

public opinion, and they are taking this view. I may refer to another gentleman, and I introduce his name with some hesitancy, because I do not think men of his position like their names to be introduced into parliamentary debate, but he made the statement publicly. I refer to the Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, of Toronto, who expressed his view as being opposed to a prohibitory law as an aid to enforcing temperance. He is a consistent man, who, by his earnest piety and the beauty of his life, is an ornament, not only to his church, to the city where he resides, but to the country, and his view is against these men; yet he is an earnest man, working and devoting his whole life for the good of his kind, a simple, earnest, straightforward Christian, whom all must admire if they cannot agree with him. Far eastward there is a gentleman, some of whose words I read not long since, Rev. Dr. McRae, who takes similar ground. I have already read, to the House an extract from the *Mail*, the best and most influential exponent of public opinion in Ontario. I do not think I am far astray in saying that the most influential organ in the Province of Quebec, if you judge it by the test of the number of its subscribers, is the *Montreal Gazette*, the editor and proprietor of which is a member of this House, and is a consistent temperance man, doing as much and perhaps far more for the promotion of the temperance cause than the hon. members for Annapolis and West Middlesex put together; for while those hon. members may be doing their best according to their lights, yet the influence of the hon. member for Cardwell is wider and larger, and the reasons I have advanced in favor of the passage of the amendment I propose to the Scott Act have been largely taken from arguments adduced by the *Montreal Gazette*. I think I have, perhaps, detained the House longer than I should have done, but I feel rather warmly on this question, being somewhat of an earnest man when I take up anything and desiring to handle it in the best way I can. It does seem a remarkable thing to find a Government calling itself a paternal Government, a Government that brings down its Budget, with large sums to be derived from revenue, and partly derived from taxation on articles of drink—and properly so because, much more than articles of food, they are luxuries—I cannot understand why a Government which derives large revenues from the imposition of customs and excise duties on liquors should allow an Act to remain on the Statute-book which separates the dealers in those commodities from every other class, and renders them liable to the harsh and arbitrary will of men, fanatical in this respect, and not imbued with the principles of fair play and justice, and to be legislated out of their means of livelihood and rights, while, at the same time, the Government derives a large revenue from taxing them. It does not appear to be a fair thing that the Government should allow such an objectionable Act to remain on the Statute book; and the Government ought, and is bound to support such an amendment as I now propose, so that if such a harsh and arbitrary law—a law taking away men's property, and depriving them of the means of living—is to be put to the test, it should be passed with the sanction of a full majority of those in whose power it is to give it effect.

Mr. MILLS. Why not tax their industries, when you support others by protection?

Mr. BOULTBEE. The hon. member for Bothwell is a publicist and a metaphysician, and I am sometimes unable to comprehend him, and in the present case I cannot see the pertinency of his remark to the present discussion. Of course, it is owing to my stupidity in not being able always to comprehend his remarks. I dare say the hon. gentleman experiences some pricking of conscience for having assisted in the passing of the Scott Act, when, perhaps, he thought he was aiding the cause of temperance, while he failed to look sufficiently far to see the gross injustice to people whom, as Mr. BOULTBEE.

the member of a Government, he was bound to protect. Mr. Speaker, I have placed this matter before the House in as brief a form as possible, and all I hope is that as the debate rolls on, and my remarks will be answered, the House will not be troubled with long lectures on temperance which are not appropriate. No one can deplore the evils of intemperance more than I deplore them. The issue involved in the passage of this Bill, or its defeat, is this—is it desirable that a law like the Scott Act should have effect unless it is shown to have the approval of a full majority of those who are entitled to vote on it? That is the only question at issue. It is not a question of temperance. The question is whether granting that it is a law which it is well to try in order to see whether it will have beneficial results, is it desirable that this sumptuary law, affecting the privileges of the people, confiscating men's property, and restricting their liberty, should be carried into effect unless public sentiment is in its favor to such an extent that its advocates succeed in obtaining the support of a majority of those entitled to vote for its affirmation or rejection.

Mr. OGDEN. I feel it to be my duty to offer a few remarks on this important question now before the House. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) has made a very lengthy and laborious speech. He has evidently accomplished his purpose; he thinks he has performed his duties to his friends, but he has also accomplished this: if there are any hon. members who have been halting between two opinions, I think after listening to the speech of the hon. gentleman they will have become thoroughly convinced that his Bill must be voted down. I sympathize with him very much. I wonder if the hon. gentleman would like his Bill to be judged by the same tribunal which he wishes the temperance question to be judged by. Is he willing that his Bill shall not pass unless it receives the votes of a majority of the members of this House, whether present or absent? For my part I have the honor of representing a temperance constituency where not one drop of liquor is sold, unless it is sold in violation of the law, and that without the Scott Act being in force. I shall feel it my duty to sustain the law as it now stands, because I think it is nothing more than right that it should have a fair trial, and I beg to move in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am exceedingly glad that my hon. friend has proposed that amendment. I had intended to move such an amendment myself, in the full confidence that it would meet with the approval of the majority of this House. I have listened with very great interest to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Boulton), while he attempted to give reasons why his Bill should be sustained by the votes of the members of this House. I have, on a former occasion—last year, I think—opposed an amendment in similar terms to that contained in the Bill of the hon. member. I have on former occasions in this House, advocated what I believed to be those temperance principles which, when applied and sustained by law, would promote the well-being of this country; and in doing so, I thought I was allying myself with a body of respectable, influential and useful men. I had no hesitation in casting in whatever little influence I had with the temperance men of this country, without fear, that by so doing I would lower my position in society or materially destroy my own usefulness, and I was surprised to learn from the hon. member for East York that in allying myself with the temperance men I was allying myself with those who were "laboring to destroy their neighbors," men who "outraged every law, human and divine," men who were "besotted in brain," men who were "intemperate," men who were "working for hire," men who "could not control their passions," men "without common sense, common honesty, or common judgment" and "fanatics." I