

pedestal above other men, who, having superior brains and common sense, can indulge moderately, and have no fear of making beasts of themselves. Never in this country will you impose a prohibitory law and make it work. To impose such a law here is humbug, because it will not be regarded. The hon. member for Annapolis says he understood this thing thoroughly, that he has studied it in every phase. I must confess, if we are to believe what he says, he has mixed in very strange society, for though I have knocked all over the world, and have seen a good deal of life, I have never witnessed the scenes he has depicted. Whether in his youth he was led away by an appetite he could not control, and mixed in society which does not qualify a man to lecture his fellow-creatures, or whether he sought those scenes with the view to cure the evils he has described, I know not, but I think that I never witnessed such scenes as he depicted the other night. What is the use of our making this miserable penny-trumpet sound about our closing the bar, when everyone knows that even were the order given it would not be closed? The law is always evaded in some way or other. I live in the hotel kept by the proprietor of the restaurant; I take my meals here, and I have never seen hon. members to any extent the worse for liquor. I may have seen a man who, on entering this Legislature for the first time, got a little bit jovial, and drank more than he should, but I am proud to say that everyone of those voted with the hon. member for Annapolis. I take exceptions to the proposition of my sage leader, that we should exclude all parties from going down to the restaurant. If effect were given to that, a member would be placed in a very humiliating position, when he could not take a friend of his from his constituency down to have some social refreshment. I think my hon. leader cannot have thoroughly considered the proposition he made. Let us consider this matter with some sort of respect for ourselves. Let us come to the determination that we are an assembly of gentlemen who are able to control themselves. Let us not be guilty of the empty folly, the poor farce of voting to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, when everyone knows the sale will go on just the same as it did before the prohibition. I do not care what the hon. Premier of the House says. You will not alter by one iota the taking down of constituents into the restaurant, or library or smoking-room. Members have authority here, and no servant that we employ would prevent a member from bringing his friends through the lobbies. While believing the hon. members for Middlesex and Annapolis were honest in the position they took with regard to the Scott Act, I believe this thing to be a bit of offensive petty clap-trap intended to hurt the feelings and annoy the sense of honor of those who are opposed to them on this question. To members in the House who deal with each other as gentlemen, who meet each other from day to day, who are glad to see each other well, and sorry when any are ill, to propose this motion is an offensive position to take. It is a gross insult to put upon those who do not agree with those extreme temperance gentlemen. They know such a motion amounts to nothing; therefore it is only an empty vaunt—an attempt to shove their principles down our throats, when they know they can give no effect to them. They think to entrap us into votes here that will be flung in our faces at future elections. I will go as far as any reasonable man in promoting what I think a proper temperance measure; but if I please to eat and drink I shall eat and drink, and I have never found at any election, in any part of the country, that the sensible, honest advocates of temperance had any objection to those who maintained the same views as myself, who want to promote temperance by such means as proper example and persuasion, but not by trying to legislate men out of their rights. So far as the motion of the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is

Mr. BOULTBEE.

concerned, as it is an amendment to the main motion, I shall vote for it; but I am ashamed to do so, because it is understood that no effect will be given to it—it will be a dead letter, so I shall, therefore, be only voting for a nugatory motion.

Mr. LONGLEY. As respects the remarks of the member for East York (Mr. Boulton), I think they may be allowed to pass for what they are worth. I shall simply notice what he has termed my extravagance in representing the scenes I have witnessed here as a result of the saloon below. My imagination is not sufficient to depict the gross results of the liquor traffic. But if the member for East York has ever wandered about in the vicinity of the gin palaces of London—

Mr. BOULTBEE. I never go there.

Mr. LONGLEY. It is a pity the hon. gentleman should not visit those places, for he would there have a glimpse of the degrading results of this traffic which he seems so insidiously bound to uphold. He should wander about the streets of Glasgow and witness the degradation, the unsexing of women due to this evil, when he would know something of the effects of this liquor traffic. We have them here in a mitigated form. I want simply to make a remark or two in reply to the hon. member for Hamilton. He says truly that, before I decided to move this resolution, I invited him to second it. He seemed to respond with great alacrity. But as soon as he found that there was a little stringency about the motion—

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). The motion was to close the bar.

Mr. ORTON. I rise to a question of order. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Longley) has lectured the House long enough; and as he has spoken to his motion already, he should not be allowed to proceed in this strain.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Annapolis says he wants to make some personal observations; but he must confine himself to the matter in hand.

Mr. LONGLEY. I want to reply to the member for Hamilton.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; chair, chair.

Mr. LONGLEY. I was going on to say that so soon as the hon. member for Hamilton found there was a little stringency about my motion, and that it was designed to have some effect, he shrank from seconding it. That is just what I have always found on the part of men who merely profess to be on the side of temperance. I do not wish either myself, or those with whom I am associated, to be misrepresented, and I say this: not only hon. members here, but the world at large, are under a debt of obligation to the present temperance men in the country. But for their efforts I am afraid we should all of us be beyond reclaim. I beg to state on behalf of those who have been assailed to-night as temperance fanatics, that we do not seek to impose the restraints that are alleged against us; we simply want to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors about this House. The central point of our creed is that no man has a right to carry on business to the injury of his neighbor.

Mr. ORTON. I again rise to a question of order: the hon. gentleman has addressed the House a great many times, and I do not think we ought to allow him to go on; he is simply speaking on the general question of temperance.

Mr. LONGLEY. I wanted to reply to the remarks of a personal character made, and I shall proceed no further.

Amendment (Mr. Kirkpatrick) agreed to on the following division:—