

five went down to premature graves through strong drink. The question, as I say, is asked, why we should object to this, why we are not willing that every man should have his liberty without restriction? I think the facts answer the question.

A great deal has been said about soldiers being allowed to have liquor. There are two sides to that question. When large numbers of men are together whether soldiers or others, there is often a temptation to drink. And I want to say right here that a debt of gratitude is owing to the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) by the people of this country for what he has done to prevent drinking among our soldiers. I find on looking over history that the same difficulty has confronted other countries. During the American Civil War, one of the greatest obstacles to the success of the Union troops was excessive drinking. It was found necessary to pass a law during that war to prohibit men from giving liquor to soldiers. Abraham Lincoln was strongly in favour of that reform and signed an Act of Congress on the 5th of August, 1865, providing that the person should be liable to a heavy fine who sold liquor to soldiers.

Something has been said in this debate about the success or failure of prohibition in the United States. Prohibition has accomplished something in that country. A careful estimate shows that after the municipal elections of April, 1915, there were 2,173,819 square miles of territory in the United States in which the saloon is forbidden. There are 32 states in which the combined number of saloons is less than in the city of Chicago. A population of over 46,000,000 of people in the United States, out of a total population according to the last census of 92,000,000, are now living under no license. Of the 2,856 counties in the United States, over 1,700 have abolished the saloon. There are over 500 cities of a population of 5,000 or more, and also 200 cities of a population of 10,000 or more, in which saloons have been abolished. In nine states, with an aggregate population of about 15,000,000, there is state wide prohibition.

I want to say a little, and a very little, on the economic side of this question. The statement has been made by men who have had experience that the drink traffic is the enemy of the factory and of the efficiency of labour. At the closing session of the National Congress of Industrial Safety, in Chicago, on the 15th of October, 1914, resolutions were passed pledging the

members to the elimination of alcoholic stimulants in their plants and factories. The National Congress of Industrial Safety represents 500 of the leading manufacturers of the United States, who employ over 1,000,000 workers in their factories. Mr. R. L. Palmer, chief inspector of the Pennsylvania Department of Labour and Industry, stated that 60 per cent of the industrial accidents were due to liquor. He said further:

It will not be long before the saloon will be as much separated from the industrial plant as it is now from the church. As a matter of business, we will have to pay in cash, to prevent men from going to the saloons to convert their checks into currency.

A proposition was made by Mr. E. K. Pritchett, representing one of the largest manufacturing concerns in America, that, after employees had been forbidden to use alcoholic beverages, milk wagons should call at the factory, at a certain hour every morning. He goes on to say:

We then permitted the men to stop work, and go out and buy fresh bottles of milk. We find this arrangement has practically solved the drinking problem.

Our attention has been called to-night to the action of leading manufacturers of this city who have endorsed the resolution now before us. Mr. Booth, one of the largest, if not the largest employer of labour in Canada, has had perhaps a longer experience than any other manufacturer, and he is most insistent that the one way to remedy the evils under which his employees suffer is to enact prohibitory legislation.

There is one other thing I should like to mention, and I am sure the other members of the House will be very gratified to learn of it. I asked the Sergeant-at-Arms to-day whether liquor was dispensed in this building, and he said that neither he nor any other man that he knew of could get anything stronger here than Tally-ho water. I am sure honorable gentlemen will be glad to know that. I will go a step further and urge upon the Government that no provision should be made in the new Parliament building for the dispensing of liquors of any kind. I see ladies in the gallery, and I hope that all the influence of the sex will be brought to bear so that never in future will liquors be dispensed in the Parliament of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. THORNTON: There is one other point I should like to mention. Perhaps it may be thought too serious a matter to be intro-