

sing it from a broad, national point of view, from an Ontario point of view, or from a party point of view? (Government cheers.) Was the partyism on the Government side of the House only? He did not think he was doing hon. gentlemen an injustice in saying that the bitter things which have been uttered by them have been largely because they feel that the position in which they are going to be placed will not favor them so much from a party point of view. (Cheers.) He denied that the Government had backed down on the question; they occupied the same position now as they did when the House was called; there had never been but one bill drawn, and that is the bill which will be presented as soon as the debate closes. In the memorandum which was distributed before the House met the clause appeared: "It appears, therefore, to the undersigned, that the Legislature should be asked to deal with the question in such a way as to it may seem reasonable and just." The Government had offered to bring down the bill a few days ago in order that hon. gentlemen might see how it was framed. (Cheers.) The policy of the Government would, he was satisfied, commend itself to the good sense of the House, and he had not seen a single Liberal that had offered the slightest objection to the bill or the policy embraced in it. The party, he declared, is a unit upon the propriety of some legislation upon this question. His hon. friend from East Hamilton had lectured them, and spoken of hon. members on the Government side as grovelling, cringing and begging for certain things from the Government. He had never during the time he had occupied a seat in the House known of any hon. member cringing before the Government; it was not the character of Liberals to do so—(cheers)—and it was not the policy of the Liberal party to require it. They had heard a great deal this session about the result of the last election and he congratulated the leader of the Opposition upon the increase in the number of his supporters, but he pointed out that his majority was not growing, as they were now where they were twenty-five years ago, and he gave them as an arithmetical problem to work out, if they had made no progress in that period, how long would it take them to obtain control of a majority? (Cheers.) Hon. gentlemen had without success adopted as many policies as there are points in the sailor's compass; they had appealed to every faction above ground and below—(laughter)—but they were now precisely where they stood twenty-five years ago. The Government have a majority of seven, the sacred number, a solid vote, in which the Opposition can make no inroads.

#### The Liberal Plurality.

Continuing, Mr. Ross said that Conservatives were not sent to the Legislature by a majority of the electors of Stormont; it was rather the result of a triangular fight. Glengarry, Centre Simcoe, South Grey, Prince Edward County, North Wentworth and others

did not send Conservatives there because of Conservative majorities, but because of local jealousies and differences. There they had six seats, or twelve on a division. The majorities of the whole Province were 30,000, or an average of 326 to each member of the House. The Liberal plurality was 7,000. That plurality, if based on the average of 326 to each member, would give an actual majority of 21 members. (Liberal applause.) They ought to have had that majority. That was not their strength now, but it might be before the Parliament closed. Mr. Whitney had said the lumbermen were against him. Was that the case in Nipissing, Muskoka, East Simcoe, North Ontario, North Renfrew and West Hastings? Mr. Ross did not believe that the lumbermen were arrayed on either side. Then Mr. Whitney had charged that the Ottawa Government had throttled the liquor vote in the interests of the Liberal party in the Province of Ontario. How about Mr. Corby, the distiller of Central Ontario? Was he not Chairman of a Conservative committee to look after several constituencies, and a most active worker and canvasser, and gave his personal attention for days and weeks of the campaign in order to promote the success of the candidate of the hon. gentlemen opposite? And how about Mr. Seagram, the prominent distiller of Waterloo?

Mr. Kribs—He did not need to step into South Waterloo.

Mr. Ross—He did not need to; no, my hon. friend was there. (Laughter.) Continuing, Mr. Ross said that the Conservatives attempted to show that the whole liquor interests were used to promote the return of the Liberal party, and then, per contra, the statement was made that the same party had got the temperance vote—the machine temperance vote, it had been called.

Mr. Whitney explained that the Liberals had had the support of that portion of the temperance party which was the machine vote.

What did he mean by that? Mr. Ross inquired. Who was to know upon whom Mr. Whitney reflected? Where was the machine temperance vote? What was the evidence that there was a machine? Did they mean the Templars, the Sons of Temperance, the W. C. T. U. or any other of the various temperance bodies?

Mr. Whitney—None of them.

Mr. Ross asked if his hon. friend had any reason to apply the term to any portion of the temperance body of the Province. He had no need to descend to the use of such strong adjectives to fortify his position. There was no temperance machine under the control of the Government or under any other control—(applause)—and when Mr. Whitney alleged such he scandalized a very useful section of the community—men who had the right to vote for or against the Government, just as they pleased. (Applause.)

His hon. friend objected to a meeting at Ottawa, at which Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Richard Cartwright and others were present with Mr. Hardy. Mr. Ross reminded him of a meeting of the Conservative Association at Toronto, at which Sir Charles Tupper was elected President and Mr. Whitney First Vice-