

Bryson,	Gunn,	Sproule,
Burnham,	Hackett,	Stairs,
Burns,	Hay,	Tassé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hessou,	Taylor,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hickey,	Temple,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Tilley,
Carling,	Houde,	Trow,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Tyrwhitt,
Cartwright,	Kaulbach,	Wallace (Albert),
Casgrain,	Kilvert,	Wallace (York),
Chapleau,	Krarz,	White (Cardwell),
Cochrane,	Landerkin,	White (Hastings),
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wigle,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Williams,
Coursol,	Lesage,	Wood (Brockville),
Curran,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	Wood (Westm'd)—107.
Outhbert,	Mackintosh,	

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Vanasse) in the seat from which he gave his vote.

Mr. VANASSE. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I have taken the seat of my hon. colleague, Mr. Homer, which is at a distance of six inches from mine.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not removing from his seat.

On the main motion, as amended, being put,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I desire, Sir, to have the attention of the House just for a few minutes. Never since I have entered public life have I voted, nor do I intend to vote, against the principle of prohibition. As early as 1855, I introduced into the Legis'a ure of my own Province one of the most stringent prohibitory Bills that was ever proposed in any Legislature or Parliament in the world. Previous to the introduction of that Bill, we had, as we thought, educated the people of New Brunswick to the point that such a law, if enacted, would be supported and sustained by the people. Reference was made by the hon. mover of this Resolution to the number of petitions presented to the House of Commons in 1877; and if my memory serves me, in the Province of New Brunswick, as far back as 1855, we had more signatures to petitions presented to the Legislature of that Province in favour of prohibition than were signed to the petitions presented to this House from the whole Dominion in 1877. They were brought into the House in the size of rolls of carpet by the hon. members who presented them. We thought that we had educated the people of that Province up to such a point that if a prohibitory law was passed it would be enforced. We had three-fourths of the people of that Province signing petitions in favour of prohibition. That law was passed by the Lower House, by something like two-thirds majority, and it passed the Upper House by nearly the same majority; and it was passed because of the strong arguments and facts presented, and because of the statistics we had collected as to the effect of the traffic in New Brunswick from 1852 to 1855, and which were so convincing that men who differed from us in opinion gave us their support, and enabled us to carry the measure by the majority stated. That law went in force on the 1st of January, 1856. I was contrasting the position I occupied at that time with the position occupied by the mover and seconder of this Resolution. Before that law went in force, I was burned in effigy in many parts of the Province of New Brunswick. On the night of the day on which it came into force, I had the doors of my house broken down by a battering ram, and I did not know but that my life would be taken. I had threatening letters, with death's heads and cross-bones, sent to me; but we carried that law in New Brunswick, and I am satisfied that if such a law was in force to-day, it would be a great blessing to that Province. For six weeks that law was enforced. The saloons and dram shops of that Province were almost entirely closed. Many gentlemen had laid in their stocks beforehand, and had as much liquor as they required; but the drinking saloons

Mr. SCRIVER.

were closed, and the result was apparent to every person, even to those who were most prejudiced against the principle of prohibition. But what took place? Some few individuals had the temerity to violate the law. They were taken before the magistrates for trial. The magistrates, though well informed men, were not legal gentlemen and were not very well up in legal proceedings. They tried the cases, and gave their verdicts according to the evidence. Appeals were taken, however, until I might say hundreds of cases were before the Judges on appeal; and through some informality in the proceedings of the magistrates, the cases were dismissed and the magistrates were mulcted in costs amounting in many cases to from \$200 to \$500. These magistrates were honest men, who were discharging their duties to the best of their abilities, and in some cases have assisted to pay the expenses to which they were subjected. This went on until the magistrates became so alarmed that they objected to undertaking them. The result was that the Lieutenant-Governor—who was hostile to the Bill—brought the subject to the attention of the Government, and suggested the desirability of having a new election, in order to test public opinion, with reference to this law, which had been in operation only about four months, the Council objected to this course. This question, though it was not the sole issue of the elections of 1854, was discussed on nearly every hustings, and many members were elected upon it. At this time some of the friends of the measure were themselves disheartened on account of the expenses incurred in the courts, and because of the increasing number of the violators of the law, who, there was reason to fear, would not be brought to trial. The Governor insisted upon a dissolution of Parliament. The Government resigned because they would not accept the responsibility of this Act. They demanded that the law should have a twelve months' trial, at all events; and declared that if then it was found to be a failure, we would be prepared either to amend the law or to ask for its repeal. We were thrown into an election, and very many of those who had signed the petition went back on us; they voted against this law, and a majority were returned to vote in favour of its repeal. Under these circumstances, and believing as I do now, that if public sentiment is not sufficiently educated to sustain a prohibition law the passage would do harm instead of good, instead of abandoning anything by accepting the original resolution even as amended, I hold that if this motion be carried the cause of prohibition will have made a great step in advance.

Mr. KIRK. We had the same thing in 1875.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not quite sure but that some hon. gentlemen who voted against this proposition to-day did not then vote for the proposition moved by Mr. Ross. That, however, does not matter at present. I believe in prohibition; I believe it will yet come in Canada; but I believe it would be the greatest injury to the permanent success of prohibition were there such a law enacted to-day, because I know, from the experience of the past, that it could not be successfully carried out. I have the courage of my convictions and am prepared to vote for the principle of prohibition, but I have also the courage of my convictions when I say that the country is not yet sufficiently educated to enable that principle to be successfully carried into operation. What did we find in New Brunswick? We found that men who signed the petition for prohibition and advocated it publicly, when it came to the vote, voted for its repeal; and until a majority of the people of the Dominion are practically teetotalers, we will have the appetite of the people, as well as the interest of the men engaged in the liquor traffic, working and conspiring to destroy it. It is because I believe in prohibition that I am prepared to vote for the principle, and to say that when the time comes when it will be desir-