

sentatives in the other Chamber who have twice voted on this question, once, on the motion of Mr. Gigault, which was voted down, and again when going to them with the express sanction of this House, when it was defeated without a division.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Will my hon. friend state what were the numbers in the first division and the numbers on the second occasion?

HON. MR. VIDAL—I do not remember, but it is of no consequence.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I can give the number.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman, if he were running an election, would be very glad to be elected by a majority even of two. On this particular amendment there was no division at all, and we have good ground for saying the House of Commons was unanimously opposed to it. The records of that Chamber would justify us in making that statement.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—In the same way the hon. member from Sarnia states that he has the names of 150,000 electors on his petitions here.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I did not say a word to that effect; I said I represented 150,000 people who had voted for the Act.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—Precisely; we have petitions here on our side of the House from a very much larger number of electors.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am not speaking of petitions, because I know how little importance is attached to petitions in this House, though coming from the most influential bodies in the land, but I claim that I represent the sentiments of 150,000 people who have given their ballots for adopting the Scott Act; that cannot be got over. One hundred and fifty thousand of our electors have thus distinctly expressed themselves in favor of the Act.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—Out of a million.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I hold that we are not meeting the views of the country as a high legislative body when we tamper with a Bill which the people value so highly and which they wish to preserve unimpaired.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I wish to say a word or two on this amendment. My hon. friend who has just sat down, I regret to say, has given us very much the same expression that he gave us on a former occasion. It is very unfortunate that these discussions cannot take place without the use of violent epithets and impugning motives, and without covert threats. As far as this amendment is concerned the question is a perfectly simple one. The House of Commons give us a reason, which we do not think is a proper one, for disagreeing to the amendment. One reason which they give is that we have, as it states, made a compact with the persons who have adopted the Temperance Act, and that it cannot be amended without a breach of faith.

HON. MR. VIDAL—An implied compact.

HON. MR. PLUMB—That language cannot be applied to it. It could not be changed by an Order-in-Council, but Parliament is supreme and can change the Act if it likes. This branch of Parliament has chosen to change it. My hon. friend lays great stress on what he terms the voice of the people who have been heard with regard to this measure. Now although the Act has been adopted in many counties, a fundamental error has been perpetuated in every election that has been held in respect to this Act. I have insisted from the beginning that this Act should only be put in force by a majority of the voters, or it never would have the respect of the people. I say so now, yet in counties which, prior to the last election, had registered voters to the number of over 390,000, this Act has been put in force, and only 123,000 have voted on both sides. Does the hon. gentleman speak of that as being evidence of tremendous enthusiasm on the part of the people? Does he not know that the association of which he is a president, has used every method possible