

an hospital in an appropriate building pro-  
cured or rented for the purpose, such as the  
Asylum at Orillia."

Mr. WOOD said the country had been for  
some years past building public asylums  
and institutions for the treatment of luna-  
tics, the deaf, dumb, and blind; schools had  
been bettered, gaols had been improved,  
charities and alms-houses had been aided.  
The notion seemed to be spreading that  
the Government was the parent of mankind,  
that the Province of Ontario ought to  
maintain model farms and houses of in-  
dustry for each county. The country was  
fast gliding into the European system of des-  
potism in these matters, which dried up all  
feelings of enterprise in private benevolence.  
The poor-law system of England was a very  
curse, which engendered, established, and  
perfected a legalized system of national  
pauperism. He objected to the Govern-  
ment launching into so great an expense un-  
til they had some idea of the manner in  
which the institution was to be conducted.  
He did not think the measure received an  
echo from the Commissioner of Public Works.  
He denounced the arguments advanced in fa-  
vour of the measure as flimsy and effere-  
vescent. The Provincial Secretary said the  
cost of the land and buildings would be  
\$100,000, but he (Mr. Wood) knew what  
the cost would really be. He showed that  
the estimates for the Brantford, Belleville,  
and London institutions were greatly below  
the mark. Labour had increased 30 or 40 per  
cent. within the last two years; and he asser-  
ted, after examining the plans and estimates  
that the building could not be erected for the  
price named. Then came the ornamentation  
of the place, the laying out of the walks  
around the building. A superintendent,  
assistant-superintendent, and a large staff  
would have to be maintained whether there  
were any inmates or not. If it did not help  
the poor drunkard it would afford an asylum  
for a number of persons who would fatten  
and enrich themselves therein. It would  
cost at least \$15,000 per annum; and he  
wished to know if a scheme had been de-  
vised as to the means of getting drunkards  
into this asylum. He supposed that if a man  
had the reputation of being a drunkard he  
would probably not only be interdicted but  
sent to the asylum for a certain number  
of weeks, months, or perhaps years.  
Allusion had been made to the number of  
drunkards by whom our gaols were filled.  
For these persons he maintained they were  
erecting an inebriate asylum at an enormous  
expense, and for their reclamation the coun-  
try was now spending a large amount of  
money. He questioned whether the Govern-  
ment were acting in the interest of the coun-  
try in entering into so lavish and romantic a  
question. He suggested that the experiment  
should be tried on a small scale, and if the  
sale of liquor were prohibited the necessity  
for such a measure would be done away with.  
He maintained that the fact of the Bill  
being brought forward by a mem-  
ber of the Government did not  
reflect upon that Government; and consider-  
ing the weighty matters the Government had  
on hand, he did not believe the Government  
had had time to give the matter that con-  
sideration which so grave a question demand-  
ed at their hands. He thought that until  
more information was obtained on the sub-  
ject, until framing some scheme by which  
persons were to be got into the institution,  
and until they were satisfied that good  
would result from the passing of the Bill, the  
House ought not to go into so large an ex-  
penditure.

Mr. PRINCE thought the subject was  
one of the greatest and most important  
that would be brought before the House.  
Intemperance was admitted on both sides of  
the House, on all hands, to be a great and  
growing evil. He had said the other day  
that he did not think the use of liquors  
could be suppressed; but the resolution be-  
fore the House pointed out quite a different  
mode of suppressing intemperance. It  
pointed to a mode by which persons habitu-  
ally intemperate might be placed under re-  
straint, as other lunatics were—for he main-  
tained such persons were lunatics. In the  
neighbouring republic these institutions had  
been in effect for several years, and persons  
had gone to them deliberately, saying,  
"I wish to be preserved and protected  
from the consequences of my evil practices."  
They had been taken in and cured. This  
measure received his hearty assent. It was  
for the reclamation of an unfortunate class of  
society, and for that reason he hoped the  
House would support the resolution, which  
was to be followed up by a measure for the  
purpose indicated. He reiterated that they  
could not stop drinking by Act of Parliament,  
but he was firmly convinced that they could  
stop the increase of drunkards by a measure

of this nature.

Mr. ARDAGH was in favour of the  
amendment of the hon. member for East  
Toronto, and thought that the experiment  
should be tried on a small scale first.

