

some remarks respecting himself by the last speaker, that that gentleman was a customer of his, and bought spirituous liquors from him.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE wished to offer a few remarks before the debate closed. It had been said that a case had not been made out; but he could not agree with that view. It was admitted that something should be done to mitigate the evils of drunkenness, and some members thought the Government should go further and prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors altogether. He considered that this measure was one step in the direction of mitigating the evil of intemperance. It had been said that it had not been shown that the institutions had done no good, but persons who made that statement could not have read the reports, or they would find that they had done a great deal of good. They had been established for several years in the United States, and about 44 per cent. of the patients had been permanently cured. He had already shown that under the law he proposed, requiring the compulsory attendance for two years if necessary, they had reason to expect that from 30 to 60 per cent. would be reclaimed. In order to put the Orillia Asylum in a state of repair sufficient to accommodate patients it would cost \$39,000, so that no saving would be effected by adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for East Toronto. The proposition of that hon. gentleman was not a consistent one. Hon. gentlemen who were in favour of the suppression of the liquor traffic were not inconsistent in supporting the establishment of this inebriate asylum because that was a step in the direction in which they were trying to move. Half a loaf was surely better than no bread. He was not one of those who opposed the suppression of the liquor traffic, but he believed the step now taken would tend towards ameliorating the condition of things arising from that traffic. He repudiated the idea that the Government, in selecting Hamilton as the site of this institution, had been actuated by the feelings attributed to it by the member for Leeds; but he had no hesitation in saying that, other things being equal, he would prefer seeing Hamilton get the institution to any other place, because that city was not rightly treated when the Deaf and Dumb Asylum was taken from there. The reason the Government decided to locate the institution there was because it believed Hamilton was the best site that could be obtained. In reference to the statement that the public was not in favour of the establishment of this asylum, he referred to the numerous petitions presented last session in its favour. It was not intended as an institution for the rich man only, but the details of the Bill showed to any one who read them that it was as much intended for the care of the poor man. Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Brant, he believed that the report of the Inspector was an able and thorough one.

Mr. CAMERON argued that an experiment should be tried in an economical way, and that so large an expense as that proposed should not be incurred till it was found that the experiment was successful. He attacked the Government for recklessness in the public expenditure, and charged them with axe-grinding in placing the institution at Hamilton. He held that the institution would only serve the rich and not the poor.

Attorney-General MOWAT said his hon. friend admitted that there was a public demand for this institution. His hon. friend stated that this asylum was not intended for the poor, but only for those who were able to pay for it. How could he possibly have

made such an assertion if he had read the report? What were they to think when gentlemen standing in the position of his hon. friend made reckless assertions of that kind? If he had chosen to listen to his hon. friend the Provincial Secretary, he would have understood that the poor were contemplated quite as much as the rich; that those who were not able to pay were expressly provided for in the Bill; and if there was a sufficient number to fill the institution, the result would be that the institution would be self-sustaining. The hon. gentleman was very inconsistent. In the first instance he charged the Government with extravagance, and then said he wanted a larger institution, where the whole body of the poor that are given to habits of drunkenness could be received. The Government did not propose any such monstrous scheme. There had been sufficient evidence that institutions of this kind would do an amount of good which would justify the establishment of such an institution. The institution had been successfully tried, and it was idle to say they must make the experiment over again. They had positive and truthful experience in favour of the establishment. The amendment of his hon.

friend proposed that instead of erecting the building at Hamilton they should make arrangements with the Dominion Government for the possession of the Orillia building. His hon. friend who had moved that resolution had stated that it would cost a very large sum to adapt that building to the present purpose. His hon. friend opposite knew nothing of the matter, and was utterly ignorant of it, whilst they had studied and thoroughly investigated it. He did not think the House or the country would approve of the course proposed by his hon. friend. The adoption of the Orillia building would be a gross and monstrous extravagance, and a waste of the public money. His hon. friend had said they had some political motive in selecting Hamilton for the erection of the building, and yet he had said it was preferable to any other.

Mr. CAMERON denied that he said he preferred Hamilton to any other city. He merely said he had a preference to Hamilton in consequence of circumstances connected with it.

Atty-Gen. MOWAT said his hon. friend did not say that Hamilton was not preferable. The Government had selected the last place, and his hon. friend could not gainsay that they had, and it was by doing the right thing that they would best retain the confidence they now possessed. (Hear, hear). The hon. member for East Toronto complained that his party was charged with axe-grinding, but there was no proof of that charge. It was the avowed principle of that party. That was a principle which the present Government repudiated. Reference had been made to the estimate, but he could tell hon. gentlemen that when they came to consider the estimates the Government were prepared to show that every item was necessary in the interests of the country. He submitted that there was ample reason for establishing this asylum. The expense had been objected to by some members who wished them to go further and abolish licenses altogether, which would deprive the revenue of \$75,000 annually.

Mr. CAMERON—But there would be the compensating gain on the decrease in the expenditure for the administration of justice.

Attorney-General MOWAT said that no doubt there would be a vast gain to the country if the liquor traffic was abolished. If they could afford to lose \$75,000 a year for the abolition of licenses they need not be afraid of spending \$100,000 in establishing this Asylum. If they could get a law passed that would do away with the drinking customs it could not take effect at once. It would take years to abolish drinking customs, and in the meantime this Asylum would be a benefit. If it should turn out that in the course of time this Asylum would not be needed, because there would be no drunkards to go there, then that would be a cause of great rejoicing to the people, who would regard this Asylum as a grand monument to the success of important principles. They would not regard it as money wasted. He thought the country would feel that gentlemen opposite had wholly failed to make any case out against the course which the Government proposed in adding to our institutions one of so great importance as the one which it was now proposed to establish.

Mr. BOULTBEE said that as the Government had affirmed that the building proposed would not cost more than the sum named, and that to rent a temporary place would cost nearly half that amount, he thought that if the Government could not be trusted so far he did not know in what they could be trusted. Under these circumstances he considered that their word should be taken. The debate had been serviceable, for the views of members had been elicited, and good would be the result.

The House then divided on Mr. Deacon's amendment, which was lost on a division. Yeas, 8; nays, 60.

YEAS:—Messrs. Ardagh, Calvin, Deacon, Ferguson, Grauge, McCall, Robinson, Rykert—8.

NAYS:—Messrs. Barber, Baxter, Bethune, Boulton, Cameron, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Clemens, Cook, Oorby, Craig (Glenarry), Craig (Russell), Crooks, Crosby, Dawson, Deroche, Farewell, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibbons, Gibson, Gifford, Gow, Graham, Guest, Hamilton, Hauey, Harrington, Hodgins, Lauder, Macdonald, McKellar, McKim, McLeod, McManus, Meridith, Merrick, Monk, Mowat, Oliver, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Prince, Read, Scott (Ottawa), Sexton, Sinclair, Smith, Snettinger, Springer, Striker, Tooley, Watterworth, Webb, Wells, Williams (Durham), Williams (Hamilton), Wilson, Wood (Victoria).—60.

A division was then taken on Mr. Cameron's amendment, which was also lost. Yeas,