

Province had not even got a Dominion Franchise Act at the present time upon which the electorate could act. When Hon. Mr. Raney expressed the opinion that the vote would be taken on Provincial lists, Mr. Dewart answered: "Oh, there are plenty of jokers in this act."

Concluding, Mr. Dewart again said it was not the desire of the Liberal party to hamper the submission of a referendum, "but rather the desire that the atmosphere should be cleared. We desire to state our position with reference to this matter, and leave the responsibility where it should be, with the Prime Minister of this Province and the Cabinet that supports him."

Hon. George S. Henry protested in the first place that, contrary to the expectations of Hon. G. H. Ferguson, the temperance debate did not proceed on Friday afternoon, when Hon. Mr. Ferguson expected to give his views. He proceeded to defend the Ontario Temperance Act from the criticisms of Mr. Dewart, and suggestions, which he said had been thrown out by members on both sides, that the act had not been a success.

Henry Opposes Referendum.

"I am not going to support the submission of a referendum under this resolution under the existing circumstances," Hon. Mr. Henry declared. "In the first place I am of the opinion that the only constitutional way the Government can assume responsibility for any measure passing this House is for a member of the Government to submit it to the House, and for that reason I am not going to support the resolution, because the first principle we are standing for as a group in this House, and I think we represent a large opinion in this Province, is that we must have constitutional Government."

He accused Hon. Mr. Raney of "quibbling" when he suggested that a stated case could not secure authoritative legal opinion in less than two or three years. In Manitoba in 1901, he reminded the House, a stated case was asked for in regard to the Macdonald Act in the spring and decision secured in the same year. In pointing out the danger of submitting for referendum a measure whose legality was doubtful, he declared: "There is nothing that retards temperance as much as going beyond our powers or making a step that proves itself ineffective."

Premier Replies.

Premier Drury was accorded a warm reception by his own supporters. If the Hill amendment were carried, he declared, it meant that hereafter a private member was to be debarred from ever introducing important legislation. He reminded the Ottawa member that he himself had introduced weighty legislation when he introduced the Proportional representation resolution into the House. "Of course," declared the Premier, "I have not the slightest idea that the amendment to the amendment is at all sincere." The carrying of the Hill amendment, he said, would strike a real blow at the authority of Parliament in Ontario.

Mr. Hill asked the Premier if he had ever heard of a private member introducing a resolution drawn up for him by the Government with a speech prepared for him by some member of the Government. "It was not at the instance of the Government that Mr. McCreary submitted it," retorted the Premier. "He submitted it of his own free will, and because he wanted to."

Must Make It Apply.

Dealing with the applicability of Bill 26, he reiterated his view that if the bill did not apply to Ontario the Dominion Government were pledged to make it apply. "If they do not," he said, "they will be a little more certain to go out of power than they are at the present time."

As to the probability of delay in the courts, Hon. Mr. Drury reminded the House that to one litigant at least every day's delay in the courts would be advantageous. And where one of two litigants desired delay decision was likely to be very long delayed. He was quite willing, as a Government, to take that one chance in a hundred of the legislation being upset in the courts.

Tribute to Rowell.

Sam Clarke, Liberal member for Northumberland, opened his striking address with a tribute to the efforts of Hon. N. W. Rowell on behalf of temperance. Recalling the days of the abolish-the-bar controversy, he reminded the House that all the eloquence of Hon. Mr. Rowell, Mr. Proudfoot, himself and the balance of the members of the Liberal party of that day could not make a single convert from the Conservative benches opposite. To the amusement of the House, he contrasted himself with the Hon. Thomas Crawford. "I vote temperance, and I do as I please myself," said Mr. Clarke. "He is good all the time, but he does not always vote temperance for the good of the people."

"The Conservative party," continued Mr. Clarke, "came back here with the vote of the liquor people and 50 per cent. of the vote of the temperance people. We did not get the temperance vote. And within two years they got conversion— instantaneous conversion." The Hearst measure, which abolished everything, in the opinion of Mr. Clarke, was, he said, one of the most serious mistakes made at that time. "They abolished everything except what you might get through a doctor, by making a liar out of him, and making a liar out of yourself, and paying a tribute for what you got."

Would Have Kept Shops.

Mr. Clarke believed that the shops should have been maintained. "Not the bars!" he added. "Properly regulated shops under Government control—no humbug of control, but business control, where the man who got a bottle of liquor and abused it would be put on the Indian list." In passing, he complimented John O'Neill for "one of the most frank and honest speeches he had ever listened to." If the shops had been maintained "until the people had become naturalized" to the new conditions, Mr. Clarke believed, Ontario would have had better conditions than existed to-day.

"Unfortunately," he proceeded, "we are governed not by the Farmers and Co. altogether, but more or less by too fanatical conditions in this Province of Ontario." (Applause.) "It is no trouble for any man who is absolutely good, or any woman who is absolutely good, to be good always. But the man who is not as good, and the woman who is not as good—different temperament, different surroundings, different early training, different atmosphere—they have to be treated as they are. To-day we want to make all the people good. I do not think that is good for humanity. I used to say that the man with the biggest heart and the man with the broadest mind was the man who took a little drink."

A Sufficient Mandate.

"I am in hopes that these two amendments will be withdrawn. The amendment to the amendment, to my mind, is nothing. It is, to my mind, humbug. I ask any intelligent member of this House or of this Province what is the difference if a private member brings in a bill or the Government brings in a bill, if the Government says, 'We are with it, body and soul?'" As for the Brackin amendment, Mr. Clarke said, its purport was simply "I see troubles ahead for you fellows if you put your nose into this game without the lawyers getting at it and straightening things up for you."

"What difference," he asked, "whether the Attorney-General makes a stated case and appeals to all the courts which are necessary to get that put aside, or whether we pass the referendum to-day? Don't you worry! If it is unconstitutional there are plenty of lawyers for the liquor men to get hold of to upset it so quickly you won't know your name. If it is unconstitutional, you are going to get it in the neck anyway."

Mr. Clarke believed that the mandate of the people last October was sufficient for any Government to act upon without taking a referendum. Of course, he commented, with regard to the new Dominion legislation, "we are the child and the father is in Ottawa, and those fellows are no straighter than the average politician."

Would Go Slowly.

Proceeding, he said: "That ballot that we had last October, whether