

burghers themselves, against whom those laws were enacted.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I thought Albrecht Durer was a worker in iron and wood.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Albrecht Durer was a celebrated painter in Nuremberg. I occupied the time of the House the other day at very considerable length, and I am quite aware that the remarks I have been making are very much disconnected; and, in fact, it is a new thing for me to be addressing an audience on the temperance question at all; and for that reason I ought to make great apologies for the imperfections and possibly some of the ignorance I have displayed on this question. At all events, I will claim this for myself: it has not been my place to extenuate, but I have set down naught in malice. I have this to say, however, that the points to which I am now about to refer in the Canada Temperance Act, operate most strongly, in my mind, against it. First, the undue interference with individual liberty; its interference also with vested rights and with honest labor and industry—the labor of the farmer in producing barley and the labor of the vine cultivator in producing wine. It interferes with those things in a most uncalled for and unnecessary way. They were alluded to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith), who sits beside the leader of the Government, the other day in his address. Secondly, I object to it because it is operative against the sober man, and is inoperative against the drunkard. Thirdly, I contend it creates a new crime—the sale of liquor; it makes men forswear themselves, and become smugglers. Fourthly, its operation is optional—sober communities accept it; drunken communities reject it. Moreover, in this case the standard rule of communities under a responsible government does not seem to hold, that majorities are to govern; and in this case it is something more than a presumption that majorities do not govern. I say in conclusion, that though I am prepared to vote with the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, I do so because I am aware that in the province from which I come the abrogation of this

law means simply leaving the province without any Act to regulate the sale of liquors, and that consideration, in addition to other motives which have influenced me more strongly on former occasions than now, convinces me of the necessity of at least giving the temperance gentlemen every assistance in my power. But I add this with regard to my future conduct on this question; that I hold it to be the duty of the Government to deal with this question. I should hail with pleasure the event if I saw the leader of the Government, even in this session, announce his intention on a future occasion to deal with it; and if at the re-assembling of Parliament next year, he were to rise in his place and announce that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a practical working measure to Parliament to control intemperance in Canada, without interfering with public liberty, without committing themselves to all the objectionable features of the Canada Temperance Act, I should not only hail it with pleasure, but I should be prepared to say that it would have my earnest support.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I wish to make a statement which may perhaps save time. The amendment which is before the House is very much in the same line with the amendment which was proposed two years ago by the hon. member from Ottawa, with reference to the Liquor License Act, the difference being that that was an amendment proposing to refer it, before it went into operation, to the Supreme Court for decision as to its constitutionality; and this amendment asks the House to pause until we have the final judgment of the Privy Council in England. I have no fault to find with the hon. gentleman for bringing forward that amendment, and I should have been prepared to support that amendment had I been here and had it been proposed at the time, when the question could have been considered by the Supreme Court. A strong appeal has been made to me on this question that the Bill before the House proposes to amend the Liquor License Act by striking out a clause which is said to interfere materially with the working of the Canada Temperance Act, if not to make it altogether nugatory as regards penalties. It is rather strange that we are asked to