COLONIAL LEGISLATURE.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, Monday, March 21, 1853.

EXPORT DUTY ON JUNIPER KNEES.

House in Committee on Ways and Means—Mr. Haviland in the Chair.

HON. MR. PALMER. I am quite sensible of the necessity of imposing a high export-duty upon Juniper-knees. I know, however, that it will be objected to on the score that the imposition of such a duty will be an inroad upon the private rights of individuals; and that nothing ought to be held more sacred and inviolate, by legislators, than such rights. But there are exceptions to all rules; and, as respects this duty, although it may, at first sight, appear to be for the benefit of a class, yet upon more consideration it will be evident that—the prosperity of the Colony being most intimately connected with it—the prevention of the exportation of Juniper-knees will prove quite as beneficial to the people in general, as to the Ship-builders; although the latter may be the first direct recipients of the benefits arising from it. The shipbuilding interests require the protection which an export-duty on Juniper-knees would afford them. The wasteful and improvident manner in which juniper trees have lately been cut down—immense quantities of this valuable timber having been sold at an almost merely nominal price and exported—affords a convincing proof that, if it be not put a stop to by the imposition of such a duty, the effects will prove most injurious to the shipbuilding interests, and, through them, to the general interests of the Colony. Although the building of large vessels may not last very long; there is reason to believe, that the building of small vessels will continue, for many years, to be a source of profit and prosperity to the Colony, if not put a stop to by an improvident and wasteful use of the timber requisite for carrying it on. Convinced of the propriety of these views, I will support an export-duty on Juniper-knees, with a view to the preservation of juniper trees for the service of our own ship-builders, on whose prosperity, the general prosperity of the country so much depends. Such a duty will, no doubt, be felt as a grievance by a few individuals, because it will deprive them of all prospect of immediate gain from the sale and exportation of juniper-knees; but, in affording protection to the ship-building interests, it will increase the general prosperity of the Colony; and the interests of the few must yield to those of the many.

MR. MOONEY. I thought these would be the opinions of the hon. and learned member for Charlottetown, with respect to this question. He says that the interests of the few must give way to the interests of the many; but to pursue the course which he recommends would, on the contrary, be a forcing of the interests of the many to give way to those of the few: it would be the inflicting of a direct and serious injury upon the tenantry, to enable the ship-builders to live in splendour. The proprietors, by the Leases which they grant, tie their tenants down by most restrictive conditions; and, now, the Legislature is to be called upon to interfere—not for the purpose of breaking those restrictions; but to increase them—to tell the tenantry that they shall not be allowed a full and free exercise of the few privileges which the Proprietors have conceded to them. Nothing can be more cruel than to say to the poor tenant upon an unimproved farm, on which, perhaps, there may be a swamp, bearing juniper trees, "You shall not cut down and sell them to the Americans who will give you the best cash price for them; but you must allow them to stand until they die of old age, or are destroyed by fire, unless they may happen to be wanted by some of our ship-builders who will pay you for them, in molasses or tea, at their own exorbitant prices. It is very true that the growth of that swamp might just now be a little fortune to you, if sold to the Yankees for hard dollars; but you must make no such use of it for your own benefit or that of your family; it must be reserved for the use of ship-builders, to enrich them, when they shall require it—no matter how pressing your necessities may be in the mean time." As well might the Legislature be called upon to prevent the exportation of fine horses, by means of an export-duty, in order that they might be reserved for our merchants and ship-builders, and made obtainable by them at their own prices. As well, and with as much propriety, might we be called upon to give effect, by legislative enactment to an idea of Judge Peters's with respect to the use of hay. His Honor the Assistant Judge says that farmers ruin themselves by selling hay, and that it would be better for them to use all they cut upon their farms, in feeding and bedding their cattle with it, than to sell it. I believe that his Honor is most sincerely anxious to promote the interests of the farmer, and that, both on account of his experimental practice in agricultural economy and his writings in recommendation of it, he is entitled to the respect and gratitude of the farmers of Prince Edward Island; but, yet, I think there are few, if any members of this House who would not at once exclaim against the monstrous injustice of a proposition for giving effect by law to this idea of Judge Peters. But that for the prevention of the exportation of juniper-knees is not one whit less unjust, than it would be to prevent a man's selling his own hay. I have a perfect right to do what I will with what is my own ["Hear!" from the Hon. Mr. Palmer.] No matter who the Proprietor may be, under whom I live—I have a better right to my farm, than the proprietor who, perhaps, never saw it. If the hon. and learned member is, however, very anxious for the impositon of a tax which would, in reality, prove a general benefit to the Colony, I will re-commend one of that kind to him—I mean an export-duty on all rents sent out of the Colony to absentee proprietors. Absentee Proprietors are, by all I believe, acknowledged to be a curse; and I think it would not be unworthy of the wisdom and patriotism of this House seriously to consider whether the curse might not be mitigated by some such means as I have now hinted at. If the House will not interfere with the land-tenure, the least they can do is to leave the tenantry in full and free possession and enjoyment of the few privileges which have been conceded to them by the proprietors. The imposition of an export-duty on juniper-knees would be a very unjust and cruel act indeed. In many instances it would, I believe, not only deprive individuals of the means of procuring the only little luxuries in which they ever seek to indulge—such as tea, sugar, and molasses—but shut up the only present source whence they could derive as much money as would enable them to pay their rents. I am not, I am sure, disposed to anathematize my fellow-men; but, so monstrously unjust, so selfishly cruel do I consider the proposition for the imposition of an export-duty on juniper-knees, that, if any thing at all likely to occur in the course of our legislation, could justify an anathema upon its authors, I think it would be the giving effect to this proposition—the preventing of poor men from sending to the best market, in order to realize a little cash, the only spontaneous production of the soil they have to dispose of, whilst otherwise employed in clearing improveable portions of their farms, and reasing therefrom a most scanty provision for the daily subsistence of themselves and families; to the end that the juniper trees may be preserved for the use of, and as a means of enriching, a few hon. members of this House and other ship-builders, to be purchased by them, when they want them, at their own prices, and to be paid for in goods, at whatever value they may please to set upon them.

