

LEGISLATURE VOTES

AGAINST REFERENDUM

Important Resolution by Liberals on the Temperance Question Defeated.

DEBATE WAS SPIRITED

Taylor Leads Opposition to Proposal--Scouts Ability of People to Decide Problems.

Roblin party votes in the legislature yesterday killed a resolution to the effect that a referendum vote of the electors should be taken on the question of prohibition. It was moved by G. J. H. Malcolm (Birtle) as an amendment to a government motion affirming that in the opinion of the house the cause of temperance can best be served by local option. This in turn was an amendment to a resolution moved by the opposition leader declaring in favor of taking a referendum vote on the question of banishing the bar. The government motion was carried.

Spirited debating on both sides of the house marked the temperance debate, fundamental lines of cleavage between parties coming out sharp and clear. For the government, E. L. Taylor attacked the principle of referendum, and scouted the ability of the people to decide their own problems. On urging the need of slow progress in reform, he was loudly applauded from the government benches. From the Liberal side of the house, the case for democracy was cogently put by the opposition leader, T. H. Johnson, F. J. Dixon, Dr. Clingan and others, stress being laid on the fact that the election of July last endorsed the Liberal plank for a referendum on the bar question. The Conservative speakers expressed their hope of having prohibition eventually, and it was for that reason that the Liberal members moved an amendment to their own motion widening its character.

The feature of the evening session was a strong speech in the debate on the address by T. H. Johnson. When he rose, Premier Sir Rodmond Roblin left the chamber, but the floor was well filled with government members, who heard one of the severest criticisms ever made in the chamber. Events of the last election were passed in review, and demands made for inquiries into the more important breaches of the law which then occurred. The galleries were filled with spectators, who frequently broke the rules of the house by applauding the vigorous remarks of the member for Centre Winnipeg.

Resolution on Referendum.

The first temperance motion stood on the order paper to the name of the member for Birtle, but he was not present and the opposition leader moved it instead. Here it is:

"Whereas, the electors of this province have by a majority at the last election declared themselves in favor of submitting by way of a referendum the question of abolishing the sale of intoxicating liquors in bar rooms;

"Therefore, let it be resolved that, in the opinion of this house, such question should be submitted by way of a referendum without delay."

Mr. Norris Confident.

Mr. Norris said he moved the resolution with more confidence than he had ever moved a similar one before, believing that it had a fair chance of being considered on its merits. In the election campaign which had so notably strengthened the Liberal cause, the Liberals had made definite and distinct promises in connection with the liquor question. They had promised, if elected to power, to submit to the people a referendum on the single question of abolishing the sale of liquor in bars. This question he thought had not been lower than second in the minds of the electors, and the Liberal party was strongly in favor of letting the people decide this question now as it was. He was glad to know the government was progressing in the matter of temperance thought, and he believed that finally Sir Rodmond Roblin would agree with

Liberal platform on this point as had on many others. In the temperance legislation already before the session, the government had embodied the valuable reforms originally proposed from the opposition benches. They were willing to let the government have the credit for it; but it should not be forgotten that in all their proposals the government had overlooked the great democratic principle that the people should rule. Public opinion had gone far on the temperance question in recent months. In fact, if the government would undertake to close every hotel in the province during the war, the opposition could support it. He believed that it would be an excellent war measure. It was not only desirable because there were so many soldiers in the cities; because he did not believe the soldiers were addicted to strong drink any more than other men. But suspension of the liquor traffic during the war would be an economic measure of benefit to all.

Referendum on Prohibition.

Mr. Norris said he thought that the Liberal platform in the last might justly be said to have led public opinion as well as represented it. In view however, of the advance in temperance thought made since the election, he was willing now to go further and suggest that a referendum should be taken as to the advisability of having total prohibition. The Liberal party was willing that total prohibition should be enacted in the province if the people supported it. He believed that as soon as conditions returned to the normal, the people would support prohibition. It should be submitted to the people as a distinct measure, free from political or religious entanglements. This was suggested not for the purpose of getting votes; they were not on the eve, but just over an election, in which the people had strongly endorsed the Liberal party. But it was suggested as something worth thinking about in the changed conditions. In any event, the people had declared their faith in the principle of the referendum, and he, therefore, moved the resolution calling for a test of public opinion by this means on the question of stopping the sale of liquor in bars.

