

charges me with insincerity upon this question. It will be recollected by every public man in this country that notwithstanding the fact that the House gave assent to the proposition which he submitted in 1874, to reform the constitution of the Senate, that he not only did not take for further action on the matter but that he entered the Government of the day and remained a member of that Government for four long years, and we heard no more about the reform of the Senate. Let me ask what did the hon. gentleman ever do with a view to carry out the spirit of the motion which had received the sanction of this House? I do not desire to enter at any great length into this question of his references to me. The hon. gentleman charges me with insincerity because a few days ago I voted against a motion which he submitted to this House. I think it is due to myself and to the temperance Conservatives on this side of the House, that I should enter into a further explanation in reference to this matter and give to the House my reasons for pursuing the course which I did. It is well known that there is a body of temperance men in this country called the Dominion Alliance for the suppression of the liquor traffic. It is organised of non-partisan members, and Reformers and Conservatives meet there on a common ground for the purpose of promoting the cause of temperance. I am and have been for years a member of that Alliance, and it has been a principle acted upon in that Alliance that any temperance legislation to be brought before this House ought first to receive the sanction of the Alliance; that every movement in reference to the amendment of the Canada Temperance Act, or with reference to the prohibition of the liquor traffic, should originate with the Dominion Alliance. On the very day and up to the very hour that the hon. gentleman made the motion to this House, I had been acting in the Dominion Alliance in accord with the temperance Liberal members on the other side of the House. We had been sitting at a committee meeting around a table that very day discussing questions in reference to the action we would take in the House on the question. What was my surprise to find the hon. gentleman who never yet manifested any zeal for the cause of temperance, except on an occasion when it was likely to embarrass those who were opposed to him, and who has never yet appeared at a meeting of the Dominion Alliance, or any other organization for the purpose of promoting the cause of temperance in this country, get up in his place and place a motion before this House under circumstances which he must have known would call for a condemnation of the resolution at the hands of the majority of the members of this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why so?

Mr. JAMIESON. Because at the time he knew it would be voted down by the members of this House. I did not vote against it simply because it was a vote of want of confidence in the Government, but I voted against it because it was a breach of the fundamental principles on which the Dominion Alliance was organised.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. JAMIESON. It is of the kind, and not only have the Liberal members of the Dominion Alliance who are not represented in this House endorsed the course which I took but they have said I could not take any other course.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not they. Name.

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes, among others Mr. Spence, the secretary of the Dominion Alliance, who is as good a Liberal as the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) is. He said the resolution was an untimely one to be submitted to the House. The *Montreal Witness* whose sympathies are altogether with the Liberal party condemned the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) for the circumstances under which he put that resolution to the House and every

Mr. JAMIESON.

fair-minded temperance man in this Dominion has taken the ground which I took on the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes, they did; and I am prepared to submit my conduct to the people of this Dominion on that question. I believe so far as this question is concerned that the people of this Dominion have more confidence in myself as a representative than the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I am bound to characterise the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell a few moments ago in reference to my conduct last year as a—well—I do not know how to characterise it so that it would be within the rules of Parliament, but I will say it is a wrong statement from beginning to end, and whoever gave that information to him I have no doubt they were “guying” him because they thought he would swallow it in the manner in which he did. There is not one word of truth in it from first to last. When we found we could not get a measure before the House last year—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why?

Mr. JAMIESON. An old parliamentarian asks why? On a former occasion I forced the measure through this House, but it was the cause of defeating several other measures. I am satisfied now that this is not a proper course to pursue and that it is not a course which is recognised by the House as a fair one. I do not know whether we could have succeeded last year in forcing the question through the House or not. We called together the men from both sides of the House; we called them to consult together, and the question was submitted to them, and the decision of that committee was that it was too late in the Session to press temperance legislation, and it would not be fruitful of any good to us if we had pressed it, because we would not be able to get the question disposed of in such a manner as to have it complete.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he notified all the temperance men of the House to go to that meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who were selected?

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) undertook to notify the members favorable to temperance on his side of the House and I undertook to notify the members favorable to temperance on my side of the House. In that way the meeting was brought about.

Mr. FISHER. What meeting are you referring to?

Mr. JAMIESON. The one that was called last year to bring up this question. You recollect it?

Mr. FISHER. I am not aware of any meeting at which it was decided that we should not push the temperance question as fast as we could.

Mr. JAMIESON. Well, I am, and I think there are gentlemen in this House who were present at that meeting.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the hon. member how many members he invited from his own side of the House to attend that meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. I am not prepared to say at the present moment, but possibly about a dozen were invited. There are a certain number of gentlemen who are connected with temperance movements and temperance organisations, and who are favorable to prohibition, and we generally invite them. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has been invited, but I am not sure that he ever attended. Now, I am sorry that this discussion has assumed the character that it has, but I think the hon. members of this House will at least excuse me for the course I have taken.