HON MR. PALMER. I certainly never expected to hear the hon. member from Flinty Glen advocate the political doctrine of the late Duke of Newcastle "that every man has a right to do what he will with his own;" but the hon. member, as well as the party with which he acts, has been guilty of so many inconsistencies, that this new one need excite no surprise. According to his very limited and defective view of the advantages which result from ship-building, they are experienced by none but the ship-builders themselves; but the truth is, that the prosecution of the trade of ship-building has been one of the chief sources of general prosperity to the Colony; and that it will continue to be so, so long as it can be prosecuted for the benefit and profit of those who are immediately employed in carrying it on. The advantages arising from it are not, by any means, confined to the few merchants who are engaged in carrying it on. On the contrary, the farmer and mechanic largely participate in the benefits arising from it, in the shape of hard Spanish Dollars, from Newfoundland; to the former, in payment for his produce; and, to the latter in remuneration for his skill and labour. I support the proposal for the imposition of a protective export-duty on juniper-knees, therefore, not with a view to the protection of the interests of a class; but with a view to the promotion of the general interests of the Colony. The imposition of the proposed duty would not, however, be an act of that arbitrary nature which is, sometimes, had recourse to. It is not to deprive a man of his property. It is not to prevent his making use of it. It is merely to induce, or, if you please, in a manner to compel him to reserve it for occasions, when the sale and use of it will be most for the promotion of the general interests, and consequently, in the end, most for his own individual benefit, and that of his family. It is surely very clear that, if ship-building timber become as high here as it is now elsewhere,—and rise in price it certainly will with us as it becomes scarcer,—the reserving of juniper trees, by tenants, on parts of whose farms they are now growing, will be a saving of them for their own great ultimate benefit. I do not, however, blame the hon. member from Flinty Glen for advocating the rights of his constituents; but I am opposed to the policy which, in this instance, he would have the Legislature to adopt, because I think it would be much less advantageous to such of the tenantry as are immediately concerned in the question under consideration, to be allowed to cut down their juniper trees and export the knees to the United States, or elsewhere, than to preserve them for home use by our own ship-builders. We know very well that the land on which juniper trees grow is not in itself valuable; but, allow the timber to grow, and that will, eventually, make it, for a time, more valuable than the most productive portions of a cleared farm.

