

with convincing force to my mind, although it does not seem to have struck all the hon. gentlemen in that way as yet—that, although the revenue would be at a loss immediately after passing the Bill, ultimately we would be no losers by the passage of a prohibitory law. I do not know whether I can work that out satisfactorily to the gentlemen who have taken the opposite view, but, as it presents itself to me, it is something in this way: Take the manufacturers who are engaged now in the manufacture of liquor and from whom the Government derives its revenue. Of course, all the revenue from the dealers is municipal. It is not to be supposed for a moment that these gentlemen would withdraw their capital and their machinery and everything they have invested their money in, and would go out of business entirely. We would find that these immense distilleries and breweries where liquor had been manufactured before would at once be turned into revenue-producing manufactories. We would, therefore, find that the capital now invested in the manufacture of strong drink would be directed into other channels.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You would have to protect them.

Mr. COATSWORTH. That would be a question for the other side to deal with, and, whether we protected them or not, we find in the actual working out of our manufacturing interests that one of the results of establishing manufactories in our country is the production of so much more revenue. There is another question which may affect it, perhaps, a little more indirectly. I am not personally familiar with the working of the traffic, but I am told on credible authority that there are fewer workmen by far employed in the manufacture of liquor than would be necessary in any other manufacture, so that one of the results of the passing of a prohibitory measure and the establishment of other manufactures in place of the manufacture of liquor would be that an immense number of workmen would be employed, more than are employed in the liquor manufacture at the present time. There is another aspect to that question, and it is that, if it be true, as the statistics of my hon. friend the mover of the resolution have shown, that a large proportion of the crime in this country is traceable to strong drink, then the natural conclusion is that, when strong drink is banished from our country, when we are able to put into force and operation a prohibitory measure, that crime, to a large extent at any rate, will be checked, will be stayed, and therefore the cost of the administration of justice, the cost of the maintenance of our prisons, and the cost of all those things which are produced by strong drink will be reduced in proportion, and there would be a great saving to the Government in that line of expenditure. In concluding my remarks, I would just like to say that we must not look entirely at what might be called the economical side of this question. Every gentleman in this House is to a certain extent responsible for the moral and social well-being of this country; and to the extent that we can by our laws, passed after due consideration, lift up the moral and social condition of our people, to that extent we are responsible for the passage of such laws as will do so, and I believe this

prohibitory legislation will be in the direction of the uplifting of our people both morally and socially. We have all realized that the indulgence in strong drink, to the extent to which it is carried on, is an enormous moral evil. What mean those petitions which are coming to us? How is it that we are having petitions presented from almost every church in the Dominion, asking for the prohibition of the traffic? It means that the churches, who are to a certain extent, if not to a full extent, our moral guides, realize that the traffic in strong drink is so immoral in all its tendencies that it ought to be suppressed. If it were not a great evil from a moral point of view, if it were not felt by all the churches of our country that the time had come for the suppression of this traffic, would we have such petitions as have been presented here from the churches? I would call your attention to a petition I had the honour of presenting yesterday from the General Conference of the Methodist Church in Canada.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 46) respecting the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule, for Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 47) to amend an Act to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

PATENT RELIEF BILL—J. S. CORBIN.

Mr. REID moved the second reading of Bill (No. 30) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Jay Spencer Corbin.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the House ought to have some explanation concerning this Bill before consenting to its second reading.

Mr. REID. The circumstances under which relief is sought are set forth in the preamble of the Bill. It appears that Mr. Corbin had a patent on some harrow, that the patent expired, and as he wished to renew it he sent forward the application and fee, which failed to reach its destination in time. There was a similar Bill passed last year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As the hon. gentleman states, the Bill is somewhat in the line of a Bill which we passed last year in this House. The circumstances are not quite similar, but the parties claim that the case is an exceptional one. It is a case in which the patentee, by what is alleged to be an oversight, failed to secure a renewal of the patent for the reason that the fee required for renewal, together with the application, arrived six days after the proper date. I had a very strong impression that one of the Bills at last Session ought to pass because the case made out in evidence before the committee showed that the patentee was in no way at fault. He had made his application in due time, and it was due to the mistake of one of his clerks that it did not reach the Commissioner at the proper time. There are no such strong circumstances stated in this Bill; nevertheless, I think it will not be improper that it should have its