

further postponement. This he did, Mr. Laurier, observing that he had gathered from the remark of the Minister of Justice, that afternoon, "that the Government will have a policy on this question."

June 17th.—Sir John Thompson requested a week's further postponement, giving a qualified promise that no more delay would be asked.

It was not till June 24th that the debate on the Prohibition resolution was resumed by the mover replying to the objections which had been advanced.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Taylor) to the amendment, and it was rejected by a vote of 7 to 185. The "yeas" were Baker, Hodgins, McNeill, Madill, Ross (Dundas), Taylor and Wood (Brockville).—7.

Motion to Appoint the Royal Commission.

Mr. Foster then moved in amendment to the amendment that all the words of the proposed amendment be struck out, and the following words added instead thereof:

"In the opinion of this House, it is desirable, without delay, to obtain for the information and consideration of Parliament, by means of a Royal Commission, the fullest and most reliable data possible respecting—

"1. The effects of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada.

"2. The measures which have been adopted in this and other countries with a view to lessen, regulate or prohibit the traffic.

"3. The results of these measures in each case.

"4. The effect that the enactment of a Prohibitory liquor law in Canada would have in respect of social conditions, agricultural business, industrial and commercial interests, of the revenue requirements of municipalities, provinces and the Dominion, and also, as to its capability of efficient enforcement.

"5. All other information bearing on the question of Prohibition."

In the course of the debate on this amendment, Mr. Davies (P. E. I.) explained that he had expected to move for a Dominion plebiscite.

The Royal Commission Proposal Adopted.

Mr. Foster's resolution for the appointment of a Royal Commission was adopted upon the following vote:

Yeas.—Adams, Baker, Barnard, Bergeron, Bergin, Bowell, Burnham, Burns, Cameron (Inverness), Carignan, Carpenter, Caron (Sir Adolphe), Cleveland, Coatsworth, Cochrane, Cockburn, Corbould, Corby, Costigan, Craig, Curran, Daly, Daoust, Davin, Davis, Denison, Desaulniers, Desjardines, (L'Islet), Dowdney, Dugas, Dupont, Dyer, Earle, Fairbairn, Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville), Foster, Frechette, Gillies, Girouard, Gordon, Grandbois, Haggart, Hazen, Henderson, Hodgins, Hutchins, Ingram, Ives, Joncas, Kaulbach, Kenny, Kirkpatrick, Langevin (Sir Hector), La Riviere, Leger, Lippe, Macdonald (King's) Macdonald (Winnipeg), Macdonnell (Algoma), Mackintosh, McAllister, McDonald (Victoria), McDougald (Ploton), McDougall (Cape Breton), McGreevy, McKay, McKeen, McLean, McLennan, McLeod, McNeill, Madill, Mara, Marshall, Masson, Miller, Mills (Annapolis), Moncrieff, Montague, Patterson (Colchester), Pelletier, Pope, Prior, Putnam, Reid, Robillard, Roome, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Lisgar), Ryckman, Skinner, Sproule, Stairs, Stevenson, Taylor, Temple, Thompson (Sir John), Tisdale, Tupper, Tyrwhitt, Wallace, Weldon, White (Cardwell), White (Shelburne), Wilmont, Wood (Brockville) and Wood (Westmorland).—107.

Nays.—Allan, Allison, Amyot, Armstrong, Bain, Barron, Beausoleil, Bechard, Belth, Bernier, Borden, Bourassa,



THOMAS B. FLINT,
Prohibition Leader in the House of Commons.

Bowers, Bowman, Brodeur, Brown (Chateauguay), Brown (Monck), Burdett, Cameron (Huron), Campbell, Carroll, Cartwright (Sir Richard), Charlton, Choquette, Christie, Colter, Davidson, Davies, Dawson, Delisle, Dickey, Edgar, Edwards, Fauvel, Featherston, Flint, Forbes, Fraser, Gauthier, Geofrion, Gibson, Gillmor, Godbout, Grieve, Guay, Hargraff, Harwood, Hyman, Innes, Jameson, King, Landerkin, Langeller, Laurier, Lavergne, Leduc, Legris, Lepine, Lister, Livingston, Macdonald (Huron), McGregor, McMillan, McMullen, Mignault, Mills (Bothwell), Mousseau, Mulock, Murray, Paterson (Brant), Perry, Proulx, Rider, Rinfret, Sanborn, Savard, Scriver, Semple, Simard, Somerville, Spohn, Sutherland, Trow, Truax, Vaillancourt, Watson, Welsh and Yeo.—88.

SECOND SESSION—1892.

May 16th.—Mr. Charlton addressed the House in favor of a Dominion plebiscite and concluded by moving the following resolution:

"That the state of public opinion upon the question of the Prohibition of the manufacturing, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, should be ascertained by a reference of the question to the electors of Canada at the polls."

After a brief debate the resolution was withdrawn.

THIRD SESSION—1893.

March 9th.—The House was in Com-

mittee of Supply and upon motion to appropriate \$15,000 for expenses of the Royal Commission a sharp attack was made upon the Commission.

Light on the Proposed Liberal Plebiscite.

A most significant speech, in the light of later events was made by Mr. Davies (Prince Edward Island). Replying to the question how he would find out whether there is a sufficient opinion in favor of a Prohibitory law to enable such a law to be carried into effect he said:

"By a plebiscite, I would not determine the question simply on the vote polled, but as to whether a majority of the registered electors declared themselves in favor of that system. If voters stayed away from the polls, that fact would show that their hearts were not in favor of the system. If, however, a majority of the registered electors declared in favor of Prohibition, that phase of the question would be settled, and we then would be brought face to face with the question as to whether our economic and financial position would justify the Government in carrying out Prohibition. That is the question which the Government would have to solve."

On the 30th of March, Mr. Foster, replying to Mr. Coatsworth's questions, said the Government had not taken, nor would take till the Commissioner's report had been received, any action upon the petition for the passage of a Prohibitory law received from the Manitoba Government.