HON. MR. WARBURTON. I will oppose the imposition of an export-duty upon Juniper Knees, as I did last year. They who have juniper trees growing upon their farms, have certainly a right to make the most of them; and ought to be left at perfect liberty to sell them to those persons, whoever they may be, who will give them the best price for them, whether as timber or knees; and whether required for home use, or exportation. It is a fact that as good prices cannot be obtained, for juniper, from our Island ship-builders, as from the Americans; and, therefore, the export of them ought not, I think, to be interfered with. It might, indeed, be perfectly fair and reasonable to require all the juniper growing in the Island, to be reserved for home use, provided there were a sufficient demand for it, and that fair and reasonable payments were made for it by our ship-builders. But that is not the case; and, therefore, to prevent the exportation of it, by the imposition of a heavy export-duty would be a very arbitrary and oppressive act. It is not from hear-say that I speak; but from my own knowledge. In my own district, the poor farmers are paid for their juniper, and, in fact for any other kind of timber they may be able to dispose of, in a way which is shamefully unfair: they are paid for it in all kinds of trash, at most exorbitant rates. In my neighbourhood, I am sorry to say there are too many engaged in lumbering; and, however necessary the carrying on of the lumbering trade may be for the supplying of the ship-yards and the benefit of ship-builders, I am very certain that most of the poor men who are so engaged, instead of improving their own circumstances by it, are, year after year, becoming poorer and poorer.

MR. LONGWORTH. Notwithstanding the threatened anathema of the hon. member from Flinty Glen (Mr. Mooney), I am not afraid to declare myself in favor of the imposition of an export-duty on Juniper-Knees. But, in so declaring myself, I am not more influenced by a consideration of the ship-builder's interests, than a regard for those of the farmer. The export trade, in juniper, as it has lately been carried on, is only in Knees, for the sake of which hundreds of valuable trees are cut down, and, after having had the knees taken off, left upon the ground to rot, and, in the case of fire, to be, as it were, an additional means of accomplishing the destruction of those which were left standing. I would not impose a high duty on what knees are now prepared for exportation; but, with respect to all now engaged for by contract, or so prepared for exportation on the opening of the navigation, I would propose a duty of from 9d. to 1s. a knee until the 1st July. But after that period, the duty should, I think, be as high as 4s. 6d. a knee. It ought, in fact, to be made prohibitory, as in New Brunswick; for all the juniper now growing in the Island will, if left, be required, by ourselves, for ship-building purposes: and, as the reserving of it for such purposes will be to provide for the support of a trade which has been the main source of whatever prosperity has, hitherto, been experienced by the Colony, and which, so long as it can be successfully carried on, will continue to promote the general interests more than any other business which could be taken up in its stead, I am decidedly of opinion that the sooner the export trade in Juniper Knees shall be put a stop to by a prohibitory duty the better.

MR. MONTGOMERY. I have always thought that the cutting down of juniper trees, for the sake of the knees, and allowing all the rest to lie upon the ground, would not only, eventually, prove very detrimental to our shipping and general interests; but that it would also cut off an immediate source of gain to those directly concerned in its destruction for the sake of small immediate gains, arising from the sale of the knees. Juniper is the most valuable timber in the country, and the preservation of it, for home use in ship-building, would be the preservation of a source of general prosperity. As good ships cannot be built here without it, the preservation of it for ship-building uses, is, no doubt, essential to the success and continuance of that trade; and, consequently, the prosperity of our ship-builders: but, necessary as it may be to their successful prosecution of the trade, its preservation would benefit the country at large much more than it would benefit them. Of late years, the ship-building business has not generally been productive of much profit to those who have been directly engaged in carrying it on. On the contrary, it has proved almost ruinous to some of them. Still its prosecution has been generally beneficial to the country: and, so intimately is the prosecution of that business connected with the general prosperity of the country, that, when it prospers, all our interests prosper; and, when it declines, its depression is injuriously felt by the whole body of the people. If the Americans be allowed, but for a short time longer, to purchase, and ship off juniper-knees, as they have done of late, there will not be a juniper tree left in the Island. I am favourable to a duty, which, like that in New Brunswick, shall amount to a prohibition; and I think 4s. 6d. a knee would be little enough to render it effective for the preservation of the timber.

