

the prosecution of persons selling liquor to Indians, in the County of Bruce, during the fiscal years 1887-88-89-90? How much was incurred for legal expenses? What was the name of each lawyer retained, and how much did each receive in the same period?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The total expenditure incurred by the Government amounted to \$836.26. The amount incurred for legal expenses was \$393.69. The amount paid to different legal firms was as follows:—Shaw & Shaw, \$43.72; H. A. Ray, \$15; Shaw & Bobier, \$12; A. B. Klein, \$283.84; A. Shaw, Q.C., \$39.13.

TYPE-SETTING MACHINES—COST.

Mr. LÉPINE asked, What is the cost of the type-setting machines purchased by the Government, and what is the cost, per thousand ems, of the work done therewith?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The machines cost \$3,500 each. They are now at \$3,000. They are capable of composing 3,500 ems per hour, or 31,500 ems per day of nine hours, for which we pay \$2. Therefore the cost per thousand ems would be 6½ cents.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. JAMIESON moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

He said: I hesitated a moment ago in presenting this resolution to the House, for I was informed there was an understanding that another matter would have precedence to-day. I am glad, however, that such has turned out not to be the case. I think we will have ample opportunity this afternoon for discussing this very important question, which has been so frequently before Parliament and this House in times past. I think I owe no apology to this House in again offering this resolution. Those who have followed this question and the action of this House upon it in the past, will agree that the present resolution in simply the logical outcome of the action which the House has taken upon the question of the prohibition of the liquor traffic in intoxicating liquors. In addition to that, we have had during the present session a very large number of petitions presented to this House in favour of the prohibition of this traffic, and if for no other reason than for the purpose of recognizing in some way the action of the people of this country in petitioning Parliament, I think it is due to the House to bring up this matter in order that we may have a full discussion upon it. It is quite evident that the people of the country, from one end of it to the other, are agitated in reference to this question. In addition to the petitions which have been presented to this House signed by private individuals, we have also had a large number signed by the ecclesiastical bodies of the country, and I think that the representations that have been made to this House in these petitions are entitled to a great deal of consideration and a good deal of weight. It is my desire, at the very outset, to express the hope that this question will be fairly discussed upon its merits in connection with the present resolution, and I do hope that no question will be raised in connection with this

Mr. LANDERKIN.

matter which will give a partizan complexion to it of any kind. It is not, and has not been, a party question in the country. Neither political party has thought proper to adopt the question and to make it a part of their policy, and, in my judgment, that is the better way to deal with it. Now, in approaching the consideration of the question, I may be permitted to look back upon the action of this Parliament in former years. I have with me here the Journals of the Senate for the year 1873, and I will refer to the action of the Upper House upon this question before referring to the action in this House. In 1873 a committee of the Senate was appointed for the purpose of considering this whole question. That committee presented a very full report, and I may be permitted to refer to some of the findings of that committee, one of which is in the following words:—

“Your committee are fully convinced that the traffic in intoxicating liquors, in addition to the evils already mentioned, is detrimental to all the true interest of the Dominion, mercilessly slaying every year hundreds of her most promising citizens, plunging thousands into misery and want, converting her intelligent and industrious sons, who should be her glory and strength, into feeble inebriates, her burden and her shame, wasting millions of her wealth in the consumption of an article whose use not only imparts no strength but induces and leads to insanity, suicide and murder, thus diverting into a hurtful channel the capital that should be employed in developing her resources, establishing her manufactures and expanding her commerce—in short it is a cancer in the body politic, which, if not speedily eradicated, will mar the bright prospects, and blight the patriotic hopes of this noble Dominion.”

The committee added:

“And concurring in the opinion of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, as expressed in their petition, that a prohibitory liquor law such as prayed for by the petitioners would be most beneficial in its results to the Dominion, would respectfully recommend that the prayer of the petitioners be favourably entertained.”

That was the action of the Senate upon this question in 1873. In or about the same year that body, by a very large majority, passed a resolution in favour of the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. In the same year there was a committee appointed by this House, and they also placed a full report before this House, which report is a most significant document. After reviewing the whole question the committee finished by this recommendation:

“In view of these facts the committee would most respectfully submit to your Honourable House the importance of speedily removing the evils complained of by the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law; that is, a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of all intoxicating liquors except for medicinal, manufacturing and mechanical purposes, to be regulated by proper safeguards and checks.”

That, Sir, was the recommendation of a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1873 upon this question. Then, again, in 1875 Mr. Ross moved a resolution in favour of a prohibitory liquor law. The House went into committee on that resolution and recommended the following:—

“That, in view of these facts, it is in the opinion of this House that a prohibitory liquor law fully carried out is the only effectual remedy for the evils inflicted upon society by intemperance, and that Parliament is prepared, as soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation as will prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors so far as the same is within the competency of this House.”

We come down to 1877 when a resolution was moved by Mr. Schultz, and an amendment was also moved setting forth that in view of the fact