there was no wharfage paid in New York.

Mr. Morrison denied this, and said he had paid it for years.

Mr. Henry—If this resolution is passed you will lose one half of those duties now collected in the Strait of Canso—as every other vessel will say they are in distress. This will make a serious difference in the revenue.

Hon. C. Campbell thought the charges in ports of our Province were lower than in any other British Colony, and it would be unwise to alter the law.

Mr. Wier—There is no other place in the world where a ship has to pay a whole year's light money for one entrance.

The amendment passed in the negative.