

so that, with all our restrictions, we realize that we have not yet got it trampled under foot, but that we must place further restrictions upon it; and the very next restriction which we must place upon it is total prohibition. The history of this movement in the direction of prohibition is one that must be interesting to every person who favours temperance reform. I think we may say that the temperance movement dates from some fifty years ago, although we have evidence of its existence at a time very much anterior to that. But the history of the temperance movement proper can be comprised within the past fifty years. We find that period has been one of development. The evil was at first grappled with in a small way by means of the license system. Then followed a reduction in the number of licenses granted. Then we had temperance organizations. Then a high price was fixed for licenses: and then came the local option laws. What is the result of this progress? We are not as far from prohibition to-day as we were fifty years ago. Although I am a young man, I can remember the time when the drinking habit was much more frequently indulged in than now; and I am glad to be able to say that the temperance movement is largely to be credited with the decrease in this great evil of indulgence in strong drink. We have yet to deal with the financial problem, and that is where a great difficulty lies. It is all very well to talk of local option and high licenses and temperance organizations; but so long as we do not strike at the source of the evil we will fail to remove it. If we could by local option, by temperance education, by high license, stop the fountain of the evil from flowing, we would be able to deal with it in a more practical manner, but the great difficulty is that the manufacture of liquor has been continually going on, and the only thing that seems capable of being done at present is to strike at the foundation of the evil and pass a prohibitory law. I am well aware that in addressing ourselves to that part of the question we come face to face with one of the most serious difficulties, and that is that there are very many persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks, and we cannot deal with this question without considering how it affects their interests. We cannot sweep away at once a man's business without making up our minds beforehand as to whether or not he is entitled to some compensation. If I am trespassing a little outside of the resolution, it may be that my hon. friend the mover of the resolution will bring me to time, but I must confess I am not quite orthodox in the matter of prohibition, because I am personally in favour of compensation to the manufacturers. That is my private opinion, which I state to the House as I have stated it to my temperance friends whenever I have had occasion to address them on this subject. It does not appear to me fair, that these gentlemen, who have such an immense amount of capital invested in machinery, buildings and other property for the purpose of carrying on their business, should have their business swept away and no compensation given them. Therefore, at the risk of being called to task by my hon. friend, I feel it my duty to this House and to the country to state that I am in favour of compensation to the manufacturers. I do not think I would like to go further. I know there are hon. gentlemen

Mr. COATSWORTH.

in this House who say: Why not compensate also the other liquor sellers. I think the others stand in a very different position, but without taking up the time of the House in discussing a matter, which will probably be a question of detail should we decide on prohibitory legislation, I would simply repeat that while I am in favour of compensation to the manufacturers, I do not think compensation should extend to those who only sell liquor and are not manufacturers. Another question arises, and that is as to the right of this House to prevent a man from taking a drink of strong liquor if he chooses. Now I would not like to refuse that right to any man because I believe in the principles of freedom as they have been enunciated, to a certain extent, by the hon. member for Muskoka. I do not think we have a right to say to any man: While there is liquor in this land you have no right to take a glass of liquor; but I do say that if, in the opinion of this House, the time has come when we ought to prohibit its manufacture and sale for beverage purposes, there would not, I believe, be any improper interference with the liberty of the subject if when dealing with a great evil we should subject people to certain restraint. It does not occur to me that the freedom of our people would be restricted to any extent which would be hurtful to them. I would, on the contrary, be disposed to say that the restriction would be beneficial even to those who indulge moderately in strong liquors. We must recognize, in dealing with this traffic, that there are multitudes of our men and our women who are dragged down by means of it so that they no longer enjoy any freedom; and not only that, but the curse falls upon their children. How much of the crime, how much of the suffering, how much of the misery in our land can be traced directly and indirectly to the immoderate indulgence in strong drink. If all men and all women could restrain their appetites so that there would be no intoxication, and no social and moral misery produced by this evil, we would not be standing here to-day speaking in support of this resolution; but it is because men and women have been made slaves, it is because children have been made worse than slaves, that we are here to-day asking that those who feel that a certain amount of restriction is placed on their liberty by this proposed law should submit to the curtailment of that liberty for the benefit of the multitude who are so deeply affected by the traffic. Another difficulty we have to face, and one likely to cause a great deal of serious discussion before a prohibitory law can be passed, is the question of revenue: and yet I do not see, after all, if we are satisfied upon other points, if we are convinced that this law ought to pass, if we are convinced of the evil we are seeking to banish, if we are satisfied that it is in the interests of the people, a prohibitory law should be placed in our Statute-book that the question of revenue should be allowed to stand in our way. If we are making revenue out of an evil so great that it requires to be prohibited, then we should sacrifice that revenue. If we are making a revenue at the cost of the suffering, and misery, and loss, and ruin of many of our people, then we ought to be prepared as a Government to sacrifice that revenue, and to say to the people: We will give you a prohibitory law, whatever loss it may be to us by way of revenue. But it is contended, and it appears to me with some degree of force—I must confess,