

was introduced to carry out the promise of the Premier to the people of Canada that a Bill would be introduced to continue what was understood by the people as the Doherty Act.

I understand that all that is intended by this Bill is to say to the people of the different provinces: "If you want to have certain restrictions added to the prohibition existing in your province, the members of your legislature may ask the Secretary of State in Ottawa to issue an order for a vote." In other words, instead of invoking the municipal authorities, as referred to by the honourable gentleman from Middleton (Hon. Mr. Ross), the province as a whole will set the machinery in motion. I can see nothing wrong in that. I know of no better representatives of the people, better qualified to speak for the people, than the legislatures of the provinces.

It is true that it may be more or less onerous for the Dominion of Canada to be called upon to pay these expenses; but, after all, it is not a thing that is going to be done often enough, nor is the amount involved large enough, to justify us in causing the people of this country to think that the Senate has thrown back into the face of the Government a measure which is generally desired by temperance people. I think it would be a great mistake for us to adopt what has been proposed by the honourable gentleman from Middleton (Hon. W. B. Ross). I think we would be misunderstood, and, while I realize that at this late hour of the session it is difficult to give the matter detailed consideration, I think the principle is simple and sane. It has been discussed in the press, and on the streets for a long time, and we should really know what it means. I am not willing, simply because we have not received this legislation at a time that we considered fitting to the dignity of this body, I am not willing that we should throw it to one side and leave the people who desire it and who have a right to it without the legislation that they desire.

If this Bill is thrown out the people who are interested in the sale and manufacture of whisky (and who are opposed to temperance) may take temporary advantage of the fact; but honourable gentlemen should remember that they are trifling with a very dangerous matter. The people of this country, whether rightly or wrongly, believe in and want temperance legislation. They have asked for it, and if by some fluke, in the last days of the session, when many honourable members are absent, they are prevented from getting it, it is not going to make for

better relations between them and the other interests.

If we are going properly to govern this country and get its affairs into the shape that they ought to be in, what we have to do is to smooth down the differences that exist and not encourage friction. Some politicians and local interests are screaming because they want their language, or their ideas, or their church views thrust upon others. No section of the people have the right to dominate everything in this country, whether they happen to be farmers, or unions, or capitalists. We had an example last week in the state of Massachusetts that we might well take to heart. We saw a man big enough and broad enough and bold enough to say: "I am not going to be cajoled or overruled by any one interest, whether the returned soldiers, the workmen, the millionaires, or any others." This may seem foreign to the matter that is before us, but it is not foreign to it.

I warn those who are interested in the opposition to this Bill that they will make a mistake if they throw it out. I warn them that the advantage which they gain will be but temporary. The temperance people will resent their action in throwing out the Bill. And on behalf of the temperance people of Canada, I earnestly appeal to the Senate to give this matter grave consideration. If there is not time to pass this Bill this morning, let us adjourn until this afternoon; and if there is not time this afternoon, let us adjourn until to-morrow. If this Senate attempts to frustrate the purpose of this Bill so surely will the Senate be criticised by people from whom we should desire good-will and approval.

Hon. PETER McSWEENEY: Honourable gentlemen, in New Brunswick in 1854 the Prohibition Bill was passed by a vote of 38 to 2. Eighteen months later the Bill was repealed by exactly the same majority because it has proved to be a total failure. In 1874 we had the Canada Temperance Act in the county of Westmorland. It was carried by the liquor-interest crowd because it was for their benefit. It has been in operation ever since. It has not lessened drunkenness, but increased it. In that county there are about twenty arrests and convictions per thousand for drunkenness. In Ottawa, where the restrictions were not any too severe up to the time of the passing of temperance legislation, there were just ten per thousand. Some years ago I was in Berlin, where there were eighteen or twenty licensed hotels, and the arrests and