E. L. Taylor continued the debate, moving an amendment to the Liberal resolution which affirmed that in the opinion of the house the best way to deal with the liquor problem was by the means of local option. He said that the opposition leader maintained that the people had already expressed its will on the point at issue, in the vote of July; why, then, did he want another vote taken? However, Mr. Taylor proceeded to discuss the abstract question of the referendum, declaring strongly against it mainly on the ground that elected representatives should not surrender their own judgment to the popular will.

Opposed to Abolition.

On the question of banishing the bar, Mr. Taylor was equally in opposition to the Liberal views. This reform, he thought, would simply change the present method of selling liquor by the glass to selling it by the bottle, and would achieve no good purpose. He said the Liberal party had not much to its credit in the way of power adopted the means of taking referendums in order to ease the pressure of agitation from the temperance forces. In 1892, out of 44,671 electors, 18,637 had voted in favor of prohibition and 7,115 against it. But in spite of such a manifest majority not a single thing was done. About ten years later another vote had been taken. This time, out of 49,304 electors, 12,304 voted in favor and 2,955 against prohibition. Mr. Taylor said he did not exactly criticize the Liberals for not enacting prohibition on such a small vote, holding that it could not be taken as a fair indication of public opinion, and that such radical legislation could not succeed without public opinion behind it. He thought, however, that the Liberal government had used the referendum to escape from a nasty position. Closing his address with an argument for temperance propaganda and faith in the local option principle, the speaker declared it was impossible to hurry the work of reform. He advised the temperance people not to worry about the legislative end of their work but to concentrate on propaganda.

Little That Was New.

T. H. Johnson said he had listened to the carefully prepared address of the hon. member for St. George, but did not find much that was new in it. The only thing he could say about it was that it was clear, and delivered in such a tone of voice that every member in the chamber could hear it. (Mr. Taylor speaks in an unusually loud tone.)

Proceeding, Mr. Johnson said the member for St. George appeared to have missed the point of the opposition leader's speech. It was not that the people of Manitoba had declared in favor of banishing the bar, but that they had endorsed the policy of calling for a referendum on the subject. What right had this house to withhold the opportunity for them to express their views on a definite subject in an unmistakable way. He had listened with some amusement to the politico-temperance history related by the hon. member. While he had started out to tell what a Liberal government—which had long since passed out of existence—had done with the referendum, he had admitted that its action was justified. But there was a convenient gap in the political history related by the hon. gentleman. He had made no reference to the fact that there was a change of government in 1899, the new one being elected on a prohibition platform; and that it had not fulfilled its pledges. The hon. member had even then been a camp-follower of that government, and also a temperance man; but he never protested when it departed from the path of virtue. He conveniently forgot that in 1902 the government of the day resorted to the use of the referendum—which was extremely uncomplimentary to his colleagues. A period in the history of this province that was most distressing and heart-breaking to the temperance forces ensued, all their efforts resulting in no progress owing to legislation enacted by the government. Yet the member for St. George passed over all that. Mr. Johnson remarked that it was well Mr. Taylor had so clearly stated he was against popular rule. He had made it clear that his attitude to the electors on public questions was: "It is not what you think, but what I think that goes." This reactionary thought sounded strangely nowadays and he had given the member for St. George credit for more sagacity than to put himself in that school.

Chapters of Disappointment.

The history of the temperance legislation in this province, said Mr. Johnson, was one chapter after another of disappointment to the workers, who they were given what looked like concessions but which was found to be legislation full of pitfalls, and they had come to the conclusion that these pitfalls were not there by accident. The temperance people of the province were so used to trickery that it was necessary to satisfy them that there was no joker in the deal to say, "Draw your own legislation. We will submit it to the electors and see to the carrying of it out." There was a precedent for this when some years ago the farmers on the one side and the grain merchants on the other had a dispute and an honorable gentleman who leads the house today said: "Draw your bill, we will put it into force." The leader of the opposition does not

quite so far, the member for Centre Winnipeg said, and he pointed out that the hon. member for St. George was not fair when he endeavored to lead the house to think that the decision was to be left in the hands of the temperance forces. What the leader of the opposition proposed was that the question should be submitted to the people and then have legislation framed on their decision, whatever it might be.

