

tended to have the law strictly carried out, and to see that a year hence it should not be said that there were 1,000 unlicensed houses in Toronto or that liquor was sold during prohibited hours. The Government did not intend to appoint as Commissioners men who would be persecutors. Speaking personally, he should like to have seen a lower limit fixed. In towns and villages he had never heard of a reason why there should be saloon licenses, but in large cities saloons might be required for eating-house purposes. The provision in the Bill in this respect would practically affect only the city of Toronto. He believed the Opposition desired to see this law carried out. They knew it was a good one, but they were afraid the appointment of Commissioners and inspectors would injure them politically. He believed nothing of the kind would occur, and that three or four years hence the people would say the Government had carried a good law into effect. He hoped in the future the law would be carried further, and that the kind of liquor sold would be inspected so as to prevent the sale of bad and poisonous liquors. When the vote was taken he hoped it would be on the ground that the Government had introduced a measure which was the best they could frame in the interest of all classes. (Cheers)

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) said he was satisfied that the better this Bill was understood by temperance people the more it would be appreciated. (Cheers.) He believed many misapprehensions had existed, but he thought the amendments suggested by the Treasurer would be found to be acceptable. He criticized the speech of the member for East Toronto, and asked why that gentleman had never brought forward a measure in the direction he had indicated. He thought the member for East Toronto might be like some others in his course in this matter. He did not indulge in the social cup himself, and perhaps he

"Compounds for sins he is inclined to
By damning those he has no mind to."

(Laughter.) If temperance people and municipal councils were honest and sincere the machinery provided by this Bill could be carried into effect, and the Government would receive the thanks of the country. (Cheers.)

Mr. SEXTON said he was sorry the member for East Toronto thought a limitation of the number of licenses would not lessen the drinking habits of the country. He thought the hon. gentleman was on the wrong track. If he were right they should encourage the establishment of drinking places, which would largely increase the revenue. The country, however, believed that by lessening the number of drinking places, the amount of drunkenness would be greatly reduced. He was glad that in this matter the Government were following public opinion. He was a temperance man and believed that, though the measure did not please the extreme temperance men, or the licensed victuallers, it was a good one. He believed the Bill went a great deal further than was generally believed, and that when it was understood it would be accepted by the whole country.

Mr. BETHUNE moved the adjournment of the debate.

The debate was adjourned.

RETURNS.

Mr. Wood presented returns in reference to the West Durham Registry Office, and respecting Charitable Institutions and Asylums.

Mr. MOWAT moved the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at six o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The Speaker took the chair at 7:30 o'clock.

REPORT.

Mr. Bethune presented the report of the Select Committee on the Bill respecting referees.

ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH, TORONTO.

On motion of Mr. DEROCHE, the House went into Committee on the Bill to confirm the agreement made by the members of the congregation of St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, for the distribution of the property of said congregation, upon its being divided into two congregations. The Bill was reported with amendments.

INCORPORATION OF ST. CATHA-

RINES.

Mr. CURRIE moved the third reading of the Bill to incorporate the city of St. Catharines, and to authorize the said city to negotiate a loan to pay existing debentures.

Mr. MEREDITH moved an amendment to the effect that the Bill be again referred to Committee, with instructions to amend it by providing that the question of what proportion of the present indebtedness of the town of St. Catharines shall be borne by the extended limits of the proposed incorporated city shall be decided by arbitration.

The House divided, and the amendment was lost. Yeas, 31; nays, 50.

YEAS.—Messrs. Appleby, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Cameron, Code, Coutts, Craighton, Deacon, Fletcher, Graham (Frontenac), Grange, Hardy, Kean, Lauder, McDougall (Middlesex), Macdougall (Stimco), McGowan, McKee, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Mostyn, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Tootey, Wills.—31.

NAYS.—Messrs. Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Dawson, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fleming, Fraser, Gibson, Gow, Graham (Lambton), Grant, Hargrave, Harkin, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McLeod, McMahon, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (York), Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Sneltinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdfield, Wigle, Williams, Wilson, Wood.—50.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

THE LICENSE BILL.

The debate on the second reading of the License Bill was then resumed by

Mr. WILLS, who agreed with the member for East Toronto that drinking usages should be made disgraceful, and that they should be made unremunerative to the dealer in liquor. He was willing to assist hon. gentlemen opposite in any measure to reduce the evils of intemperance—(hear, hear)—but he was afraid the present one would not accomplish that object. (Laughter.) He should like to see the provision that Municipal Councils could limit the hours of selling made more clear. The Government ought to have taken up the question of shop licenses.

Mr. BRODER said they were all agreed as to the desirableness of reducing the evils of intemperance. The only question was as to the best mode of carrying out the object. It was unquestionable that drunkenness increased as the number of taverns increased. This Bill, as it curtailed the number of licenses and facilities for drinking, was therefore a step in the right direction. Canada, he contended, was in a most dangerous condition with regard to the liquor traffic—more so than any other country in the world. The excessive drinking was increasing year by year, and legislation of some kind was undoubtedly needed.

Mr. CURRIE regretted that this Legislature had not the power to prohibit entirely the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, for he believed the feeling of the House was in favour of such an enactment. He referred to the past action of the House with regard to the question, and said that as they had not the power to prohibit entirely, they should exercise to the utmost their power of restriction. The licensing power had been most shamefully abused by the municipal bodies of the Province. In 1874 the revenue of the Government from liquor licenses amounted to the large sum of \$115,000, and he found that in some municipalities in the Province there was a licensed tavern for every 17 men within its bounds; in others, one for every 35, and so on. He went on to read from the Public Accounts to show the large amounts paid by some municipalities throughout the Province to the Government from license fees. He believed that the provision of the Bill putting the licensing power into the hands of the Government was a good one. It had been said that the Bill would throw too much patronage into the hands of the Government, but he did not anticipate any danger in that way, for he didn't believe any Government could strengthen itself by such patronage. He thought that the county judge, the sheriff, the warden of the county should be *ex officio* members of the Board of Commissioners, and that at the first meeting of the County Council in each year two others should be appointed. He was sorry the Government could not see their way clear to abolish saloon licenses altogether, for in his opinion there was no excuse for them. He believed that although the licensing power should be taken out of the hands of the municipalities, the revenue should not be taken away from them, especially in view of the burden which would shortly be imposed on