

was willing that the vote should be three-fifths of the whole. That was a letter written when I was in a position to express my views without reference to political and party considerations of any kind, and that is my conviction to this day; and, therefore, I urged my friends when moving in the Scott Act, only to move in localities in which the public sentiment would sufficiently sustain it. I did so in the interest of temperance. I can appeal to gentlemen present, who have known that when the Scott Act was carried by a majority and not enforced, that it was not in the interest of prohibition and temperance in many cases, and, therefore, the opinion that I then entertained thoroughly, and still entertain with reference to this proposition: That if you wish it to be beneficial to the cause of temperance, and to show that by shutting liquor out of a locality the effect is good, you will do it where the moral sentiment of the people is sufficient to enforce the law. That will convince the people, and they will say that it is a correct principle, and it will extend from one end of the Dominion to the other; but if you carry it and put it into operation where the public sentiment is not with you, a reaction will follow, and the people will say: "It is a failure," and abandon the whole principle. This position I have maintained now for thirty years and upwards since I introduced into the Legislature of New Brunswick a Bill in favor of prohibition, which was endorsed by almost all the men, women and children in the Province, and we thought from the petitions received—a cartload almost was brought in—we had the public sentiment sufficiently strong in the Province to carry it; but many who signed the petitions the moment it came into force backed down and never lent the least assistance, moral or in any other way, to the measure. And, as "a burnt child dreads the fire," I have always felt since that that it is most desirable in the attempt to get prohibition—which I believe will be carried some day in the Dominion of Canada throughout—to educate the people up to it, and to show that its results are favorable and beneficial to the morals and social condition of the people. If the moral sentiment of the community is not sufficient to sustain it then we will have a dozen grogeries. Take the county of Charlotte in my own Province. I think that in some sections of that county, to-day, there is as much liquor sold as before the Scott Act went into force, and it is sold openly. In St. Andrews there has never been any attempt to enforce it. The moral sentiment of the community is against it; and, therefore, I am quite sure that it is not better for the cause of temperance—though we all felt that it was a triumph to carry the measure—that it was carried. As a matter of sentiment, I would like to see it carried everywhere; but we have to look at the matter with a degree of common sense, and to see whether we can carry the principle to success. That is my reason for favoring this amendment. If I had been a member of the House when the Scott Act was considered, and a division had been taken, I should have voted, that not simply a majority but three-fifths of the whole votes cast should have been required in its favor. More than that, a great deal is to be said in favor of open voting on this question, because when a man goes up and records his vote in favor of the principle, it is a pledge that he will see it enforced; but if he signs a petition, often that will not follow. I would rather have open voting, as it commits a man to it; and feeling ever since this has been discussed in favor of such a majority from every locality as will ensure enforcement if the principle is adopted, I would therefore, myself, rather as between the two propositions for the success of the measure, go for the amendment than for the section in the Bill.

Mr. GILLMOR. Did the hon. gentleman introduce the Prohibitory Bill in New Brunswick thirty years ago? I thought it was Mr. Schooler.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Schooler introduced the first Bill; but not the Bill which carried—that I introduced as a member of the Government at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. I have always believed a great deal in the adoption of the view, which the hon. gentleman has just stated; and if we were dealing here with a large one, there might be some plausibility in his observations, because if so—if we were dealing with whole electoral districts, or a county, as in the Scott Act, it is quite possible that a bare majority in that county will mean a minority in particular localities; and if you find it carried by a small majority throughout the county, it will almost certainly be that in certain localities there will be a majority against the Act where it will be difficult to enforce it. But that is not the proposition before us, which is that of a small locality, a polling sub-division, where there are only 200 voters according to the law; and in that small locality you have not that difficulty. If you find a majority in a small locality against the introduction of a tavern, I say that the popular sentiment may be fairly taken to be sufficiently pronounced there to ensure the observance of the law in it. This is quite a different case. I have known myself in a county with which I was intimately connected for many years, where the Temperance Act was carried by a very considerable majority; but in particular parts of the county, in considerable sections of it, there were large majorities against the Act—which circumstance rendered it inoperative, and it was repealed almost without resistance; so I was satisfied by experience as I was by theory, that when dealing with a very large area of country, in which a diversity of feeling exists in different parts of it, a bare majority does not ensure you such a moral force as to enable the Act to take effect. But we are dealing with a different state of things, with a locality containing no more voters than there are members in this House when it is full; and as the majority of this House decides what shall be the laws of this country all over the country, I believe the majority of the electors of a polling sub-division can decide fairly for the polling sub-division, whether there shall be a tavern in it or not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. gentleman's argument should lead to just the opposite conclusion. In one locality, or village, or town—

Mr. BLAKE. I am not talking of the town, but of the country.

Mr. McCARTHY. But the Bill applies to both town and country.

Mr. BLAKE. There are hundreds of polling divisions in the country to one in the towns.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then there is no difficulty in amending the law to suit the country. The hon. gentleman has requested with great earnestness that the clause should stand; but before any person can get a license he has to get one-third of the signatures of the electors in the polling division, and then the License Commissioners have to deal with the fitness of himself as an applicant for license, the suitability of his house, its situation, &c. The clause says that a majority can petition against the application on one or on other of these grounds. First, that the applicant is of bad character, and if it were confined to that ground I should be willing to have the clause stand as it is. The second ground of objection is, that the premises are out of repair. Now, eight, or ten, or twenty people may say that the house is out of repair, other twenty may say that he is not a man of proper character to keep a hotel, while others may say that a tavern is not required in the neighborhood. The result may be that the applicant cannot even have his case considered, and the matter is practically decided without a hearing. The hon. member for Perth spoke of the town of Stratford where