The member for St. George, said Mr. Johnson, made it clear that he himself was a better party man than he was a temperance man—and he was a good temperance man. The hon. member explicitly said he was opposed to banishing the bar—most temperance men wanted to banish the bar, but the member for St. George, when it suited his party, despite the fact that he was a temperance man, stood ready to oppose this movement.

Mr. Taylor Explains.

Mr. Taylor rose to remark that what he said was that he was opposed to abolishing the bar and leaving the wholesale places open. If the latter could also be abolished then he would also be in favor of abolishing the bar. Mr. Johnson continued, and said that the member for St. George had also said he was opposed to the referendum, yet he was in favor of the referendum in 1902.

"Never," said Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Johnson proceeded to deal with the reasons advanced by Mr. Taylor for his belief that a referendum was not a conclusive vote. A province-wide referendum said Mr. Johnson, was just as good as a municipality referendum. Referring to Mr. Taylor's remarks respecting the temperance people finding fault with the application of the law by the courts, Mr. Johnson said he did not believe the temperance people had any fault to find with the way the law was administered by the courts; it was the legislature which framed the laws, they blamed. He challenged the member for St. George to recall any place where province-wide prohibition had been started. It commenced with the local option propaganda, but the time was to come when the temperance forces were not content with this, a time when such a movement was too narrow, and that time had come, now. He also challenged Mr. Taylor to point out any state, province or country that had established prohibition by local option alone. It would be an extremely difficult, if not impossible, task, that the hon. member for St. George would set the temperance people of the province. Mr. Johnson finished with a stirring appeal to the house to let the people deal with this all-important question themselves.

Will of the People.

Mr. Johnson was followed by F. J. Dixon, Centre Winnipeg, seat B. There was a principle involved in this question, Mr. Dixon said, and that was that the will of the people should prevail. The member for St. George, he declared, blew hot and cold in the same breath. Local option was nothing but a referendum by municipalities, and the St. George member was in favor of this, yet opposed to the same principle applied to the province. It was all very well for people to tell municipal councillors what to do, but apparently the hon. member thought they should not tell members of the legislature what to do. For himself, Mr. Dixon declared it to be his firm belief that it was the duty of the legislature to find out the will of the people and to then carry it out. There was no better way to do this than by the referendum. It was not a question of destroying local option but a question of local option plus banish the bar. Over 20,000 people had asked for a vote on this question and surely 25 members would not deny these 20,000 the right to vote on such a question. He also referred to a number of states which had come under prohibition laws by virtue of the referendum.

Dr. Clingan's Views.

Dr. Clingan (Virden), in a short but emphatic speech strongly endorsed the remarks made by the two members for Centre Winnipeg, and also opened up some new viewpoints on the question. He suggested with regard to the hon. member for St. George that, perhaps "in those portions of his anatomy where he did his thinking he had some other way of finding out what the people wanted without asking them." A referendum was only asking them what they wanted. That was the ordinary procedure in business, and it was just as vital in the legislature. He had taken occasion to speak on temperance considerably in his campaign, and the result had shown that the people were not averse to the temperance idea. Regarding Mr. Taylor's remarks, he understood that gentleman said, the people had some right to blame the courts. "Is that what he said, Mr. Speaker?" asked Dr. Clingan, and receiving no negative reply, he continued, saying the courts had only interpreted the law as it had been framed by the legislators and were not, therefore, to blame. He did not believe that the law in Winnipeg would be any harder to enforce than anywhere else, despite the insinuations to the contrary.

"The hon. members on the government side keep on referring to twenty years ago," said John Williams (Arthur). "Everybody has progressed during the intervening time, the whole country has progressed. There is only one section that has not made progress and that is the Conservative party." The Golden Age, for that party, he said was in the past, but for the Liberals and for the cause of temperance the Golden Age was in the future. He scored the government for not crediting the people with sufficient sense to know what they wanted, and cited instances of the manner in which local option worked in districts, perhaps in the centre of which was a town with licensed houses. In such places the law, he said, was disregarded continuously and continually, and there were many people who would hesitate to vote for local option who would be glad of the opportunity to vote for province wide prohibition.

Not Fair to Portage.

