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A STUDY OF THE USE OF PLEBISCITES AND REFERENDUMS
BY THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

INTRODUCTION

On eight separate occasions in the eighty-five years since British Columbia became a province of Canada, the government of the day deemed it wise to seek direct electoral approval, either by plebiscite or referendum, before enacting legislation on issues involving woman's suffrage, daylight saving time, health insurance, and various aspects of the traffic in liquor. Yet the plebiscite and the referendum are foreign to the British system of representative, responsible government, which, by both the British North America Act, 1867, and the Constitution Act, the province of British Columbia is governed. Why the governments involved deemed it necessary, by using the plebiscite or referendum, to deviate from the usual legislative processes; what constitutional issues were involved in their use; and what advantages or defects their use brought to the enactment of
legislation constitute the problem of this thesis.

Before examining each plebiscite and referendum for the answers to this problem, it is necessary to briefly sketch their place in political theory, their definition and function, their merits and defects and their legal and political position in the framework of provincial legislative processes. As it is outside the scope of this paper, no attempt will be made here to trace the general history of their use by other countries or even by other provinces of Canada, except where such instances are useful in clarifying their employment in British Columbia.

The plebiscite and referendum, as used by British Columbia governments, are the instruments of the political practice known as direct democracy which originated with the progressive movements of the Western United States in the late nineteenth century. The guiding principle of this theory is the exercise of greater control by individual electors over the making and repealing of the laws by which they are governed. Its technique is the initiative, referendum and recall.

Defined in general, the initiative is a direct law-making process enabling electors popularly to initiate a law and secure its enactment by popular vote. The specific use of initiative is provided for by law, but it usually requires the signatures on petitions of a certain percentage of the electorate, before the proposed legislation is submitted to the whole electorate for its acceptance or rejection. If, on submission to the electorate the proposed legislation receives the approval
of the majority, it becomes law. The initiative is usually optional, that is, it is exercised by an individual or a group on his own or their own volition.

The referendum may be generally defined as a direct law-approving device by which a specific act is referred from a legislature, which has previously passed it, to the electorate for its approval or rejection. The specific use of a referendum is provided for by law, but it may be instituted by the legislature or by the electorate and may be either obligatory or optional. An obligatory referendum is one which by law is required to be submitted to the electorate on certain specified issues. An optional referendum is one submitted on the volition of the legislature to its electorate or requested by the electorate for such submission. As in the case of the initiative, a referendum popularly requested, must have the signature of a certain percentage of the electors before it will be submitted to the electorate for its approval or rejection.

The plebiscite is a vote of all the electors in a given area on some specific issue. It differs from the referendum in that a plebiscitory vote decides a specific question ad hoc and pro hac vice, whereas the referendum is a normal procedure of voting applied on a general system to certain classes of legislation. In other words, the plebiscite is an expression of the opinion of the electorate on a specific question and the legislature is not obligated to enact legislation in accordance with the verdict; whereas a referendum constitutes the expression of the electorate on certain legislation, which if
favoured must become law.

The recall logically rounds out the system of direct democracy. It may be defined as a device by which a certain percentage of the electorate may secure the recall or dismissal from office of an elected official whose conduct of office does not suit his electorate.13

Of these techniques of direct democracy only the referendum submitted on the volition of the government and the plebiscite have been used by the governments of British Columbia.14

The particular advantage of the referendum15 is that it permits the severance of specific issues from political parties and enables the electorate to reject them even though they may have been enacted by the political party which enjoys the support of a majority of the electorate. It is thus a convenient device from the viewpoint of both the elector and the political party for deciding contentious issues, which might because of their nature be avoided by the party, or, if made a subject of party politics, face the elector with the difficult situation of voting for an issue and against the party which otherwise represents his choice. On the theory that only the electors' direct vote can effectively commit the electors' consciences, the referendum has a unique advantage for all moral issues.

The chief disadvantage of the referendum is that it is open to emotional oratory and distortion or misrepresentation by interested parties, which may so confuse the electorate that it
may vote on the issue without being aware of its real merits or
demerits, and thus, no continuing party can be held responsible
for the consequences of the decision. Or as one critic of the
referendum states:

It asks an opinion from people whose prejudices or
emotions or passions are stirred up because an issue
is isolated, and whose judgment accordingly lacks
the soundness which usually comes during a general
election when governmental policy as a whole is under
consideration.16

The plebiscite also suffers from this defect, and from
the point of view of the electorate has the additional defect of
permitting the government to get rid of a contentious issue
without providing a solution for it.17 The government, after the
plebiscitory vote is taken, while responsible for the consequences
if it does, is nevertheless free to treat that vote as nothing
more than an expression of opinion and is under no legal obligation
to enact legislation on the issue. Such a device tends to breed
irresponsibility in a government for it enables the government to
make the subject of a plebiscite any issue upon which it does not
care to take a stand. However, the full effect of this defect is
somewhat tempered by the consideration that the electorate may tire
of a vacillating government which takes plebiscitory votes on
issues to evade legislating on them and retaliate by turning it
out of office at the next general election. It would also be
political folly for a government to discount a plebiscite supported
by a large majority.

Whatever their advantages or defects, the use of the
referendum or the plebiscite was not part of the scheme of
government envisioned by the Fathers of Confederation. They specifically vested the legislative powers exclusively in the federal and provincial legislatures, which were supreme within their assigned spheres. Yet the British North America Act, 1867, does not expressly forbid the use of the referendum, except for the specific provisions regarding money bills, as there are no provisions for the legislative procedure to be followed by the legislatures. This was not because the Fathers had no opinion as to what type of procedure should be used, but because they assumed that the vague phrase "with a Constitution similar in Principle to that of the United Kingdom" provided for the system of representative, responsible government and all the conventions of parliamentary procedures. The British practice of responsible government did not then and does not now include the use of the referendum or the plebiscite, though the United Kingdom parliament has unquestioned authority to institute a referendum by legislation. Whether or not their usage by the B.C. legislature is constitutional thus involves issues basic to the Canadian systems of government.

It is necessary here to distinguish the difference between constitutional in the legal sense and constitutional in the political sense. Legally, the term constitutional is used in reference to the formal document, that is, the British North America Act, 1867, its amendments, and judicial decisions referring to it, and is applied to those laws, passed by either the federal or provincial legislatures, the subjects of which fall within the powers of those legislatures as specified in the
said Act. The Courts, empowered to rule on the legal constitutionality of a federal or a provincial law, provide the safeguard for the written Constitution. Politically, the term constitutional is used in reference to the mass of unwritten conventions, which direct, no less than the Constitution itself, Canadian legislative processes. A law would be unconstitutional in this sense if it were contrary to the spirit or practice of one of these conventions. Public opinion, expressed by the voters on election day, provides the safeguard for these unwritten conventions.

This distinction is somewhat arbitrary and not at all clear-cut, but it must be made as the Courts are not empowered to rule on the political constitutionality of a law. This difficulty was especially apparent on the two occasions when the Courts had to rule on laws involving the referendum.

In 1916, Manitoba embarked on a scheme of direct democracy as provided for in an act intituled "The Initiative and Referendum Act," (6Geo5), c. 59, Manitoba. It provided that qualified voters totalling eight per cent. of those who voted at the previous general election could petition the government to submit a proposed act to the electorate at the next general election; or that five per cent. could have an act passed by the legislature submitted within ninety days of its passage to the electorate for its approval or rejection. Any proposed law so submitted to the electorate and approved by the required majority, had to be enacted by the legislature at the next
session without amendment; or any law referred to the people and rejected by the required majority was considered repealed thirty days after the announcement of the result of the votes was recorded in the Manitoba Gazette. Because this Act would have deprived the Lieutenant-Governor of his constitutional right to assent to or veto legislation, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council ruled it was *ultra vires* of the Manitoba Legislature:

Their Lordships are of the opinion that the language of the Act cannot be construed otherwise than as intended seriously to affect the position of the Lieutenant-Governor as an integral part of the Legislature, and to detract from rights which are important in the legal theory of that position.

The Privy Council also dealt with the broader aspects of the case and ventured to state its opinion, without deciding the point, as to the political constitutionality of the Act:

Section 92 of the Act of 1867 entrusts the legislative power in a Province to its Legislature and to that body only. No doubt a body with a power of legislation of the subjects entrusted to it so ample as that enjoyed by a Provincial Legislature in Canada could, by preserving its own capacity intact, seek the assistance of subordinate agencies, but it does not follow that it can create and endow with its own capacity that new legislative power not created by the Act to which it owes its own existence.

However, another interpretation was expressed by the Privy Council three years later when it discussed the political constitutionality of the "Direct Legislation Act" in the case *Rex vs. Nat Bell Liquors*. In 1915, under the terms of the Direct Legislation Act, an act prohibiting the traffic in
liquor for general consumption was popularly initiated and subsequently approved when submitted to the electorate. Nat Bell Liquors, Ltd., charged with an infraction of the said Liquor Act, as part of their defence stated that as the Act was not "exclusively" made by the Legislature, which was according to the Constitution, exclusively empowered to make laws, but partly also by the people, it was therefore ultra vires. The Privy Council rejected this interpretation, stating instead that:

On the first point it is clear that the word "exclusively" in s. 92 of the British North America Act means exclusively of an other Legislature, and not exclusively of an other volition than that of the Provincial Legislature itself. A law is made by the Provincial Legislature when it has received royal assent duly signified by the Lieutenant-Governor on behalf of His Majesty. Such was the case with the Act in question. It is impossible to say that it was not an Act of the Legislature and it is none the less a statute because it was the statutory duty of the Legislature to pass it. If the deference to the will of the people, which is involved in adopting without material alteration a measure of which the people has approved, were held to prevent it from being a competent Act, it would seem to follow that the Legislature would only be truly competent to legislate either in defiance of the popular will or on subjects upon which the people is either wholly ignorant or wholly indifferent. If the distinction lies in the fact that the will of the people has been ascertained under an Act which enables a single project of law to be voted on in the form of a Bill, instead of under an Act which, by regulation general election, enables numerous measures to be recommended simultaneously to the electors, it would appear that the Legislature is competent to vote as its members may be pledged to vote individually and in accordance with what is called an electoral "mandate," but is incompetent to vote in accordance with the people's wishes expressed in any other form.
As to the constitutionality of the referendum it appears from these decisions to depend on whether or not the provisions of the law itself interfere formally with the legislative processes. In neither of these cases did the Privy Council decide the point as to whether the principle of the referendum was *per se* inimical to the scheme of responsible government. Such a decision would require the consideration of political aspects and the court is empowered only to decide upon the legal aspects of a case.

The opposing opinions of the two sets of judges\(^3\) as to the political constitutionality of the referendum, leaves its position within the legislative processes of Canada somewhat in doubt. Other opinions as to its constitutionality show a similar divirgence. Halsbury's Laws of England cautiously states the affirmative case:

> The power to create the system of initiative and referendum has received, indirectly, approval by the Privy Council and may be regarded as a matter of constitutional change or as a mere creation of a subordinate form of legislation.\(^3\)\(^9\)

The negative case is more strongly presented, with one critic emphatically stating that "the cabinet system cannot be driven in double harness with any form of the initiative and referendum, except to its hurt and detriment, if not to its ultimate confounding."\(^1\)\(^0\) This view is supported by W. B. Munro who insists that "it ought to be a self-evident proposition that their use on any considerable scale would inevitably weaken and demoralize the scheme of parliamentary government which Canada has inherited and developed." It is not indeed possible to
"drive in double harness responsible government and plebiscites of any sort without getting ditched" for a "ministry cannot serve two masters -- the legislative body insisting on one thing and the electorate requiring something different."\footnote{11}

As criticism has been based on the detrimental effects of the referendum and the plebiscite on responsible government, it is perhaps in order here to explain what the practice of responsible or cabinet government involves. First it is a system of government which is operated within the framework of political parties. They submit candidates to the electorate, which chooses from them its representatives,\footnote{22} and after a general election, the party which has obtained the majority of the seats in the legislature becomes the Government (Party) and its leader becomes the Prime Minister.\footnote{33} He in turn selects the other ministers and they together constitute the unofficial executive or Cabinet. The Cabinet conducts public policy through legislation which must receive the approval of a majority of the legislature or it must submit itself to a new general election.\footnote{44} The executive is therefore responsible to its legislature for every act in its name. Under this system of government the electorate possesses final authority over legislation for should the legislature enact legislation inimical to a majority of the voters, the electorate may express its disapproval at the next general election by replacing the Government with a new set of legislators.
This replacement is made possible by the existence of an Opposition (Party). The Opposition provides a check to the Government's arbitrary use of power as it is not only an ever-present critic of Government policies, but it is also an ever-present alternative to the Government should a majority of the people concur in this criticism. Without an Opposition, cabinet government would not in fact be democratic at all, as there would be no focus for people's discontent and no practical alternative to the Government.

Only on election day does the electorate exercise its authority over legislation, when it chooses its representatives to exercise that authority for them in between elections. In other words, the electorate does not constitute a law-making body outside of and separate from its legislature. "Accordingly, in electing representatives, the voter has to express a double choice in a single action -- designation of the politicians who will constitute the legislature as well as approval of the policies in dispute at the moment of the election." The plebiscite and the referendum, which are devices for seeking direct electoral approval on specific issues or legislation are therefore not part of the system of representative, responsible government and in the eyes of their critics are positively inimical to it.

As can be seen, the absence of direct democracy techniques in representative, responsible government is, by implication, compensated for by the alternation of Government
and Opposition, which gives practical effect to the theory that sovereignty resides in the people. A literal substitute for initiative and referendum for these issues which neither the Government nor the Opposition is prepared to include in their legislative programmes, is provided for by Private Member's Bills. A private bill is introduced by a Member's petition and though the Member concerned may belong to the Government, the latter is in no way responsible for the bill as there are no party connotations at any of its legislative stages. Should public reaction appear favourable to a Private Member's Bill, the Government usually will assume responsibility for it by making it a public bill. Even if rejected, the Private Member's Bill provides a "useful opportunity for ventilating ideas and preparing the public or official mind for reforms" not on the Government or Opposition's programmes. As well as being used for initiatory purposes, the private bill is equally useful for those subjects for which the referendum is particularly suited, that is, issues of conscience where the "matters are small matters but the issues are great issues." In other words, while the subject ought not to affect the fate of the Government, it merits legislation.

Governments of British Columbia have twice resorted to the referendum and six times to the plebiscite despite doubts existing as to their constitutionality and the existence of the Private Member's Bill. The following chapters will contain an analysis of each of these uses in an attempt to find out why the government involved considered their use necessary and whether
their employment justified the plaudits claimed by their admirers or produced the calamities threatened by their detractors.
Regulation of the liquor traffic was the first issue to become the subject of a plebiscite in British Columbia. Neither the issue nor the plebiscite on it was unique to British Columbia. From earliest colonial days, regulation of the liquor traffic has been a contentious issue in Canada. First colonial, then federal and provincial governments have all been faced with the difficult problem. They somehow had to provide legislation acceptable to their electorates whose opinions have over the years run the gamut from complete freedom to total prohibition of the traffic and varying degrees of control in between the two extremes. To meet the fluctuating demands the various governments have at different times tried numerous types of licensed retail liquor outlets, regulated hours of sale, local option for municipalities, intraprovincial prohibition, restricted sale of liquors, and government sale of liquors. By their very nature, regulatory liquor laws are not effectively enforceable unless supported by a large majority of those affected. Both federal and provincial governments have therefore frequently sought to gauge public opinion by means of a plebiscitory vote before
legislating on the liquor question.

The early colonists realized that liquor facilitated the fur trade with the Indians and so bartered it for furs. The resulting demoralization of the Indians led Louis XIV in 1657 to issue an edict banning this practice. The edict found little support in the colonies and the traffic continued. Alarmed by its effect on the Indians, Bishop Laval threatened to impose the penalty of excommunication on anyone conducting the trade. However neither state fines nor church sanctions were enforceable and the trade persisted unabated. By 1666, all restrictions from the liquor traffic were removed and it continued without state or church restrictions until 1774, when the Imperial Parliament imposed a license system on the British North American colonies on retail sale of liquor and retail outlets. Between then and confederation only two changes were made in the system: prohibition of sale of liquor to Indians and local option for the counties, cities, towns, townships and villages of Quebec and Ontario.

The first attempt to regulate the consumption of and sale of liquor to non-Indians was the result of reaction against their somewhat excessive drinking habits. Conditions in colonial Canada were conducive to heavy drinking and habitual use of liquor was both customary and socially acceptable. Most of the settlers lived in isolated areas free from the restrictions of society and many brought a taste for drinking from their mother country. Children born in these areas accepted habitual use of
liquor, as they were brought up with it. The social structure of colonial society encouraged it as backswodmen relied on their neighbours to help with clearing their land and constructing their buildings and freely flowing liquor was the inducement to help in these "clearing and building bees." Weddings, wakes and all social events relieved the monotony of hardships, frequent disappointments and loneliness of pioneer life and were regarded as occasions for conviviality. Even religious meetings were not free from intoxicated persons as liquor circulated liberally whenever and wherever men gathered. Added to its social acceptability was its cheapness and easy accessibility. Besides numerous inns, taverns and grocery stores where liquor was sold, many farmers distilled their own whiskey and sold the surplus.

In the communities, inns were the focus of all social affairs and served variously as dance halls, banquet halls and meeting places for various societies. All travelling circuses and plays were also held there. Prior to elections, they were used by candidates for "treating" practices. Under this system the candidate would buy liquor for the group then present. The practice was usually reciprocated by the others and the plentiful flow of drink provided usually resulted in drunkenness and frequently in brawls and fights, sometimes with fatal results. Brawls and accidents resulting in death and injuries were the too frequent outcome of excessive drinking. Loss of man hours and wages and incurrence of debts were other results deplored by the critics of uncontrolled imbibing. Reaction against such conditions took concrete form with the growth of
temperance societies in Montreal and Halifax in 1828 and in Toronto in 1831. The emphasis of these societies was on individual reform with the object of producing temperate drinking habits. A typical pledge was "That no member should be able to drink more than a pint of liquor in one day."

The first fraternal temperance society, the "Sons of Temperance" appeared in the Canadian colonies in the late 1840's with the aim of producing total abstinence from drinking through educating members and non-members on the evil results of alcohol consumption. Within the next decade the "Sons" concluded that an abstinence campaign was ineffective in the face of easy accessibility of liquor and so passed a resolution asking for legal prohibition of the traffic in and manufacture of liquor. Other temperance societies with the same objective made their appearance in the 1850's. They were joined by women with the organization of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (W.C.T.U.) in 1874.

One of the fields the W.C.T.U. entered was public education. The Maritimes division pressed for and got abstinence taught in the primary schools and in high schools and normal schools, it ranked as an examination subject. In Ontario, after an intensive campaign it was taught in the primary schools. The rising generation was being shown a different aspect of the liquor question from that of the backwoodsmen's outlook. Habitual drinking, not only excessive drinking, was becoming socially unacceptable.
The change in outlook was first reflected in the legislature of New Brunswick, which passed a prohibitory law in 1856. The law was in advance of general opinion and so proved both difficult and costly to enforce. Thus Governor Manners-Sutton asked for dissolution of the legislature over the question. The cabinet balked at the move and resigned rather than authorize it. A new cabinet favoured repeal of the legislation and it was immediately carried out.

The federal government was also affected by the activities of the temperance groups and in 1874, appointed a Royal Commission to probe the whole liquor question with special emphasis on the operation of prohibitory laws and licensing systems of the United States. The Commission duly reported on its investigations but made no specific recommendations. However, as a result of the report the Senate adopted a resolution 25/17 in favour of the principle of prohibition. The House of Commons sitting in Committee of the Whole House, passed a resolution favouring prohibition in principle but decided to wait until public opinion would "efficiently sustain stringent measures to promote such legislation as 'would' prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquor so far as the same" was "within the competency of the House."

The temperance societies were disappointed at the results and doubled their efforts to increase favourable public opinion. In February, 1876, all the provinces sent delegates to Montreal in order to form a united front to promote prohibition.
laws. An executive body was formed to direct the efforts of all the various temperance groups to put into effect the following resolution:

That in order that a prohibitory law when passed, may have the sympathy and support so indispensably necessary to its success, it is the opinion of this convention that the Dominion Parliament should be urged to enact such a law, subject to ratification by popular vote.68

When confronted with the resolution Prime Minister Alexander Mackenzie expressed a doubt as to the constitutionality of such a procedure and felt that public opinion was not then sufficient to support prohibition.

Two years later the attitude of the federal government changed and Senator Scott introduced the Canada Temperance Act to the Senate on behalf of the government.69 It was actually an enlargement of the Dunkin Act and provided a system of local option for the cities and counties of the Dominion. It required that a petition be signed by one-quarter of the electors before a plebiscitory vote was taken on the question of local option. If it passed it could not be revoked for three years and then only by a majority vote. The three-years clause also applied to a defeated measure.70

To the temperance societies, local option was just the first step towards their goal of prohibition, which they urged on the public through pamphlets, speeches and temperance plays and on parliament by largely signed petitions. However several suggested amendments presented by prohibition-favouring Members


of Parliament were defeated. These defeats only seemed to stimulate the societies to greater endeavours. They enlisted the support of Presbyterian and Methodist churches. The former, in General Assembly in 1888, sent a petition to parliament asking for prohibitory legislation. The latter, in General Conference in 1890, gave its support to the political platform of the Dominion Alliance: to give electoral support only to candidates who favoured prohibition and if neither party's candidate did so, to put up a candidate of their own. Neither the temperance societies nor their church supporters had any qualms about making liquor legislation a political issue.

The federal government felt it could no longer ignore the growing tide of prohibition sentiment and yet it was reluctant to legislate on the subject. In 1892, it attempted to resolve its dilemma by appointing a Royal Commission to investigate the whole liquor problem. To this Commission, church organizations and temperance societies submitted petitions and sent delegations expressing the need for and desirability of prohibition legislation. However, the majority of the Commission declined to agree with their claims and recommended reforms in the control of the liquor traffic, e.g., higher licence fees, permanent licences, fewer licences, registration and taxation of all persons engaged in the traffic and establishment of reformatories for the intemperate drinker. None of these reforms was implemented by the government.
Defeated again in their attempt to have the federal government effect prohibition, the temperance societies decided to concentrate their efforts in the individual provinces. The Manitoba Prohibitionary League was the first to attain results. It organized petitions to demand a plebiscite on the question of prohibition. The plebiscite was submitted to the electorate who approved it by a large majority. Similar plebiscites were held in Prince Edward Island, in 1893, and in Nova Scotia and Ontario in 1894. In each case, the government treated the plebiscite as an expression of opinion, which it was not bound to honour by legislation.

Thwarted by the provincial governments' refusal to legislate on the subject, the temperance societies once again appealed to the federal government. With an eye on the results of the provincial plebiscites, the government could not effectively argue that public opinion did not favour such legislation. However, it felt that as it had no mandate for prohibition legislation, and that it had not been an election issue, it was advisable to seek the opinion of the electorate by a plebiscite. The plebiscite was announced in September, 1898, and the vote was taken three weeks later. It was approved by a majority in every province except Quebec which rejected it.

The effective operation of a prohibition law depended upon a large degree of support from the public and the government felt that the 51.8 per cent who expressed their approval did not constitute an effective majority. As Prime Minister Laurier,
speaking on behalf of the government, stated:

The expression of public opinion at the polls in favour of prohibition did not justify the introduction by the Government of a prohibitionary measure. 78

Disappointed by the federal government's attitude the temperance societies turned once again to the provincial field with the aim of achieving prohibition legislation. To keep the issue before the public they campaigned for and got a series of local option laws and licensing restrictions. It was at this stage of their campaign that British Columbia entered the picture. By 1907, 79 it was the only province that did not have restrictive liquor legislation and so the temperance societies organized an all-out campaign to place a local option law in its statute books.

The pattern of liquor consumption in British Columbia resembled that of the other Canadian provinces, but the attempts to alter it by restrictive legislation had not met with the same success. 80 The province was younger than its eastern counterparts and the reaction to excessive drinking was, until the 1900's, not strong enough to be reflected in legislation. A large percentage of the men were employed in isolated occupations, e.g., trapping, mining, lumbering and fishing, which were also seasonal in nature. They were therefore supplied with both the cash and the time for drinking bouts in between working seasons. Small towns close to the lumber camps and mining sites frequently had generous supplies of liquor outlets, both retail stores and saloons to cater to their tastes. 81 Greater Vancouver
also had its share of outlets and was the centre to which many men gravitated when they were not working. Notorious conditions characterized by brawls, "treating" and "rolling" of patrons for their payroll existed uncurbed by law.

There was a provision in the Licence Law which provided for Sunday closing of retail liquor outlets, but it was in practice a dead letter as travellers were allowed to purchase liquor and a three-mile walk qualified one as a traveller. Petitions of ratepayers against the issuance of licences were ignored as were petitions to give the municipalities the power to elect their own license commissioners. When Mayor A. I. Morley of Victoria asked the Premier for changes in the membership system of the licensing boards, he replied that such appointments were political and were considered the prerogative of the party. Liquor licences were in effect in the control of party machinery.

These were the conditions in existence when the temperance societies, under the leadership of the W.C.T.U. in 1907 began their militant campaign for a local option law. In November of the following year, a convention one hundred and twelve strong and representing almost every section of the province was held in Vancouver to organize the British Columbia Local Option League. The League sought to co-ordinate the activities of the various temperance societies and so produce a more effective campaign. By the beginning of 1909, they had organized fifty branches of the League and were busy collecting signatures for a petition on the question of local option.
The success of the League in collecting signatures for their petition began to worry the liquor interests of the province and they assembled in a convention at Victoria in January, 1909, to discuss what action was to be taken in the face of the League's campaign. The convention passed a resolution which it forwarded to the Premier, Richard McBride, with supporting telegrams to the effect that the legislature then in session make no changes in the Liquor License Act and stated "Furthermore that petitions having been presented to your Government asking for the passage of a Bill, in the opinion of this Association would be most unfair and unjust for this Government to deal with the vested rights of licensed property without first having been made an issue of the previous election in this Province. . . ." It also expressed doubt as to the validity of such petitions and asked that "the Government closely inspect the bona fides of these petitions."

The Local Option League continued to collect signatures for its petition and in February, 1909, Dr. Spencer, supported by a delegation of one hundred and fifty, presented Premier McBride with a petition signed by over 9,000 electors and a draft bill of the law the petition requested. Premier McBride told the delegation that although its petition represented a sizable proportion of the electorate, it did not represent the majority, and in view of the additional fact that the electorate had not expressed its opinion on the issue at the previous election, he had no mandate to enact such legislation. He would, however, not just ignore this petition but would make
it the subject of a plebiscite and let the electorate make the decision as to whether it desired such legislation. Further, he promised Spencer that he would give him adequate advance notice of such a plebiscite and consult him on the wording. McBride also expressed the desire to keep the issue free from party politics. The League was disappointed at its failure to secure a law, but accepted the government's proposed plebiscite with good grace.

The culmination of the League's campaign in the local option plebiscite came at an awkward time, as it coincided with McBride's negotiations concerning extension of the Canadian Northern Railway into B.C. and he decided to seek electoral approval of the proposed construction by holding a general election on the issue. To make the liquor question an issue at the same election would have confused the two issues and placed many of the electorate in the awkward position of choosing between a railroad and a saloon. To have ignored the League's petition and made a well-organized minority hostile to his government would have been politically unwise. To have held the plebiscite before the election and thus disposed of this issue before the railway issue, would have involved the government in the extra expense of using the electoral machinery twice in one year. McBride himself stated that the "object of having the Local Option question voted upon at the time of the General Election was to effect a saving of at least $40,000."
Dr. Spencer did not question McBride's motive of having the liquor question decided by plebiscite and began to prepare for the coming vote although he did not know its terms or date. The legislature did not so readily accept the proposed plebiscite and its Socialist member, Mr. Hawthornwaite, proposed further elucidation of the issue before the vote was taken. He asked that the government set up a Royal Commission to investigate the Gothenberg system. This system, under which the government appointed a manager for the saloon at a fixed salary and no commission from the sale of drink, had been credited with producing temperate drinking habits in Norway and Sweden. He doubted whether local option, which was really partial prohibition, could be effectively enforced and felt that the whole matter needed thorough investigation for "If such an inquiry as I suggest it will put the House and the people in possession of all the facts in this question and they will be in a better position to pronounce upon it." 

The resolution was greeted by applause and approved by a vote of 19/12 with all the Liberal members and two of the Conservatives voting against it. However, the Government decided not to act on the resolution, explaining that "the language of the resolution is not mandatory nor obligatory and so the matter has not been considered by the Government."

With the dismissal of consideration of the Gothenberg system, the liquor issue resolved around the proposed plebiscite and the pros and cons of a local option law. There was a great
deal of confusion over the issue as the government had not announced when the vote would be taken, what the wording of the plebiscite would be, what percentages of votes would be required to approve it or what action the government would take should the vote be favourable. McBride was repeatedly asked to clarify these points by announcing what the terms of the plebiscite would be and how the Government would regard a positive vote, but he carefully avoided making any statements of the Government's policy.

Early in May, E. B. Morgan, President of the B.C. Local Option League wrote to McBride asking for clarification of these questions in connection with the proposed plebiscite: (1) Is it intended to defer the taking of the plebiscite until the next Provincial Election? (2) Will the Government consider a majority of the vote taken, to be decisive either for or against local option? (3) If the plebiscite results in a vote favouring local option will the Government promise to bring in the necessary legislation?

McBride's reply was non-committal, and so on June 1 Morgan wrote again asking the Government to clarify its policy as a local option rally was being prepared in Vancouver and the League was anxious to tell the public what the plebiscite entailed. McBride again declined to state the Government's position and also rejected an invitation to speak at the rally.
When half of July passed, without any clarification of the proposed plebiscite, Morgan and Spencer sent a joint appeal and warning to McBride stating that:

The over sixty Local Option Leagues throughout the Province consisting of thousands of electors are anxiously awaiting the decision of the Government re the times and conditions of the promised plebiscite(sic)...we are much disappointed at having no information and ask that it may be given to us. We can assure you that, so far as we know the temperance and moral sense of the country, it is increasing volume against the Government's delay while at the same time liquor men rejoice and publicly boast of their influence with the Government on this question... Allow us also to state that the determination is pretty general that men pledged to the local option principle will be nominated in both political parties if the parties themselves do not do so... If you can say that the plebiscite(sic) vote will be taken at the next Provincial election (when that will be we do not ask) it would satisfy us at present.

McBride's reply was evasive, but he assured his enquirers that he "had no desire to prolong the uncertainty as to the date," but that he was then "not in a position to make a public announcement." He added the solicitous adjoinder that "ample time will be given between the announcement and the taking of the plebiscite."

The summer and fall passed without further enlightenment and it was not until October 19 that the Government broke its silence by announcing that both a general election and a plebiscite on local option would be held on November 25. Neither the terms nor the wording were given at this time. At once, Mr. H. H. Stevens of the Mount Pleasant Association of the
Local Option League asked McBride: "If the plebiscite carries will you submit at the next session a bill to meet the demands of the Electorate?" In reply McBride skillfully sidestepped the issue stating "...the Government is most sincere on the question of the plebiscite, with a view to carrying out the desire of the people of the Province in the matter."  

The announcement of the proposed plebiscite did not appear in the newspapers until November 14, but the Local Option League was informed only slightly in advance. The wording brought immediate protest from Dr. Spencer. The ballot read "plebiscite for local option" instead of "plebiscite for a local option law." "You will remember I drew your attention to the distinction when with you last week, and shall be greatly obliged if you will consider the matter from the point of view stated to the Honourable Provincial Secretary. As long as we understand the situation, it is alright but you will see there is a difference between a vote for a local option law and a vote for local option."  

McBride tried to allay Spencer’s fears by assuring him that "...it is the intention of the Government to treat the ballot in question as if the words 'local option law' were printed upon it." However, Spencer's fears that the wording would be misconstrued were realized in the propaganda campaign that followed the formal announcement:
The Real and True Meaning of the Plebiscite Vote....
the plebiscite is for Local Option -- It says so on
the ballot paper.... Local Option supporters say that
a Local Option law would "Give the right to every
municipality to vote for local control of the liquor
license system."....... This is NOT TRUE and they know
it, but are trying to DECEIVE YOU. A local option law
gives no power to control the liquor license system,
BUT ONLY the right, every three years, to vote whether
there are to be licenses for the next three years or
not. 104

Another point of contention was the manner of the vote.
McBride in his statement to the press announcing the plebiscite,
did not mention what size majority would be necessary to approve
the plebiscite. The Local Option League again took it upon
itself to ask the Government to explain this issue. However, no
reply was forthcoming from McBride and it was not until
November 2 that Bowser 105 undertook to explain the significance
of this point at an election rally:

If 50 per cent. of the voters who cast their votes
for candidates voted in favour of local option,
then the government would introduce legislation,
but the terms of the bill would be settled by the
legislature. 106

This explanation did not clarify the issue for many
and so the League again asked the Conservatives for further
enlightenment. Bowser, again speaking at an election rally
stated that:

It had been suggested by some, that 50 per cent. of
the names on the voter's list should be polled before
we could pass a bill. But the Government did not
think that was fair, because the voter's lists are
often padded.... On the other hand, some of the
temperance people suggested that 50 per cent. of those
who voted for it on election day should be sufficient
to carry it, but we hardly thought that fair either, as unless people who came to the poll voted on the question it would not show that they felt much interest in it, so that we decided it should require 50 per cent. of those who voted for the candidates to carry the plebiscite. If it is carried we shall bring in a Local Option law. Then, of course, the question arises as to what percentage of the vote of any community it shall require to make Local Option operative. That has not yet been decided. First we want to know the feeling for it as expressed in the vote next Thursday. In the Act it may by (sic) 50 per cent; it may be more or it may be less; but that will be given to the public in due time provided the plebiscite is carried in favor of Local Option.  

Both the leading political parties, the Conservatives and the Liberals, decided not to make local option a partisan measure, but to leave it up to the individual's conscience. The Trades and Labor Council of Vancouver concurred in this view and refused to consider the issue as a body.  

On the whole the local option campaign was conducted quietly with little newspaper comment or advertising. The railway policy was of overwhelming interest to the electorate and this plus the fact that the liquor issue was not discussed by the political candidates combined to make it a very minor concern. There were no extreme claims made by either its supporters or detractors. The latter published a few paid advertisements in newspapers just prior to the election claiming that should local option pass, property would be depreciated, investments lost, unemployment occur and illicit drinking result. They also doubted the rightness of coercion of one-half of the electorate by the other. The strongest newspaper support for the plebiscite came from the Vancouver World which featured both
favourable editorial support and the greatest amount of advertising space for the plebiscite.

