

so it is with regard to theft. Is such the case in regard to the subject of prohibition? Does not the hon. gentleman know that it is not? If he wishes a measure of prohibition to be practical it must have the sympathy and support of at least a majority of the people in the locality where the law is to be operated, and it is therefore unwise and highly inexpedient in the interests of really genuine temperance legislation to propose a measure with which public opinion does not sympathise and which it will not support. We have on the Statute-book a measure of prohibition. There is nothing to prevent the people from making it law throughout the entire Dominion from one end to the other. If there are defects in this measure let them be pointed out, and they can be corrected, and the people can be given an opportunity of saying whether they will have prohibition or not. Does the hon. gentleman propose to force prohibition down the throats of those opposed to it? Does he suppose such a measure would be operative? Does he not know what is done up the Ottawa just beyond his own constituency, where the Act was carried by a narrow majority, and does he believe that in the large lumbering districts where the vast majority of the men are opposed to prohibition such a measure will be operative? He knows it will not. What the hon. gentleman proposes is merely buncombe, and the reign of buncombe is over; it was a reign of usurpation, and we trust this the last opportunity in which any of its friends will exhibit themselves in this House.

Mr. JAMIESON. As I have a right to reply I will now avail myself of the opportunity to do so. I do not like to appear before the House again so soon, but the conduct of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has been such as to call upon me to reply. If the hon. gentleman had discussed the question on its merits I would not at this stage of the debate have asked the privilege of again speaking in regard to the question before the House. It seems to me that the conduct of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is of a most extraordinary character. He, forsooth, is the great champion of the cause of temperance, at least he was a few days ago in this House when he sought to embarrass not only the Government but the friends of the Government. I am now glad, however, to find that he has shown his hand. I think not only the members of this House but the people of the whole Dominion will appreciate at its true worth the conduct of this new apostle of temperance in Parliament. The hon. gentleman has charged me with bringing up this motion at an inopportune hour. Every hon. member knows that this is the first opportunity I have had since the Session opened to bring this question before the House, and the hon. gentleman ought to remember that this debate will close at six o'clock simply for the purpose of giving the hon. member for Bothwell an opportunity to air his eloquence upon a certain important question. If he considered this question so important as he would indicate by his remarks, let him forego the opportunity of addressing the House to-night on the other question, and let us have this question discussed to the very bottom. I think it is most unfair on the part of the hon. gentleman to attack me for the manner in which this resolution has been brought before the House, because it was utterly out of my power to bring it forward at an earlier period of the Session, or on any other occasion than the present; but I apprehend that if I had refused to avail myself of the opportunity of bringing the question before the House at the present time, the hon. member for Bothwell would have been the first member to have risen and charged me with endeavoring to shirk a duty that had been placed in my hands by the Dominion Alliance. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Canada Temperance Act, which was placed upon the Statute-book by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was at the head of the Government. I am quite pre-

pared to give the Government of that day due credit for anything they did in connection with the temperance question.

Mr. MILLS. But you voted against them all the same.

Mr. JAMIESON. But the principle was admitted before the Canada Temperance Act became the law of this country. In 1864 a Conservative Parliament placed on the Statute-book of the country another measure, the Temperance Act of 1864, which was the first measure ever introduced and placed upon the Statute-book which conceded the principle of local option. Although I am quite prepared to admit that the Canada Temperance Act was an improvement on the old Temperance Act of 1864, still the principle of the two measures was identical, and I do not know that the Government were entitled to so much credit for that measure after all. I will tell the House why. In 1874 the temperance people of the Dominion, representatives from every Province of the Dominion, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario, and I believe Manitoba, met in convention in the city of Montreal in order to devise the best means of promoting the cause of temperance in the Dominion. They passed a resolution giving a committee authority to approach the Government of that day for the purpose of securing a measure under which a popular vote would be taken upon the question. But when the committee reported at a subsequent meeting that was held for the purpose of receiving that report, it was found that the Premier of the Dominion at that time refused to grant what the temperance people asked, a plebiscite on the question, on the ground that there was no constitutional precedent under the British Crown for such a procedure. So that the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did not concede to the temperance people of the Dominion at that time what they asked; they did concede a half-way measure, the Canada Temperance Act, and although we were thankful at the time to get it, still it was not what we asked, and I would prefer to-day to have this question submitted to the popular vote of the Dominion rather than have the question tested by a measure of partial prohibition which necessarily is unsatisfactory as a proper test of the question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has attacked me for the course I pursued two years ago on the motion which he submitted to the House in regard to the reformation in the constitution of the Senate. Allow me for a few minutes to point out the course of the hon. gentleman on that question a few years ago. In 1874, when his friends were in power, he submitted a resolution to the House with the same object in view. Did he pursue the same course as he pursued on the last occasion? Not at all; the circumstances were different, his own friends were in power, and instead of moving his motion as an amendment to go into Committee of Supply, he moved it as a substantive motion. *Hansard* will show that on the last occasion on which that gentleman submitted that motion to this House I rose and said that if the hon. gentleman would place the motion before the House on that occasion in the same manner in which he did on a former occasion, I would support it; but he did not do anything of the kind, because on a former occasion his own friends were in power and he did not want to embarrass them. On this occasion his political opponents were in power and his action was for the purpose of embarrassing them and for nothing else.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman know that the proper time for moving a motion relating to any defect is when going into supply, and it is not regarded as a vote of want of confidence?

Mr. JAMIESON. If it were the proper time to take it up why did not the hon. gentleman, on a former occasion, bring it up in the same way? What is more, Sir, he