

House, he rejoiced to find that gentlemen on both sides of the House agreed that something should be done to ameliorate the condition of those who fell victims to intemperance. They only differed as to the means to be employed. The Government believed that it was better to buy the land, and erect a building, while gentlemen opposite thought that a building should be rented, and the institution opened on a small scale as an experiment. He fully believed that they should be cautious in incurring new expenditure, but this was no experiment. Such institutions had been in operation in the United States, and had in every case been successful. He therefore maintained that instead of spending a large sum in fitting up existing buildings, and paying rent for them, it would be better to build an institution of their own. The land which they proposed to purchase was worth the money they would pay for it at any time. The member for South Brant had endeavoured to alarm the House with the idea that they were going to burden the country with the establishment of this institution. He (Mr. McKellar) maintained that the Government would not be acting in the interests of the country if they did not make the traffic which created the necessity for this institution pay for its establishment and maintenance. He should be sorry to throw a burden upon that class that would be unfair; but he thought it could easily be demonstrated that they could bear the additional burden without feeling it. No class of people could bear it better. If he was correctly informed, the number of licenses now issued was in round numbers about 7,000. If they were to place \$4 additional upon each of these licenses they should be able to pay for the land and the erection of the building and the maintenance of the institution. After the expiration of that time—assuming that the licenses would not increase in number, although it was likely they would increase—the addition of \$2 upon each license would keep up the maintenance of the institution, without any burden upon the rest of the community or upon the consolidated revenue of the Province. It was to be remembered that a large number of the inmates would pay for their own maintenance. This was not an experiment. It was well-known that institutions of this kind had succeeded elsewhere. It would not be a burden on the country, and he could see no good reason why any member should oppose its establishment. The Government had not considered this matter, but his own opinion was that the Government would take a wise precaution by levying a rate upon those who are vending liquors for the maintaining of this institution. He hoped no one would be led away by the cry that we are being led into debt. The hon. member for South Brant had grown eloquent in stating that the public buildings we have erected had cost enormously, had cost nearly a hundred per cent more before they were finished than they had been estimated to cost. He (Mr. McKellar) acknowledged that fact, but contended that it did not follow that every public building in the country should be built with the same carelessness. With proper management any building could be erected for the estimated price, as the Governor's residence had been. The plan proposed for the Asylum intended to be erected at Hamilton had been examined carefully by two architects, who had reported that it could be carried out within the figure named. He had also found that without destroying the original design one of the wings could be dispensed with at the present time, thereby reducing the expense by about \$20,000. If found necessary, the wing could be built hereafter. He thought probably that this would be the wiser course. The building was proposed to accommodate a hundred patients, but perhaps for a time a less number might be taken in.

Mr. CORBY considered his business a legitimate business, and that it ill-became the Hon. Commissioner of Public Works to attack him. The hon. gentleman should clear himself of the Elgin frauds charges before he spoke of others.

Mr. McCALL had been under the belief that the Commissioner of Public Works was a temperance man. He (Mr. McCALL) cordially agreed with the member for Brant that the evil should be struck at the root. There was a strong feeling in the country on the subject, and he regretted it was not the intention of the Government to deal with the matter this year. He thought the Government was not in its expenditure looking forward to the next ten or twenty years. The sources of income must diminish, and if the expenses of the country were managed so extravagantly great difficulty would be found in meeting the demand on the public purse. The expenses of public institutions now cost over

\$319,000 yearly, and with the new ones being erected would bring the cost up to \$350,000. He thought the expenses should be decreased as much as possible, and if this new experiment must be tried that the first attempt should be made in a rented building. People were anxiously looking forward to the report of the Committee on the Liquor Bills.

Mr. RYKERT said that the temperance people of the country were rather in favour of having the liquor traffic abolished altogether than having an inebriate asylum. If the Government would make men found drunk on the streets or deserting their families go through hard labour as a punishment, instead of sending them on to a hundred-acre farm and allowing them to play the gentleman, they would strike a blow directly at the evil. He alleged that the demands upon the treasury were already very great, and now it was proposed to spend \$125,000 to \$130,000 for an inebriate asylum. The Government had a large backing in the House, and could probably carry whatever measures they introduced, but he could tell them that direct taxation would have to be resorted to before very long at the present rate of expenditure. We wanted a technological college, a school of agriculture, and such like useful institutions, but not an inebriate asylum; and, notwithstanding the Treasurer's statements in regard to the working of such asylums, where established, he knew of men who had entered them and had come out worse drunkards than ever. He thought the suggestion of the member for East Toronto was a good one—that the Government should make an experiment first of all as to how an inebriate institution would succeed, and then deal with the matter on a basis of actual observation. The feeling of the country was in favour of putting down the sale of intoxicating liquors altogether, and not of providing inebriate asylums. He would, therefore, vote against the resolution.

Dr. CLARKE (Norfolk) rose to reply to a charge made by the member for East Hastings, that the avowed friends of temperance in the House were dealing in bogus legislation. Now he could tell that honourable gentleman that it was not his intention to push his Bill providing for total prohibition this session, but he wished to test the feeling of the House on the subject—to see if it would reflect the sentiment of the general public—for temperance men wanted to know who their friends were. It was to be seen whether this Legislature would wash its hands entirely of the liquor traffic. But so long as people here went to foreign inebriate asylums, it would be acknowledged that we needed such an institution here. He was thoroughly in favour of the resolution. From the statements made by judges, clerks of the peace, coroners, and police magistrates, it could easily be seen how great were the evils that flowed from intemperance.

Mr. CORBY said he had been informed that the hon. gentleman who had just spoken was interested in a drug store in Thunder Bay, in which liquors were sold.

Dr. CLARKE replied that hon. gentlemen on the other side had a knack in dealing in second-hand stories—from the Proton outrage to the Elgin frauds—and now they had travelled to Thunder Bay for another. He would like to hear the authority for the statement made by the preceding speaker.

Mr. CORBY said it was the member for North Grey.

Dr. CLARKE said that he never had a store in Thunder Bay, and that he had never sold an ounce of liquor in his life. He had nothing whatever to do with the drug store kept by his son in Thunder Bay—not one dollar of his money was invested in it. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. WOOD (Victoria) did not think opposition would have been given to the expenditure of \$100,000 for the purpose of erecting an asylum for inebriates, inasmuch as the Government derived a large revenue from the sale of that which had been the means of the degradation of those who would be patients. There were two parties concerned in the liquor traffic—the manufacturer and the consumer—to the former it was wealth, happiness, and prosperity; to the other it resulted in poverty, wretchedness, and degradation. He thought the least the Government could do was to provide an asylum for the wretched drinker, who had helped to swell the revenue. It was contended that they were not financially in a position to erect such an asylum. This he maintained was not correct, and he wondered if members who had opposed this resolution would oppose the division of the surplus. He was surprised at the course taken by the temperance members in the matter. If it had been proposed to reduce the licenses to one half of their present number the financial contention would not have been urged; yet that would have made a