

time, but for the hundredth time, it will be the success of those who advocate true Liberal principles." (Prolonged Ministerial applause.)

#### Col. Matheson's View.

Col. Matheson (South Lanark) was against the referendum in any shape, manner or form, as being against the constitution, and for that reason he would vote for the amendment. He quoted from John Bright in support of his contentions, and, continuing, held that the Government should take the responsibility of adopting the measure and standing by their act. The proposed present action of the Government would serve as a precedent, and a bad one, to the Dominion Government, which might evade responsibility in the same way and shift it to the people.

#### The True Significance.

Hon. Mr. Gibson said that Mr. Crawford's proposal meant that if the bill was going to become law it would be without reference to the people. Those who voted for it would be assuming the responsibility of placing it upon the statute book without giving the people an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. Hon. gentlemen might afterwards try to place a different construction upon their action, but that would be the true significance attaching to the action of those who voted for the amendment and he wished it to be clearly understood. He desired also to call attention to the fact that not only had the Government given the matter most careful consideration, but were also adopting the well-considered recommendation of the former leader of the Opposition, who after the Provincial plebiscite on the liquor question had stated that no legislation of that kind should become law without being again submitted to the people.

#### Mr. Foy Would Kill the Bill.

Mr. Foy (South Toronto) was sure that if the referendum clauses were struck out the members of the Government would not themselves vote for the remainder of the bill. The effect of carrying out the amendment, for which he himself would vote, would be to do away with the whole bill and they would have nothing more to do with it. He was personally against both portions of the bill, and if he could not kill it altogether and at once he was quite willing that it should be killed in two par-

cels. He wondered what the honest and individual opinions of the members of the Government were, and whether they would vote yea or nay on the bill.

#### Mr. Stratton's Reply.

Hon. Mr. Stratton said it was evident that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foy) was opposed to prohibition in any manner, shape or form, opposed to the bill and opposed to the referendum. He

sympathized to some extent with the position of the hon. gentleman from West Toronto (Mr. Crawford), but his amendment was clearly for the purpose of killing the bill. Did Mr. Crawford find his motion consistent with his record in this city and throughout the Province on the question of prohibition?

They knew now exactly where his hon. friend (Mr. Crawford) stood on the question. As far as the Government was concerned, they accepted the full responsibility of their position. (Ministerial applause.) They placed before the people as complete a measure of prohibition as the Privy Council declared they had power to enact, and a referendum, so that the people had the opportunity of expressing their opinion on the subject. If that opinion was favorable the bill would become law and the Government would assume the responsibility of seeing that the law was carried out. (Renewed applause.) The hon. gentleman from South Lanark (Col. Matheson) had made a comparison between the responsibility assumed by Sir John Macdonald when he asked the Dominion House to vote the loan to the C.P.R. and the attitude of the Ontario Government on this bill. The comparison, he considered, was not a fair one. In the former case the question was a business transaction pure and simple; in this case the question had to be considered in a higher light than that of a cold-blooded business proposition. The Government were quite satisfied that they were right in giving the people an opportunity to express an opinion on the question, and that their position was a correct one. It was quite evident that his hon. friend from South Toronto and other members of the Opposition were not in favor of giving the people a choice of expressing their opinion on the measure. (Renewed Ministerial applause.)

Mr. Marter (North Toronto) said he intended to vote for the amendment, but not for the purpose of killing the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dryden—Other hon. gentlemen on your side say that is their purpose.

Mr. Marter—I do not want anyone to feel nervous on my account, or to think for one moment that I am going to do it for the purpose of killing the bill.

#### Mr. Whitney's Interest.

Mr. Whitney said he had been much interested in the remarks of the Ministers, and more particularly in those of the Provincial Secretary and the Attorney-General, whom public opinion understood to be the men who had fought to the greatest extent of their power against the action of the Government. Yet to-day they were performing the Japanese act of hara-kiri, falling on their swords, and, so to speak, committing suicide.