

names on the voters' lists. What does that mean? It means, in the first place, that the man who comes up and votes for the Temperance Act of 1878, under his Bill, if it passed, will have no more influence than a dead man in the village churchyard; in the second place, the man who is at his post of duty and votes for the Temperance Act of 1878, has no more influence than a man who may be in Tasmania; further, the man who may have his name entered on the voters' list five or ten times, as is frequently the case in Ontario, may vote once for the Act, and nine times against it, contrary to his own will. Is that the honest legislation we are going to get from my hon. friend? We are charged with being deficient in common sense. Is that a proof of common sense? We are charged with being deficient in common judgment. Is that a proof of the supreme wisdom of my hon. friend? Is it common honesty? If my hon. friend can point me a clause in the Temperance Act of 1878 that has the stamp of dishonesty so clearly on its face as that simple statement in his own little Bill has, I will abandon the Act altogether. I give him all the liberty he may want in the advocacy of his side of the question. Would it not be an outrage on common decency—I use the words of the hon. member who introduced the Bill—for Parliament to place on the Statute-book a Bill by which a living man would have no more weight than a dead man in the councils of his country—by which a man living in the Dominion, discharging his duty to his country and Queen, would have no more weight than a man wandering in a foreign land? Would it not be disgraceful to all common decency, not to say to all common sense, that a man should be compelled by a Statute of Parliament to vote nine times against himself when he was endeavoring to enforce his opinions by his action at the polls? I hope my hon. friend will reconsider another point in his Bill. But let me first say that we have various grievances of a local character. Take the case of a constituency in the Maritime Provinces, where a number of electors may be at sea—in that case, what would be the result? Every man thus providing for his livelihood would be counted as voting against the Act of 1878, no matter what his opinion on the subject. We understand, and I think the House and country have understood, that the principle upon which our legislation is founded—by which the affairs of this country are governed municipally as well as by Parliament—is the general, broad principle that the majority must govern. Why has my hon. friend opposite sought such a principle as that? It is because he was in search of some respectable authority by which he might sustain the position he intended to take? It is because he was afraid that, without the precedent of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, he would find no person in the House to consider his proposition? While finding that, the precedent in reference to a railway bonus by-law, he might find hundreds of precedents in regard to the policy of government by the majority. Look at the excellent school system of Ontario. How is that managed? Is it by the principle of the hon. gentleman's Bill? No; but by the principle of the rule of the majority. Why did he not quote that instance? Look at our municipal or parliamentary system, and what do we find? We find these systems are founded in the broad principle that the majority must rule. I contend that, under the circumstances, it is safer, more honest, more convenient, that in this, as in other legislation, we should follow some broad principle. Or, if you consider the importance of the matter to be adjudicated upon, I contend that the principle of the majority should apply. How are we governed in this House? How did we dispose of vast interests in this House a short time ago? How do we dispose of all great affairs but on the principle of the majority? No matter how important temperance legislation may be, it will not be contended it is more important than that carried on in this House. If it be confessed that it is

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

not, nor more important than the legislation of the great parliamentary assemblies of the Kingdoms of Europe, then let us honestly apply to this question, important as I believe it is, only the same broad principle which is applied to legislation in other cases. But if we apply to my hon. friend's own election, for instance, the principle of his own Bill, how would he stand? I find in the East Riding of York there were at the last election 4,774 voters, of which the hon. member polled but 1,526, or thirty-four per cent. Well, if his principle were applied to his own case, where would he stand? He would not be here. We should not see his manly form or hear his melodious voice. Elsewhere my hon. friend would be, no doubt standing up for the same great principle of legislation; perhaps, were he inside this House, he would be contending for the right of being elected by a minority of the total vote, the only chance, perhaps, he might have of being elected under any circumstances. Let us apply this rule to the case of other hon. gentlemen in this House, and what do we find? If we applied it to those hon. gentlemen in front of you, Mr. Speaker, everyone of us would have to leave the House but the hon. leader of the Government and my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. There are only two members in this House to-day who were elected by a majority of the voters in their respective constituencies; and only two other cases where the gentlemen were elected by forty-nine per cent. of the electors; and besides them, every other hon. gentleman in the House was elected by less than forty per cent. of the electoral vote of his constituency, except the hon. member for Prince Edward, who was elected by forty-one per cent. Now, if the principle is good as applied to the Temperance Act of 1878, let us have it of general application, and in the vote we are shortly to give in regard to the proposed destruction of the Temperance Act of 1878, let my hon. friend who introduced the Bill accept the effects of his own medicine, and agree as an amendment to the Bill he now proposes, that no amendment should take effect unless carried by a majority of the Commons. But he says, further, that he is acting in the interest of the temperance cause. Well, I ask for his credentials. I want to know what temperance organization has sanctioned his course? Why, the Dominion Alliance, the other day, in this city, at its annual meeting, passed a resolution protesting against the passage of what it calls the Boulton amendment, which he has introduced in this House. He has not the sanction of that representative body that has spread its organization from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island. The Sons of Temperance, an organization representing over 30,000 members in the Dominion, at their gathering passed a resolution, after the amendment of last year was introduced in this House, protesting against its ratification by Parliament. The Independent Order of Good Templars, representing, perhaps, a larger membership, passed a similar resolution. I do not know, then, by whom the hon. gentleman is accredited. I do not know how he stands on the floor of the House to claim to speak for the temperance men of Canada. But what do we find besides? We find that the Canada Methodists, at their last General Conference, passed a resolution protesting against the adoption of the amendment he has now proposed. In the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and at the annual meeting of the Baptist denomination of Canada, similar resolutions were passed. Wherever men have spoken out their views in regard to the temperance question, they have protested against the proposition of my hon. friend from East York, and yet he pretends here to speak for the temperance men of Canada. We have evidence that the Temperance Act of 1878 is reasonably acceptable to the people of the country. True, it has only been adopted and retained by one county in Ontario, but there is to be a vote within a few days in Hamilton, in the county of Wentworth, and in Halton. It has been adopted