

Committee might be enabled to make such a report that would determine whether further legislation could be entered upon which would place the liquor traffic of this Province upon a better basis. There were already three or four Bills dealing with the question introduced this session, and all those Bills should go into the hands of that Committee, who, he hoped, would be enabled to throw out valuable suggestions in regard to future dealing with the subject. He suggested that the following gentlemen compose the Committee: Messrs. E. B. Wood, Oliver, McDonald, Merrick, Calvin, Gibbons, Fraser, Deacon, Farewell, Haney, Fairbairn, S. C. Wood, Dawson, Grange, Webb, J. M. Williams, Boulter, Guest, McLeod, Ardagh, Bethune, and Clarke (Norfolk.)

Mr. PRINCE would vote for the resolution, because he believed that the Committee asked for would have some success; but, at the same time, he should like to state that he had had some experience in regard to the working of temperance law. He happened to be in the State of Indiana at one time when a prohibitory law was in force there. He was not in the liquor business himself (laughter) at that time, but was engaged in shooting prairie hens. He asked the conductor on a train whether it was possible that his friends and himself could get some whiskey. (Laughter.) The conductor said they could go to a druggist's, and they accordingly bought four ounces of alcohol at one of these places, and drank it. (Renewed laughter.) He mentioned this to show that prohibition had been tried in the United States, and failed in its object, and that he did not believe drinking could be stopped by Act of Parliament.

Mr. CALVIN thought one part of the work of the Committee would be to find out how many ounces of alcohol would make a man drunk.]

Dr. CLARKE said it would be the duty of the Committee to lay some reliable information before the House on the subject. He adverted to a similar Committee being appointed by the English Parliament. The petitions in favour of some prohibitory measure had been signed by some 400,000 persons. He proceeded to refer to various Bills which have been passed upon this subject, and urged the appointment of a Committee to ascertain what were the operations of those laws.

Mr. WOOD did not think intemperance was on the increase. He was not prepared to say that the laws now in force had not succeeded in their effect. In the rural portions of Ontario there was very little liquor used. He thought the Saturday night law had had a good effect in making a change in the habits of some classes. It was true that in the large cities the law was not much abided by, but in the country it was rigidly observed. There seemed to him great plausibility in the argument that one man should sell liquor as well as another, and that there should be no more restriction in that than in the dry goods or grocery business. If there was to be any restriction at all the bull must be taken by the horns, and everyone be prevented from selling liquor. Whether or not public opinion was sufficiently educated for an entire cessation of the traffic would be the duty of the Committee to decide. Certainly that result would be most valuable. Most important information could be had in writing from judges and magistrates. The expense would be very small. He hoped the Committee, if it did close its labours this session, would report in short, plain, explicit terms, using the same terseness and brevity as had been adopted by the Commissioner of Public Works in his report on Emigration.

Mr. A. S. MACDONALD said the question was one that called for immediate attention. He thought it would have been advisable to give a wider scope to the Committee. The subject was a good one and he hoped the members of the Committee, whatever their views might be would enter upon the consideration of the subject in an impartial manner. In his opinion the measure was of so important a nature that it should be introduced by the Government; and he held that ample provision should be made for the sale of liquors for medicinal purposes, and for remunerating those who would be deprived of that means of maintaining themselves if the traffic was abolished.

Mr. LAUDER would like to see the hands of the member for South Ontario strengthened. He must remember that the report of his Committee would be hostilely criticized, and he (Mr. Lauder) called on him to see, when he brought down the report of that Committee, that he stuck to it like a man.

Mr. McCALL thought the Saturday night closing law had not been respected in the country. He hoped that the interests of the community would be advanced by the pas-

sage of a prohibitory law.

Mr. GRANGE advocated the appointment of the proposed Committee, the results of whose labours would be most valuable in supplying the House with statistics such as at present were not to be had in an available form.

Mr. CORBY said "consistency is a jewel," and yet the last speaker, although strongly advocating the establishment of a prohibitory law, was a very large dealer in barley, which was used for the manufacture of that very liquor the use of which he so much condemned.

Attorney-General MOWAT thought the motion should be allowed to pass, the suppression of the liquor traffic being a question of very great importance. The House might or might not have the constitutional right to pass a law of this description, and if they had that constitutional right this method of suppressing intemperance might or might not be the best; but it was important that they should have the facts bearing upon the question. Each of them knew something of the matter which might be of importance. All the statistics and information relating to this subject should be collected—information from our own country and from other countries respecting their legislation and experience. He hoped the Committee would not be alarmed by the fearful prospect portrayed by his hon. friend from South Leeds, that of having to remunerate all the tavern-keepers, brewers, and other engaged in the liquor trade. He thought he might say no such result would be contemplated. In reference to the allusion made to the South Grey report he would advise the mover of this resolution not to permit the hon. gentleman opposite to draw up the report. (Hear and laughter.)

The motion was then carried.

RETURNS.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE presented a statement of the emoluments of all employes permanent and temporary, appointed since last year.

Also—Statement of expenses incurred in the Proton Committee enquiry.

Also—Copies of regulations of the Council of Public Instruction and other instructions relating to the admission of pupils to High Schools and Collegiate Institutions.

TIMBER POLICY.

Mr. FRASER resumed the debate on the timber question. He congratulated gentlemen opposite upon the skillful manner in which they attempted to fight under cover. They set out with the protestation that the motion of the hon. member for Lincoln was not a motion of want of confidence, and yet as the debate advanced the fact was more and more apparent that their object was an attack upon the Government, culminating in the outburst from the member for North York. Another feature of the debate was the peculiar nature of the attack. Sometimes they flattered the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and sometimes they abused him. Honourable gentlemen would do anything to bring about a state of affairs which would bring to them the support of the Commissioner of Crown Lands. No doubt, after all the accusations thrown out against him, they would only be too happy to take him to their embrace if they could only get his support. They frequently threw out the insinuation that if certain parties now supporting the Government were to desert the Commissioner of Crown Lands, the Government would go to pieces. Hon gentlemen opposite had better count noses before they made that assertion. If the following which the hon. gentlemen referred to were to leave the Government the Liberals in the House were quite strong enough to support the Government so long as they did what was right. The hon. member for East Toronto had adverted to the position of the hon. member for South Brant, and said he had been caught tripping. The hon. gentleman should look to his own position. He was now supporting a motion which went much farther than motions which he had steadily voted down while in the Government. The position he had taken was that the Government should be responsible to the House and the House to the country. Now if he supported the motion of the member for Lincoln he stultified this position. It had been said the member for North York made a very effective speech. There could be no doubt that although that hon. gentleman sat on the Government side of the House, in spirit he was with the Opposition, and to be consistent he should take his seat opposite, and not attempt to deceive his constituents into the belief that he was with the Government when he was against them. That