

\* \* \*

**PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW**

On the order for the further consideration of the proposed motion of **Mr. ROSS (Middlesex West)** that the second report of the Select Committee on petitions for a prohibitory liquor law be now concurred in.

**Mr. OLIVER** said he desired to say a few words on the subject. He complimented Mr. G.W. Ross and the Premier (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) upon the views they individually entertained upon this important subject, and felt sure that the sentiments they expressed would be received with great satisfaction throughout the country. He commented upon the extraordinary number of petitions presented to the House in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, and quoted the opinions of leading medical men in this country and in England averse to the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. He held that public sentiment had recently undergone a very great and favourable change with respect to both temperance and temperance men, both on this continent and in the mother country.

The law as it stood at present was in no way competent to meet the requirements of the great evil. The Dunkin Act had been a failure, and something more potent was wanted. Temperance organizations had been doing their best to check the growth of the evil; the Local Government of Ontario had taken steps to establish an Inebriate Asylum in that Province; Ministers of the Gospel had laboured faithfully, and local efforts of great force had been put forth, in order to meet the growth of intemperance, but it had nevertheless grown steadily and much. He quoted the large amount of money spent on drink in this country and the United States yearly, and showed to what an extent the sum so spent would reduce the public debt if applied for that purpose. He denied, however, that we were worse in this country in respect of temperance than in other countries; he repudiated any such idea altogether, and contended we were comparatively better than many others.

He expressed his pleasure at the removal of the drinking saloon in connection with the House of Commons, and only wished that the Chamber at the other end had come to a similar resolution. He hoped a Commission such as that asked for in the motion would be appointed to take evidence on the matter, and he concluded by cordially supporting the resolution of the hon. member for Middlesex West.

**Hon. Mr. CAUCHON** said he had no objection to seeing the motion pass, but he contended it was a matter for the Local Governments to deal with.

**Mr. ROSS (Middlesex West)** said the Attorney General had denied the right to the Local Legislatures, as had the member for Quebec Centre (Hon. Mr. Cauchon) to the Parliament of the Dominion; but, as it was a matter affecting the revenue, although it was not within the jurisdiction of the former, it certainly was, he contended, of the latter.

After a few words from Hon. Mr. Cauchon,

The motion was carried.

\* \* \*

**PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETIES**

**Mr. MOSS** moved the second reading of the Bill to make further provisions for the management of Permanent Building Societies in the Dominion of Canada. In doing so, he said he did not intend to trouble the House with the details, for the simple reason that a private Bill had been introduced last session which gave to a certain Society powers almost identical with those he now sought for Societies generally. There were a large number of private Bills introduced this session which would be unnecessary if this Bill were passed.

The motion was carried, and the Bill was read a second time and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

\* \* \*

**MR. PERRY'S ELECTION**

**Mr. SCATCHERD** moved the second reading of the Bill to indemnify Stanislaus Francis Perry (Prince County) for having sat and voted as a member of the House of Commons under the circumstances therein mentioned.

**Hon. Mr. ABBOTT** said there was a question whether it was necessary to pass this Bill, as no election could be questioned except in the way pointed out by law. If it were not necessary it was not desirable to establish such a precedent.

**Mr. CAMERON** said the Committee on Privileges and Elections had recommended the passage of this Bill.

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** thought if the hon. gentleman was disqualified by law, it was not for the House to remove that disqualification. He considered it would be improper for the House to interfere under the circumstances, and that such a proceeding would destroy the whole principle of the law of disqualification. If this were done he believed it would open a door that would be found to be very inconvenient.

**Mr. SCATCHERD** pointed out that the Committee on Privileges and Elections had been unanimous in their opinion that Mr. Perry ought to be seated, and the report of the Committee had been unanimously adopted by the House.

**Hon. Mr. LAIRD** contended that the whole scope and spirit of the law of Prince Edward Island was to allow a member of the Legislature to send in his resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor, although the wording was not to that effect. It was never anticipated that Prince Edward Island would be taken into the confederation, and he thought the spirit of the law had been carried out by Mr. Perry.

**Mr. MILLS** said there was a precedent in 1867, when Bills of Indemnity were passed for several members of the House. He contended that this Act was necessary to prevent vexatious prosecution.

**Mr. MOSS** thought this question a very important one. The whole question was, as stated in the preamble of this Bill, whether