

whether anybody ever disputed with him about it, but his remarks have no possible application to this bill for the reasons which I have given, and for reasons which perhaps I may dilate upon at greater length later on. Let us see, too, what the honorable gentleman will make out of the speech or remarks uttered by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. My honorable friend, after quoting Chief Justice Cooley, and these other citations, which have no bearing whatever upon the question, also stated that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie used this language, and I have no doubt he did use the language, but I want to read it: "I have always taken the ground that until public sentiment has reached such an advanced stage of maturity that we would be quite certain of a very large majority in favor of such a measure, it would be unwise and impolitic to attempt to enforce a total prohibition of the liquor traffic." Who disputes it? I do not, Mr. Speaker. Well, my honorable friend goes on to comment on this, and then quotes Senator Vidal, also Senator Aikins on this question, but he does not say one word as coming from these gentlemen, because he could not utter such a word in favor of a referendum at all, or in favor of such a referendum as is proposed here. Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and the other distinguished men alluded to did not, as he endeavored to have honorable gentlemen believe, express one word in favor of the idea of adopting the referendum.

SIR W. R. MEREDITH QUOTED.

Then, it was amusing to listen to my honorable friend. I have been in this House fourteen years, and it was the first time I ever heard one word uttered by the honorable gentleman except in condemnation of Sir William Meredith, but it does seem to me that my honorable friend will not get very much from the reference he has made to that distinguished gentleman. It is our experience, and has been our experience in this House that honorable members should never be surprised at anything the honorable gentleman does, and not very much at anything he may say, but to think he should be so far driven to a corner as to find himself compelled, and he must have found himself so or he would not have done what he did, to quote Sir William Meredith's remarks made during a political speech at London, and also the remarks of Mr. John J. MacLaren in support of the constitutionality of this act! Mr. John J. MacLaren is a reputable member of the legal profession and all that sort of thing, but I ask, honorable gentlemen, whether it would have occurred to anybody else in the City of Toronto, or in the Province of Ontario, but the Premier of Ontario, to quote him as an authority on any constitutional question, and outside of a matter of interest to the political parties of the Province of Ontario? (Opposition cheers.) It is not the first time that the honorable gentleman has gone to Conservative sources for the inspiration which guided him with reference to his public conduct, it is not the first time that doctrine has been borrowed from Conservative sources in order to bolster up and reinvigorate the tottering and dying party which he is leading still. (Opposition cheers.) In 1884, I think it was, it was before I came here, the same distinguished man, Sir William Meredith, introduced a bill into this House providing for the establishment of manhood suffrage in the Province of Ontario, and this gentleman who valued his opinion so highly to-day stood up in his place and voted down this proposition of the distinguished gentleman, Sir William Meredith. They waited three years and then they adopted the principle advocated by Sir William Meredith, and to-day it is the law of the land, like many other questions which have come from the Conservative party in this House, and have not been acknowledged—like the position taken by the Great Reform Party of the Dominion of Canada which has swallowed holus bolus the National Policy and Protective Tariff, and feels very comfortable after the dose