Dr. Spencer spearheaded the campaign for local option making speeches to various clubs and local option rallies, writing letters to the editors of newspapers urging support for his cause and replying to those who had written attacking it. In his campaign he was supported by the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Catholic churches and also by the Canadian Northwest Association of Reformed Episcopal Churches. Despite his agreement in principle with McBride that the issue was best left free of party politics, he drew up a pledge urging the candidates to support the plebiscite:

Temperance people, wake up! The elections are announced for November 25. Nominations take place Nov. 11. The Plebiscite vote for a Local Option Law will take place at the same time as the election. Now is the time for church, temperance and moral people to wake up.

The Local Option League aims at giving the right to every citizen in B.C. to say "Yes," or "No" to the licensed liquor traffic. This must be done, first, by obtaining a local option law, and then by letting the people in each city, town or district put the same into operation if they desire to do so. It surely is the right of the people to say whether the liquor traffic shall be legalized or not. Therefore the coming Plebiscite vote will probably ask: Are you in favor of local option legislation? Your answer will be "Yes!" Is not this a fair proposition? The Plebiscite vote and the general elections are at hand. A full temperance vote on the first and the election of local option candidates are your responsibility.
If you are a voter and a temperance man, it is important you should get into the primaries and conventions of your own political party and see that local option candidates are nominated. Unless you do this, you simply play into the hands of the liquor men. We urge you, therefore, to take your place and part in your own political party and use your influence to get others to vote for this principle and for good men. If you claim not to be a party man, then consider under present circumstances that it is best to choose one or the other, in order to use your influence not for party reasons, but the public good. Many of our best citizens have left provincial politics alone, consequently, we are handicapped by the vote of liquor men and others, who want an open province... Get into the primaries and conventions, and vote as you pray. 111

The Local Option League, led by Dr. Spencer, held its final rally three days before the vote was taken. It was lightly attended. A speaker from Victoria 112 prophetically stated that he was "not very sanguine that local option would pass, but urged supporters to carry on education and agitation for local option if defeated." 113

The balloting took place on November 25, but the early returns did not disclose a decisive result. Local option appeared to have been approved:

The recount of the sixty ballot boxes was concluded this morning, and although the percentage of the plebiscite has not yet been ascertained, local option has obtained a majority of nearly 1000 votes and Dr. Spencer regards it as a virtual triumph for his cause. 114

Difficulties in collecting the ballots from outlying polls, working out the percentage and judging of spoiled ballots produced a long delay and the newly elected Conservative government announced that the results would not be known until the House
met in January. Indeed "Some of the poll officers have either failed entirely to turn in their reports or else have made them in such a manner as to confuse the returning officers." 115

The final results were announced on January 20, 1910. To Dr. Spencer's consternation local option failed by just over 500 votes of approval by the required majority. 116 A meeting of the League was called at once to discuss the results and comment on the manner in which the plebiscite vote had been conducted. Word of irregularities had reached Dr. Spencer from various sources but he had refrained from making any official protest until the results were known. 117 With the defeat of the plebiscite by so narrow a margin and in view of the many irregularities the League passed the following resolution on January 24:

Whereas the final account of the local option vote lacks about 500 votes, and that in 18 constituencies the majority was 4200 in favour of a Local Option law, and that 11 constituencies having reached the 50 per cent. demanded, with 536 votes to spare, and that in the other constituencies only 500 of a majority was obtained against local option, which gives 3695 majority for the whole province, be it resolved that this meeting, mostly of men, assembled in the City Hall, Vancouver, January 23, 1910, respectively, request the Vancouver members of the House of Assembly in session at Victoria, to appeal to the government for the enactment of a Local Option law, giving the right to the people in any municipality or district to decide for themselves the continuance or cessation of the licensed liquor traffic. 118

This resolution, plus a carefully tabulated account of the plebiscitory vote and a letter of explanation were sent by Spencer to McBride on January 25.
At the same time, Spencer announced that the Local Option League planned on holding a convention in Victoria on February 18 to discuss the plebiscite's results and asked permission to have a deputation wait on McBride at that time. McBride agreed to receive the deputation and Spencer began to organize his supporters to get as large a delegation as possible. Invitations were sent to all the various branches of the League, to churches of all denominations, the Independent Order of Good Templars, the Royal Templars of Temperance, and the Women's Christian Temperance Union. 119

Just prior to the convention, Morgan and Spencer made one more joint plea to McBride to consider passing a local option law, quoting the statistics of the voting to support their argument that the majority was sufficient to warrant such legislation. McBride made no comment to this appeal prior to the convention which took place on February 10. 120

The Convention placed the following resolution before McBride:

(1) Feb. 2, 1909: Presented the Government with petition containing 35,000 signatures asking for a Local Option law to be placed upon the Statute books and a deputation of 150 waited upon the Government on that date.

(2) Feb. 27: Premier replied to Spencer that the importance of the question demanded a further pronouncement by the electors and that resource(sic) would be had to a plebiscite - conditions of which would be subsequently communicated.
(3) All further enquiries elicited the reply that the Government was giving serious consideration to the matter and would "do everything possible to secure the wishes of the majority of the people."

(4) Oct. 26: Dr. Young advised the date of election and plebiscite vote. (Plebiscite vote was Government's idea alone.)

(5) Protest of form of ballot - words misleading.

(6) A statement of the votes.

(7) 18 constituencies had a favourable majority of 4200. 16 constituencies had a negative majority of 505. Local option had a net favourable majority of 3695.

(8) "This, in our estimation, is a clear intimation of the will of the people on this question, and we respectfully submit to the Government that such an expression of the will of the people is sufficient to be considered mandatory."

"Therefore we ask, as representing the majority of the electorate and the people of British Columbia, that a local option law be enacted." 121

McBride in his reply to Spencer carefully refrained from comment as to the validity of the League's claims, but noted that they "have received the most careful consideration." As to the request for a local option law, "The Executive Council after fully weighing the whole matter" was "unable to give any assurance that legislation on the lines requested" would "be introduced at the present Session." 122

The Local Option League was not the only one to question the plebiscite vote. Prior to the League's Convention the matter was discussed in the Legislature during the debate on the throne speech. Mr. Williams 123 opened with a critical statement on the government's failure to clarify the plebiscitory issue:
The Attorney-General seems to be unduly praised for the result of the Local Option vote. We are told that the reason why Local Option was defeated was because in rural districts the people were so satisfied with the way in which licenses were being conducted at the present time that they did not want any change... Local Option, I understand, dealt simply with municipalities, and had nothing to do with outlying districts, which were simply under the control of the Attorney-General.

The Attorney-General refuted this interpretation, saying, "It was clearly understood that if a Local Option law should be introduced it would apply to the whole Province and not to the municipalities alone. That was why all the people of the Province voted on it."

Mr. Williams then discussed the significance of this point. He had, he said, presented the plebiscite to his constituents as applying to municipalities alone "and they had voted under the impression that if Local Option were put in force in the municipalities it would drive the drink traffic into outlying districts which were under the control of the Attorney-General. Rather than do that they had decided they would not have Local Option at all. . . ."

Dr. McQuire attacked the terms of the plebiscite. He felt that the requirement of 50 per cent. of the votes cast at the polls for candidates, was a severe handicap and reminded the House that "... if you were to place in vogue in electing the Government of the day the principle on which the Local Option vote was taken, there would be some vacant seats in this House." He also questioned the honesty of the government's
handling of the plebiscite when some parts of B.C. received no ballots and in others voters had to ask for theirs. Further he challenged "that places that voted distinctly in favor of local option should not be deprived of the right to exercise it." 129

These arguments carried no more weight with the government than those of the Local Option League and so no Local Option bill was presented to the Legislature. Dr. Spencer, however, was not yet through with the issue. He asked the federal government to have the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, apply to B.C. and was able in June, 1910, to inform Premier McBride that:

...we have obtained an amendment to the Canada Temperance Act which makes it possible to apply that Act to British Columbia's cities and counties...and having failed to obtain the votes that your Government demanded of us, although we obtained a majority of upwards of 4,200, we had no alternative but to turn to the Dominion Parliament for assistance and the application of this non-political, non-partisan Act of Parliament, which is working so well in the Maritime Provinces. It would have been more to our liking if our own Government had given us a Local Option Law. 130

Thus, quickly and quietly, the federal government gave the people of B.C. a local option law, which years of petitions and a favourable plebiscite had not been able to extract from their provincial government.
McBride's decision to hold a plebiscite on local option seems at first glance to be quite justified. He had been approached by two groups bearing petitions with conflicting requests; the Vintners' Association opposing local option, the Local Option League demanding it. Both had a large following. In addition was the complication of the railway question. As McBride had deliberately made railway construction the issue upon which the election was being held, a plank in the same party platform on local option, may have presented the electorate with the dilemma of choosing between a railway or a saloon. Since he had no mandate to change the liquor laws during the last session before the election, a plebiscite seemed the logical way out of the difficulty.

In the event, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that McBride was motivated by political expediency, using the plebiscite to dispose of a hot issue rather than a sincere desire to let the electorate decide the question. The wording of the plebiscite was both obscure and confusing. As McBride never explained its terms, the electorate could not know precisely what it was voting for or against. Since he authorized the plebiscite by order-in-council, there was no discussion in the legislature to clarify the issue. Confusion was so widespread that even after the election a Conservative member complained in the legislature, that he did not understand what was to be decided at the polls. McBride's relations with the temperance organizations are also difficult to reconcile with political good faith. Despite his repeated promises to consult
them on the wording of the plebiscite and to give them adequate advance notice of the date of the vote, he failed to do either. The conduct of the polling casts even greater doubt on McBride's motives. The returning officers were given no instructions on the taking of the plebiscite vote and so each acted as he saw fit. As a result, many serious irregularities, including insufficient number of ballots, failure of each elector to receive a ballot, and failure to collect all ballots, were reported. Despite these irregularities, the existence of which McBride did not deny or deplore, the plebiscite received a favourable majority. Still the plebiscite was defeated as McBride announced that the majority was short by 629 votes. He demanded that the affirmative vote should equal a majority of all the votes polled in the general election despite the fact that the number of ballots distributed fell short of the number of electors. Petitions protesting the lack of clarity on the issue, the irregularities of the polling and requesting further government consideration of local option were brushed aside as McBride proclaimed he had to "obey the will of the people." Doubt exists even as to whether he was obeying this so-called will, as no official recording of the plebiscitary vote exists, although the returns of the general election held at the same time are fully recorded.\textsuperscript{132}
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE REFERENDUM, 1916

In British Columbia, unlike Great Britain and the United States, the first organization to interest itself in the enfranchisement of women, was not a suffrage group but the Women's Christian Temperance Union. So it was not as a part of an abstract political ideal that women's suffrage was first brought to the attention of the Legislative Assembly of B.C. In 1885, the Victoria branch of the W.C.T.U. presented the Legislature with a petition asking it to enfranchise women. The Union's immediate interest in woman suffrage was that it felt that once women had the vote, they would use it to abolish the liquor traffic. The delegation which accompanied the petition was politely received, respectfully listened to and sent away disappointed. The government of the day did not agree that women should have a direct hand in the affairs of the province.

Defeated in their first attempt to get the provincial franchise, the women were optimistic of ultimate victory. Women, married as well as single, had been granted the right to vote in municipal affairs some twelve years earlier. Surely success in one political sphere would be repeated in another.
Meanwhile more petitions and more delegations went to the Legislature, sent by W.C.T.U.'s of Vancouver and Victoria, and Local Councils of Women, during the 1880's and 1890's. The government did not, however, feel called upon to accede to the petitioners' requests, frequently giving as its reason for rejection, the excuse that women really did not want the vote as witnessed by the comparatively small number of signatures on the petitions. Petitions were not the only avenue of approach used, as Members of the Legislative Assembly were persuaded to introduce bills on the subject. From 1886 to 1899, eleven bills were introduced; none of which reached second reading.

Though these methods failed to achieve the goal, they did succeed in keeping the issue before the public. The women were still confident of success as during this period great gains were made in the local government sphere. By 1896, women with the necessary property qualifications or wives of men with same, could vote for their school trustees or present themselves as candidates for such offices.

After this success an inertia unaccountably set in. The movement lost its momentum and only two bills for provincial enfranchisement of women were introduced during the period from 1900-1910. They were crushed by the Conservative majority during the debate on the second reading. The only tangible gain during this period was the official support of the Local Council of Women of Victoria. This group was the first to suggest that a political equality club should be organized. The importance
of the suffrage issue was masked when supported as a secondary aim of other clubs. This suggestion was quickly acted upon and by November, 1910, the Political Equality League of Victoria was in operation.\textsuperscript{142}

A similar league was organized in Vancouver about a month later under a different impetus.\textsuperscript{143} Disgust at the manner in which the government had jokingly rejected a new Dower Act, which Vancouver Women's Clubs had petitioned for, was the decisive factor in bringing about a political equality league in Vancouver.\textsuperscript{144} Married women's rights as regards property, education, marriage and guardianship of children had no protection in law but were contingent upon the characters of their husbands. Under the then current law, wives could be deserted and left destitute; minors' estates belonged entirely to the father and even if he deserted his family he still had legal claim to the earnings of his minor children; in certain circumstances, a husband could collect and use his wife's income; he could will his property, even her dower away from her; and as sole guardian, he could will guardianship of children away from her and need not consult her on their education or marriage.\textsuperscript{145} The basic assumption of this law was that man was the natural protector of women and children and their rights should therefore be legally under his control. Unfortunately many cases\textsuperscript{146} were reported where men abused their superior legal status. The law did not leave women entirely defenceless. A woman could, for example, obtain a court injunction restraining her husband, if he had
deserted her, from acquiring the wages of their minor children. But this was not common knowledge and recourse to the law was an expensive process. Further, the dread fear of having their children willed away from their control, resulted in many women passively accepting abuse. It was with the hope of eliminating the worst of these anomalies, that the Vancouver Local Council of Women and the University Women's Club, petitioned Attorney-General Bowser to amend the Dower Act. Specifically they asked for a fairer law of inheritance; protection of dower; equal guardianship of children; widow to automatically become sole guardian; consent of both parents to marriage of minors; father not able to will children away from their mother; and deserted wife to have right to earnings of minor children without court order. Only the dower was considered out of the many requests, and Bowser was quick to point out that it was not a government bill and members could vote on it as their consciences dictated.

The pretence of a dower bill that was brought in in the waning hours of the session, though arousing violent opposition in the case of one or two members, furnished much merriment to the House, and the discussion was treated by the newspaper reporters with a facetiousness that was intended to make most amusing reading. By way of a joke the bill was even allowed to pass the second reading — with full understanding that it could not be passed.

One of the newspapers, however, did not consider the treatment of the dower bill a joking matter and contemptuously explained the reason why the bill was allowed to go to second reading:
Several members who voted for the second reading of this bill...did so with full knowledge that it could not be passed in view of time limitations. They desired to make themselves solid with a certain feminine element that has been active in urging the passage of this law...

What the government hoped to gain by deliberately insulting the best organized section of women in the province is not clear. The effect of its crude treatment was immediately noticeable as this group decided to go all out for the franchise:

Our women were intelligent enough to recognize at last the real value of their present influence with parliament, and that the dignity of citizenship alone will make their wishes carry weight in the legislative halls.

This resolve was realized when the Pioneer Political Equality League was organized in Vancouver in January, 1910, "with the express object of securing the franchise for women." It was followed in May, by a more ambitious scheme of organization when the B.C. Political Equality League was formed. This group had a membership of both men and women and was to be province-wide. It did not anticipate using the violent measures of the suffragists of the United States and Great Britain:

There is nothing of the "suffragette" in this sane and quiet movement that is taking place in our midst. It is rather the gradual outcome of thought and education amongst an admittedly intelligent, observant and progressive people.

The B.C. Political Equality League held its first convention on May 5, 1910, with Mayor Taylor of Vancouver presiding. The Mayor gave the opening address in which he wholeheartedly
gave his support to women's suffrage and promised to give it favourable coverage in the newspaper (Vancouver World) with which he was connected. Senator Gottrell of Washington State also spoke enthusiastically in favour of women's suffrage. During his address he described the struggle for the franchise in his state and pointed out that "You could not now find a politician who would not own he had voted for women's suffrage." However, it was Mrs. Gordon Grant, who voiced the basic need for women's suffrage in B.C.:

Women in British Columbia have got tired of going to the legislature and asking for amendments to the laws concerning them and being put off with polite assurances of consideration, which were forgotten as soon as the last "Good afternoon" had been spoken. In order to get needed legislation, they must have the vote.

All the suffrage societies felt that their greatest enemy was the inertia of the women themselves. In rejecting their petitions for suffrage, the governments charged that only the small percentage of women as represented by the suffrage societies actually wanted the vote, the greater number of women seeming to be indifferent to it. By lectures, pamphlets, plays and afternoon tea meetings, the suffrage societies would have to make these women aware of their inferior legal position and its deleterious effect upon their homes and families and finally be convinced that only with the vote in their hands could they ameliorate their situation. There were no groups organized to oppose the extension of the franchise to women. Men and women had to be convinced as individuals as to the wisdom of such a
between 1911 and 1916, delegations representing the various suffrage societies took largely signed petitions to the government at Victoria and were denied their request with monotonous regularity by the Conservative governments. They were graciously and smilingly bowed out with promises of consideration. But newspapers of those days said the petitions were tossed into the waste-paper basket, "unknelled, uncoffined and unsung." The Pioneer Equality League held public meetings admission free every Sunday in order to plead the cause of women's suffrage. Distinguished speakers sometimes addressed these meetings. Teas were held with the double purpose of propagandizing over the teacups and of raising funds for more extensive campaigning. During the winter months of 1910, '11 and '12, a series of law lectures open to the public and delivered by judges and barristers expounded different phases of the law as it affected women and children. They were the suffragette's answer to the sneering query "What good will it do for women to have the vote?"

One of the most telling devices used by the suffragettes to popularize their cause was the Mock Parliament. First used by Nellie McClung in her suffrage campaigns across the prairie provinces, these "all-female parliaments" would discuss extension of the franchise to men, read hugely signed petitions and then reject the proposal, giving for their reasons, the excuses that
they had been met with by anti-suffragists. These parliaments humorously, yet pointedly revealed to their audiences that "every argument for popular government and suffrage for men is an argument for women. Every sound reason against women voting would be an argument against men voting."  

Although rejecting the violent methods of the suffragists of the United States and the United Kingdom, preferring peaceably to educate the public on the reasonableness of their cause, the suffragettes of B.C. were affected by their more violent counterparts. The Vancouver and Victoria newspapers gave prominent, front page space to the arson and assault methods of the militant suffragists and these "unwomanly" acts were described by anti-suffragists as typical of the behaviour to expect should women be allowed to vote. Largely to counterattack this opinion, but also to reach a larger audience, the Vancouver Sun issued a special Women's edition on March 19, 1913. It was edited entirely by members of Vancouver women's clubs and discussed women's endeavours in the political, social, educational and cultural fields, describing the contributions made by them in social welfare work such as the children's hospital, the maternity ward, the unmarried mothers' home and the sailors' home. These were pioneer efforts in the realm of social welfare and had been undertaken voluntarily by various women's clubs. Such endeavours showed the women of B.C. to be responsible, active members of the community, willingly undertaking the duties of citizenship, but cut off from full participation by lack of the vote. They also indicated the need for social welfare legislation and pointed out...
that this was a field that men neglected and that women would consider their special charge when they secured the vote. The usual plea for political equality was a small part of the paper, the editors feeling that demonstrated ability to participate in citizenship was the most effective argument. 168

The reaction to this newspaper as judged by the letters to the editor was predominantly favourable. The idea of being able to reach a wider audience by newspaper than by public meetings, lectures and teas resulted in the Political Equality League's decision to publish its own newspaper. "The Pioneer" was "devoted to suffrage propaganda" and also covered "a broad field along other lines of Women's work." The first edition appeared on March 21, 1913, and sold well. 169

The need for a stepped-up campaign was quite obvious. On February 18, "a deputation representing the suffrage Societies waited upon Sir Richard McBride and presented to him a monster petition signed by 10,000 men and women of British Columbia, praying for a law enfranchising B.C. women." 170 McBride refused their request saying: "We see no reason for bringing forward a government measure to give votes to women." 171 This refusal the Political Equality League interpreted as indicating that the Government did not consider the representations made as strong enough. The League would therefore have to organize its supporters better and recruit new ones so that the next time a deputation waited on the premier, its demands would be backed up by an organization of many thousands of women, supported fully
by public opinion. To further its recruiting program, the League formed an Evening Work Committee.

The outbreak of World War I in 1914 coincided with the peak of suffrage activity, but rather than attempt to capitalize on their successful propaganda campaign, the suffrage societies ceased campaigning as such in order to participate in the war effort. The valuable contributions made by these efficient groups and their temporary abandonment of their own interests added a great number of supporters to their cause. However, the war also provided the Government with a new excuse for rejecting the extension of the vote to women "because the demand is uncertain and untimely." Yet even this excuse melted away when by 1917 the three prairie provinces granted suffrage to women on the same basis as men. In each of these provinces, the ballot was given by a Liberal Government. Especially in Manitoba was the influence of women felt in provincial politics. In 1914, Nellie McClung stumped the province urging on the electors the triple cause of prohibition, women's suffrage and a Liberal Government. The Conservatives retained office in the general election that year by a narrow margin of four, but were replaced the next year by a Liberal Government. The new Liberal premier, Mr. T. C. Norris, credited Nellie McClung with the success of the Liberals and gratefully, in return, extended the franchise to women.

The connection between the Liberal Party and women's suffrage was not lost on the women on B.C. and late in 1915,
The Women's Liberal Association was formed to help the Liberal Party defeat the Conservative Government. In the election that was soon to come, members of this Association electioneered actively for the first time in the history of the province.

By 1916, the Conservative Government's grasp of power had become exceedingly tenuous. The popularity which had swept it into office with an Opposition of only two in 1912, had been dissipated primarily by: failure to complete railway projects although enormous expenditures had been made on them; charges of corruption related to the railway construction and failure to alleviate the economic depression which began in the pre-war years. The Conservative Party was also weakened by internal strife and there were open breaches on the questions of railway policy and women's suffrage. McBride saved a split on the railway issue by resigning in 1915. His successor, Attorney-General Bowser was unable to resolve the suffrage question so smoothly. Early in the 1916 session of the Legislature, two Conservatives, mindful of the fate of the Manitoba Conservative Government who had refused to consider the issue, introduced a private bill extending the franchise to women. Premier Bowser was furious and after heated debate, wielded party discipline to defeat the measure. He was somewhat uneasy when three Conservatives voted in support of it. His excuse for opposing the bill was that he had one of his own pending on the issue. Since he had strenuously and emphatically opposed women's suffrage for years, the astonished members of the suffrage societies
wondered uneasily what his bill would provide. Bowser decided to divorce the suffrage question from party politics by making it the subject of a referendum plebiscite to be held at the same time as the general election later in the fall.182

The suffragists were not happy at Bowser's latest manoeuvre for various reasons. From the strategy angle, their whole campaign had been directed at women and Members of the Legislative Assembly and now the issue was to be decided by the male electorate and they had only a short time to convince it of the justice of their cause.183 Further they argued that "if a group could be enfranchised by plebiscite ...it or any other could be disenfranchised by the same irresponsible(sic) technique! the broad truth being that when any minority is excluded from the protection of a principle a break is made through which it or any other may be attacked."184 They protested vigorously to Bowser, who replied by amending the Elections Act 185 to admit the suffrage referendum. By the terms of the Women's Suffrage Referendum Act, a simple majority would decide the issue and the soldiers overseas would be allowed to vote on the question.186

The short campaign period was fully utilized by the suffragists to impress upon the voters by every means at their command, the justice of letting women vote. Besides speaking at election rallies, they held teas and garden parties and conducted drawing room meetings, addressed labour at the Labor Temple, organized telephone campaigns and distributed pamphlets
and circular letters. Many of them joined forces with the Liberal Party and spoke on their platforms urging the men to not only to approve suffrage, but also to return a Liberal Government. They pointed out that the Conservatives had passed no important domestic legislation during their long tenure in office. The Liberal leader, H. C. Brewster, on the other hand promised a bill providing for equal guardianship of children as well as one for women's suffrage should the referendum fail. Mr. Brewster hoped to capitalize on the suffrage issue and contemptuously attacked the Conservatives' referendum:

At this time, when every woman is putting her efforts and her work into assisting those at the front; when the women have done and are doing so grandly; at this time, when they have earned, even if they have not a natural right, a right to the ballot by their attention to the needs of the nation and by a knowledge of public affairs just as great as that of thousands of men, at this time, when it is more than ever unjust to keep them out of their full share in the management of affairs; at this time when their duties are multiplied, they are asked by a government which is not big enough to give them their rights as a matter of justice to go out and try to convert the male population to the point of giving them the franchise...

Another sign of repentance—or the despair of a drowning politician—was seen in Mr. Bowser's adoption of the referendum idea. He used it first for the purpose of shelving prohibition for the time, then adapted it to get rid of female suffrage...

The Conservative Party, while permitting suffragists to speak at its election rallies, theoretically took the position that the women's suffrage question was one in which the party was taking no part, "because it has been referred to the will of the
people, and the will of the people is law to the government." Yet Premier Browser, when the Liberals treated it as a political issue, felt no qualms about stating his own position unequivocally on the issue as he said that "the public life of the country... would not suffer by the women being co-electors with the men, and he felt they would raise the moral standard of the country." Warming to his subject he continued, "I therefore feel that when the time comes for the women to take part in public discussions and meetings, that (sic) we will have good order at the meetings and they will see that there will not be so much personal abuse as there has been in the campaign of 1916." 

On the whole the suffrage campaign was quietly conducted and lacked the bitterness and acrimony which marked the battles of the two organized factions of the concurrent prohibition campaign. This was partially due to the fact that the suffragists faced no organized opposition. No anti-suffragist groups appeared to oppose their claims and those newspapers which did not actively support the suffragists, tacitly did so by not opposing them in print. The letters to the editor were primarily concerned with the prohibition issue and party issues. Those on the suffrage question were rare and nearly always favourable. Long years of education by the suffrage groups had gradually succeeded in wearing away individual's prejudices on the issue. Still the old arguments against women's suffrage and their refutations were trotted out for the last time for the electors' examination. The two favourites were: that woman's place was in the home and that politics was too rough for
women. Against the former claim, the suffragists submitted that legislation affecting every aspect of the home was passed by legislatures in which they had no voice. The latter was countered by Reverend Principal Vance who declared that "if that is the case, in God's name, its (sic) time women got into politics." But none exposed the barrenness of the anti-suffragists' arguments so skillfully and wittily as Nellie McClung:

The arguments used as weapons in keeping the women out had been many and varied; and to the frail feminine mind, they seemed so diverse as to be contradictory. For example, it was claimed that that women if they had the ballot would become so enamoured with their new possession that they would forsake all other pursuits and duties in the following of politics and public life. Again, it was declared that women wouldn't use the vote if they did have it. It was argued that it would despoil domestic happiness because political disagreements would enter into the sanctuary of the home, and at the same time it was argued that women would have no mind of her own, in the matter, but would merely vote the way their husbands did."

To all this Mrs. McClung appealingly asked: "Were you men asked what you were going to do with the ballot when you got it? Wasn't it given to you merely because you were a human being and 21? You weren't asked whether you were intelligent moral or wise. Women were asking for the vote on the same basis. They want a voice in their own government because it is a sign of spiritual independence, a mark of individuality. They also want the ballot as a weapon with which to fight against the things that threaten home and children."
The poverty of the anti-suffragists arguments, the long years of intensive campaigning, the proven willingness of women to undertake civic duties together with their remarkable achievements in the war effort combined to ensure approval of the referendum. It was registered on election day when the male electorate agreed two-one that women should have the vote. Within a year a woman had secured a seat in the legislature and a position in the cabinet four years later, and the first of a series of acts dealing with social welfare had been placed on the statute books. The vote, so long in coming and so often despaired of, had not been attained in vain.

Premier Bowser's Conservative Government was the only one in Canada which felt that woman suffrage needed to be given direct approval by the electorate. All the other provincial Governments and the Dominion Government admitted women to the franchise on the same basis as men by acts of parliament. Bowser's decision to submit the decision is difficult to explain outside the context of political expediency. The issue was not, by 1916, highly controversial, there were no anti-suffrage organizations to appease and members of his own party had supported a woman's suffrage bill. Bowser's excuse that the issue should stand above politics was not even given lip service during the campaign by the Liberals, and Bowser himself and other Conservatives spoke publicly in favour of woman's suffrage. The issue could no longer be ignored because of the interest aroused by the recent triumphs of the suffragists in the prairie
provinces. The two by-elections of 1916, had revealed a sharp decline in the popularity of the Conservative Party and so Bowser could not afford to risk antagonizing the suffragist organizations to which many of the electorate belonged, by continuing openly to oppose woman's suffrage. Yet both he and his party were not in favour of woman's suffrage. Therefore, theoretically a referendum offered a solution as it permitted him to deal with the issue without either irritating the suffragists or committing his party. In the event, the referendum choice proved unwise as it defeated its own purpose. It aroused the hostility of the suffragist groups who felt that the referendum was being used to sidetrack the issue and disgusted by this tactic, campaigned actively for the Liberals. As the campaign progressed, opinion favourable to the issue became apparent, and thus more votes could be lost by being silent on the suffrage question than gained, so Bowser and other Conservatives ignored their own band and vociferously supported the referendum.
The contentious liquor regulation problem came to the fore again in 1916 and the Government decided, as it had in 1909 to seek the opinion of the electorate by a plebiscite. Since the 1909 plebiscite there had been several changes in the regulation of the traffic in liquor, all reflecting the growing prohibition sentiment. In 1910, Attorney-General Bowser introduced an amending and consolidating Liquor Act, which was to replace that of 1900. While introducing it, he described it as the "most potent measure for the elimination of drink evils possessed by any Canadian Province." The Act greatly enlarged the powers of the public in the vetoing of licenses. Unless petitioned by two-thirds of the residents within a radius of three miles, no license could be granted. There was also an increase in the number of requirements to be met before a license would be granted. The conviction of offenders was simplified. It now required only the sworn statement of the prosecutor that liquor was sold and was intoxicating to place the burden of proof of innocence upon the accused. Hours of sale in bars were further restricted. They were to be closed Saturday night at
eleven o'clock and not to be reopened until one o'clock Monday morning.205

Further restrictions of the sale of liquor in organized districts were made possible by an amendment in 1911 to the Municipal Clauses Act, by which municipalities were empowered to abolish saloon licenses and in future to grant licenses only to hotels.206 During the year 1913, a uniform closing hour of eleven o'clock on every night except Saturday when it was ten o'clock, with sales prohibited on Sunday, was imposed upon unorganized districts.207 These new regulations were "a result of Mr. Bowser's careful study of the law's (Liquor Act) operations" in such areas and "as many hotels had previously kept open all night, this meant a considerable advance."209

Clubs incorporated under the Benevolent Societies' Act or the Companies' Act210 were the next targets for restrictive measures of 1915. On May 16, Attorney-General Bowser cancelled the licenses of a number of such clubs "in pursuance of his policy of preventing evil-disposed people banding themselves behind the organization of clubs."211 The law would no longer tolerate the operation of liquor outlets disguised as clubs.212 These measures reflected the policy generally favoured by the Conservatives in Canada; that is, a policy of "restrictive liquor legislation along lines of stringent regulation but opposed to total Prohibition."213
The period from 1909-1916 also saw intensified action on the part of the prohibitionists. Defeat of the 1909 plebiscite had not in any way discouraged the temperance societies; in fact, it served as a spur. Prohibition, which had been the ultimate goal when they agitated for local option, now became the immediate objective. "Away with compromise," "absolute abolition," and "ironclad prohibition" were the rallying cries heard frequently and received willingly by the delegates of the B.C. Local Option League convention in 1911. Prohibition was to be popularized by meetings every Sunday and frequent public lectures on the effects of drinking. Petitioning the Government was an integral part of their campaign and so on February 13, 1912, a delegation presented Premier McBride with a petition praying for a municipal plebiscite law permitting the limitation of license, hours of sale and other limitations. In reply, McBride referred to the negative result of the 1909 plebiscite, and stated that the Government did not intend to pass a local option law, pointing out the restrictions on the sale of liquor recently enacted.

Undeterred by the implacable opposition of the Government to prohibitory legislation, the League expanded its activities. By meetings, public lectures, pamphlets and exhortations from the pulpit the League acquired new recruits and new supporters. The outbreak of war in 1914 produced a general sympathy towards reform movements and the cause of prohibition profited by it. The year 1915 marked a tremendous
upswing in the popularity of prohibition. In May, five hundred Vancouver businessmen attended a banquet at which total prohibition of the manufacture and sale of liquor in the Province was endorsed by a standing vote. This acted like a spur on other prohibition-minded groups and individuals and a series of resolutions requesting a referendum on wartime prohibition were passed at meetings in Victoria and Vancouver. In August a delegation of forty took part in a conference with Premier McBride and other members of his Government. The delegation asked for prohibition for the duration of the war without any recommendation for compensation to hotel owners. Some went further in their demands and asked not only that wartime prohibition be instituted, but that it should not be rescinded until a plebiscite was held on the issue, six months after the war's end. The delegation asked for an immediate reply so that it could report to the Provincial Prohibition Convention to be held later that month. At first McBride was noncommittal, promising consideration, yet pointing out that the "liquor business throughout the Province represented a very large investment and that the question of compensation was important." Finally, on August 23 McBride announced that "it has been decided, after careful deliberation, to submit the whole question to a plebiscite of the electorate."

The first Provincial Prohibition Convention considered the Premier's proposal and after much debate rejected it. In the first place the Convention, recalling earlier unsatisfactory
experiences, objected to an advisory plebiscite. Secondly, the Premier's proposal left unclarified the following points of contention: content of the plebiscite, date of the vote and the time when effect would be given to the vote if favourable. The Convention counter-proposed that the Government submit a bill, to be drawn up by one of the Convention's committees, to the electorate and, as the issue ought to be kept separate from party politics, that the vote should not be taken on the same day as a provincial general election, but on the earliest legal date. The proposal was drawn in the form of a resolution which was then submitted to the Premier. Until the Government chose to accede to these demands, the prohibitionists "were to bombard it with resolutions from no matter how small a meeting." Certain, however, that the Government would agree to fulfill the terms of its resolution, the Convention drew up a scheme for organization of the campaign for the proposed prohibition referendum and set up an initial organizational fund. On a high note of optimism, the Convention closed and the confident delegates returned to their respective homes to begin an all-out campaign against the "liquor interests."

