

radical change, but he contended that other changes just as radical had been effected without petitions of the people; among those were the introduction of the ballot, et cetera.

He gave a number of statistics to show that drinking and crime were on the increase. During the last few years crime had increased in Canada 20 1/2 per cent, whilst the increase in population had only been 4.82 per cent. The commitments to jail had averaged 33 1/2 per cent, and those for drunkenness 41 1/2 per cent. He gave statements collected from the principal cities of the Dominion in proof of the increase of liquor traffic, which was now so alarming as to necessitate immediate intervention. In Toronto in 1871, the number of arrests had been 4,787, of which 2,321 were "drunk and disorderlies"; in 1873, 5,654, of which 2,952 were "drunk and disorderlies", being an increase of 19 per cent; and it appeared that, according to the calculation made by the recorder, nine-tenths of the cases of crime which came before him were caused by drunkenness. It was estimated by one of the Clerks of the Court at three-quarters, and by the Assistant Clerk at seven-eighths. During the last three years arrests had increased 15 per cent, whilst those of drunkards had risen 23 1/4 per cent. The Chief of Police of that city also attributed the greater part of the crimes to drink, and no wonder, for during the last year no less than thirty-seven new licences had been added to the dreadful list.

He also gave figures from Nova Scotia, from the United States, and from England, which bore out his assertions that intemperance was upon the increase. On this account it became necessary, if not to adopt a prohibitory liquor law, then to adopt some law which would tend to roll back the huge tide of intemperance and restore to Canada that good name which, unfortunately, she had lost. Crime was the legitimate offspring of the liquor traffic. Was it only tolerated because it was impossible to get rid of it?

He instanced the restrictions which were placed upon the trade as proof that the Government did not recognize it as a legitimate trade, or they would, instead of restricting it, do their utmost to foster it. The liquor traffic was a blow at the industrial capacity of Canada, and thus a blow at the revenue of the country, and a decided blow at the foundation of our national wealth, which instead of being depleted by the passage of a prohibitory law, would be most largely increased.

He quoted from a statement submitted to the English House of Commons, which held that the liquor traffic decreased industrial power by at least one-sixth, and, citing Hoyle, he showed that pauperism was in about the same proportion as the decrease in labour power. Assuming that the loss of labour power in Canada was only one-tenth out of a million working population, we lost the labour annually of one hundred thousand individuals. What would not the Minister of Agriculture give for an annual increase to the country of the industrial energies of a hundred thousand men, each of whom, at the lowest calculation, was worth a thousand dollars to the country? A calculation had been made that we used twenty-five million dollars worth of liquor annually, to distribute which only about fourteen thousand people were employed, whilst industries of an equal amount would supply work for six or seven times that

number of men, while the collection of the revenue on liquor cost far more than the receipts.

The revenue derived from liquors, inclusive of the cost of justice, the loss of industrial power, and the loss of life, which was at least one in a thousand, cost the country upwards of \$6 for every \$5 collected from this source. He contended that the sacrifices made for the revenue from liquor were far too great, and he hoped that when the question came up from a revenue standpoint, the House would place at their proper value the lives and happiness of our people; and, when the question came up in its entirety, he hoped that the moral weal and the education of our people would be held at far more value than the pecuniary loss, if any, and he denied that there was a loss which might accrue from total prohibition. Mr. Ross sat down amid cheers from all sides of the House at his eloquent and effective speech.

Mr. FARROW said the House was greatly indebted to the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat for the able speech he had made upon this subject. He desired to test the sense of the House upon this matter, and therefore would move the following amendment:—

That the traffic in intoxicating liquors is an evil for which the laws of the country provide no adequate remedy, and that it is desirable to prohibit the importation and manufacture of intoxicating liquors in the Dominion except for medical and manufacturing purposes.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Cardwell) also maintained that the motion was out of order, as a question affecting the revenue could not be brought before the House in this way.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he was personally in favour of the principle laid down in the amendment, but, as it was one not merely affecting the revenue of the country, but also proposing to change the system of raising it, it was clearly out of order. Such a resolution must arise in Committee of the Whole.

He would vote against the motion of the hon. member for Huron North (Mr. Farrow) under present circumstances, even if it were not out of order, because it was calculated to drive the House to a decision which might be adverse to the principle affirmed before the necessary information regarding the effect of prohibitory legislation in other countries had been laid before it; yet he would not hold himself open to the charge of opposing the intention of the hon. member. He thought it would be unfortunate to have the time of the House wasted in a discussion which would have no effect here or in the country.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON held that the motion was clearly out of order, and could only originate with the Government.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER requested Mr. Speaker to consider for some time before giving his decision upon that point. He desired to know, if it was impossible for a motion of this kind to originate except in the Executive, how an expression of opinion upon the large number of petitions in favour of the law could be given by the House.