Representing the only city in the province under local option, E. A. McPherson, of Portage la Prairie, contended that it was not fair that one city should bear the brunt, and he explained what resulted when it was possible for people to go but a short distance away into territory not under local option.

A great opportunity for the government was what J. H. McConnell, of Ilamfota, called the present chance for the government to submit a referendum to the people on banish the bar, and he promised his hearty support if such action should be taken by the government forces. He spoke strongly against the evils of the liquor habit, and said that the farmers of his district would vote both for banishing the bar and for the referendum.

J. B. Baird (Mountain), thought it a great shame that a petition signed by 20,000 people, presented to the house four years ago, should not yet have been acted upon. He believed in local option up to a certain extent, but prohibition would be much better

and more satisfactory. He could not understand the temperance man who was not in favor of abolishing the bar. He felt very keenly on the question, and was sure that such legislation would go a long way towards saving the young men of the day from the evils of the drink habit.

Evidence of Votes.

Dr. J. W. Armstrong (Gladstone), remarked on the great change in the sentiment of the province which was apparent in the last five years. He said that the hon. member for St. George gave one the impression of a man talking absolutely against his own convictions. He referred to the Liberal majority of votes to prove that the people as a whole would welcome temperance legislation. There never was a time when the temperance opinion was so advanced and he believed the present to be a golden opportunity for the government to put before the people the opportunity of saying whether or not they were in favor of the bar.

In response to insinuations by members from the government side that he himself was interested in a license, he directly denied this. "I never had any interest at any time in any licensed house, and," he added, "if I ever had been interested in one, it would not have had its license long."

"That is more than some of the government members can say," said a voice from the Liberal benches, and as this shot appeared to be too close to home Mr. Armstrong was not further interrupted.

The house adjourned at 6 p.m., Dr. Armstrong still talking.

Evening Session.

At the commencement of the evening session Dr. Thornton objected to the amendment of E. L. Taylor, contending that it was a complete negative of Mr. Norris' resolution, and therefore out of order.

Mr. Speaker ruled that the amendment was in order.

Dr. Thornton moved to amend Mr. Taylor's resolution by striking out the substance of it and adding the words:

"And whereas some progress in this cause has been made under the local option clauses of the Liquor License act.

"And whereas, in the opinion of this house, the time has now arrived when the will of the electors of the province should be ascertained on the question of the total prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor in the province,

"Therefore, in the opinion of this house, the question of total prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors to the extent of the constitutional powers of the province should be submitted forthwith to the electors by way of a referendum."

Speaking to the resolution, Dr. Thornton noted that only one speaker on the government side of the house had taken part in the debate. That one speaker (E. L. Taylor) had dealt chiefly with ancient history, covering a time when many members present had not even reached the province. T. P. O'Connor had said that every generation must live in the spirit of its own time. They must not deal with the temperance question as a heritage from twenty or thirty years ago, but as a matter of extreme importance to the people of Manitoba today. They must be guided by the fundamental principle that the voice of the people should control the legislation of the province.

Would Get Huge Majority.

It was the economic development of the people in recent years that had focussed attention upon the temperance question. Public opinion had progress-

ed beyond the point where it was when the citizens en masse were petitioning the house for a referendum on banish-the-bar. He believed that if the question were to be submitted fairly and squarely to the people, an enormous majority would be obtained, not merely for banish-the-bar, but for total prohibition. The feature of the day was the conversion of business men to the need for advanced temperance legislation.

Mr. Malcolm said he had never been identified with the temperance movement as a total abstainer. He was, however, in favor of any temperance measure which the people of the province were in favor of accepting. If the people desired total prohibition, he was willing to abide by their decision.

At a time like the present, when all their spare money was needed for philanthropic purposes, the idea of the leader of the opposition to have prohibition while the war lasted, and then to let the people say whether or not they wished to continue prohibition was a good one. For himself, he had decided to touch neither liquor nor tobacco while the war lasted. It would be a good thing, he thought, for all citizens in the province to impose upon themselves some sacrifice at the present time.

Premier Roblin: "Perhaps you get yours paid for."

Opposition cries of "Oh, oh."

Mr. Malcolm: "Thank you. That is a very gentlemanly remark. I don't

have to have it paid for. I can pay for it."

Mr. Norris—"I don't think we need slurs of that kind from the first minister."

Hot Controversy.

