

question is one of sufficient importance to merit a place in the Speech, and to demand the attention of the Legislature. I do not, however, feel that unmixed satisfaction which hon. gentlemen seem to think I should, at the announcement of the proposed legislation, because I am a little suspicious of what we are to get, and because I may not be able consistently to support the measure which may be introduced. We are promised a measure simply to secure uniform legislation throughout the Dominion. If that means that we are to be further fettered with a Dominion law sanctioning and licensing this traffic, and that its interests shall be more deeply and securely entrenched among us by our highest legislative authority, then it is a measure I shall oppose. If it is to restrain the traffic or tend to lessen its evils, I shall most likely support it, even though I may consider it defective; if the Government will take the existing law of Nova Scotia—although it is a license law, and I don't believe in licensing the traffic—still, if they give us that law, I will thankfully accept it as an improvement, and as bringing the law into uniformity with the best standard we have ever yet had in the Dominion. Whatever shape it may take, the Government will have my most cordial support and best efforts to assist them in passing a measure which will in any way tend to lessen the amount of that enormous evil which has hitherto so fettered our country. I hesitate not to say, that proper legislation on this subject will do more to promote the prosperity, happiness and true greatness of this Dominion than any measure, however important, of a fiscal nature, or even than that great enterprise, the Pacific Railway. No family, no interest, no rank or station in life is free from the baneful effects of the liquor traffic, and I shall hail with joy the smallest step in advance towards the satisfactory settlement of this most important matter.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH.—It was not my intention to say anything to day on this subject, as I did not consider that there was sufficient matter in the Address to cause any discussion, but it has elicited several remarks from my friend the Secretary of State, and other hon. gentlemen, which I feel I cannot let pass without some comment. In the prologue (the first

*Hon. Mr. Vidal.*

paragraph) of the Address, it leads almost to nothingness; it follows with a dozen or more paragraphs in which the Government propound no policy—nothing to go before the country with or to dispose of. A Reform Government should, according to the principles of Reform, always have something to reform. Is there nothing to reform, when under the present Government, we have less money, smaller revenues, heavier taxes and a larger debt? I should think when the Government come down with a Speech from the Throne, in which they say, after four years of power, that they have nothing to reform, their principles or vocation are gone, and they have nothing left of the principles which they advocated, on which to appeal to the country. I think I have read somewhere, that the President of the Council—the late President of the Council now—said when there was nothing more for the Government to reform, or when a Reform Government could find nothing more to reform, he would not be slow to leave it. There has been a sudden change lately in the Government, a reconstruction, and we have not yet been told the reason for this reconstruction; but it must be plain that that vacancy has been caused because the Government have found themselves incapable to deal with the many interests in this country which require reform, and the President of the Council found it to be his duty, on his declared principles, to leave the Cabinet. We have the Government declaring in the first place that we are called together and have nothing to do beyond the ordinary business of the country. That we should be called together and go back to the country without anything to be considered or proposed by the Government is very strange. The hon. Premier, when in Opposition, declared that there should be reform, retrenchment and economy in the administration of public affairs; that the number of Cabinet Ministers was too large, and one would naturally suppose that on coming into power, and after being in power four years, and now going to the people, the Reform Government would at least propose a death-bed repentance—a decrease in the amount of departmental expenditure. We are promised that some measure is to be introduced here with regard to the departmental service, but I do not believe it is in that