The "liquor interests," an all-inclusive term used by the prohibitionists or "drys," to describe all anti-prohibitionists or "wets," did not sit idly by as passive witnesses to the growth of "dry" sentiment nor did they leave the claims of the prohibitionists' resolutions to the Government unchallenged. Delegations representing "wet" organizations were
sent to the Premier insisting that no major changes take place in liquor regulations without a plebiscite. In the summer of 1915, similar views were expressed to the Premier by a large delegation from both Vancouver and Victoria, who also argued that prohibition was a menace to investment and would stimulate crime as smuggling would not be considered immoral by the public. Their concluding argument in the case against prohibition was that it could not really be instituted as it was possible to import liquor manufactured in another province. No more willing to commit himself publicly to a policy recommended by the "wets" than he was to one endorsed by the "drys," McBride hedged by replying that the "question required consideration," but warned that "temperance sentiment was strong." His decision, announced later, revealed that a plebiscite on the liquor question would be held at some future date. This policy corresponded to the "wets'" demands while it annoyed the "drys."

After announcing that the plebiscite would be held, McBride was content to let the issue hang fire for months without further elucidation. During this period he was besieged with resolutions, delegations and petitions from both those favouring and those opposing prohibition. A delegation from the Prohibition Movement requesting an early plebiscite received no satisfaction from McBride nor did the delegation from the opposite camp, trying to get the Government to postpone all plebiscites until after the war.
Finally, after repeated appeals from the Prohibition Movement for a definite statement of policy McBride partially acquiesced by announcing the date of the plebiscite. Contrary to the expressed wishes of the prohibitionists, the next provincial election day was chosen "as the best date because of economy and of bringing out the largest and fairest vote." As this statement left the question as to the terms of submission still unanswered, a Prohibition deputation waited on McBride on November 11 and was promised a written statement on the matter. Meanwhile, the "wets" continued to marshal forces against the "drys" and plague the Premier with their demands. On November 26, a delegation presented McBride with a petition of 33,947 signatures requesting that no prohibitory legislation, referendum or plebiscite, be introduced for the duration of the war; that the principle of compensation be recognized and that no referendum be held except at a general election. Caught between the conflicting demands of the two groups, McBride stuck by his decision to hold the plebiscite on the same date as the general election, and remained silent as to its terms until his resignation of the premiership early in December.

The new premier, William J. Bowser, personally satisfied with the system of regulation then in force and underestimating both the urgency of the question and the depth of public feeling towards it, prepared for the new session of the Legislature without reference to the prohibition plebiscite. His immediate concern was to find seats for
three new Cabinet ministers, namely Hon. A. C. Flummerfelt, Hon. C. E. Tisdall, and Hon. Lorne A. Campbell at by-elections in Victoria, Vancouver and Rossland respectively. The Vancouver by-election was first and the Prohibition Movement, annoyed at Bowser's silence on the liquor issue, proclaimed that they would use it as a test of strength. They therefore actively campaigned against the Conservative candidate who was subsequently defeated. Bowser attributed the defeat partially to the "activities of the prohibitionists." Impressed by the strength of the prohibition sentiment at last, Bowser intervened during the Victoria by-election with a pledge of prohibition more or less along Manitoba lines and a referendum. The pledge, while not saving the Conservative candidate from defeat, bound Bowser to a policy of a plebiscitory referendum on liquor. On March 2, a Prohibition Bill with a referendum clause attached was promised in the Legislature. The announcement served to intensify the controversy over compensation. Opposed to the principle of compensation, the prohibitionists were pleased that the Government made no mention of it. The license-holders also interpreted the Government's silence on the issue as meaning no compensation. They responded by sending a delegation to the Premier with claims for compensation. They reminded Bowser that only a few years earlier his Liquor Act Amendments had involved them in heavy expenditures for fitting up their premises into hotels; and that many were still in debt for these improvements. To protect these claims, they formed a Workers' Equal Rights
Association and began to organize province-wide. Meanwhile many church congregations endorsed the Government's policy and sent resolutions requesting that the principle of compensation be denied. On May 4, a large Prohibition meeting in Victoria passed a unanimous resolution expressing appreciation and support of the Government's policy and also voicing opposition to compensation to the liquor vendors. Not to be outdone, on May 6, a delegation led by Lieutenant A. E. Tulk, Charles Wilson, Q. C., and others, representing the Merchants' Protective Association waited upon Premier Bowser to protest the policy of "non-compensation." This controversy, which raged all April and May and inundated the Premier with letters, resolutions, petitions and delegations, was carried to the newspapers which began to contain advertisements as to the merits and demerits of Prohibition.

In the meantime Bowser had the session of the Legislature extended in order to provide for legislation on the prohibition referendum and the soldiers' vote. Providing for facilities for the soldiers overseas to vote robbed the "wets" of one of their objections to a wartime plebiscite as they had contended that it was unfair to hold a plebiscite if the men overseas were unable to record their vote on the issue. Brewster challenged the legality of this extension and also the validity of legislation passed during it. While this contention did not confuse the referendum issue during the ensuing political campaign, it caused difficulty after the vote was taken.
The campaign on the liquor issue was a struggle between extremists. It was a battle royal conducted entirely in exclamation points, featuring wild and largely unsubstantiated charges and claims, fist fights at public meetings and indeed, everything but the voice of the moderates. The Prohibition Movement was determined to destroy for evermore the pernicious "liquor traffic," which it charged with "destroying homes, debasing citizenship, polluting politics, wronging childhood, degrading womanhood, commercializing debauchery and coining profit from causing human misery, sin, shame, want, insanity, sickness and death." Worse yet, the "Traitorous Traffic" asked the "loyal, right-loving citizens of B.C. to vote it the right to continue its humanity-cursing, nation-destroying work by voting against the B.C. Prohibition Act." The electorate was exhorted to "be British" and "follow the King" who had adopted prohibition for the duration of the war. Lloyd George's famous speech "We are fighting Germany, Austria and Drink, and as far as I can see, the greatest of these three deadly foes is Drink" was a particularly effective slogan used against the liquor traffic.246

Abolition of the liquor traffic would also save the people of B.C. millions of dollars and create employment as it would free capital then invested in the liquor trade and make it available for useful industry which would employ four times as many men as it then employed. Besides saving money for the people and thus improving their welfare, it was patriotic to vote
in favour of the referendum as much of "liquor's money" now "goes outside to German brewers and the whiskey ring of Britain and Canada, which has remorselessly sought to tighten its grip on the throat of the Empire in this time of national stress."
The voters were also warned not to be confused by the "Whiskey Combine" who argued that the B.C. Prohibition Act did not prohibit. Proof that it did rested in the fact that the "liquor interests" had opened their "boodle barrel" in a desperate attempt to defeat the referendum.247

To help impress the electorate with the evils of liquor consumption and the virtues of prohibition, the People's Prohibition Movement invited Billy Sunday, a leading American temperance preacher, to address rallies in Vancouver and Victoria. In a campaign featuring extremes, Billy Sunday was perfect for the part. "Drink," he told an overflow crowd, mostly women, assembled at the Arena, "is the bitterest enemy of the human race that ever belched and vomited out of hell."
"Whiskey is all right in its place, but its place is in hell and the sooner it gets there the better." These statements were fortified with statistics for which no source was given:
"Seventy-five per cent. of our idiots come from drinking parents. Eighty per cent. of the paupers are whiskey made paupers. Eighty-two per cent. of crime is committed by whiskey."248
Having harangued Vancouverites against continuing the disastrous saloon system, he departed to treat Victoria to a similar diatribe.
The "wets" centred their attack against the referendum on the charge that the B.C. Prohibition Act did not prohibit drinking as the Provincial Legislature did not have the power to restrict the importation of liquor into B.C. from other provinces of Canada or the United States. The Act, in fact, they claimed, only prohibited the public sale of liquor for beverage purposes. It was therefore a "goldbrick" which "will not and never was intended to restrict the consumption of liquor."

Instead of prohibiting drinking, the Act would result in the establishment of uncontrolled, illegal drinking in "blind-pigs" and would enrich bootleggers. Further, they warned, it would produce unemployment, raise taxes and send thousands of dollars out of the province. The anti-prohibitionists resented as a slur the charge that drinking and the liquor industry were unpatriotic. Admiral Jellicoe and General Haig were both connected with the liquor trade as were 1214 men enlisted in the B.C. forces.

Furthermore, the Act was "un-British" as it provided for forcible entry of premises on the strength of an accusation by an unnamed accuser and the accused had to prove his innocence. It was clearly a choice between "the British flag or the Constable's club."2149

The battle was fought daily and increasingly vociferously in the newspapers, through paid advertisements, letters to the editors and editorials. Feelings on the issue ran so high that some newspapers sold their letters to the editor space at classified rates as the only fair means of selecting material
for these columns. The Vancouver World refused outright either
to sell space to the "wets" or print letters to the editor which
were anti-referendum. High feelings were also much in evidence
at political rallies where speakers pro and con the liquor issue
usually delivered their speeches. Frequent interruptions,
heckling and questions from the floor often produced bedlam, and
not infrequently, fist fights.

Nor did the churches let the vote be taken without
guidance from the pulpit and three monster rallies, organized
by the First Presbyterian, the Congregational and Metropolitan
Churches exhorted their audiences to vote "yes" on the
referendum. "The bar room must go" and "come and save the
bairns" were the rallying cries at these meetings.

The trade unions of Vancouver and New Westminster went
quietly on record against the referendum. Unaccompanied by any
of the noisy huckstering indulged in by the "drys," the "wets"
and various church groups, the Vancouver Trades and Labor
Council adopted a resolution "in harmony with representative
bodies of organized labor elsewhere," placed "itself upon record
as opposed to the B.C. Prohibition Act and to the principle
enshrined therein." In a like manner, the New Westminster
Trades Council adopted a similar resolution that "this Council
go on record as opposed to Prohibition as contained in the
proposed bill, from an economic and social standpoint, and
report this decision to the various unions, with the request
that they help to defeat the present measure."
It would have been difficult to keep such a contentious issue free from party politics, but despite claims to the contrary, no real effort was made to do so. As early as 1912, the Liberal Party had placed a temperance plank in its platform and the 1916 platform contained one favouring the adoption of prohibition.\(^{254}\) The Liberals traded frankly on their "dry" reputation during the election campaign. Though warned in August of 1915 and again in December\(^ {255}\) that a prohibition act would sweep the Conservatives into office and that silence on the issue would weaken their chances at the polls, McBride refused to adopt such a principle. Premier Bowser was equally unreceptive to the claims of prohibitionists until the by-election defeats early in 1916. Even then he refused to legislate for prohibition outright, stating that the issue was one which the people themselves should decide, free from party politics.\(^ {256}\) He was prepared to abide by the people's decision. However, the long anti-prohibition history of the Conservative Party, which the prohibitionists constantly cited, outweighed the conciliatory referendum policy. To most of the electorate the Conservative Party and a "wet" liquor policy were inseparable. It was thus very much a partisan issue on which the voters cast their ballots on election day.

"Abolish the saloon and drive out the dive" sentiments triumphed as 36,490 to 27,217 of the civilian electorate said "yes" to the referendum "Are you in favor of bringing the B.C. Prohibition Act into force?"\(^ {257}\) The balloting of the soldiers
at home was very close with 3,353 for and 3,622 against. The first returns of the soldiers overseas showed a great disparity with only 2,061 favourable and 5,263 against. Voting continued until December 16, 1916.\textsuperscript{258} According to the terms of the B.C. Prohibition Act, a simple majority was sufficient to approve or defeat the measure and as the overseas vote was sufficient (20,000) if a negative vote was returned, to upset the favourable civilian majority of 5,802, the newly elected Premier Brewster's hands were tied as far as the prohibition issue was concerned until the final count was made.\textsuperscript{259} The Prohibitionists' exultance changed to dismay as the continuing returns showed that a negative majority was highly possible. They charged irregular voting methods and conditions in the recording of the overseas ballots. Repeating the old pattern, delegations pro and con waited on the Premier for months. The "drys" urged that prohibition as provided for by the referendum be instituted as the overseas vote was fraudulent, while the "wets" claimed that the referendum vote must decide the issue and that there was no mandate for liquor legislation apart from it. Meanwhile, Sir Richard McBride, the Agent-General for B.C. in London, was charged with supervising the ballot count as the voting continued. It was finally stopped because of some 1,500 votes in dispute. At this point the Government and the Agent-General called in an eminent counsel, Sir John Simon, to decide the issue. He advised that the votes should be counted. The final tally upset the favourable civilian total and so the referendum was defeated.\textsuperscript{260}
Brewster was in an awkward position. Ought he to go ahead with prohibitory legislation in accordance with the Liberals' electoral platform or regard the negative referendum vote as ending the issue? The vociferous activities of the Prohibitionists, who charged crooked work in the taking of the vote resolved his dilemma. To appease them, he appointed a Royal Commission to examine the whole question of the soldiers' vote to determine whether their allegations and imputations were valid.

The Report of the Royal Commission was presented to the Legislature on August 14, 1917, and stated that of the 8,505 votes cast after September 14, 1916, 4,697 should be rejected because of irregularities. The Government resolved the long controversy by choosing to accept the report and passed an Act bringing the B.C. Prohibition Act into operation on October 1, 1917.

Then came a short-lived pause in the long, bitterly contentious struggle between the "wets" and the "drys," while the Province experimented with a curious type of prohibition, which in reality only closed the saloons and ended the public retail sale of liquor within the province.

The liquor controversy, coming to a head in an election year, placed Bowser in an awkward position politically. With the organized clamourings of "wet" and "dry" societies, it was impossible to do nothing about the liquor question. As the
leader of the party which for years had opposed prohibition, sudden conversion to it would have been regarded as a vote-catching device, as well as antagonizing the anti-prohibition element. On the other hand, if he rejected prohibition, he would be regarded as a tool of the "wets" and so lose the support of the "drys." He compromised by making prohibition the subject of a plebiscitory referendum. Bowser did not view the liquor referendum as a politically expedient measure. He claimed that the liquor question was a moral one and so should not be dealt with in the framework of party politics.

In the event, the non-partisan outlook was observed only by the Conservatives. The Liberals, correctly assessing the trend of public opinion, did not hesitate to support prohibition. Isolation of the liquor question also made it very vulnerable to the claims of the extremists of both the prohibition and anti-prohibition organizations. Their propaganda both distorted and misrepresented the referendum. In fact the haze of charge and counter-charge obscured the real issue, the B.C. Prohibition Act. A large section of the electorate mistakenly thought they were voting for prohibition in the abstract and not for a specific Act.

The Conservative Government failed to provide adequate safeguards for the taking of the overseas vote. The resulting confusion over the validity of the vote cast doubt as to whether the approval of the Prohibition Act really represented the
majority of the electorate. Yet effective enforcement of such legislation depended on the support of a large majority. There is nothing to suggest that this laxity was deliberate.
The experiment with prohibition revealed flaws which led to widespread public dissatisfaction. The chief difficulty lay in the change in the public's attitude towards it. The high moral tone of "no sacrifice too great" which produced the wartime measure did not carry over into peacetime. Many felt that the act was only an emergency measure and should now be repealed. Veterans' clubs and service clubs insisted on the right to use and sell beer or wine. Those who expected prohibition would end or at least greatly reduce consumption of liquor had also been disillusioned. As it was impossible for the Provincial Government to prohibit private importation of liquor, those who could afford it were able to import all they desired. Liquor could also be obtained by a doctor's prescription. The practice became farcical as prescriptions were issued by the thousands every month. So widespread was this practice that it was "... difficult at times to maintain a supply of liquor sufficient to meet the demands made upon the vendors from day to day, which kept increasing towards the end of the year to an extent quite unlooked for."\(^263\) The illicit sources, bootleggers, "stillers" and blind-pig operators provided a
steady flow of alcohol for all who were willing to meet their prices. In face of public indifference or sympathy with the illicit suppliers, the police, provincial and municipal, were inadequate to cope with the extensive extralegal practices. The municipalities were disgruntled as they were responsible for enforcing the Act within their districts, but were deprived of the revenue they had formerly received from sale of liquor licences. Law enforcement on the whole was lax and the Opposition constantly criticized the Government for non-enforcement of the law.264

Prohibition provided the new Premier, Oliver, with another embarrassing problem, that of compensating the license-holders whose business had been terminated by the Prohibition Act. Before introducing the bill to the Legislature in 1915, the Lieutenant-Governor had extracted a promise from Premier Bowser that an independent commission would be set up to investigate the question of compensation.265 He had taken the same position in regard to Premier Brewster's Prohibition Act of 1917 and Brewster had also promised to appoint such a commission. The Lieutenant-Governor wanted to know why the Government had not yet appointed such a commission in view of these promises. Former license-holders had formed an Association and applied to the Government for recompense.266 Oliver explained his delay by claiming that he was "... convinced that the attitude of the present Legislature (March, 1919) would be opposed to the payment of compensation" although he had never
"taken any other position than that there was an obligation
resting upon the present government at least to very carefully
consider the appointment of the suggested commission." He also
recommended to his cabinet colleagues that such a Royal
Commission would have to be appointed soon as undoubtedly there
would be a demand for partial or total repeal of the Prohibition
Act at the next session of the Legislature. He also intimated
the possibility of another plebiscite by stating that ". . . it
will probably be necessary again to submit the question to the
Electorate during the year 1920."267

At last the promised commission was set up and on
January 12-19, 1920, with Mr. Justice Aulay Morrison as
Commissioner, heard arguments on the question of compensation.
The commission decided that the claims for compensation were more
"ethical and moral than legal" and recommended non-payment. The
Association of License-Holders appealed again to the Government
asking for the re-submission of the case to the Commissioner with
a new question: "Were the applicants not entitled in 'fairness
and reason' to some compensation?" The Government refused the
application on February 3rd, and no compensation was granted.268

As was indicated in Oliver's memo to his cabinet, the
Prohibition Act was the subject of legislation during the 1920
Session of the Legislature. Amendments were passed to restrict
the issuance of prescriptions and thus plug one of the loopholes
of the Act.269 In addition, Premier Oliver announced that it was
time for the electorate to decide whether it wished to continue
prohibition. His "Temperance Act" plebiscite accordingly asked "Which do you prefer: (1) Maintenance of the present Prohibition Act or (2) An Act to provide for Governmental control and sale, in sealed packages, of spirituous and malt liquor?" He justified the taking of this plebiscite on the grounds that the Prohibition Act had not been approved by the soldiers overseas or women and thus might not represent the opinions of a majority of the electorate; that effective enforcement had proven difficult; and that there was widespread public dissatisfaction with the present Act. The alternative offered a solution, which if continuation of prohibition was not approved, would provide a "temperate" system of liquor outlets without a return to the evil saloon system of the pre-prohibition era.

The week after the introduction of the "Temperance Act" a sixty-woman delegation, representing various women's societies, waited on the Premier with a request to include in the plebiscite a section on light wine and beer table licences. The Legislature had received petitions on the same question on March 22 and April 7, and a delegation of "brewery interests" had petitioned Oliver on April 8 to add sale of beer and light wines under trade licence to the section on "sealed packages" and not as a third question. Oliver rejected these requests with the explanation that he wanted a plebiscite which would permit a clear expression of opinion leaving no doubt as to the subsequent verdict and the injection of "beer and light wines issue" might militate against such an expression.
The prohibitionists were unhappy about the plebiscite and wanted the Government to submit a different plebiscite, that is, on the question of federal restriction of importation. Under Part IV of the Canada Temperance Act,\textsuperscript{275} it was possible to hold a plebiscite requesting the Federal Government to enact legislation prohibiting the importation of liquor into the province. But only those provinces in which a prohibition act was in force could hold such a plebiscite. Accordingly, Mr. George introduced a Resolution into the House requesting that a plebiscite worded "That the importation and the bringing of intoxicating liquor into the Province may be forbidden," be held in place of the "Temperance Plebiscite."\textsuperscript{276} Oliver moved an Amendment to this Resolution to provide for the importation plebiscite to the effect that should the electorate approve the continuation of the present Prohibition Act, it would be desirable to take a referendum under the provisions of Part IV of the Canada Temperance Act.\textsuperscript{277}

There were other objections to the terms of the plebiscite. Bowser, the Leader of the Opposition, questioned the necessity of taking the plebiscite separate from a general election in view of the extra expense thus involved.\textsuperscript{278} The prohibitionists complained that the electorate was asked to vote blindfolded, to make a choice between an act and an opinion, between a statute and an abstraction. They repeatedly asked for a definition of the terms, government sale and government control. The Liberal Government, they charged, was really not
being fair asking them to vote on a general bill without details, when in 1915 the Liberal Party had made a formal declaration of its liquor policy. The Government did not act on these adverse criticisms and the Temperance Plebiscite Act passed without further amendments, as to the date of vote (October 20) and content. However, during the campaign, the Attorney-General, J. W. deB. Farris, defended the Government's policy in the following manner:

Liquor legislation was a question which was being keenly debated. It was a moral question. The Government had two choices. It could have decided one way or the other -- either in favor of a wet plank in the platform, or of adopting a policy in favor of bone-dry legislation, and have gone to the country for support. This would have resulted in a return to power of a government elected on one principle, and that alone. Parties would have been split over the question and the government would not have been representative of the people on other important issues which would come before the Legislature for consideration. It would be impossible to carry on such an arrangement. . . . The government is not trimming on this question. It is asking for a straight opinion of the people on the facts before them on this moral issue.

Apart from this explanation by Farris, neither of the major parties, the Liberal and Conservative, was willing to make a statement on the plebiscite, preferring to treat it purely as a nonpartisan issue. "I can't discuss Prohibition from a personal angle," explained Premier Oliver, "because it would look as if I spoke for the Government and the Government is chiefly anxious to have the unassisted view of the people on the matter." Only the leader of the Socialist Party, Hawthornwaite, was unwilling to make this sacrifice and came
out unequivocally in favor of repealing the Prohibition Act.

The campaign for continuance of the Prohibition Act moved into high gear with a three day (October 1-3) convention of the People's Prohibition Party. The keynote address was given, as in 1915, by Archdeacon Lloyd of Saskatoon, who first took the Government to task for not elaborating on the details of Government control and sale. The claim that voting against prohibition would result in "moderate" or temperate drinking was sarcastically refuted. "If you vote moderate you can imagine what a beautiful province you will have," he began and went on to draw a graphic word picture of hordes of drunkards and wastrels invading the province from the bone-dry United States and the dry Canadian provinces. "Furthermore, . . . you are to be asked to turn your Government into bartenders so that breweries and distillers shall have reputable bartenders and distributors." Nor should the mess of pottage promised by government sale be an inducement. "Do not let the Government throw dust in your eyes, either by the argument that the traffic is for revenue purposes or any other. We tried that game in Saskatchewan and twenty-three liquor stores were established and these came to be known as Scott's liquor shops, named after the the attorney-general who really was doing his best. If this referendum fails us you will have in British Columbia your Oliver shops or Bowser booseries."
Similar warnings were delivered by various speakers at the Convention as to the meaning of the plebiscite. "We are not concerned with temperance but the state control and regulated sale of liquor. Remember you are asked to vote not for government control but government control and sale, a very different thing. Government sale might pay off our national debt in a few years, but it will not be by moderation. Instead a "deluge of booze" supplied by "government boozoriums" was promised. The usual ringing slogans were coined and delegates were asked "Shall we get our revenue from booze?" and exhorted to "Let the motto of Verdun be ours, 'They (liquor interests) shall not break through.'" As a final warning, the Convention was reminded that "Government liquor control meant the liquor control of Government."284

In addition to criticizing the return to a "booze" system, the Convention staunchly defended the Prohibition Act and made many claims for it. In the first place the Act which the electorate was to approve at the plebiscite was not at fault. "The trouble lies with those entrusted with the law's enforcement and interpretation."285 Furthermore, the prescription scandal was eliminated with the amendments just passed and statistics were quoted to show that the number of prescriptions had been considerably reduced since the amendments came into force. Since the original Act had been in force, four jails had been closed, the penitentiary was nearly empty, the old saloon had gone and drunkenness reduced by 92 per cent.286 Despite lax enforcement
and illegal trafficking, the Act had greatly reduced the total sale of liquor and convictions for drunkenness. The annual expenditure on liquor had been lowered from eleven million dollars pre-prohibition, to two million dollars in 1919. During the "dry" years, the country had been unusually prosperous. Even the declining death rate from tuberculosis was credited to the practice of prohibition.\(^\text{287}\) In effect, prohibition had fulfilled many of the glowing promises of its supporters in the three years of its enforcement and ought to be continued.

As polling day approached, the prohibitionists' campaign gained momentum, both in extent of activities and extravagance of claims. In the week prior to the voting, one hundred public meetings were held; 85,000 issues of the Prohibition Bulletin were distributed and extensive door to door canvassing carried out.\(^\text{288}\) The electorate was informed that the real issue at stake was "the booze shop versus the home; the bottle versus the boy."\(^\text{289}\) It was warned that political chaos was in store as government control and sale would breed political corruption and graft and leave the Government at the mercy of the liquor lobbyists. On a lighter note, it was reminded that "a government-produced drunk looks like any other kind."\(^\text{290}\) The religious appeal was not overlooked as voters were exhorted to obey the commandment "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" -- "for the other man's sake vote for prohibition."\(^\text{291}\) In a diatribe reminiscent of Billy Sunday, Rev. A. E. Cooke addressed a final harangue against government
control and sale: "I am going to let the cat out of the bag on the Moderationists, or 'Wets' as they should properly be termed. They want to make this province a system of boozoriums, bring whiskey into politics, unite the government with the distillers and by selling liquor to make men drunk and then arresting them through the attorney-general's department, which will also have charge of the sale of liquor, bring damnformation and reformation side by side like two heavenly twins at the beck and call of the 'Wets.'"  

The Prohibitionists tried to get full union support and members of the One Big Union and some others helped campaign for the Prohibition Act. However, the Trades and Labor Council (Vancouver) flatly refused to advocate prohibition, preferring to take a neutral position, leaving it up to the individual members to vote as they saw fit. The Prohibitionists did get extensive help from the pulpit as various Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist and Congregational clergymen urged their congregations to vote for the continuance of the Prohibition Act. 

The Moderation League, which carried the banner for government control and sale was content to conduct a two-week whirlwind campaign. The League proclaimed itself in favour of temperate or moderate liquor legislation. It did not desire a return to the saloon system, but it did want enforceable liquor legislation and abolition of the illicit outlets. It advocated government control of outlets as a system most apt to promote a
temperate society. Prohibition had failed in that it had not resulted in sobriety but had produced instead, blind-pigs, bootleggers, rum-runners, and stillers on an extensive scale. The real choice the electorate had to make was "will the bootlegger or the Government sell." In addition, prohibition had brought the medical profession into disrepute through the prescriptions scandal. Even more harmful results had accrued. Deprived of liquor, some had been driven to harmful substitutes such as drugs and home brews. Temperance, the League maintained, could not be promoted by law, but only by education. Meanwhile, the province had a Prohibition Act to maintain, which was both expensive and impossible to enforce, yet was not producing the benefits claimed for it. The Act had two other strikes against it. It was class legislation, as the poor had to perjure themselves to get a doctor's prescription in order to secure a drink, while the rich could import by the carload. In its search without a warrant clause, the Act destroyed the sanctity of the home, "to which every citizen as inheritor of British traditions was entitled."

Extreme claims were not the trademark of the prohibitionists only and some Moderationists made rather immoderate statements about the forthcoming plebiscite. The melodramatic warning issued by Mr. Thompson, presiding at a League meeting, was typical of these: "The enactment of prohibition will make a soured and discontented people, a people ripe for revolution. Look at Russia. Thrones rocked and murder
followed when a ban was placed on vodka." Other references were made to the Russian revolution as one Moderationist claimed that "Soviets" and clergymen stood shoulder to shoulder with bootleggers in support of the Prohibition Act.

As women were able to vote at a provincial plebiscite for the first time and would in fact cast the deciding vote, each side was eager to obtain their support. The Prohibitionists, who had long been linked with the cause of woman suffrage, were confident of their support. "We rejoice that in this plebiscite the women of British Columbia exercise for the first time their general right of equal franchise with men. . . . We count on an overwhelming majority of women's votes for prohibition in this plebiscite, but we urge every woman, as she values her newly-found power, to use it for the great cause of prohibition." Dr. George Telford publicly voiced his opinion that ninety percent. of the women would support prohibition. Mrs. J. W. deB. Farris, under the Council of Women's auspices, spoke at several public meetings, urging women to support prohibition in order "to preserve the sanctity of the home" and as the best means of ensuring the future of their children. The Council of Women, representing 5 women's societies and the Nurses' Federation campaigned actively to retain the Prohibition Act. No women's organizations came out in support of government sale and control, but several women spoke at Moderation League meetings urging the institution of government control and sale. Their support was also evident earlier, when over eight thousand women petitioned
Premier Oliver for the repeal of the Prohibition Act.\textsuperscript{308}

On the eve of the election both sides predicted victory. The campaign, noted for its lack of personal abuse, had aroused public feelings to the extent of filling meetings, pro and con, to overflowing. The expected large vote was duly recorded and by election night it was known that government control and sale had won by a huge majority. The final count was 75,964 for "temperance" and 49,225 for the Prohibition Act.\textsuperscript{309} As one newspaper editorial pointed out, the verdict was a valid one. Such a large majority showed that the people were opposed in principle to prohibition and not just to feeble enforcement. The Government was therefore under direct obligation to obey the decisive mandate it sought.\textsuperscript{310} Premier Oliver expressed surprise at the result, claiming that he had supported prohibition and had expected that most of the electorate would too, but as it had not, "... it will be the duty of the Government to prepare and submit substitutional legislation at the earliest possible date."\textsuperscript{311} The Leader of the Opposition, Bowser, refused to express an opinion on the vote: "I am deaf and dumb as regards yesterday's vote on prohibition."\textsuperscript{312}

Prohibition's supporters, while stunned were not disheartened. The vote was treated only as a temporary setback. The evils which would result from government control and sale, after a brief period of experiment, would result in a public clamour for the return of prohibition. Therefore, the People's Prohibition Party would not disband, but continue in readiness
to lead the public back into the prohibition fold when they were disillusioned by the new system. The actual cause of the defeat of prohibition at the polls was the "immaturity of girl voters without sufficient age and experience to judge the problems of life and . . . apathy on the part of a great number of persons whose names were on the voters' lists but who did not exercise their franchise." Whatever their degree of maturity, women, who the newspapers claimed, "flocked to the polls," were generally acknowledged as having cast the deciding vote in favour of government control and sale. They thus exploded the myth, long held by temperance societies, that women would vote "dry" when they got the franchise.

Whatever the reaction to the vote, the general view was held that the Government would outline a government control and sale measure and then seek electoral approval at a general election. As the Prohibition Act had been so thoroughly repudiated at the polls, it was imperative to replace the discredited legislation with new liquor laws as soon as possible. The Government had three choices. It could call a special session of the Legislature, draft a new liquor bill and then go to the electorate for support; it could pass new liquor legislation and not seek electoral support until the following year; or it could outline a general policy on liquor legislation and seek electoral support. The first and second choices were deemed politically unwise in a Sun editorial. In the first instance, the issue did not justify the expense of calling a
special session. Secondly, "no government faced with the necessity of an early appeal to the people would wish to enact so controversial a measure as a liquor control bill, and then seek election immediately afterwards before the merits of the measure had been proven."\textsuperscript{315} The Liberal Government decided upon the third choice, announcing that it would appeal to the electorate on the first of December, on the general principles of a liquor bill. It would not outline the new Act in detail as it hoped "to secure the benefits of public opinion at the hustings before final drafting of the measure."\textsuperscript{316} The Government chose to be vague about even the general principles of the bill and few explicit statements were made. On the question of liquor control, so worrisome to the Prohibitionists, the Liberal Party announced in a manifesto on November 3, that "... to secure effective control of the liquor traffic, it will be necessary to appeal to the Dominion Parliament for legislation under which the Provincial Government would have effective authority to control the sources of supply, to the extent necessary to prevent such sources of supply being made a base from which liquor could be obtained in contravention of the Provincial statute."\textsuperscript{317} Speaking at an election rally in Esquimalt, Premier Oliver gave some indications of what course the liquor legislation would follow: "I consider the vote as one that liquor shall be on sale in reasonable quantities at a reasonable price, and not be abused. I have no conscientious scruples about making all I can out of the business. But of
that revenue a portion should go to the municipalities; the cost of enforcing the law and keeping offenders in gaol should be another charge; the sale of liquor to those under twenty-one should be prohibited."318

Bowser, speaking for the Conservatives, strenuously attacked Oliver's handling of the liquor question. "The Government," he charged, "must have known what the bill they would submit to the people if moderation or prohibition carried would be, but instead of taking the course of a man with the courage of his convictions, Premier Oliver is attempting to get through this election without letting the people know just what the Government intends to do. I say Premier Oliver is appealing to the electors for a vote of confidence in his Government, and he has no right to go to the people and ask them to sign a blank check."319 Though highly critical of the Liberals' reticence on this question, he suffered from the same defect and committed the Conservatives, only to a "Moderation Bill under which liquor would be sold by the Government and the Government alone -- with a strict audit, strict control, strict enforcement."320 The only definite commitment was the promise by both parties that there would be no return of the saloons.

The Liberals were returned with a reduced majority,321 and so were faced with the immediate problem of drafting liquor legislation. The Government moved cautiously on the issue. On February 11, Premier Oliver moved a Resolution asking leave
of the Lieutenant-Governor to place a Liquor Control Act before the House. This unusual method of introducing legislation, bitterly attacked by the Opposition, was justified by Oliver as giving every member a chance to discuss the bill as it really was of nonpartisan nature. In discussing the Resolution, Oliver described the history of the Prohibition referendum, its subsequent enforcement and public dissatisfaction leading to the recent "Temperance Plebiscite." The results of the latter he did not interpret as "an instruction authorizing the return of the bar or the drinking saloon, but rather as an instruction to make available, for use, spirituous and malt liquors in reasonable quantities, at a reasonable price and subject to reasonable restrictions."

