

my position good. By adopting the motion we will do credit to ourselves, contribute to our safety and to our self respect. But that is a matter of private opinion on the part of hon. members, and I am quite willing to submit my motion to the decision of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have been long enough in Parliament to have seen motions of this kind frequently made and carried. I have seen them made in Quebec, Toronto, Ottawa, and always for the same cause, and that an influx of strangers being allowed to go to the House of Commons restaurant. I believe it is the cause of very great irregularity, there is no check upon it, and members are in a great measure to blame for it. It is very natural for a member receiving here a number of his constituents as guests to ask them to take a glass of wine, and the restaurant is the most convenient place for doing so. That has been the chief cause of all these irregularities. The resolution that was passed seven years ago is a standing instruction to the Speaker, but the reason why, in effect, that resolution is absolutely valueless, arises from two causes. In the first place this House has no control over the Senate restaurant, and the consequence of preventing the sale of wine in the Commons restaurant was that everybody went to the Senate, and made the fortune of the man in one end of the building, instead of the other. That trebled the custom of the man in the Senate restaurant, and rendered the Commons restaurant valueless. The person who had the Commons restaurant said it did not pay him, and no man could be got to keep it selling food alone. For that reason shutting up the bar was no check whatever. Then again, it was known that you cannot prevent a member from doing what he likes. He can bring his own bottle of wine or his own flask if he likes. If the man who keeps the Commons restaurant happens to be a wine merchant outside members can purchase from him. The resolution was found to be of no value and could not be enforced. That is the reason why it has faded away. If you want to prevent all irregularities, if my hon. friend would add to the resolution that not only the bar should be closed but that all strangers should be rigidly excluded, I think the hon. gentleman will get something that can be carried out. The original resolution of the hon. gentleman will have the same effect as the old resolution. It is found to be of no value, no check, no use whatever. The resolution of the hon. gentleman will fail in making any improvement at all, but by shutting up the bar and keeping out strangers he will make real and substantial improvement in the removal of the irregularities complained of.

Mr. MACDOUGALL. I am sorry that I cannot, from my own experience and observation, entirely concur with the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman. I do not see any reason, on grounds of morality, or right why members of Parliament, whose home this is, when their constituents visit Parliament, many of them for the purpose of consulting with members upon important public matters which may be under the consideration of Parliament, should not be at liberty to take those gentlemen to the rooms down stairs—for those are really the only rooms available—for the purpose of consulting with them. I do not see why we should tie our hands, why we should vote ourselves incapable of conducting ourselves like gentlemen, and prevent ourselves from conferring with our friends in the country when they come here, merely because some gentlemen in this House desire to make themselves popular outside by advocating a particular crotchet of theirs on every occasion. I am not an advocate of temperance in the way that particular gentleman advocates it, but I began my public life as a strong advocate of temperance and prohibition, and I believe I drafted the first prohibitory Act introduced into the Legislative Assembly, and I drew it up with great care. But I have lived to learn that that

Mr. LONGLEY.

mode of effecting temperance in a free and civilized community like ours is not the proper mode. I am firmly of that conviction. I am willing the experiment should be tried under the Scott Act. I believe we cannot satisfy public opinion until that experiment has been fairly tried; therefore, I am disposed to give every encouragement to the experiment in order that people may be satisfied that they cannot force upon the public, in a free country, particular notions about eating and drinking. I believe it is not in accordance with the genius of our institutions, and our civilization that any portion of the community shall force upon us their habits and ideas in regard to the way in which we shall live or what we shall eat or drink. I protest, as a member of this House, against the insinuation, or the implication that results from this motion, that we are a body of drunkards—for practically that is what it comes to. During all my experience as a member of Parliament, I do not remember a House more notably sober. I avow upon my honor that since I have been in this House I have not seen a member of Parliament intoxicated—not this Session at all events—and I am in the habit of going down stairs pretty often. As I live some distance away I take my meals below, and I have seen nothing of that kind. I admit that I have seen persons who appeared to be strangers, and others, servants of the House, exhibit signs of intoxication. Therefore I agree thoroughly with the suggestion that the bar, if we can properly call it a bar, or the place where liquors are served to members, should be closed to strangers. Members should have the right of procuring refreshments with their meals, whether wine or beer. I take a glass of beer occasionally, and I find it beneficial to me. I consider myself a sober man; I do not believe I was ever intoxicated in my life. Therefore, I claim the right to take my meals below and to have a glass of beer or wine with a friend. I can do it elsewhere, why should I be debarred from doing it here to please the hon. gentleman. I say this very motion, this discussion, is an advertisement to the country that something is wrong in this House which I do not see to be wrong, except in the matter to which I have referred. Therefore, I shall vote with great pleasure for the amendment of my hon. friend, which shuts up the bar; but I claim that the members of the House should have the privilege to order a glass of beer or a bottle of wine if they desire it. While that is the law of the country, while we have not actual prohibition prevailing everywhere, I do not see why we should advertise to the country that we are not capable of conducting ourselves properly in this respect.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). When this matter was brought before the House in 1874, the resolution moved by Mr. Chisholm was as follows:—

"That Mr. Speaker be requested to issue an order prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors within the precincts of this House."

That resolution was carried, after little discussion, by the House, and, as the right hon. gentleman has said, has been a standing instruction to the Speaker. It appears, however, from what has been said, that that order has been disregarded by some means or other, and disregarded, as the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley) has said, in a manner that has not added to the dignity of the House. I cannot speak myself from observation during this Session; but I know that in 1874, when that order was passed, it was felt to be due by this House to the sentiment that prevailed in the country, that we should, as a House, avoid everything that had the appearance of intemperance. I do not know whether that order was then more necessary than it is now. It was then the unanimous opinion of the House—there was no division upon it—that it would add to the dignity of the House and to its influence in the country that we should protect in this way, as far as we were able to control the matter ourselves,