

Dominion Parliament

The Plebiscite—Hon. S. Fisher
Defends the Government's
Action.

He Denies Charges of Fraudulent
Voting in Quebec—The
Address.

Ottawa, April 14.—In the House yesterday the Hon. Sydney A. Fisher, the member for Bromide, made a two hours' speech in which he defended himself in the main to a very full explanation of the government's further policy in the matter of prohibition, and to a reply to the charges which have been preferred against the administration in that connection by Conservative members. Later in the evening the Conservative amendment to the address was moved, expressing confidence in the government policy.

The Minister of Agriculture referred in opening to the charges which had been brought against him of neglect in attendance upon the sittings of the House. He would only say that in his absence he had the best of reasons. He was indeed, it was worthy of remark that on the occasion of the recent speech of the ex-Minister of Justice, Sir Herbert Tupper, he had been favored by an attendance of not more than twelve of the members of his own party. His friends were not sufficiently interested in the subject matter of his lengthy address to care to remain in the House and listen.

Brockville By-Election.

The other day the ex-Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Foster, went down to Brockville and fired the first gun of the Conservative party in the by-election which is now going on there. Mr. Fisher read from a Montreal daily a report of that speech in which it was stated that there had been no word of reference to the Yukon charges which it took Sir Herbert Tupper six hours to elaborate in the House, nor was the name of a Tupper mentioned in any way by any of the speakers.

Mr. Foster—I am going to take the earliest opportunity to remedy that defect in my speech. It was due to my not having more than about forty-five minutes in which to speak.

The Minister of Agriculture—My honorable friend, I suppose, wanted to emulate his former colleague and friend. He wanted six hours to elaborate those charges. But the honorable member's party press are telling the people of this country that these Yukon charges are the greatest blot upon the present administration of Canada, yet in three-quarters of an hour, the first speaker, who had to strike the keynote of their accusations against this government, he did not see fit to refer once to those charges and that the statement in the newspaper is correct. The honorable gentleman's very lame excuse is abundant proof. He is convicted of one of two things—either he has no sympathy with those charges or he feels that the speech of the Minister of the Interior was so completely disposed of them that it was not safe for the Conservative party to continue them.

Mr. Foster—No, but you have so many sins that it is not easy to deal with them all.

The Minister of Agriculture—The honorable gentleman knows in his heart the reason for what he has done.

Continuing, the Minister of Agriculture quoted the resolution passed at the largest meeting in the history of the Liberal Association of Manitoba in March last, being a full endorsement of the course pursued by the Minister of the Interior.

Where Credit Is Due.

The gentleman opposite had been worrying themselves a good deal concerning certain credit which they thought ought to be given the late government for certain reforms in the interests of the agriculturists of Canada. They had insisted on it so often and so vehemently that they are bringing themselves to believe that the facts, however they may be, are true. The government did not need to go to the people and insist that they are prosperous, for it is the people who come to the government to testify thereto. Similarly, Mr. Fisher claimed that the credit for the several reforms in his department came to him because of the free will of the people themselves. He would leave the matter in the hands of the people and trust to their judgment. He was pleased to observe that the ex-Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Montague, had not followed this line of attack. Dr. Montague had been out six months in charge of the Finance Department and had very little opportunity to exercise his ability.

Cold Storage.

In 1895, upon the recommendation of Prof. Robertson, whose foresight he fully recognized, ten steamships had been furnished with isolated cold storage compartments. But as a matter of fact the cold storage was not found to be a success and in consequence in 1897 sixteen vessels were fitted out with mechanical refrigeration, which is now understood to be the only really practical system in large vessels, and warehouses.

Our Butter Trade.

The Minister of Agriculture presented to the House the results which have followed the introduction of this splendid system of cold storage. While in 1894, and up to 1896 Canadian butter of the best quality ranged from seventy-two to eighty-five shillings per hundredweight, in 1898 the difference between finest Canadian and Danish ran under six shillings per hundredweight. In August last he had himself seen Canadian butter sold at a higher figure than the Danish. In 1898, fancy Australian ran from ten to twelve shillings above the best Canadian. In 1898, throughout the whole season, there was not a single instance in which the Canadian butter was not higher than

Australian. This result he attributed to the fact that the new product by which Canadian creamery butter is placed upon the English market in the same splendid condition in which it leaves and Canadian creamery butter at the creamery in Canada is not surpassed in quality by any butter on the face of the earth.

Pork, Ham and Bacon.

Incidentally the Minister of Agriculture drew attention to the immense increase in our sales of pork, ham and bacon. In 1891 we exported \$632,000 worth of these products. In 1896 it grew to \$4,400,000, and in 1898 to \$8,000,000. For the present fiscal year it would seem that the figure may well reach twelve millions.

Our Cattle Trade.