The Government Liquor Act was introduced and reviewed in detail by the Attorney-General on February 23. The principal clauses may be summed up as the following: There would be annual liquor permits for both residents and visitors; a one quart per purchase limit; drunkenness to constitute a punishable offence; no public drinking; a $2.50/qt. tax on imported liquor; no liquor sold to those under twenty-one; inspectors given the right of entry and search; and municipalities to receive half of net profits.

The next day Premier Oliver explained the Government's new liquor policy by stating that "the whole intent of the Act is to put the sale in the hands of the Government so that people may obtain liquor under certain conditions which will prevent
its abuse and illicit traffic. The high taxes on wholesale houses are to help us overcome constitutional difficulties about private importation. The tax of $2.50 a quart on imports is made designedly heavy so as to be prohibitive of importation."325

The Bill did not have an easy passage through the House. Licensed sale of beer in hotels and restaurants, dining rooms and in bars and clubs provided the most contentious issue. Several resolutions were received by the Government protesting licensed sale of beer as the plebiscite had been definitely anti-bar and anti-saloon.326 Veterans, on the other hand, protested against the ban of sale of beer in their service clubs.327 By 34 to 11, the House adopted an amendment to the effect that no one, other than a Government vendor, could sell malt liquors.328 It rejected another amendment to raise the limit for non-intoxicating liquors from one per cent. alcohol by weight to two per cent. Thomas Uphill's amendment in favour of a Beer clause met the same fate despite his plea that the "... Bill made it easy to get hard liquor and difficult to get good beer."329 A compromise of sorts was finally reached between those who advocated "Booze as free as water"330 and those who protested against any public sale of liquor, spirituous or malt by inserting a clause providing for a special permit for public drinking.331

Other issues caused difficulty. Bowser protested against the failure of the Government to provide for a non-partisan Board of Control; he warned that the special permit
clause would result in widespread public drinking and noted that the $2.50 tax on imported liquor for the express purpose of curtailing importation, was ultra vires of the Legislature. Finally after almost seven weeks of heated debate and many amendments, the Bill, on a partisan vote, despite Oliver's plea for a no-party measure, passed third reading and on April 2 received Royal Assent. The members of the Liquor Control Board were appointed on April 13, and on June 15 the old Prohibition Act went out of operation and the new experiment in government control and sale took effect.

With the failure of prohibition, Oliver was faced with the necessity of providing a different type of liquor distribution. He decided to offer an unspecified system of government control and sale as an alternative to prohibition, with the electorate choosing by a plebiscitory vote. A plebiscite was used as the issue was deemed a moral one which ought to be kept separate from party politics. The terms of the plebiscite were not clear as the Government failed to elaborate on what type of government control and sale was envisioned. As the Conservatives also remained silent on the issue, the two interested pressure groups, the Moderation League and the B.C. Prohibition Association took it upon themselves to enlighten the public as to what was at stake. The explanations of both were at best only guesses, and at worst were misleading. As the electorate was offered an unknown alternative, the vote can only be interpreted as a rejection of
prohibition.

After the plebiscite returns were known, Oliver decided to hold an election before making any changes in the liquor laws. Despite his protests to the contrary, the liquor question was one of the leading issues of the ensuing political campaign. The plebiscite therefore proved useless in this instance as a device for keeping the liquor issue out of politics.
Although there had been discussion on the sale of beer during the debates of the Government Liquor Act, 1921, the Legislature rejected amendments which would have provided for the sale of beer by the glass in clubs, restaurants and hotels. The Act provided that government liquor stores alone were able to sell bottled beer and glass sale was prohibited to them as well. It was immediately apparent that the prohibition against sale by the glass would be difficult if not impossible to enforce. Veterans' clubs, which had advocated beer-selling licences, refused to comply with the new law and on July 23, 1921, announced that they would continue selling to bona fide members. The Attorney-General warned that the law would be enforced and conducted a series of raids on various clubs, resulting in the arrest of several people. The arrests produced a series of court cases, in the judgment of one of which the Supreme Court Justice Mr. Murphy decided that selling beer to members of a club did not constitute sale of beer within the meaning of the Act, but only a distribution of property amongst members. Fortified by this decision, "beer" clubs soon made their appearance and the Moderation League conducted an extensive advertising campaign for...
the right to sell beer by the glass.

The prohibitionists viewed these activities and the direction to which they were leading with alarm and held a convention on October 25-26 to discuss the situation. The Secretary predicted the doom of the Liquor Act and a return to prohibition. The convention adopted a resolution to seek the repeal of the present Act; strict enforcement of a Prohibition Act; and the securing of dominion prohibition. No resolution as regards clubs and sale of beer therein was recorded.

During the second session of the Legislature, the Moderation League again urged the Government to make provision for the sale of beer by the glass in regularly appointed places. Two weeks later, Ian Mackenzie moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole "to consider the question of the sale of malt liquors under the Government Liquor Act, 1921." The motion carried on division by 23 to 11. In Committee, it was resolved to hold a referendum on the question of sale of beer in standard hotels and in bona fide clubs. The Committee rose and reported the matter. However, a point of order was raised that the resolution was out of order as "infringing on the prerogative of the Crown," in that it touched public moneys and therefore required a Government measure." The Speaker ruled that the point was well-taken and the session ended a few days later without further discussion of the sale of beer. However, the Government Liquor Act, 1921, did not escape the remainder of the session without bitter attacks. In reply to a
series of criticisms by the Opposition, the Government introduced amendments to tighten up the Act.

In December, acting on reports that ten hotel bars had opened in Vancouver and were offering beer for sale to members at a ten cent fee, the Liquor Control Board conducted an investigation into the club situation. Twelve clubs lost their licences and thirty others were raided. This in no way curbed the growth of the clubs whose numbers grew daily.

The club system was only one aspect of the illicit sale of liquor which existed in the province. Rum-running over the United States-Canada border had developed on a grand scale, involving fleets of boats and trucks. Bootleggers, and stillers, selling cheap and frequently bad or dangerous liquors, were still part of the scene despite the claims of the Moderation League that government control and sale of liquor would force them to retire. To curb bootlegging activities at one source, new regulations were enforced governing the sale of liquor by the warehouses. A series of raids throughout the province put still other bootleggers out of business. In face of continued public demand for bootleggers' services, the two measures had no lasting effect in curbing illicit sales.

The whole liquor situation was discussed by the Legislature again during the 1922 Session when the first annual report of the Liquor Control Board was presented by the Attorney-General. A Conservative member urged that the licensed sale of light wines by the glass would eliminate the bootlegger.
However, the Attorney-General, contending that private importation produced illicit sales, moved a resolution asking the federal parliament "to enact legislation providing for the prohibition of intoxicating liquor into British Columbia for use therein except by the Provincial Government." Sale of beer by the glass was again revived when Ian McKenzie tried to get a resolution passed asking for a referendum on the question. The resolution was ruled out of order and another, resolving that "it is unadvisable at this Session of the Legislature to make provision for the sale of beer by the glass" was passed, thus putting off the problem for another year, but assuring that it would have to be dealt with then.

During the same year, the liquor situation was the subject of unfavourable comment by the prohibitionist element of the province. The B.C. Prohibition Association conducted public meetings condemning government liquor policy in general and failure to curb rum-runners in particular. The condemnations were repeated in the Prohibition Bulletin which was again brought into publication. At the Provincial Methodist Conference held in Vancouver on May 20, regret was expressed that under the government sales system there had been a great increase in the sale of liquor and urged that the Government prohibit the use of advertisements encouraging its sale and use. The convention of the Prohibition Association took up cudgels against a beer and wine referendum and warned that if such a proposal were made, the Association would meet the issue with a bone-dry prohibition demand.
Illicit liquor sale through "clubs," bootleggers and rum-runners increased in 1923 despite the enforcement of the previous year's liquor act amendments. The extensiveness of these sales prevented a satisfactory operation of the government sale and control system and failure to curb them resulted in increasingly critical comment of the system itself. It was attacked in the federal parliament, at meetings of the Dominion Alliance, by the various churches and during conventions of prohibition organizations. The chief critics of the system were members of the B.C. Prohibition Association and during a mass meeting of the organization in Victoria, Rev. A. E. Cook, charged that British Columbia was fast becoming the "whiskey sinkhole of the Dominion." The only solution to the liquor problem was to repeal the government control act and replace it with "bone-dry" prohibition legislation. A resolution to that effect was adopted. Another one on the club situation, declaring that the prevalence of beer in clubs in Vancouver made conditions worse than they had been when "the bars were in full swing" was passed and action by the Government to end the situation was urged.

Again pleas were renewed that the illicit sales of liquor could be greatly reduced by providing for sale of beer by the glass. Speaking in the House, during the throne speech debates, Burde urged that the prevalence of bootleggers and beer clubs made liquor law amendments urgently necessary. As these illegal sources existed due to the demands for their
services, the Government ought to take cognizance of this demand by expanding the number and type of liquor outlets. The Moderation League met the Premier and other members of the Cabinet and repeated its request for sale of beer by the glass throughout British Columbia or a referendum on the question. Such a request had been rejected in former years for the reason that there had not been sufficient trial of the system. However, the system had been in operation for three years and illicit sales were on the increase. Some change was absolutely imperative.

Concurrently the liquor situation was hotly debated at a conference between the Government and the parliamentary committee of the Union of B.C. Municipalities, with each party blaming the other for the flaws in the liquor system. The Union initiated the conference by sending a delegation to the Premier to protest strongly against "the present disgraceful situation throughout the province in regard to the formation of clubs and the sale of liquor therein, that the present situation is worse than in the days of the open bar, and that the Government be urged to enact laws to alter this deplorable state of affairs." The Attorney-General countered that the failure of the government control system to curb the illicit sales was the fault of the municipalities, whose police forces had rendered almost no assistance in the matter of law enforcement, especially in regard to handling liquor in clubs. In fact, had it not been for the clubs, the record under the Liquor Control Act would have been a "very clear one." The municipalities bitterly resented the
Attorney-General's claims and the unseemly controversy over them continued after the conference ended. 353

Ill-feeling was not the only product of the conference. The Government decided it could no longer delay action on the beer question, which was the crux of the "clubs" problem. Therefore, on December 15, a "Sale of Beer Plebiscite" Bill was introduced. 354 The bill provided for a plebiscitory vote on beer by the glass in licensed premises; 20 per cent. of the total vote before municipalities which registered a favourable vote could have such sale; and the granting of licences to clubs for sale to members only. In introducing the bill, the Attorney-General contended that it was necessary because the municipalities were not enforcing the laws and people were drinking more hard liquor than was good for them. There was to be no return to the bar system, he promised, the policy being to license only dining rooms of hotels. Nor would there be any return of the cabaret and dance hall system that prevailed under the prohibition near-beer law. 355

The proposed bill provoked acrimonious debates and the bitter feelings aroused made it difficult to get agreement on any points. The bill was as sharply criticized by the Liberals as by the Conservatives, thus allowing no unity in the House on liquor policy. M. B. Jackson (Liberal) could "not support the bill" as he felt it would result eventually in the return of the bar. 356 David Whiteside (Liberal) flatly rejected the bill as "It is
simply going back to the old bar days with all the worst
features..." R. H. Pooley (Conservative) charged that
the Government was sidestepping its responsibility through a
proposed plebiscite and sharply attacked the local option
feature of the bill for injecting the liquor issue into the
realm of municipal politics. Such a provision would make the
problem ten times worse. The Leader of the Opposition, Bowser,
urged that the plebiscite be taken at the same time as a provincial
general election; that the hours of sale be fixed beforehand and
that the House decide the number of license to be issued.
Thomas Uphill (Labor) asserted that a plebiscite was not necessary
and the Government was justified in inserting a beer clause into
the Liquor Act.358

The question of local option was especially trying. In
its original form the bill possessed a clause whereby if 2/5 of
the total votes cast on the plebiscite were in the affirmative,
the sale of beer by the glass would be allowed in those
municipalities which cast a favourable vote. Both Liberals and
Conservatives cried out against minority legislation and this
clause was amended out. Some members urged that the plebiscite
ought to be on a local option basis so that those municipalities
which gave the plebiscite a favourable majority could have beer
sales regardless of the total vote. Finally a local option
clause passed on division by 23/18, over Bowser's strong protests,
as he maintained it had never worked satisfactorily.359
The Government received protests against the terms of the bill from sources outside the Legislature. Various women's organizations sent a delegation to the Premier asking that the plebiscite include a section on the sale of light wines. The terms were also unacceptable to the B.C. Prohibition Association which registered its protest to the Government, claiming that the plebiscite so constituted really advocated a return to the bar. It should offer prohibition as an alternative choice. Both these proposals met with rejection.

Five days after it was introduced the plebiscite bill received third reading. The lack of agreement was barely overcome and this reluctance was reflected in the vague phrasing of the bill. The date of the plebiscite was not decided nor was the term "licensed premises" defined. The local option clause was equally obscure. It provided that should any district decide for beer the Government, through the Liquor Control Board "may" provide for the sale of beer by the glass in licensed premises. In fact the liquor issue "was left in such a clouded condition that not even all of the members of the House were clear as to what was intended."

Newspaper reaction to the plebiscite varied according to political affiliation. The Daily Province (Vancouver), a Liberal paper, favoured the plebiscite as being necessary as a means of providing a workable liquor system. The Sun (Vancouver), a Conservative newspaper, noted that the act was
received without enthusiasm and credited the Government with an ulterior motive for the plebiscite. The Government, it maintained, really wanted to stage a surprise election and as revision of the voters' lists necessary for this would give the date away, the plebiscite provided a smokescreen for the revision. The Daily Colonist (Victoria), was equally unenthusiastic about the plebiscite and had urged the Legislature to reject it, claiming that there had been no general demand for it.

When the date of the plebiscite was being discussed, Attorney-General Manson rejected the proposal by Bowser that the plebiscite be taken at a general provincial election to save money, on the ground that such an election might not be held until 1926 and as the question was vital, delay would be unwise. Furthermore, he did not wish to have the electoral candidates at the mercy of the liquor interests and other pressure groups as they had been at the 1916 liquor referendum. By May of 1924, he reversed his opinions and announced that a plebiscite would be taken on the same time as the provincial general election (June 20) saying, "It is a matter of regret to me that the record of the Government and the beer question must be judged on the same day, but the general feeling on the part of the public in favor of economy decided us to hold the election and the plebiscite at the same time."
A week after the announcement of the plebiscite Attorney-General Manson explained its terms. The Government had "purposely left the matter (sale of beer by the glass) to regulation by order-in-council, so as to retain better control during the initial year and allow more elasticity and simplicity in alteration to meet circumstances" as they arose. In accordance with this policy, it was understood, though not mentioned in the terms of the act, that the plebiscite was actually a question of local option, that is, provision for sale would be available only in those municipalities or districts in which a majority voted in favour of the plebiscite. Though also not mentioned it was possible that means would be provided for the sale of beer in approved dining-rooms during meal hours. At the same time, he emphasized that the "bar" under any circumstances would not be tolerated.

The announcement of the plebiscite met with a hostile reception from the B.C. Prohibition Association, which pledged itself to "organize the temperance forces to defeat the proposal" which was really a preliminary step to the rehabilitation of the bar. The Association opposed the plebiscite on other grounds as well. Claiming that there was no demand from the people to justify the plebiscite, it charged that it was "largely a gratuitous move on the part of the government to increase the sale of liquor that profits may be much greater."
The prohibitionists centred their anti-plebiscite campaign on the charge that it meant the return of the bar, but also advanced many other charges, moral, social and economic, against the plebiscite. As the Government refused to operate the licensed premises, the element of private gain would again be injected into the liquor question and result in inducements to encourage drinking. It would thus nullify the "moderation" legislation of 1921, which was supposed to curb excessive drinking by substituting public sale for private and thus eliminated the profit motive. Also if beer were sold privately it would introduce a system of patronage, with the Government involved in unsavoury dealings with those who wanted a liquor licence. Furthermore, no additional outlets were required as there was a huge amount (twenty million dollars annually) spent on liquor in the province. Only the Brewers' Association and liquor interests wanted this change. Sale of liquor was then paralyzing "legitimate trade" by absorbing so much money and an increase in outlets would further depress this trade and cause unemployment. The proposed licensed premises or "guest rooms" with tables instead of bars, would be worse than the latter "for its semblance of respectability will entice women patrons."

No decrease in hard liquor sales could be expected from the open sale of malt liquors as the Quebec experiment bore testimony. In fact, beer drinking creates an appetite for hard liquors. The question of control was also essential and as the Government admitted inability to control present sales, an increase in outlets would produce utter chaos.
As in earlier plebiscites, the Moderation League defended the beer plebiscite against the claims of the prohibitionists. The League denied the "no public demand" charge, claiming instead, that demand was amply shown by the widespread existence of illegal beer clubs. Since so many people favoured sale of beer by the glass it was better to have regulated sale. Beer sale would curb hard liquor drinking and encourage the consumption of malt liquors which were "healthful and nutritious," because of their high food values. Besides, as beer drinkers were not drunkards, a vote for the plebiscite "was a vote for increased temperance and sobriety." The prohibition charges of disastrous economic effects of beer sales were met with ingenious reasoning. Reducing expenditure on imported hard liquor in favour of "light wholesome cheaper beer made by B.C. workers from materials produced on B.C. farms" would lessen the amount of money directed into the import liquor trade, while anticipated expansion of local breweries would provide employment opportunities. The League's final appeal for a quietly conducted campaign repeated its central idea "Keep them temperate by voting for the beer by the glass plebiscite."

Premier Oliver, personally a prohibitionist, wanted the issue to be kept out of the political campaign. "The beer question," he said, speaking at an election rally at Kamloops, "is for the people to decide. With my permission no member of the Government will take any side on this issue." Dr. M. Raynor, Liberal candidate for Victoria, did not share the
Premier's views and campaigned against the plebiscite because of the effect open sale would have on the youth. "If we allow the open sale of beer, our girls and boys will learn the taste of it and want it. We should fight this move and see it does not succeed in B.C."\(^{379}\)

The Conservative Party remained silent on the plebiscite as did the recently formed Provincial Party, which was contesting an election for the first time.\(^{380}\) However, the Provincial Party confused the issue by accusing the Government of corrupt dealings in raising the wholesale price of beer to the brewers. In May, 1921, the price was raised from \$16.50 to \$18.00/barrel, retroactive for three months, by executive action.\(^{381}\) The Provincial Party charged that the advance was made for the purpose of obtaining money from the brewers to support the Liberals' campaign. The Premier issued angry denials and claimed that he had gotten them to accept a lower price than they were asking and that the price increase would not be passed on to the consumer. Despite Oliver's protests to the contrary, the beer price rise was connected with the plebiscite and became an election issue with the Liberals appearing as the beer party.\(^{382}\)

Though public interest in the liquor plebiscite was high, the appearance of a new political party commanded greater attention. The Provincial Party, an outgrowth of the political committee of the United Farmers of B.C., was formed in January, 1923, and charging the two older parties with corruption in connection with the building and operating of the Pacific Great
Eastern railway, made corruption in Government the main issue of the 1924 political campaign.

On election day, a negative majority in the aggregate and in the heavily populated municipalities was registered against the plebiscite. The electorate was not yet ready to approve of beer-by-the-glass outlets. In atesty editorial the Daily Province asserted that "the people have decisively said that they do not want any system of beer bars, operated for private profit and capable of being involved in trafficking under political bosses."

Despite the plebiscitary rejection of sale of beer-by-the-glass, the Government introduced legislation to provide for it during the 1924 session for the Legislature. By it the Lieutenant-Governor in Council was empowered to hold local option plebiscites in a polling division, a group of polling divisions or an electoral district. A fifty-five per cent. vote entitled the area concerned to sale by the glass in licensed premises. Clubs were also permitted to sell to members, but sale in restaurants, sale of spirituous liquors, use of bars and advertising these licensed premises were expressly forbidden.

Unrelenting pressure from various sources, including veterans' and service clubs and the Moderation League, plus the widespread existence of illegal beer clubs had convinced the Government that it must take some action on the question of sale of beer by the glass. Yet at the same time prohibition
associations had unmistakably voiced their opposition to provision for such sale. The Liberal Party itself, as revealed in the legislative debates was divided on the liquor question. An election was also in the offing. The Government therefore attempted to appease both "wets" and "drys" and avoid a split in party ranks by holding a beer-by-the-glass plebiscite. The electorate was offered an unspecified system of glass sale; with the Government refusing to explain what the system involved.

At first it was announced that the plebiscite would be held separate from a general election to keep the issue free from party politics. Then in the interest of economy, the Government reversed its decision and held the plebiscite with the general election. Though neither the Liberal nor the Conservative Party defined a policy as regards the plebiscite, it became an issue of party politics with individual members campaigning either for or against it.

Though the proposal was rejected, the Government brought in a liquor bill providing for sale of beer-by-the-glass at the first session of the Legislature after the plebiscite vote was taken. It is difficult to reconcile this action with the Government's contention that the issue was moral and had to be decided by the electorate. In view of this measure, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the plebiscite was motivated by political expediency. The plebiscite enabled the Government to avoid announcing a policy on an embarrassing issue with an election in the offing. Then after the election, as the plebiscite
was only advisory it cynically pursued the policy it preferred though such a course repudiated the plebiscitory verdict.
THE PUBLIC HEALTH INSURANCE PLEBISCITE, 1937

In their campaign for women's suffrage, advocates claimed that enfranchisement of women would usher in a long list of badly needed social welfare legislation. The years immediately following the granting of the vote to women saw the fulfillment of this claim with the passage of Acts providing for mothers' pensions, schools for subnormal boys, maintenance of deserted wives, land for soldiers, better housing, minimum wages for women, juvenile courts and adoption of children. With this strong emphasis on social welfare, it is not surprising that the question of state health insurance was raised in the Legislature in 1919. The scheme was not unique as sickness insurance had been in effect in Germany since 1883, and in Great Britain since 1911, and some form of state hospital or medical insurance was then in effect in twenty-five countries. The Legislature though not ready to deal with state health insurance, resolved that early consideration of it by the Government was desirable. Following this resolution, Premier Oliver appointed a committee of four members of the Legislature to inquire into the subject of health insurance and maternity benefits. Two years later the committee reported that some state insurance scheme was
both necessary for, and in demand by, the public. When the throne speech of 1922 contained no reference to such a scheme, a Socialist member moved that the Legislature resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to discuss the advisability of appointing a committee to bring in a state health insurance bill at that session. The motion was amended out and replaced by one of Premier Oliver's, which declared that health insurance was within the competence of the Federal Parliament and urged early consideration of the question by that Legislature.

The issue disappeared from the political scene until 1926, when the Conservative Convention, held that year, wrote the "investigation of state insurance with a view to its introduction" and "endorsement of the principle of mothers' benefits" into its programme. The Liberal Party followed suit by including both these subjects in the platform adopted by their Convention six months later. Two days after this Convention, a resolution was unanimously carried in the House, calling for the appointment of a committee of five members to inquire into the workings of systems of health insurance and maternity benefits "wherever such systems could be found in effective operation." The resolution was not acted upon, however, as the Legislature was dissolved shortly after and a general election held on July 18.

In the campaign that followed both the Liberals and the Conservatives offered to consider some scheme of health insurance, but the issue was overshadowed by the Pacific Great
Eastern Railway question. The electorate returned a Conservative Government, which, early in the new session supported a Liberal resolution calling for the appointment of a select committee of the Legislature, under the "Public Inquiries Act," to report upon systems of health insurance and maternity benefits. The motion carried unanimously and on April 16, 1929, a "Royal Commission on State Health Insurance and Maternity Benefits" was appointed.

The Commission presented a Progress Report to the Legislature in February 1930, which stated that: state health insurance had been successful where tried, it was necessary, and there was a general demand for it; but raised questions as to its feasibility on a provincial level, as systems examined had been on a national basis, and as to its constitutionality since there were no precedents in the other Canadian provinces.

The Commission continued its investigations, hearing evidence from 292 individual witnesses and from representatives of the following bodies: "Local sickness insurance associations, hospitals, medical profession, nursing profession, dental profession, health centres, pharmacists, the Canadian Legion, fraternal societies, trade-unions, farmers' institutes, women's institutes and unions, departmental stores, wholesale houses, industrial concerns, lumber industry, boards of trade, municipalities, railways, life insurance companies, Christian Scientists, drugless healers, chiropractors, anti-vaccinationists, anti-vivisectionists." Their evidence disclosed an
"overwhelming desire on the part of the public generally for the introduction of both state health insurance and maternity benefits" and "the undeniable and acute necessity for such a scheme." In fact, there was "no evidence of any weight presented against the principle of compulsory health insurance, aside from those who object to any kind of medical treatment." Accordingly, the Commission recommended the early establishment of a state health insurance and maternity benefits scheme with first provision for general medical and surgical treatment, including the necessary pharmaceutical supplies and surgical appliances, hospitalization and maternity benefit. The system was to apply compulsorily to all employed persons between 16 and 70 whose income did not exceed $2,400 per year, while provision was to be made for any persons outside this group who chose to join the scheme voluntarily. The system was to be financed by contributions from employee, employer and the Government. These recommendations were included in the Final Report which was presented to the Legislature in January 1932.

The Commission's recommendations were not acted upon by the Government as it was at that time anxious to avoid new expenditures and was reducing the budgets of all departments in order to meet its obligations. The world-wide depression with the resultant high unemployment left the provincial and municipal Governments with heavy relief expenditures and a declining revenue to meet them. The costly relief burden, complicated by the number of transient indigents in the Vancouver area, increased despite public works programmes and by 1933, the credit of the province
and the municipalities was exhausted and "necessary loans had to be made from the Dominion.\textsuperscript{404}" As a result both 1932 and 1933 passed without legislative action on the public health insurance question.\textsuperscript{405}

It was not an auspicious time for a general election. Premier Tolmie, claiming that a Union or non-Partisan Government would be better able to cope with the depressed economy, appealed to the Liberal Party and the Independent (Non-Partisan) Party to form a Union Government and then seek electoral support.\textsuperscript{406} Both parties rejected the offer. Despite their rejection, Tolmie decided to run as a Unionist, but the Executive of the Conservative Association of B.C. left it up to the Conservative Associations in each electoral district as to whether they would run a Conservative or a Unionist candidate. The disturbed economy was reflected in the appearance of eleven political parties, with 219 candidates contesting the forty-seven seats.\textsuperscript{407} Tolmie issued his own Unionist Manifesto in which he offered to support state health insurance on a federal basis. The Liberals, Conservatives and the newly formed Co-operative Commonwealth Federation offered some system of state health insurance on a provincial basis. In the event Tolmie was personally defeated and only one Unionist candidate was successful at the polls. Not a single Conservative retained his seat as the Liberals were returned with a majority of thirty-four seats. The seven new C.C.F. members formed the Opposition.\textsuperscript{408}
Though the unemployment and relief problems absorbed most of the energies of the new Liberal administration, it did not forget its electoral promise to legislate on state health insurance and by 1935, under the guidance of Dr. G. M. Weir, had drawn up a draft bill on the subject. Though the draft bill was distributed to the Legislature that year, the Government did not propose any action on it at that session, preferring to circulate the bill and hold public hearings on it so that interested groups could present their criticisms and suggestions; the draft bill to be altered accordingly.

The purpose of the draft bill was "to provide for wage-earners, for farmers, for other persons of low income, for indigents and for the dependants of such persons, so many of all groups as can readily be brought under the provisions of this Act, the advantages of adequate medical service, both curative and preventative, and of cash benefits to replace wages lost owing to absence of the wage-earner from work on account of sickness; and so to protect and to improve the health and well-being of the mass of the population." The compulsory plan, considered financially feasible, was to be financed by employees, employers and the Government. The levy on employees was not to be more than three per cent. of their wages and employers not more than two per cent. of the payroll of the insured employees. The Government's contribution would not be an additional charge on public funds, as the amount spent on subsidies to hospitals would no longer be necessary and would be transferred to the health insurance fund. The fund would not go into debt as benefits would only be granted as the fund permitted. The plan would be
limited to those with an income of $2,400 per year or less, but others could join if they assumed full cost of premiums. The Government would assume full cost of premiums for indigents and pay one-half the cost of administration of the plan. In addition to medical and hospital services, the plan provided for payment of a cash benefit not to exceed $10 per week up to twenty-six weeks to the beneficiary receiving treatment, laboratory services, limited dental service and limited nursing service. A Commission of five was to administer the Act, and the Commission was to have broad powers to make whatever regulations were required for the efficient carrying out of the intention of the Act. There were also to be advisory councils to represent the views of the benefitted and a special medical committee of three members to be nominated by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, without whose advice and views the Commission could not deal with the matters affecting medical practitioners or medical benefits.

In July, 1935, a Committee chaired by Allan Peebles was appointed to lay the draft bill before interested persons and groups, analyse their representations and make recommendations for amendments to the plan. While all approving the principle of compulsory state health insurance, opposition to parts or all of the plan which embodied it was apparent in many of the representations made. The B.C. Division of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association objected to the financing of the scheme, claiming that it was an additional tax and would over-burden employees and employers alike. In the present economic
situation, they felt that the federal Government should finance the plan on a national basis. The Trades and Labour Congresses of Vancouver, and New Westminster and District wanted the plan altered to include all over twenty-one and unlimited free nursing (home) care. Various women's associations wished to have a woman on the Commission. The Christian Science's Committee opposed the plan only to the extent that it might interfere with their faith and their pockets and urged an amendment to exclude persons on the ground of religious belief. The Chiropractic Association of B.C. objected to the plan because it did not recognize them and thus left the medical men with a monopoly of medical practice. More serious for the success of the plan was the attitude of the B.C. Medical Association which announced that it was "unanimously and unalterably opposed" to the scheme and that while seventy-five per cent. of the doctors "supported the principle of health insurance on a sound basis, the present bill was unworkable and unfair." The Committee considered these objections, suggested amendments to the draft bill accordingly and the health insurance plan which was submitted by the Government to the Legislature in 1936 largely incorporated its recommendations.

These objections presaged a difficult passage for the "health insurance" bill through the legislature. Introduced on March 18, the bill did not reach Third Reading until March 31, with the Government sustaining a number of reverses in votes at the Second Reading and Report stages. Even the Liberal members
were divided in their attitude, with five of their number voting against the bill at Second Reading and seven at Third Reading.\(^4\)\(^2\)\(^1\)

The new plan was on a more modest scale than the original and was to include: The coverage of all employees earning less than $1,800 per year; the employee to contribute two per cent. of his wages and the employer one per cent. of his payroll; mandatory benefits to include medical care by the physicians or surgeons chosen by the insured, hospital care, laboratory services, medicines and a cash maternity benefit of $20; the Commission was authorized to pay doctors on a salary basis, on a per capita basis or on a fee method.\(^4\)\(^2\)\(^2\)\(^\) The modified plan would cover about 125,000 employees and their families, some 300,000 persons in all, at a cost of about forty cents per week to the wage earner.\(^4\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

The Act was to come into force upon proclamation by the Lieutenant-Governor.

Considerable opposition to the new plan was voiced even before it was submitted to the Legislature. The Health Insurance Committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of B.C. protested that it did not resemble the original plan, and urged delay with the new measure and further actuarial investigation. Protests were also voiced by a delegation representing agricultural, business and industrial interests, who urged that the plan should be delayed on the ground that the cost of the plan would handicap these interests.\(^4\)\(^2\)\(^4\) Their protests failed and the Act was proclaimed on May 18, 1936 and the first of the Commissioners was appointed on May 22.\(^4\)\(^2\)\(^5\)
The Health Insurance Commission spent the remainder of the year securing the registration of persons subject to contributions and entitled to benefits and other matters related to getting the scheme ready for operation. Meanwhile, opposition to the Act continued. There were protests because indigents were not included in its scope. Numerous municipalities claimed they were not in a position to erect the hospitals called for in the Act. The medical profession continued its implacable opposition to the plan. In view of these conditions, the Government postponed enforcing the Act, which was to have begun operation early in 1937. 426

The Commission and the medical profession were still deadlocked over negotiations to bring the plan into operation when Premier Pattullo announced his decision to seek a new electoral mandate and, in addition, to hold a plebiscite on the question of public health insurance. 427 In announcing the plebiscite, Pattullo frankly admitted that "the Government was unable to cope with the wave of protest that greeted its health insurance bill" and so was "returning to the electorate for an expression on the issue." 428 He expanded on the need for a plebiscite in a manifesto printed in the leading newspapers: "Before effect could be given to the provisions of the Bill, the measure met with violent opposition." But, he continued, "Sumptuary laws are difficult of enforcement unless preponderantly supported by public opinion." Therefore, "in the light of circumstances, the Government has thought it wise to test public opinion upon the question before providing further, and for this
reason is submitting the question to the electors for an expression of opinion."

Every effort was made by the Liberal administration to explain the terms of the plebiscite, which asked "Are you in favour of a comprehensive health insurance plan progressively applied?" In two radio broadcasts, originating from Vancouver, Dr. G. M. Weir, stated "I should like to make it emphatically clear that in the plebiscite you are not being asked to vote upon the present Act, but rather upon the principle of health insurance being progressively applied to our whole population... This means a broad type of measure broad or comprehensive in the scope of its benefits and progressively applied to embrace more and more people in the Province." It was a mandate for the insured, that is, those contributing to the scheme, not the indigent, who "would be viewed entirely apart from the insured." An affirmative vote would be interpreted by the Government as a mandate for a limited system of health insurance, to be progressively applied to include "new groups of insured persons and to increase the benefits obtainable."

All the political parties were in favour of some scheme of state health insurance, but individual candidates objected to the terms of the plebiscite or attacked its use. The Conservative candidate for South Okanagan disliked the use of a plebiscite on the issue because it could have "no binding effect on the Government whatever the result," nor would the vote solve the present "impasse brought about by the refusal of B.C. physicians
to operate under the Act as it exists."  The Conservative Party Leader, Dr. F. Patterson, complained that "the present plebiscite is a negation of responsible government -- a sham and a camouflage to save the face of the government seeking desperately to escape responsibility for an impracticable and ill-considered scheme." Editorial support for Dr. Patterson's views was expressed by the Daily Province, which elaborated that the Government "should have worked out a scheme and asked for a mandate, as it was the government's job to supply leadership and have policies and accept responsibility for them."

Dr. Weir, who spearheaded the support for the plebiscite, pointed out that this criticism was not valid because all parties agreed on the principle of health insurance and so a vote for one or another would not show how the electorate felt. A plebiscite was absolutely necessary to gauge their attitude. Nor was the Liberal Government trying to evade responsibility for the issue as testified by its "Health Insurance Act" and its present endorsement of a health insurance measure. Furthermore, it was the announced intention of the Government to treat a favourable vote as a mandate for a limited health insurance plan.