HON. THE SPEAKER. He could not believe that any hon. member could be conscientiously persuaded that the successful carrying on of the ship-building business, in this Colony, would be for the benefit of the ship-builders only, and not for that of the people in general also. He had no connexion with ship-builders, and could not, he thought, be suspected of a desire to promote their interests at the expense of those of the tenantry, or of any portion of them. He was at a loss to perceive any good grounds for the great warmth and earnestness with which the proposition for the imposition of an export-duty on juniper knees was opposed by the hon. member for the Second District of Queen's County. It was not the first time that exportation had been prevented by an act of the Legislature; and when an embargo was laid upon grain, that hon. member was, he believed, in favor of it. The crop in question was not however like grain. It was one which, once cut down, would never grow again: at least a second growth of a useful size could not be looked for. The prevention of exportation, when likely to be attended with injurious effects, was, besides, a policy, the wisdom of which had been practically acknowledged by all countries. A quantity of juniper, for which, if exported, not more than £100 would be received, would, if left at home, for the use of our ship-builders, eventually realize a return of £1000, for the benefit of the Colony. Surely then it would be wise to prevent, if possible, so great a loss to the country, as would be caused by such improvident exportation of juniper. The hon. the Colonial Secretary had said that they who were engaged in lumbering derived no lasting benefit from it. That was a mistake. Some ship-builders gave employment to as many as 1000 men, in that way, and in their shipyards; and it was well known that many, by means of such employment, had become free-holders. In some districts there was no ship-building; and in such there was little or no lumbering. At the west end of the Island there had, last year, been burned down more juniper, if he had been correctly informed, than had been shipped from that quarter for years before. If that was the case; if such was the danger to be apprehended from fire, it would be better to cut down and ship-off all the juniper they had left, although they might not be able to sell it for more than one-tenth of its value. It would surely be better to secure something, than to run the risk of losing all. In the policy of preventing exportation, the great commercial prosperity of Great Britain had its origin. For hundreds of years, no wool was allowed to be exported from England, unless in a manufactured state. Even in his own time, a British wheel-wright was not at liberty to remove to a foreign country; and the exportation of all kinds of machinery was prevented. Manufacturers themselves were not at liberty to emigrate to other countries; and, if their leaving the kingdom was, at any time winked at, they went out as labourers. The hon. member for the Second District of Queen's County (Mr. Mooney) had said, that it would be cruel to prevent a poor farmer from doing as he liked with any juniper which he might have on his land. So might English farmers have said, and so, perhaps, some of them did say, when they were not allowed to export their wool to France, in which country they could have obtained 5s. sterling a pound for it, whilst, at home, they could obtain only 2s.; but the general prosperity of the nation depended upon the prohibition, and it was, therefore, wisely persevered in. Indeed, if he mistook not, the exportation of English oak was prohibited, because it was required for the maintenance of the British navy. The policy of such prohibitions was not questionable; great national benefits had resulted from them; and whenever it could be satisfactorily proved that their imposition would tend to the promotion of the general interests of a people, it would be wise to have recourse to them. His former opinion, with respect to the prohibition of the exportation of juniper, had, however, been a little shaken by what had lately come to his knowledge concerning the quantity of that timber destroyed by fire; and he was of opinion that, whilst it would be positively unjust to impose any prohibitory duty that would interfere with existing contracts, circumstances would scarcely authorise its imposition at all for a longer period than three years, dating from the end of the summer.

TEMPERANCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF HASZARD'S GAZETTE.

Sir,—You would oblige a constant subscriber, and a sincere well-wisher to the progress of one of the most needed Reforms, by publishing the following Speech of Professor Stowe, at the anniversary meeting of the Scottish Temperance League, as it appears in the *Glasgow Christian News*. I was delighted to see the names of upwards of 30 ministers, eminent in the Church, who were upon the platform. We cannot expect prosperity in our cause, without it can be taken up by the promoters of Religion, and as many of them are now coming forward to help it on, we may indeed look forward to increased prosperity.