At this point a hot controversy arose as to the right of Mr. Norris to continue the debate on Dr. Thornton's amendment to Mr. Taylor's amendment.

Mr. Norris rose to speak, but was immediately interrupted by Mr. Speaker, who said that he could not permit Mr. Norris to speak if anyone objected to his doing so, as the leader of the opposition had already spoken in the debate.

Premier Roblin—"I desire you to enforce the rules of the house, Mr. Speaker."

Several of the Liberal members expressed astonishment at Mr. Speaker's ruling, and Dr. Thornton quoted a rule which in his opinion gave Mr. Norris an undoubted right to speak.

Mr. Johnson—"If you, Mr. Speaker, decide to regard the debate as a whole, surely the leader of the opposition has the right to close the debate."

Mr. Speaker—"Not now, if any member objects."

Mr. Breakey believed the time had arrived when every father in the house would be driven to support prohibition. He was in favor of submitting a bill calling for total prohibition by way of the referendum as far as the province had power to do so. He was sat-

ished the time had arrived in
toba when the people must rule.

On being put to the vote Dr. T
ton's amendment to the amen
was lost by 24 to 20. The amen
of Mr. Taylor was then carried
to 20, Hon. George Lawrence h
entered the house in the meant

Debate on Address Resumed

The debate on the address was
tinued by Valentine Winkler, M

and Rhineland. Mr. Winkler said that the exiguous nature of the address must be his excuse for departing from it. The patriotic utterance of Mr. Foley had greatly pleased him and he wished the speech could be delivered to the soldiers. In his opinion it was fortunate that a Liberal government was in power in the Old Country when the war broke out. It had stopped short only of principle and honor in its endeavor to prevent a conflict.

Mr. Winkler thought he was the only member of the legislature who was wholly of German descent, except perhaps his honorable friend the premier, who was wont to boast to German audiences at election times that he was of German descent. (Laughter). He, the speaker, was proud of his German ancestry. In the way of science, art, literature and manufacturing the German people has achieved great distinction.

"But I am not proud of German militarism," said Mr. Winkler, amidst cheers. "My forefathers left Germany almost one hundred years ago and came to this country to avoid the militarism that existed at home. Mr. Winkler said he had conversed with a great many Germans since the war broke out and he had yet to find one who would wish to transplant German institutions to this country in place of British institutions. As far as the German people of Manitoba were concerned they were loyal to King and Empire."

Mr. Winkler said he had listened with much interest to the speech of Mr. Ray upon the north country. That speech strengthened the Liberal argument that the natural resources of the province should be handed over to the province.

Many More Liberals.

Referring to the election of last July Mr. Winkler said Mr. Speaker would see many more faces on the Liberal side of the house. The opposition felt that it had a mandate from the people behind it. The Liberals had come back to the house in strength in spite of having to face a diabolical machine.

In Morden and Rhineland the government had foisted a candidate upon the people simply because it was necessary to have a candidate with money. Roads, railroads and many other things had been promised. Early in the contest he was confronted on the platform by the statement that the constituency had already received \$7,000. Councillors claimed to have received sums of money. Certainly the money they were spending to secure the return of the government candidate did not come out of their own pockets.

No less a person than Hon. Robert Rogers had come down to his constituency in a private car and in one district the federal minister of public works had promised a railroad. The member for Manitou had been there also, and had told them he would use whatever influence he possessed if the vote went favorably to the government. Even the premier had been down and bunches of 25 or 50 railroad tickets had been given away to get good attendances at political meetings.

Turning to the The Pas election, Mr. Winkler said it appeared that certain honest and respectable citizens of the province could not get across The Pas bridge because they were not Indians. (Laughter). The attorney-general and the provincial secretary were there to keep them back.

Mr. Howden—"I never went across the bridge."

"Well, others had gone across," said Mr. Winkler. "The member for Morris had crossed and the member for Ste. dyre, and the member for Iberville." Mr. Parent—"I was at the The Pas, but I never went across the bridge. (Laughter and cheers on both sides of the house).

Mr. Hamelin—"I was at The Pas, but I never went across the bridge." (Laughter).

Class by Themselves.

Mr. Winkler—"I think these men must be a class of Indian by themselves." (Loud laughter). We know the attorney-general wouldn't allow the leader of the opposition to go across the bridge."

