

down. Then, when the hon. gentleman saw that the Senate was opposed to his measure, and when he saw that a majority of the Senate held those views, and we proposed that the Government, who can control the Senate, that exercises a potent influence over the Senate, should assume the responsibility of those amendments to the Canada Temperance Act, and there was a chance, not only of carrying them through this House, if the hon. gentleman had been in favor of it, but there was also a chance, upon that line, of carrying them in the Senate—did the hon. gentleman support my proposition? No, Sir, he voted it down. And when last year the hon. gentleman had a motion upon the paper, and it was proposed to put it upon the Government Orders so as to give an opportunity for legislation of the sort desired, what did the hon. gentleman do? Why, Sir, he assured hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that he did not want to put it upon the Government Orders, that he was a Government supporter first, and a temperance man afterwards.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. gentleman is stating what is not true—if I may so so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did the hon. gentleman appear in his place.

Mr. JAMIESON. Whoever said that in reference to my conduct last year, said what was not true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I put this question to the hon. gentleman: Did he not know there was a proposal to be made to put his motion upon the Government Orders so that there would be an opportunity of reaching it?

Mr. JAMIESON. I will explain to the hon. gentleman, if he will permit me. There was some conversation in reference to that matter, and the friends of prohibition on both sides of the House were called together and the matter was submitted to them, and they decided not to force the question in the manner indicated by the hon. gentleman, and I submitted to the action of that meeting.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who were at the meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. The member for Broome (Mr. Fisher) was one; there were about a dozen at the meeting, representing both parties in this House, all temperance men. I may say that I never saw the hon. member for Bothwell, (Mr. Mills) at any meeting or on any occasion when it was necessary to advocate temperance in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not undertake to prostitute my position as a member of Parliament by doing what the hon. gentleman has done in this House upon that question; I did not profess to support a motion that I took the earliest opportunity of opposing afterwards—that is what the hon. gentleman has done. I do not profess to give an opportunity to the Government to put it out of my power to put a motion that I desire to make, or to decline to allow a motion to be put upon the paper along with Government Orders. That is what the hon. gentleman did on that occasion last year.

Mr. JAMIESON. I deny it again, and I insist that the hon. member for Bothwell is wrong in the statement he is making with reference to my conduct last year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, Sir, we know the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JAMIESON. The House will remember that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the present constitution of the Senate, and on entering the Government, for five long years, he never did anything towards reforming that body.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says he never saw me at one of those temperance meetings.

Mr. JAMIESON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, Sir; he did not. But I happened to be a member of a Government that assumed

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

the responsibility of putting the only measure upon the Statute-book on this subject that is to be found since the Union, and Sir, we did not receive the support of the hon. gentleman in that undertaking, we did not receive the support of the hon. gentleman's political allies in that undertaking. I remember, Sir, that there was a prominent temperance man, a member of the Government, that preceded us in office, the late Finance Minister, the Hon. Mr. Tilley; I remember that he was seven years a member of the Government, and never proposed legislation on the subject. I remember that the moment the Hon. Mr. Tilley returned to office, the political associates of the hon. gentleman, and some of those who pose as temperance men with him, met Mr. Tilley here and complimented him upon the progress of the temperance work—not work that had been done by Mr. Tilley, or through his instrumentality, because it was done by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Did they thank my hon. friend for East York for what he did, for the sacrifices which he made, the opposition which he incurred? No, Sir, nothing of the sort was done. Why, Sir, it is well known that the hon. member and the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) hunt in couples. The hon. member for South Lanark appears here as an opponent of temperance, and receives the support of the hon. member for North Lanark, (Mr. Jamieson), who is the advocate *par excellence* of temperance; and so the one secures the liquor support for the temperance candidate, and the other secures temperance support for the liquor candidate; and we have the temperance candidate for North Lanark and the anti temperance candidate for South Lanark. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman will find that that policy is pretty nearly played out in this House, and he will find that it is very nearly played out in the country. The hon. gentleman has appeared for two or three Sessions as a legislator in favor of temperance; but he has, instead, been its impeder, he has stood in the way of legislation. The hon. gentleman forced himself to the front in undertaking to amend a measure put upon the Statute-book by a Government that the hon. gentleman has always opposed, while the hon. gentleman never dared to ask the men who sit on the Treasury benches, whom he hourly supports, to take up this question and to amend a measure which a former Government put upon the Statute-book. Sir, that is the position of the hon. gentleman. And the public will thoroughly understand it. What does the hon. gentleman do now? He brings up his measure within one hour of the adjournment when he knows that another subject is to be taken up after recess, and that in all probability his motion will not be reached again this Session. He has taken precious good care not to permit this measure to occupy a foremost place in the notices of motion; he took precious good care last year that his motion should not occupy a foremost place, and the result was that last year his motion was never reached, and a vote was never taken on it, and so seeing how eminently successful he was last year in preventing legislation of a practical character, giving the people an opportunity of acting in accordance with their moral conviction, he comes here now, and leaves the measure proposing to amend the law—it has not yet been reached or dealt with—and he proposes to take up an abstract resolution which may secure him certain temperance support in his constituency by those who do not take the trouble to ascertain exactly how the business of the House is conducted. I think the hon. gentleman has succeeded eminently well in showing exactly where he stands upon the temperance question. He has said that he is ready to support a measure of prohibition. He proposes to ask the House to vote on the subject of prohibition—certainly he does. He says that when the people favor a measure we place it on the Statute-book. So we do. When men are guilty of forgery the public are ready to punish them, and