

jails 9,880 persons, with a cost of maintenance of \$44,783; that in the prisons there were 995, with a cost of maintenance of \$32,190; that in the Boys' Reformatory and Mercer House there were 321 and 303 respectively, with a cost of maintenance of \$26,120 and \$21,568 respectively, making, altogether, a large amount of money which was paid out for the maintenance of criminals of this class in the Province of Ontario alone. The report of the Bureau of Statistics in Massachusetts, after exhaustive researches, makes the calculation that 84 per cent. of the criminality is due directly or indirectly to the liquor traffic. Then, 84 per cent. of that cost of maintenance in Ontario amounts to \$105,515 every year, which, at a low estimate, the Province of Ontario pays out for the maintenance of that portion of its criminals in gaols, prisons, and reformatories, which is found, as we may conclude after proper investigation, to be caused by the liquor traffic. More than that, Sir, the asylums in Ontario had in them last year 2,890 inmates, and the cost of their maintenance was \$283,040. The Earl of Shaftesbury, who for a long time served on the Commission of Lunacy in Great Britain, and who was, I think, for about twenty years, its chairman, gave as his opinion that three-fifths of the insanity of Great Britain was due directly or indirectly to the liquor traffic. I am assuming here but 50 per cent., showing in the case of Ontario the sum of \$130,520. Adding that to the cost of the maintenance of criminals due to the liquor traffic gives \$242,035 as the cost of the maintenance of crime and insanity in Ontario paid for by the Ontario Government as the proportion of cost which is due to the liquor traffic. Sir, it cannot be said of any other traffic or business in the world that it is responsible for anything approaching that amount of crime, and for the burden of crime which is placed upon the different countries in the world for its maintenance, its watching, and its punishment. More than that; in 1881, Sir, we find that the arrests in all the cities of Ontario footed up to 13,196; and of those the arrests for drunkenness and drunkenness and disorderly conduct alone numbered 6,926, giving 45 per cent. of the total criminality in the cities of Ontario in that year as being for drunkenness, and drunkenness and disorderly conduct alone. You may go outside of that, and find that all the crimes which come from this as a proximate or indirect cause; but that is sufficient, and it will show you that the vast burden entailed upon our Provinces and our cities for the watching and guarding and maintenance of criminals comes directly from this traffic, and it comes from no other traffic which we have in this country. It is upon that ground, Sir, that prohibitionists are able to contend that they have a right to stop the use of property which is devoted to a purpose the ultimate outcome of which brings so many burdens and entails so great an expense on the community. The traffic is not a traffic of our creation. It has usurped control against the protests of the people; it has remained in spite of the warnings of the people; it has fed and grown rich by the spoliation of the people. The property in it is not required or to be taken for public uses, and therefore should have no compensation. The property, as the ultimate outcome shows, is devoted to the injury of the body politic, and consequently the people and the Government have a right to curtail it, destroy it, and give it no compensation in return.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for the attention you have given to these remarks. I wanted to have this discussion go on, and wished to lay before the House my views with reference to this resolution from one standpoint, so that if they are wrong, they may be refuted. All we want in this country is to get at the right idea, and we can only get at right ideas and conclusions by persistent discussion; and I believe the people of this country, and the Parliament of this country as representing the people, will, as the ultimate outcome of this discussion, do what is just and honest and fair; but we shall never get at the truth by refusing to discuss the question or by shelving it in any way. We have to discuss it and decide upon it, and it is best, in the ultimate interests of justice and even-handed fair play, that it should be discussed thoroughly and generously; and then time should be given to the people to make up their minds with reference to it.

FOR WHAT ARE WE TO PAY?

In conclusion, I would like just to leave one thought which may be elaborated, if any person thinks worth while to elaborate it, and which may perhaps form an element in the discussion and in the ultimate decision. It is this: What are we asked to compensate the traffic for? Are we asked to compensate it for any prospective profits it might make? I think no person puts forth so absurd a claim as that. I do not think the resolution of my hon. friend contemplates that at all. Then we may put that out of the way. The prospective profits, what might be made in the long years to come, we do not propose to compensate them for, and it is not asked that we should. What are we asked to compensate them for, then? The capital they have accumulated? Whence does the capital come? Most of this has been laid up from profits, and put from their profits into capital and stock; and this property and stock it is not proposed to take from them or to touch. No person proposes to confiscate their past profits. The stock they have to-day in liquors no one proposes to confiscate. Every honorable man and every reasonable man proposes to give them long enough time to get rid of their stock, if any measure of prohibition is passed, so that when the measure of prohibition comes into actual force, they need not have one single dollar's worth of their stock on hand to be a loss to them. Are we to compensate them for their buildings and real estate? All the buildings and real estate have come out of the profits of the traffic of preceding years, and for such I think they have not very much claim upon us for compensation. These are the accumulations of years of the profits of their traffic, and the country says and can say truly: Whilst you have had these profits and have amassed this accumulated capital, we have had all the disadvantages of the trade, we have had all the burdens to bear, and we have had to bear the losses and to take care of the burdens which have come as an indirect or direct result of the traffic.

