

so great was their anxiety to obtain power, that they became more reckless in their pledges, more profuse in the promises on each succeeding occasion they appeared before the electors, and now that their chickens are coming home to roost the so-called temperance men on their side of the House are put up to whitewash the Government and condone their actions, while throwing this sop to the temperance people to try and ally their restlessness and irritability caused by the hypocrisy of their own political leaders. This resolution only provides for the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors in any province, and does not legislate against the manufacture and importation, as the Plebiscite Bill which was submitted to the people and on which they voted, provided for. It is therefore only a partial measure, a half-hearted attempt, and will not meet the requirements of the people in those provinces that have pronounced in favour of total prohibition. On the question of the prohibition of the liquor traffic including the importation, manufacture and sale I voted in the affirmative and pledged myself to support such a measure if introduced in this House to apply to the whole Dominion. I have always felt that the Government were insincere on this question, that they were merely utilizing it for party purposes, that they never seriously contemplated its adoption, and events have fully justified that opinion. I have received no instructions from any of my constituents to support such a resolution as this one introduced by the member for Yarmouth, no temperance organization in my constituency, so far as I am aware have endorsed it, and as I believe it is merely meant to remove the responsibility from the shoulders of the men now in power and not for the purpose of furthering the temperance cause I mean to oppose it.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, it is not because the resolution of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) goes as far as I would like it to, that I shall give it my support, but it is because it seems to me to be the most practicable and feasible solution of the problem now before us. In the brief time at my disposal at this late hour, I think I can show that the action of the Government is justified under the present circumstances. I am one of those who endeavour to look at circumstances as they are, and not as they might be. We have no right to go behind the vote recorded for the province of Quebec any more than the people of Quebec have the right to go behind the vote recorded in the province of Ontario, and I think we must look upon the matter just as it presents itself to us here. It has been urged to-night as an argument, that if we were to reverse the situation the people of the province of Ontario would not be willing to be coerced, as it is claimed it has been attempted to coerce the people of the pro-

vince of Quebec. Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, in so many words, assert that the Government is bound to carry out prohibition, but at the same time there is a mental reservation that so far as the province of Quebec is concerned at all events, and indeed so far as the Dominion is concerned, prohibition would be clearly inoperative, because it has not public sentiment behind it. I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to one or two points wherein I think the Government is justified in the action it has taken. We look upon the province of Ontario as being the banner province so far as prohibition sentiment is concerned, and we regard the vote in the province of Ontario and the sentiment in the province named, as justifying us to some extent in the stand we take. I believe that an analysis of the vote in the province of Ontario would convince any reasonable man, that it would be decidedly imprudent at the present time to enact a strict prohibitory law. I represent a county that is as strongly prohibitive in its sentiments as any county in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) said that he was pledged to his people, and that his people had voted so largely in favour of prohibition that he felt it incumbent upon him, in harmony with their votes, to vote for prohibition. The same reason would impel me to vote for prohibition, but I do not think it would be a logical course to pursue, simply because my constituents, by a large majority, voted for the plebiscite. I do not feel bound to do so unless the other conditions existing were such as would justify me in believing that prohibition could be enforced. In the province of Ontario there are ninety constituencies, and out of these ninety, in nineteen the percentage of the total vote polled was slightly more than one-half the votes on the list. In sixty of the constituencies, the percentage of the votes polled was less than half the votes on the list. In six constituencies the percentage of the total vote polled was only one-third the total votes on the list, and that leaves out of the calculation the cities which, with one or two exceptions, were strongly adverse to prohibition. I hold that there is not a sufficiently strong sentiment evinced by these figures to warrant the Government in passing a prohibitory law. It has been stated to-night, and reiterated time and time again, that the people expect the Government to introduce a prohibitory law. I do not regard that as the fact, and I wish to quote briefly the opinion of one or two persons of high standing in the community, as evidence that the people at large do not regard the Government as being called upon, under the circumstances, to pass prohibitory legislation. At the recent Presbyterian Assembly the Rev. Mr. Jordan, who is represented as a Conservative, said:

I believe the Government has done wisely in not urging upon Parliament the acceptance of a