

was prohibited. If we were able to put down intemperance by that means I should likely approve of this Act, though I am like my hon. friend from Belleville in thinking that a ten-gallon temperance act would not commend itself to me. Now, who are the persons who are authorized to sell liquor under this Act which nobody is to find fault with or to amend? The druggists, and we know from the returns from Halton what quantities they can sell. If you were on your bed sick, and a messenger were sent to have a prescription made up which was wanted immediately, he might find the druggist engaged in supplying liquor to applicants, and have to wait until they were served. Bear in mind that the man who fills your prescription is the man who sells the liquor, and who, it is quite possible, may be inclined to indulge in the article he sells. In some of those prescriptions the slightest error might be attended with fatal results. Take for instance morphia, strychnia and other drugs; yet the druggist is the man who is deputed under this Act to sell liquor. I had not the making of that law, but if the hon. member who framed it and my hon. friend from Sarnia, who knows how decidedly I am in favor of temperance, had consulted me I should have advised them not to place this traffic in the hands of the druggist. If my hon. friend was not so strongly in favor of the Temperance Act I think he would see that in this respect, at all events, it should be amended; but of course this bantling of his has no faults; it has always a clean face and never a dirty nose. My hon. friends from British Columbia are united in opposing the introduction of the Chinese into this country. They do not think, as I do, that people of every race should be free to enter and leave the country as they please. One of their objections to the Chinese is that their presence here tends to increase the consumption of opium. Will my hon. friend from Sarnia tell me that the effect of the Act will not be to increase the consumption of opium? Will he tell me that the use of opium, chloral-hydrate and laudanum is not becoming more extensive, and that they will not be consumed in a much greater degree, if a Temperance Act should come in force all over the

Dominion? I have always given my hon. friend from Sarnia credit for a good deal of sense—combining with a good deal of the wisdom of the serpent, a small dash of the harmlessness of the dove. He will acknowledge, I think, that what I have said is correct—that the druggist should not sell liquor, and that prohibition would increase the use of opium. I am opposed to intemperance, and what is the reason that it so prevails in the land? The reason is, that the temperance people have diverted public attention from the right way to put down intemperance and have led them to suppose that it can be prevented by this chimera of a Temperance Act. What ought to be done is, to pass a good License Act, and not only to arrest the man who is found drunk, but to punish the man who made him drunk. Take the police reports and you will find every day that persons who have been found drunk are fined or imprisoned, but no fine is imposed on the men who furnish them with the liquor. Suppose you were to give those persons who sold the liquor, three months' imprisonment, do you not think that they would be deterred from selling liquor to drunkards again? Could not the names of habitual drunkards be handed in to the authorities and furnished to licensed liquor sellers, so that there need be no mistake as to the character of the persons applying for liquor? Would not that put down intemperance? I would not confine it to the selling of liquor. If a person is taken up for drunkenness, and it is found that he was dining at the first house in Ottawa, the person who turned him out of his house in that condition should be punished. I do not favor lowering the franchise, but I am in favor of giving the poor man equal rights with the rich, and I say that the rich man in whose house any one is made drunk should be punished just as severely as the saloon keeper, who in earning his livelihood makes people drunk, or punished with even greater severity. The hon. member from Sarnia, though in favor of temperance, never advocates a measure of that kind. I may be dogmatic, but I am convinced that such legislation would do more to put down intemperance than any sumptuary law or prohibitory legislation that has ever been suggested.