

him now state with what authority, that Messrs. Tilley and Foster were in favor of—I do not quote his exact language—but he quoted them as witnesses in favor of adopting the referendum. He produced no proof, and until he does I simply say he was trifling with this House. He also alleged that Sir John Thompson was in favor of the referendum. Fancy the assurance with which this honorable gentleman took upon himself to state to the members of this Legislature and to the province at large that all those leading statesmen were in favor of the doctrine of the referendum, at the same time producing no word of proof of the statement which he made. Then, he actually quotes Sir John Thompson in these words: "I am not submitting, as the honorable gentleman seems to anticipate, that there is any constitutional question involved. Sir John Thompson did not raise constitutional objections. He said: 'I have no doubt we can change and mould our constitution in that respect as we please.' So he had no doubt as to the constitutional process." No, he had no doubt as to the constitutional process, but he did not say a word as to the presence of any constitutionality in the adoption of the referendum without a constitutional process having to be gone through, and more than that Sir John Thompson said:

I feel very confident in the assertion that such a mode of action is utterly repugnant to the constitutional principles we have adopted and followed with zeal down to the present time. (Opposition cheers.)

Then he also claimed the old hero, Sir John Macdonald. Of course Sir John Macdonald cannot come here to reply. My honorable friend said:

Further evidence shows that Sir John Macdonald and Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and all who had any status in Parliament in fact, for the last ten or fifteen years, either by their vote or by their speeches accepted the constitutionality of a referendum.

The old hero has gone; if the honorable gentleman will produce anything to prove his statement he will make his position unassailable with regard to Sir John Macdonald, but I want to read a few words now.

Hon. G. W. Ross—My remarks were based on this. In 1889 when the subject of prohibition was up in the House of Commons there was first a motion by Mr. Jamieson, the then leader of the temperance forces, and there was an amendment by Mr. Wood, of Brockville, and there was an amendment to the amendment by Mr. Taylor, of Leeds, as follows:

That all the words after "purpose" in the original resolution be struck out, and the following substituted: If it be found on a vote of the qualified electors of the Dominion first being taken that a majority thereof are in favor of a prohibition law, it shall also make full provision for compensating those engaged in the manufacture of such liquors!

Sir John Macdonald and Sir Mackenzie Bowell and fifty-six others voted for this resolution. (Government cheers.)

Mr. Whitney—And on that was based the statement with regard to Sir John Macdonald! I do not wonder it was not given to us. I do not wonder that the honorable gentleman did not show to us the foundation upon which he stood in this deliberative assembly for saying that these two men had been in favor of this referendum to which the honorable gentleman wishes to call as supporters all the leading men of the Dominion of Canada.

SIR MACKENZIE BOWELL'S DENIAL

I have some proof here myself and we will see what one of the gentlemen whom he wrongfully accuses has to say with regard to this. (Reads letter from Sir Mackenzie Bowell as follows):

Ottawa, Feb. 20th, 1902.

Dear Mr. Whitney,—Your favor of the 18th only reached me this morning, in which you call my attention to a statement which you say was made by Hon. Mr.