

understood policy of the department that there would be no compromise with anyone in regard to the enforcement of the liquor license law.

The Provincial Secretary retorted to the statement that the Government had deserted its colors with the charge that the Liberals had nailed theirs to the fence and attempted to straddle the fence.

Other speakers were: Dr. Jas. McQueen (North Wentworth), Mr. C. R. McKeown (Dufferin), Mr. R. J. McCormick (East Lambton), Mr. Wm. McDonald (Centre Bruce), and Mr. Allan Studholme (East Hamilton). Mr. Hugh Munro (Glengarry) moved the adjournment of the debate and will continue the discussion when it is resumed.

#### Two Amendments.

Two amendments were introduced, one by Mr. Hanna reiterating the position of the Government last year, and another by Mr. T. Herbert Lennox (North York) expressing appreciation of the administration of the Government during the past eight years, and deprecating that the temperance question had been brought into party politics.

Some surprise was caused by the non-participation of Sir James Whitney in the debate so far. In reply to Opposition taunts that he was not speaking, Sir James advised the Liberal members to have patience. The fact that the proposed amendments are but repetitions of those introduced in the discussion last year and that a Conservative caucus is called to meet this morning lends color to the belief that the Government has not made up its mind what course to pursue and is unable to meet the Liberal challenge.

#### The Second Time.

"This is the second time," said Mr. Rowell, "that I have had the honor of presenting the Liberal policy on the question of the liquor traffic. I submit that the whole problem of how best to deal with this is one of the most important questions that can engage the attention of this House." Its evils, he said, were recognized in all civilized communities, and a study of the legislative records of all civilized countries showed that all of them had endeavored to do something to curb the traffic. The leader of the Opposition declared he had no preconceived notions as to the best way of dealing with the problem. For years the legislation had been based upon a consideration of it from the standpoint of morality and religion. In later years these two appeals had been re-enforced by others quite as practical and far-reaching. Appeals were later made for the promotion and conservation of public health, and in answer the demand for greater efficiency in industrial and commercial life.

Mr. Rowell referred to the statement made by Sir James Whitney last year when the question was before the House, to the effect that there was not a rising tide of public sentiment in favor of the abolition of the bar, and that the high-tide had been reached twenty years ago. Mr. Rowell declared that by this statement the Premier had shown he had not kept pace with modern thought on the problem. He quoted eminent British physicians, including Dr. Sims Woodhead and Sir Victor Horsley, showing the views of British scientists as to the evil effects of indulgence in alcohol. It made the human system unable to combat disease and generally reduced the vigor.

#### The Fight in Ontario.

Turning to present conditions in Ontario with regard to the fight against the liquor traffic, Mr. Rowell said there had been much progress in the Province in limiting the area within which liquor was sold. Out of the 835 municipalities in the Province 502 were dry, 123 held up by the three-fifths clause and 333 were wet. The relation that this bore to the population of the Province was that 1,090,502 people resided in dry municipalities and 311,460 in municipalities which had voted to become dry, making a total of 1,401,960. There were in municipalities under license 1,121,312 people, leaving a majority of 252,000 under local option and those who had voted to become dry.

#### Further Legislation Needed.

"This is a remarkable showing," said Mr. Rowell, "in that it shows

what a strong body of public sentiment has registered itself in favor of curbing the liquor traffic. Both parties in this House recognize that local option alone is not equal to the task of curbing the traffic. It is a fact that this House is a unit in its expression of opinion that further legislation is needed."

Outlining the Liberal policy, Mr. Rowell said it was a widely recognized fact that the bar was the stronghold of the liquor traffic, and that in and around it lurked most of the evils that were hurting the Province. The Liberal method, he said, was to abolish the bar. The Government's method was to abolish the treating in the bar.

"Our remedy a year ago," declared Mr. Rowell, "was to abolish the bar. It is exactly the same to-day. I wonder if the Government has changed its attitude of a year ago or if it is the same." He pointed out that there were doubtless many members of the Government who favored the abolition of the bar, and who, if they were free to vote as they thought, would vote for its abolition. Party exigencies, he said, made it impossible to do this.

There had been, Mr. Rowell pointed out, many resolutions adopted by various bodies throughout the Province calling for the abolition of the bar.

#### And the Premier Smiles.

Mr. Rowell—My hon. friend the Premier smiles, but I venture to think that the clergy and laity of this Province who have worked so hard and so unselfishly to benefit human conditions should be entitled to a hearing on this momentous question.

Sir James Whitney—If my hon. friend will wait a minute I will frown.

Mr. Rowell—I venture to think that my hon. friend has frowned inwardly many times since I commenced this afternoon.

The Liberal leader then reviewed some of the local option contest results last January. There were 77 municipalities voting on the by-law. Twenty-six of them carried it, 37 had a majority but failed to carry it owing to the three-fifths clause, and 14 defeated it by a straight majority. In short, out of 77 contests 63 municipalities showed a majority for the by-law with only 14 against. This was a remarkable record, as showing the trend of public sentiment. In repeal contests 16 municipalities sustained the by-law, in five it was saved by the three-fifths clause, and one municipality repealed the by-law.

Indicating the scope of the Liberal policy, Mr. Rowell said that out of 835 municipalities the retail sale of liquor would be wiped out in all but 83 or 84 municipalities, which comprised largely the larger towns and cities, and here it could be done when a sufficient body of public opinion became aligned against the traffic.

Mr. T. H. Lennox (North York)—Why do you not abolish the shop licenses?

Mr. Rowell—If you will join with us we will wipe out the shop licenses too.

#### Bar the Source of Evil.

Dealing with the two remaining planks in the Liberal platform Mr. Rowell said that the Liberal party stood for the strict enforcement of the law by men in sympathy with the enforcement of the law, and for the elimination of political influence from the administration of the present law. The evil effects of political influence were clearly shown in the case of the License Inspectors and License Commissioners. He favored giving the Inspectors sufficient territory to cover and sufficient pay to make it worth while for the Inspector to give his whole time to his duties. As to the Licensing Board under the system proposed by the Liberals, Mr. Rowell said such a board would be largely unnecessary, but he favored making it free from political influence. He favored the appointment of men representing both parties on the board, to make political intrigue impossible. He also favored such regulation and inspection of hotels in the Province as would keep them up to the standard required for the convenience of the travelling public.

"I say to this Government," said Mr. Rowell, in conclusion, "that many of its members believe in the policy of abolishing the bar. If they were free from partisan considerations they would vote for it. I call upon the Government to join with us and wipe out the curse of the open bar."