Yours, truly,

E. E. R.

PROFESSOR STOWE, who, on rising, was received with great cheering, said—I once heard of a good old orator who was accustomed to say when asked to speak—'Well, my friends, I never could begin a speech till after I made a few remarks.' (A laugh.) Now, I am afraid I shall this evening have to make a few remarks, and then sit down without making a speech—so I hope you will excuse me. The first remark I have to make is, that the temperance cause in Scotland seems to be just exactly where the anti-slavery cause is in America. Now, if you in the temperance cause here give us a good impulse in the anti-slavery cause in America, we will give you a good impulse in the temperance cause in Scotland. (Cheers.) So that we shall help each other 'to do good and communicate,' and thus to fulfil 'the law of Christ.' I wish this evening to explain to you, so far as I can, the causes, the nature, and the operation of the Maine Law as it is called; and, having been engaged in the temperance movement for twenty five years, in all its stages, from the lowest depression up to the hour of triumph, I am satisfied all true temperance movements must culminate in a Maine Law. (Loud cheers.) I first went to the state of Maine in 1819 before anything was thought or said on the subject of temperance, and, after living in the State for six years, while that question was in the lowest state of depression, I returned in 1850 just as it was beginning to enjoy the triumph of the Maine Law, and I lived there two years to witness the operation and effects of that law. Now, the state of Maine is inhabited chiefly by seamen, fishermen, and lumpers, that is, men who go into those vast forests, spend the winter in cutting and drawing the timber on the rivers while frozen, so that in spring when the ice breaks up, the timber will be floated down to the sea ports, whence it is transported to all parts of the world. These being all employments entailing a great deal of hardship and exposure to bad weather, it was thought universally that distilled spirits, intoxicating drinks, were necessary for those who were exposed to such hardships; and being removed to a great extent from the restraints of domestic life, it was very natural that these indulgences should be carried to excess. And that was the fact. Throughout that State there was the excess of spirit selling and spirit drinking which, I am sorry to say, I witnessed in Scotland both now and when I visited this kingdom in 1836. It seemed to me, then, as it seems to me now, that as Scotland, in its natural features and the character of the people, bears a strong resemblance to the state of Maine, so the drunken habits of Scotland very much resemble those which prevailed in Maine; and I hope you will ere long have in Scotland a law like the Maine law. (Great applause.) When I went to Maine in 1819, it was said that the village, composed chiefly of lumper men, drank enough to float their whole timber to the sea—there was so much rum drinking—their was so many drunkards—so many paupers—all would be ruined. The people thought of a society to prevent intoxication. That was the first society I ever heard of—it was formed by about twenty-five or thirty individuals. The habits of drinking were bringing ruin and poverty into every town in the State. I was educated in the State of Maine, and many of my class, in which there were such men as General Pierce, President of the United States, John P. Hale, Longfellow the poet, Hawthorn, and others, since very much distinguished—some of the very finest minds in the College, in every way equal to those I have mentioned, and perhaps in some respects superior—amiable, intelligent, and young men, whose names would have shone throughout the world, were ruined by intoxicating drinks. They acquired the habit in College, and before they were 25 years of age they were miserable drunkards, beyond all hope of reclamation. In despair, several of them committed suicide; many of them died of the most loathsome diseases; others disappeared from society, and were never heard of. People began to think what they should do; 'this rum,' they said, 'will destroy us all—we must do something;' and they began a series of efforts—one experiment after another; but everything proved more or less ineffectual till they came to the Maine Law. They did make improvements—they did diminish the drinking habits—they did rescue many from a drunkard's grave; but many more were drawn into the vortex, and hundreds of families were plunged into poverty—reduced to the extremity of misery. At last the people said they would not bear it any longer. Don't suppose that this Maine Law was the act of the Legislature of the State of Maine—not so, it was the act of the people themselves, and therefore it was executed. It was supported by nine-tenths of all the women and children, and by three-fourths of all the men. (Cheers.) Therefore it went high and dry above all opposition, and vindicated its own claims to support. (Cheers.) What is the Maine Law? It is an act to suppress drinking and tippling houses—to put an end to traffic in intoxicating drinks among the people. It has nothing to do with the interior of any man's family—any man, wherever he can find liquor, if he chooses, may purchase it and bring it into his own family, and use it there if he likes—the law does not touch it or him. It considers