According to the newspapers of the time, the campaign for the plebiscite was conducted quietly, with support of and opposition to it being conducted by the political parties. The pressure groups who had so vociferously opposed the Health Insurance Act were probably active in rallying public opinion to return a negative vote, but they did not utilize the newspapers
for their purpose.\textsuperscript{437}

By a majority of 144,198 votes, the plebiscite was approved and the Liberal Government was returned, though with a reduced majority, to deal with the health insurance question.\textsuperscript{438} Despite its electoral promises and the approved plebiscite, the Government chose a policy of waiting on the public health insurance question, neither enforcing the 1936 Act nor replacing it with another. The Government defended its lack of action on the issue by explaining that it was awaiting the report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, which had just been appointed and would probably have some recommendations to make on the question of public health insurance. But it was later recognized that the Royal Commission had little to do with the collapse of the health insurance scheme, which was in fact due to the refusal of the medical profession of B.C. to accept such a plan, coupled with the disinclination of the Attorney-General to take the drastic steps necessary to enforce it.\textsuperscript{439} For though the Commission, in its report published in 1940, recommended "that, if a system of Health Insurance is to be adopted, it ought to be instituted and administered by the Province," the Government still did not legislate on the issue.

Failure to bring into operation a system of state health insurance was a bitter disappointment to Dr. G. M. Weir, almost resulting in his resignation.\textsuperscript{441} It also produced dissatisfaction in Liberal Party circles. The C.C.F. reacted by initiating a
series of motions in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1942, and 1945, which requested the legislature to consider a measure of public health insurance, but these motions were ruled out of order as involving the expenditure of public funds. It was not until 1948, eleven years after the plebiscite, that the Government introduced and secured the passage of a bill providing for a compulsory system of hospital insurance, while provision for medical services and maternity benefits has yet to be made.

The Liberal Government's use of the plebiscite on the question of public health insurance was justified. Unless the issue was voted on separately, it would have been impossible, since all the parties supported public health insurance, to know whether a majority of the electorate did or not. An unmistakable mandate on the question was imperative in view of the strong opposition of the medical profession and other pressure groups for the successful enforcement of any insurance plan. It is difficult, however, to either justify or understand the Government's failure to make use of the mandate asked for and given by the electorate. While the opposition of the doctors made the Government's position difficult, it could, with the help of the Attorney-General's Department have forced the doctors to accept a health insurance plan. Yet they made no effort to devise a new scheme or enforce the old, even after the Rowell-Sirois Report's recommendation that the provinces should be put in a position to institute health insurance destroyed the only excuse they offered for their inaction on the question.
The Liberals had nothing to gain by repudiating the mandate they expressly asked for in using a plebiscite, in fact their decline in provincial politics dates from the time of this repudiation. At the first general election following the plebiscite, the Liberals' representation was reduced from 31 to 20, while the C.C.F. representation was increased from 7 to 16. The Liberals retained control of the Government only by forming a coalition with the Conservatives who held 11 seats. The Coalition Government remained in power for eleven years, splitting into its component parties for the 1952 election, when the electorate rejected all but six Liberals and four Conservatives, returning a Social Credit Government and a C.C.F. Opposition. While it is not possible to measure how much the repudiation by the Liberal Party of the mandate for a health insurance system contributed to this decline of electoral support, it is probably safe to conclude that it was a leading factor, since the number of seats it lost was almost matched by those gained by the C.C.F., which in and out of the Legislature urged and is still urging the adoption of public health insurance.
THE LIQUOR PLEBISCITE, 1952

The series of plebiscites which were held under the new Liquor Act, 1924, resulted in introducing beer parlors in many areas including Vancouver and New Westminster, though they were rejected by Victoria. The B.C. Prohibition Association greeted these results with increasing alarm and at their annual convention in 1931, the president blamed the apathy of the temperance-minded people for the success of the "wets" at the polls. "There is no disguising the fact that we have been losing," he admitted, "but if the people who really were opposed to the beer parlors had turned out in force we would have snowed the wet vote under." Another disappointed delegate charged that the church and many ministers throughout the province were "cool" towards prohibition. The prohibitionists were doomed to greater disappointments in the future as the trend of public opinion became increasingly "wet." 446

During the 1930's there was little evidence of this trend. Almost no agitation for reforms in the liquor laws occurred, beyond infrequent criticisms of the activities of the
rum-runners and the other bootleggers, as the more pressing problems resulting from the Great Depression occupied the political arena to the exclusion of other issues. However, in the Liberal Party Caucus, held in October, 1935, the sale of beer and wine in public dining-rooms on the basis of local option, not a province-wide plebiscite, was discussed. Premier Pattullo favoured this policy, but both the Cabinet and the Caucus were divided and so the issue was dropped. \(^{447}\) In 1936, there was newspaper speculation that the Legislature would deal with the highly controversial issue, but it proved to be idle. \(^{448}\) The next year, proprietors of hotels and restaurants were reported to be planning a move for a plebiscite in Vancouver on the sale of beer and light wines in their dining-rooms. But this too proved to be mere rumour as no delegation waited on the Government with such a request. \(^{449}\) At the November 1938 session of the Legislature, Thomas Uphill's Bill to amend the Government Liquor Act, which dealt with the sale of beer, was defeated, on the motion for second reading. \(^{450}\)

As a wartime emergency measure, greater restrictions were imposed on the sale of alcoholic beverages by the federal Government in 1942. For the duration of the war: beer and liquor advertising were prohibited; the amount of beverage alcohol released from bond was sharply reduced; the alcoholic content of all distilled spirits was reduced to not greater than thirty per cent. underproof; and the hours of sale were restricted to eight. \(^{451}\)
These restrictions produced shortages in supply so that, frequently, the liquor stores could not meet the demands of their customers. To ease the situation, a system of rationing was introduced which proved irksome to the public as the many complaints recorded in the newspapers of the time bear witness. The annoyances of the rationing system served to focus public attention on the inadequacies of the liquor distribution system as a whole. After the war, as part of the general urge against restrictions, agitation for reform of the liquor laws once more appeared on the political scene. Temperance opinion was the first to be publicly recorded, as the B.C. Temperance League and the B.C. Conference of the United Church of Canada advocated a royal commission rather than an immediate plebiscite on the liquor question. Rumours of a plebiscite to be held at the general provincial election (later in 1945) had been in circulation. No mention of such a plebiscite was made during the ensuing political campaign.

At a meeting of the Vancouver Centre Liberal Association in March, 1946, a resolution was passed demanding an overhaul of government policy affecting administration of the provincial Liquor Act. The Association declared there was no necessity for a new act, the present one, if properly enforced was wide enough. The need for more beer parlors as against more types of outlets was also noted. Three Coalition Members did not share these sentiments and pressed for liquor reforms, charging that "existing conditions are intolerable and must be changed."
The Attorney-General, Wismer, urged that a royal commission be set up to investigate the whole problem. Don C. Brown "warned that the repulsive features of prohibition - bootlegging, crime and juvenile delinquency - are creeping into the present system of liquor control and that a change must be made at once." Louis Lebaudois blamed "restrictions on the sale of liquor" for the increase in consumption of alcoholic beverages. Neither indicated what changes in the liquor distribution system were desirable. The Liquor Commissioner, Mr. Kennedy, also agreed that reforms were necessary and suggested a plebiscite on the sale of liquor with meals. The Government took no action on these suggestions, proroguing the Legislature without bringing in any reforms.  

Shortly after the session ended, the newspapers were again full of rumours predicting that sweeping legislative amendments to the liquor act, including sale of beer and wine with meals and cocktail bars, would be forthcoming at the next session. Six months later, the Attorney-General quashed these rumours with his announcement that the Government was not contemplating legislation providing for sale in restaurants; adding that he was personally opposed to same. Since he made no statement as to the fate of cocktail bars, silence was taken for consent, and just before the 1947 Session opened, a Vancouver newspaper announced that the liquor act would be amended to permit a limited number of cocktail bars in Vancouver and Victoria. At the same time, the B.C. executive of the Trades and Labor Congress presented a lengthy brief to Premier Johnson
and his cabinet requesting: more beer licences; more liquor stores, longer opening hours for liquor stores; cocktail bars and the ending of liquor rationing. During the session, the Rev. Dr. John Coburn, general secretary of the Canadian Temperance Federation waited on the Attorney-General to protest against any increase in the facilities for public drinking. Instead he urged that there be no changes in the liquor laws except in the direction of greater restrictions. "Introduction of cocktail lounges and serving of beer and wines in restaurants would be a retrograde step," and he warned, "we intend to fight it as we intend to fight every application for every cocktail bar in Ontario." Despite the increasing agitation on the liquor issue, the Government was content to leave the liquor act unamended except for ending the permit system.

During October, 1918, the B.C. Cabaret Owners' Association carried the campaign for more liquor outlets to the newspapers. In a series of advertisements, it proclaimed that "the right to drink while eating and enjoying entertainment is a personal right based on the widest interpretation of traditional Canadian freedom" and asked for liquor licences for B.C.'s established night clubs. The throne speech of February, 1919, contained no mention of amendments which might permit the sale of liquor in cabarets or restaurants. Speaking later in the session the Attorney-General confirmed that the Government planned no changes in the Liquor Act, but hinted that at some future date the administration might recommend a plebiscite on the liquor
At the same time, he reported that he had received thousands of letters from church organizations and community welfare groups beseeching him "not to introduce what they think would be another attractive opening for young people."  Like the proverbial bad penny, the question of liquor law reforms came up again at the 1950 session of the Legislature. Wismer again shelved the problem, stating that he was too busy with other government problems and had no time to study the liquor problem; perhaps next year something might be done.  Next year, the Coalition Parties rejected any changes, deciding in caucus to delay action of the liquor question until the next election.  Three weeks later, Wismer announced this decision in the House, revealing also that he saw no need of the plebiscite and was opposed to the sale of liquor by the glass, but would nevertheless accept the Government's policy.  The plebiscite was to be taken at a general election because an off-year plebiscite would produce only a small vote, resulting in a minority decision and would, in addition, give pressure groups with heavy financial backing a greater chance to influence the vote. It would also cost $300,000 to hold a plebiscite separate from a general election.

The terms of the plebiscite: "Are you in favour of the sale of spirituous liquor and wine by the glass in establishments licensed for such purpose?" were made public in March, 1952.  The wording of the plebiscite had a highly critical reception from some quarters. Harold Winch, the (C.C.F.) Leader of the
Opposition, charged that the plebiscite was a "complete evasion, absolutely nonsensical" and that the electorate would have difficulty voting as it would not know what it was voting on. The Victoria Daily Colonist echoed these charges, and added that the Liberal administration had been deliberately vague, so as to get a carte blanche from the electorate to do what it liked with liquor control, should the Liberals be returned to power. In addition to being a "pig in the poke offer" the plebiscite was a "death-bed repentance" offered by the Liberals as a vote-catching device.

The three major political parties, Liberal, Conservative, and C. C. F., were silent as to how they would view the plebiscite, none caring to define a liquor policy should the plebiscite vote be favourable. When announcing the plebiscite, the Liberal Government had promised to set up a representative committee to investigate methods of sale of liquor by the glass and the other parties were agreeable to this. In addition, the Conservatives committed themselves to a policy of local option. They also attempted to capitalize on the liquor issue during the political campaign, charging that the wording of the plebiscite was not specific and should have contained three or four questions.

The silence of the political parties on the liquor plebiscite combined with greater public interest in other issues such as hospital insurance; the appearance of a new political party, the Social Credit Party; and the break-up of the Coalition
of the Liberals and Conservatives resulted in reducing the liquor issue to a matter of minor concern on the political scene. Two non-political groups, the Alcohol Research Council and the Citizens' Committee for Commonsense Liquor Laws took it upon themselves to arouse the electorate's interest in the plebiscite by information as to what changes in the liquor laws they believed would be involved. The Alcohol Research Council was an organization set up by the Vancouver Council of Churches, the B.C. Temperance Federation and "other anti-liquor groups" and led the campaign for a "no" vote on the plebiscite.\textsuperscript{478} The Council asked "Would you sign a blank cheque?" and warned that the plebiscite was not a prohibition issue, but if passed would give the Government a free rein to open bars in any district. "Do you want an establishment in your neighbourhood?" was one of its most frequently used slogans.\textsuperscript{479} A "no" vote was also essential to protect land values as residential land values depreciate in the neighbourhood of a bar. The Council admitted that "our present liquor system is not satisfactory but grabbing at a pig-in-a-poke is not the answer." It advocated instead, that the plebiscite be rejected, and a thorough study be made of the alcohol distribution system before the Government be given a free hand.\textsuperscript{480} For the same reasons, the Greater Victoria Citizens' Association also urged that a negative vote be registered, emphasizing that a "no" vote was essential "until we know what we are voting for."\textsuperscript{481}

Early in May, a group known as the "Citizens' Committee for Commonsense Liquor Laws" was formed to campaign for a "yes"
vote on the plebiscite. The claims of the Committee had a familiar ring. It argued that liquor by the glass was a "practical step toward temperance because it eliminated the need to buy a minimum of a full bottle of spirits. It would also reduce law-breaking by eliminating the "bottle under the table evil." The present law corrupted youth, by forcing adults to evade the law. The liquor laws were also unenforceable, adversely affected tourist travel, encouraged bootleggers, and were discriminatory because club members only could purchase liquor by the glass. The Committee did not advocate an indiscriminate issuance of licences and, with an eye on the slogans of the Alcohol Research Council, insisted that licences could be issued only in commercial zones and thus would not affect the residential areas. It reminded the electorate that the Government had promised to appoint a committee to make a careful study of the liquor situation before any new legislation was introduced. "Vote yes to assure a change," the Committee urged as a no-vote would leave the unsatisfactory liquor situation intact. Furthermore, there was no guarantee that another twenty-eight years would not pass before the electorate were given a plebiscite on the issue.

Voting on a straight ballot the electorate gave the plebiscite a fairly substantial majority. A minority Government elected by a preferential ballot, was formed by the Social Credit members, who held nineteen out of the forty-eight seats. Fulfilling the promise of the previous Government, the new one
appointed a royal commission, consisting of H. H. Stevens, Chairman, and George Home and Cecil Swanson, Commissioners. The Commission held twenty-seven public sittings, at which about two hundred briefs were submitted by "labour-union executives, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, hotel and restaurant associations, church associations and other organized groups" as well as by private individuals. Some of the Commission's recommendations included in its report were: a three-member Liquor Control Board responsible to the Legislature; an inspection and enforcement branch of the Board (lax enforcement was one of the main criticisms of the present act); a permit system; sale of liquor by the glass in dining-rooms of certain hotels; a limited number of public houses licensed for sale of beer by the glass; club licences of different types; a limited number of restaurants licensed for sale of liquor with meals; sale of liquor by the glass in cabarets or night clubs, certain resorts, commercial boats and trains; and no sale to persons under twenty-one. The licensee and employees were to be responsible for observing the law and all regulations; infractions of which were to be punishable by suspension or cancellation of licences in addition to any fines or imprisonment that may be imposed.

The Government Liquor Act, 1953, which was passed by the Legislature at its first session after the publication of the Liquor Report, contained varying degrees of most of these recommendations. Conspicuous among those not included was the membership of the Liquor Control Board, which according to the new
act was to be appointed by and responsible to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and not the Legislative Assembly. The Act also provided for a system of local option whereby a licensing area (as designated by the Act) was given the chance to decide by a plebiscitory vote which one or any combination of the following systems it wanted:

(a) Are you in favour of the sale of beer, ale, and stout only under a public-house licence for consumption on licensed premises?

(b) Are you in favour of the sale of beer, ale, stout, and wine only under a dining-room licence for consumption with meals on licensed premises?

(c) Are you in favour of the sale of liquor under a dining-lounge licence for consumption with meals on licensed premises?

(d) Are you in favour of the sale of liquor under a lounge licence for consumption on licensed premises?

The Liberal Government turned to the plebiscite as a convenient device to prevent a split in the party over the liquor question. Several years of discussion had revealed a lack of party solidarity on the liquor issue. With a crucial election in the offing, the party could not afford a split on this question. Nor could the Government remain silent on it any longer, as agitation for liquor law reforms had become too widespread. A vaguely-worded plebiscite, not committing the Government to any particular policy and yet promising reforms, if a favourable vote were recorded, eased the Liberals out of a difficult position.
Daylight saving time, or the practice of advancing the clock one hour ahead of standard time, was, in addition to the liquor issue, made the subject of a plebiscite in 1952. Of a less controversial nature than the liquor issue, it commanded less public interest, and compared with the other political issues, was of negligible importance. This lack of interest was in complete contrast with the public's reception of the first daylight saving legislation. In 1918, the federal parliament of Canada enacted legislation to provide for daylight saving time only over the strong protests of members representing farming constituencies. The first year of its operation produced vociferous complaints from farming communities who claimed that daylight saving time meant an hour's work per day lost as cows could not be milked any earlier and heavy dew on the ground made field work impossible. Their complaints were effective for when the Act came up for renewal the next year, it was dropped; the federal government preferring to leave it up to the municipalities to decide whether they wanted it or not. The British Columbia Legislature reacted by passing an act empowering the Lieutenant-
Governor in council to institute daylight saving when he deemed desirable.\textsuperscript{495}

"Fast time" became a lively issue in Vancouver in June, 1941, when the City Council announced that if the provincial Government did not institute daylight saving for the province, it would do so for Vancouver.\textsuperscript{496} An immediate reply was forthcoming. By order-in-council, daylight saving was to be in effect in British Columbia from July 6, 1941 to October 1, 1942.\textsuperscript{497}

In Chilliwack, a rural district, the reaction was immediate. Ninety farmers attended a Chilliwack Board of Trade meeting, and claiming that fast time caused them a loss of two hours per day working time, adopted a resolution to be forwarded to the Premier "that agricultural areas of British Columbia be allowed to revert to Standard Time."\textsuperscript{498} The request was not granted so Chilliwack turned to her neighbours for support against fast time. At the invitation of Chilliwack's municipal council, the municipal councils of Surrey, Matsqui and Delta, endorsed a resolution favouring a return to Standard Time on September 1, with Langley delaying until October 1. The various school boards of the municipalities involved lent their support as they claimed that fast time produced difficulties in transporting children to school during the early morning in winter months; children in outlying districts would have to leave home before dawn.\textsuperscript{499}

While this controversy was still raging the federal Government ordered fast time for the Dominion for the duration of the war.\textsuperscript{500}
As the practice was highly popular with most city dwellers, the provincial Government, by order-in-council continued it after the war, but only for the summer months from 1945 to 1952. Protests were still heard from the farming communities. Finally, according to the Daily Province, it was at the request of Alex Hope (Conservative, Delta) "who claimed farmers would no longer complain about daylight saving (time) if the province as a whole voted in favor," that the Government decided in March, 1952, to hold a plebiscite on the question at the same time as the provincial general election. The plebiscite may also have been held to ensure a large rural turnout at the election as the issue was of great interest to the farmers.

Though supporters and opposers of fast time could roughly be divided into urban and rural dwellers respectively, neither one formed an organization to campaign for or against the plebiscite. Nor did any of the political aparties take a stand on the issue. As one newspaper commented "Nobody is saying anything about daylight saving time."

Daylight saving time received a favourable vote, though not so large as that of the liquor plebiscite. It is interesting to note that in thirteen of the nineteen electoral districts which returned Social Credit members, the plebiscite was rejected. Since 1952, fast time has been proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor under the authority of the Daylight Saving Act, 1919, without incurring protests from the farming community.
OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

At the beginning of this paper it was indicated that its purpose was to determine why plebiscites were used, what were the advantages and disadvantages of their usage and whether they were an asset or liability to responsible government. The observations and conclusions on these points, given in this chapter, can only be as valid as the evidence upon which they are premised. Where such evidence was scarce, as that regarding the daylight saving plebiscite, it would be foolhardy to venture conclusions and so only observations have been made. Where evidence existed which could logically be made the basis for a number of varying interpretations, as that regarding the liquor plebiscites, the conclusions drawn will probably reflect my own opinions.

The theoretical advantage of a plebiscite, that of enabling the elector to vote for a party and against an issue or vice versa, was particularly evident in the 1909 local option plebiscite. Premier McBride, seeking an electoral mandate for his railway policy was suddenly faced with largely-signed petitions from the temperance societies requesting immediate,
radical changes in the liquor laws. While the number of signatures on the societies' petitions was large enough to make it politically dangerous to ignore their requests, it did not represent a majority of the electorate and so could not authorize McBride to legislate on the liquor question without further reference to the electorate. Were it an ordinary general election, the reference could have been made in the customary way by inserting a liquor plank in the party's platform, but the impending election had been called for the express purpose of endorsing McBride's railway policy. If the liquor issue had been injected into the electoral campaign, it would have forced the electorate to choose between a railway and a saloon and probably have left both choices in doubt. A plebiscite on the liquor issue provided the electorate with the opportunity of expressing its opinion on both questions without prejudice to either, thus also providing McBride with unequivocable mandates for both local option and railway construction.

The advantage in separating an issue from party politics was also evident in the public health insurance plebiscite of 1937. A plan of health insurance had been devised, after a four-year investigation by a Royal Commission and further investigation by a public health insurance committee, which provided for a limited system of health insurance, that is, it was to be applied only to the lowest wage earning groups as the disturbed economic conditions made it impossible for the
Government to finance the cost of a more extensive scheme. However, before the plan could be brought into operation, it was opposed by a number of influential pressure groups including the medical profession, whose objection extended to refusal to accept the plan. In the face of such formidable opposition the Government decided to seek a mandate on the principle of the plan, that is, a limited system of health insurance to be expanded as revenues permitted. If approved, the Government would make the adjustments necessary to secure the approval of the medical profession. The usual practice of placing a health insurance plank in the party programme and then seeking an electoral mandate would not have revealed the electorate's wishes on the issue, as every political party had been on record as approving some scheme involving it since 1919. With an unequivocal vote in favour of a limited scheme, the Government would be in a position to coerce the medical profession, if necessary, into operating a public health insurance plan. Only a plebiscite could provide this mandate.

The special advantage assigned to the plebiscite with regard to moral issues, that is that only the electors' direct vote can bind the public conscience, was claimed by the various governments for their liquor plebiscites of 1916, 1920 and 1924, but refuted in practice. Prior to 1916, Bowser had been content to support McBride's liquor legislation and indeed, as Attorney-General, assume responsibility for enforcing it, although it had not received direct approval by the electorate. Yet, with
the advent of the question of prohibition, the liquor issue suddenly became sacrosanct, with Bowser, now Premier, claiming that only the electorate could decide the question. The use of the referendum on prohibition was a deliberate attempt to remove the liquor issue from politics, which failed when the Liberals, under Brewster, treated prohibition like any other political issue by campaigning on their "dry" reputation. Since 1912, the Liberal Party had had a temperance plank in its platform and Brewster now promised the electorate that regardless of the vote on the referendum, he would, if elected, pass a prohibition law. The electorate followed Brewster's lead by treating the referendum as a partisan issue and went to the polls to approve the referendum and the "dry" Liberal Party and reject the "wet" Conservative Party.

In 1920, Premier Oliver and his Liberal Government undertook the same reversal of policy that the Conservative Government under Bowser had done earlier; stating that changes in liquor legislation involved a moral issue which only the electorate, unaided by guidance from the political parties, could decide. This time the Opposition Party (the Conservative) acquiesced and it was only the small Socialist Party which treated the liquor question as a partisan matter. In order to emphasize its nonpartisan nature, the "Temperance Plebiscite" was held some months before the provincial general election.
Yet the advantage of more effective enforcement claimed for moral issues when removed from the realm of partisan politics and voted on directly by the electorate did not apply, in the event, to this plebiscite. As the only alternative to a discredited system of prohibition, the plebiscite offered the electorate an undefined liquor distribution system vaguely described as "Government control and sale." However, the real change in liquor legislation was embodied in a public bill, which, following the usual legislative processes, was approved by a partisan vote. The plebiscite thus offered only a chance to reject prohibition and so the liquor legislation which replaced it could not claim the support due to an act directly approved by the electorate.

Premier Oliver, still insisting that liquor legislation could only be decided outside the context of party politics, held a plebiscite on the sale of beer by the glass in 1924. The Conservative Party and the newly formed Provincial Party concurred in this view and so, though the plebiscite was held at the same time as a provincial general election, it played no part in the political campaign. In the first session of the Legislative Assembly held after the plebiscite, the Liberal Government refuted the superiority of the electorate's direct voice in moral issues, by enacting legislation providing for a local option system of sale of beer by the glass, though the plebiscite vote on this issue had been negative.
It is evident then, that in dealing with the liquor problem, however sincere the attempt, it has not been possible to treat it as a moral, nonpartisan issue by use of the advisory or referendum plebiscite. The liquor question has remained as a very lively, troublesome topic of party politics. It is significant that in announcing the 1952 liquor plebiscite, no attempt was made to present it as a moral issue.

Another of the advantages claimed for the plebiscite is that its employment for a contentious issue may avert a party split, that is, a party may avoid legislating on an issue because such action would result in dissenting members leaving the party. A plebiscite on such questions shifts the onus for decision onto the public. If the plebiscitory vote is favourable, it may then be possible to overcome members' individual scruples and legislate on the subject without disruption of the party. This advantage was applicable only to the 1952 liquor plebiscite.

Years of discussion of the liquor problem in party caucus and in the legislature revealed that the Liberal Party could not agree to changing the liquor laws despite growing public clamour for new ones. Faced with a crucial election in 1952, the Liberal Party could no longer risk antagonizing the electorate by silence on the issue and so made it the subject of a vaguely worded plebiscite, which, while not binding it to a definite policy did promise reforms, if the vote were favourable, and thus avoided a party split.
The chief disadvantage of the plebiscite, that it is so vulnerable to misrepresentation and emotional oratory as to obscure the real issue from the electorate was amply shown by the 1916 prohibition referendum. Coolly ignoring the truth, the "dry" elements proclaimed that the referendum if approved would establish total prohibition of the sale, consumption and traffic in liquor. The "wet" elements tried, in vain, to point out that the referendum provided for only a special type of prohibition, that of public drinking and retail sale as the province could not prohibit importation of liquor. Both "wets" and "drys" indulged in emotional appeals. The latter even imported evangelical speakers, including Billy Sunday, to impress the electorate with the fact that the referendum should be supported solely because it abolished the "sinful liquor traffic." The issue was further confused when both sides went so far as to appeal to the electorate to accept or reject the referendum on patriotic grounds, claiming that the result would affect the very outcome of the war. In the crossfire of these contradictory claims and oratory, the prohibition act, which was the subject of the referendum, was forgotten. The electorate went to the polls, not to accept or reject the Act's twenty page provision for limited prohibition, but to say yes or no to the abstract ideal of total prohibition.

In less dramatic fashion, the 1909 plebiscite was also the victim of misrepresentation by pressure groups who were opposed to it. Their propaganda blurbs insisted that
local option was the issue to be decided, quoting the actual wording of the plebiscite as their authority. In the absence of an official denial, many people voted according to this interpretation, whereas they were actually voting on a local option law, a considerably different matter.\textsuperscript{511}

Vagueness in wording in each of the 1920, 1924 and 1952 liquor plebiscites also encouraged misrepresentation by pressure groups. The government control phrase of the Temperance plebiscite was stressed by the Moderation League as implying a sort of rationing system, which the Government would use to prevent excessive consumption of liquor, whereas the ensuing legislation was concerned only with sale. Similarly, the failure of the Government to define "licensed premises" or explain that the principle of local option would operate, enabled the prohibitionists to threaten the public with the return of the dreaded bar, and worse yet, its appearance on every corner, if the beer-by-the-glass plebiscite was approved in 1924. Yet the following legislation expressly forbade the return of the bar\textsuperscript{512} and provided for glass sale of beer only on the basis of local option so that even the initiative for it rested with each municipality. The seemingly wide authority for liquor outlets in the 1952 liquor plebiscite enabled the "dry" elements to issue a threat identical to that of 1924, whereas the resulting legislation was again based on the principle of local option. While it is not possible to measure the extent these claims influenced the outcome of the vote, it is probably safe to
conclude that at least some of the electorate were affected and voted under a misconception.

Another theoretical disadvantage of the plebiscite is that it enables the government to evade responsibility for a "hot issue." There was evidence of this political expediency in each of the liquor plebiscites. McBride, in 1909, faced with a bona fide dilemma, used the plebiscite to dispose of the local option question instead of "carrying out the desire of the people of the Province in the matter." Though he promised, early in February, that a plebiscite would be held and that "ample time" would "be given between the announcement and the taking of the plebiscite," it was not until late October that the date was announced, while the wording was not revealed until eleven days before the vote was taken. In the ensuing months the wildest speculation concerning the terms of the plebiscite was indulged in, with the result that the brief time between the announcement of the terms and the vote was insufficient to clear up the many misconceptions that had been created. The wording of the plebiscite added to the misconceptions as the ballot read "plebiscite for local option" while McBride intended treating it as if the words "plebiscite for a local option law" had appeared on the ballot. McBride, however, did not trouble to make his intention known and many people accepted the words at their face value and voted accordingly.
While unfamiliarity with the plebiscite technique might excuse much of McBride's handling of the plebiscite prior to the actual voting, the serious irregularities surrounding the voting procedures provide irrefutable evidence of McBride's political bad faith. Returning officers were not given any instructions regarding the issuance, collection and counting of the plebiscite ballots, with the result that each returning officer acted as he saw fit. Some gave out ballots only if requested, while others did not bother to collect them from the voters. Worse yet, not all polling booths were supplied with ballots nor were they collected from others. Such negligence becomes sinister when it is realized that McBride made the stipulation that the plebiscite to be approved needed fifty percent, plus one, of the ballots cast for candidates. Yet when protests were lodged regarding these flagrant irregularities, McBride, making no attempt to refute or deny them, treated the fraudulent vote as the final word on the local option question.

In McBride's handling of the local option issue, it is evident that he, while professing lack of authority to legislate on the issue, had no compunction about ensuring the outcome of a plebiscite on it, by actions designed to produce a negative vote. Most significant of all, one must take McBride's word that the vote was negative, as there is no extant official record of the 1909 plebiscitory vote.
McBride's high-handed treatment of the local option question did not dispose of the liquor problem and by 1915, the growing prohibition sentiment reached such proportions that it was politically dangerous for him to ignore their requests for prohibitory legislation. By then too, anti-prohibition opinion had been well organized and was urging McBride not to enact prohibitory laws. Caught between the two conflicting demands, McBride sought an escape by offering to hold a plebiscite on the subject. But the prohibitionists, recalling their 1909 experience with a plebiscite, rejected the offer and insisted upon a referendum. No decision had been taken when McBride resigned his premiership and his successor, Bowser, was left to find a solution in an election year.

Bowser elected to remain silent on the issue, until three by-elections, resulting in defeat of three of his cabinet members, forced him to announce his policy in regard to prohibition. He attempted to appease the two strong, conflicting pressure groups by making prohibition the subject of a referendum plebiscite, though he defended his decision as necessary because prohibition was a moral problem requiring personal acceptance or rejection by the electorate. The expedient failed, when the electorate, judging on the Conservatives' past liquor policies, disregarded the moral interpretation and voted for the "dry" referendum and against the "wet" Conservatives.

By 1920, public dissatisfaction with prohibition had become so strong, it was apparent that the liquor problem would
be an issue at the general election that year unless the Liberal Government was able to provide more acceptable liquor legislation. Yet the Liberals' wholehearted endorsement of prohibition had accounted for much of their success at the polls and an open reversal of policy would be politically unwise. Premier Oliver, following his predecessors in office, offered a plebiscite on the liquor issue. His plebiscite paid lip service tribute to prohibition sentiment by offering continuation of the B. C. Prohibition Act as one choice. The other choice, government sale and control, while holding out the possibility of public sale of liquor implied a moderate system of retail liquor outlets and not a return to the saloons and bars so offensive to prohibitionists.

The Temperance plebiscite, while succeeding in removing the liquor issue from the ensuing political campaign, caused difficulties when it came to formulating effective liquor legislation. When the terms of the plebiscite were announced, various groups had petitioned Oliver to include a "sale of beer and wine under trade license" clause to government control and sale, but he refused. Such sale provided much acrimonious debate when the liquor bill was under consideration in the legislature, but Oliver refused to advocate it, claiming that the plebiscitory vote was specifically anti-bar.518

Like McBride's earlier dismissal of local option, Oliver's narrowly interpreted plebiscite did not dispose of the
question of public sale of beer by the glass. Instead, it resulted in the widespread existence of beer clubs. The number of these clubs nullified the law prohibiting the sale of beer. Dissatisfaction with the anomalous position of such sale became increasingly vociferous, with petitions from the Moderates advocating provision for public sale and from the prohibitionists advocating a return to prohibition. Caught once again between the conflicting demands of two pressure groups, Oliver refused to take any action on the beer question, until the nearness of a general election made continued silence political folly. And so the question which Oliver would not consider in 1920 became the beer-by-the-glass plebiscite in 1924.

Again at the insistence of pressure groups, the Liberal Government of 1952 was forced to sail in the tricky waters of liquor legislation in an election year, and like its predecessors, sought to ease the course by a vaguely worded plebiscite. Since the electors repudiated the Liberals at the election, it was left to the new Social Credit Government to interpret the plebiscitory vote and provide new liquor laws.

In conclusion it must be noted that in so far as the liquor plebiscites are concerned, both the advantages and disadvantages of plebiscites were qualified. From the electorate's point of view, it was of no advantage to be able to vote on an issue separate from general party policy, unless that issue was clearly stated. There was no satisfaction to be gained from voting for a "pig-in-a-poke" as the public was asked to do in
each of the undefined liquor plebiscites. For the politicians, the plebiscite provided only a brief respite. Disposing of the local option issue gained only six years for the Conservatives, who then had to face the more controversial prohibition problem with the shady reputation for handling liquor questions gained by the 1909 plebiscite. Similarly, failure to make provision for the sale of beer in the Temperance plebiscite only delayed decision on the issue as the Liberals had to deal with it four years later, while the Pattullo Government's experience with the public health insurance question revealed the danger of ignoring a plebiscitory mandate. When this Government failed to institute a system of health insurance after a majority of the electors approved a plebiscite on the issue, it was repudiated at the polls by the electorate.

