

as far as that evidence can influence their minds, the strongest possible impression of the desirability of enacting a prohibitory liquor law. And, after the vote has been taken, then it will become the duty of Parliament as well as the duty of the Government—for I do not consider it to be solely a question thrown upon the shoulders of the Government, but a question to be faced by Parliament as a whole—to consider the relation in which they stand to this question, and to assume their duty as parliamentarians and as gentlemen desirous of properly representing public opinion, and so conduct themselves as to speak and vote in a manner to strengthen the hands of any Administration which may attempt to carry it through.

Mr. KAULBACH. The question of prohibition pure and simple, in my opinion, is very important, and should be discussed purely on its merits without party bias or restrictions, that the electorate throughout this Dominion may have the opportunity of reading and discussing all comments pro and con, so as to be better prepared to vote intelligently on the question when submitted to them at the polls. By some the plebiscite is spoken of as an excellent device to divert the energy of the temperance people from the Ministry for a time by way of postponement, till a something else can be thought of to further postpone—whether there is anything in it or not I cannot divine—but it is to be hoped the Government are sincere and would not tolerate a thought of that kind.

Both political parties are pretty well a unit on this great question now exercising the minds of the temperance body. I, as one, claim to belong to the temperance party, and am in sympathy with their effort thus put forth, and proud to be able to say I am sincere, having ever shown my allegiance to the cause by my living example, as well as by my devotion to its claims, and never expect to make a deviation therefrom by word or act, as I have seen and heard too much of the improper use of alcoholic drinks that intoxicate, and the effects on the part of those enslaved by the resistless and craving appetite for the abominable use of it. By the excessive use of strong drinks I know of domestic homes having been rendered desolate for the want of bread, and the other necessities of life for home comfort, wives forsaken and almost driven to destruction, children neglected, families homeless, Christian and religious training and observances disregarded, homes devastated, life and property destroyed, law placed at defiance, and an untimely end, and a premature grave reached, and all through worthless and dissipated husbands lacking the strength to refrain from the use of strong drinks. I may say that there are cases of husbands by their example bringing wives and children to follow in the use of the

abominable evil, whereby misery and the worst of trials have been encountered, and as a consequence crimes of the most heinous kind perpetrated, hence I would never think of doing anything by word or act but what would serve to promote and encourage this project of prohibition to a successful end, and remove the poison, if possible, except for medicinal purposes, entirely from reach.

The right hon. the leader of the Government admitted that he believed prohibition would be defeated in Quebec, which if the case is as he believes, then I say he should have been the last to think of giving Quebec a franchise with advantages over the other provinces of the Dominion, by means of which they, as voters, will have as many votes as they possess property qualifications, or, in other words, the prohibitionist voter in Nova Scotia will find his one vote for prohibition more than counterbalanced or offset by the three or four votes of some anti-prohibitionist in Quebec. I ask if this is right or just? I am not a pessimist, but I have a proof here that the Franchise Bill giving one province advantage over another, is radically unjust, and if it will work injuriously to the temperance party in this plebiscite vote, it must work unjustly in every other vote, Quebec having the advantage over the other provinces every time—cannot hon. gentlemen opposite see for themselves the injustice they are doing the other provinces and redress the wrong. Why not run on the principle one man one vote? Was the Franchise Bill placed by the Government in advance of the Plebiscite Bill with a view of defeating this measure? It certainly appears to me somewhat like it. I say, give the plebiscite a fair chance, and let us deal with the subject like men.

I cannot agree with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is the promoter of this Bill, and poses as the champion of the temperance cause, when he says that the subject of prohibition "is relegated to the people and to the hustings, where the question is to be threshed out," meaning that we are not supposed to discuss it here, but in the country and at the polls. I say we should express our views here in this Chamber, by a free and unbiassed discussion showing the sentiments of either side, the pros and cons.

We are told complications may arise of a constitutional character preventing prohibition being carried out, or such difficulties may offer as to bar the possibility of an Act of this kind becoming workable. If such condition of affairs is liable to occur, or if there is even a doubt, why not consult the Minister of Justice, or some other expounder of the law on constitutional questions. We have numbers of lawyers in this House and some very good ones, surely they should possess sufficient acumen to give a definite answer and thereby remove all doubt or uncertainty as to our course of action. Until such is done, what is the use, and where is the sense in our asking a vote