every man's house his castle, and if he has a mind to drink in the bosom of his family, and expose himself in that way to his own household, it does not take hold of him—it leaves him free in that respect. But if any man does bring intoxicating liquors into the State for sale—if he sells intoxicating drinks, and make money by it—if he even gives it away, and takes something else to evade the law, what does the law do? It takes all his rum away and throws it on the ground. (Cheers.) It does not touch his pocket or his person; but it says, You are not a fit person to have the possession of intoxicating drink, and we shall take it away. (Laughter.) All the testimony required is the presence of the store itself—wherever it is seen, the criminal cannot escape. There is the witness, and what do we do with the criminal? Just knock him on the head, and leave him on the ground. (laugh.) If a man makes solemn oath that he will not sell, and does not sell, any of that spirit, it leaves him unmolested. If alcohol is introduced for the arts and manufactures—and we know it to be necessary in many of the arts—it is not touched. If it is kept for medical purposes, like opium, calomel, or any other article of that kind, to be used and prescribed by a physician, it is not touched. In every town, there are agents appointed by the town and paid by the town, for the sale of alcohol for these purposes—manufacturing and medical—but they are under oath and heavy bonds to sell it for no other purposes. The certificate of a respectable physician is sufficient to authorise its sale for medical purposes, and the oath of a manufacturer is required for its sale to a manufacturer. And to prevent the effects of monoply, the agents have not the profits of the sale—the article is sold at cost, and the community or the township receives all the profit—the agent acts for the township and not for any individual. Such is the substance and purpose of the law; and it has been most perfectly effectual. (Cheers.) I never saw a law that operated so beautifully and vindicated itself so nobly as that law does. (Cheers.) But suppose it had been passed against the will of the people, it could not have been executed at all. It would have done more harm than good; but the people being persuaded such a law was necessary for their protection, it was passed, although it required the labours of twenty-five years to bring the public mind to that position. When the law passed, the majority of the Legislature were against it—I know the Governor of the State was against it—the majority of the Senate was against it, and probably a majority of the House of Representatives was against it; but the representatives were instructed by the people to enact such a law—the law was discussed, it was examined by the people, approved by the great majority, they instructed their representatives to vote for it; and there were very few of the representatives that dared to resist the will of the people in that respect, because they knew the people were right. When it came to the Senate they dared not resist the whole of the people. But though the majority was against the bill, the Governor was not particularly popular, and said, We will just pass that bill, and as we know he drinks brandy, he is sure not to pass it. Well, the Senate passed it, and brought it to the Governor. He looked very glum—(laughter)—and asked, What have you passed the bill for? They handed it to him—the responsibility was thrown on him. Well, said he, if you have killed the skunk, you must skin him yourself—(laughter)—and thus, the bill being the desire of the people, it was signed by the Governor, although, at the same time, the Senate was opposed to it. (Cheers.) Then they all said, Let us judge the law by its effects. In less than six months the Governor was in favour of the law, when he witnessed its effects. So also were the majority of the Senate; and at the next meeting of the Legislature, when a tremendous effort was made by one-fourth, who were opposed to it, to get them and the Legislature against it, the majority was found stronger in its favour than before; and when, a third time, a proposition was made to amend the law, it was made even more stringent than it was at first. (Cheers.) Well then you may say this was an infringement of public right; how do they justify the entire prohibition of the sale of alcohol? They justify it in this way—They say, We know the use of this article is dangerous, and did do an enormous amount of mischief—we know it used to murder the young men by hundreds—we know that it used to introduce poverty, misery, distress, and a thousand evils into domestic life—we know that it occasioned two thirds of all the pauperism, three fourths of all the crime, nine tenths of all the poverty in the state, and they did not see that it did any good to compensate for all this evil—that it could be shown through alcohol did a great deal of harm, far from the good preponderating, the more they examined into the matter, the more they saw alcoholic drinks were not necessary to persons in health, but, on the contrary, generally injurious—that they did effect an amonnt of evil without any corresponding good; and they said further, on the part of the public, we have a right to prohibit this traffic—the same right we have for the good of society to put down counterfeiting, smuggling, and other practices injurious