The daylight saving plebiscite does not provide indisputable evidence for any of the theoretical advantages and disadvantages discussed above. While daylight saving did arouse controversy in the early 1940's, it was not an important issue by 1952. No pressure groups had been organized to seek or prevent its enactment, and so face the government with making an embarrassing decision in an election year. It was not then a choice between issue or party, nor was it a moral issue. As a clearly stated non-controversial issue, it was not subjected to misrepresentation or obscured by emotional oratory. Perhaps the strongest case can be made for political expediency, for while no organized groups existed to marshal opinions, supporters
and opponents could roughly be divided into urban and rural electors respectively. Since it was a crucial election in which every vote would count, the Liberal Government did not wish to risk alienating the marginal voters in either group by legislating on the issue and so put it to a plebiscite.\(^5\)

To an even greater extent, the woman's suffrage referendum is inconclusive concerning the theoretical advantages and disadvantages of plebiscites. Enfranchisement of women was not a moral issue, nor was it controversial as no pressure groups existed to oppose it. It was saved from the effects of emotional oratory by the more contentious prohibition act. It is difficult to make a case for political expediency without accusing Bowser of unbelievably bad judgment. Opinion was so favourable to woman's suffrage that there was more to be gained by legislating for it than by making it the subject of a referendum. Bowser, aware of this fact urged support for the referendum in the ensuing campaign. Perhaps the suffrage societies were correct when they accused Bowser of using the referendum to sidetrack the issue, for although the Liberals included it in their electoral platform, the greater interest in other issues made it difficult even to make the electors aware of the suffrage issue, let alone its importance.\(^5\)

The alternation of Government and Opposition which theoretically compensates for the absence of direct democracy techniques in responsible government would have rendered the use of plebiscites unnecessary only in the case of the prohibition
and woman's suffrage issues. The Conservative Government's repeated refusal to legislate on these questions, emphasized by their rejection of private bills for woman's suffrage, as contrasted to the Liberals' platform promises favouring both prohibition and enfranchisement of women, provided the electorate with a clear-cut choice as between parties, on both these issues. From the experience of the prairie provinces, there was a definite advantage to be gained for the Liberals by campaigning on these questions. There was, however, no such advantage to be gained by utilizing the other liquor issues, which became subjects of plebiscites, and so neither the Government nor Opposition Party would consider them in their political programmes. The electorate therefore having no choice as between a "wet" and a "dry" party, the alternation between Government and Opposition did not provide for an expression of opinion on liquor reforms. Nor would this alternation have provided the electorate with a choice on public health insurance, as both Government and Opposition were in favour of such a scheme.

Private Members' bills, the theoretical substitute for initiative and referendum, were utilized only for the woman's suffrage issue, and, after 1924, the liquor question. Sixteen private bills for the enfranchisement of women were introduced between 1887 and 1914, but the Government of the day, in spite of increasingly stronger public favour, refused to support them, defeating them at division on second reading. A seventeenth opportunity met a similar fate when the Conservative Government
opposed a private bill introduced in 1916 by two of its own members, insisting that it was preferable to hold a referendum on the question. The bills, while unsuccessful in their primary purpose, did succeed, not only in keeping the question before the public, but also in establishing the hostility of the Conservatives to it. When the Conservative Government later tried to remove the suffrage issue from politics, by using a referendum on it, the attempt was not successful. Thus though the Government, in form, departed from the usual processes of responsible government, the issue was, in effect, decided on the basis of the alternation of Government and Opposition.

Prior to the period following the 1924 plebiscite, there was no attempt to utilize Private Members' bills for liquor reforms, because pressure groups addressed their petitions to the Government. Even during the Conservative regime of 1903-1916, which was implacably opposed to their demands, the temperance societies did not attempt to air them in the legislature through private bills. Nor were the political parties interested in focussing attention on the liquor issue by having one of their members introduce a private bill. The Conservatives were satisfied with their liquor legislation, the Socialists were opposed to prohibition, and after 1912, prohibition's only supporters, the Liberals, were not represented in the legislature. Between 1916 and 1924, both the Liberal Government and the Conservative Opposition were anxious to avoid any legislative discussion involving liquor. When the insistence of the pressure
groups for liquor reforms became too strong to ignore, the Government resorted to a plebiscite. It never attempted to take the initiative for reforms, by testing opinion through discussion on a private bill.

Between 1924 and 1952, Conservative and Liberal parties' reluctance to discuss new liquor legislation continued and private bills seeking changes in the liquor laws were limited to those of the Socialist member, Thomas Uphill, who unsuccessfully sponsored several bills dealing with the sale of beer. Again, when pressure groups became too insistent to be safely ignored, a plebiscite, not a private bill, was used to initiate new liquor legislation.

In discussing the larger question of what effect the plebiscite had on responsible government, it is necessary to distinguish between the advisory and the referendum types. In the former, the plebiscite involves an expression of opinion which does not obligate the legislature to enact legislation. Thus while the advisory plebiscite enabled the Government to air opinions on various liquor issues and so aid it in deciding what general direction legislation should take, whether more or less restrictive, the final responsibility for such legislation still rested with the Government. It had to secure the majority approval of the legislature and if necessary, defend its legislation at the next election. The advisory plebiscite therefore, did not weaken the letter of responsible government, nor did it weaken the spirit of it, for when the McBride Government used a plebiscite solely
to dispose of the local option issue, the resentment aroused by this apparent evasion of responsibility made it impossible for him to use the advisory plebiscite for the prohibition issue. For moral issues, like the various contentious liquor reforms, which both the alternative of Government and Opposition and of the Private Member's bill failed to bring before the legislature, though legislation was desired on them, the advisory plebiscite played a useful role, aiding not weakening responsible government.

The referendum plebiscite, as a direct law-approving device by which a specific act is referred from the legislature to the electorate for its approval or rejection is destructive of responsible government. In order to substantiate this claim, it is necessary to examine the different bases of direct democracy, of which the referendum is a technique, and representative responsible government. Direct democracy originated in the United States to correct abuses of their governmental system, in which the executive is not responsible to the legislature, but directly to the electorate, as the executive is elected separately from the legislature by a numerical majority of the citizens. In other words the individual citizen is the creator and motive power of both the executive authority and the legislative authority. Thus when the American electorate asserted the right to initiate and refer legislation, it was not claiming a new power, but giving a different expression to an old one.
Responsible government proceeds from a radically different basis, with the executive authority originating not with the individual citizen but with the monarch. It is best described by the phrase, government by the "King in Parliament," in which the King, by and with the consent of parliament governs the nation. In current British Columbia practice, this means the executive powers invested in the Lieutenant-Governor are exercised by a cabinet with the majority consent of the popularly elected legislature. The cabinet is made up of ministers chosen from the political party (called the Government party) which has gained a majority of seats in the legislature. The cabinet is thus responsible to the legislature and may continue to exercise the executive powers only so long as it retains the support of this majority or until a new election. The Cabinet usually originates legislation on all matters of public concern and legislation involving the expenditure or raising of money must originate with a Government bill. The active and originating element in legislation is thus the Cabinet. The legislature does not initiate legislation or govern but secures full discussion of matters both legislative and administrative as the price of its assent to government policy. To balance the power of the Cabinet in responsible government, there is an Opposition, which as critic and alternative to the Government, prevents arbitrary use of its executive powers.

In exercising the sovereignty of the will of the people over legislation in cabinet government, the individual voter is
limited in function to the choosing between the two alternatives, the Government and the Opposition. He must in this single choice approve both policy and legislator, though the Government and Opposition are both influenced in their policies by public opinion which each voter has his share in forming. But when the referendum was used, it gave the electorate an authority over legislation specifically denied to it by the cabinet system. When the right to refer legislation to the citizens is asserted, then by corollary, the right to initiate cannot be denied, but as just shown, initiation of policy is an executive function, indeed the very basis of cabinet government. If the dangerous precedent set by the Conservative Government in referring the B.C. Prohibition Act and the Women's Suffrage Act, that is, to refer what it is afraid to enact, had been continued, and then logically expanded to include the initiative, responsible government would have become too unstable to provide good government or would have ceased to exist. Succeeding governments have ignored this disruptive precedent and the cabinet system continues unweakened by direct democracy techniques.

It is hazardous to predict possible use of the advisory plebiscite in the future, but from past experience it would seem apparent that any changes in the liquor laws in B.C. will be preceded by an advisory plebiscite. Since liquor involves a moral issue, it is difficult for a political party to formulate and present to the electorate a policy on the question, unless circumstances should, as they did in the prohibition plebiscite,
involve a distinct political advantage. Thus almost the only way the electorate has a chance to express its opinion on liquor questions is through a plebiscite. The Private Member's Bill does provide another outlet for public expression on moral questions, but it has a dismal record of no success in securing changes in liquor laws in the past. Thus for those issues in which the public desires legislation, but neither the choice between parties nor the Private Member's Bill succeeds in bringing them before the legislature, the advisory plebiscite is a necessary last resort. It is even desirable if one accepts the maxim that good government consists of doing the possible.

As the referendum plebiscite cannot be used without eventually destroying responsible government in B.C., its possible future use can only be contemplated if cabinet government were to be replaced with some other form of government with which its use is compatible. While perhaps somewhat remote, this replacement is not altogether an impossibility as cabinet government owes its origin and continued existence to its usefulness and could conceivably be overthrown when the public decided that its usefulness had ended. Until that time the referendum can be of no use in the future government of B.C.
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132 The Provincial Secretary's office has no record of an order-in-council authorizing a plebiscite; nor has the Chief Electoral Officer's office any record of the plebiscitory vote.


134 "The petition of the undersigned residents of British Columbia, humbly sheweth, that your Petitioners believe it would conduce to the best interests of the Province if Women were admitted to the political franchise.

Your Petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your Honourable Body will, during the present Session, so amend the Franchise Act as to enable women, being British subjects of legal age, to vote at any election of Members for your Honourable Assembly." (B.C. Legislative Assembly, Sessional Papers, vol. XIV, 1885, p. 323.) This petition was organized by the Victoria W. C. T. U. though not presented on behalf of it. It was supported by similar petitions from Wellington, Comox, Sumas and Chilliwack, Maple Ridge.


137 Cleverdon, *Woman Suffrage*, p. 86.

138 This argument was to be used by every Government faced with a suffrage petition until 1916, when the suffrage referendum of that year ended the agitation. "... because the desire is not general among the women" were the words used by Premier McBride when he rejected the claims of the suffragists' petitions in 1911. (Elsie Gregory MacGill, *My Mother the Judge: A Biography of Judge Helen Gregory MacGill*, Toronto, Ryerson Press, 1955.)

139 The one in 1899 almost succeeded, being defeated on motion for second reading by 17-15. (B.C. Legislative Assembly, Journals, 1899, vol. XXVIII, p. 74.)


142 Cleverdon, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

143 Mrs. Gordon Grant, one of the pioneers of women's suffrage in B.C. and first president of the Victoria Political Equality League, went to Vancouver to help organize its political equality league. (Ibid., p. 89.)


145 Ibid., p. 4. The "Married Women's Property Act, 1887, c. 20," enabled a married woman to own and sell property as though a femme sole; but the "Dower Act, c. 63, Revised Statutes of B.C. 1897," [Imperial: 3 & 4 William IV, c. 105] gave a married woman no automatic claim to dower as her husband could will it away from her, or in his lifetime dispose of it without her consent.

146 There is a full description of these cases on pp. 127-8 of Elsie MacGill's *My Mother the Judge*.


148 That is, without first having to petition the courts, the only recourse then open.

149 Townley, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

150 Loc. cit.
151 (Name of newspaper not given.) The quotation concluded:
"... and no doubt many of the ladies who were so pleased when
the bill received its second reading, will be wondering how
they have been euchred out of what they have been considering
practically won." (Townley, Points in the Laws Regarding Status
of Women, p. 9.)

152 Ibid., p. 10. "By 1911 women were voting in New Zealand,
Australia, Tasmania, the Scandinavian countries, and the American
states of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Idaho, Washington and
California... In each of these areas woman suffrage had
been followed quickly by changes in social laws; by statutes
that provided for equal rights of guardianship between parents,
that raised the age of marriage, protected the marriage survivor
from poverty by will of the deceased spouse, enforced maintenance,
prevented destitution. Here was prima facie evidence that only
when women could threaten or cajole with the power of the ballot
could they expect immediate sweeping reforms, for elsewhere such
legislation lagged." (MacGill, My Mother the Judge, pp. 122-3.)

153 Vancouver Women's Building, Limited, Yearbook, 1922,
Vancouver, B.C., Vancouver Women's Building, Limited, 1923, p. 22.

154 "The women of Vancouver are now prepared to advance in
ordered ranks upon the strongholds of conservatism to demand
the ballot. Working quietly, but with commendable despatch,
the machinery was got in order, and the city possesses an
organized society for the advancement of women's political
status" was the description given of this League by the World,
[Vancouver], February 4, 1911.


156 Ibid., p. 16.

157 Ibid., p. 17.

158 Loc. cit.

159 The Vancouver Sun, March 19, 1913.

160 The regular rejection of their claims did not seem to have
disturbed the suffragists. A description appearing in the
Vancouver Sun, March 19, 1913, describes their optimistic reaction
to McBride's rejection of the suffrage petitioners of 1912:
"The members of the League are in no wise discouraged by their
failure to gain political recognition during the session. They
note with gratification the immense change in public opinion
which is taking place, and which is particularly noticeable in
the altered attitude of many prominent men and women who lie
beneath the demand for suffrage on the part of women." (Women's
Special Edition, The Vancouver Sun, March 19, 1913.)
The Province [Vancouver], October 23, 1937. Women's suffrage bills introduced, by private members, in 1909, 1913 and 1914 were negatived on second reading by Conservative members. (B.C. Journals, 1909, p. 128; 1913, p. 115; 1914, p. 83.)

Among whom was Nellie McClung, a well-known fiction writer. Her connection with the suffrage movement is described later in this paper. See note 164.

Included in this group were: Alfred E. Bull, then police court magistrate and Judge of the Juvenile Court; Judge Grant; and barristers Arthur Creagh, Alex Henderson, Fred Lucas, J. Stuart Jamieson. (MacGill, My Mother the Judge, p. 126.)

Nellie McClung was the chief organizer of the suffrage campaigns in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. She appeared briefly in Vancouver to attend a Prohibition convention in August, 1915, and also spoke at public meetings on behalf of women's suffrage. Later she toured several American states for almost two years for the double cause of female suffrage and prohibition. In the 1920's she was a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta and was one of the appellants in the Persons' Case in which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that women were eligible to sit in the Canadian Senate.

Senator Cottrell of Washington, speaking at the first convention of the B.C. Political Equality League and reported in the World [Vancouver], May 6, 1909.

"There is something very alarming in the attitude of the Militant Suffragettes. They are exceeding all bounds, and are most surely alienating any existing sympathy with their cause. It will take but one greater outrage than any that has passed to utterly rout and extinguish a movement which many educated, intellectual and broadminded anti-militant women have at heart." (The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], March 9, 1913.)

The editor-in-charge was Helen MacGill. Twenty societies representing 4,500 clubwomen of Vancouver contributed to this paper. It went through two editions which sold at five cents per copy, the profits being used for campaign expenses.

This paper did much to alter the attitude expressed in the following quotation: "The proceeding at that time (here, the 1911 delegation of suffragists to Victoria) was generally regarded as one of enormity on the part of their sex and treated with levity due to the whim of women, who apparently, unmindful of their womanly duties, were crying like spoilt children for the moon." (Editorial entitled: "Rights of Women Restored by Election," The Vancouver Sun, September 15, 1916.)
169 It was to be a bi-weekly edition for the first six months and then to become a weekly if funds permitted. (The NewsAdvertiser [Vancouver], March 21, 1913.) I could find no further trace of "The Pioneer" and do not know if it achieved its aim.

170 Cleverdon, Woman Suffrage, pp. 91-2.

171 The News Advertiser [Vancouver], March 30, 1913.

172 "For this purpose the Evening Work Committee of the Pioneer Political Equality League (a league formed for the purpose of obtaining the parliamentary vote on the same terms as it is now or may be granted to men) have started a series of public meetings for the purpose of bringing before the public the many reasons why women should be allowed to vote. As a further means of keeping up public interest in the women's movement, the members of the committee are publishing a paper that will deal with all women's political, industrial and educational interests. An office has also been rented for a headquarters, from which to carry on this campaign. Public meetings are held every Wednesday at the Labor Temple at 8 p.m., admission free. All are welcome." (The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], March 30, 1913.)

173 MacGill, My Mother the Judge, p. 146.

174 Cleverdon, op. cit., p. 93.

175 MacGill, op. cit., p. 147.


177 Ibid., pp. 60-65.


180 Ibid., pp. 147-48.


182 At a by-election held in Vancouver on March 4, 1916, Malcolm A. MacDonald, a Liberal, defeated Hon. Charles E. Tisdall, Minister of Public Works. At a by-election held in Victoria on the next day, the Liberal party leader, Harlem Carey Brewster defeated another cabinet minister, Hon. A. C. Flumerfelt, Minister of Finance. (The Canadian Parliamentary Guide, 1916, pp. 405-10.) It was after these by-elections,
which clearly revealed that the tide was running against the Conservative Party, that Bowser introduced his suffrage referendum, i.e. on May 23, eight days before the session prorogued. (B.C. Legislative Assembly, Journals, pp. 151-176.) Bowser's own explanation of the referendum was somewhat inept: "Since the Legislature commenced, however, he had felt that since the great question of prohibition was coming before the people, a referendum should be taken at the same time on the important issue of the franchise." "Bowser, speaking at an election rally at the Empress Theatre, Vancouver, on September 1, 1916, as reported in The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], September 2, 1916.)

MacGill, My Mother the Judge, p. 149. "The suffragists of B.C. had expected that they would gain the vote through the usual method - parliamentary action - and were organized for that purpose only. When the referendum was given it meant that the women had a greater task on hand than they had expected, for this method would take much greater organization as this meant far more detail to work out." (Report of Mrs. J. A. Clark, Chairman of the City Central Suffrage Referendum Association entitled "Women are now on equality with men," in The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], September 17, 1916.) Miss Helen Guttridge, Secretary of the Pioneer Political Equality League of Vancouver, was one of the few suffragists who approved of the referendum: "We did not ask for a referendum on women's suffrage, but since that has been given us we have admitted that after all it is probably the best thing for us, because the referendum has taken the question of women's suffrage entirely out of politics altogether. It has nothing to do with either party and we think that it is more desirable for us to receive our suffrage in that way, without reference to either party." (The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], September 2, 1916.) However, the reason she gave was only theoretically valid, as both parties openly discussed the referendum during the campaign, in fact, treating it like any other political issue. (See pp. - of this chapter.

MacGill, op. cit., p. 149.

"An Act to Amend the 'Provincial Elections Act,'" B.C. Legislative Assembly, Journals, vol. XLV, pp. 150-76.

According to The Vancouver Sun, August 14, 1916, the suffragists' campaign was in the hands of volunteers, as they had no appropriation for advertisements, no campaign fund and no paid organizer.


Brewster, speaking at an election rally at the Old Victoria Theatre, July 11, 1916, as quoted in the Times [Victoria], July 12, 1916.

This was an abrupt volte-face on the part of the Conservatives as prior to this referendum they were implacably opposed to the extension of the franchise to women. It was true of the western provinces, from Ontario to B.C. that the Liberal Party favoured woman suffrage, while the Conservatives opposed it.

The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], September 14, 1916.

Ibid. Dr. McGuire, a Conservative candidate for the Vancouver riding further elucidated his party's viewpoint on the suffrage issue: "... As soon as it (Conservative Government) was convinced that a question would be for the good of the province it did its utmost to put it on the statute books at the earliest possible moment. This was what had been done with the woman suffrage question." (Ibid., August 4, 1916.)

In the bitter struggle of the election and the controversy aroused by the prohibition issue, it was difficult to keep the public aware of the suffrage campaign. "In spite of the valiant efforts of the women, it would be erroneous to infer that woman suffrage was more than a minor issue in the campaign as a whole." (Cleverdon, op. cit., p. 99.) In an editorial entitled "Votes for Women," The Vancouver Sun asked the electorate not to forget the suffrage question: "The attention of the people is violently attracted to other issues. But see how important this one is..." (The Vancouver Sun, September 14, 1916.)

The Colonist [Victoria], a Conservative newspaper, was one notable exception. In an editorial entitled "Women and the Ballot," it took the ladies to task, charging them with being anti-Conservative and chiding them for regarding the suffrage referendum as a political issue, and reminding them that the referendum was a deliberate attempt to remove the issue from politics. (The Colonist [Victoria], July 11, 1916.)

The News Advertiser [Vancouver], September 1, 1916.

Nellie McClung, addressing a suffrage rally in Vancouver on August 29, 1915, as reported in the World [Vancouver], August 30, 1915.
World [Vancouver], August 30, 1915. There were many more arguments, pro and con, on this issue. Only the most popular ones were given here.

The Civilian vote for Woman Suffrage was 43,619 and against 18,604; the Soldiers' vote stood 8,273 and 6,002 respectively. (Canadian Annual Review (1916), p. 781.) Mrs. Ralph (Mary Ellen) Smith was the first woman to win a seat in the Legislative Assembly of B.C. She won a by-election in January, 1918, which was necessitated by her husband's death. She was made Minister Without Portfolio by Premier Oliver in 1921. (Cleverdon, Woman Suffrage, p. 101.) "Minimum Wage for Women Act," (B.C. Legislative Assembly, Journals, vol. XLVII, p. 222.)

See pages - of this chapter.

With this important difference, the 1909 plebiscite was an advisory one, whereas the 1916 plebiscite was a referendum.


Canadian Annual Review, 1910, p. 769.

The Liquor Act, 1910, Pt. I. For purposes of estimating this proportion, wives and children, over 21 years of age, were included.

Ibid., pts. 2, 3, 4, Sec. 5-74.

However, during these restricted hours, bona fide travellers could have liquor served with their meals.

An Act to amend the "Municipal Clauses Act," chap. 37. (Municipal Clause Act Amendment Act, 1911.)

Saloon licenses were not permitted in unorganized territories or along lines of railway construction. (Canadian Annual Review, 1912, p. 595.)


Canadian Annual Review, 1913, p. 676.

Revised Statutes of B.C., 1911, chap. 19 and 39.


Ibid., p. 733.

Ibid., p. 737.
The 300 delegates of the third annual convention of the B.C. Local Option League meeting on February 16, 1911 in Vancouver, accepted unanimously the resolution that the campaign continue until "absolute Prohibition was obtained." (World [Vancouver], February 17, 1911.) The Canada Temperance Act under which municipalities could have local option had become unpopular with many temperance people who considered the machinery supplied to be inadequate to enforce the law. (World [Vancouver], February 11, 1911.)

183

184 The 300 delegates of the third annual convention of the B.C. Local Option League meeting on February 16, 1911 in Vancouver, accepted unanimously the resolution that the campaign continue until "absolute Prohibition was obtained." (World [Vancouver], February 17, 1911.) The Canada Temperance Act under which municipalities could have local option had become unpopular with many temperance people who considered the machinery supplied to be inadequate to enforce the law. (World [Vancouver], February 11, 1911.)

185

186 Canadian Annual Review, 1912, p. 595.

187

188 Ibid. 1912 was an election year and Brewster, leader of the Liberal Party adopted the temperance societies' double plank of local option and women's suffrage in the hope of attracting votes away from the extremely popular Conservative administration. But the electorate still preferred the Conservatives and not one Liberal attained a seat.

189

190 The Methodist, Presbyterian and Metropolitan churches had been early and active supporters of prohibition.

191


193

194 Ibid.

195

196 It was organized by the B.C. Local Option League and held in Vancouver and attended by over 1,000 delegates representing every district in B.C. (The Vancouver Sun, August 23, 1915.)

197

198 The meeting took place on August 4 and the proceedings were reported in the World, August 11, 1915.

199

200 McBride to Stevenson, August 24, 1915. For full text see Appendix VIII.

201

202 "... and the history of mere plebiscites in Canada and B.C. has not been such as to make temperance people waste much time and money in securing a repetition of them. In fact, a straight plebiscite, we think, would only cause 'resentment.'" (The World, [Vancouver], August 24, 1915.) The irregularities of the 1909 plebiscite were also recalled: "Moreover, the purely mechanical difficulties are important. Temperance workers have never quite forgiven the government for the conditions attending the vote on the local option bill in 1910 (sic), when a ballot for the local option vote was issued only on the request of the voter; and returning officers, whether under instructions or not, were often reluctant even to hand out a ballot on request. A repetition of such a condition would arouse deep resentment among temperance people." (World [Vancouver], August 27, 1915.)
"Doubtless, Sir Richard will seek to justify this (plebiscite) on the ground that his party cannot act in such a vital matter without the direct assent of the people. But he omits to state -- or perhaps the omission is the fault of the government newspapers -- the date on which the referendum (sic) will be held. This is the all-important point. If there is to be no vote taken for six months the value of the government's concession will be neutralized." (World [Vancouver], August 23, 1915.)

For full text see Appendix XVIII.

Ven. Archdeacon Lloyd, Principal of Emmanuel Divinity College, Saskatoon, and President of the Dominion Alliance, who had been invited as principal speaker to the Convention. (The Vancouver Sun, August 27, 1915.) Nellie McClung had also been invited to address the Convention and other public meetings. She was an extremely popular speaker and 5,000 attended one meeting while hundreds more were turned away as there was no more space available. (World [Vancouver], August 24, 1915. Other public meetings re prohibition held at that time were similarly attended to capacity.

Typical of the resolutions passed was the following: "... owing to the magnitude of the interests involved, this meeting is opposed to any emergency legislation tending to Prohibition, even during the continuance of the War, without a general referendum to the people of this Province." (Canadian Annual Review, 1915, pp. 732-3.)

This delegation was headed by Colonel E. G. Prior of Victoria and J. J. Shallcross, Vancouver, and claimed to represent the largest financial and business interests in the Province. (Ibid., 1915, p. 733.)

Loc. cit.

A large Prohibition delegation waited on McBride on September 14 and one from the Merchants Protective Association waited on him on October 4. See Appendix IX.

Jonathan Rogers of the People's Prohibition Movement, tired of McBride's noncommittal attitude had written him the following warning letter: "... In order to allay their (followers') suspicions and to assure them that we have been using every endeavour to secure a statement of the Government's intention, we must very soon now publish our correspondence. This will not be done with any hostile intent but simply to let the public know the position of affairs." (Rogers to McBride, October 30, 1915.) McBride's reaction to this letter was to announce the date of the plebiscite. For full text of his letter to Rogers see Appendix X, Letter 72/15.

233 Ibid., 1917, p. 735.

234 Loc. cit.

235 McBride resigned the Premiership and was later appointed Agent-General for B.C. in London. He was replaced by Attorney-General William Bowser.

236 Bowser had other pressing issues as well to settle, namely, the problem of railway construction and debts and charges of mishandling of funds of same.


238 Tisdall was defeated by the Liberal candidate by 9,590 votes to 5,462. (Loc. cit.)

239 Loc. cit.

240 He was defeated by Brewster, Leader of the Liberal Party by 4,812 votes to 2,416.


242 Rev. R. W. Patterson was cheered loud and long when he made the following statement at the Prohibition Convention in August: "Then arises the question that when we get prohibition ought we to compensate the liquor men for the investment of their money. I say no. I call them gamblers and gamblers must take their chance. For every man who applies for a liquor license knows he takes the chance of the country going 'dry.' And he gets that hotel license simply as a liquor license. And he knows he does. This system is not a hotel licensing system, but a liquor licensing system and all hotelmen know it." (The Vancouver Sun, August 27, 1915.)

243 Canadian Annual Review, 1916, p. 767. Though unknown to the public at the time, the Lieutenant-Governor refused to assent to the liquor referendum without Bowser's assurance that should it pass, the question of compensation would be looked into by an impartial commission: "For your information, and in order that the matter may be on record, I (Lt.-Governor) beg to say that before assenting to the Prohibition Act and Referendum, 1916, I obtained a promise from Mr. Bowser that he would make a statement to parliament upon the introduction of the Act that, in the event of the Prohibition Act being brought into force, the Government would appoint a commission to inquire into and report upon the question of compensation to be paid to those formerly engaged in the liquor trade." (Quoted from a confidential memorandum for the executive council, signed by Premier John Oliver, undated and uncatalogued paper in the Pattullo collection, Provincial Archives, B.C.)
244 Canadian Annual Review, 1916, p. 768.


246 Cited from a pamphlet issued by the Prohibition Movement in the Vancouver City Archives collection entitled "Prohibition Docket."

247 Advertisement in The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], September 1, 1916.

248 The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], August 11, 1916.

249 Ibid., July 29, 1916.

250 The Vancouver Sun announced this policy on August 31, 1916.

251 The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], September 2, 1916.

252 Times [Victoria], September 13, 1916.

253 Ibid., September 12, 1916.

254 "11. A declaration that the liquor traffic of British Columbia is at present under the absolute control of the Provincial Government and is used as a political machine. To insist upon the complete removal of liquor question from party politics. A Local Option law for the protection of the public; careful inspection of all liquors offered for sale." (Plank of the Liberal Party for the provincial general election, 1912. Canadian Annual Review, 1912, p. 614.) "Mr. Brewster declared strongly for . . . total Prohibition with Local Option as a preliminary." (Loc. cit.)

255 See Appendix XII.

256 "Two days before the by-election in this city at a meeting held in the Orpheum Theatre I told the people of Vancouver that the promise made by my predecessor, Sir Richard McBride, on the matter of prohibition would be carried out by me," he said. He had promised that a referendum of the people would be taken and that the government would act upon the wish of the electorate as expressed in this referendum.

"And now the Liberals are claiming that my decision to this effect was a death bed repentance and that it was not till after Mr. Tisdall had been defeated in the by-election that I
made the decision. You people who heard me will bear me out when I repeat that I made a promise before that election . . ."  

A roar of assent gave (sic) instantaneous answer to the Premier's words.  

He had felt, he continued, that a question of such importance as this should be referred to the people and he had carried out his promise to place the matter before them." (Premier Bowser speaking at an election rally in Vancouver as reported in The News-Advertiser [Vancouver], September 8, 1916.)

257 Canadian Annual Review, 1917, p. 826. It also marked the defeat of the "wet" Conservatives and the return to office for the first time of the "dry" Liberals. Liberals returned 37 M. L. A.'s; Conservatives, 9; and the Socialists, 1. (Canadian Annual Review, 1916, pp. 779-780.)

258 Loc. cit.  
259 Loc. cit.  
260 Ibid., p. 831.  
261 Ibid., p. 833.  
262 Loc. cit.

263 Report of the Prohibition Commissioner (J. Sclater) for the year ending December 31, 1919, quoted in Canadian Annual Review, 1920, p. 829. "The Attorney-General (Mr. Farris) stated that in the eight months from March to October, inclusive, doctors in British Columbia had issued 186,120 prescriptions for liquor -- one Doctor writing 4,000 prescriptions in a month." (Canadian Annual Review, 1919, p. 796.)

264 Ibid., 1921, p. 876. Later, during the 1921 Liquor plebiscite campaign, Premier Oliver "blamed public sentiment, which, he claimed, had not been strong enough, for not enforcing the prohibition act and maintaining that 86 per cent. of the responsibility was entirely due to the municipalities." (Oliver, quoted in the World [Vancouver], October 6, 1920.) Only for the 14 per cent of the population in unorganized districts was the Provincial Government responsible for enforcing the Act.

265 See Appendix XIII.


267 See Appendix XIII.


269 "B.C. Prohibition Act Amendment Act, 1920." (B.C. Statutes, 1920, chap. 72, sec. 6, 7, 8, 9.)
270 "Temperance Plebiscite Act." (B.C. Statutes, 1920, ch. 93.)

271 Canadian Annual Review, 1921, p. 876.

272 Colonist [Victoria], April 9, 1920. The delegation claimed that the worst evils of illicit sales would disappear if light wines and beer sale were permitted. They were also alarmed at the growth of drug addiction since the Prohibition Act had been in force.


274 Colonist [Victoria], April 14, 1920.


277 Ibid., pp. 250-1. The Oliver Government was committed to a further plebiscite only at an indefinite date as the Resolution stated "earliest possible date."

278 World [Vancouver], October 15, 1920.

279 Ibid., October 6, 1920.

280 Farris, speaking at a Vancouver City Liberal Association meeting, at which he also hinted that a provincial general election would be held in the near future after the results of the plebiscite were known. (The Province [Vancouver], October 18, 1920.)

281 The Vancouver Sun, October 17, 1920.

282 The Convention was held in Vancouver.

283 Quoted in The Province [Vancouver], October 2, 1920.

284 Loc. cit.

285 Loc. cit.

286 Loc. cit.


288 The Vancouver Sun, October 13, 1920.

289 Ibid., October 15, 1920.

290 The Province [Vancouver], October 16, 1920.
Though brief, the League conducted an extensive campaign, using as did the Prohibitionists, public meetings, newspaper advertising, pamphlets, and door-to-door canvassing.

"Every vote for Prohibition is a vote for bootlegging" is the version that appeared in the *Colonist* [Victoria], October 19, 1920.

The League also maintained that prohibition legislation which attempted to legally enforce a moral code on society was an unjustifiable impingement on the rights of the individual. "The main object of the Moderation League is to promote sobriety, but at the same time hold inviolate our heritage of liberty under the British Constitution." ('Back to law and order' advertisement of the Moderation League, appearing in *The Province* [Vancouver], October 19, 1920.)

Statistics were quoted to prove that the number of arrests for drunkenness was higher in 1919 than it had been before prohibition was instituted.
311 Oliver, quoted in the *World* [Vancouver], October 21, 1920. The Attorney-General, Farris, was more voluble in his appraisal of the plebiscitory vote: "I believe the vote today is not intended in any sense as a repudiation of temperance sentiment in the Province, but is an expression of the belief of the mass of the electors that the best results in favor of temperance will come from strict regulation and control, rather than from attempted prohibition. To my mind this vote is a mandate to the Government, not for a return to a 'wet' or a 'wide open' British Columbia, but rather to impose on them a solemn obligation to devise and carry out wise legislation that will in reality control and restrict the use of liquor. . . . The vote indicates that public sentiment in the Province is against the present Act, and explains to a large extent the grave difficulty which the authorities have had in carrying out its enforcements." (Quoted in *The Vancouver Sun*, October 21, 1920.)

312 *World* [Vancouver], October 21, 1920.

313 W. G. W. Fortune, financial secretary of the People's Prohibition Party, quoted in *The Vancouver Sun*, October 21, 1920.

314 *Times* [Victoria], October 21, 1920. The House actually had another year to run, "but it was felt that Prohibition and other questions required a political verdict from the people before they could be properly handled." (*Canadian Annual Review*, 1920, p. 830.)

