

ther impose such a duty on such manufactures as would abolish them altogether.

Mr Howe said that he was surprised to hear a gentleman, whose speech betrayed his country, rise to oppose a petition of this kind, and to depress the manufacture of Whiskey. He, Mr. H. had thought of moving for a Committee on the subject, and of proposing that that honourable gentleman should be the Chairman of that Committee. He himself wished that the people could be kept from drinking spirits of any kind, it was a bad practice; but if spirits would be used, and if good whiskey of home manufacture, could be made to displace the bad liquors brought into the market, the petition might be worthy of consideration.

Mr Holland said that his speech was said to have betrayed that he came from a country where whiskey was popular. He did come from that country and if the honourable gentleman who made the remark had seen the evils which he had witnessed, both in that country and in this, as the consequence of the use of strong liquors, he would not advocate the recognition of the manufacture.

Mr W. Sargent said that even if the country could supply a manufactory of that which was evil, he did not see that that was a reason why manufactures should be encouraged.

Mr Waterman having written the Resolution previously alluded to, rose for the purpose of moving it. He said that his desire was to have an evidence of the spirit of the age on the Journals of Nova Scotia.

Mr Doyle remarked that that was one way of exhibiting the spirit of the age.

Mr Waterman moved, that the House considered the use of intoxicating liquors as productive of great evils—and that the presenter of the petition have leave to withdraw it.

Mr Smith said a few words on the same side.

Mr Doyle said that he was always adverse to clap trap. If members were sincere they should not touch one penny of the unhallowed money gained from the traffic in ardent spirits; yet when the House came to the scramble for money, these members were first grasping for it. Let them declare that they would not touch that which the rum yielded,—let them put a stop to the importation of the article,—that would be the way to promote temperance effectually, but that kind of talk was mere clap trap.

(At the conclusion of these remarks half a dozen gentlemen started to their feet simultaneously.)

Mr Smith said that although he would willingly encourage useful manufactures, he considered it his duty to oppose the position. Its object was, to encourage the application of an article wanted for bread, and of which the Province did not produce enough, to the manufacture of an article which was allowed to be highly injurious. In answer to the remark about the revenue, he would say, if a majority of the House allowed the importation of an article contrary to the views of the minority, and compelled their constituents to submit to the evils arising from the traffic, he did not see why they should be precluded from participating in the profits also.

Mr Dewolf said that there was no requirement of a manufacture of that kind in Nova Scotia; he was the more against it from the facts as stated in the petition, that it would convert a useful grain, of which there was not enough for useful purposes in the Province, into an injurious article. If the member for Isle Madame would make the motion which he proposed to offer, he, Mr D., would cheerfully give him his support. He hoped there was a disposition in the House to dispose of the question at once. An argument often used against Temperance societies, that they tended to de-

stroy the revenue, would apply with much force against the petition.

Mr Lewis said that he had serious thoughts to move for the prohibition of ardent spirits altogether. He believed that such a course would do great good. By the traffic, a sum not less than £54,000 was sunk every year in the Province; a sum which might as well be thrown into the ocean,—better indeed, because its use did much evil and no good. By the loss of this £54,000, £17,000 of revenue was gained,—so that to collect £17,000 a sum of £54,000 was expended! Look to your Poor House, and see the miserable victims of intemperance,—see the individuals who might fill useful stations in society sunk in wretchedness; see the haggard wife and hungry children; and then say whether the traffic should be encouraged. Intemperance was like a stream of liquid fire flowing through the country destroying all before it. It was an undeniable fact that ardent spirits were a prime evil, they did no manner of good to soul or body. Before he left home he attended a Temperance society meeting, and one of the speakers remarked, that Nova Scotia seemed like a great valley, through which a destructive stream rolled; efforts were made to stop its progress, but it rolled over every embankment. At the head of the stream was a gate, and if the people living near the gate could only be persuaded to shut it, the evil would be immediately checked. Here, said the honourable member, here are these people, here is the gate, here is the power to close the barrier. Prevent the evil from coming into the Province, and you confer one of the greatest possible benefits on the country. He would give his cordial support to the amendment.

