

it was the way it had been dictated, was—I was going to say the most crooked ballot in the world—not a fair ballot. We have made good progress in the last fifteen years. Think of it. All the bars are gone, and yet you could not get fifteen per cent. of the people to vote for their return. Yes, but you want religion to come all at once, and you cannot get it. If I were the Prime Minister I would go a little sparingly. I'd give the hard-working man in the shop his glass of beer."

With all due respect to the temperance element, Mr. Clarke declared, there must be a little of humanity exhibited. Beer to many had been a food all their days. Probably most of them had never been drunk in their lives. Sentimentality had been introduced. "People," he said, "won't understand humanity aright." Many a time, he said, he had taken in a tired workingman in his home town and given him a drink. "Yes," he added, amid laughter, "and I'd do it again if I were 'pulled' for it to-morrow."

Applauded by House.

"What are we living for?" he asked. "Living to be men; living to be frank and honest; living to help each other; to be broad-minded. You cannot make people Christians. You cannot make them absolutely temperate."

"What I call the greatest temperance in this world is the man who is big enough to do what he thinks is right, the man who has humanity enough to feed or help any man who needs it. I tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, under judicious management, shops, with four per cent. beer for five or ten years, in my opinion, would probably be the best thing that ever happened the Province of Ontario. To-day you have men drinking wood alcohol. To-day they are taking drugs. It would be far better to feed them a little legitimate stuff, and not be dictated to by this or that fanatic."

At the conclusion of his address, Mr. Clarke was personally congratulated by every Labor member from the Government benches. Hon. Messrs. Grant, Smith, and Doherty walked across the floor to shake hands with him, and the whole house, including U.F.O. members and the Premier himself, warmly applauded his speech.

Thinks Prohibition Impossible.

Mr. Z. Mageau, Liberal member for Sturgeon Falls, complained that there had been "too much play" with the temperance question, and his plea was: "Let hypocrisy be done away with." He instanced the effort of a friend of his to secure a bottle of Scotch whiskey, which, when finally procured, cost \$10.50, and declared, "I say, Mr. Speaker, that any law, I don't care what it is, or where it is, that allows anything of the kind to be perpetrated on the good citizens of this Province is not a good law, and it is time that it should be amended."

In Mr. Mageau's opinion, "you can overdo anything." He proceeded: "Why not have a sane policy enacted? Let the people get around together. That is all. The people who are asking measures must understand that there are other people to be considered in this country. If you attempt to make this a 'bone-dry' Province you cannot raise enough revenue to make it so. So long as man lives liquor is going to be made. It is being made everywhere in homes to-day."

Would Copy Scandinavia.

It was a good thing that the bar was gone, he said. Nobody desired that it should return. But let the Government take charge of legitimate sale of liquor. Absolute prohibition laws, he believed, were not in the interests of temperance. He called the way whiskey was being handled throughout the Province at present a curse. Some system such as was operated in Norway and Sweden should be inaugurated in Ontario, whereby the man who wanted a little liquor could procure a license to have it. He differed from the opinion that a private member should not introduce a temperance measure. The effort had always been to secure full and free discussion on the matter in the House.

None of the propositions to be submitted, he said, met with his

views, and he urged that the Premier and the movers of the two amendments get together and bring in some sane temperance measure which could meet the approval of all members.

Are in Dilemma.

"If we were debating mothers' pensions, or some legislation to give help to unfortunate widows with children, there would not be a 'corporal's guard' in the galleries," sarcastically commented Mr. Swayze, Labor member for Niagara Falls, with regard to the numbers of men and women in the galleries.

He pointed to the dilemma members found themselves in on being asked to do one thing by one temperance body and another thing by another temperance body. "I hold that the Brackin amendment," he said, "is right, and that we should go to the Dominion Government and ask them to tell us fairly if the bill applies to the Province of Ontario. If it does not, then change the bill so it will."

With Mr. Mageau, Mr. Swayze was in favor of the Swedish system of handling liquor. If some such measure were introduced, he believed, within ten years the liquor question in this country would be swept away. "This restriction of importation of liquor into Ontario," he said, "will not create the conditions that you hope for." If an element in the Province were determined to bring about "bone-dry" conditions, then let them, he said, concentrate their forces, go to the Dominion Government and ask them to prohibit the manufacture of it entirely.

Tired of Being Fooled.

Briefly Lieut.-Col. H. S. Cooper, Liberal member for Northeast Toronto, declared that there was no doubt of the demand from the people of the Province for advanced temperance legislation. But the people were sick and tired of being fooled. He was in favor of the Brackin amendment.

Mr. J. G. Lethbridge, U.F.O. member for South Middlesex, said he had been making temperance speeches throughout his section of the country for years, and was for the McCreary resolution. It was time he said, that the political forces ceased making temperance a political football, and for that reason he was entirely opposed to the Hill amendment. The Brackin amendment, in his opinion, might open up years of litigation, and in the meantime people would be filling their cellars with liquor. When Ontario had this law, with the restrictions of the Sandy bill, Ontario would have what the people voted for last October.