A PRACTICAL QUESTION.

Who is to pay this compensation? I will put a practical question to my hon. friend the mover of this resolution. Will he take with him the 130 brewers and distillers and go down to any county in this Dominion, call the hard working people together in assembly, and stand up before them on the platform, and looking into their faces over which have passed years of experience, say to them: Here am I and these poor brewers and distillers who want compensation; you propose, now, not to allow them to brew or distill any more, and we propose, now that they have a capital of five, six, or twelve million dollars, to call upon you, poor, hard working people, to put your hands into your pockets and compensate them. How many votes does my hon. friend suppose he would get from the hard-working men of this country in favor of such a proposition? They would reply that all these men had acquired all they had accumulated in years past, had first passed through the hands of the workingmen, had been wrested from the fruits of their hard toil; they would say that there had been no tribute laid upon this country so heavy as this which they paid out of their homes and their earnings; they would reply, that they did not propose to add to the burdens they had already borne this unnecessary burden to compensate men who are now rich, and whose riches had been accumulated by means of this traffic. They would say: We forgive you the past; we ask no restitution for injuries done us; but leave us the future, and let us live happily and prosperously and become independent, without having this abuse from past ages, this worst of all tyrannies, this slavery than which no slavery is so grinding, or so far-reaching in its effects, further perpetuated.

Mr. JAMESON said—When I say that I do not propose to touch the principle involved in this resolution, it would be obvious to all that I have no intention of making a speech. I have but a remark or two to make in the line taken by the hon. member for Bromé (Mr. Fisher), whose amendment I had the honor to second. I think his view of the question is a very proper one. I am prepared to admit at the outset that the question is a very important one, and ought at the proper time to receive proper consideration; but for my part, and I think I speak not only my own views but the views of several hon. members of this House, and also the views of a very large portion of the electorate of this country, I think this question is one that properly ought to be considered when the question of prohibitory legislation is brought before the House. For my part, I do not feel disposed to commit myself to any resolution, but I will say that when the Government of the day or this House, in its wisdom, thinks proper to enact a prohibitory liquor law, and that law has embodied in it the principle of compensation to the class of persons referred to in the resolution of my hon. friend, I for one will be prepared calmly, honestly, and candidly to consider the question of compensation, and perhaps will go so far as to say that at the present moment I would concede it. I am not disposed to go so far as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. Possible he may be right. He opposed in toto the principle of compensation. Well, I think there may be circumstances in which compensation might be ceded, and at the proper time, when this question of prohibition comes before Parliament, there is a large class of temperance men, both in this House and out of it, who will fairly discuss the question of compensation. I do not think it would be right to discuss that question when it does not come up in a practical way. Now I hold that we cannot discuss it in a practical way in advance, because we do not know what the circumstances of the country or the circumstances of the traffic may be at the time that a prohibitory liquor law may be submitted to this House. If the votes which have been given on the Canada Temperance Act during the past year can be taken as an indication of public sentiment, and I have no doubt that such votes are an indication of public sentiment, it will be a very short time before this House will be called upon to deal with this question. It has forced itself upon this House and the electorate of this country, and I have no doubt it will force itself upon the members of this House more strongly when they go back to their constituents for the election at the next general elections. This is all I have to say upon the question. I simply rose to say that I was not prepared, and there are a great many members in this House who are not prepared at the present time to discuss the question, and I do not feel disposed to be committed to the view, although perhaps the hon. member who has just sat down is correct which he holds on this question to-day. I believe that the people in favor of prohibition in this country are prepared at any moment, when this question is brought in a practical shape before the House, to meet the case of the men whose interests would be affected by prohibition in a fair and reasonable way, and I have no doubt that many of them would accede a fair degree of compensation, although I, for my part, would not accede it for any great extent.

Mr. FAIRBANK said—I would say with the last speaker that I do not feel there is one member of this House called upon at this time to discuss the question of compensation. I do not understand that the question of compensation is before us. As between the resolution and the amendment to it, the question seems to me to be what is the proper time to consider the question of prohibition; and to my mind it is clear and conclusive that the proper time will be whenever the question of prohibition is before us. Has the Ministry at present brought before us any measure dealing with prohibition? I believe they have not. When we will be called upon to consider that question, or when, as is more likely, some future Parliament will be called upon to deal with it, it will have been fully considered by the people, our masters, and probably we will have received instructions in that direction. It seems to me that to enter upon this question at the present time is like giving judgment before hearing the evidence. It seems to me as if we were called upon to constitute ourselves a grand jury and to instruct the petty jury, who will hear all the evidence and decide upon it what to do. I do not think we ought to assume that we have all the wisdom of a future Parliament; I do not think we ought to assume that, when the question