

William Murray, for nineteen years superintendent of an alms house in Brooklyn, New York, said:

My opinion is that liquor is the principal cause of pauperism. If there had been no liquor drunk, say for the past one hundred years, there would be almost no pauperism, and there would be no poor houses.

I should like to quote a few statistics that have been gathered in a number of states showing the percentage of paupers caused by drink. In the institution at Worcester, Massachusetts, 90 per cent of the male criminals and paupers, and 70 per cent of the females, were there through strong drink. In the city of Albany, New York, nine-tenths of the pauperism was caused by strong drink; in Meadville, Pennsylvania, nine-tenths of the pauperism was due to the same cause. In Minneapolis at least eighty per cent of the pauperism and poverty and crime was due to strong drink.

I read a statement some time ago to the effect that in Kingston Penitentiary 75 per cent of the inmates were there through strong drink. Dr. Howard Crosby says:

I have been watching for thirty-five years and in all my investigations among the poor I never yet found a family borne down by poverty that did not owe its fall to strong drink.

Horace Greeley said:

Most of our paupers have become such through the use of alcoholic liquors—often by themselves, sometimes by their parents or other guardians. We estimate that nine-tenths of the paupers in our country were made so directly by strong drink.

The question may be asked, why is it that strong drink should have the effects charged against it? One thing it does is to divert money from the grocery stores, shoe shops, clothing stores and other legitimate businesses. In the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Dr. Weichel) he quoted to us opinions of men who disapproved of prohibitory measures. I am sorry to find him in what I consider rather bad company. Who are the men in this country that are defending the liquor traffic, and who are the people who are opposing it? How many women whose husbands patronize drinking places are defending the traffic? How many boys and girls who have suffered from lack of food and clothes, because of the waste of money on drink by their fathers, are defending it? Compare to-day the saloon or the places where drink is sold, with the churches in the matter of contributing to the order and well-being of the community.

[Mr. Thornton.]

Does it improve the reputation of a man to be known as a frequenter of a drinking place? Like other members of this House, I have had young men apply to me for positions, and what is one of the first questions that we ask? We want to know at once what the young man's habits are; we want to know whether he is a user of liquor or of tobacco. Tobacco is not included in the resolution before the House, but I class liquor and tobacco together. We see notices posted up in this building by order of the Minister of Public Works that there must be no smoking except in three places in this building. I want to say something which perhaps other members may not favour, but I see men every day in this building violating that order and smoking in different rooms in the building.

Why was that notice put up? It is because there is a lurking suspicion in the minds of men inside and outside of this House that the burning of the Parliament Buildings was due to somebody dropping a match or a cigar stub or cigarette stub, and it is hoped by this rule to prevent a recurrence of such a disaster. Yet every day there are members of this House who violate that rule. I call the attention of the Government to that fact.

We are often asked: why should you be prejudiced in connection with this drink business? The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) related an incident that occurred in his own city, showing that the family of an otherwise reputable citizen suffered untold miseries because of his indulgence in drink. The part of the country in which I live, I presume, is an average country district. Within five miles of the place where I was born and brought up inside of fifteen years there were twelve violent deaths from strong drink. In the township in which I lived there were at one time fifteen licensed hotels, and I presume that a similar proportion held good for almost every township in that part of Ontario. It was impossible to travel those roads a single day of your life without seeing from one to a dozen drunken men. To-day it is a rare thing to see a man drunk in that township, for there is not a license in it nor within twenty miles of the place where I live. Some of the most brilliant men this province has ever seen came from that section of country—professional men, doctors in particular. I know five doctors who were boys when I was a boy, all wonderfully successful practitioners, and all