

HON. MR. VIDAL—I cannot allow this amendment to pass without at least putting on record my views concerning it, and lodging my emphatic and solemn protest in the name of 150,000 electors of this country who have voted for the Act, against the outrage which I insist is being perpetrated upon them. A great deal of argument has been adduced here to prove the fallacy of a statement that has not been made; in the reasons given to us by the House of Commons for disagreeing with this amendment there is no suggestion that Parliament has not power to change the law. No member of the House of Commons would allow such an expression to emanate from that Chamber. I contend that the language used in this message is justified by the circumstances. I assert that this amendment is a violation of the fundamental principle of the Act. Who can dispute that the fundamental principle of the Temperance Act is to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, without any reference to the quantity of alcohol in them? I hold that the amendment is a distinct and outrageous violation of the principles of that Act. Where in the argument used by the House of Commons do you find anything of the suggestion that Parliament had not the power to amend its laws? There is no such thing. It simply says it would be a breach of faith on the part of Parliament.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. VIDAL—Is it not a pure breach of faith on the part of Parliament?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No. What they say is the order-in-council shall not be revoked for three years. It does not say that Parliament may not interfere.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It does not, but it is implied. The very meaning of that Act is that where it is adopted it should not be interfered with for three years.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Not by order-in-council.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It does not matter how. I am speaking in the name of common people, who believe in what Parliament says, that that Act when brought

into force can only be revoked by an order-in-council obtained by the same mode of procedure, but the vote cannot be taken within three years. The people have thus the right to expect that the Act shall be kept in force for three years, and it is a violation of an implied compact which Parliament entered into with those who believed that they meant what they said. Therefore, I contend that the House of Commons were perfectly justified in saying that it is a breach of faith on the part of Parliament with those who accepted that Act. The Minister of Justice himself admitted, after his attention was called to the matter by the hon. member from Ottawa, that he thought there might be an exception made in favor of those counties which have adopted the law.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I said I thought they stood in a different position.

HON. MR. VIDAL—But not until the hon. member from Ottawa had called attention to it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It did not occur to me. I thought if some suggestion were made to the other House that they might be disposed to consider it in a different way.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am quite aware that the hon. gentleman said this, and I was pleased to hear it, and I was also pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Amherst in the same direction, but I hold the reasons given here why that House does not agree to the amendments made by the Senate are valid and cogent reasons and will be appreciated and understood by the people of this country. I am convinced that the legislation we are now passing will not meet with the approbation of the country. We see it indicated by the meetings of the various church courts since we adopted this amendment; they speak clearly and distinctly the sentiments of the people. I say that we are proceeding in direct opposition to the sentiments of the people of this country, sentiments made known to us in a constitutional way by their repre-

HON. MR. DICKEY.