The Minister of Agriculture referred with pardonable pride to the results which have been accomplished by the removal of the American quarantine against Canadian cattle. While in the four years from 1892 to 1896 in which the embargo was in force Canada sent to the United States 3,703 head of cattle, of the value of \$32,000; in the two years which have elapsed since that restriction was removed Canada sent to the United States 180,849 head of cattle of the value of \$2,514,000.

Mr. Wallace—How much is that per head?

The Minister of Agriculture—Figure that out for yourself.

Mr. Wallace—Under fourteen dollars a head.

The Minister of Agriculture—Yes, and the honorable gentleman, if he knew anything about the state of our stock interests three years ago in Canada would have known well that our farmers here could not at that time sell the class of cattle which went to the United States for eight or ten dollars, let alone fourteen dollars a head. The cattle which were sent across to the United States are chiefly young cattle, unsaleable animals which could not go to the English market and which were resting like an incubus on the cattle market of Canada. Of the effect of the removal of the Ironsides, of the firm of Gordon & Ironsides, the largest cattle dealers and exporters in Canada, had expressed the gratitude which Canadian farmers owe to the government by which the young cattle under two years of age in Canada had doubled in value.

Mr. Ives Sarcastic.

Mr. Ives asked if the Postmaster-General agreed in this piece of administration.

The Minister of Agriculture replied that he fully concurred, and that in so doing he acted not inconsistently with the position which he had formerly occupied. Upon the shoulders of Mr. Ives were the heavy burdens of the Interior, the burden of remission rested, by which the British embargo was saddled upon Canadian cattle.

Mr. Ives—I think from what we have heard of the person of the honorable member who went to Washington should have been changed and my honorable friend should have gone down.

The Minister of Agriculture—The honorable gentleman's compliments are highly appreciated. But while I have my work to do, my honorable friends who went to Washington had their work to do and I have no doubt did it with the same success.

Mr. Ives—Then, the Minister of Agriculture observed that he was not fishing after credit and yet he could not but feel gratified at the assurances which he had received from the press of the Interior, alike, when in their daily conferences, live stock associations and fruit growers' associations, of satisfaction at the work which he had been able to do.

A Personal Explanation.

Proceeding to another point which has excited some anxiety among members of the opposition, the Minister of Agriculture assured the House that he had no intention of withdrawing from the government. The reason he was not going to resign was because there was no cause of difference between him and the leader of the government. When a few days ago he was called away by matters of private business it was charged against him by the press of the opposition, the state that he was indulging in a sulk. So far as sulking is concerned, he could say that it was not a characteristic of himself or of any member of the government. The Minister of Agriculture praised the present distinguished incumbent of the High Commissioner'ship in London for the manner in which he has attended to his high duties. Even if it were his wish to attain to that position he would shrink from the attempt to follow such a man as Lord Strathcona.

THE PLEBISCITE.

Mr. Fisher's Views on the Subject—The Attack on the Government.

Coming down to what may be regarded as the most important part of his address, the Minister of Agriculture found that the Opposition were worrying a great deal about himself and about what the government is going to do in the matter of prohibition. It is rather an extraordinary fact. There is but one song on the Opposition side, and it is, "You naughty government, why do you not propose a prohibitory law?" "No, no," said the minister, "on the other side of the House has proposed a prohibitory law. Nobody on the other side has said what he is prepared to do, and although this attack upon the government has been made, the fact that it is prohibition which the honorable gentlemen have at heart is shown by the fact that whoever be the speaker on the other side, or whatever his views on prohibition, the burden of his attack is exactly the same. Everybody who knows these gentlemen knows that the honorable members for Compton (Mr. Pope) and Stanstead (Mr. Moore) are diametrically opposed on the question of prohibition, and yet the speeches which they have made are almost identical. And why are they identical? Because their whole aim and object has been to accuse the government and to put it in a hole, and not to benefit or help prohibition at all."

The honorable gentleman," he said, "on that side of the House have accused the government of not proposing a prohibitory law. Has my honorable friend meant what he would do on this question if he were in office? Has he said that he is desirous of going to the country to test the people upon this question from a party point of view? Not a bit of it."

What the Plebiscite Is.

"The plebiscite is a thing of very old

origin. Without going back to its first institution in the days of ancient Rome, I will say that it has been in modern times chiefly made use of in France. The plebiscite was made use of there in the third empire to obtain endorsement from the people of a political question which had been already 'un fait accompli'."

Mr. Foster—The referendum. The Minister of Agriculture—Excuse me, the referendum is an entirely different thing from the plebiscite. The referendum is the submission of a definite or particular law to the people of the country to be adopted, just as the act of a referendum is a political question which has been already 'un fait accompli'."

Mr. Bergeron—Are there any cases in England?

The Minister of Agriculture—There have been no cases in England in which a plebiscite has been used for the purpose of obtaining an opinion of the people on the question of prohibition, not upon 'un fait accompli' but upon a referendum.

