

difference to the revenue of \$30,000 or \$40,000. It was urged that if the prohibitory liquor-law were passed there would be no necessity for such an institution. The House had the power to prohibit the sale, but they could not control the manufacture and importation. Then if the law were passed he was sure there would be some persons with appetite for liquor so strong that they would obtain liquor by some means or other. (Hear, hear.) It was for persons of this class that the asylum would be established. Again, he found from a statement of the Treasurer that investments in public institutions were so much capital.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—(Hear, hear.)

Mr. WOOD considered this was another argument in favour of the erection of the asylum. He would say "Let us have the asylum, if direct taxation is to follow tomorrow;" and he hoped the resolution would be passed by the House. (Cheers)

Dr. BAXTER was satisfied that public sentiment was growing in favour of total abstinence. He had no doubt that habitual drunkenness was a disease, and they had undoubted authority that it could be cured; that in institutions of the kind proposed the drunkard could be reclaimed and made a useful member of society for the rest of his life. He did not think we should look upon the drunkard as a criminal. He should not be hurried off to gaol, where he would lose the last remnant of his self-respect. He should be looked upon as an erring brother to be reclaimed. In the United States many of these institutions were managed by private individuals, but in nearly every instance they were assisted by the State. The argument, he considered, was very strong in favour of the proposition that these institutions could be more successfully managed by the State. If they could be maintained by raising the license fee it would be a proper move. He wished to make one suggestion. In erecting the building it should be so constructed that it could be easily turned into a lunatic asylum at any future time, in case intemperance was abolished and the use of such an institution no longer necessary. Our lunatic asylums were now full, and it was evident that in the future this Province would need additional accommodation of that kind. After a medical practice of many years he was satisfied that an institution of this kind would do a great deal of good, and would be approved of by the people.

Mr. SINCLAIR contended that it was not necessary or just that liquor dealers should be compensated for the doing away with the liquor traffic. He had always looked upon the license system as being carried out not for the sake of making tavern-keepers Government servants, but as keeping the trade under control and a sort of ban. He did not think any compensation should be made to liquor vendors. A good deal of mawkish sentiment had been expended upon drunkards, whom he regarded more as guilty criminals than as unfortunates. He, however, thought that a helping hand should be extended towards their reform by means of a reformatory institution. He was afraid that public feeling was not educated up to abolishing the liquor traffic.

Mr. FAREWELL did not think it proper that any remuneration should be made to liquor manufacturers and sellers for the abolition of that trade. Licenses were granted for only one year at a time. He congratulated the hon. member for Norfolk on the probable success of his prohibitory Bill. He was glad to hear hon. members on the other side proclaim themselves in its favour, but these gentlemen were perhaps only speaking so now for the sake of making a point against the motion of the Secretary. He thought there were some persons who had gone so far in drunkenness that they were incapable of self-management and that these persons should be cared for and cured in an inebriate asylum. According to Dr. Day fifty per cent. of the inebriates could be cured. It would take a long time to carry out a prohibitory Bill even after it was passed, and it would probably take some time to do that.

Mr. CALVIN, in the course of a characteristic speech, pointed out that the revenue collected from the liquor traffic was \$75,000 per annum, and now it was proposed to spend \$100,000 for the purpose of taking care of those who had been ruined by the issuing of licenses. Authority had been given throughout the whole country to make drunkards. It was contended that they had not the right to deprive the saloon keepers of their licenses; but he maintained that if they had a right to give them they had a right to take them away. He had always understood that "an ounce of preventative was better than a pound of cure," (hear,

hear), and yet they gave licenses for the sale of drink, and proposed to erect an asylum to remedy the evil produced by the granting of those licenses. In order to meet the additional expense of the asylum, it was suggested that the price of licenses should be raised. This course, he thought, would have a salutary effect. When he was reeve of his township he strenuously endeavoured to get the price of licenses put up to \$100, but failed to get them above \$25. As an instance of the evil effects of intemperance, he stated that he had just received an announcement from his lady that two men were then dying in consequence of the immoderate use of strong drink. Those men were writhing in the agonies of death. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He wished the House to understand that he was speaking experimentally, (loud and continued laughter) and warned the Government on this point. After referring to what he termed the failure of the House in its attempt to deal with this question, he asserted that the principle sustained by the Government was that of making black white. The Government, he found, could do what it liked; it only had to say this or that should be done, and it was done. (Hear, hear) He complained of liquor licenses having ever been granted, because had it been otherwise they would have required no asylum. (Hear.) He wondered what would be said if they were to send round to the homes of the people the small-pox (laughter), and then propose to erect a "pock" house to take care of those people. He could not think of a better analogy than that of sending small-pox broadcast, and then of going to work to correct the evil. (Laughter, and hear, hear.) He proceeded to speak of what he termed the extravagant expenditure by the Government of the money of the people, and afterwards went on to refer to the Technological College, and the Agricultural College, and he wished to impress upon the member of the Government having charge of those Bills the desirability of keeping them in his bag, for they were not required, and the result of these Bills being "bagged" would be that the country would be relieved of an expenditure of some \$100,000. With regard to the Normal Schools he did not see any reference made to them in the estimates, and he supposed they had been abandoned. They were not needed. So far as he knew—and he did not pretend to know a great deal (laughter)—a youth could be educated for a teacher's position at college, and if he could not teach after that, and would not be able to teach—(hear)—it would be plain, then, that the ability of teaching was not possessed by the person who failed in this respect after the collegiate course. On returning to the question of the inebriate asylum, the hon. gentleman thought the Prohibitory Liquor Bill should have been brought up this session. During no previous session had he seen so many members in favour of that measure, and he asserted the subject was ripe for consideration. He announced his intention of voting for the amendment.

Mr. SNETSINGER said that no person wished to see a Prohibitory Liquor Law passed more than he did. He thought the Dominion Government should pass a measure of the kind, making it general. A good deal, however, could be done by moral suasion, and he referred to the labours of the Rev. Mr. O'Connor, in Alexandria, who said that 1,500 persons had become total abstainers in Glengarry within the past eighteen months. Hundreds in St. George's parish, Montreal, had also taken the pledge. Inebriate asylums had been productive of good elsewhere, and therefore he was in favour of the resolution.

Mr. DEROCHE said the Bill now before the House had certainly not been introduced without a good deal of talk on the subject having taken place throughout the country, and in this way he believed that the Government were only yielding to public sentiment. The resolution was a step in the right direction, and the members of the House would be only doing their duty by supporting it. Anything that would tend to decrease the evils of intemperance ought to be encouraged. The amendment of the member for East Toronto was a fair, straightforward one, but the subsequent amendment contained a quibble, and for that reason it should not be supported.

Mr. PRINCE wanted to know what was the question before the House. It would seem that it was the abolition of the liquor traffic. He considered the measure of the Government a very important one, and would support it.

Mr. GRANGE defended himself against the charge of inconsistency made against him by the member for Addington. He spoke at some length of the evils of intemperance and urged the necessity of some steps to suppress it.

Mr. CORBY observed, with reference to