

these results, because every hon. member is unfortunately too familiar with them. Our observations in every direction prove, beyond a doubt, that the result of these drinking usages, whatever may be the cause, whether inherent in human nature or in the article itself—whatever may be the immediate cause, the result is very injurious to the community at large. In sentiment, I am prepared to go as far as the Resolution goes, but, as a matter of practical legislation, I am not prepared to go that far at present. There are various difficulties, to my mind, in connection with legislation even to the extent to which I allude—the prohibition of spirits. The first objection we have to meet is the compensation to those who are engaged in the manufacture of this article in the country. I think it is only fair and reasonable, that if legislation should take away from the distillers their occupation and business, they should be, to a reasonable extent, compensated for the damages done to them by such legislation. That is the first principle in connection with these matters. I never felt very enthusiastic about the Dunkin or Scott Act, chiefly because there was no compensation provided for those who were especially engaged in legitimate trade, or, at all events, in legalized trade. I think they ought to be reasonably compensated for such loss as they might suffer at the hands of this Parliament. Now, that is the first obstacle we have to meet—compensation—and yet that would not be a very great matter, because in Canada, at the present day, there are only seven distilleries. Five of those do not amount to much as to value or production. Two of them—the distillery at Toronto and the distillery at Windsor—are very large concerns, and would represent, at least, I should imagine, two-thirds of the whole value of the seven distilleries. It was represented to me a year or two ago that the Toronto distillery represented half the value of the whole then existing distilleries, there then being in the country not less than twelve. Since that time—from what cause I do not pretend to say directly or particularly, but I presume it is from the growing capacity of these two large distilleries—the other distilleries are giving up, and now, instead of twelve, there are only seven in existence, and the probabilities are that, in two or three years at most, these seven will be reduced to three or four, if they are still allowed to go on. The whole value of the property included in this question of distillation would, then, as was represented by one of the Inland Revenue officers, only represent about \$5,000,000, and the Toronto distillery would represent about a half of the whole. So the question of compensation would not be so serious a question, involving only—the interest account being taken as the only practical question—an expenditure to the country of about \$100,000 or \$200,000 a year, as the case might be. There is also the question of revenue, which is probably the most important one, from our standpoint, as legislators, how we are going to meet that diminution of revenue which would actually arise, at the start, at all events, from legislation of this character, the prohibition of the production of spirits. I will give a few figures—not going lengthily into the question of figures—for the purpose of showing what this revenue is and whence it is derived. Taking the year ending the 30th June, 1882, there was brandy imported into this country, 265,608 gallons; entered for consumption, 265,608; the duty paid on that was \$395,115.66. Under the name “cordials,” 3,280 gallons were imported; entered for consumption the same amount; duty collected, \$6,233.04. Gin imported, 359,874 gallons; the same amount entered for consumption, and the duty on that, \$476,831.11. Rum, 118,620 gallons imported; the same entered for consumption, on which a duty was collected of \$157,263.95. Whiskey imported, 143,281 gallons; and made in Canada, 3,552,817 gallons; representing a total of 3,696,098 gallons; on which a duty was collected of \$3,745,343.05. Of other spirits, 1,635 gallons were imported and entered for consumption, the duty being \$2,644.52. The total

of imported gallons of spirits was 892,298, and made in Canada 3,552,817, making a total entered for consumption of 4,445,115 gallons, on which there was a revenue collected of \$4,773,431.31. In 1883, there were of spirits imported under the same heads, 1,044,083 gallons; made in Canada, 3,848,787; total entered for consumption 4,892,870, representing a revenue of \$5,273,854.29. Of malt liquors, there were, in 1882, imported 249,391 gallons; made in Canada 11,850,425 gallons; total entered for consumption, 12,098,816, from which the revenue collected was \$432,175.14. In 1883, there were imported 346,697 gallons; made in the country 12,587,727 gallons; a total of 12,934,424 gallons, on which there was a revenue collected of \$463,876.51. The imported wines in 1882 were 544,967 gallons, from which a revenue was collected of \$405,505.10; and in 1883, 607,113 gallons, with a revenue of \$437,911.37. So it will be seen, by comparison of these figures, that the revenue from malt liquors and wines is so small that it bears very little comparison with the large amount collected from spirits. But there is another feature—the strength of the liquors which are drunk. Brandy is represented in this country to possess from 85 to 90 per cent. of alcoholic strength; rum the same; gin, 80 to 85; whiskey, 75; beer, 8 to 12; sherry, port and Madeira, 18 to 25, if pure, and 25 to 40, as usually imported; Canadian wines, about the same; French wines, light, 15 to 20 per cent. So we see, by a comparison of the brandy, rum, gin, and whiskey, with beer and wines, that the large amount of alcoholic strength is in the whiskey, brandy and rum, as compared with the beer and the wine. Now, the idea is that this country might go so far as to prohibit the liquors possessing this great alcoholic strength and allow good beer and wine to be sold, as it is now sold, by licensed taverns, in the way in which it is done at present, the adulteration of those beers and wines to be prevented, and the people who may drink them to be protected, so that they shall not be adulterated either by the addition of any alcohol beyond the proper strength, or of any other deleterious drug whatever. In reference to this matter, I have a statement taken from the *Week*, a paper published in Toronto, and I think it is the production of Mr. Goldwin Smith; at all events, I know that he entertains the same view in reference to this question. He says:

“The root of the evil in this country is the production of whiskey. Whiskey is the real poison, and if produced will infallibly find its way, by one channel or another, to the lips of the consumer; so that the only consequence of harassing the respectable retail trade will be here, as everybody says it has been in Maine, the multiplication of disreputable and clandestine taverns. If we want to kill the monster and to do a noble thing at the same time, let us sacrifice the Excise, and having paid due compensation to the distillers, whose trade has been not only recognized but made a source of revenue by the State, shut up the distilleries.”

That expresses the idea which I entertain in reference to this matter exactly, and that is the view we should take, if the question comes to practical legislation. I do think that the motion made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), certainly expresses the condition of things existing at the present day; but there is another view to be entertained in this matter, as we know it is the great alcoholic strength of the liquors I have named which is the cause which produces the vagrancy and violence and the poverty and misery which are so sadly seen over the whole land, and especially in cities. We find this to be the result in most cases of men having ready access to these strong drinks. The way would be, therefore, to prevent their reaching these drinks, and, if we did this by a prohibition of spirits, we think that, at all events, it would be action in the right direction; and, whatever might be the ultimate result, it would enable us to understand more particularly whether the idea of prohibition could be practically carried out successfully and safely in the country. I would have moved for legislation in that direction this Session, were it not that there is confusion enough now in