Mr. Howden—"I deny that. He went across the bridge to the other side and came back."

Premier Roblin—"Is it true that every person going across was searched for whiskey?"

Mr. Johnson—"Ask your own employees."

Premier Roblin—"There weren't any there." (Cries of "Oh! Oh!")

Mr. Winkler said that someone was up there to prevent people crossing. Whoever that was must have had the authority of the department of justice. Of all British institutions respect for the administration of justice should be greatest. What was the use of sending men to shed their blood for justice on European battlefields when justice was being flouted at home. (Cheers.)

Coldwell Amendments Fathomless.

Mr. Winkler urged upon the minister of agriculture the necessity of providing cheap money for the farmers. He also said that if the government were ready to bring forward legislation which they thought was approved by the people, the opposition would be only too pleased to assist them in every way. But if they thought the opposition would help them to keep the Coldwell amendments where they were, they would find themselves mistaken. They could not get to the bottom of the Coldwell amendments. The minister of education could not manage that himself. Apparently nobody could. The one thing the government could get to the bottom of was the treasury. (Laughter.)

W. L. Parrish (Winnipeg South) said that it was the platform of the Liberal party which had been responsible for his return to parliament. The questions of compulsory education and hash-the-bar had led to his election and those of his colleagues. He felt that the mandate from the people demanded that the business of the province should be conducted in a more business-like manner. He thought that it was nothing but a poor keeping of books which resulted in the assertion that it would cost \$25,000 to produce what the members had asked for.

Here the minister of public works interrupted to say that no business house could produce them in the way the speaker thought.

Duty to Home.

They all felt they had a duty toward the empire, but they had also a duty at home, which was not incompatible with the other. He thought that the government had not made the best deal possible with regard to the elevators. The government should encourage mixed farming in all ways possible. Manitoba was selling, he had been told, \$300,000 worth of hogs per week.

Mr. Parrish mentioned a case in which the Motor league had become interested, and complained that the government had required \$200 from the league before it would secure the arrest of a motor thief who had decamped to the United States.

Hon. J. H. Howden denied the statement, and gave the government side of the question.

The speaker also referred to the moratorium, and thought it ought to be extended for six months more; but Mr. Rodmond Roblin explained that unless it was repealed the moratorium stood in the statute books.

Mr. Johnson Stirrs House.

T. H. Johnson made a stirring speech half of which was an eloquent declaration of loyalty to the empire and an exposition of the principles of the em-

pire, and the other half devoted to a searching and scathing denunciation of the government's record. Mr. Johnson stated that he agreed with everything that had been said with a view of inspiring patriotic sentiment. On that subject there were no two opinions in the province of Manitoba today. Without distinction, of party, without distinction almost of national origin, one and all responded to the situation in appropriate fashion.

Naturalized British subjects had come to the country for the purpose of improving their condition, of sharing the benefits of the citizenship that the people of this country enjoyed. Those who were naturalized British subjects claimed every privilege that came with British citizenship. They came to Canada for the purpose of merging in the nationality which was being developed in this country at the present time the best which was to be found in the nationalities from which they came.

Bound by Strongest Ties.

The British empire was constituted in a peculiar way, and was not bound together in the way many empires had been, but by the stronger tie of human liberty. The war had brought out the best that all the nations of the empire had to give to her.

Only One Result.

Speaking of the result of the war, Mr. Johnson said there could be no two notions as to that. There could be only one result. Right was strong, and was bound to triumph. After this war he hoped that war would be made impossible for ever (applause). If that were so, the blood and treasure had been well spent.

A great war was on, but there was the duty before that house of attending to its regular business. We have had it held out to us this time that we ought to let the government alone. "Please don't bother us while we are in charge of the treasury. Please do not ask so many questions. Please do not remind us that we are a minority government." This was the way the government were talking. The government had given help to the British government, and the opposition had supported them in this, as in the small donation they had made to the Belgian Relief fund. At the war session it was actually proposed to prorogue without making any grant to the government.

The Real Cause.

