

People Should Rule.

"As Leader of the Liberal party in Ontario my appeal to the electorate during the recent campaign was 'the will of the people must prevail.' I called their attention to their vote in the plebiscite of 1924 when they had recorded their approval of the Ontario Temperance Act. I stated that the Liberal party stood for the maintenance and enforcement of the act so long as the people by their votes declared for its maintenance and enforcement.

"The Premier, on the other hand, as Leader of the Conservative party, declared that the vote on Dec. 1 was to be a plebiscite upon the Ontario Temperance Act. The policy of the Premier and of the Conservative party was Government control of the sale of liquor and the repeal of the Ontario Temperance Act.

"Both appeals were given full publicity by the press. The people rejected my appeal and adopted the policy of the Premier and of the Conservative party. As Leader of the Liberal party I must accept the will of the people, but with some misgivings as to the future. Under our system of government it is rightly recognized that majority rule must prevail. Time will tell whether the bill is in aid of temperance, as claimed. I express the hope that our Province may not be too seriously injured by the decision of the people on Dec. 1 whereby this bill will be carried into effect.

Responsibility on Government.

"Upon the details of the bill in committee there will no doubt be wide differences of opinion. The Government should welcome criticism and suggestion. The Government must accept full responsibility for the consequences of the bill and whatever follows. The people, who gave the mandate as an aid to temperance, may learn they have been deceived when it is in operation. Their condemnation of this Government on its next appeal to them may be as emphatic as was their endorsement on Dec. 1 last."

Premier Is Criticized.

"The Prime Minister," said Hon. W. E. Raney, in opening his speech, "in one breath invites constructive criticism, and in the next breath he says: 'You're wasting your breath.' Not only that, but he says: 'I want criticism, but show me the hypocrite who will dare criticize this bill.' I've had some experience with the vocabulary of the Prime Minister, and I suppose I have to take the risk.

"The Prime Minister and Dr. Cody tell us that this new law is to be an experiment," he continued. "True, it will be an experiment, so far as Ontario is concerned, but it will not be an experiment in Canada. Five other Canadian Provinces have had Government sale of liquor in one form or another for periods ranging from six years, in the cases of Quebec and British Columbia, down to two years, in the case of Saskatchewan, and there is scarcely any possible variation of the idea that has not been, and is not in fact, at this moment, under actual trial in one or another of these five Provinces.

Situation in Quebec.

"Some of the Provinces have made attempts to restrict quantities that may be purchased by individuals within a limited time. Quebec, for instance, enforces a limitation of a quart of whiskey at a time. But a man is permitted to walk back and forth between his automobile and the Government liquor store, fetching a bottle at a time until the tonneau of his car is filled. On the other hand, under the Saskatchewan law, a man or woman is limited to a quart of whiskey, plus two gallons of wine, plus two gallons of beer, for each day of the week, except Sundays. Three of the Provinces, Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia, allow beer to be sold by the glass in hundreds of beer parlors or taverns. And it is only because of a change of mind of the Prime Minister of this Province that we have escaped liquor parlors.

"But perhaps the House will be more interested in the Manitoba law. Not only is Manitoba Ontario's next-door neighbor to the west, but her people are perhaps nearer of kin to the people of this Province than are the people of any of the other Provinces. Moreover, the law now before us resembles, I think, the present Government sale law of Manitoba more nearly than it does that of any of the other Government-control Provinces, even to the feature of a strong man for its administration in the person of Mr. Waugh, the Chairman of the Manitoba Liquor Commission.

"There can be no question that Attorney-General Craig and Mr. Waugh have since the Manitoba Government-control law was enacted in July, 1923, striven valiantly both to strengthen the law and to enforce it. The Prime Minister and Mr. Hanna will, I should think, be very keenly interested to know with what result.

View of Mr. Craig.

"Mr. Craig, who, I judge, is not a prohibitionist, made a speech at Portage la Prairie two months ago before the United Farmers of Manitoba. Speaking of the bootlegger about whom we heard so much during the recent election campaign in

Ontario as being the friend of the O.T.A., Mr. Craig said:

"Our difficulties have been with the retail bootlegger and the brewer and the distiller, but principally with the retail bootlegger and the brewer. It is frequently asked, 'Under a system of Government sale, why should there be a bootlegger?' 'Why should there be any unlawful selling or unlawful possession of liquor?' Many factors enter into the reason for the bootleggers' existence. There is the facility for obtaining supplies either from the Liquor Commission or from the brewers, and the temptation to resell these supplies at a profit by retail. There is the element of time. A man wants a drink when he wants it, and not an hour or several hours or half a day afterward. There is the element of place. Frequently for various reasons, either through choice or from the necessity imposed by the wife or mother a man does not care to have liquor in his residence, though he is not indisposed to get it or have it elsewhere.

