

brought before the magistrates and charged with infractions of the Scott Act. What was the result of that? It was absolute failure so far as the prevention of drinking was concerned, but the result was of a very serious character in bringing about an amount of perjury, false swearing and false evidence fearful to contemplate. Finally, when the three years had elapsed, the Scott Act was repealed in that county by almost as large a majority as that which originally passed it. But it is said that this Act was not enforced because the officials of the Ontario Government did not try to enforce it. Well, I have, perhaps, as poor an opinion of the officials of the Ontario Government as anyone in this House. I have had some experience of them, and I think they are as inefficient for any purpose except political campaigning as any body of people in the Dominion of Canada. But it was said that they did not enforce this Act because it was a Dominion law, and the Dominion Government ought to enforce it. I think all criminal Acts are Dominion Acts, but it is the duty of the province to enforce them. Why should they make an exception in this case when there are a hundred other Acts which they do enforce? The reason why they did not enforce it was this, which will always stand in the way of any legislation of this kind: that public opinion did not support them in doing so. We can enforce a law against stealing because we are all united in the belief that it is contrary to the well-being of the community that one man should be allowed to rob another. We can enforce a law against crimes of violence because we all have respect for our own skins, and do not want men to go at large who will commit such offences. Public opinion does support the enforcement of laws of this kind, but in regard to the Scott Act they were powerless because public opinion was not with them, and because people who were brought forward, from whom better things might have been expected, did not hesitate in many cases—of course it is hard to say that a man actually swore a false oath, but the inference is very strong that they did give false evidence; and the result was that liquor was sold as freely and openly during the latter part of the existence of the Scott Act as in any previous period of the history of the county. It is said that you could not enforce the Scott Act in a county because it is surrounded by other counties in which liquor is sold. If that applies to a county, it would apply to a province, and it would apply equally to the Dominion. Have we not a country with a frontier of 3,000 miles? What power can prevent the smuggling of liquor along that frontier? Are the Government now able to prevent smuggling in the North-West Territories? Is that army of the North-West Mounted Police able to enforce the law there? We know that it has been to a large extent a failure. If there were only two millions of people in this country who wanted liquor, how could the Government prevent its being smuggled when it might be brought in at any place on the frontier from Victoria to Halifax? Then, illicit distillation had become common under the Scott Act. In many parts of the backwoods, in swamps which were inaccessible, stills had been erected and illicit distillation had become very common. Illicit distillation is very common to-day. The price at which ordinary whiskey is sold to-day is sufficient to induce many persons to enter into

illicit distillation. If that is practised under the present system, how much illicit distillation would there be, in the present state of public opinion, if the manufacture and sale of liquor was entirely prohibited throughout the Dominion? Then we come to another question, and a very practical question. I said that I did not question the sincerity of the promoters of this legislation or its advocates in this House, but I do not think they have given sufficient weight to the heavy responsibility which would rest upon them if this measure were carried. With regard to the question of revenue, I will freely admit that, if you can prove your case, if you can prove that the prevention of the sale of intoxicating liquor will bring about all the advantages you say would accrue from it, then the Government would be bound to lose the revenue they derive from it and find that revenue from some other source. All I say is that the advocates of this measure must face the responsibility of calling upon the Government of this country—whoever they may be—to impose the necessary taxation, and to justify the course they have taken in causing the additional taxation. I say I admit that, if you are right in your contention, there ought to be no difference whatever on the ground of a loss of revenue, but that those who advocate this measure must be prepared to face that responsibility, and to ask themselves this question: If this resolution were carried to-day, the Government must carry it out as a resolution of this House. They must do that, or, if they resigned, and other gentlemen took their places, they would be equally bound by the mandate of this House. Are those who advocate this proposal prepared to assume that responsibility? I do not mean to say that they ought not to assume it, but I ask them: Are they prepared to assume it? My hon. friend upon my left says, in a very vague and airy way: Oh, we have no doubt that the prosperity of the country will be so great under prohibition that enough revenue will flow in from some other source. Well, that is just about on a par with the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite when they are met with the prospect of a loss of a similar amount of revenue by unrestricted reciprocity, and they tell us: Oh, we would be so prosperous that our revenue would come from some other source. I should like to hear from those who advocate this motion, some definite idea of how we are going to meet that difficulty, which we should have to meet if we passed the resolution now in your hands. Now that is a very serious consideration, and it is one to which the members of this House are bound to pay respect. They are also bound to meet all the practical difficulties which would arise in the event of such legislation. It is said in this resolution that the Dominion is to enforce it. Well, how is the Dominion to enforce it? Is the Dominion to establish police all through the country in order to enforce it?

Mr. JAMIESON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; that is not in the present resolution. It simply affirms the principle of immediate prohibition.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, if it is not in the present resolution, all I have got to say is that it ought to be in the present resolution, because it has been the contention with reference to the Scott Act, when the officials would not enforce it, that it was Dom-