315 *The Vancouver Sun*, October 21, 1920.

316 Quoted *ibid.*, October 24, 1920.

317 *Canadian Annual Review*, 1920, p. 830.


319 Quoted in the *World* [Vancouver], October 27, 1920.

320 *Canadian Annual Review*, 1920, p. 832.

321 The Legislative Assembly before dissolution, October 20, 1920: Liberals - 31; Conservatives - 9; Others - 6; vacant - 1. After the provincial general election, December 1, 1920: Liberals - 26; Conservatives - 13; Others - 8.

322 *The Province* [Vancouver], February 17, 1921. The Conservatives protested that the resolution to petition the Lieutenant-Governor to present a "bill embodying a reasonable and moderate policy" was unconstitutional. On this issue the House divided and the Resolution passed 29/14, with seven Independents voting with the Government and one against, thus defeating Oliver's hopes for dealing with the issue on a non-partisan basis. (*Canadian Annual Review*, 1921, p. 877.)
"(In the Committee) Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that a Bill be submitted to the House amending the 'Government Liquor Act, 1921,' providing for the sale of beer by the glass in standard hotels and bona-fide clubs under the control of and by permits or licences issued by the Liquor Control Board; such Act to come into operation contingent upon a favourable vote on a referendum; and for a referendum to be taken to determine if the electors of the Province are in favour of such Act coming into operation by Proclamation after the taking of such referendum."

339 Canadian Annual Review, 1921, p. 887.

340 Ibid., 1922, p. 854.

341 Loc. cit.

342 Earlier in the year (May), the Vancouver City Council had proposed that draught beer be permitted in hotels, but no action had been taken by the Provincial Government to make such a provision. (Canadian Annual Review, 1922, p. 853.)
For full text of the Resolution, see Appendix XIV. The previous June, the House of Commons had passed a Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act to abolish private importation of liquor, but the Senate had rejected the Bill. Because the Senate action came at the end of the Session when many Senators were not present, the Attorney-General felt justified in asking for further consideration of the issue at the next Session.

The Liberty and Moderation Leagues met Premier Oliver and members of his Cabinet to ask for sale of beer by the glass throughout B.C. or take a referendum on the question, but their request was denied. (The Province [Vancouver], November 10, 1922.)


Loc. cit. As a subtle reminder to the Government, the local Methodist Conference meeting in Victoria on May 25 of the previous year had adopted a Committee Report which declared that the electorate had instructed the Government to provide an "adequate control of the drink traffic and not to permit the sale of liquor in unlimited quantities and for the purpose of raising revenue." (Ibid., 1921, p. 880.)

Ibid., 1923, pp. 764-66.

World [Vancouver], November 17, 1923.

Major R. J. Burde was an Independent member representing Port Alberni. (The Vancouver Sun, November 6, 1923.)

Loc. cit.

The Province [Vancouver], November 21, 1923.

Canadian Annual Review, 1923, p. 765.

Attorney-General Manson, in a statement in the House blamed the Vancouver City Council for the critical beer club situation. Without giving specific examples he said it was the action of the City Council which led to "the establishment of gambling dens and hard liquor dives of the worst type" and "which had resulted in social conditions which were an eyesore to all decent people." (Quoted in The Vancouver Sun, December 18, 1923.) Alderman Rogers angrily denied the Attorney-General's charges. "When Mr. Manson says the city council issued beer licences, he's wrong. Because we never did and he knows it. When the City brought in the by-law to license clubs it was clearly understood that there would be no provision in the by-law to permit clubs to sell beer. Everybody knows the clubs sell beer, but it is the provincial government which supplies them with the beer and it is up to the provincial government to stop the supply
if it does not like present conditions." (Quoted in The Vancouver Sun, December 18, 1923.)

354 B.C. Journals, 1923, vol. LIII, p. 198. The Government's policy on the liquor issue was hinted at when Farris, during the throne speech debates "urged the government to take steps to provide better facilities for the securing of beer by the glass" as "the present system of selling liquor only in bottles encouraged the consumption of spirits." (Quoted in the World [Vancouver], November 10, 1923.) Also Ian Mackenzie (Liberal member for Vancouver) had urged the government to submit a beer plebiscite with the electors to have the opportunity of local option. (World, [Vancouver], November 17, 1923.)

355 The Vancouver Sun, December 19, 1923. "It may be argued that there is no demand for beer by the glass," Mr. Manson admitted. "I confess I have always had grave doubts of a demand for beer. I was never satisfied in my own mind that there was a very substantial demand for beer by the glass. But there was a sufficient portion of the public who wanted beer to make it extremely difficult to enforce the liquor law unless you give beer to them. At present, the public refused to abide by the liquor law and it was useless to have on the statute books a law that could not be enforced. It would be far better, to have a law that the public would support. . . ." He added that he wanted to give the people, if they desired it, some system that they could respect and observe. (Quoted in the Colonist [Victoria], December 17, 1923.)

356 The Province [Vancouver], December 18, 1923.

357 World [Vancouver], December 20, 1923.

358 The Province [Vancouver], December 18, 1923.

359 Ibid., December 19, 1923.

360 World [Vancouver], December 1, 1923.

361 Colonist [Victoria], December 18, 1923.

362 The Province [Vancouver], June 9, 1924.

363 Loc. cit.

364 Ibid., November 26, 1923.

365 The Vancouver Sun, December 16, 1923.

366 Colonist [Victoria], December 17, 1923.

367 The Province [Vancouver], December 19, 1923.
The charges continued, "This is entirely in keeping with the policy of the Liquor Control Board, which has steadily increased the number of liquor stores throughout the province, establishing them in some places, such as quite recently in Cloverdale, where a three-to-one majority of the people petitioned against the opening of a store. In spite of this, however, the store was opened and is now doing business." (Quoted in The Province [Vancouver], May 13, 1924.) An editorial appearing in the Times [Victoria], supported this claim: "We have no recollection of hearing of any influential citizens appearing at the Parliament Buildings with the request for this course." (Times [Victoria], December 4, 1923.)

Other organizations, societies and various churches lent their support to the Prohibition Association's campaign against the plebiscite. The fifty-four affiliated societies of the Local Council of Women, the W. C. T. U., the Methodist Conference, the Women's Missionary Society of the Metropolitan Church, the Victoria unit of the Labor Party, the Federation of Nurses, and the One Big Union. (The Province [Vancouver], May 12, 1924.)

The Conservatives limited the liquor plank in their platform to a promise to "recast the administration connected with the Liquor Department" and would "without fear or favor properly enforce the Liquor Act." (Party pamphlet issued by the Conservative Party, entitled "Why I am voting against Oliver," n.p. 1924, n.p. p. 18.) The liquor plank of the Provincial Party was "That any drastic change in the liquor laws of the province must be submitted to the people by referendum (preferably at a general election), in terms which will permit a clear expression
of the will of the people." (Quoted in The Province [Vancouver], December 6, 1923.)

381 Canadian Annual Review, 1924-5, p. 449.

382 "The recent advance in the price of beer, to the brewers, and the plebiscite (sic) being taken at the general election, was generally accepted as a move for "campaign funds" and was resented by the temperance people." (Maxwell Smith to Oliver, July 3, 1924. Kept in the Pattullo Papers, uncatalogued, in the Provincial Archives, Victoria.) Also, in a letter from C. B. Lotta to Oliver, it was claimed that the beer price increase had become an election issue with the Liberals as the beer party. (C. B. Lotta to Oliver, August 4, 1924, Pattullo Papers.)


384 The Province [Vancouver], June 21, 1924.


386 Quoted from a copy of "The Health Insurance Plebiscite," a radio speech delivered by the Honourable G. M. Weir, May 25, 1937, p. 1. There was no system of state health insurance on the North American continent.

387 Dr. McIntosh moved: "That this Legislature resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the question of "State Health Insurance," with a view to discussing the advisability of appointing a Committee to bring the Bill before the close of this Session of the House." This motion was amended by Dr. MacLean (Liberal) to read: "Resolved, That in the opinion of this House the early consideration by the Government of legislation with respect to State Health Insurance, Mothers' Pensions, and the broadening of the provisions of the "Workmen's Compensation Act" is desirable." (B.C. Legislative Assembly, Journals, 1919, p. 144.)

388 A partial report of the Committee was presented to the legislature, April 7, 1920. (B.C. Journals, 1920, p. 60.)

389 Ibid., 1928, p. 175.

390 See Appendix XIV.

391 Loc. cit.


394 See Appendix XV.


396 Out of office since 1916, the Conservative Party was returned to office with a large majority of 33 seats; the Liberals held 12 and Labour, 1. (Ibid., 1928-29, p. 508.)

397 See Appendix XVI.

398 See Appendix XVII.

399 B.C. Journals, 1930, p. 53.


401 The Commission held 33 public meetings, 21 day and 12 night sittings throughout B.C. to determine the necessity of a health insurance scheme. It also examined the health plans of 25 countries. (B.C. Final Report of the Royal Commission on State Health Insurance and Maternity Benefits, 1932. Victoria, King's Printer, 1932, p. x20.)

402 Ibid., p. x59.

403 Ibid., pp. x59-62.

404 Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, Book I, Ottawa, King's Printer, 1940, p. 171.

405 The Province reported "no possibility of state health insurance being adopted at the 1932 session of the legislature, but hope for a limited scheme at the next session."
(The Province [Vancouver], April 3, 1932.)

406 Canadian Annual Review, 1933, p. 295. The Independent (Non-Partisan) Party was organized by W. J. Bowser, Conservative Premier from 1915-16, but out of politics since 1926. He invited candidates from any party to run on the Independent platform. If the Independents were successful at the polls, their elected members were to choose a leader. During the campaign, Bowser died. (Ibid., pp. 293-5.)


408 Also elected were 2 Independents (Non-Partisan) and 1 Labour Member. In 1934, Columbia was made an electoral district and returned a Liberal by acclamation, giving the Liberals 35/48 seats. (Canadian Annual Review, 1934, p. 335.)
Dr. G. M. Weir was Provincial Secretary and Minister of Education in the Pattullo Government.

B.C. Journals, 1935, p. 111. On July 24, 1934, the Province reported that the Pattullo Government was working on a necessary and welcome scheme of state health insurance, but warned that, to be successful the assent and cooperation of the medical profession was essential. (The Province [Vancouver], July 24, 1934.)


The Commission of Five was to consist of: the Director of Social Welfare (Chairman), the Provincial Health Officer, the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Administrator of Health Insurance and the Director of Medical Services, the last two to be appointed. (Ibid., pp. 420-21.)

Loc. cit. In October, 1934, the B.C. Hospitals Association Convention had appointed a Committee of three to help Dr. Weir draft the bill. (The Province [Vancouver], October 5, 1935.)


Their representation was supported by the B.C. Lumber and Shingle Manufacturers' Association. (The Province [Vancouver], September 12, 1935.)

Ibid., September 10, 1935.

They included: Women's Institutes; League of Women Voters; W. C. T. U.; Local Councils of Women, Victoria, Vancouver, New Westminster; Soroptimist Club; Canadian Daughters' League and the Registered Nurses' Association of B.C. (From a copy of "The Health Insurance Plebiscite," a radio speech by the Honourable G. M. Weir, May 25, 1937, pp. 2-3.)

The Province [Vancouver], September 10, 1935.

These sentiments were voiced by the B.C. Medical Association meeting in convention in September, 1935. The President of the Canadian Medical Association, addressing this convention, used stronger language in stating his opposition to the scheme. The doctors were, in his words, to present "a united front" and use "political pressure" to prevent the passage of health insurance legislation. He was, furthermore, opposed to any provincial scheme, and claimed that "the Canadian Medical Association stands for a royal commission to make a coast-to-coast investigation of health insurance and decide upon what basis, if any, it shall be administered in this Dominion." (Dr. J. C. Meakins, quoted in The Province [Vancouver], September 24, 1935.)
Division on second reading, 28/10 with full C. C. F. support, third reading, 29/14, with 5/7 C. C. F. members supporting it. One of the Liberals who voted against it was Dr. Gillis, a member of the Royal Commission on State Health Insurance and Maternity Benefits. (B.C. Journals, 1936, pp. 103-4, p. 136.)


The 1935 draft bill was to have covered about 500,000 persons, at a cost of about forty-five cents per week to the wage earner and provided for the care of indigents. (The Province [Vancouver], March 23, 1935.)

Included in this group were representatives of the Shipping Federation of B.C.; the Building and Construction Industry's Exchange; the Vancouver General Contractors' Association; the Lumber and Shingle Manufacturers' Association; the Nursing Association of B.C.; the Loggers' Association; the Canadian Medical Association; the Vancouver Board of Trade and the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific Railway Companies. (The Province [Vancouver], February 20, 1936.)

Two of the others were appointed on June 2 and the fourth on September 4.

The plebiscite and the general election were announced on April 13, with election day to be on June 1. (The Province [Vancouver], April 13, 1937.) The terms of the plebiscite were announced on April 15. (The Vancouver Sun, April 15, 1937.)

Quoted from a "plebiscite manifesto" under the signature of Premier Pattullo, appearing in The Vancouver Sun and The Province [Vancouver], April 15, 1937.)

Quoted from "The Health Insurance Plebiscite," a radio speech delivered by the Honourable G. M. Weir on May 25, 1937. In the same speech, Dr. Weir defined the terms more closely; "The terms 'comprehensive' and 'progressively applied' might properly be construed to mean simply 'wide in the scope of benefits' and applied to more and more people in our Province. The terms can allow of no other explanation and need none."
Dr. Weir's radio speech of May 25, 1937, pp. 9-10. "The Government is in favour of a health insurance measure, but will be guided by the decision of the electorate in its future action." (Pattullo, quoted from his "plebiscite manifesto" in The Province [Vancouver], April 15, 1937.)

Quoted in The Province [Vancouver], April 16, 1937.

Quoted ibid., April 26, 1937.

Ibid., April 16, 1937. In the same editorial, it was claimed that "a plebiscite of this sort is not fair to the people of the Province, who are asked to vote in the dark. It is not fair to the medical profession, who will be asked to work out the scheme. It is unfair to public health insurance itself."


Both the election and the plebiscite had to compete for attention with the coronation of King George VI, which took place in May, 1937, the Ethiopian crisis and the Manchurian "incident," among other important items of international interest.

Canadian Annual Review, 1937-38, p. 11. The Liberals held 31 seats, the Conservatives returned to form the Opposition with 8 seats, while the C. C. P. retained 7 seats and Labour, 1.

Loc. cit.

Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Affairs, Book II, p. 159.

Canadian Annual Review, 1937-38, p. 149.

See Appendix XVIII.

"Hospital Insurance Act," 1948. The "Health Insurance Act," 1936, was not repealed, though except for the provision referring to the Health Insurance Commission, it has never been in force, and remains in the Statutes as c. 143, R. S. B. C., 1948.

The Canadian Almanac, 1944, p. 144.

B.C. Statement of Votes: General Election, June 12, 1952, Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1953, p. 11. From 1941 to the present (1958) the C. C. P. has formed the Opposition in the B.C. Legislature.
Dr. W. S. Reid in his presidential report, quoted in *The Province* [Vancouver], November 22, 1931.

Ibid., October 21, 1935.

Ibid., January 13, 1936.

Ibid., August 4, 1937.


*The Province* [Vancouver], December 17, 1942.

Federal wartime restrictions were repealed, except as they related to advertising, on August 6, 1945. (*The Province* [Vancouver], August 6, 1945.)

*News-Herald* [Vancouver], September 20, 1945.

Ibid., August 29, 1945.

*The Province* [Vancouver], March 16, 1946.

Ibid., March 20, 1946.

Loc. cit.

Ibid., May 21, 1946.

Ibid., October 2, 1946.

Ibid., January 16, 1947.


Ibid., March 27, 1947.

Ibid., October 5, 1948.

During the Session the Cabaret Association and the Restaurant Association requested the Government to legislate for the sale of liquor in cabarets and restaurants. Their applications were rejected.

*The Province* [Vancouver], March 11, 1949.

"But," he continued, "the will of the people must prevail. If in the future, the government sees fit, a plebiscite may be held." (Quoted in *The Province* [Vancouver], March 11, 1949.)

On March 13, 1949, the Government announced the date of the general election (June 15, 1949), but made no mention of a liquor plebiscite. (Ibid., March 13, 1949.)
Wismer was personally opposed to an increase in liquor outlets: "The theory that two or three hundred new cosy places on the front street selling liquor would lessen drinking is one that for sheer hypocrisy equals even the most vicious insinuations that have been launched against my good faith."

(Quoted in The Province [Vancouver], March 30, 1951.)

"... The present plebiscite has been a last minute concession to an electorate about to vote on the life of the administration itself, akin to a death-bed repentance. ... Having done nothing effective about liquor control for three years although under pressure to act, the present regime now asks the electors to furnish it with a mandate in blank and this is called "local option." The plebiscite is not only a futile but a mischievous one. Under it a yes-vote on administration could license open-door saloons, peephole cocktail bars, more roadhouses or anything else that could be read into the meaning of a question which is as wide as a barn door. A no-vote might prove an excuse to continue to do nothing. In short, the electors are being asked to give the Liberals, if they are returned, blanket authority to do what they like with liquor control. ..." (From an editorial appearing in the Colonist [Victoria], June 10, 1952.)
The results of the plebiscite:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>315,533</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>20,856</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>205,736</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of voters - 793,073

(B.C. Statement of Votes, General Election held June 12, 1952, Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1953, p. 136.)

The general election results:

Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (C. C. F.) - 18
Liberals - 6
Conservatives (Progressive-Conservatives) - 4
Labour - 1

(Ibid., p. 13)

B.C. Report of the British Columbia Liquor Inquiry Commission, 1952, Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1953, p. 3.) Among the terms of the Order in Council appointing the commission was the following statement: "And whereas it has been represented to His Honour's Government that the wording of the question (plebiscite) was not clear and unambiguous and that it is deemed desirable in the public interest that the relevant facts relating to the sale, distribution and consumption of spirituous, vinous and malt liquors be made the subject of a public inquiry, and that the matter concerned is connected with the good government of the Province, and it is deemed expedient to cause inquiry to be made into and concerning the same." (Quoted in the Report, p. 3.)

Ibid., p. 4.

Ibid., pp. 26-30.


Ibid., sec. 25.

"The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may prescribe a period in each year in which the time, for general purposes in the Province, shall be seven hours behind Greenwich Time." ("An Act to provide for the reckoning of Standard Time during the Summer Months." B.C. Revised Statutes, 1924, c. 65, sec. 1.)

The Province [Vancouver], June 23, 1941.


The Province [Vancouver], July 10, 1941.

Ibid., August 28, 1941.

Ibid., January 26, 1942.

Ibid., March 20, 1952.

Ibid., June 5, 1952.

Results of the daylight saving plebiscite:

Yes - 290,353  Reject - 20,828
No - 231,008  Total - 542,189

No. of voters - 793,073.

(B.C. Statement of Votes: General election, June 12, 1952, Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1953, p. 137.

These were the predominantly rural electoral districts of: Caribou, Chilliwack, Columbia, Delta, Dewdney, Fort George, Kamloops, North Okanagan, Omineca, Rossland-Trail, Salmon Arm, Similkameen, Yale. (Ibid., p. 137.)

This advantage of permitting selection as between issues cannot be claimed for the other liquor plebiscites as the circumstances were not the same. Nor were these plebiscites presented as having this advantage, but were presented as moral issues.

"Which do you prefer (1) Maintenance of the present Prohibition Act or (2) An Act to provide for Government control and sale, in sealed packages, of spirituous and malt liquor?" (B.C. Statutes, 1920, c. 93.)

Though Oliver asked the legislature to consider the liquor bill as a nonpartisan issue, the bill passed third reading on a party vote.
The speech from the throne had made no mention of prohibition and Premier Bowser had to call an extra session of the legislature to provide for the prohibition and woman's suffrage referendums.

While refusing to define what government control and government sale meant, Oliver had no hesitation in stating that it did not countenance any type of public sale of liquor or beer by the glass.

Daylight saving has been accepted without further protest and the Government has been untroubled by petitions requesting its abolition. In 23/48 electoral districts, there was a majority negative vote for daylight saving, all of which could be classified as rural ridings. The total negative vote was 231,008 while the total positive vote was 290,353. This vote contrasted sharply with the vote on the liquor plebiscite, in which only four electoral districts registered a majority negative vote and the total negative vote was 205,736 as against a total positive vote of 315,533. (B.C. Statement of Votes: General election, June 12, 1952, Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1953, pp. 136-7.)

Bowser's own explanation "... since the great question of prohibition was coming before the people, a referendum should be taken at the same time on the important issue of the franchise" does not assert any special advantage for using the referendum.

Private Members' bills could not be utilized for public health insurance as it involved the expenditure of public funds.

Between 1903-16, the Government was Conservative. The bills were introduced by Socialists or Liberals, except for the 1916 one which was introduced by Conservatives.

It was measurably stronger, as the number of signatures on the petitions increased over the years.

"Known attempt" would be a more accurate phrase here. After failure of the local option plebiscite the temperance societies were faced with a hostile Conservative-dominated legislature, in which the Opposition of 1909-12 consisted of 2 Socialists and 1 Liberal and from 1912-16, of two Socialists, whose vehement opposition to prohibition was well-known. The temperance societies may very well have tried to interest one of the members in introducing a private bill on prohibition, but failed in the attempt.

Or a minority party which can command the support of other parties for its legislation.
508 As such, the liquor plebiscite played no part in the political campaign, but there was another liquor issue in the campaign. The increase in the price of beer to the wholesaler was used by the Provincial Party against the Liberals as evidence that they were buying support of the "liquor interests." The Liberal Party was thus represented to the electorate, in the opinion of some Liberals, as a "wet" party. (Maxwell Smith to Oliver, July 3, 1924; and C. B. Lotta to Oliver, August 4, 1924.) In the event, the electorate rejected the plebiscite and returned a minority Liberal Government. However, it is not possible to establish a correlation between the two results, on the information available.

509 There was no attempt to use this argument in the case of the woman's suffrage referendum and the daylight saving plebiscite.

510 It was not advanced as an argument in favor of any of the other plebiscites, though after the event, Attorney-General Farris claimed that the Temperance plebiscite prevented a party split. However, Oliver had little difficulty getting unified support from the Liberals for his Liquor Control Act, 1921, though the plebiscite could only be interpreted as rejecting prohibition and not as a mandate for the liquor system embodied in the Act.

511 Letter 265/09 of McBride to Spencer, October 1, 1909.

512 "No holder of a beer licence under this Act shall keep or maintain, or permit to be kept or maintained, in any part of the premises in respect of which the licence is issued any bar or counter over or at which any alcoholic or non-alcoholic beverage is sold." (Government Liquor Act, R. S. 1924, c. 146, s. 28(9).


515 The announcement that a plebiscite on local option would be held was made on October 20; the text was announced on November 14 and the vote was taken on November 25.

516 McBride had promised to consult the Local Option League on the wording of the plebiscite. Morgan and Spencer pointed out that there was a difference between a vote for a local option law and a vote for local option and urged McBride to explain his intention regarding interpretation of the latter as if it were the former and thus clarify the issue for the public. (Letter 265/09 of Spencer to McBride, October 29, 1909.)
526 But responsibility cuts two ways and the cabinet is not merely a "committee of the legislature," subject to its legislature's whim, for the executive power of dissolution enables the Cabinet to prevent capricious behaviour by the legislature and thus to ensure a stable government.

527 By convention, amendment of a money bill involves the resignation of the Government.

528 Whereas in the American system, he selects these separately, or has a double run at them since he selects the executive and the legislature separately and both may initiate legislation.

529 The Direct Legislation Act, 1919, which provides for both initiative and referendum by the electorate has never been in force, though it is not possible to claim that this results from the Governments of B.C. being aware of the dangers to responsible government inherent in their use.
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APPENDIX I

LIST of the petitions, resolutions and bills presented to the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia re regulation of liquor sale and consumption between 1872 and 1909.

1872-1883: None.

1884: Petition from the "Women's Christian Temperance Union of Victoria, B.C." was read and received by the Assembly re: the wording of the "Dominion Liquor Act, 1883." (Journals, 1884, p. 45.)

1885: None.

1886: Petition from E. V. Bodwell, R. Ward, and 687 others re: Sunday closing of saloons, etc., was read and received. (Journals, 1886, p. 44.)

1887: Petition from Louis Marks, John Gilmore, and others, for a revision of the laws relating to the liquor traffic in the Province, was ruled out of order as being a copy only. (Journals, 1887, p. 26.)

1888: Petitions from residents of Victoria, New Westminster, Vancouver, Langley, Nicola, Nanaimo, Kamloops, Comox were read and received re:
1. The closing of all places for the sale of intoxicating liquors from midnight until six o'clock in the morning on all weekdays, and during the whole of Sundays;
2. That the maximum number of licences to be issued be fixed, so as to be fewer than at present in proportion to the population;
3. That efficient machinery be provided for enforcing such regulations as may be enacted. (Sessional papers, 1888, p. 311.)

1889-1890: None.

1891: Petition from Thomas W. Mouatt and 21 others was read and received re:
... believing, therefore, that the closing of Saloons, Bars, Shops and other places where such liquors are sold would materially lessen the evils complained of, and be a great benefit to the community at large, we do earnestly pray your Honourable House to enact such legislation as will secure the closing of such places throughout the Province from 7 p.m. on Saturday till 7 a.m. on Monday in each week, and from 11 p.m. till 7 a.m. during the rest of the week. (Sessional papers, 1891, p. 415.)
A similar petition from T. Bryant and 1679 others was read and received.  
(Sessional papers, 1891, p. 425.)

A similar petition from J. S. Muir and 1557 others was read and received.  
(Sessional papers, 1891, p. 485.)

1892: Petition from John Welch and 18 other ratepayers of the Electoral District of Cowichan was read and received re: That it was unnecessary, and not required and we believe that such restrictions are detrimental and unsuitable to the growing interest of our Province, and we therefore hope that your Honourable Body will pass Mr. Nason's Amendment.  
(Journals, 1892, p. c.)

A similar petition from the same district, signed by 11 others was read and received.  
(Journals, 1892, p. ci.)

A similar petition from the City of New Westminster signed by 56 persons was read and received.  
(Journals, 1892, p. ci.)

Petition from R. S. Rendall and 1512 others was read and received re: Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable Body will not, during its present Session, pass any measure that will permit the re-opening of the saloons on the Sunday of each week.  
(Journals, 1892, p. ciii.)

A similar petition from residents of Victoria, signed by 213 persons was read and received.  
(Journals, 1892, p. ciii.)

A similar petition from the executive officers of the Grand Lodge of the Province of British Columbia on behalf of its almost 2000 members against the amendment on Sunday opening, was read and received.  
(Journals, 1892, p. cv.)

A similar petition from A. E. Green and 209 others was read and received.  
(Journals, 1892, p. 65.)

Petition from Samuel Handy, A. C. McAlpin and 1200 others supporting the amendment was read and received.  
(Journals, 1892, p. 71.)
1893: Petition from the W. C. T. U. and the Independent Order of Good Templars (I. O. G. T.) was read and received re:

... humbly request that the "Municipal Act, 1892," be so amended as that the Board of Licensing Commissioners for each Municipality may, in addition to the Mayor or Reeve of the Municipality, be composed of men elected annually by the direct vote of the people for that office, this being, in our opinion, the only fair way to constitute the Board.

(Journals, 1893, p. ciii.)

A similar petition from the Grand Council of Royal Templars of Temperance of B.C. was read and received.

(Journals, 1893, p. cv.)

1894: Petition from G. C. Sauer and 67 others was read and received re:

... Therefore we ask that you will be pleased to amend the law so that the closed hours in this particular shall be from six o'clock on Sunday morning until one o'clock in the afternoon, and from 6 o'clock p.m. to 9 o'clock p.m. of the same day. ...

(Journals, 1894, p. lxxxiii.)

1895: Petition from the officers of the Grand Lodge of the I. O. G. T. on behalf of its 2000 members was read and received re:

... that the present License Law, while an improvement, does not enforce the closing of saloons and bar-rooms on the Sabbath Day, but simply says they shall not sell intoxicating liquors, which makes it very difficult to convict under said law. ... Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your Honourable Body will, during its present Session, enact such a law as will enforce the closing of all saloons and bar-rooms from seven o'clock on Saturday night of each and every week, and remain closed until the following Monday morning at seven o'clock of each and every week, and that all lights be extinguished. ...

(Journals, 1895, p. xxix.)

Petition from the Executive Temperance Association, Vancouver, was read and received re:

... During the present Session of Parliament, your Honourable Body will enact such a law as will make the requirements for renewal of license, especially in rural districts similar to the requirements for the obtaining of a new license.

(Journals, 1895, p. lix.)
Petition from the Sumas Lodge of I. O. G. T. was read and received re:

. . . we call the attention of Your Legislative Body to the provision in the "Municipal Act" permitting the using of Club Licenses within rural municipalities is detrimental to the best interests of society, and said licenses, for legitimate business, are only intended for cities. And would request Your Honourable House to amend said Act as to said provision. (Journals, 1895, p. lxxv.)

Petition from the Perseverance Lodge No. 1, I. O. G. T. was read and received re:

. . . regret that a Bill is now before the House to amend the present retail Liquor License Act, by granting licenses to the premisés instead of to the person, which would practically make it a vested right. Your petitioners would therefore request your Honourable Body not to pass any such Bill, as it would take away the rights of the people in the locality where such licenses are granted, and would also make it impossible to cancel a license in the case of a tenant violating the law, as the license would be on the premises instead of being held by the person as at present. (Journals, 1895, p. cvii.)

A similar petition from the officers and members of Dominion Lodge No. 5, of the I. O. G. T. representing 75 voters was read and received. (Journals, 1895, p. cxxxv.)

1896: Petition from 296 residents of the Municipality of Chilliwack was read and received re:

1. That the people of this Municipality are emphatically opposed to permitting the traffic in intoxicating liquors to obtain a footing here as evidenced by their refusal to grant a licence.

2. That there is intense feeling against and dissatisfaction with "Clubs" as conducted in this Municipality. We have the traffic without any restrictions.

Therefore, you (sic) petitioners humbly pray that the law be so amended that "Clubs" will not be allowed in Rural Municipalities. (Journals, 1895, p. lxv.)
Petition from a committee of the Perseverance Lodge, No. 1, I. O. G. T. of Victoria representing 100 members was read and received re:

... Your petitioners have seen with regret that an amendment to the Licence Law, whereby the saloons will be open certain hours on the Sunday of each week, is to be brought before your Honourable Body. Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable Body will not during the present Session pass any measure that will permit the re-opening of the saloons on the Sunday of each week.

(Journals, 1896, p. lxxxv.)

A similar petition was read and received from W. W. Columbia, Bishop's Close, Victoria, J. Nicolaye, Administrator of Vancouver Island, W. Leslie Clay, St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church.

(Journals, 1896, p. lxxxv).

A similar petition was read and received from S. Cleaver, Pastor of Metropolitan Methodist Church, J. Campbell, Pastor First Presbyterian Church, J. F. Betts, Pastor Centennial Methodist Church, E. Manuel, Pastor Methodist Church, Duncan's, Ralph W. Trotter, Pastor Calvary Church.

A similar petition on behalf of the Victoria W. C. T. U. was read and received.

(Journals, 1896, p. lxxxvii.)

1896: A petition on behalf of W. J. White and 9650 others was read and received re:

1. That all screens and curtains shall be removed from saloon windows and doors, so that there may be no obstruction to carrying out the present law.

2. That the side or back doors shall be closed to the public and no entertaining room in the rear of buildings, as may of the minors of our fair land are being made drunkards in violation of the law through these sources.

3. That the liquor licence be taken entirely from the grocers.

(Journals, 1896, p. lxxv.)

1897: Petition on behalf of the Vernon Local Council of Women, on behalf of 800 women was read and received re:

... Therefore, we humbly pray your Honourable Body to make the study of Scientific Temperance in our Public Schools compulsory, and examinations therein necessary for promotion to higher grades.

(Journals, 1897, p. xci.)
A similar petition was read and received from the Vancouver Local Council of Women. (Journals, 1897, p. xci.)

A similar petition was received from the W. C. T. U.'s of B.C. and signed on behalf of its 400 members by its president. (Journals, 1897, p. xci.)

1898: None.

1899: Petition on behalf of Green and Martin and 15 other hotel proprietors was read and received re: . . . to so amend the law governing retail liquor licences
1. That the party actually vending under licence shall be the holder or licencee.
2. That a landlord or owner of premises used as a saloon or hotel shall not be the holder of the licence unless actually vending under said licence and being in possession of premises licensed. (Journals, 1899, p. xli.)

A petition on behalf of Mary Walls, Balmoral Hotel and 21 other hotel owners that the law stand re licencing the premises and not amendment to the present law be passed, was read and received. (Journals, 1899, p. xliii.)

1900: None.

1901: None.

1902: None.

1903: Petition on behalf of A. McNaughton and others re amendments to the Liquor Licence Act was read and received. (Text not given.) (Journals, 1903, p. 82.)

1903-04/1909: None.
APPENDIX II

EXCERPTS from travelogues describing the drinking habits in areas in B.C. in the 1860's and 1880's.

"The lowest depth of all is reached in the 'Saloon' of the western 'city' or miner's camp. This is simply a drinking-shop, where very ardent liquids are dispensed at a price which one would suppose would rapidly lead to fortune. No doubt it would do so, were it not for the proprietor being compelled to drink so much of his own merchandise as a guarantee of good faith, that his constitution always 'caves in' just before affluence is attained. A saloon seems to be the very first need of any civilised community out West; in fact we passed one place which consisted entirely of a saloon, the rest being left to the imagination. . . . It is at such places that most of the rows commence which occasionally chase away the ennui of a backwoods life." (J. A. Lees and W. J. Clutterbuck, B. C. 1887. A Ramble in British Columbia, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1892, pp. 29-30.)

"On waking in the morning I presented myself at the bar, and received the customary 'cocktail'. . . . The average Victorian's sense of bliss apparently consists of the largest possible number of drinks in the shortest possible time. . . ." (Ibid., pp. 44-45.)

"Yale was a lively little place. . . . The bar-rooms, with the nevertheless absent billiard tables, were as numerous as ever; and I noticed that the farther we travelled on so the quality of the liquor deteriorated, and the capacity of the people for swallowing it increased. So soon as a bargain was struck in one of the stores, its ratification in alcohol seemed to be necessary." (Ibid., pp. 68-69.)