Mr Uniacke could not refrain when he heard such charges against the population of Nova Scotia. They were described as a drunken rabble, rushing to wallow in the stream of destruction. His opinion was that there was not a more sober peasantry on the face of the earth. The proposition of the hon. member for Isle Madame was a rational one—prevent the importation—do not bring in the article and then rail against it, and advise that it should not be used and provide remedies against its evils,—but prohibit it. The present system was as bad as if a doctor was to say take poison, you need not fear, for I have a stomach pump ready to save your life. Ship load after ship load of the evil was introduced, revenue was made from it, and all the time it was abused, and the people were told not to touch the plague. The praises of temperance were sounded—but every one was convinced on that head. Suppose a man was trained to any extreme physical exertion, the first step would be to stop his grog. If a pugilist went to Tom Crib for training, the question would be, are you prepared to sign the articles—if not, you must go away, you will never be fit to meet a man who conforms to the requisite for full bodily vigour. Though no class of men mingle more in reckless company than Pugilists and Jockeys, it was well known how abstemious they became when any great work was to be done; they came back to cold water, and touched nothing of spirituous liquors when strength and activity were the objects. The celebrated pedestrian Captain Barclay, took nothing stronger than tea during the performance of his great feats. At one time he was induced to take 2 glasses of sherry, and it had such an influence that it was with great difficulty he could be brought to his work, and he nearly lost his match.—Those who attended to physical energies should, without the shadow of a doubt, avoid intoxicating draughts,—and respecting mental considerations, no comment was required. The question was not were those things evil, but how are you to prevent such evils. The member for Cumberland contemplated a bill to pre-

vent its importation; if that were done they would destroy the only source of revenue in this country, that gentleman said that a sum of £54,000 was lost by the traffic,—why yes, large sums are paid for that and other things—see what is paid for articles of food, (Mr. Lewis that does good,) yes, but what good does tobacco do? Yet at the Temperance meeting to which he alluded, no doubt, there was plenty of chewing and spitting around the room. A friend in the country spoke to him, Mr U. about temperance, and about what the house should do on the subject, but he replied, what right have you to talk of temperance while your nose is filled with snuff? Intemperance appears in various particulars—than intemperance in using spirituous liquors, in chewing, smoking and snuffing, in opium eating, and in coffee drinking—and where were they to stop in attacking such evils.—The wretched wife was spoken of, but might not the husband bring misery on his family without the use of ardent spirits,—might he not be guilty of incontinence, and desert his home out of preference to his neighbour's ewe lamb? Evils were numerous, but how could they Legislate on these matters without carrying it out all the way? He would state one fact respecting himself, and members might judge whether they had not met with similar experience,—he could drink a bottle of wine without being more affected than if he had drunk a bottle of water, yet if he took a cup of coffee he would be intoxicated; it would make him restless and sleepless; tea also was a luxury, and its importation might be opposed.—Who would say, that if the people of Nova Scotia refrained from tea and drank milk instead, they would not be stronger and better.—Tea was only used as a medicine on its first introduction; habit made many things appear indispensable, which, in reality were not so. Tobacco was a poison, and if taken by any animal for the first time the effect would be similar to that of a dose of arsenic. All such matters could not be legislated for,—opinions might be expressed, but men cannot be forcibly prevented from procuring and using articles, deleterious in themselves, but rendered familiar by habit. The peasantry of the country, he would repeat, were remarkable for sobriety; last summer, while on a visit to the country, he only met with one drunken person beyond Sackville Bridge,—that person was a military pensioner, and when remonstrated with, he said that on pension days he took a drop, and on the anniversary of every great battle he got drunk, and he would continue to do so. They might deplore those evils but could not abolish them by legislation.

Mr Lewis said, that the hon. gentleman who had just sat down, made a pretty good story of every thing he undertook. He again enquired was not the traffic total loss to the country.

Mr Uniacke—if you were to send out the productions of the country, and bring cold water in return, the loss would be the same.

Mr Lewis, The argument of the hon. gentleman was that of excusing one evil by another; he Mr L. did not believe that two wrongs would make a right. If it was wrong to drink rum it was wrong—if wrong to take tobacco it was also wrong but one being wrong did not make the other right. The argument used was, that because one man did one thing wrong, a second person might do another.—For every cargo of lumber that was sent away, and rum brought back, more evil was done than if the whole was lost. The people not only pay the duty but they pay the principal also, and it was the worst kind of loss to men for they paid for what did injury.

Mr Howe moved, that the Petition be referred to the Committee on the Tariff.

The Amendment was moved.