

Marder) attempted to bring this question up by means of a bill the Government opposite, of which the honorable gentleman was, as he is now, a member took steps to again bar the door in the face of the prohibitionists of Ontario, and now after a distinct, specific and clear-cut promise that in the event of the jurisdiction being given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to the Legislature of Ontario to deal with this matter, action would be taken, the Government, instead of carrying out their promises in the simple and frank manner in which they were made, now say: "We will not do so, we will avoid the responsibility ourselves and we will send this bill over to the people" to allow them to say whether they will have it? No, sir, not to allow them to say whether they will have it, but loaded up with conditions and burdens which render it in their view, at any rate, practically impossible that a majority of the people of this province shall be able to say whether or not they are in favor of this measure. I say, Sir, this is not fulfilling the promises which he and his predecessors gave. They did not say anything of the kind that is proposed by this bill; they said they would introduce a bill if jurisdiction were given, they did not say if a bill after passing this House was passed by a majority of the people who voted at the previous elections that then it would become law, but they say now: "You can take it if you can get it, we wash our hands of all responsibility, and we do not propose to help you to get it. Sir, I was very much interested indeed—it is always a matter of interest to listen to the honorable gentleman speaking—and I was very much interested indeed from beginning to end of his speech for various reasons, some of which I have attempted to delineate this afternoon, and one remaining reason to which I desire to call the attention of honorable members. The honorable gentleman, after discussing the question of a two-thirds majority and three-fifths majority, different proposed majorities, looked around this House, sir, with that childlike and bland expression of his and said: "As for me, Mr. Speaker, I have always been in favor of a simple majority"—a simple majority! I will venture to say, sir, that what the honorable gentleman had in mind at that time was not a simple majority, but the simple people whom he thought he would be able to draw away from the actual facts of the simple majority which he was apparently suggesting. (Opposition cheers.) I have already shown you, Mr. Speaker, perhaps at tedious length, that a majority which, under the provisions of this bill, will be necessary in order to pass it upon the referendum vote must be 60,000 at least more than was polled in favor of the prohibition plebiscite a year or more ago. That is indeed the simple majority that is required, and our people will indeed turn out to be a simple people in every sense of the word if that suggestion of the honorable gentleman is taken at the value at which he would desire it to be taken.

#### A LIBERAL VOICE ON THE REFERENDUM.

Now, let me read to you a few words from a newspaper which is a leading organ of the Reform party in the Maritime Provinces, and if I am not mistaken a paper formerly, and perhaps at present, controlled by the Hon. Mr. Fielding—I am not sure of that—the Halifax Chronicle. Its view of the question is one of the many reasons why we, who disagree with the present situation, have reason to congratulate ourselves on finding we are in company with all shades of political and party feeling, not only in the Province of Ontario, but in the Dominion of Canada. What the Chronicle says is:

So far as we are concerned we are entirely without sympathy for either squirming set of paltering politicians. It would rather please us on the whole to see