

April 29, 1874

Hon. Mr. CAUCHON said the motion was out of order, and contended that there were various models of testing the feeling of the House on the subject, without invading the rules of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE referred to a decision recorded in *Hansard* and which was made in 1842. It was then ruled that the House must resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole before it could consider any motion having reference to trade or taxation.

The **SPEAKER** on being called upon for his ruling by **Mr. BUNSTER**, said in his opinion the amendment was an abstract motion barren of result, and therefore it might be entertained.

Mr. FARROW said, as it appeared to be the opinion of the friends of temperance in the House that it would be in the cause of temperance to withdraw it, he begged to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BUNSTER then moved in amendment that the report be read six months from this day. He contended that no one had a right to dictate to him what he should eat or drink, and that the liquor traffic gave an impulse to trade and employment to large numbers of people.

The **SPEAKER** pointed out that the amendment could not be put in its present shape. The report had been read, and the question was now on its adoption.

Mr. BUNSTER altered his amendment accordingly.

Mr. MacKENZIE (Montreal West) said he hoped the hon. member for Vancouver (**Mr. Bunster**) would withdraw his motion, as the report recommended the getting of more information with regard to the matter. He (**Mr. MacKenzie**) was opposed to a prohibitory law as much as the hon. gentleman, though on different grounds.

Mr. BUNSTER refused to withdraw his motion.

Mr. SINCLAIR believed it would promote the peace and prosperity of the country to do away with intoxicating liquors as a beverage. He had no fear with regard to the revenue if they had a prohibitory law, but thought they should in this, as in other matter, consider what was right and then do it. (*Applause.*)

The amendment of **Mr. Bunster** was then put and lost on a division.

Mr. GORDON thought the country would feel grateful to the Premier for the views he had expressed today with regard to this matter. He (**Mr. Gordon**) went on to express himself in favour of prohibition.

Mr. CHISHOLM said that he regarded the admission the Premier had made today as one of the greatest things for temperance that had ever occurred in the country. They all agreed as to the advisability of getting rid of crime. As to whether they could do this by passing a prohibitory law there was a difference of opinion. He believed himself that if they had such a law crime would be greatly decreased. At any rate they should be willing to get more information on the subject. He thought that hon. members of this House should set an example to the country by themselves abstaining from the use of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. SMITH (Peel) believed that if it could be shown that the revenue would not be affected by the passage of a prohibitory law, this House would be in favour of it. He thought that they were as much called upon to fight intemperance as to establish a military college to train men for the defence of the country from other enemies.

Mr. WILKES said he was sure a large number of members were much indebted to the member for Middlesex West (**Mr. Ross**) for the pains he had taken in this matter. It would be wise not to precipitate action in this matter. The financial aspect of this question was undoubtedly an embarrassing one, but the revenue now derived from this traffic could be easily derived in other ways. The revenue derived from this source in Canada was 30 per cent of the total revenue, in England 33 per cent, in the United States about the same. He called the attention of the First Minister to the fact that there was a large liquor traffic being carried on with Indians in the Northwest. They were being supplied with liquor by Canadian traders, and not from across the border as heretofore.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said the Government had taken very peremptory steps to stop that.

Mr. WILKES was very happy to hear it. He hoped when the information asked for by the Committee was disseminated among the people, good results would ensue. It was a mistake to imagine that the hotel system of the country would be injured by such legislation. It was the tavern system which was objected to. They did not desire crude legislation in advance of public sentiment, but hoped they would see that it was their interest to restrain the traffic.

It being six o'clock, **Mr. Speaker** left the chair.

AFTER RECESS

PRIVATE BILLS

The following Bills were passed through Committee, read a third time, and passed:

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Canadian and Great Northern Telegraph Company, as amended by the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines—**Hon. Mr. HOLTON**.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Caughnawaga Ship Canal Company, as amended by the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines.—**Hon. Mr. HOLTON**.

An Act to consolidate the mortgages and other preferential charges of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada; for raising further capital; for establishing a Superannuation and Provident Fund Association; and for other purposes, as amended by the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines—**Mr. IRVING**.

An Act to incorporate the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company, as amended by the Standing Committee on Railways and Canals.—**Mr. THOMSON (Welland)**.

The following Bills were read a second time:—