

Mr. LONGLEY. The hon. gentleman, I know, has no desire to misrepresent me. I did not say I had witnessed disgraceful scenes.

Mr. McCALLUM. I did not say you did. I wish to read a short extract from the Ottawa correspondence of the *Toronto Globe* of last Session:—

“Mr. Longley, of Annapolis, will on Monday move that the Speaker be requested to issue an order prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors within the precincts of the House of Commons. This is a step which will probably meet with public approval. The bar in the House of Commons is in every respect a public bar, and not confined to the use of members. Drunken strangers frequently, and even intoxicated members occasionally, are to be met in the corridors or stairs leading from the basement to the main floor. If it were not for the fatal facility with which members obtain intoxicating liquor within a few steps of their Chamber, the brawls and scenes which have disgraced not only this but previous Parliaments would never have been witnessed.”

I repeat that I have been here for thirteen years, and I have never seen any brawls here as the result of indulgence in intoxicating liquors. We have heard strong language hurled across the floor of the House, but it was not owing to liquor drinking; and I, as a member of this House and one who does not drink himself, would no more think of preventing members from taking a glass in the evening than I would of depriving them of their cup of tea.

Mr. WRIGHT. While I agree with much that has fallen from the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley) with respect to the desirability of closing the bar, I certainly agree with him as to the desirability of excluding strangers, yet I think that many unfair and unjust insinuations have been sent broadcast over the country with regard to the conduct of members of this House. I agree with the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) that you cannot find anywhere 206 or 207 more temperate gentlemen than those composing the membership of this House, and I think it is especially cruel and unjust that these insinuations should be sent abroad with regard to those of our number who have been ill. Does anyone suppose that the hon. member for Lambton has been injured by the existence of a bar down stairs, or that the Minister of Railways suffered at all from the same fact. Both of these gentlemen are, I believe, practically teetotalers. I believe the Minister of Finance is one who has also been ill. Will anyone say that his illness was at all to be attributed to the bar down stairs? I think the insinuations to which I have referred are grossly cruel to the memory of those two hon. gentlemen who have passed away from us, who are mourned by us all, and who were notoriously among the most temperate men in the House. Those members who have been ill, instead of being of the number who indulged in the social glass, have been among the most temperate members of the House. I think this matter is one which you, Mr. Speaker, should regulate; I think that the restaurant should be managed somewhat in the fashion of a club with a committee of members to arrange matters in connection with it. I am in favor of excluding strangers, but I object to the insinuations being thrown broadcast over the country. I think the statement of the *Toronto papers* that if matters in the Local Legislature with regard to the drinking habits of its members are in a bad state, they are worse here, is unfounded, and I think no more temperate body of gentlemen can be found anywhere than the members of this House.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am sorry to hear the imputation cast against members of this House that they are in the habit of indulging too frequently in strong drink. I have vanity enough to think that I am not one of the class referred to, and I do not think the hon. member for Annapolis will consider me inimical to the Order he represents so worthily when I protest against the insinuation that there is any necessity for such a motion as has been made on the present occasion. I certainly agree with the hon. member in his remark that it is unfortunate there is a

place in this House where intoxicating liquors are sold to strangers, where persons can enter and obtain liquor, as though they were in the town, where establishments are under license regulations, the supervision of inspectors, and under the laws. I think it is desirable we should put a stop to it. I do not believe any of the illness which has arisen among members of the House has been occasioned by the fact that they belonged to the class addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors; and I agree with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright), that it is an unfortunate aspersion on some of those whom we have lost, that reflections should be cast on their characters, as it were indirectly—for I do not think any one would directly say a word against them—owing to the fact that they were addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors. I beg to move in amendment:

“That the Speaker be requested to issue an order closing the bar within the precincts of this House for the sale of intoxicating liquors.”

Mr. LONGLEY. Perhaps we should be thankful for small favors, but the amendment, I must frankly say, does not by any means satisfy me. I think I can give very good reasons why it does not satisfy me. It is but a piece of the policy which characterizes all attempts made to patch up that which cannot be patched up; in other words, it is an attempt to regulate an irregularity. That is not an original expression, but it is the expression of one who sifted this question most thoroughly; and it is an expression of sentiment that must receive a thorough endorsement on the part of every reflecting man. There is excess in the thing itself. The habit grows and it grows even where people least anticipate its growth. The amendment seems to sound well, to be quite a concession, and some hon. gentlemen opposite no doubt feel they are entitled to a large meed of praise for the concessions which they have proposed. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) who has moved the amendment, reserves to himself the privilege under it of asking half-a-dozen of his friends who may visit Ottawa down stairs, to treat them at any time he pleases; and that I think, is one of the reasons why a number of hon. members are reluctant to consent to forego that privilege. I shall be obliged if the hon. mover of the amendment or any other hon. member will tell me what difference there is in the way of example, of morality, or of wrong doing, between a resident of Ottawa going down voluntarily to the bar and getting what he wants, and his being taken down by others, by no means better than himself, and treated by them. So that under the amendment that which we condemn might be carried on almost as successfully and nearly to the same extent as it has been going on during the last three months. I hope we shall not for a good while to come, after this question has been ventilated a little, see such exhibitions as were witnessed this winter below stairs; and I do not wish to reflect on hon. members when I say that. But I say this, that the members of this House are not, every one of them, above suspicion in that respect. And I can say more, if I am pushed to an extremity, as some hon. gentlemen may find out. I know exactly the ground on which I stand on this matter. We do not like to say, we ought not to say, what we think. We ought not and dare not, in fact, impart all we know, and especially in regard to those who have passed away.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame, shame, shame!

Mr. LONGLEY. The half is not told and the half is not known in regard to this iniquity anywhere. But I do not wish to continue this line of observation. I am not, however, satisfied with the amendment; I desire to test the opinion of the House on it, and if hon. members think it will do them credit individually, or do the House credit as a body, to refuse to abate in a proper way this nuisance, let them do so. For my own part I prefer to be consistent, and keep