

single exception of Quebec, gave large majorities in its favour and even with the adverse vote of Quebec there was some 14,000 of a majority in its favour. Is the rule now going to be laid down that on a question submitted to the popular vote, the minority is going to rule? There were 129 constituencies which gave majorities in favour of prohibition, and 84 constituencies gave majorities against it, or a clear majority of 45 constituencies in its favour, a larger majority than this Government had when they came into power in 1896; but still they did not hesitate to take office, because every province in the Dominion did not give them a majority, nor did they take into consideration the unpolled vote. Toronto gave a large majority against prohibition, but Ontario in which province Toronto is located, rolled up a large majority in its favour. In granting provincial prohibition to Ontario, therefore, would you not be perfectly justified in coercing Toronto, as hon. gentlemen are pleased to call it, and require that city to conform to the wishes of the majority? So would it be wiser and more reasonable to carry out the wishes of the majority including Quebec, or to allow the minority, the adverse vote of one province to dictate the policy to the greater number. But there is more than a suspicion that the reputed vote of the province of Quebec is not a fair index of the views of the people in that province, that in fact the "machine" got in its work by the stuffing of ballot-boxes, and the length of time it took to obtain correct returns from that province, 40,000 of a majority against being reported the day after the vote which had increased to over 90,000 in a couple of weeks' time. That coupled with other suspicious circumstances and charges that have been made lends great colour to the suggestion of an improper vote. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) a few moments ago referred to the returns from some polling places in Algoma, and to the returns from some other places as evidence that the prohibitionists had stuffed the ballots because more votes were polled than appeared on the list, in refutation of the charge made by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore), that ballots were stuffed in Quebec by the opponents of prohibition. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in Algoma he was dealing with the polls in unorganized districts. In some of these districts that he has referred to a local election to the Ontario legislature was recently held, and we find that in one polling subdivision, the Empress Mine B, 12 votes were polled for the Conservative candidate, and 4 for the Liberal candidate, 16 votes in all, when there is not a single vote appearing on the list. At Oliver, 10 A polling subdivision, 4 Conservative votes were cast, 14 Liberal votes, making a total of 18 votes, when there was not a single vote upon the list. At Saw Bill, 16 A, 23 votes were polled for the Liberal

Mr. ROCHE.

candidate and there was not a vote on the list at all. At Ignace, 17 A, 8 votes were polled for the Liberal candidate and there were no votes on the list. In each of these cases that have been quoted by the hon. member for Labelle as evidence that the prohibitionists had been ballot-stuffing the polls were in unorganized municipalities and there were no lists whatever. No better evidence of the hypocrisy of the Government on this question is required or the duplicity practised on the people, than the spectacle of three Cabinet Ministers stumping the country against a policy that was made a principal plank in their own party platform, and declaring in advance of the vote that the temperance people were getting the plebiscite but that was all they would get, and even in granting that they said their party had made a huge mistake.

Surely that fact alone should be sufficient to disillusionize those temperance people who had faith in the promises of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture, and should convince them of the palpable manner in which they have been duped.

Now this resolution provides that before prohibition can be put into effect in any province, another provincial plebiscite must be taken, and taken only at the time for the holding of a general election for the House of Commons. What a farce that is, to be sure; have we not already had two plebiscites taken in the most of the provinces of the Dominion, one in favour of provincial, and the other for national prohibition? And what nonsense it is, and how superfluous to demand another vote on a question in which the wishes of the people are so well known. In my opinion this is merely meant to secure delay to allow the Government time to extricate themselves from the embarrassing position they have through, their own duplicity got themselves into. Knowing that a vote can only be taken once in five years, if this resolution becomes law they see an opportunity to put off as far as possible any action on the question and hope, like Dicken's Micawber, that something may turn up to relieve them of dealing with it at all. Almost every temperance organization of the country have condemned the inaction of the Government, and denounced this breach of faith with the temperance people, many of whom gave their votes to the party now in power on the strength of their temperance pledges. It was not the temperance people who asked for the plebiscite, the major portion of them considered it entirely unnecessary, expensive, and uncalled for. It was merely gotten up by the Liberal party as a campaign cry to draw a certain element of the voting population to their side, while at the same time they had not the slightest intention, no matter how large a majority was polled in favour of prohibition, to introduce and pass a prohibitory measure.

They had been so long in opposition and