

glancing at the effects of the imbibing of strong drink, he expatiated upon the benefits that would accrue from the total prohibition of the sale of alcohol.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk), thought the remarks of several of the preceding speakers were not to the point. The Bill was not for the prohibition of the sale of liquor, but for the protection of those who had become so degraded and helpless as to require their attention. The Bill was more than a step in the right direction, and he trusted it would be allowed to pass to a committee. It would throw a mantle of salvation, if he might so speak, upon all classes of persons in the Province, and he maintained that the Bill was a vital necessity to the people of this portion of the Province.

Mr. BOULTBEE said that, in view of the many petitions sent into the House on the subject of prohibition, it was impossible to let the session pass over without members giving attention to the matter. But at the same time the House must be careful of the steps it took, so that no harm should be done and a good end lost through hasty action. There were many different views among temperance men as to the best way to curtail the liquor traffic evil, and it was a matter that required the closest scrutiny. There were several ardent advocates of temperance in the House, but still they took different views on this matter as well as on others. The hon. member for South Ontario, who had always been a warm supporter of prohibition, opposed a Bill a few hours previous of a cognate character—one to prevent gambling—but he undertook to put his heel on it because he did not like mere matters of detail that were in it, though he approved of the principle of the measure; while, though the Bill now before the House was, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, wrong in principle, yet he would support it. The judgment of man was not infallible in a matter like that now before the House, and the greatest care should be exercised in dealing with it. There was one point which, during the two hours' debate, had not been touched upon, and it was this,—that, under our constitution it was provided that a man should do what he liked with his property under certain restrictions, and the Bill under discussion was a daring innovation on this right. It did not define who an habitual drunkard was, but the decision was left to a man as fallible as any one else, and who might be prejudiced in his views, like many extreme temperance men were. He had heard a man say that if he had the power he would have every member of the Legislature indicted because they did not pass a temperance law: that represented the feeling of a number of warm advocates of temperance. He (the speaker) believed that the efforts that had been made to decrease the evil effects of drinking had not been without good results, and the country was rapidly advancing in the cause of temperance, so that he did not think there was any necessity for the introduction of the Bill of the member for Stormont. If such a law as that was passed, a man in his sound mind could be prevented from having control of his own property: and if there were occasion for a Bill of such importance it should be introduced by the Government. He had not heard a single member of the Government express an opinion on the subject; and they were, he supposed, going to test the feelings of the House, and go by the majority. So crude and ill-digested a Bill he had never seen, and if allowed to become law it would produce wrong. Feelings of spite, envy and malice would be evoked. There was no provision made in the Bill regarding what the course of procedure should be where the party sought to be interdicted as an habitual drunkard did appear before the judge within the eight days provided in the Act—whether the judge was to hear the case and make his order, as if the man did not appear at all. It seemed to be the object of some legal gentlemen in the House to get as much business settled by the Court of Chancery as possible. If they could get cases into that court they were happy. He hoped the Government would ask the gentleman who had introduced the Bill to withdraw it, for the idea of leaving it within the discretion of one man to determine whether the party brought before him was an habitual drunkard or not was wrong. It compelled a wife to appear against her husband, and this was one of its most objectionable features. He trusted that the Bill would not be pressed this session, but that time would be allowed to give it greater consideration. He did not ask that it should be withdrawn altogether, but merely postponed till next session, so that there would be a better opportunity given for considering it.

Atty.-General MOWAT said he was not at all disposed to adopt the suggestion of his

hon. friend. He thought the subject of this Bill was sufficiently understood by the country, and the principle of it received the approbation of the great mass of the community. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman complained the Bill placed the habitual drunkard upon the same ground as a man of unsound mind. But the habitual drunkard was not a man of sound mind. It had been stated that this Bill was a violation of the rights of person and property. But a man had no moral or legal right to be a drunkard, no moral or legal right to ruin his wife and children. The object of this Bill was to alleviate these evils as far as it was possible for such means to do so. He understood the principle of this Bill to be the interdiction of drunkards who were, in consequence of their habits, wasting and squandering their property and injuring their wives and children. That principle was a good principle. There was not a member of the House who had not been familiar with many instances in which men possessing property had been precisely in the position to which this Bill referred—men who had acquired these habits, and who in consequence were wasting their property and ruining their wives and children. They ought, therefore, to entertain any reasonable proposal to protect the families of such persons. It had been said it would be a great evil to allow a woman to take a position of antagonism to her husband. But the law provided that already, and it would not be right if she was not allowed that. Let any one go into our Police Courts and he would find, constantly, cases requiring that a wife should appear against her husband. No member of the House would wish to take away that protection from a wife. But this was very inadequate protection; it gave no protection to the property by which she and her children ought to be supported. It had been said that this evil was not a remedy for the evil of intemperance. It did not claim to be that. It claimed merely to deal with one class of evils, and a very formidable class. No one denied the magnitude of the evils of intemperance; every one knew how very great they were. Reference had been made to the very large proportion of the evils afflicting society that arose from intemperance. It was not merely members of temperance organizations that made these calculations; judges who were not members of temperance organizations, wardens of gaols and penitentiaries and the Superintendents of Lunatic Asylums, and every other class who had the means of judging, all unite in testifying that three-fourths of the crime, three-fourths of the lunacy, three-fourths of the vice, of the wretchedness, sin and poverty that existed were owing to this evil of intemperance. Seeing, then that the evil was so very formidable they should favour any measure that would alleviate it. It was not sufficient to say that the details of this measure were not as they ought to be. No doubt it was a sound course to take that if the principle of a Bill was approved of it might safely be received by those who desired its details amended. In opposing a former Bill, they on his side of the House differed from the other side as to what the principle was. But in this case the principle of interdicting a drunkard who was wasting his property was a good principle, and if the details of this Bill were not adapted to carry out its principle, there was no reason why they should not support the Bill, though at the same time they might desire the details to be amended. It had been said that there would not be many instances in which advantage would be taken of the Bill, but it was to be remembered that with regard to a law of this kind its effects would not be felt merely in those cases which came under its operation. The very existence of the law would prevent a large amount of evil. A man knowing that if he persevered in his habits of drinking he would be brought under the operation of this measure would thereby be prevented from going so far as to render an application of the measure necessary. He thought the Bill also one which ought to receive the support of the House, and if its details were not so perfect as they should be there would be an opportunity to amend them. He was decidedly in favour of the Bill. (Cheers.)

The Bill was then read a second time.

Mr. BETHUNE moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Messrs. Pardee, Farewell, Striker, Calvin, Deroche, Clarke (Wellington), Grange, Snetinger, and the mover.—Carried.

REGISTRATION OF TITLES.

Mr. MACDONALD moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Registration of Titles (Ontario) Act in so far as relates to certain portions of the county of Leeds. He explained that this Bill had been laid over for the decision of the Government as to