

member for East Toronto had been carried.

Mr. GRANGE said that for every petition presented to the House for the establishment of this asylum ten had been presented for the passage of a prohibitory liquor law. The Government had not yet expressed their views with respect to the advisability of passing a prohibitory law. To restrain drunkenness it was necessary to cut off the supplies. He instanced the efforts made for the freeing of the Abyssinian prisoners, and said that the same rule would make it compulsory on us to relieve some of our fellow subjects from the chains of intemperance. The killing of Scott in Manitoba caused a great change in the complexion of this House, and yet the House stood idly by and saw thousands of persons killed by drunkenness. He was opposed to the establishment of asylums of the kind proposed, while at the same time the Government were aiding, abetting, and licensing the drunkenness which they proposed to cure.

Mr. HAMILTON wished to explain the vote which he was about to give. He had voted for the amendment of Mr. Cameron the other night, because he thought the experiment should be tried first on a small scale. He did not think it had been proved that the institution would be productive of practical results sufficient to justify so large an expenditure. Holding this view he would vote for the amendment.

Mr. MONK observed that gentlemen lost sight of the fact that, even if the institution was not successful, the expenditure would not be lost. They would still have the property, which would realize the amount expended upon it.

Mr. TOOLEY thought the price of the land that it was proposed to buy was excessive. The price paid for the site of the London Lunatic Asylum was \$75 an acre, and it was complained of as excessive by the late Opposition. Now it was proposed to give \$240 an acre for the land at Hamilton. He was decidedly in favour of the principle of the Bill, but he was opposed to going to so great an expense, and would, therefore, vote against that Bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Hamilton) wished to say a few words respecting the observations that had been made about the proposed site. That site was one selected in 1864 for a Deaf and Dumb Asylum. At that time forty-six acres of it were to have been bought for \$30,000, while now the Government could get ninety-three acres for \$22,000. The site adjoined the city, and was a very desirable one for the purpose. The hon. member for Toronto had stated that another site had been offered near Hamilton for a less sum, but he would say that the gentleman who had made that offer was one of those who had signed the petition in 1864 in favour of the purchase of 46 acres of the proposed site for \$30,000.

Mr. TOOLEY—I am not finding fault with the site, but I understood you to say that another site could be obtained for \$7,000 less, which was equally eligible.

Mr. WILLIAMS said he had made no such statement.

Mr. CAMERON said he had made a statement of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS said that that site was 100 acres, about three miles and a half below the city, near the race course. The moment the Inspector saw it he said it would not do. He (Mr. Williams) thought the Government could not have made a better selection in the Province than the site chosen. A good deal had been said about the location of this building, and some hon. gentlemen had gone out of their way to have a fling at Hamilton. He was not surprised at the hon. member for East Toronto taking this course, because he had belonged to an axe-grinding Government that was not particularly well pleased with the conduct of Hamilton towards them. The member for Leeds had had a good deal to say about the political aspect of Hamilton. He would just remind that hon. gentleman that when he ran his election he did not have to run round the city and beg for a recommendation. He did not have to get any gentleman to endorse his position before he appeared before the electors. The hon. member for Leeds could scarcely say as much. With regard to the claims of Hamilton to this institution, they did not ask it as a favour. They never asked favours from any Government, or from the House either. The position he had taken since he was a member of the House was never to ask for anything for Hamilton that the city was not justly entitled to. That city was the second in the Province, and he held that it offered advantages for this institution which could not be surpassed in any other locality in Ontario. He was surprised at the course taken by his hon. friend from Brant.

When that gentleman was a member of the Government he had spoken warmly of the necessity of establishing institutions for the blind and the deaf and dumb, and other unfortunate classes of the people. The consideration of expense did not trouble him in connection with those institutions, and he (Mr. Williams) held that the establishment of an inebriate asylum was equally needed.

Mr. SCOTT (Grey) said economy would be served by placing the institution in Owen Sound or some country place where a site could be had free.

Mr. CRAIG (Glengarry) said he was a little surprised at the conduct of some honourable gentlemen in the House. He himself did not make any pretensions to being a temperance advocate, but he considered that hon. gentlemen who had, during the whole session, been boring the House with their temperance proclivities and speeches, were placing themselves in a false position by opposing this Bill. He thought it would be only fair if this or some of the public institutions were placed in the eastern part of the Province; but wherever the Government might see fit to place it he would support its establishment, because, as one who was anxious to see the temperance cause promoted, he believed it might, if properly conducted, do a great deal of good to the unfortunate class of drunkards. He would take the responsibility of voting against the three months' hoist, because he thought that if in a few years it was found that the institution was not a success, or was too expensive, costing more than the benefit would warrant, the property and the building would be there to turn to use as an educational institution or some other purpose. He hoped the people of the country would approve of the action of the Government in the matter.

Mr. WELLS referred to the report of the Inspector of Prisons, which showed that out of 244 persons who had entered inebriate institutions in the United States 184 were discharged with great hopes of their permanent improvement. The expense of \$38,929 incurred in keeping them in operation was more than met by income—some \$2,000 more. He thought these facts were enough to convince hon. gentlemen of the utility of such institutions.

Mr. SINCLAIR said that there was no class in the community who contributed more to the revenue of the country than the drunkards, for some of them drank nearly all the money they had, and therefore if ever an experiment should be tried to benefit any class it was for them. Before the Government brought down their measures it was supposed that they were well considered, but even then he would not support them unless he was convinced in his own mind that they were desirable. As a supporter of the Government he was able to say that he thoroughly believed that an inebriate asylum was needed. The member for South Brant had taken a contrary view of the matter, but he (the speaker) could tell him that, only the other day, a gentleman expressed to him his desire that such an institution should be erected, for he wished to place in it a near and dear friend. He (the speaker) was convinced that the asylum would do good in reclaiming unfortunate persons who would otherwise be given up permanently to the gratification of debased appetites; and he thought that some of the temperance members of the House were not acting consistently in opposing the measure.

A division was then taken on the amendment, which was lost. Yeas, 12; nays, 38.

YEAS.—Messrs. Boulter, Cameron, Code, Corby, Deacon, Grange, Hamilton, McCall, Macdonald, Scott (Grey), Tooley, Wood (Brant)—12.

NAYS.—Messrs. Barber, Baxter, Bethune, Caldwell, Christie, Clarke (Norfolk), Cook, Craig (Glengarry), Crooks, Crosby, Deroche, Fairbairn, Farewell, Gibbons, Gibson, Harrington, Hodgins, McKellar, McKim, McLeod, Meridith, Monk, Monteith, Mowat, Pardee, Paxton, Prince, Read, Scott (Ottawa), Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Wells, Williams (Durham), Williams (Hamilton), Wood (Victoria.)—38.

The original motion was then carried.

The hour of six o'clock having arrived, the House rose.

After recess,

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following Bills were agreed to in Committee:—

Mr. Boulter—To incorporate the Gatling Gold and Silver Mining Company.

Mr. Dawson—To amalgamate the Nazrey