The real cause for calling that special war session was the fact that the treasury was depleted by the bad management of the affairs of the province. Then the government wanted to make out that this present session was also a war session. They wanted to capitalize the war and hide their misdeeds behind the plea of patriotism. Hon. Dr. Montague had indignantly denied that any charge could be laid against him of wrongful expenditure of public money. He must have a short memory, for he, Mr. Johnson, had definitely charged him, in a charge made up of nine counts, of wrongful expenditure of \$93,000. Notwithstanding this, the honorable gentleman opposite had denied them an investigation.

Mr. Johnson went on to speak of the financial stress resulting from the war, and stated that no one had contributed to that panic as had the government of Manitoba. Notwithstanding that the

house had voted \$2,500,000 for parliament buildings and that there was supposed to be \$1,000,000 in the treasury for good roads, yet, when the war broke out all work stopped at once. This was supposed to be a government of surpluses. They were told of a surplus of \$7,000,000 yet when the war broke out there did not appear to be a dollar in the treasury.

Mr. Armstrong Interrupts.

Hon. Hugh Armstrong here interrupted and stated that, because the house had voted \$1,000,000 for good roads and about \$2,000,000 for public works, that did not say that they had those moneys in the treasury. Mr. Armstrong said that Mr. Johnson was misrepresenting the government, which the member for Centre Winnipeg denied.

Mr. Johnson asked: "But you had that \$1,000,000 in the treasury?"

Mr. Armstrong again denied this, and Mr. Johnson retorted: "We will go into that question later on."

The member for Centre Winnipeg spoke about the Redistribution act and made an effective contrast of the constituencies of Centre Winnipeg and Nelson and Churchill. Centre Winnipeg was the smallest constituency in the house but had the largest number of people in it. Grand Rapids was also a fortunate stroke for the government. That constituency had the same voting power in that house as his largely-peopled constituency. It took 45 men in Centre Winnipeg to compare with one man in Grand Rapids. Hon. Hugh Armstrong had the distinction of being the only member in the house who had run for two constituencies. It might be said that in the latter case it was a long distance run. Certainly it was a long distance from home. (Laughter.)

Attempt Failed Ignominiously.

Mr. Johnson, continuing, said that the government had tried to shuffle him out of his seat, but though he was 350 to the bad in new Centre Winnipeg the people of his old constituency had given him a majority of 1,400, leaving him a clear majority of 1,150. "This must look large to the minister of public works. (Laughter.) And even to the prime minister himself." (More laughter.) The speaker went on to describe the naturalization frauds in Centre Winnipeg and roused members to roars of laughter again and again.

Machine Blew Up.

Mr. Johnson recalled a few more of the coups attempted by the Roblin supporters, remarking that most of them ended in failure. After the exposure of the bogus naturalization frauds, the conspirators did not know how much more the Liberals knew. So the machine blew up, and some of the pieces had not been found yet. He attributed the victory of himself and his colleague in Centre Winnipeg to the vigilance and the enterprise of their constituents, which was a marvel considering the corrupt forces that were arrayed against them. On the side of the government were the "clubs of that class," the low hotels, the riff-raff of the city. However, the time was bound to come when the open connection of the government with that element would destroy any political value that element might once have had. Apparently the government had now come to realize this, considering

the way it was treating its former friends.

Illustrating some of the methods employed to defeat Mr. Dixon and himself, Mr. Johnson showed how the smallest and meanest hotels had registered the largest number of voters for the Roblin government. The Nugget hotel had registered an astonishing number, but it didn't vote them. There was a wonderfully large registration from 662 Main street, 686 Main street and 684 Main street. A little enquiry revealed that these addresses were those of the Bell, Savoy and Reno hotels respectively. It was usual to give the residence of the voter, but in these cases the numbers had been used to throw the Liberal investigators off the scent of the colossal plugging that was contemplated. On the list he noticed 71 men registered from 175 Logan avenue and 61 from 181 Logan avenue. Thinking these must be extraordinary houses to contain so many qualified voters, he looked them up. They proved to be the Coffee House and the Men's Own. He by no means suggested that these places should go in the same category with "clubs of that class." On the contrary, the managers of the places were Christian men, and had afforded the Liberals every facility to clean up the lists. With their assistance, it was found that out of the 71 men registered from the Coffee House, only 8 had ever been known or had ever stayed there. It was about the same with the Men's Own.

Was Himself Offered Ticket.