Mr. LAUDER said if the establishment of  
the Inebriate Asylum was approved of by  
the House, that amounted to a declaration  
that the liquor traffic was to continue, and  
the gentlemen who were urging on the House  
the passage of a Prohibitory Law, must  
strenuously oppose the scheme at present un-  
der discussion. He entirely concurred in the  
remarks of the hon. member for South Brant.  
Considering the agitation that was being  
made throughout the country in reference to  
the suppression of the liquor traffic, and the  
withdrawal of those significant Treasury li-  
censes which were posted all over the coun-  
try, the Government should not, at this time,  
bring such a scheme before the House. He  
had thought that the hon. leader of the Gov-  
ernment was opposed to the liquor traffic—  
that he abhorred the very sight of a saloon.

Dr. CLARKE (Norfolk) thought the chari-  
ty of hon. gentlemen opposite was dwindling  
away. They seemed to be afraid of the cost.  
The country and press had passed opinions up-  
on this matter, and had demanded the es-  
tablishment of an Inebriate Asylum. It  
would redound to the glory of any govern-  
ment which built such an asylum. The experi-  
ment had been tried in the mother country with  
the greatest success, and several institutions  
of the kind had been established on the other  
side of the line. It was but right that the  
Government should be paternal in its char-  
acter, not only towards those who were in  
want of any of their senses, but towards  
those whose miseries had been brought about  
by their own evil habits, and seek to bring  
back again to the proper standard of man  
those who had unfortunately lost what they  
once possessed. While institutions had been  
established for the use of the blind, the deaf  
and the dumb, and the insane, it would be  
only just to provide for that class of persons  
for whom legislation was contemplated by  
the measure before the House. He had often  
heard it argued that intemperance did not  
produce mental disease, but it would be well  
for persons who argued thus to refer to  
authorities who had thoroughly established  
the fact that drunkenness was a most prolific  
cause of disease. The medical student was  
told that alcohol was a poison, and that it  
was a great cause of both mental and phys-  
ical ailments, and very often productive of  
insanity. Dr. Sewell, of Columbia College,  
told us that dyspepsia, delirium tremens,  
paralysis, premature old age, and many other  
diseases were produced by intemperance.  
The honourable gentleman also referred to  
the report of an investigation that had taken  
place in 1869, with Archdeacon Sandford in  
the chair, in which was collated the evidence  
of leading judges, medical authorities, and  
coroners throughout Great Britain—all prov-  
ing in the most conclusive manner that alco-  
hol produced scores of diseases, mental and  
bodily. It had also been shown that drunk-  
enness was a disease capable of being cured,  
and the testimony of some of the authori-  
ties on this point he would quote. The hon-  
ourable gentleman then read to the House a  
statement made by that Nestor of coroners,  
Dr. Wakeley, editor of the London *Lancet*,  
showing that intemperance continually led  
to fatal results; and also a statement made  
by Dr. Howe, of Massachusetts, that a very  
large proportion of idiots were the offspring  
of dissipated parents. He could quote by  
the hundred authorities similarly as strong,  
and all pointing to the fact that in order to  
reclaim the drunkard the establishment of  
inebriate asylums, where he could be re-  
strained in his bad habits, and  
where he could be physically and  
morally reclaimed, was a most excellent de-  
sign. In such institutions the inebriate  
would be cared for until health and strength  
returned; and in what way could the want of  
the Province in this direction be better met  
than by the expenditure of the sum proposed  
in the resolution before the House for the  
establishment of an asylum for inebriates?  
He heartily approved of the erection of such  
a place, for it would to some extent allay  
the evils arising from that prolific cause of  
misery and disease—intemperance.

Mr. GRANGE was opposed altogether to  
the establishment of an inebriate asylum.  
While the Government allowed the sale of  
spirituous liquors the proper way was not  
taken of dealing with the question. If a  
prohibitory law were enacted there would be  
an asylum then extending from one end of  
the Province to the other. He held that  
the only effectual remedy for the disease of  
intemperance was the total abolition of the  
liquor traffic. That measure, he  
thought, would soon be obtained, and  
therefore he contended that it was  
not wise to launch forth into a great expense