"The town (Williams Creek) comprised the ordinary series of rough wooden shanties, stores, restaurants, grog shops and gambling saloons;. . . ." (Ibid., p. 115.)

"One morning before breakfast the Honourable and I were taking our cocktail at the bar,. . . ." (Ibid., p. 194.)

"It seemed strange to one when I first went to America to drink tea or coffee with every meal; but it is the custom there, and you hardly ever see an American or Canadian drink beer or wine with his dinner. All their libations of that sort are taken at the 'bar' probably out of respect to the ladies; for it is considered a heinous offence against public morals that
a lady should be anything but a teetotaller. I am afraid this idea tends to more cupboard-practice than is good, . . . Happily these puritannical notions are now wearing out in the higher circles of American society; . . . " (R. Byron Johnson, Very Far West Indeed; A Few Rough Experiences on the North-West Pacific Coast, London, Sampson, Law, Marston, Law and Searle, 1872, pp. 146-47.)
LETTERS re McBride's decision to have a local option plebiscite.

294/09 (copy) Wattsburg
British Columbia
March 23rd, 1909

The Hon. Richard McBride
Premier
Victoria, B.C.

My dear Mr. McBride,

Allow me to congratulate you. You are certainly an adept in diplomacy; your decision on the treatment of the local option and timber licence questions is ingenious, pleases the majority and offends nobody, shifts the onus on other shoulders.

A. E. Watts
(signed)

* * * * * * * * * * *

310/09 (copy) Coleman, Alberta
April 2nd, 1909

Personal
The Hon Richard McBride
Victoria, B.C.

Dear Sir,

Enclosed you will find a clipping from the platform of the Conservative Party of Alberta, also the election results. Judging from these, the people of Alberta are not prepared at the present time to confiscate the hotel property of the Province to satisfy the demands of a few caricature speakers of the "Billy Sunday" order. The Conservatives told the hotel keepers that this plank did not mean anything but that they put it in the platform just because they put it in. They told all the Temperance cranks in the country that they would wipe every hotel out of existence if they could just put the plebescite (sic) vote through. . . they wrote letters to preachers, etc., calling their attention to this particular point, but it evidently did not take with the thinking class.

Lloyd A Manly
(signed)
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Copy of the platform of the Provincial Conservative Association adopted in Convention at Red Deer, 12th and 13th, February, 1909 and referred to in above letter:

2. Prohibition:

This Convention pledges the Conservative party to submit to the vote of the electors of the Province the question of prohibiting the sale of and traffic in intoxicating liquors in the Province, and to pass an Act for the total prohibition of the liquor traffic in this Province to the full extent of the Provincial power in that respect if upon the taking of such a plebiscite 60 per cent. of the vote cast is cast in favor of such Act.

Result of election:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberals</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred election</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Letter 29¼/09 of Watts to McBride and Letter 310/09 of Manly to McBride in the McBride papers, Provincial Archives, Victoria, B.C.)
COPY of a pro-local option advertisement which appeared in the Daily News-Advertiser, (Vancouver), November 21, 1909.

When you vote for your candidates on Thursday next do not neglect to vote on the Local Option Plebiscite, for if you do you will count as one on the other side. A majority of the ballots cast for candidates is necessary to carry.

The plebiscite is as fair to the liquor men as to the temperance men. It asks: Are you in favor of a Local Option Law being given to the people that they may have the right to say yea or nay, in their own town, city or district, to the licensed liquor traffic? Your answer will be: Yes, I want that right for myself. Mark your ballot thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservatives, Liberals, Laborites and Socialists can all cast this vote without it affecting party. It is the principle of the referendum and the common right of every elector. Do not be misled. It is not Local Option Law, but a vote to say whether I want a Local Option Law or not.
APPENDIX V

LETTER to McBride from the Bishop of Caledonia describing the confusion over the plebiscite:

Letter 1239/09 (copy)

"We have not yet heard the final result of the Local Option Plebiscite but there was the utmost difficulty to explain the matter to the electors. Local Option was taken as a synonym of Prohibition. The opposition statement that it meant the overturning of the present license system, instead of simply the insertion of a Local Option Section into the present License Act, was believed by many. This ought to be taken into consideration. Fifty per cent. of the total votes cast for the candidates was a tremendous handicap. The principle of referendum cannot be shackled by such a weight. The plebiscite was to express public opinion upon a most sane and moderate measure - the right of the municipality, or locality."

(Letter 1239/09 of F. H. Duvernet, Bishop of Caledonia to McBride, December 1, 1909.)
APPENDIX VI

RESULTS of the Local Option Plebiscite, November 25, 1909.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>5672</td>
<td>4,898</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saanich</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernie</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewdney</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossland</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaslo</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeena</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelstoke</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlin</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquimalt</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilloet</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similkameen</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocan</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ymir</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,779</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>505</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net majority for Local Option was 3,695.

(Letter 292/10 of Spencer to McBride, January 31, 1910.)
APPENDIX VII

EXCERPTS from a personal letter from Spencer to McBride re the plebiscite and local option law.

"... Lately and now the paper cry is we agreed on the conditions of the plebiscite vote and now object. You and I know very well we had no agreement on the question, but that my League loyally submitted and not agreed with those conditions.

... he believed McBride to be sincere when he stated he would abide by the will of the majority—and that the 50 per cent. clause was the plan of another's.

... The irregularities were many. I have many pages, but have not yet published them. In brief allow me to state a few:

1. In many places the ballots (sic) were not handed unless asked for, and so hundreds were lost to us. In Victoria, despite Mr. Baxter's promises, the arrangement was a hindrance and we had even to demand the removal of a drunken deputy. The ballots (sic) here were not stamped. At Vancouver no scrutineers were allowed, except for candidates. In the recount wherever a fair (next word illegible) man was deputy we had a good majority, because the ballots (sic) were handed out. Several times our men had to request the Returning Officer to command they be given out. Your own member Dr. McGuire had to ask for his.

2. In Abbotsford (sic), Pearsonville and Matsqui there was a shortage of ballots (sic). We consider we lost 50-60 here. In Yale 15 ballots (sic) were refused by the R. O. because they were stamped. W. I. Lehman is our informant. In Cranbrook Rev. W. King states that the liquor party had (word illegible) booth in the basement of the (two words illegible) were (sic) the ballotting (sic) took place. All the spoiled ballots (sic) of the Columbia are not in and not really known. In Dewdney at several places - Hammond and Haney the voters had to ask for their ballots (sic) and replied to by sneers. At Greenwood we know the foreigners did not understand and kept their ballots (sic). But in Grand Forks and Phoenix over 50 per cent. was gained through the fairness of the Deputies. From Rash comes a very unpleasant statement made by one of your party which did not help the voters to vote for a local option law. At Ferguson, the R. O. refused to count a ballot (sic) because the voter did not vote for either candidate. In New Westminster a good vote was registered because a fair-minded R. O. was appointed. In Newcastle and Nanaimo misrepresentation by both candidates cost us votes, one of whom has a
correction to make in the House. In the Okanagan strong objection was raised on the question of a plebiscite and its conditions without prior legislation. At Ymir the ballot (sic) was not given out unless asked for.

Kindly permit me dear Mr. Premier to further point out that proper instructions were not given in time and you will remember Mr. Buchanan asking that it be done. I have a copy of the (word illegible) which I got from the Kootenays. No "instructions" reached this office from the Government. Hence the 30 days knowledge of the conditions staggered every body and you will remember J. L. Beckwirth's wire to you and your reply. With these facts and many others I could give, you will see how easy it was to be 500 behind. I also wish to say that the Skeena recount favor our lawyer's (two words illegible) "15 outlying posts no ballotts (sic) were returned." The Members are not suffering thro' the loss of these or any others, but we are.

Please, Mr. Premier, pardon the length of this letter (10 pages) and allow me ask you as a man, a gentleman, and our honoured Prime Minister, but more as a husband and a father to think of this question as it relates to the conscience. . . ."

(Letter 286/10 of Sepncer to McBride, February 10, 1910.)

To which McBride replied:

"I can assure you that the Government in causing the Plebiscite to be taken was actuated by a sincere desire to secure the views of the electorate on this subject and bound itself to abide by the decision arrived at.

The conditions of the Plebiscite were considered fair and there was every desire to give the fullest facilities for securing the voice of the people.

In view of the result of the Plebiscite the Government was bound to accept the decision arrived at, just as it would had the result been in favour of Local Option."

(Letter 286/10 of McBride to Spencer, February 14, 1910.)
APPENDIX VIII

LETTER of McBride to Stevenson of August 23, 1915, explaining his decision to hold a plebiscite on the liquor question.

"Having in view the representations made to the members of the executive by a deputation representing the Social Service Commission and my promise to give you an early answer, I have now the honor to submit a definite reply. We have been careful to consider the views presented by various persons and organizations, which on the main are somewhat divergent, and I desire to have this announcement, which will be of a public nature, made public for the benefit of all concerned.

In the resolutions appended to this letter it is asked that the government take steps to bring about the prohibition of the sale of liquor during the period of the war! It is also requested that such legislation shall not be repealed without a referendum!

On the other hand, we have been asked that such legislation be not passed without the question be first submitted to the people in the form of a plebiscite. It seems to me that, logically, one proposition is the converse of the other.

On the one occasion the people of the province passed upon the question negatively, and since that time the government has had no contrary mandate from the electors. We recognize, however, that since the occurrence of the present war conditions which have arisen may have changed the attitude of the public of British Columbia towards this question, and this more particularly on account of the action taken in other parts of Canada as something relating peculiarly to the present necessities.

It has been decided, after careful deliberation, to submit the whole question to a plebiscite of the electorate. The date of taking the plebiscite will be announced as soon as it is decided what shall form the basis of the referendum. I may say it is intended to direct the course of the legislation in this regard according to the general result of the vote to be taken."

(Quoted from The World [Vancouver] August 24, 1915.)
APPENDIX IX

RESOLUTION adopted by the People's Prohibition Movement Convention and presented to Premier McBride in August, 1915.

"Whereas the evil arising out of the traffic in intoxicating liquors results in an economic waste, loss of efficiency and moral and social degradation;

And whereas it is believed the sentiment in favour of the abolition of this traffic is predominant throughout the province of British Columbia;

And whereas it is the sense of this convention that the time is now ripe for a definite step to be taken in regard to the enactment of a prohibitory measure;

And whereas the reply of the premier of the province to the delegation which waited upon him asking for a prohibitory measure did not state upon what the electorate would be asked to vote or the time at which the vote should be taken;

Therefore, be it resolved that the delegation from all parts of the province of British Columbia duly assembled in convention do hereby place themselves on record in favor of the principle of prohibition and request the provincial government that they at the earliest date possible, present to the electorate of the province of British Columbia a bill to be taken by a committee of this convention similar in wording and in intent to that endorsed by the electors of Alberta on the 21st day of July, 1915, and entitled 'The Liquor Act';

In the event of the said bill being approved by a majority of the electors of the province of British Columbia voting on the said measure the same to be enacted as law, to come into force not later than the last day of January, 1917:

And be it further resolved that it is the sense of this convention that the presentation to the electorate of the province of British Columbia of the aforesaid bill, shall not be made at the time of an election, this being an issue separate and distinct from party politics."

(Quoted from The World [Vancouver] August 27, 1915.)
APPENDIX X

PETITION submitted by the Merchants Protective Association to Premier McBride on October 4, 1915.

"... your petitioners humbly pray:

1. That no prohibitory legislation be introduced during the war.

2. That no referendum or plebiscite on this question be submitted during the war.

3. That no prohibitory legislation be introduced without making adequate provision for compensation.

4. That no referendum be submitted unless it is understood as a condition that legislation following such referendum, in case the result shall be in favour of prohibition shall make adequate provision for compensation.

5. That no referendum shall be submitted except at a General Election for the said Province.

(Paper 72/15 of the McBride collection in the Provincial Archives, Victoria, B.C.)
APPENDIX XI

LETTER of McBride to Rogers (undated).

"... There are two questions, mainly, to be considered: First, as to when the plebiscite should be submitted, and, second, what form it should take.

Your Committee expresses anxiety to have the reference to the people in respect of prohibition kept entirely free from party politics and for that purpose it is suggested that the plebiscite should be taken on a day other than that of a general election. The Government wholly concurs in the advisability of the question being dealt with in a nonpartisan way, but, personally, I am inclined to think that much more satisfactory results would be obtained by the voting being concurrent. It does not in any way involve the mizing (sic?) up of issues, and I have sufficient faith in the intelligence of the electors to believe that they can thoroughly discriminate. There are two reasons for submitting the plebiscite on the day of general elections. Owing to the interest excited in a political contest the maximum of votes is recorded, and what we particularly want is the fullest expression of public opinion. The danger is that on a separate day the voting will only bring out the extremes of both sides leaving a large mass of voters unrecorded. You will agree with me that it would be very unsatisfactory if only about fifty per cent. of the electors should record their votes and a bare majority of these were to be cast on either side. All experience goes to show that a law that does not have a large and generous public opinion behind it cannot be successfully enforced. The other consideration is that of expense. It will cost between $40,000 and $50,000 to submit a plebiscite separately. However, these are not insuperable objections and will be the subject of further consideration.

As to the form of submission you wish a referendum in the exact terms of a bill to be placed before the people, and an absolute response, yea or nay, to be registered. There are, in my opinion, two fundamental objections to this proposal. In the first place, it restricts the choice of the people to only one method of dealing with the liquor problem, whereas there may be effective methods of bringing about what prohibitionists have chiefly in view. An Act of Parliament may be inspired by a right principle, but may express it badly.

In the second place, I am opposed to the suggestion of direct legislation, which is contrary to the spirit of British representative institutions and responsible government. It is a form of legislative procedure growing up in the United States with very unsatisfactory and expensive results. What the
government is desirous of ascertaining is the wish of the people as a whole on various phases of the question involved, and what the people want we are prepared to carry out to the letter. If they emphatically declare for prohibition, my colleague, the Attorney-General, will carry it out without fear or favor, and therefore, the form of the plebiscite must be such as to indicate clearly what is the public wish and what is fair to all classes of the community.

As soon as the form of reference is prepared an announcement will be made. In the meantime you are quite at liberty to publish the correspondence.

Yours faithfully,
R. McBride.

(Letter 72/15 of the McBride collection in the Provincial Archives, Victoria, B.C.)
APPENDIX XII

LETTERS to McBride re the Conservative Party and the prohibition issue.


"I don't know if you are quite informed how strong feeling is on prohibition. Colonist and Times are both anti-prohibition, and exclude much information about it.

There is a majority for it, I think, in the local main executive, and in a meeting of the Ward 3 executive last night (only 8, but our best workers) they were to my surprise all enthusiastic about the good that plank would do to the party platform in securing votes about which all were anxious. No question of prohibition when they were elected. . . .

I doubt if you give enough weight to the very striking action of the King and I'm not sure you recognize how little the measure of the British Cabinet represented their desires.

This letter I have mentioned to no one nor shall I. But I want the Party to come through. I fear reciprocity so much.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Alderman C. E. Mahon (Vancouver) to McBride, November 5, 1915.

". . . I am afraid that we are going to be unable to keep this question out of politics, as some of us have strived hard to do.

. . . in fact there was a suggestion today that we should approach the other party and ask them to put a plank in their platform to that effect, which if they do Sir Richard, they will sure sweep the country, in spite of all we could do.

I do feel Sir Richard that if you would deside (sic) to say that you would at the next session of the Legislature bring down a Prohibitory (sic) Bill similar to that coming into effect in the Province of Alberta, taking the responsibility on yourself, the same to take effect July 1st next year, and then

* Chairman Ward 3, Conservative executive.

McBride's reply to Home made no reference to a prohibition plank in the Conservative Party's platform.
appeal to the country on that alone that you would sweep the country again. I have heard some rabid Grits say they would support you if you gave them prohibition. I have never heard as many men in both sides of politics say "they would drop party this time for prohibition," as I have heard say that this summer, and from men that have never left there (sic) party.

I am very sincere in this matter, and think it would be a master stroke. It would certainly knock some of these fellows off their pegs, such as Dr. McKay, Rev. Cook and others, as they would not have a leg to stand on and would be honor bound by their position to come in and support the Government.

... You know I have always said that we had much smarter men in the good old party than they ever had among the Liberals, yet in the two Provinces East of us they have led in advanced prohibition measures."

* * * * * * * * * * * *

McBride to Mahon, November 10, 1915.

"I have your letter of November 5th, which was evidently written before my reply to the Prohibition Committee was published. I am sorry that I could not meet their views more closely, but it is not a question of what I or you or the liquor people think is right, but what the people as a whole think, and what the majority of the people want the government is ready to carry out."

(Letters 72/15 of the McBride collection in the Provincial Archives, Victoria, B.C.)
APPENDIX XIII

COPY of a "Confidential Memorandum for the Executive Council re Royal Commission to inquire into the financial hardships and losses alleged to have resulted from bringing into force the 'B.C. Prohibition Act';

I am advised by His Honor the Lt. Governor that he gave his consent to the introduction of this Act conditional upon a promise that a commission of inquiry would be appointed, and this statement of His Honor's is borne out by a letter written by the Hon. W. J. Bowser, Premier, under date of May 23rd, 1916, which reads as follows:

'I have the honor to submit herewith the B.C. Prohibition Bill for the approval of Your Honor.

I wish to draw your attention to Section 61 of the Bill which provides that before it becomes effective the consent of the electors is required which is to be taken at the time of the forthcoming General Election.

In the event of the majority of the electors voting in favor of the measure I intend to recommend the appointment of a commission, probably composed of three judges of the Supreme Court, one representative of the Merchants Protective Association and one from the Prohibition Party, to investigate fully all financial hardships of losses which it may be contended will result from bringing into force the Act, and who, after making full inquiries, will report their findings and recommendations to the Government.

I wish to further state that I propose on the second reading of the Bill to make a statement covering the proposal to appoint said Commission.'

I recall that at that time many of the Liberal candidates for election in the 1916 elections were requested to state their position in regard to this proposed Commission. Personally, I took the stand that any person who alleged they had suffered loss on account of the B.C. Prohibition Act should have an opportunity of proving their contentions, and I made this statement to the Electorate at the time of the election. I was very careful to refrain from stating that I would be in favor of paying compensation. I believe a great many of the Liberal candidates took a position similar to mine.
On March 27th, 1919, I received a communication from His Honor the Lt. Governor, reading as follows:—

'Upon referring to the votes and proceedings of the Legislative Assembly I find that on Tuesday, the 18th ultimo, on page 8, in reply to a question put by a member with reference to the appointment of a Commissioner to inquire into the question of compensation to those formerly engaged in the liquor business in the Province on account of bringing into force the Prohibition Act, you replied that the Government had not reached a decision on the question.

For your information, and in order that the matter may be on record, I beg to say that before assenting to the Prohibition Act and Referendum, 1916, I obtained a promise from Mr. Bowser that he would make a statement to parliament upon the introduction of the Act that, in the event of the Prohibition Act being brought into force, the Government would appoint a commission to inquire into and report upon the question of compensation to be paid to those formerly engaged in the liquor trade.

Again, before I assented to the Prohibition Act of 1917, the late Premier, Mr. Brewster, stated that he was bound, he considered, by the pledge to parliament of the former Premier, to carry out the terms of such pledge, and would appoint the commission as promised.

I assumed that when I asked you to undertake the responsibility of forming a Government, that you would feel as the late Mr. Brewster did that there was an obligation on the part of Government to fulfill the conditions upon which the electorate were invited to express an opinion on this question.'

to which I replied as follows:—

'I am in receipt of your communication of this date re appointment of a commission to inquire into the question of compensation to those formerly engaged in the liquor business in the Province on account of bringing into force the Prohibition Act.

I am aware that a commission of inquiry was promised by the Hon. W. J. Bowser, and I have no doubt your Honor is correct in that the late Premier, Hon. H. C. Brewster, considered that he was bound by the pledge made by the former Premier. Personally,
I never have taken any other position than that there was an obligation resting upon the present Government at least to very carefully consider the appointment of the suggested commission. The only reason I had in delaying action has been I was convinced that the attitude of the present Legislature would be opposed to the payment of compensation.

As Your Honor no doubt has observed there is a movement to again bring this matter before the Electorate, and I am very strongly impressed with the idea that it probably will be necessary again to submit the question to the Electorate during the year 1920. I also am impressed with the thought that if a commission of inquiry into the matter of compensation is to be held the present Summer would be an opportune time to make the inquiry.

However, I shall bring the matter to the attention of my colleagues within a very short time, when the question will have very careful consideration and I will advise Your Honor further after consultation with my colleagues.

I have taken the trouble to refer to the newspaper reports of the Speech delivered by Premier Bowser on the 2nd Reading of the Prohibition Bill. The "Colonist" report reads as follows:-

'Then there were the arguments advanced relative to vested interests, bad financial conditions, large outlays in building operations, furnishings and fixtures. He could, in consequence, quite understand that people having money directly or indirectly involved should feel that they had a grievance. The Government had always made it a rule that any person or body who felt he or it had a grievance should have the opportunity to present it. Accordingly it was decided that if the Bill before the House should be approved by the people, that an investigation into the question of compensation should be held.

There were at present many and varied claims running the gamut from expensive furnishings and fixtures, loss of profits, cancelled contracts for sales and purchases, hop contracts with breweries, covenants in leases, rentals, idle premises, etc. The Government has come to the conclusion that the fairest way would be to investigate by means of a commission composed of three judges and two others, one representing the Prohibitionists and one the liquor interests, so that both interests would be
represented and be in a position to see that a proper inquiry was held. The commission would go fully into the entire question, hear arguments for and against and submit its recommendations to the Government.'

The 'Times' report reads as follows:-

'It seemed only fair, he said, that if the Act passed there should be an inquiry into the whole matter of compensation of the various rights affected and the most intelligent way seemed to be by the appointment of a royal commission of three judges and two others, one representing the People's Prohibition Party and the other the liquor interests, in case the people approved the Bill. In closing, Mr. Bowser stated that if he remained attorney-general he could promise to give to the public the same careful enforcement of this Act as in every other act under his administration.'

You will note that in my letter to His Honor I took the position that there was an obligation resting upon the present Government at least to carefully consider the appointment of the suggested commission. After mature consideration I cannot come to any other conclusion than that a Royal Commission should issue along the lines indicated in the letter of Premier Bowser to His Honor.

I think that the present is a very opportune time for the appointment of this Commission. Undoubtedly there will be very strong demand made at the next Session of the Legislature either for a total or partial repeal of the Prohibition Act. I am very decidedly of the opinion that, at some period during 1920, this question again will have to be referred to the electors of the Province for their decision.

I recommend the appointment of the Commission if the same appeals to your best judgments.

John Oliver."

(signed)

(From the uncatalogued Pattullo Papers kept in the Provincial Archives, Victoria, B.C.)
APPENDIX XIV

WHEREAS a plebiscite was taken in the Province of British Columbia in October, 1920, on the following questions:—

WHICH DO YOU PREFER?

1. The present "Prohibition Act"?

or

2. An Act to provide for Government Control and Sale in Sealed Packages of Spirituous and Malt Liquors?

AND WHEREAS the vote was strongly in favour of Government Control and Sale:

AND WHEREAS as a result of the said plebiscite there was passed by the Legislature of this Province the "Government Liquor Act":

AND WHEREAS eighteen months of administration under that Act has demonstrated the necessity for the prohibition of the importation of liquor into this Province by other than the Provincial Government in order to accomplish the effective working of the said Act:

AND WHEREAS Federal legislation to that end was sought at the meeting of the Federal Parliament in the spring of 1922, and the said proposed legislation met with the unanimous approval of the House of Commons, but was defeated in the Senate at the close of its Session when many Senators were not present:

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that this Province again seek the enactment of the proposed legislation:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Federal Parliament be requested at its next sittings to enact legislation providing for the prohibition of the importation of intoxicating liquor into British Columbia for use therein except by the Provincial Government; such legislation to be for the purpose of supplementing and giving effect to the aforementioned "Government Liquor Act" and to be contingent upon and to exist only during its continuance.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that he will cause a copy of the preamble and Resolution hereinbefore set out to be transmitted to the Hon. the Secretary of State at Ottawa.
The House divided, and the Resolution was carried on the following division:--

YEAS -- 30
NAYS -- 14

(B.C. Journals, 1922, vol. LI, p. 143.)
A MOTION moved by Mr. Guthrie (Socialist) as follows:

"That this Legislature resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the question of State health insurance, with a view to discussing the advisability of appointing a Committee to bring in a Bill before the close of this Session of the House"

was amended by Premier Oliver to read:

"WHEREAS at an Industrial Conference held at the City of Ottawa, at which representatives of both the Dominion and Provincial Governments were present, an understanding was arrived at to the effect that legislation dealing with the questions of health and unemployment insurance and old-age pensions belonged to the Federal Parliament:

AND WHEREAS the National Liberal Convention held in the City of Ottawa in August, 1919, resolved that, in so far as practicable, having regard for Canada's financial position, an adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age, and other disabilities (which would include old-age pensions, widows' pensions, and maternity benefits) should be instituted by the Federal Government in conjunction with the Governments of the several Provinces:

AND WHEREAS the Province of B.C. has provided for a system of mothers' pensions at a cost of approximately $500,000 annually:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That this House urge upon the Government of Canada to give early consideration to legislation providing for an adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age, and other disabilities.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that he will cause to be conveyed to the Secretary of State for Canada the foregoing preamble and Resolution."

The amended Resolution carried on division 40/5.

(B.C., Journals, 1922, pp. 138-40.)
APPENDIX XVI

A MOTION moved by Mr. Colley (Liberal), seconded by Dr. Wrinch (Liberal), as follows:

"WHEREAS, under the 'Public Inquiries Act,' a Commission was appointed on November 19th, 1919, to inquire into the subject of health insurance and maternity benefits, and particularly as to how far they were being put into operation in any other country or province:

AND WHEREAS this Commission submitted an exhaustive report upon these two subjects to the Legislature on March 18, 1921:

AND WHEREAS, while this Commission recommended as its considered opinion that it was desirable that a measure of benefits under some method of health insurance as well as a system of maternity benefits would be of advantage to the people of the Province of British Columbia:

AND WHEREAS, on account of the heavy financial cost of initiating and carrying out as thorough a system of health insurance as it considered would be required by the people of that Province, and for other reasons, the Government of this Province has not deemed it wise up to the present time to introduce such a scheme of health insurance or of maternity benefits:

AND WHEREAS it would appear that there is now a much more general demand for such a provision to be made to conserve the health of the people of this Province, as is shown by the numerous appeals from widely differentiated sources of origin that are being made to the Government for such legislation:

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, That a Committee of this Legislative Assembly, consisting of five members, be appointed, whose duties shall be to: (1) Inquire into the workings of any systems of health insurance and of maternity benefits wherever such systems can be found in effective operation; (2) to report its findings to this Legislature."

The Resolution carried unanimously.

(B.C. Journals, 1928, pp. 175-6.)
APPENDIX XVII

A MOTION moved by Mr. Wrinch (Liberal) was amended by Mr. Rutledge (Conservative), as follows:

"It is advisable, in the interests of the people of this Province, that this Legislature should be in possession of authentic, full, and up-to-date information regarding the subjects of maternity benefits and health insurance:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That a humble petition be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that a Commission composed of members of the Legislature, who shall serve without salary, be appointed under the 'Public Inquiries Act' to inquire as to what laws relating to the subjects of maternity benefits and health insurance are in force in other Provinces of Canada or any other countries; to collect facts as to the actual operation of such laws and as to how far they have been found satisfactory; to inquire as to whether and to what extent the public interest requires the introduction of similar laws into the Province of British Columbia; to estimate what would be the total annual cost to the people of the Province of British Columbia; to estimate what would be the total annual cost to the people of the Province in regard to each of these subjects, and what portion of the annual cost would fall upon (a) employers of labour, (b) prospective beneficiaries, and (c) the general taxpayers; to suggest methods by which the annual cost might be collected from the employers, prospective beneficiaries, and general taxpayers respectively; and generally to inquire into any or all matters affecting the said subjects respectively; and to report its findings and recommendations to this Legislature at its next Session."

The amended Resolution carried unanimously.

(B.C. Journals, 1929, p. 24.)
APPENDIX XVIII

ORDER-IN-COUNCIL setting up the Royal Commission on State Health Insurance and Maternity Benefits:

"His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has been pleased to appoint Cyril Francis Davie, Barrister, of Duncan (Chairman); William Farris Kennedy, of Vernon; Lorris E. Borden, M. D., C. M., of Nelson; George Sharratt Pearson, of Nanaimo; and John Joseph Gillis, M. D., C. M., of Merritt, Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia, Commissioners under the 'Public Inquiries Act' to inquire as to what laws relating to the subjects of maternity benefits and health insurance are in force in other Provinces of Canada or any other countries; to collect facts as to the actual operation of such laws and as to how far they have been found satisfactory; to inquire as to whether and to what extent the public interest requires the introduction of similar laws into the Province of B.C.; to estimate what would be the total annual cost to the people of the Province in regard to each of these subjects, and what portion of the annual cost might be collected from the employers, prospective beneficiaries, and general taxpayers respectively; and generally to inquire into any or all matters affecting the said subjects respectively; and to report its findings and recommendations to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of B.C. at its next Session."

(B.C. Gazette, vol. LXIX, no. 17, April 25, 1929, p. 1472.)
APPENDIX XIX

A MOTION moved by Mrs. Steeves (C. C. F.), as follows:

"WHEREAS 'An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Provincial System of Health Insurance' was passed by the Legislature on March 31st, 1936; and

WHEREAS Health Insurance progressively applied was endorsed by a majority vote of the people of British Columbia in a plebiscite submitted to them on June 1st, 1937; and

WHEREAS the Government has not brought the provisions of the 'Health Insurance Act' into operation; and

WHEREAS it has been reported to the public press on October 12th, 1937, that the Premier stated that Health Insurance would not be brought into operation until the Rowell Commission had reported;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That this Legislature is of the opinion that the Government has forfeited the confidence of the people in neglecting to put the 'Health Insurance Act' into operation."

Motion debated but negatived on division 7/33.

(B.C. Journals, 1937, p. 58.)

IN DEBATE on Speech from the Throne, Mr. Guthrie (C. C. F.) moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. E. E. Winch (C. C. F.), to add the following words:

"This House regrets that the Speech from the Throne conveyed no intimation of the Government's intention, at the present Session of the Legislature, to implement the expressed will of the citizens by placing into effectual operation the principles of an actuarially sound Health Insurance Act, progressively applied, as endorsed by referendum of the electorate of this Province."

Motion negatived on the following division: 13/27.

(B. C. Journals, 1938, p. 16-17.)
A MOTION on the Order Paper of Mrs. Steeves (C. C. F.), was ruled out of order:

"WHEREAS the Prime Minister has stated that the 'Health Insurance Act' is not being put into operation because the Government is waiting for the report to the Rowell Commission:

AND WHEREAS in the brief presented by the Government to the Rowell Commission no request is made that health insurance become a matter of Federal jurisdiction and no specific request is made for a Federal conditional grant for health insurance:

AND WHEREAS there is complete unanimity amongst all representative groups of the people of British Columbia on the matter of the urgent necessity of health insurance for this Province:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That a Select Committee of this House be set up to inquire into all possible ways and means of making health insurance, on a sound actuarial basis, operative in B. C., and report the result of its findings to this House."

(B.C. Journals, 1938, p. 84-85.)

A MOTION moved by Mrs. Steeves (C. C. F.), as follows:

"WHEREAS by referendum vote of the electorate of this Province a considerable majority voted in favor of a 'comprehensive Health Insurance plan progressively applied':

AND WHEREAS effective action to implement the expressed will of the people has not been undertaken:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That this House is of the opinion that the Government should immediately take steps to make Health Insurance operative in this Province."

Motion ruled out of order as involving an impost on the people.

(B. C. Journals, 1939, p. 94.)
A MOTION moved by Mrs. Steeves (C. C. F.), as follows:

"WHEREAS by a referendum vote of the electorate of this Province in 1937 a considerable majority voted in favour of 'a comprehensive Health Insurance Plan progressively applied':

AND WHEREAS no effective action has been taken by the Government to implement this expression of opinion by the people:

AND WHEREAS war conditions have made the need for effective medical services for all more acute:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That this House is of the opinion that the Government should take under immediate consideration the implementation of a Provincial Health Insurance system."

Motion ruled out of order, not competent for a Private Member, as involving expenditure of public money.

(B.C. Journals, 1941-42, p. 98.)

A MOTION moved by Mrs. Steeves (C. C. F.), as follows:

"WHEREAS the Federal Government has not established a national health plan:

AND WHEREAS Canada lags behind Great Britain and other British Dominions in provision of national health services:

AND WHEREAS organized labour has demanded that preventative and curative health services be supplied to all through a national health insurance plan:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That this Legislature endorse the principle of free curative and preventative health services to all and petition the Dominion Government to institute such a national health plan.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Provincial Health Insurance Commission be instructed to formulate a Provincial Health Insurance plan in order that the Province may consider ways and means of instituting a Provincial health plan if a national health service is not established in the near future."

Motion ruled out of order as involving expenditure of public money; ruling supported on division, 26/15.

(B.C. Journals, 1945, pp. 117-18.)
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ORDER-IN-COUNCIL providing for the "Liquor Plebiscite, 1952":

"WHEREAS in and by section 4 of the 'Liquor-control Plebiscites Act,' being chapter 193 of the 'Revised Statutes of British Columbia, 1948,' it is provided that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall fix by Proclamation the date for the taking of the vote on any question to be submitted to the electors under the provisions of the said Act and shall order the issue of writs in Her Majesty's name for taking the vote, and shall fix the date for the return of the Writs; and

WHEREAS Our said Lieutenant-Governor, by and with the advice of Our Executive Council, has been pleased to direct by Order in Council in that behalf that the following question be submitted to a vote of the electors of all the electoral districts of the Province:--

'Are you in favour of the sale of spirituous liquor and wine by the glass in establishments licensed for such purpose?'

and that the date of taking the said vote shall be Thursday, the twelfth day of June, 1952, and that Writs be issued accordingly, returnable on or before the thirty-first day of July, 1952.

NOW KNOW YE that We do by these presents proclaim and declare that the date for taking the vote of the electors of all the electoral districts of the Province on the aforementioned question shall be Thursday, the twelfth day of June, 1952, and that Writs be issued accordingly, returnable on or before the thirty-first day of July, 1952."

(B.C. Gazette, vol. XCII, no. 17, April 24, 1952, p. 1169.)