

selling them beer, brandy and wine. That is where the bulk of the property comes from, both in city and country. You cannot dissociate it from the liquor traffic. I doubt if there is a single member of this House who would take the ground that intoxicating liquors should be sold without any restraint whatever, and if it be true that some restraint upon the traffic is required, we would have simply to inquire what sort of restraint we shall seek to impose upon the traffic, whether we shall license it—and that is an odd way to put down anything—and give it the sanction of the law, or whether we shall adopt the principle of prohibiting the traffic altogether. The present law simply gives the right to a majority of the voters in any county or riding to say whether liquor shall be vended in that particular riding or county, or whether it shall not. We adopt that principle in almost all the relations of life. We allow the majority to rule, and in fact, in a great many instances, we could not help ourselves if we desired to do so ever so much. The Scott Act is nothing unless it receives the endorsement of the people. I contend that the right to restrain the liquor traffic or any immorality involves the right to prohibit. I think that is a sound principle. Now, if in the interests of society restraint is sought to be put on any source of immorality, then there remains simply the question of how far you shall go; and it also becomes a question of whether you shall seek to confine it within certain limits or utterly prohibit it. Prohibition is the more sensible method of dealing with an acknowledged evil, but it is not always competent for the people to accomplish it. Let us inquire if that principle is not adopted in the way of promoting the education of the people. We know that where the assessment principle is applied for the promotion of the purposes of education, that principle is applied against the earnest protest of at least a portion of the voters; but the State, considering that it is responsible for the education of the people, assures that it is better to make a certain proportion of the people, who would otherwise be relieved from any taxation in connection with education, pay than to relieve them, because in that way the education of the people would be first promoted, and what a portion of the people would be unable to accomplish the united force of the whole is able to accomplish in the most satisfactory way. So the State in various stations and relations, and in reference to almost every state of society, imposes more or less restraint, in fact, every member of society is by law put under a certain restraint, and our liberties, as a rule, are curtailed just in proportion as civilization advances. That is capable of demonstration, though I shall not now stop to demonstrate it. Now, I presume that in regard to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec there is very much less interest felt in the keeping of the Scott Act intact than there is in the Lower Provinces, simply because in Quebec the license system is, I apprehend, preferred, and in Ontario—that is in regard to many of the constituencies, if I am to judge by the opinion of their representatives—there is no very great interest felt in regard to the Scott Act. There may be this said that when the sentiment of the constituencies is opposed to the Scott Act, it is a nullity, it does not go into force; and all we ask is the privilege of adopting the Scott Act when the majority of the people, voting in the ordinary way, say it shall be adopted. Let us deal with this question somewhat hypothetically, and see what will be the result of the principle of the Bill of the hon. member for East York. I will assume, for the purpose of illustrating my argument, that there are 50,000 voters in the Province of Nova Scotia, and I will assume that 41,000 out of the 50,000 come to the polls and vote. Now, the half of the 50,000 is 25,000, and if you add 16,001 votes to the half of the number of votes in Nova Scotia you will find that the 16,001 control the 50,000 votes. I will assume that in the Dominion of Canada there are 400,000 voters, and I will assume that 300,000 of that number

go to the polls and vote. The half of 400,000 is 200,000, so that all you require to make up the 300,000 who go to the polls and vote is just 101,000 votes. Now, I ask every fair-minded man in this House, if that is a proper principle to apply to this Act, or any other Act, where it is so utterly at variance with every principle known to British legislation. I ask the introducer of this Bill to say when that principle has ever been applied to British legislation. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) has shown what would have been the effect if this principle had been applied to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) at his last election; he would have been elected to stay at home by a majority of 61 votes. I do not see the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) in his place, or I might have said something for his especial benefit. He received just 36 per cent. of the whole number of votes in his riding, and yet he rightfully comes here to discharge his duties as a representative. It is a singular circumstance, but the men who are here by the narrowest majorities in some cases polled the largest percentage of votes, simply because the contest was sharper and pretty much all the voters came out. I will just mention a fact which will go to illustrate the vicious principle which it is sought to introduce into our legislation and apply to the Scott Act. My worthy friend, the late Mr. Oliver, of North Oxford, was here by the overwhelming majority of 903 votes, I think, and yet any hon. gentleman who will take the pains to analyze the vote cast in his riding will find that he lacked just that number of having one-half the votes in his constituency. My hon. friend from Northumberland, who is here by a majority of 691 votes, only polled, I think, 1,760 out of the nearly 6,000 votes in his county. He sits here, not by a majority of the votes of his riding, but by a majority less than one-half the total number of votes by some 400 or 500 votes. Our energetic, popular, and determined friend from Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) lacked, I think, twenty or 120 votes of having fifty per cent. of the electors of his county in the last election. With two exceptions, you may go through the House and there is not a single member here by a majority vote. I do not see my popular and worthy friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) here, but I observed that though he had a majority of 813 votes, he sits here by a vote of only 40 per cent. of the electorate. Now, I think I have said enough to show conclusively the vicious principle of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from East York. I might present many similar cases. I have a word or two to say with regard to the city of Bangor, where it is said drinking prevails to such an alarming extent. General Dyer, Inspector-General of Militia, said:

"That in his county (Kennebec), with a population of about 39,000, containing three cities and twenty-four towns, the law was enforced; that it was the best law they ever had, and that it materially improved both the moral and social condition of the people, as it reduced crime and poverty. It was a great point to remove the temptation, and he felt confident the vote of the State, if taken, would be against its repeal. He said that yesterday some liquor was secretly brought on to the camp ground, but it was suspected, searched for, seized and destroyed at once."

Althens Lyons (Police Court Recorder) said:

"He had kept the records of the Court during the last eighteen years. In the cities, crime had no doubt increased with the population; but in the country districts it has decreased. He remembered as far back as 1826, when no business could be done without liquor. In Waterville, where he was residing, was conversant with the fact that one merchant in three months sold 300 barrels of rum, and now he doubted if in the same place you could get a glassful."

A great deal is said about sumptuary laws, but we are only asking that intoxicating liquor shall not be sold, in order that the temptation may be taken away from all classes, but especially from that unfortunate class. Talk about the rights of individuals engaged in the liquor traffic. Nothing is said about the rights of the poor victims of the traffic. Nothing is said about the rights of the children who have to go hungry and almost naked in consequence of