

was arguing this as a sample of delay in a test case.

The Speaker pointed out that the word "quibble" was not Parliamentary.

"I bow to the ruling," said Hon. Mr. Henry, "but the honorable Attorney-General was misleading."

He was then asked to withdraw that remark.

"I withdraw misleading, but he misled some members," replied Hon. Mr. Henry.

He was again asked to withdraw and bowed his withdrawal.

Labor Man For Resolution.

"I have made up my mind to support the McCreary resolution," said P. Heenan, Labor member for Kenora. Despite all the centering of the power of the Liberty League, his constituency had voted dry, except on the last question on the ballot. He was, however, in favor of Government control of liquor, and he hoped a measure could be brought in some time which would give liquor legally to those who must have it, under Government control.

R. R. Hall (Parry Sound) was the only member who got in two speeches on the question. He spoke on the resolution, and he spoke again last night on the amendments. He opposed both of them. "Both come from a very questionable quarter," he said. "Both come from lawyers." He would place no obstacle in the way of the Government by voting for the amendments.

Scores an Editor.

Mr. Dewart at the outset showed the consistency of the Liberal party in its attitude toward temperance and progress. Personally, he had never got away one particle from the Liberal platform on that question. The Liberal Leader alluded to a newspaper editor, who, he said, could not be elected pound-keeper, and who had attempted to dictate the policy of the party, and who still chose to make a distinction between the "wets" and the "drys." "If we find he still attempts to dictate a policy for the party in power or the party gone from power, I think these matters will be taken at their face value, and will receive such value as they deserve."

He referred to the Liberal resolution on liquor in favor of temperance legislation to the fullest extent of the Provincial jurisdiction. "To that principle the Liberal party in Ontario is pledged," he continued. There might be a question to-day which method was best to adopt in carrying out this principle. "I know that, so far as the Premier is concerned, he has declared himself, as I did, upon the platform in favor of carrying out and effectively putting into effect what the people expressed at the polls." (Applause.)

Then Attacks Mr. Rowell.

Mr. Dewart then attacked Hon. N. W. Rowell. A gentleman, he said, to whom he had given his loyal support had impugned his motives and suggested some ulterior motive. He referred to Mr. Rowell as a man who had deserted the Liberal party and had found it more profitable to look after his own interests at Ottawa. "He said that I was allied with the liquor interests. He knew when he said it that it was false. I have frequently repudiated that suggestion on the public platforms of Ontario, and at no time in my advocacy of the interest of the Liberal party have I ever receded from the policy and platform of the Liberal party in this regard."

Mr. Dewart declared that this gentleman (Mr. Rowell) had failed to rise to the measure of his temperance advocacy, for what could have been done at Ottawa for the temperance people had now been passed to the Ontario Legislature. The Ontario Government, he continued, was entitled to sympathy after Sir George Foster and Hon. N. W. Rowell had failed to rise to their responsibility, and, failing to give a measure, they shoved the burden on to the Province. Did anyone imagine, he asked, that the Dominion could not have taken a plebiscite and one without the loopholes the Provincial one would have? It was his sincere desire to meet the responsibility placed on the Province by the evasion of duty by the Dominion Government.

Province Not Under Dominion Act.

Mr. Dewart referred to the Do-

minion Alliance as a consistent and persistent temperance reform organization, and said he was compelled to ponder over its arguments in the present case. He read long extracts from it on the applicability of the referendum in Ontario and then gave his own views. "Differing from the Attorney-General on this, I must express my own views and leave the responsibility on the shoulders of those who will take it, and acquit myself of liability," said Mr. Dewart. He declared his own opinion that Ontario did not come under section 152 of the Dominion Act. It did not need the spectacles of a lawyer or an appeal to the Privy Council to see it, he maintained. He read the clause and repeated the phrase "in which there is a law forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes."

He thought that plain enough. Ontario was not in that class.

Attacking Ottawa again, Mr. Dewart said he would not put it past them to have left this loophole. He disagreed with the legal opinion of Mr. Clarke of Toronto on the matter. Mr. Clark said, in thinking that the act did apply to Ontario, that the whole act must be taken and not the grammatical meaning of a phrase. Mr. Dewart thought this an admission. It was a question to consider before throwing the Province into the expense of a referendum vote.

Continuing, Mr. Dewart declared that the Legislature must proceed with great care if we are to make the proposed temperance laws of this Province effective. He went over the various legal opinions which have been the subject of so much controversy, and submitted that the best that could be concluded from them was that there was room for grave doubt as to the applicability of the Dominion legislation.

Let People Decide.

The Liberal party would say that "we should hesitate to have any referendum at this time. So far as the Liberal party is concerned, it is committed to this principle with reference to temperance legislation, that if there is any question in regard to which the people desire to have an opinion of the people taken we desire to have that decided by the people, and not by any party themselves. That is the principle we advocated in the last campaign, and the Government in taking responsibility, which by resolution in this House it has been urged it should take, for the submission of the referendum was not to pledge its faith to the particular phase of the referendum that should be adopted by the people, but rather to see that under the circumstances the legal right existed to have that referendum submitted to the people.

"And if, sir, as a member of the Liberal party, I thought that, under the circumstances here, and having regard to the study I have given to this question, and the literature I have received, if I thought there was legal ground upon which this question could honestly be submitted to the people, I would hold up both hands for the referendum.

"Having regard to the opinions that have been given; having regard to the very strong view that I honestly and earnestly hold with reference to this matter; having regard to the fact that, while the Government has been forced to accept responsibility for the McCreary motion, it has not accepted the responsibility for putting the law into the shape in which our temperance friends ask it shall be put, I must say, under these circumstances, I must raise my voice in protest against the submission of this matter, and I do so, not because of any desire to impede, not because of any personal views that may be imputed to me. I care not what the newspapers of Toronto say of me with reference to my views. I am honestly and fearlessly expressing my views and convictions to-night with reference to this matter."

Not Fearful of Litigation.

Mr. Dewart was inclined to differ from the view of the Attorney-General that litigation would be drawn out two, or possibly three, years in the event of a request for a stated case. He felt that the Attorney-General could if he desired find some means by which the question as to the applicability of Bill 26 could be decided beyond doubt.

Mr. Dewart pointed out that the