

the higher courts where the estates were large, but he thought it would be unfortunate to shut out the great portion of society by providing that all cases should be brought before the Superior Courts. The cases which did arise under this Bill were essentially ones in which it would be advantageous to see the witnesses and the parties face to face, and to know the full facts, and it was with that view that he had proposed that the remedy should be a local one as far as possible. One gentleman to whom he had spoken had suggested that power should be given to two magistrates to deal with such cases; but although he had the greatest respect for the magistracy of the Province, he believed that this was too important a jurisdiction to entrust to them, and that it should not go further down than the Judge of the County Court. Another objection to the Bill was that after the order of interdiction had been issued by the Judge it could be registered, and while it continued in force the drunkard could not buy nor sell nor mortgage his estate.

Mr. WOOD (Brant) — Real property?

Mr. BETHUNE—Yes, or anything else. They knew how frequently the tavern-keeper or the country store-keeper took advantage of the unfortunate drunkard. How frequently he ran up long bills in a tavern, and that was followed up in a drunken moment by the signing of a mortgage, a deed by which he lost his real and personal property. But by far the most important provision in this Bill was that it would shut off the liquor from the unfortunate man during the year. It provided that the interdiction might be served on the tavern-keeper after which he would be liable, if he continued to sell to the drunkard, to a fine of a hundred dollars and the abolition of his license for three years. He was not one of those who assailed all the persons engaged in the liquor trade, as he believed there were many honest men in it who made it a rule to sell no liquor to habitual drunkards, but there were, unfortunately, many barkeepers of a very different class who would take the meanest advantages of a drunkard's weaknesses, although they knew they were draining the life-blood of the unfortunate and his family. The Government measure proposed to shut up the drunkard from his drink. He proposed to shut up the drink from the drunkard. As he said before, this was not a new measure. It had been tried in some of the States in the Union and had been found to work well. It operated in this way. It did not simply restrain the drunkard, but acted as a prevention. When a man knew that the management of his property would be taken out of his hands if he drank to excess, he would be apt to restrain himself before he brought himself under the operation of the law. He asked the House to affirm the principle of this Bill—the sound and sacred principle that a man has no right to do wrong to himself or to his family. A man had a perfect liberty to do right, but he had no right to do wrong to himself or his family. The machinery of the Bill was similar to that adopted in the Government Bill. It seemed to be the best machinery that could be devised. There was no danger of the Bill being too strictly enforced; the danger was that the Bill would not be enforced strictly enough, instead of a man being deprived of the management of his property unjustly. Still, he believed that the Bill would have a good effect, and he had no doubt that almost every member had some one in his eye who should be brought under the operations of this measure. He could assure the House that the country was watching them on this question. The temperance people formed a large army of noble men who for years had been striving with much self-denial to mitigate and, if possible, destroy the evil of intemperance. Depend upon it, if members voted against this measure they would hear about it when they went back to their constituents. The vice of intemperance was the great vice of the age, and it was the duty of the House, irrespective of party or creed, to do all in their power to diminish that vice. (Cheers.)

Mr. CAMERON said the mover of this Bill had called the attention of the House to the fact that the temperance organization was exceedingly extensive, and that they were watching hon. gentlemen upon the floor of this House. If that were thrown out as a threat to prevent members from discharging their duty here freely, it was improperly done. He believed respect was due to those who were advocating the temperance cause; they showed a great amount of self-denial, but at times they advocated that cause indiscreetly. As he desired there should be no uncertainty as to his position on this question, he would say that so far as this measure was concerned he believed they had a right to legislate in the direction to which this Bill pointed. They had a right to punish a man who attempted

to injure himself or his family. At the same time those who advocated the temperance cause looked to one thing alone, and did not consider the rights of others. They did not consider that the use of intoxicating liquors had been found in many instances, if we could believe medical testimony, exceedingly beneficial. In some diseases, particularly typhoid fever, it was absolutely essential to secure the recovery of health. If that were so, those who advocated the total abolition of the manufacture of intoxicating liquors were going farther than the interest of the country required. It was desirable, however, to stop, if possible, the vice of drinking, but this Bill did not strike at the root of the evil at all. All it did was to protect a man as far as his property was concerned. He believed a man who drank ought to be treated in the estimation of the public as a criminal, because it was a crime for a man to do an injury to himself in that way, and he should be punished therefor. So far as this Bill was concerned, he thought it would be difficult to carry it out. It would be difficult to say who was a habitual drunkard. There were persons who would soak themselves in liquor and be in a maudlin state from year's end to year's end, and there were persons who would go on sprees lasting for weeks at a time, but these latter would be just as unable to attend to business as those who were continually in a maudlin condition. A man, too, might be generous when he was drunk and not so when sober; or the reverse might be the case; and there would be a law made taking the penurious man into custody, because he happened to be mean and penurious. There was no proper distinction made in the Bill. He did not think that any good would come of it, and when the measure went into Committee it would be found to be inoperative. He believed that excessive drinking should be treated as a crime, and a law made that no matter whether at a gentleman's table or a drinking house a person who should drink himself into a state of inebriety should be punished therefor. If such were the case he believed it would be beneficial. He never tasted anything intoxicating himself and was practically a temperance man, but he did not consider that a man who was moderate in his habits should be prohibited from taking a glass of wine at a friend's house. As long as he did no harm there should be no such resolution. The advocates of temperance in advancing their views overshot the mark and prevented the attainment of the good object they had in view. He had many warm friends who believed in total prohibition, and although it might be considered objectionable he wished them to understand exactly what his view was. Opposed as he was to alcoholic drinking in any shape, he did not think the manner in which temperance societies went to work to stop the liquor traffic was the way to do good or to achieve the object they had before them.

Mr. PRINCE said it was perfectly plain by the number of petitions presented to this House that there was a strong feeling against the sale of liquor. So many petitions were there, that the papers did not give the names of the societies by whom they were signed or from whence they emanated, but merely stated that so many such petitions were presented. The cheapness of alcohol in this country was the root of the evil, and poor unfortunate women suffered from it most. Everybody, however, felt the curse of the traffic. He would like to know whose judgment, under the operation of the Bill, would decide who the habitual drunkards were; and if notice of service was served upon a man who was one of that unfortunate class, he would not know what it meant, for an habitual drunkard was simply a lunatic. This notice of service would be to the effect that if he did not, within eight days, attend before a judge he would be interdicted. He had witnessed many disastrous effects from drinking, and even lately some dear old friends of his had died through the habit; but he firmly believed, with the late Sir Allan McNab, that drunkenness could not be abolished by Act of Parliament. The moment a thing was prohibited, the keener the desire for it, and he did not think that the Bill would accomplish the result looked to.

Mr. WOOD (Brant) thought that public opinion was being educated more and more towards prohibition. The remedy for the evils of the liquor traffic must be more strict and more general than now, though he would not favour the prohibition of the manufacture or importation of alcohol. That article was of use for many mechanical and chemical purposes, but the most anomalous thing was the prominent place given to alcohol in the bars of hotels or saloons, which were to be found at almost every four corners, or wherever there was a blacksmith's shop. The time would undoubtedly come when the