

were such that in their practical operation they would be carried out by the people, that [particular would do much to recommend them in my eyes; but I am satisfied they are too complicated, and require so much legal expense, that this amendment of the hon. member for Rouville would not be acted upon. I am the more satisfied of that, because I find the foes of local option altogether in favor of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has just asked when my hon. friend was converted. We were converted at about the same time as the hon. gentleman was to give his support to the Bill. He is suffering under the keen pangs of remorse. The hon. gentleman is held up in the press to the criticism of his own side, and the Conservative side—he is even shown by his friend, Mr. Bengough, in that great paper, *Grip*, as weeping—over what? Because this Bill was introduced without his assistance, and really it is a good Bill. He did not wish this introduced, nor Parliament to interfere in any way in this matter.

Mr. BLAKE. Nor do I now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did not wish to have any legislation. He has found out that he made a great mistake. Never did a man make so great a political blunder, never did a man show himself so wanting in political sagacity as when, to back up the pretensions of Mr. Mowat, for the mere purpose of backing up his own party in his own Province, he chose to oppose a great measure of reform. He cannot deny it. He is playing the cheap game of patriotism. He does not want a Bill that will redound credit to this House and the Committee, and this measure will redound credit to Parliament. His first speech against the measure showed his true sentiment, and that was to stand by his own party, and his own Province. That was the principle that actuated him, and he now calls us the foes of the temperance cause. Why, I wonder that, notwithstanding all the training and his long experience in Parliament has given him, he would not blush at getting up and throwing that taunt across the floor. A man, who, when he was asked to sit on the Committee declined to go, because he thought that by playing that little game this measure would be thrown over, and he might taunt the Government, as he has tried to do about the Franchise and the Factory Bill, that this was a mere pretence and the Government never intended to carry it out. He kept away and kept his friends away from sitting on that Committee, and now taunts us with not being sincere. The country will know whether we are sincere or not. When the country gets this measure, with or without local option, they will say the Government fulfilled its pledge by bringing down a measure, by taking the best means of getting a good measure, in choosing men of experience in every Province to sit on the Committee, and that we did not desire to get the miserable satisfaction of having it called a mere party measure. On the contrary we invited the hon. leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend from Middlesex, who has been an apostle in the cause, to attend the Committee. We invited the leading members of the Opposition to join in making this a good measure. They stayed away, they would not come, they hoped we would fail, they hoped no measure of this kind would pass; and when they find they are disappointed and that the whole country has declared against them, the hon. gentleman has tried to draw back, to make violent speeches for temperance to make up and atone to the Dominion Alliance, to the Temperance cause in the whole Dominion, for his lack of wisdom, his lack of prevision, his lack of patriotism and his sacrificing the interests of the country and of morality to the miserable spirit of party jealousy.

Mr. BLAKE. Trying to atone to the Dominion Alliance, am I? Has not the gentleman read the resolution of the

Mr. BLAKE.

Dominion Alliance deprecating action of this Parliament on this question?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. It was before any action was taken.

Mr. BLAKE. Deprecating any action, I said, this Session of Parliament, after the Speech from the Throne had been delivered, after the announcement had been made that it was intended action should be taken. Does the hon. gentleman not know, that sitting here under the shadow of this building, that Alliance pronounced itself against interference with Provincial rights? Make atonement to the Dominion Alliance! Whether I act for or against it, in this or in any other question, I have no call to offer an atonement to the Dominion Alliance, or any other body. I have acted throughout on my conviction; and for the hon. gentleman to tell me that I am trying to atone to anybody, or to make up to anybody, when I am simply endeavoring to persuade him to hold fast by all that is good in this Bill! Am I opposed to amending the Act? Am I proposing a change? Am I proposing something different? I say, stick to what is good in the Act. If the country has received his measure in any respect with pleasure or satisfaction, why is it? Has not the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) told him that it has been received upon its merits, as a measure of great merit, and that the clause which has most induced that view is the clause which he proposes to obliterate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the hon. member for King's to speak in that sense, and a good many other gentlemen on this side of the House understood him to speak in that sense.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman is probably right, and the House is right. I did say that amongst all the clauses in the Bill, there was none that called forth a more unanimous acclaim of public approval than the one providing for local option. The hon. gentleman is right so far as that is concerned, but he is not right when he says that the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government has expressed himself as being determined to vote against that principle in this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not at the moment asking the hon. gentleman to vindicate my views of what the First Minister said. I was confining myself to the hon. gentleman's own utterances, and if he will attend to himself, I have no doubt the hon. First Minister will be able to do the same. Now, Sir, we have heard here a discussion of whether I was guilty of an act of unparalleled political stupidity and want of prevision in the course I took at the commencement of this Session. I am inclined to think that, under these circumstances, events will justify me rather than the hon. gentleman. I am inclined to think that what the country will look at is not what the hon. gentleman has proposed, but to what he will do; not what he has brought down, but what he carries, and that the House will look at his action in this light. It must be remembered, in reference to what is called the Scott Act, that it has been found almost impossible to procure the needed amendments to carry that Act into practical execution, and that those who are interested in the Temperance cause were told: "It is dangerous to appeal to Parliament to amend the Scott Act, because you will find that something will happen to destroy it altogether." Something of that nature was tried, and when the amendments came down, there were tacked on to them clauses which would destroy the Scott Act practically. And at this very Session a suggestion was made for amendments to the Scott Act. And the question was whether an attempt should be made to amend it, unless the Government would consent to take the matter in hand, and I believe an appeal