The purpose of adopting a particular law. The honorable gentleman opposite knows perfectly well that the temperance people of this country did not wish a referendum. They felt, and rightly, that if a referendum a special law were to be submitted for vote in the country, a series of side issues would be brought in and the people of the country would be deterred from voting in consequence of the detraction of the plebiscite. The government had that request of the temperance people in view. Furthermore, the government carried out its pledge to give a plebiscite to the people in which the government had dealt with party when in Opposition, had said they would do.

Sir Charles's Accusation.

Sir Charles Tupper stated in his speech that we had deceived the people and he implied that the government was deceiving its party and policy and the count of the manner in which it took the plebiscite.

In this connection the Minister of Agriculture quoted what Mr. Spence, as reported in the *Temperance Herald*, had said, when in November last a deputy approached a committee of the government. Mr. Spence then said: "It was only eight months since a delegation of the Dominion Alliance had called upon the first minister and his colleagues, asking that the question be referred to the electorate by any side issues. For the straightforward and honorable way in which the government had dealt with that petition they owe their thanks."

This, the minister thought, disposes of the objection brought forward by the leader of the Opposition as to the manner in which the government had carried its pledge to the temperance people, that they would give them an opportunity of expressing their opinion at the polls.

What, asked the minister, were the results? I may say emphatically this: The plebiscite was for the purpose of enabling the electorate of Canada to give expression to their opinion upon the question of prohibition, and the whole and sole thing in connection with the plebiscite; it was for that purpose and that alone. The people of the country had that opportunity given them in the first instance, and the government was stated by the representatives of the temperance people when they came to the government in November last.

Analysis of the Vote.

How, then, did the people of Canada take advantage of that opportunity and how did they go to the polls? The figures which are held in this country are as follows: The result of the vote was that 100,000 voters in the Dominion of 1896 sixty-six per cent. voted and fifty-six per cent. of the whole number enrolled on the list did not vote. Twenty-two and a half per cent. voted "yes" and twenty and a half per cent. of the whole list voted "no."

The right and the fair thing would be to take the average vote at the ordinary elections, and to base the law upon that. As a matter of fact of every hundred names on the voters' lists in the elections of 1897, seventy per cent. of the people voted. In the elections of 1891, sixty-six per cent. of the people voted. The average of 1896 sixty-six per cent. was a list which was about three years old. In 1898, when the plebiscite was taken the list in the province of Quebec was about three years old, in some of the smaller provinces it was not new, but on the whole the average was much newer than that used in the Dominion of 1896. The average of Canada about three years old. It may therefore be fairly taken that the average vote on the plebiscite, comparing it with the ordinary elections would be about sixty-six per cent. in its benefit of the doubt fully and entirely to the question. In other words, of sixty-six per cent. which would be fairly to be expected vote, only forty-four per cent. voted "yes" and twenty and a half per cent. voted "no."

Of those practically about a half voted for prohibition and about a half, in round figures, against. Therefore a third voted for prohibition, a third against and a third did not vote at all.

The Government's Pledge.

Mr. Foster—My honorable friend lays this down as a rule which would be fair to abide by. Did he take the trouble to do that before the plebiscite was taken at all?

The Minister of Agriculture—I did not. It was before the plebiscite was taken. It was an absolute fact, and the honorable gentleman and every one else knew it.

Mr. Foster—One other question: The honorable gentleman is reported as having said at the Liberal convention in 1893, "I propose to read the resolution which pledges the Liberal party, if returned to power to give the people of Canada an opportunity to express their views upon this question, and the government in power must necessarily carry out the expressed will of the people. There is no doubt that that is what the Liberal party would do, for we know their pledges can be trusted." Is that statement correct?

The Minister of Agriculture—Speaking from memory, I think it is.

Mr. Foster—Then might I ask whether my honorable friend meant there, as his words say, that it should be "the expressed will," and as "the expressed will" was only shown in the votes for and against, and as a majority of that vote was in favor of the principle of prohibition, whether he does not think his own words hold him to the "expressed will" being shown by the majority of

those who came out to express their will by vote.

An Insufficient Vote.

The Minister of Agriculture—I will answer personally that I do not think it does. As I have already said, the plebiscite was for the purpose of obtaining the will of the people upon this question. If the people did not have an opinion, or did not express that opinion, the plebiscite does not show the true opinion of the people of this country, as expressed in the vote, and until the responsible advisers of the crown in this country can be assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Mr. Ives—Was the honorable gentleman at the time of the Ottawa convention aware of the understanding, as he is assured of what they believe to be the opinion of the people they can only carry that out by their judgment. I say this emphatically that it would be a folly, and it would not be consistent with the good government of this country, or with the duty which this government were to undertake to put into force a prohibitory law.