Continuing, the speaker said he could never express his appreciation of the manner in which the electors of Centre Winnipeg had taken hold of the situation in August, and fought their fight for justice, fair elections, and the rights that had been trampled on by hon. gentlemen opposite. The government workers had hired every auto they could lay their hands on to bring voters to the polls. He knew whereof he spoke, for actually a government worker had offered him a ticket good for \$35, if presented next day at a certain place, if he would lend his own car. This was on the morning of the election. He regretted that he was asleep at the switch and did not take the ticket that was offered to him; but he could have had it had he been smart enough; it was handed out at arm's length. What a contrast the friends of the other side presented? On election day 153 men of Winnipeg took out their own autos and employed them, without any fee or reward, in the Liberal behalf till the polls closed. If it were to be the last statement of his life, he would say that not one man was paid one cent for the use of a conveyance of any kind in Centre Winnipeg by himself or anyone representing him, either directly or indirectly.

If he allowed himself to be diverted from his duty to such constituents as that, he would, indeed, be wanting in the qualities of a faithful representative. But nothing should cause him to forget that it was his duty to lay bare those facts connected with the Roblin regime which had disgraced the province.

Speaking in lighter vein, Mr. Johnson said he regretted the first minister had not done him the honor to listen to his speech. This was something to

which he had become resigned in the last few years. However, he merely desired to present a little map, which he had drawn -himself, to the first minister. It was drawn in two colors, the red depicting that part of Centre Winnipeg which had voted Liberal and the blue that part which had voted Conservative. Only two little patches of blue there were. One, in the old constituency of West Winnipeg, represented a poll that had voted Conservative repeatedly. A personal friend of his, but a political friend of his opponents, had a tavern there. The poll always carried for the government, and it would have been a pity that such a small piece of consolation should be denied.

Sent Map to Premier.

Mr. Johnson sent the map to the premier by a messenger.

Proceeding, he said he agreed that at this time their first duty was to the empire, but he did not admit that they had no other duties. The opposition had the duty of making the government face certain unpleasant facts. First, they demanded a satisfactory explanation of why the government

broke down and ran on or about Aug. 4 last, instead of continuing business as usual. Next, they wanted the fullest and most complete disclosures of the facts in connection with the contract for the new parliament buildings—which had already exceeded the estimated cost by more than \$700,000 on the foundations alone. They would demand the fullest investigation into the naturalization frauds, with punishment for the culprits. When any body of men laid plans to steal our citizenship, which was more precious than our treasure, they should be punished. He was not condemning the government unheard; but simply served notice that facilities for a full and free investigation would be required. Later in the session, facts to serve as a preliminary base for that enquiry would be laid before the house.

A full investigation would be demanded into what, for lack of a better name, had come to be called The Pas election—although there was no election at all. Although the law of Manitoba said there should be free election, it was not free in The Pa, but

frustrated, one of the candidates disappearing and remaining hidden to this day. Statements in regard to this affair would be laid before the house in a constitutional manner, and an investigation must be held. No matter who they were, the wrongdoers had to be punished.

In the matter of the fair wage contract on the new parliament buildings, Mr. Dixon had showed that the contract had been broken and the men deprived of their just pay. It was necessary that restitution should be made to those men; the laborer was worthy of his hire.

"There must be redress for the unfair representation accorded to the people of the province in the last redistribution. The liquor traffic must be withdrawn from politics or pass out of existence. Autocracy in this province must be put down, and the legislature must see to it that the mandate given by the people in the general election becomes translated into law," declared the speaker, in a rousing peroration.

"Finally—and let the minister of

education hearken unto me—the people of the province declared emphatically on July 10 that real, genuine compulsory education is the mandate of the province, together with repeal of the Coldwell-amendments.”

“Which you voted for,” interjected Mr. Coldwell.

“This is not a time for quibbling,” said Mr. Johnson. “That matter will be discussed on a later occasion.”

Mr. Coldwell adjourned the debate.

Bills Introduced.

Numerous bills were introduced, and several received their second reading. When the law amendments committee meets next week it will have plenty to do.

Hon. Joseph Bernier withdrew three bills standing to his name—a bill to amend the Municipal Boundaries act, a bill to amend the Railway Taxation act, and a bill to amend the Good Roads act.

T. H. Johnson's bill to amend the School act by repealing the Coldwell amendments was down for second reading but was allowed to stand.