"There is the element of quantity. Sometimes a man wants only a glass of liquor, and not a bottle. He may want only a bottle of beer and not a case of beer. There is the element of sociability. Men like to drink together, and frequently that is done away from a residence. Then there is the problem of the transient, particularly in urban centres such as Winnipeg, and time or convenience does not allow him to get legally the liquor he desires. Other factors might be mentioned. The purchaser creates the demand which the seller supplies, and the seller furnished the temptation for a purchaser to break the law."

Shifting Responsibility, He Claims.

It was no kindness to Mr. Hanna, the Progressive Leader submitted, for Premier Ferguson to put the former on a pedestal as a Samson and then hang around his neck the responsibility, "which belongs to the Prime Minister of this Province," of banishing the bootlegger from the Province by the establishment of the Government sale of his commodity.

Referring to statements that Attorney-General Craig had been vigilant in enforcing the Manitoba liquor control law, Mr. Raney added:

"Of the eight breweries operating in Manitoba seven were convicted at least three times each last year. One brewery was convicted twice; two were convicted three times; four of them four times and one seven times. I have yet to hear of one of the twenty-eight Ontario breweries having been convicted once during the last year. Do you think Ontario brewers are, or are likely to be, better observers of the law than Manitoba brewers?"

Mr. Raney asserted that when during the campaign Premier Ferguson and Dr. Cody had promised the rural people of Ontario "a better temperance law than the Ontario Temperance Act," they were not promising the impossible. The Ontario Temperance Act, he submitted, was not a prohibitory law of the same class as the Volstead Act in the United States. But the Premier had promised a temperance law that would protect the boys and girls of the Province, and yet the Government had recently announced that it expected Mr. Hanna to produce a revenue of \$3,500,000 "between now and Oct. 31" from the Government liquor stores to be established under the new law.

Facilities for Selling.

"The only way that great revenue, which will be at the rate of upward of \$7,000,000 a year, can be realized," said Mr. Raney, "will be by giving every facility to our own people and to visitors from the United States to buy whiskey—because the Prime Minister is under solemn promise to sell beer at cost.

"Already, before the law is passed," he went on, "Mr. Hanna is busy. Of course, at the instance of the Prime Minister. And there is feverish haste to get the law passed and to get the liquor stores opened, so that the inflow of revenue may begin. So great is the haste that the municipalities are not to be given time nor opportunity to say whether they want liquor stores or not. The Treasury can't wait. Neither can the brewers wait."

"Ha! ha!" gibed the Government side of the House.

Trouble for Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Raney claimed to recognize "in a sound in the mulberry trees" further trouble for Mr. Hanna. "The workers," said he, "want jobs, and the Patronage Committee—I say nothing as to private members of the House—have been getting busy. He will be beset with difficulties enough if he is given a free hand in the choice of his subordinates. If he yields an inch to the patronage hunters the whole ell will disappear in a twinkling. Once the camel gets his head into the tent the whole body will be there before he can say Jack Robinson.

"Either we are to have a business administration of the Government liquor stores or they are to be linked up with the political machine, which functioned so smoothly during the recent election campaign. There is no middle course. Either Mr. Hanna will have a free hand or the bosses and Patronage Committees will be in charge of the liquor stores. And there will be no possibility of concealment. Just as soon as the vendors and their assistants are appointed the people will know whether they have been chosen as any business man would choose his subordinates or whether they are being rewarded for services to the party.

No Free Hand, He Claims.

"It seems quite clear that it is not the intention to give Mr. Hanna a free hand. In the first place, he has two fellow-Commissioners who, however respectable they may be, are obviously political appointments.

"And already it is said that not only has the number of liquor stores that are to be opened in Toronto been settled by these distributors of patronage, but that a list of vendors has been made up, to save Mr. Hanna the trouble of looking about for himself."

Mr. Raney contended that unless a declaration was had from the House that there would be a non-

partisan administration of the new law and that the board would be free to engage and dismiss its subordinates without any interference whatever by the Government or members of the House supporting the Government or Patronage Committees, the situation that arose in November 1905, when Sir Joseph Flavelle, Col. John Davidson and J. A. Murray, License Board Commissioners, had resigned over the dismissal by the Whitney Government of three "Liberal" license inspectors, would be repeated in 1927.