

personal remarks that had been made in the course of the debate, several of the subjects referred to having had nothing whatever to do with the Bill. The Bill, he considered, was no party measure; it was merely a question of detail. Had it emanated from gentlemen on the other side of the House, he was convinced the Government would have managed to have given it their support, and allowed it to pass to a Committee. The measure was levelled at corruption, and, being so, it ought to command the support of the House. He cordially seconded the remarks of the hon. member for North York. He proceeded to deprecate the attack made upon the Dominion Government by the Commissioner of Public Works and Mr. Wood, which, in his opinion, ill became them. He was willing that the Bill should be amended, but he did not desire that it should be barked by the six months' hoist proposed.

Mr. CALDWELL could very easily see why the hon. member for Brockville went to the House with a pious horror of betting at elections after what had recently transpired at Brockville. (Laughter.) The Conservatives at the last election had been much confident as to the results of the elections in this Province, and they had not only made great mistakes as to the results but they had also lost large sums of money. (Hear, hear.) How this Bill was to prevent corrupt practices was more than he could see. The only argument he had heard adduced in favour of the Bill was that parties having made large bets might influence others or bribe others—in order to carry their point—to vote with them. That was the only argument he had heard given in favour of the Bill. Now that would be bribery, and there was a law to meet bribery. If it were the morality of the thing then why not bring it in to cover all betting, not only betting at elections? He thought the Bill would only be a means of giving to unscrupulous persons a means of laying out their money upon unsuspecting individuals for the purpose of destroying their vote. As this would be the only effect of the passing of the Bill, he should support the amendment. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. WOOD, upon attempting to give an explanation to some remarks which had lately fallen from hon. members, was intercepted, and his remarks were ruled out of order.

The members were then called in, and the House divided upon the amendment, which was carried—Yeas 40, nays 17:—

YEAS—Messrs. Barber, Bethune, Boulton, Caldwell, Christie, Clark (Norfolk), Clemens, Crooks, Dawson, Farewell, Fraser, Gibbons, Gibson, Graham, Haney, Hodgins, McKellar, McLeod, Meredith, Monk, Mowat, Oliver, Pardee, Prince, Robinson, Rykert, Scott (Ottawa), Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Webb, Wells, Williams (Durham), Williams (Hamilton), Wilson, Wood (Brant), Wood (Victoria)—40.

NAYS—Messrs. Boulter, Calvin, Cameron, Clarke (Wellington), Code, Coyne, Deroche, Ferguson, Fitzsimmons, Grange, Guest, Lauder, McCall, Macdonald, McManus, Merrick, Read—17.

HABITUAL DRUNKARDS.

Mr. BETHUNE moved the second reading of his Bill to provide for the interdiction of Habitual Drunkards. He said the question of restraining the evils resulting from the liquor traffic had forced itself upon the attention of the House. No person who had noticed the number of petitions from all parts of the country, and from all classes, with the view to get prohibition, could say that there was not a deep feeling on the subject existing; and any one who noticed the dire results flowing from intemperance, could not but be alive to the importance of the matter. It was too true that about nine-tenths of the crime in this country had been produced directly or indirectly by the liquor traffic. The House knew, from the Prison Returns lately laid before it, that of the six thousand and odd commitments made to the common gaol within the last year, upwards of 4,000 had been for the crime of drunkenness or crimes originating in drunkenness, and no later than yesterday a statement was made by a learned Judge in this city, while addressing the grand jury, to the effect that his experience convinced him that nineteen-twentieths of the crime with which the administration of justice was charged had its origin in drink. This was a fact which they must face, a most serious matter with which they must contend. It was impossible that they should fold their hands and say they were powerless. Some remedy must be found, and the evil met seriously and deliberately. He thought himself that the best remedy would be found in the prohibition of the liquor traffic. Without any hesitation he would be very happy, were it in the

power of this Legislature to pass such a measure, to give it his cordial support. He had, however, carefully examined the question and had consulted legal authorities on the subject, and believed it came within the terms "Trade and Commerce," and was a matter with this Legislature was not competent to deal. There would be less misery, certainly less crime, if the traffic were abolished. This House could not, however, deal with that question, and the public mind had not, he thought, been educated up to a point which would allow of an entire abolition of the sale of spirituous liquors. Some other means must be adopted to stay this terrible torrent of evil and vice, and he was glad the Government had brought down so beneficial a measure as that having for its object the cure of inebriates. That was a measure fraught with good to the country, and one which would receive the support and approval of all classes of politicians. That was, however, only a partial remedy. It was impossible to lock up all the drunkards in the Inebriate Asylum, and the measure of the Government did not look forward to such a step. So large was the class that three or four asylums would be unable to contain them all. It was necessary to go further and to deal with those who could not be locked up, and to whom the remedy of an inebriate asylum could not be applied. The remedy which he proposed by the Bill which he had just moved was not novel in its character, but was a very old one. The civil law of Rome recognised habitual drunkards as lunatics, and gave the praetor, who was in fact a judge, the same right to interdict him that was given in the case of a person who was not of sufficiently sound mind to care for his property. In Scotland he was not aware how far this law was carried. In Lower Canada drunkards of a particular class were treated as lunatics, and a few years ago a measure had been brought in to still further extend the provisions of the law on the subject, and to give to a wife or other member of a family, a friend, or creditor the right to apply to the Superior Court for the restraint of a drunkard just as for that of a lunatic. A drunkard was in fact a lunatic, who was suffering from a disease which had seized his appetite and deprived him of his self-control. He had had, in the shape of letters from every county, a volume of testimony in favour of the beneficial nature of his proposed measure, and he believed there was not an hon. member in the House who had not received from his constituents some similar testimony in favour of his scheme, which he claimed combined cheapness, efficiency, and despatch. The only objection he had heard made was as to the difficulty of determining what a "habitual drunkard" was. The Government had adopted in their Bill the definition which was given by Dr. Dalrymple, used in the English Acts, which was that

"An habitual drunkard is a person who by reason of frequent, excessive, and constant use of intoxicating liquor is incapable of self-control, and dangerous to himself and others, and incapable of proper attention to and care of his affairs and family."

This was the definition adopted by the Government Bill, and he had thought it wise to use the same definition for his Bill also. With this definition expressed it would be the easiest thing in the world to find out who was an habitual drunkard. The Committee had been able to make the necessary distinction without any set rule. The term was well known to the law, and unfortunately we had all around us but too many living definitions of what the words meant. We met them on every street corner. When hon. members went home at night they met on King and Yonge-streets persons reeling home in a state of drunkenness. It was a serious matter to interfere with personal liberty, as was proposed by the Government Bill, but when the safety of the State required it, personal liberty had to give way. The consequences to the State of the prevalence of drunkenness were the increased cost in punishing crime and vice, and the expenditure either through charitable institutions or private avenues, of large sums for the maintenance of the unfortunate families of persons who had through drink neglected to support them. Some objections of detail had been taken to the Bill. He had been asked, Why entrust so important a matter to the Surrogate Court? His answer was, that the class of persons who needed this protection were generally of small means, and he had brought to their doors as cheap a remedy as he could. A few days would answer to settle the matter, with very little expense or trouble. A simple petition was given in the Bill so that any person who could read or write could take every proceeding made necessary by the proposed measure. It might be necessary, and he had made provision, to carry the proceedings to