to the community at large, that produce a great deal of evil without cerresponding good. They said, if a man came into one of our towns and sets up a gambling establishment, we are perfectly justified in taking away his implements and destroying them; if a man comes and sets up a coining establishment, we may take away his implements and destroy them, although they are his private property; if a man smuggle goods, the Government is fully justified, in certain cases, in destroying them—in all these circumstances private property is taken and destroyed on the old maxim *salus populi suprema lex*. They found that the Maine law was the proper form of legislation. They illustrated it in this way. The State of Maine knew there were two-thirds for it, and they said—If a man come into one of our towns and keeps a parcel of bears in his yard, and if, when our children are going to school, these bears break out and destroy them, we will tell this man to take his bears away; and if he says these bears are my paivate property—I am keeping them in my private ground—you have no business with them; but if these bears molest our children, you will find that we will take care of them if you will not. One liquor shop does more harm than twenty bears. I would rather my child were torn to pieces by bears than be made a miserable wretched drunkard. (Cheer.) But it was said the law is not constitutional. It was brought before the courts, and they said, after full examination—Society has a right to protect itself against evils of this kind; and as they had tried every way to regulate the traffic, as they had tried every possible expedient to bring the traffic within such bounds as not to do injury to the community without effect, and found the injury it did was measured by thousands, and the good it did measured not by units but by ciphers, no good at all but evil, and if the people choose to enact such a law, it must be in accordance with the constitution—(cheers)—and therefore it stands. (Cheers.) Within six months of its being enacted and coming into operation, its friends were two to one—(cheers)—and many towns that had instructed their representatives to vote against it, the very next year returned representatives in its favour. I will select only one instance out of many. A little town of Fairfield—a beautiful farming town, similar to many between this and Edinburgh—with a population of 2400, it had eighteen dram shops. When this law was enacted, the good people of this town went to those dram shops, and told them to shut up. They generally did shut up—all but four, who continued to sell in spite of the law. Then the proper officers went to these four establishments, and took out every barrel and avery bottle, and quietly emptied them all in the river. And what was the effect? The year before this was done they had to pay 1100 dols. in the shape of pauper tax; the year after, the pauper tax was only 300 dollars. (Loud cheers.) The inhabitants met—they had cleared 800 dollars by the operation of the bill, and they determined to add 600 dollars to their school fund, and keep the 200 dollars to empty any other barrels that might come in. (Loud cheers.) Property there is valued every year, and the tax comes on it according to the valuation. They found that the value had very nearly doubled since the distruction of these eighteen dram shops. (Cheers.) This is not a singular instance. In some towns pauperism had entirely ceased. (Cheers.) In others, where there had been many paupers, there was not one—even the jails were empty, and their keepers advertised them to let. (Cheers.) A friend of mine in Portland—one of the wealthiest men in Maine—had been very much opposed to the law, having just opened a distillery worth 10,000 dollars, which then became good for nothing. No doubt he grumbled a little, but in less than six months he came forward in public meetings and stated that if he had ten distilleries he would go for that law—such was the improvement he saw around him; it would compensate for all the loss. (Cheers.) Another friend of mine in the town of Portland had a large number of dwellings; one was occupied by a man who had not paid rent for four or five years. He had an interesting wife and family, and for their sakes he allowed the man to remain another year. At the close of that year, the Maine law had been in operation, the tenant paid him not only the year's rent but all arrears, and even offered, being a bricklayer, to build a brick cistern which would be a great improvement to the premises. [illegible] proprietor was astonished, and asked him [illegible] he got the money. Oh, said he, I [illegible] where my work in the morning—formerly [illegible] now go to shop at every corner, and I was [illegible] then I continued drinking [illegible] I saw a liquor my business, my famil[illegible] tempted to taste; miserable; but now [illegible] all day, and neglected go to work, I ha[illegible] [illegible] was ruined and I was man; I tha[illegible] [illegible]ily [illegible] there is no spirit shop; I can never be rep[illegible] no temptations I can be a sober went on to d[illegible] God for that law; I hope it will the same eff[illegible] while I live. The Professor which produ[illegible] other interesting anecdotes to audience, in th[illegible] and concluded an eloquent speech, [illegible] a most powerful effect on the midst of loud cheers.