

of those laws in every community. The test to be applied is, does the law minimize the evil and keep it down? If so it is useful and ought to be maintained. So much, then, with respect to the test of law. Recollect that it is not to entirely annihilate the evil but to minimize it, to bring it within the smallest possible compass, that we maintain such laws as advisable; and if you find such laws minimize the evil, they are a success and not a failure. I hope that the same reasonable and fair test may be given to prohibitory laws as is granted by common consent to every other law we place on the Statute Book. With respect to the effectiveness of prohibitory laws, I do not propose to enter at any length into that argument. I merely wish to state that in Great Britain prohibitory laws have existed a considerable length of time, and that the testimony to their good and advantage is unvarying and unimpeachable. There are to-day in the ecclesiastical Province of Canterbury 1,500 parishes, in which there is no dram shop, bar room or tavern where intoxicating liquors are sold, and a population of more than 250,000 is living in those parishes. The Committee of the House of Convocation made a very careful investigation into those parishes, and reported that the results were such as temperance people were led to expect. There are in the British Isles more than 100 estates, covering large areas of country, in which, by the will of the landlords themselves, no intoxicating liquor is sold, and the testimony is unvarying as to the good effect which comes from that restriction and prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors. Sir, the principle of prohibition has been admitted by the British Parliament on several occasions. In 1854 the principle of prohibition was applied to the Kingdom of Scotland for one-seventh of the time, and kept in force since then. In 1878 it was applied to the Kingdom of Ireland; and I notice a very significant fact which has occurred within the last few weeks, that whereas, when that law for Sunday closing in Ireland was introduced and passed the first time, it was as a private measure and excluded five of the principal cities and towns in Ireland. Within the last four weeks the British Government have introduced that measure as their own, and extended its provisions to the five formally exempted cities and towns. I ask no better proof than that practical test which has been given in Ireland, and the practical results which have followed, that the British Government, after carefully investigating the matter, are so informed and so sure as to the good effects of it, that they have, of their own motion, made the law their own and extended its provisions to the five exempted towns. I will not call the attention of the House to the prohibitory laws which have been passed and are in force in the United States, and with great success. I will not call the attention of the House at any length to the prohibitory laws passed in this Dominion, which have also had their success. I wish merely to refer to one law, and to quote an authority not unknown to this House with respect to its beneficial effect. In 1875 the Parliament of this country passed a prohibitory law, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and possession of intoxicating liquors in the North-West Territory. That has been kept on the Statute Book ever since, and only this year a very eminent authority, one whom this House will be glad to recognize, Sir Charles Tupper, made the following statement from his place in Parliament:

"It will hardly be necessary for me to allude to the fact that, under an Act which I had the honour of submitting to Parliament when Minister of Customs, in 1873, the Inland Revenue has not much to do, I am happy to say, in the North-West Territories, because, under that Act, we established what is called a Maine Liquor Law throughout the North-West Territories, which prevents the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors in any part of those Territories. The result of that enactment has abundantly justified it. It was with no small degree of satisfaction that I found, when it was proposed to take a section of the North-West Territory within the bounds of old Manitoba, that the people arose *en masse* against it, and protested against being carried into the Province of Manitoba on any other terms than that they could maintain the exclu-

Mr. FOSTER.

sion of intoxicating liquors, which they then enjoyed in the North-West, and retain that provision when they became part of the Province of Manitoba."

That is the testimony of the Minister of Railways and Canals; a conclusion at which he arrived, after an intimate knowledge of the operation of the Act in the North-West Territory, for seven or eight years. I offer no further remarks, to-night, Mr. Speaker. I leave the Resolutions, and the principle which is contained therein, to the arbitrament of this House, feeling satisfied that if it will pass these Resolutions in the shape in which they are, it will not only have given an expression of opinion, which will have its effect on a traffic always aggressive and always destructive, but it will also hold out a silver token of hope and inspiration to thousands and hundreds of thousands of people who are earnestly and honestly working in this country to suppress a traffic which has brought about a multitude of evils, with no compensating advantages.

Mr. KIRK. I did not intend to say a word on this question, nor do I intend to say much now. We always listen with admiration to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster). On this occasion I have listened to him with a good deal of pain and with a good deal of surprise. I could not understand why he wasted so much eloquence in arguing the question of prohibition when he eliminated, or allowed to be eliminated from his prohibitory Resolutions, anything which was prohibitory in them. I regret that when the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was before the House, and was carried by the unanimous vote of the House, I did not object to it. I was looking to the hon. member for King's to rise and divide the House on it. I regret he did not do so. When he accepted that amendment, he spoiled his Resolutions—there is nothing now left. The Resolutions as now drawn are simply the Resolutions passed by this House in 1875. Has not prohibition sentiment advanced in this country? I think it has. In 1873 this fact was proved, for the Scott Act, which is a prohibitory measure, was passed. It was thought by the temperance people, and I thought so, that it was the intention of the temperance men in this House to press in Parliament this Session the square issue of prohibition; but from these Resolutions prohibition is altogether eliminated. The Resolutions before Parliament to-day are simply milk and water Resolutions, with very little milk in them. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the people call him enthusiastic. Well, I am not surprised at that, when they hear him talk; but when the point comes when action is required, he seems to have very little backbone. I regret this very much, from the fact that I, as a temperance man, looked upon him as my leader. I am sorry I did not as a temperance man, and as a prohibitionist, object and demand the views of this House when the amendment was introduced. So far as the Resolution is now concerned, I, for one, care very little about it. We are no further advanced in regard to it than we were in 1875, and I think the temperance people of the country will feel in the same way with regard to it that I do. Now, I have nothing more to say with regard to this question, except to repeat that I regret very much that our leader on the temperance question in this House has thought proper to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Cardwell.

Mr. FOSTER. Allow me to make an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have a right to make a personal explanation, when such a grave charge has been made against me. If I have not, I will move the adjournment of the House. The hon. gentleman gets up in his place, after the time for action on his part has entirely passed, and he speaks professedly—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Is that an explanation?