Mr. Foster—We are anxious for information.

Dr. Landerkin—You need it.

Some will say that this has been a waste of public money—that \$250,000 has been spent to no advantage. I do not think so. For long years back in my temperance work in Canada I have found that the progress made has been made through constant agitation and discussion of the subject. I have found that the best way to secure discussion and agitation has been to bring up what may be called legislative or political action on the part of the temperance people. By bringing the question forward in that way we could get men to discuss it who without that interest would have left it alone, and have been utterly indifferent to it. This being the case this plebiscite campaign has done greater good and has brought about a more thorough discussion of the temperance question than it has ever had before in the Dominion of Canada; and I have faith enough in the temperance cause and in the principle of prohibition to feel that the more it is discussed the greater will be its progress, and the nearer will come its final triumph. If for no other reason than that, I would gladly see the expenditure of a quarter of a million of money to bring that about.

A Lesson Learned.

But there is another, and perhaps a greater, result from this plebiscite. It has removed all doubt about the position of this question in the country. We know now that there are about a third of the electorate who are ardent prohibitionists; devoted men, who have the temperance cause sincerely at heart; who are ready to sacrifice their time and go to the polls and declare for it. We know now where we are, and the temperance people know what they have to overcome. Those who are indifferent never before had the opportunity which they have had of appreciating the consequences of their indifference. If they had only desired not to see prohibition enforced they have injured their own side of the question because they have given the prohibitionists the opportunity of showing their strength to the country to be such that it must be considered in the future.

This is not a party question. It was not brought forward as a party question. When the plebiscite bill passed last session there were very few in the House who ventured to take any exception to it. The honorable gentleman opposite did not challenge a division, but helped us to put it through. Therefore I am warranted in saying that it was not a party question, and that neither was it a result of a party question. The honorable gentleman opposite is not making it a party question in any sense or shape, except in their desire to make a little party capital out of the censuring of the government. It is not a party question because we find that men of all parties are speaking about it differently.

The Minister of Agriculture quoted the published opinion of the Rev. Mr. Ker, of Grace Church, Piquette St., Charles, a gentleman who has avowed himself an opponent to this government, who is also a prohibitionist and a man of standing. In this letter Dr. Ker declares his belief that the government would not be justified in introducing a prohibitory law.

Proceeding, the Minister of Agriculture said: There are only one or two other questions on which I would like to say a few words. When the act is to be adopted the act requires that at least a quarter of the electors on the voters' list of a particular county shall sign a petition in favor of the mission of the act. The honorable gentleman opposite do not ask that we should submit a prohibitory law, but do ask that we should submit a petition in favor of the law, because we do not do so, when less than twenty-five per cent. of the voters on the list voted for it.

But let me refer to another point. In the province of Quebec, under the law, applicants for license shall furnish to the collector of provincial revenue a certificate signed by a quarter of the electors of the municipality, or by a majority of the residential municipal electors if they number less than fifty of a population of a township, and in the cities of Quebec and Montreal an absolute majority of municipal voters residing within the municipal polling district must signify their opposition to the license before it can be refused.

This shows that not a certain number of those who vote upon the lists have to express their opinion on the questions submitted. I shall not go into details, but practically the same thing is true in Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

But the honorable gentlemen opposite have been making a good deal out of the plea that the Liberal party holds office on a less or more vote than the vote that was given for prohibition in the plebiscite. The facts, however, are not so. I have taken the trouble to go through the figures in every constituency in this Dominion, and I find that in a straight fight, that is where there was not a three-cornered fight or anything of that kind. Where there is such a fight it is difficult to estimate how many votes were cast for either the party or the other. I think that the one thing that is certain is that the Liberal party, therefore, to take the constituencies where there was a fair fight between the two parties, and taking all these we find the Liberal party had thirty-four per cent. of the vote on the lists, and the Conservatives only thirty-two per cent., making sixty-six per cent. of the vote on the lists, which were actually cast in these constituencies. In other words, while in the plebiscite, prohibition had 22 per cent. of the votes on the lists, in the elections in these constituencies where there was a straight fight the Liberals party had 37 per cent., and not 28 per cent., as an honorable member so boldly declared the other night.

As a matter of fact, in the plebiscite the prohibition party had less than a quarter of the enrolled vote in its favor, whereas the government had a third of the enrolled votes, thus presenting a very different contrast from that which the honorable gentleman opposite had been hugging themselves with so often in this debate.

THE QUEBEC VOTE.

Mr. Fisher Denies the Stories of Fraudulent Voting.

There is another important point I wish to deal with. A number of honorable gentlemen have been making very rash statements as to the plebiscite vote in the province of Quebec. The honorable member for Compton (Mr. Pope) the other night said he had proof of gross frauds in Quebec. We know that in the Ontario press immediately after

the plebiscite there was some little display of bitterness, and