

stand up and ask the Legislature to repeal that law, and for the Finance Minister to state that the fact that the people enacted a law thirty-five years ago and found it unpopular, shows they still enjoy the same view in relation to a prohibitory law, is absurd. I will say now what I have said heretofore, that the sentiment in reference to prohibition in this Chamber is not very strong. I do not think it is quite the reflex of the sentiment of the country. It is very true that, a few years ago, when this country was ruled by another Government, the people of this country were very clamorous for a prohibitory law, and they did not appeal in vain to the Government of that day, led by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. He gave them what is known as—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

MR. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentlemen try to keep quiet for a few moments, until we get to a division on the matter.

MR. IRVINE. He gave them what is known as a local option law, that is, a permissive law, prohibitory in its character when enacted but left to the people, of course, to accept or reject it. We found last year that that law could be amended, and the Alliance which met in this city a year ago, proposed some amendments to that law, and it is very well known that a committee was appointed to have those amendments embodied in an amendment to be sent to this Parliament, and we know very well that they never were presented, for the reason, exactly, that the Government of the day, of which the hon. the Finance Minister is a shining light, could not undertake the responsibility of introducing the law in this House to carry it through Parliament—that is, the amendments embodied in the Resolution. So we have abundant proof that the present Government, the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury Benches, are not very favorable to what we call advanced temperance legislation, and I think all that the temperance people of this country ask now is, that we have what we call a fair show: that is, that we have a fair sight to enforce the Scott Act. But we believe—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

MR. IRVINE. We have a fair exhibition of the temperance sentiment of the House to-night. We know on what side advanced temperance principles are. I said in the outset that I believed the temperance people of this country wanted nothing better than the Scott Act, if it received that treatment which it should receive at the hands of the Government, but we are satisfied from what we know, we have reason to believe, that the present Government are willing to see that law frustrated and wiped off the Statute Book.

We know that, notwithstanding that the Finance Minister votes one way and speaks another, the sentiment of the party on the Treasury Benches is decidedly hostile to the temperance movement and to temperance legislation. We know that the temperance question has been the hobby upon which he rode into power, upon which he sits in power now, the hobby which he has always sat upon, in order to advance his own interests.

Main motion as amended, agreed to on the following division:—

## YEAS.

## Messieurs.

Allen,	Ferguson, (Leeds & Gren.),	Mulock,
Allison (Hants),	Fisher,	Paint,
Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Armstrong,	Foster,	Platt,
Auger,	Gague,	Ray,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gault,	Reid,
Bain (Wentworth),	Giganet,	Rinfret,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gillmor,	Robertson (Hastings),
Baker (Victoria),	Gordon,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Beaty,	Guillet,	Ross,