

that the country has spoken out as to total prohibition, so it did, somewhat emphatically in both instances: it had never spoken on the question of partial prohibition. And we, therefore, had to consider what we were to do. The temperance men were urging that we should do something this session. We hadn't a mandate from the people for prohibition of this kind, no election had turned on it, no man had been sent to Parliament with authority from the people to advocate any such cause; if he had any authority or quasi-authority, it would be for total prohibition. As the matter was urgent, the Government said: "No, we will not take the responsibility of casting into the waste basket the license laws," and they said, inasmuch as local option and the Scott Act, which were in each case a form of partial prohibition, had been submitted to the people by referendum, that in this case we would take the same course, and follow the old precedent. The precedents were so strong that they governed the Parliament of Ontario, as to local option since Confederation and the Dominion Parliament which passed the Scott Act, since 1878, and in both instances the referendum had been accepted as the policy of Parliament. As you see, the precedents were so strong that the Government did not feel justified in passing a partial prohibitory liquor law, and a complete prohibitory liquor law we could not give. We had to take a middle course. We could have brought in this bill, submitted it to the House and see what its fate might be. I can't say what its fate might have been on a vote in the House if we had proposed direct legislation, and I can't say what the fate of the Government would have been if they had assumed it as a Government measure, but we thought, as the people of this country are sovereign, and had already accepted the referendum in the liquor law up to a certain point, that to ask them to go a little further was not at all unreasonable. I do not think it was unreasonable, with all respect to what has been said. You say the referendum is not constitutional; high authorities, and the authorities that guide Parliament, say it is constitutional. I propose to follow the high authorities on constitutional law. When it comes to good Calvinistic doctrine I go to Dr. McKay, and for Arminian theology—and there is no one whom I would sooner consult than he—I go to Dr. Carman. But in law, I follow the constitutional advisers, and many of these are not aliens to the temperance cause, for I understand that Dr. Maclaren has not said it is unconstitutional. If its constitutionality is settled, then the whole